

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**
SIXTH SESSION

Official Records

DOCUMENTS
INDEX UNIT

20 FEB 1952



SECOND COMMITTEE 187th

MEETING

Friday, 18 January 1952, at 3 p.m.

Palais de Chaillot, Paris

CONTENTS

Page

Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapter II) (A/1884, A/C.2/L.134 and Rev.1, A/C.2/L.135, A/C.2/L.137, A/C.2/L.140, A/C.2/L.141, A/C.2/L.143/Rev.1, A/C.2/L.144, A/C.2/L.145, A/C.2/L.146, A/C.2/L.147 and A/C.2/L.148) (continued)..... 259

Chairman : Prince WAN WAITHAYAKON (Thailand).

**Report of the Economic and Social Council
(chapter II) (A/1184,¹ A/C.2/L.134 and Rev.1,
A/C.2/L.135, A/C.2/L.137, A/C.2/L.140, A/C.2/
L.141, A/C.2/L.143/Rev.1, A/C.2/L.144, A/C.2/
L.145, A/C.2/L.146, A/C.2/L.147 and A/C.2/
L.148) (continued)**

[Item 11]*

DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY CUBA (A/C.2/L.141)

1. Mr. MARINO PEREZ (Cuba) thought that as the general aim of his delegation's draft resolution was quite clear and explicit, it would serve no purpose to speak about it in detail until he had heard the comments of other members of the Committee. He added that it had not been submitted with reference to current difficulties in the production and sale of the main primary products in world markets. Generally speaking, the position with regard to primary products in his opinion, was satisfactory. The purpose of the resolution was rather to safeguard such commodities against possible future difficulties and the Cuban delegation did not think that such difficulties were likely to arise for a large number or different products at the same time; it thought that the guarantee referred to in the resolution would only be necessary from time to time for a particular product or products and that therefore it would be practicable and feasible to provide for such a guarantee in such circumstances only.

2. It had been suggested to him unofficially that it might be better for the Committee not to discuss the substance of the question referred to in the resolution at the present time but to refer it to the Economic and Social Council for consideration at the appropriate point in its proceedings.

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

* Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.

3. If the Committee shared that view, the Cuban delegation would agree to such a procedure without discussion.

4. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) said the Cuban draft resolution was of great interest. His delegation, however, would prefer not to discuss it at present since it dealt in great detail with technical solutions to the problem considered, which appeared to be a matter for the Council rather than the Committee, and since it was based on a recently published experts' report on *Measures for International Economic Stability*² which delegations had not yet had time to study. He therefore formally proposed that the Cuban draft resolution should be submitted to the Economic and Social Council for study at its next session in connexion with the relevant item on its agenda.

5. The CHAIRMAN thanked the Cuban representative for the spirit of co-operation he had shown and said that, in accordance with the Chilean representative's suggestion, the Rapporteur's report would indicate that the Secretary-General would submit the Cuban draft resolution for the consideration of the Economic and Social Council at its fourteenth session when it would deal with the question of full employment, so that the Council might study it at that time.

**DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY THE PHILIPPINES
(A/C.2/L.140)**

6. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) wished to raise a point of order in connexion with the Philippine draft resolution. The draft resolution dealt with the Council's decision to discontinue the Economic, Employment and Development Commission, a decision which was reported in the section dealing with the organization and operation of the Council and its commissions, in chapter 1 of the Council's report, which was to be discussed by the Joint Second and Third Committee. He therefore felt

² United Nations Publications, Sales No : 1951.II.A.2.

that it would entail duplication of work if the Second Committee were to discuss that draft resolution. He rather felt that the Joint Second and Third Committee would be in a better position to consider the draft resolution of the Philippines in relation to the Council's decisions on the other functional commissions of the Council. He therefore urged the Philippine representative to agree that his draft should be transmitted to the joint Second and Third Committee for study in connexion with its consideration of chapter 1 of the Council's report.

