

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

FIFTEENTH SESSION  
Official Records



**SECOND COMMITTEE, 710th  
MEETING**

Friday, 9 December 1960,  
at 10.55 a.m.

NEW YORK

**CONTENTS**

|   | Page |
|---|------|
| <i>Agenda items 12, 29 and 74:</i>  |      |
| <i>Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapters II (sections I, II and III A, except paragraphs 189-198), III, IV and VII (section I and paragraph 645)) (continued)</i>                                   |      |
| <i>Economic development of under-developed countries (continued):</i>   |      |
| (a) <i>International flow of private capital: report of the Secretary-General and recommendations thereon by the Economic and Social Council;</i>   |      |
| (b) <i>Question of the establishment of a United Nations capital development fund: report of the Secretary-General;</i>   |      |
| (c) <i>Methods and techniques for carrying out a study of world economic development: report of the Secretary-General and comments thereon by the Economic and Social Council;</i>                                |      |
| (d) <i>Promotion of wider trade co-operation among States: report of the Secretary-General</i>  |      |
| <i>Land reform (continued)</i>  |      |
| <i>Consideration of draft resolutions (concluded) . . . . .</i>   | 397  |
| <i>Agenda items 28, 30, 31 and 32:</i>  |      |
| <i>Progress and operations of the Special Fund (continued)</i>  |      |
| <i>Programmes of technical assistance:</i>  |      |
| (a) <i>Report of the Economic and Social Council (continued);</i>   |      |
| (b) <i>United Nations assistance in public administration: report of the Secretary-General (continued)</i>  |      |
| <i>Opportunities for international co-operation on behalf of former Trust Territories and other newly independent States: reports of the Economic and Social Council and of the Secretary-General (continued)</i> |      |
| <i>Question of assistance to Libya: report of the Secretary-General (continued)</i>   |      |
| <i>Consideration of draft resolutions (continued) . . . . .</i>   | 400  |

Chairman: Mr. Janez STANOVNIK (Yugoslavia).

**AGENDA ITEMS 12, 29 AND 74**

Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapters II (sections I, II and III A, except paragraphs 189-198), III, IV and VII (section I and paragraph 645)) (A/4415) (continued)

Economic development of under-developed countries (continued):

- (a) International flow of private capital: report of the Secretary-General and recommendations thereon by the Economic and Social Council (A/4487, E/3325 and Corr.1.3);
- (b) Question of the establishment of a United Nations capital development fund: report of the Secretary-General (A/4488, E/3393, E/3393/Add.1-4);
- (c) Methods and techniques for carrying out a study of world economic development: report of the Secretary-General and comments thereon by the Economic and Social Council (A/4489 and Add.1, E/3379, E/3379/Add.1-7);
- (d) Promotion of wider trade co-operation among States: report of the Secretary-General (A/4490, E/3389)

Land reform (A/4439) (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.2/L.474/REV.3) (concluded)

1. Mr. B. K. NEHRU (India), introducing the third revised text of the joint draft resolution (A/C.2/L.474/Rev.3), said that the sponsors had agreed to replace the word "outflow" by the word "flow" throughout the draft and to incorporate the French amendment to operative paragraph 2 (A/C.2/L.543). They had been unable to accept the Italian amendment to operative paragraph 3 (A/C.2/L.541), but had reworded the paragraph along the lines suggested by the New Zealand representative, so as to make it clear that the recommendation applied to all countries, economically advanced as well as under-developed. Although they had been unable to meet the Netherlands representative's request for the rewording of operative paragraph 4 (A/C.2/L.540), it had been redrafted to meet the substance of his suggestions. While they had no particular desire for a separate report as such, the sponsors felt that the statistical information they had in mind would require presentation in a form different from that employed in the report prepared by the Secretary-General under Council resolution 780 (XXX). In connexion with another comment by the Netherlands representative, he pointed out that, although the reference to private capital had been dropped from operative paragraph 1, operative paragraph 2 showed clearly that the sponsors had in mind both public and private channels for the flow of capital.

