

HUNDRED AND TWELFTH MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York, on Thursday, 3 November 1949, at 10.45 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Hernán SANTA CRUZ (Chile).

Full employment (A/972) (concluded)

DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY THE DELEGATION OF AUSTRALIA (A/C.2/L.14/Rev.4).

1. The CHAIRMAN reopened the debate and asked the Committee to discuss the revised Australian draft resolution (A/C.2/L.14/Rev.4) and the Chilean amendment (A/C.2/L.27).
2. Mr. SCHNAKE VERGARA (Chile) said the Chilean delegation supported paragraph 5 of the Australian draft resolution as it stood. The aim of the Chilean amendment was to avoid a debate, similar to those which had arisen on previous occasions, on international agreements not yet ratified by certain countries. The discussion on the Final Act of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment (Havana Charter) had indicated that it would be prudent to avoid any definite mention of that charter.
3. Chile supported the Havana Charter and was a member of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. The wide divergency of opinion in the Committee concerning the Havana Charter had, however, led the Chilean delegation to submit its amendment, not only in order to achieve unanimity and a compromise solution, but also to avoid any misinterpretation of that Charter in a discussion on paragraph 5.
4. Mr. PLIMSOLL (Australia) stated that his delegation would be glad to accept the revision suggested by Chile, since it confirmed in essence the content of the original Australian proposal.
5. The CHAIRMAN stated that the Chilean amendment would be incorporated in the text of the Australian draft resolution.
6. Mr. PATIJN (Netherlands) asked what was meant by the phrase "international agreements for the furtherance of the production and consumption of, and expansion of international trade in goods", contained in the Chilean amendment.
7. Mr. SCHNAKE VERGARA (Chile) replied that the phrase was taken from the text of the Economic and Social Council's resolution of 18 February 1946¹, which had served as a basis for convening the Havana Conference.
8. The CHAIRMAN put the Australian draft resolution, as amended by the Chilean proposal, to the vote.
The Australian draft resolution was adopted by 39 votes to 5, with 2 abstentions.
9. Mr. KARMARKAR (India) stated, in explanation of his delegation's vote, that his delegation had made no formal amendment to paragraph 6, since it had assumed that "a high and stable level of international investment" implied certain corollaries to safeguard national interests, such as were indicated in article 12 of the Havana Charter.
10. Mr. PATIJN (Netherlands) stated that his delegation had voted for the Australian draft resolution, as it agreed with the main idea ex-

pressed in the draft resolution, although it thought that the emphasis was unbalanced.

11. Mr. MERTSCH (Union of South Africa) remarked that there were certain aspects of the Australian draft resolution which his delegation had found necessary to refer to its Government, and that it had therefore abstained from voting. But it reserved the right to change its position when the draft resolution came before the Assembly.
12. Mr. VILFAN (Yugoslavia) observed that his delegation had abstained from voting, although it considered that the Australian resolution contained positive aspects, particularly in relation to the problem of the development of under-developed countries. The Australian draft resolution provided the only direct international approach to the problem of unemployment in highly industrialized countries.

DRAFT RESOLUTION PROPOSED BY THE DELEGATION OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA (A/C.2/L.16)

13. The CHAIRMAN called for consideration of the Czechoslovak draft resolution (A/C.2/L.16).
14. Mr. BORBERG (Denmark) drew attention to rule 120 of the rules of procedure. He pointed out that the Australian draft resolution called for further study by the Economic and Social Council of the question of full employment. Moreover, the fact that the Australian draft resolution had been approved by the Committee clearly demonstrated that it was superfluous to consider the Czechoslovak draft resolution. He therefore suggested that the Committee should not vote on the Czechoslovak proposal.
15. The CHAIRMAN replied that the rules of procedure did not give Committees the right to decide whether or not to vote on proposals. The general rule was that all proposals should be put to the vote. Rule 120 provided an exception to this general rule where two resolutions were incompatible. He had, however, already ruled that the Australian and Czechoslovak draft resolutions were compatible, and that they should be put to the vote one after the other.
16. Mr. ALTMAN (Poland) said that he shared the Chairman's view that the two resolutions were not incompatible. He asked for a vote by division, paragraph by paragraph.
17. Accordingly the CHAIRMAN put the Czechoslovak draft resolution to the vote paragraph by paragraph, beginning with that paragraph of the preamble the initial words of which were "Taking note."
The paragraph was rejected by 15 votes to 6, with 21 abstentions.
18. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the paragraph of the preamble beginning with the word "Considering".
The paragraph was rejected by 10 votes to 6, with 26 abstentions.