7. Mr. GARCIA (Philippines), said that the question raised by his draft resolution was purely economic, and that was why it had been brought before the Second Committee. But his delegation had no strong feeling on the matter and, if the Committee felt the draft resolution could be more appropriately discussed by the Joint Second and Third Committee, he would not oppose that procedure.

8. There being no objection, the CHAIRMAN announced that the Philippine draft resolution (A/C.2/L.140) would be transmitted to the Joint Second and Third Committee.

REVISED DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY YUGOSLAVIA
(A/C.2/L.143/Rev.1)

9. Mr. MATES (Yugoslavia) said that since his delegation's draft resolution had already been presented in the general debate, he would merely draw attention to the revisions made in document A/C.2/L.143/Rev.1 to the original text. The revised draft did not introduce any change of principle.

10. The alterations in paragraphs 1, 2 and 6 were purely formal.

11. Paragraph 5 had been rendered more explicit as regards improvement of the data collected by the Secretariat, while leaving it open to the Council to decide on the procedure it would adopt. His delegation wished to ensure an improvement in statistical methods and techniques so that the data collected might be strictly comparable and could be used for studies and analyses.

12. Paragraph 7 was based on Article 102 of the Charter. The appeal to Member States had been restricted to treaties and agreements relating to economic relations, since that was the Committee's sphere of activity, but he hoped that the last words of the paragraph "in compliance with the general obligation under Article 102 of the Charter" would be sufficient to avert any suggestion that the General Assembly was differentiating between the obligation with regard to economic treaties and treaties on other matters. The paragraph had been inserted because his delegation felt that international economic agreements provided an important source of information.

13. In the course of the discussion it had frequently been deplored that the comments of some delegations were based on valueless or inaccurate data. The provision of complete factual information on economic conditions and living standards would therefore facilitate the task of all who wished to give serious study to the problem of international economic relationships. The Secretariat had already provided a number of excellent studies and even better results could be expected in future if it was enabled by governments to base its studies on a wider range of data. Therefore, while

repeating the general appeal for the raising of standards of living, the draft resolution at the same time tried to organize the United Nations work in that field in such a way that it might be based on a solid knowledge of the facts.

14. He hoped the Committee would support the draft resolution.

15. Mr. NARIELWALA (India) asked the Yugoslav representative for clarification of the words "working population" in paragraph 1 of his draft resolution. He thought the standard of living of the population as a whole was important and not only of the "working population".

16. His delegation felt that paragraph 7 of the draft resolution might have been useful, if it had been discussed in connexion with the resolution on "Integrated economic development and commercial agreements" recently adopted by the Committee (175th meeting) and by the General Assembly (A/2052, resolution VI). It was, however, out of place in a draft resolution which was not specifically concerned with treaties or agreements; he could not therefore support its conclusion and requested that the paragraph should be put to the vote separately.

17. Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) agreed with the representative of India that it was the function of governments to take an interest in the standard of living of the whole population, including retired workers and children. He therefore proposed that paragraph 1 of the draft resolution should be amended so as to refer to the living standards of the whole population.

18. Mr. ORMSBY-GORE (United Kingdom) associated himself with the Indian representative's remarks regarding paragraph 7 of the draft resolution. The United Kingdom had always supported the principle of the registration of treaties, but there were certain objections to the inclusion of the paragraph in the draft resolution under consideration. In the past, when an item on the registration of treaties had been on the Assembly's agenda, it had been quite correctly referred to the Sixth Committee. There was no such item on the Assembly's agenda at the current session and he did not think the Second Committee should become involved in a discussion of it. Moreover, any limited restatement of the Articles of the Charter as of any international convention, was bound to be unsatisfactory.

19. Mr. MARINO PEREZ (Cuba) suggested that the United Nations should obtain more adequate information on factors which might adversely affect living standards than that which would be provided in response to the draft resolution. He proposed the addition of a phrase at the end of paragraph 6 mentioning the problem of disequilibrium in the balance of payments of certain countries, which was one of the important factors influencing standards of living.