2. His delegation had not felt that the draft resolution, even as originally worded, could be construed as infringing the principle of national sovereignty. However, in deference to the views expressed in the Committee, the word "Urges" in operative paragraph 1 had now been replaced by the phrase "Expresses

the hope" in order to remove completely any suggestion of interference with the sovereignty of States. He hoped that change would enable the Greek representative and others who had expressed similar doubts to reconsider their position on the draft. In that connexion, he would point out that the approach taken in operative paragraph 1 was now global, and that countries were no longer called on individually to increase their contributions.

3. The sponsors had done their best to accommodate all the suggestions made. It was now for the Committee to decide whether it would again content itself with the expression of a general hope that the flow of capital and technical assistance would be increased or would take a further step forward by quantifying the request.

4. Mr. FRANZI (Italy) said that his delegation would maintain its amendment (A/C.2/L.541), but wished to revise it to bring it into line with the terminology customarily employed in Assembly resolutions. The Italian proposal would therefore be that the word "countries" in operative paragraph 3 should be replaced by the words "States Members of the United Nations or members of the specialized agencies".

5. Mr. KORTEWEG (Netherlands) said that it was not clear from the revised text of operative paragraph 4 whether his delegation's suggestion had in fact been met. However, in the light of the Indian representative's explanation and on the understanding that it was the sponsors' intention that the Secretary-General should prepare one report covering the entire question, pursuant to Council resolution 780 (XXX), his delegation would withdraw its amendment (A/C.2/L.540). He would point out that the Council resolution in question requested precisely the kind of statistical information the sponsors of the draft resolution had in mind.

6. Mr. VIAUD (France) withdrew his delegation's amendment (A/C.2/L.543), which had now been incorporated into the draft.

7. Mr. PAYNE (United States of America) said that the draft resolution in its revised form was an excellent statement of an urgent problem. However, one key difficulty remained—the clause in operative paragraph 1 beginning "so as to reach". Although his country's contribution to the economic advancement of less developed countries already amounted to about 1 per cent of its national income, it could not, for constitutional and governmental reasons, undertake to contribute a given fraction of its national income for that purpose. In his delegation's view, even the revised text of paragraph 1 implied such a commitment. In view of the opposition to the phrase expressed by almost all the economically advanced countries, it seemed pointless to insist on including it. If the sponsors agreed to eliminate it, the Committee would be able unanimously to adopt a draft resolution which would have a desirable effect on Member Governments. If the sponsors were unable to accept that suggestion, he would request a separate vote on the phrase in question, which his delegation would vote against.

8. Mr. GREEN (New Zealand) said that the revised text of operative paragraph 3 met his delegation's views on the matter completely. Its objections to operative paragraph 1 had also been partially met by the global approach now taken, although it continued

to feel that the figure given should have been more in the nature of a target. In particular his delegation interpreted the paragraph as now taking account of differences between various economically advanced countries, including, for example, differences between capital-exporting and capital-importing countries and considered that, because of those differences, the revised text carried no obligation on any one country to make a contribution of aid of any specific amount in terms of its national income. In the light of the changes, his delegation would abstain on the second part of operative paragraph 1 and would vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

9. Mr. DUDLEY (United Kingdom) said that his delegation might have been willing to accept the revised text of operative paragraph 1 as no longer infringing the principle of national sovereignty. However, operative paragraph 4 still constituted a request for an inquest on the performance of States in relation to the hope expressed in paragraph 1, and, taken in conjunction, the two paragraphs still gave his delegation pause, for the reasons he had explained in detail at the 709th meeting. His delegation would be unable to support the second part of operative paragraph 1 and would, if that was retained, be unable to support the draft resolution as a whole.

10. The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the Italian amendment (A/C.2/L.541), as orally revised.

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

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

*In favour:* Canada, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Greece, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil.