After a protracted procedural discussion, it was decided to continue voting on the draft resolution in the order in which it appeared in

¹See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council*, First Year, First Session, resolution 1/13.

document A/C.2/L.16 and to vote on the preamble to paragraph 1 in three parts, as indicated below.

19. The CHAIRMAN called for the vote on the phrase in the preamble to paragraph 1 reading: "To recommend to Member States suffering from unemployment".

That phrase was not adopted, 13 votes being cast in favour and 13 against, with 19 abstentions.

20. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the following phrase which occurred in the preamble to paragraph 1 "... the immediate adoption of the following measures".

That phrase was rejected by 13 votes to 6, with 26 abstentions.

21. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the phrase comprising the remainder of the preamble to paragraph 1.

That phrase was rejected by 17 votes to 6, with 26 abstentions.

22. After further short procedural discussion on the method of voting the CHAIRMAN put to the vote successively sub-paragraphs (a) to (k) of paragraph 1 of the operative part of the draft resolution.

Sub-paragraph (a) was adopted by 9 votes to 2, with 32 abstentions.

Sub-paragraph (b) was adopted by 7 votes to 6, with 31 abstentions.

Sub-paragraph (c) was adopted by 8 votes to 2, with 34 abstentions.

Sub-paragraph (d) was adopted by 6 votes to 3, with 37 abstentions.

Sub-paragraph (e) was adopted by 10 votes to 3, with 35 abstentions.

Sub-paragraph (f) was adopted by 10 votes to 2, with 30 abstentions.

Sub-paragraph (g) was adopted by 19 votes to 2, with 24 abstentions.

Sub-paragraph (h) was adopted by 19 votes to 3, with 26 abstentions.

Sub-paragraph (i) was adopted by 9 votes to 2, with 36 abstentions.

Sub-paragraph (j) was adopted by 15 votes to 2, with 31 abstentions.

Sub-paragraph (k) was adopted by 14 votes to 1, with 28 abstentions.

23. At the request of the representative of Colombia, paragraph 2 of the operative part of the draft resolution was put to the vote in two parts.

24. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the phrase "on measures adopted to implement the present recommendation".

By 9 votes to 7, with 26 abstentions, the phrase was rejected.

25. The CHAIRMAN put the remainder of paragraph 2 to the vote.

The remainder of paragraph 2 was adopted by 13 votes to 1, with 29 abstentions.

26. The CHAIRMAN put paragraph 3 of the operative part to the vote.

Paragraph 3 of the operative part was adopted by 8 votes to 1, with 33 abstentions.

27. Mr. BLUSZTAJN (Poland) asked for a roll-call vote on the Czechoslovak draft resolution as a whole as amended by the voting on its separate parts.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Costa Rica, having been drawn by lot, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Czechoslovakia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Against: Denmark, France, Greece, India, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia.

Abstaining: Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Haiti, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Venezuela, Yemen, Argentina, Brazil.

The Czechoslovak draft resolution as a whole was rejected by 21 votes to 6, with 21 abstentions.

28. Mr. PATIJN (Netherlands) explained that he had voted against paragraph 1 of the operative part of the draft resolution, although nearly all the lofty objectives of that paragraph formed part of his Government's policy, because he felt that the draft resolution was irresponsible and its only purpose was to create confusion and disorder.

29. Mr. TEJERA (Uruguay) said that he had voted for certain sub-paragraphs of paragraph 1 of the operative part of the draft resolution which stated principles incorporated in his country's legislation. He had voted against and abstained on other sub-paragraphs and had voted against the draft resolution as a whole because he felt that it was liable to encourage dissension between different classes of society. It would be very dangerous to adopt measures subordinating one sector of the economy to another; the United Nations should aim at adopting measures which would lead to social harmony.

30. Mr. MEJÍAS PALACIOS (Colombia) had abstained in the voting on the sub-paragraphs of paragraph 1 of the operative part because, although the measures there set out were good in principle, the Australian resolution (A/C.2/L.14/Rev.4) in paragraph 7 already noted with satisfaction government action to achieve those ends.

31. He had voted against the draft resolution as a whole because he did not feel the General Assembly, of and by itself, could decide the universal adoption of such measures.

32. Mr. COMPTON (United States of America) stated that his Government had felt that there was merit in the principles embodied in some of the sub-paragraphs (a) to (k) but that the resolution as a whole was not constructive.