20. Mr. MATES (Yugoslavia) answering the Indian representative's question, said that in the mind of his delegation the term "working population" included all people who earned their living by their work, whether manual or intellectual; it implicitly also included dependents and retired workers which were a section of the working population.

21. Mr. JACOME (Ecuador) said the sense attached to the term "working population" had been unduly limited in political circles by the opposition of the working class to other classes. He therefore suggested that difficulties in terminology might be overcome if the Yugoslav draft resolution referred to the general living standards of the population.
22. Mr. DE SMET (Belgium) said his delegation felt that paragraph 3 of the Yugoslav draft resolution contained an interpretation of the Charter which was not within the competence of the Committee.
23. He supported the amendment proposed by the United States representative to paragraph 1.
24. He associated himself with the United Kingdom representative's remarks on paragraph 7. His delegation would rather see that paragraph eliminated; in any case it would accept it only if it repeated the exact terms of the Charter.
25. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) said that his delegation was in agreement in principle with the Yugoslav draft resolution and considered that there was no room for reasonable doubt as to the interpretation of the term "working population".
26. In the past, the General Assembly had adopted recommendations aimed at maintaining the general standards of living of the population. The Yugoslav delegation was, in that instance, calling attention to the responsibilities of governments towards the needier sectors of the population on whom the burden of the restrictions imposed as a result of existing world tension fell most heavily. In his view, it would be impolitic to alter the phraseology of paragraph 1 of the Yugoslav draft resolution, since it had been chosen in order to reflect most accurately the purposes of the draft resolution. Such a change would moreover be particularly undesirable in view of the draft resolution submitted by the Czechoslovak delegation on the deterioration of the position of the working population as a result of the armaments race in a number of countries (A/C.2/L.135).
27. It was an undeniable fact that the cost of meeting defence needs affected most adversely the lower-income groups, particularly in the under-developed countries. Acceptance of that fact did not imply recognition that that was due to the pursuance of an aggressive policy and his delegation fully associated itself with the view that measures for collective security were essential. To reject the Czechoslovak draft resolution on the basis that its propaganda aims were unacceptable, without adopting a draft resolution of the nature of the Yugoslav draft resolution expressing the need for maintaining the standards of living of the working population, might give rise to assertions that the interests of the working population were being overlooked.
28. In order to prevent certain countries from exploiting the rejection of the Czechoslovak draft resolution for their own ends, he would suggest that the constructive considerations contained therein, as distinct from political expressions, should be incorporated in the Yugoslav draft resolution; his delegation wished to submit amendments to that effect (A/C.2/L.147).
29. It should constantly be borne in mind that the raising and maintenance of standards of living were essential for collective security, since they resulted in a material and moral strengthening of the home fronts.
30. Mr. LIMA (Brazil) said that, if he had been present, he would have voted in favour of the draft resolution submitted by the Burmese delegation on the regional economic commissions (A/C.L.136), which had been voted upon at the previous meeting.
31. His delegation would vote in favour of the Yugoslav draft resolution and would oppose any deletion of the term "working population" since that was the class most affected by economic instability, which the draft resolution sought to protect.
32. His delegation attached great importance to the question of trade relations contained in paragraph 3 which it believed constituted an obligation under the Charter as well as a necessary measure for bringing about normal conditions in the world economic and political situation.
33. He supported the Indian representative's view that it would be desirable to delete paragraph 7.
34. Mr. MATTAR (Lebanon) suggested that, as a compromise solution, the words "of the working population" be amended to read "of the population, and particularly of the working classes".
35. Mr. GASTAMBIDE (France) supported the Yugoslav draft resolution since it would appear that its subject matter had not hitherto been sufficiently studied by the General Assembly and by the Economic and Social Council.
36. His delegation had no objection to the term "working population" as in France that comprised almost the entire population. However, if it would assist the Committee in reaching agreement, he suggested that it might be replaced by the term "the poorer classes of the population".
37. Paragraph 5 of the draft resolution referred to technical methods. He had had an opportunity of appreciating the importance of statistical data in his work on the regional commissions and, in view of the existing shortage of qualified statisticians, he would welcome the views of the Secretariat on the way in which the work referred to in paragraph 5 could best be carried out.
38. Although he was in agreement with the substance of paragraph 7, he shared the view expressed that it was inappropriate in the draft resolution under consideration.
39. Mr. WEINTRAUB (Secretary of the Committee), replying to the French representative, said that paragraph 5 of the Yugoslav draft resolution raised both the question of statistical methods and techniques, and that of the publication of regular annual reports. He would like to take up first the question of annual reports. The *World Economic Report* dealt with general economic trends rather than living conditions on the individual level. Standards of living were normally dealt with by United Nations bodies as coming within the social rather than the economic sphere and, in that connexion, he noted that a report on world social conditions would be submitted to the Economic and Social Council in the current year. Such a report might become an annual document.
40. The question of statistical methods might perhaps appropriately be raised when the report on world social conditions was submitted. Any gaps in the information could then be considered from the technical and metho-