*Against:* Ceylon, Chile, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Liberia, Libya, Mali, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Togo, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia.

*Abstaining:* Israel, Jordan, Somalia.

*The amendment was adopted by 39 votes to 35, with 3 abstentions.*

11. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the phrase in operative paragraph 1 of the revised draft resolution (A/C.2/L.474/Rev.3) beginning with the words "so as to reach..."

*At the request of the United States representative, a vote was taken by roll-call.*

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

*In favour:* India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal,

Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Sweden, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Burma, Ceylon, Congo (Brazzaville), Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea.

Against: Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Philippines, Spain, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, China, Denmark, France.

Abstaining: Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Mali, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Somalia, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela, Albania, Argentina, Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Greece.

*The clause was approved by 28 votes to 14, with 36 abstentions.*

12. Mr. DUDLEY (United Kingdom) requested a separate roll-call vote on the revised draft resolution, as amended, excluding the words "so as to reach as soon as possible approximately 1 per cent of the combined national incomes of the economically advanced countries" in operative paragraph 1.

*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, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of South Africa.

Against: Upper Volta.

*The revised and amended draft resolution, excluding the words "so as to reach as soon as possible approximately 1 per cent of the combined national incomes of the economically advanced countries" in operative paragraph 1, was adopted by 77 votes to 1.*

13. Mr. TAPSOBA (Upper Volta) explained that he had mistakenly voted against during the preceding roll-call; he had in fact intended to vote in favour.

14. Mr. HAKIM (Lebanon) requested a roll-call vote on the revised draft resolution, as a whole, (A/C.2/L.474/Rev.3) as amended.

*The Congo (Leopoldville), having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.*

In favour: Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Guate-

mala, Guinea, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville).

Against: None.

Abstaining: Japan, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*The revised draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 75 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.*

15. Mr. VIAUD (France) explained that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole mainly because the sponsors had been good enough to incorporate the French amendment (A/C.2/L.543). He had voted against the words in operative paragraph 1 on which a separate vote had been taken because he believed the objective underlying them should be clearly stated and command complete unanimity. As such unanimity was obviously not forthcoming at the present stage, his delegation felt that the clause had no great significance.

16. Mr. KORTEWEG (Netherlands) explained that he also had voted against the words in question because the basic objections to the inclusion in operative paragraph 1 of such a vague statistical target had not been overcome. His delegation had voted in favour of the joint draft resolution as a whole as an expression of general sympathy with its aims.

17. Miss HARELI (Israel) said that she had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole because she fully supported its objectives. In fact, the Israel Foreign Minister in her statement to the General Assembly (897th plenary meeting) had laid great stress on the importance of an increased flow of assistance of all types from the developed to the under-developed countries and had actually mentioned that a desirable yardstick for assessing how much States should contribute would be a percentage of national income. Her delegation had nevertheless abstained on the concluding phrase in operative paragraph 1 for one reason only, namely, that the words in question had not commanded the approval of those countries which had demonstrated in actual fact their willingness to increase their activities in every sphere of economic assistance and on whose active agreement the implementation of the resolution depended.

18. Mr. BREIVIK (Norway) said there could be no doubts about his Government's general attitude to the proposal to increase aid to the under-developed countries. Norway had consistently sought to increase its share of such aid. His delegation supported the general principles of the draft resolution and also felt that the proposal to fix a long-range goal for the amount of international assistance could be useful if

the target were clearly defined and commanded general approval. However, it must be remembered that not all advanced countries were net capital exporters. Norway, for instance, was not. Furthermore, the Governments of the advanced countries often had no great influence on private investment and might not even have much information on that subject. In other words, the information available to the Secretary-General for his report might not reflect the true position. In addition, methods of calculating national income might vary widely from one State to another. For all those reasons, his delegation had abstained on the concluding phrase of operative paragraph 1.