33. Mr. HASSAN (Pakistan) had abstained from voting on the draft resolution because in his opinion the voting procedure adopted was bound to lead to illogical results, since most of the elements of the draft resolution were covered by the Australian resolution which had already been adopted. Furthermore, the Australian resolution

left countries free to adopt the measures which they considered desirable against unemployment.

34. Mr. KARMARKAR (India) said he had already, during the general debate (108th meeting), given his delegation's reasons for opposing the Czechoslovak draft resolution. Some of the provisions contained in the resolution were good, others were not, but the subject was fully covered by the Australian draft resolution, and it was inadvisable to adopt the Czechoslovak draft resolution at that stage.

35. Mr. PIERCE (Canada) said he had abstained in the voting on the draft resolution because he considered the Australian draft resolution sufficient, as well as for the reasons given in the Canadian representative's statement to the Committee at the 108th meeting.

36. Mr. ARUTIUNIAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) had voted in favour of the Czechoslovak draft resolution because he was fully convinced that its proposals were constructive and aimed at helping the General Assembly to draw up measures acceptable to all its members. The United States representative had expressed the fear that the draft resolution was meant to undermine free competition under the capitalist system. That was not the case; it was merely meant to help remove unemployment in whatever country it occurred.

37. The fact that the concrete proposals contained in the sub-paragraphs of paragraph 1 of the operative part had been adopted, was proof of the draft resolution's constructive quality, and the failure to adopt the draft resolution as a whole had been due to manipulation of the rules of procedure by certain representatives.

38. Mr. CORLEY SMITH (United Kingdom) had voted against the draft resolution as a whole and abstained on paragraph 1 of the operative part because, although the draft resolution contained some excellent provisions, in his view its general effect was to embarrass, confuse and mislead.

39. Mr. SCHNAKE VERGARA (Chile) said that his delegation's reasons for opposing the draft resolution had already been stated at the 109th meeting.

40. In addition, he felt that the draft resolution tended to destroy the harmonious interplay of United Nations organs by dealing with subjects which properly fell within the competence of another United Nations organ.

41. He had abstained on paragraph 1 of the operative part of the draft resolution because he had disapproved of the voting procedure.

42. Mr. BORBERG (Denmark) had already stated during the course of the meeting the reasons which had led him to propose that the Czechoslovak draft resolution should not be put

to the vote at all. He had voted against the draft resolution as a whole because it had been put to the vote in a form in which it would be ridiculous to submit it to the Assembly.

43. Mr. GARBUZOV (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) had voted in favour of the draft resolution because he considered it a constructive and democratic proposal which required no particular set of social conditions for its implementation.

44. Mr. DE SEYNES (France) said his delegation's position was the same as that outlined by the representative of India.

45. Mr. BLUSZTAJN (Poland) said his delegation had already explained the reasons for its support of the Czechoslovak draft resolution. It had voted in favour of the draft resolution also because it thought the adoption of the Australian draft resolution was not enough in view of the gravity of the problem. He had been astonished and distressed to see the attempts made by certain representatives to present the Czechoslovak draft resolution under a false light and reduce its text to absurdity.

46. Mr. SMOLYAR (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) and Mr. VILFAN (Yugoslavia) had supported the Czechoslovak draft resolution because it was a constructive proposal and corresponded to the basic interests of the working class all over the world.

47. Mr. VANER (Turkey) and Mr. DE OLIVEIRA CAMPOS (Brazil) had opposed the Czechoslovak draft resolution for the same reasons as had the representative of Pakistan.

48. Mr. ČAKRT (Czechoslovakia) called the Committee's attention to his statement made at the 110th meeting when he had refuted the accusation that he had attempted to confuse the Committee.

49. The CHAIRMAN announced the completion of consideration of agenda items 60 and 61 relating to full employment. He stated that the 113th meeting would consider the draft report of the Rapporteur on item 28 relating to economic development (A/C.2/L.29), as well as the remaining item on the agenda, in Chapter II B of the report of the Economic and Social Council, (A/972).

50. Mr. SMOLYAR (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), Rapporteur, stated that the draft report on item 28 incorporated a number of suggestions made by various delegations. He had, however, rejected certain suggestions which representatives were of course free to introduce when the report came up for discussion. He also wished further discussion of certain suggestions made by the representatives of the Netherlands and the United States.

The meeting rose at 1.40 p.m.