dological standpoint by the Statistical Committee, which would then make recommendations to the Economic and Social Council.

41. Mr. FORSYTH (Australia) could not support the Yugoslav draft resolution not because he disagreed with its intentions but because he was unable to accept the latter half of paragraph 6 referring to factors which might affect adversely the maintenance and raising of living standards.

42. Rearmament for defence needs obviously constituted one such factor and, in that connexion, he felt it imperative to state that, although the Australian Government had consistently endeavoured to raise the standard of living, and had indeed succeeded in reaching a high level, it had at the present time committed itself to a considerable rearmament programme, which would entail sacrifices on the part of the whole population. Such sacrifices had been willingly accepted by the Australian people and, in view of that, it would be inconsistent if the Australian delegation were to approve a recommendation of the nature of paragraph 6 of the Yugoslav draft resolution.

43. Mr. MARINO PEREZ (Cuba) urged the Australian representative to reconsider his objections to the Yugoslav draft resolution since the recommendations contained in paragraph 6 as he understood it, presupposed and accepted the need for rearmament and merely sought to remedy or attenuate its repercussions without, however, disputing its necessity.

44. Mr. MATES (Yugoslavia) reserved the right to speak on the various amendments submitted to his draft resolution when they circulated to the Committee.

45. The CHAIRMAN announced that the amendments submitted at the present meeting to the Yugoslav draft resolution would be circulated shortly. In the meantime, he invited the Committee to vote on the revised joint draft resolution submitted by Chile and the United States of America (A/C.2/L.134/Rev.1). He called attention to the amendment (A/C.2/L.146) submitted to the original text by the Indian delegation which had been accepted by the United States representative and consequently incorporated in the revised joint draft resolution.

REVISED JOINT DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY CHILE
AND THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (A/C.2/L.134/Rev.1)
(continued)

46. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that he had reserved the right to speak on the revised joint draft resolution when the Russian text had been circulated.

47. His delegation had submitted amendments (A/C.2/L.137) to the original joint draft resolution (A/C.2/L.134) in an attempt to arrive at the adoption of a unanimous resolution, and had sought to improve the draft resolution by introducing constructive elements in view of the urgent need of combating the problem of food shortages and famines, particularly in the interests of the under-developed countries.

48. After a thorough study of the revised joint draft resolution, his delegation wished to maintain the amendments it had submitted to the original draft resolution.