19. Mr. CHERNYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his Government would continue to give effective assistance on an increasing scale to the under-developed countries to promote their economic development and industrialization. Such assistance would of course be considerably increased if agreement was reached on disarmament.

20. His delegation did not, however, agree that the volume of assistance to under-developed countries, whether through the United Nations or not, should be based on a fixed quota, or that the same quota should apply to all countries. Present and former colonial Powers should return to the under-developed countries at least part of the wealth they had derived from the exploitation of those countries' natural and human resources. His delegation had also found unacceptable the statement in operative paragraph 2, subsequently amended in accordance with the French representative's suggestion, that as much as possible of the funds should be channelled through the United Nations. For those reasons he had abstained from voting on the concluding part of operative paragraph 1, but had supported the draft resolution as a whole. In taking that position, his Government did not assume any additional financial obligations and its assistance to under-developed countries would remain on a voluntary basis.

21. Mr. THIAM (Mali) said that his delegation warmly supported the purposes underlying the draft resolution, the more so because the newly independent States of Africa urgently required additional assistance in order to raise their levels of living. However, his delegation considered it inadvisable to subject the flow of international assistance to rigid rules of the kind contained in operative paragraph 1 which, as some delegations had stated, would in effect impose a levy on the national incomes of States. For that reason, while supporting the draft resolution as a whole, his delegation had abstained on the concluding phrase of operative paragraph 1.

22. Mr. SMID (Czechoslovakia) explained that he had voted for the draft resolution as a whole but had abstained on the concluding phrase of operative paragraph 1 because it raised an important question of principle. His Government fully understood the needs of the under-developed countries and was making a substantial contribution towards their development, particularly through long-term low-interest loans. In fact, Czechoslovakia's share amounted to more than 1 per cent of its national income. Nevertheless, it opposed the idea that a fixed quota should be recommended for all States without distinction. It was only proper that countries which had enriched themselves at the expense of their colonies should contribute more than countries like his own which had never directly or indirectly profited from colonialism.

23. Mr. ZENKER (Austria) explained that he had voted for the joint draft resolution as a whole because he supported its basic aims but had abstained on the concluding phrase of operative paragraph 1 because the proposal it embodied was impracticable and might even have an effect opposite to that sought.

24. Mr. PANYARACHUN (Thailand) said that he had also abstained on that phrase because it might prove unpalatable to public opinion and actually discourage an increase in the flow of capital and technical assistance to the developing countries. The clause might also be construed as constituting interference in the internal affairs of States and thus prove unacceptable to many nations. He had, however, voted in favour of the resolution as a whole, because his delegation agreed with its basic principles and objectives.

25. Mr. DEWULF (Belgium) said that his delegation had opposed the words voted on separately in operative paragraph 1, but in the interest of solidarity had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole instead of abstaining.

26. Mr. SERBAN (Romania) said that he had voted in favour of the draft resolution because he supported its basic aims. However, he did not agree with the proposal that the responsibility for aiding the under-developed countries should be apportioned equally among the economically advanced countries. The main responsibility should be assumed by the colonial Powers which had derived so much wealth from what Mr. Nehru, the Prime Minister of India, had described in his book *The Discovery of India* as the legalized exploitation of their colonies. He would also point out that at the 583rd meeting of the Committee, the Managing Director of the Special Fund had urged that Governments should contribute to the Special Fund on the basis of their quotas of the United Nations budget but that that suggestion had not been accepted. For those reasons, his delegation had abstained on the concluding phrase of operative paragraph 1.

27. Mr. DUDLEY (United Kingdom) observed that the remarks made by the Soviet Union, Czechoslovak and Bulgarian representatives demonstrated clearly the kind of trouble which he had thought would arise if the words objected to in operative paragraph 1 were adopted. At the same time, the peculiar theory of exploitation advanced by those representatives could not be allowed to remain unchallenged.

28. Mr. GURINOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), explained that he had also abstained on the concluding phrase of operative paragraph 1 for the reasons advanced by the Czechoslovak, Romanian and Soviet Union representatives.