49. The United States representative, at the 183rd meeting, had accused the USSR delegation of having failed to contribute any constructive proposals on the subject under discussion. Such an allegation was unacceptable, since it was evident that the delegation of the Soviet Union had done much towards making constructive proposals in the hope of reaching unanimity, whereas the United States representative had, on the five occasions on which he had intervened in the debate on the subject, failed to make a single reference to the USSR amendments which had been submitted in all good faith. In the light of past events, it was doubtful whether such silence signified assent.

50. Indeed, the United States representative had taken a singularly unconstructive stand by recalling the famine which had occurred in the Soviet Union thirty years previously and had quoted a dubious document (185th meeting) to prove that the United States had allegedly saved the Soviet Union.

51. In reply, he recalled a statement made by Lenin to a United States correspondent to the effect that the United States and Japan had at that time pursued their predatory policy of enriching capitalism by aggression against the Soviet Union. All the United States efforts to stifle a free people by both economic blockade and military intervention in the young Soviet Republic had proved vain thanks to the leadership of Lenin and Stalin and the struggle of the workers and peasants themselves.

52. The United Kingdom representative had at least referred to the USSR amendments when he had stated that they were unacceptable to his delegation (185th meeting). He had furthermore said that the mechanization of Soviet agriculture was not proceeding sufficiently rapidly and had cited the figure of 137,000 tractors to which the USSR delegation had referred previously. However, that figure constituted the number of tractors distributed in 1951 alone and the total number of tractors produced since 1929, and particularly since 1932 when the most powerful tractor-producing plant in the world had been built at Stalingrad, would amount to some fifteen times that figure. Indeed, the world was fully aware of the high level of mechanization reached in Soviet agriculture.

53. The United Kingdom representative had also stated that, with its vast fertile territories, the Soviet Union could provide considerable assistance towards combating food shortages and famines. He should, however, be aware that the Soviet Union did, in fact, provide such help without proclaiming its generosity as did the United States. In that connexion, he noted that the only foodstuff in the United Kingdom which was not severely rationed, namely bread, originated to a large extent from wheat exports from the Soviet Union following an agreement concluded the previous year for 1 million tons of wheat and other cereals. Thus, thanks to its effective mechanization of agriculture, the Soviet Union had found it possible to render assistance in a serious food shortage although it did not choose to advertise such aid.

54. In reply to the United Kingdom representative's reference to the statement made by the former British Prime Minister, Mr. Attlee, in 1951 to the effect that the Soviet Union had allegedly 175 divisions in a state of preparedness, he pointed out that in February 1951, Premier Stalin had discounted that assertion as

slander since it was well-known that the Soviet Union had demobilized after the war. Indeed, if such an assertion were true, there would surely have been insufficient manpower available to harvest the wheat which was helping to meet the food shortage in the United Kingdom to the extent of one million tons of cereals annually.

55. He would therefore urge the United States and United Kingdom representatives not to introduce extraneous considerations into the debate and he requested the United States representative to give his views on the USSR amendments so that a generally acceptable draft resolution might be arrived at in the interests of the population suffering from food shortages and famine.

56. Paragraph 1 of the Chilean-United States revised joint draft resolution was based on the reactionary and totally untenable theory of Malthus who, according to the theory that the population of the world increased at a higher rate than its food supplies, seemed to welcome wars and natural disasters which would keep the population of the world at a certain level. It was unworthy of the United Nations Charter, which attached such great importance to the dignity of man, to assert in the twentieth century, a century of advanced technical development, that the world could not produce sufficient food to nourish its increasing population. He therefore requested the sponsors of the joint draft resolution to withdraw paragraph 1, otherwise he would be obliged to vote against it.

57. The revised text of paragraph 1, as amended by India (A/C.2/L.146), was somewhat better but still based on Malthus' theory, and it was unacceptable to his delegation.

58. Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) agreed with the USSR representative that the Committee was considering a very serious matter. But that representative, who had asserted at the beginning of his statement that he wished to discuss the joint draft resolution and the amendments thereto, appeared to have spoken not for the benefit of the Committee but of *Pravda* or *Izvestia*.

59. With regard to the remark that historical facts were being distorted, he asked the USSR representative whether the Council of People's Commissars of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics had or had not adopted a resolution on 10 July 1923 expressing its appreciation of a generous and disinterested way in which the United States had contributed to the alleviation of the famine in the Soviet Union at that time. He hoped to make photostat copies of the original Russian text available to all the delegations, which requested them.

60. He wondered whether the USSR representative in appealing for co-operation and unanimity and in calling for a special discussion on the amendments to the joint draft resolution, had understood that certain amendments had already been accepted and others had not. The United States delegation was unable to accept the USSR amendments (A/C.2/L.137).

61. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) observed that the USSR representative, in his rejection of paragraph 1 of the joint draft resolution, had implied that the sponsors of the text were Malthusians, whereas that paragraph merely referred to a situation of fact. Irrefutable statistics had been adduced to show that, in the last

ten years, the population of the world had increased by 13 per cent as against a 1 per cent increase in its food production; that was the reason for the recommendations listed in paragraph 3. Nothing could be less Malthusian than the draft resolution which made recommendations for increasing production, based on constantly advancing technical improvements.

62. He appreciated the USSR representative's desire to find a unanimous solution. On the other hand, he was unable to accept the USSR amendments for the following reasons. The first two amendments amounted to a refusal to appreciate the efforts of FAO and other inter-governmental organizations to alleviate food shortages and famine. The Chilean delegation, while recognizing that FAO and the other organizations had been and were unable to solve the problem as a whole, nevertheless felt that they had accomplished some very effective work, a sentiment which was certainly shared by the majority of the Committee. The efforts of FAO would be increased if States, which were not at the moment members of that organization, were to join and contribute to its budget.

63. With regard to the fourth USSR amendment, he pointed out that it would not be in accordance with the usage of the Charter to amend the word "Secretary-General" to read "Secretariat" and that it was difficult to see how the regional commissions were to participate effectively in the administrative and technical work contemplated, particularly since it was hoped that the appropriate recommendations could be prepared for consideration by the Economic and Social Council at its fourteenth session.

64. He agreed that financial and other types of assistance afforded by one country to another should not be made conditional on the granting of privileges, but, in his view, if he included the fifth USSR amendment in the draft resolution it would mean that, the Committee accept as definite a fact that loans and other forms of assistance provided by certain countries and agencies in the past had been accompanied by political considerations. He was prepared to vote for an amendment in that sense, but not to take the responsibility of sponsoring it.

65. With reference to the third USSR amendment, he agreed that the resources of the world should be directed towards improving the welfare of its population and not towards rearmament. But there were obvious facts which could not be overlooked, as exemplified by the United Nations joint action in Korea and current efforts to establish collective security. The serious difficulties confronting the world would not be overcome by a mere recommendation on the lines of the USSR amendment but by reconciling political differences through inter-governmental action or through the United Nations. The Soviet Union would find Chile ready and willing to co-operate in the appropriate organs of the Assembly or the Security Council, in bringing rearmament to an end and in improving living conditions in accordance with United Nations principles.

66. Mr. NARIELWALA (India) recalled that the new text of paragraph 1 was based on his amendment (A/C.2/L.146). India, with one of the densest populations in the world, suffered from food shortages and famine partly because of the continuously large increase in its population. His country was therefore confronted with two possibilities: it could recognize the

cogency of the Malthusian theory or it could become imperialistic. India preferred to choose the first alternative.

67. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that, in paragraph 2 of the revised joint draft resolution (A/C.2/L.134/Rev.1), the words "of hunger" had been included after the words "widespread conditions". Paragraphs 3 and 4 were unchanged. The words "and annexed herewith" had been added at the end of paragraph 5.

68. He then put to the vote the first USSR amendment (A/C.2/L.137) to paragraph 6, of the revised draft (formerly paragraph 3 of document (A/C.2/L.134)).