#### AGENDA ITEMS 28, 30, 31 AND 32

Progress and operations of the Special Fund (A/4415, A/4491, E/3398, E/3401 and Corr.1, SF/L.24 and Corr.1) (continued)

Programmes of technical assistance:

- (a) Report of the Economic and Social Council (A/4415) (continued);
- (b) United Nations assistance in public administration: report of the Secretary-General (A/4589, E/3370 and Corr.1) (continued)



Opportunities for international co-operation on behalf of former Trust Territories and other newly independent States: reports of the Economic and Social Council and of the Secretary-General (A/4415, A/4585) (continued)

Question of assistance to Libya: report of the Secretary-General (A/4575, A/4576) (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.2/L.532) (continued)

29. Mr. NESBITT (Canada), introducing the draft resolution on arrangements to facilitate prompt supply of technical assistance personnel (A/C.2/L.532), expressed the belief that it would, if adopted, significantly stimulate the future growth of the United Nations technical assistance programmes. Those programmes had become important factors in the economic development of less developed countries and the demand for the services of highly-qualified experts had grown steadily. The United Nations rightly applied high standards in their recruitment, but it was often difficult to find suitable personnel willing to interrupt what was usually a successful career for relatively short-term assignments in foreign countries. Such highly-qualified people were normally in great demand in their own countries. Special measures were therefore needed to attract them in increasing numbers to the field of technical co-operation and the purpose of the resolution was to encourage measures to facilitate and speed up the recruitment of qualified experts.

30. The sponsors were aware that the United Nations had been criticized by some delegations for not making full use of the experts in their countries and hoped that all States able to provide suitably qualified personnel would be given the opportunity to do so. The resolution, however, was addressed not to the administering bodies of United Nations assistance programmes but to Governments, which were urged to co-operate in the recruitment of experts.

31. Operative paragraph 2 emphasized the need for a prompt response to requests for experts, particularly in cases where prolonged delay could be harmful. Paragraph 3 recommended that Governments consider the possibility of maintaining rosters of qualified personnel available for United Nations assignments; that would apply especially to those willing to serve at short notice. He recalled that, in his address to the General Assembly (871st plenary meeting), the Canadian Prime Minister had suggested

the establishment of an "experts' bank"—a scheme whereby experts in the fields of medicine, health, sanitation, welfare, supply, communications and transport would be available for service in disaster areas. The system need not, however, be confined to emergencies but could contribute greatly to recruitment for a wide variety of assistance assignments. His Government intended to compile such a roster of experts, drawn from fields in which Canada's experience might be useful. National technical assistance committees had also been extremely valuable in locating and recruiting experts and there were, no doubt, other effective means by which Governments could facilitate such recruitment. In making that suggestion the sponsors did not of course contemplate any departure from the well-established and fundamental principle that the requesting Government should have the right to specify the personal qualities, professional qualifications and nationality of the experts it would accept.

32. Operative paragraph 4 dealt with possible means of encouraging personnel to accept technical assistance assignments. The needs of the less developed countries were not always widely-known or appreciated and the report of the Council's Committee on Programme Appraisals emphasized the importance of bringing the value of service with international organizations to the attention of those governmental and other bodies from which potential technical assistance personnel were mainly drawn. The value of such service to the experts themselves and to their countries was also not always appreciated. The phrase "subject to their own requirements" had been inserted to protect the interests of those developing countries which in a spirit of co-operation had provided experts for service in other countries, but which also had internal requirements to meet. Career considerations were a major obstacle to the rapid recruitment of experts, and procedures for the protection of careers along the lines suggested in the draft resolution were being developed by the Canadian and other Governments.

33. General adoption of the measures suggested in the draft resolution would have a salutary effect on recruitment and contribute substantially to the success of United Nations technical assistance programmes and he hoped that the draft would receive a wide measure of support in the Committee.

The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.