The USSR amendment was rejected by 37 votes to 5, with 4 abstentions.

69. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the second USSR amendment, to paragraph 7 of the revised draft (formerly paragraph 4 of document A/C.2/L.134).

The USSR amendment was rejected by 36 votes to 6, with 4 abstentions.

70. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the third USSR amendment, to paragraph 7 of the revised draft (formerly paragraph 4 of document A/C.2/L.134).

The USSR amendment was rejected by 27 votes to 6, with 12 abstentions.

71. The CHAIRMAN announced that there had been no changes proposed to paragraphs 9, 10 and 11, but in paragraph 12 the sponsors of the joint draft resolution had accepted the substitution of the words "and made available promptly to Member States threatened or affected by serious food shortages or famine" for the words "will be available", as suggested by the representative of India (185th meeting, paragraph 35). The Indian delegation had also proposed that a new paragraph should be inserted between paragraphs 12 and 13 (A/C.2/L.145, paragraph 2) and the Chilean and United States representatives had submitted, as a sub-amendment to that Indian amendment, that the words "food-grain net-exporting" should be changed to read "*either food-grain net-exporting or net-importing*" (185th meeting, paragraphs 53 and 54).

72. Mr. PARKINSON (Canada) pointed out that one of the Indian amendments referred specifically to the establishment of grain reserves and that Canada exported large quantities of grain. That Indian amendment might be taken as implying that certain countries were more responsible for contributing to the solution of the problem than others, a point on which he wished to ponder.

73. He therefore requested that the vote on the Indian amendment should be postponed until the following day.

It was so decided.

74. The CHAIRMAN remarked that the words "paragraph (2) above" in the second Indian amendment (A/C.2/L.145) should be amended to read "in the FAO resolution on emergency food reserves".

75. He then put to the vote the fourth USSR amendment (A/C.2/L.137), to paragraph 13 of the revised joint draft resolution (formerly paragraph 8 of document A/C.2/L.134).

The USSR amendment was rejected by 34 votes to 5, with 10 abstentions.

76. He then put to the vote the fifth USSR amendment proposing the insertion of a new paragraph between paragraphs 13 and 14 of the revised joint draft resolution (formerly at the end of paragraph 8 of document A/C.2/L.134).

77. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested a vote by roll-call.

A vote was taken by roll-call as follows:

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yemen, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Liberia, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Against: Bolivia, China, Netherlands, Turkey.

Abstaining: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Cuba, Denmark, Ecuador, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Lebanon, Mexico, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Sweden, Thailand.

The fifth USSR amendment was adopted by 17 votes to 4, with 27 abstentions.

78. Mr. GARCIA (Philippines) explained that he had abstained because, while he concurred in the principle that assistance to a given country should not be made subject to demands for privileges, the USSR amendment, in the context of the revised joint draft resolution, pre-supposed that privileges had already been extended to countries which had provided assistance. Moreover, it was difficult to see how such privileges could be granted since the assistance to regions suffering from food shortages and famine would be afforded on an international basis.

79. Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) said that he had abstained for the reason so effectively adduced by the Chilean representative.

80. Mr. HACHOEN (Israel) remarked that he had voted for the USSR amendment but not on the supposition that assistance to certain countries had in fact been made subject to demands for privileges.

81. Mr. BILBAO (Bolivia) explained that he had voted against the amendment because he considered it to be unnecessary. He did not believe that assistance should be accompanied by special privileges or that any country would accept assistance on such terms.

82. Mr. GORK (Turkey) said that he had voted against the USSR amendment as he regarded it as superfluous.

83. Mr. AREAN (Argentina) explained that he had abstained, despite the fact that he supported the general idea of the amendment, because he felt that it would introduce certain controversial political elements into the joint draft resolution.

84. Mr. NARIELWALA (India) moved the adjournment of the discussion.

The motion was adopted.

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.