

# United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SEVENTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**SECOND COMMITTEE, 875th  
MEETING**

Thursday, 13 December 1962,  
at 10.55 a.m.

**NEW YORK**

## CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda items 12, 40, 41 and 78:	
Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapter IV) ( <i>continued</i> ) . . . . .	495
Progress and operations of the Special Fund ( <i>continued</i> ) . . . . .	
United Nations programmes of technical co- operation ( <i>continued</i> ):	
(a) Review of activities;	
(b) Confirmation of the allocation of funds under the Expanded Programme of Tech- nical Assistance;	496
(c) Question of assistance to Libya: report of the Secretary-General. . . . .	
Rwanda and Burundi: report of the Secretary- General on the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1746 (XVI) ( <i>continued</i> ).	
Agenda item 38:	
Population growth and economic development ( <i>continued</i> ) . . . . .	496

*Chairman: Mr. Bohdan LEWANDOWSKI  
(Poland).*

*In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Allana  
(Pakistan), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.*

## AGENDA ITEMS 12, 40, 41 AND 78

Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapter IV)  
(A/5203) (*continued*)

Progress and operations of the Special Fund (A/5247,  
A/C.2/L.710/Rev.1, E/3576, E/3646/Rev.1) (*continued*)

United Nations programmes of technical co-operation (A/  
5259, A/5330, A/C.2/L.710/Rev.1) (*continued*):

- (a) Review of activities (E/3680);
- (b) Confirmation of the allocation of funds under the Ex-  
panded Programme of Technical Assistance (A/C.2/  
216);
- (c) Question of assistance to Libya: report of the Secre-  
tary-General (A/5281, A/5282, A/C.2/L.711)

Rwanda and Burundi: report of the Secretary-General on the  
implementation of General Assembly resolution 1746 (XVI)  
(A/5283 and Corr.1, A/C.2/L.716 and Add.1) (*continued*)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the delegations which  
wished to do so to explain their vote on the draft  
resolution (A/C.2/L.710/Rev.1) adopted at the 873rd  
meeting.

2. Mr. KOCHUBEI (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Repub-  
lic) said that the Special Fund should not restrict its  
activities to the field of pre-investment and should

play a more active part in the development of the non-  
aligned countries. His delegation would like the Manag-  
ing Director of the Special Fund to indicate what  
measures could be taken to that end.

3. It was common knowledge that the monopolies  
were continuing to make enormous profits out of the  
enterprises taking part in the operations of the Special  
Fund. Since the Special Fund was financed by Govern-  
ments of which more than half represented under-  
developed countries, the profits in question were drawn  
in large part from the contributions of the under-  
developed countries themselves: in all justice, the  
monopolies should be given formal notice, when they  
worked for the Special Fund, to return a portion of  
their profits which could be used to increase the volume  
of assistance given to the under-developed countries.

4. It was also well known that most of the experts  
employed in the Special Fund programmes, as well as  
a large part of the equipment supplied, came from a  
very small number of countries. An end should be put  
to that state of affairs; the Ukrainian SSR was convinced  
of the desirability of recruiting experts on a wider  
basis, and it was one of the countries willing and able  
to provide experts.

5. In view of the agreement which had been reached  
on the need for decentralizing the activities of the  
United Nations and the specialized agencies, the  
regional economic commissions should participate  
more widely in implementing the Special Fund projects.  
The ECE could certainly play a more important part,  
particularly as executing agent for certain projects.

6. More exact information must be obtained on the  
activities of the Special Fund, especially on the execu-  
tion of projects, so as to be able to determine what  
remained to be done in full knowledge of the facts. It  
would also be useful to have information on the requests  
for assistance which had been rejected and to know the  
reasons for the rejection. Lastly, in the sphere of  
technical assistance, it would seem sensible to combine  
the Expanded Programme and the Special Fund in a  
single programme which would make the action taken  
more effective.

7. It was in that spirit that his delegation had sup-  
ported the two-Power amendment (A/C.2/L.715),  
anxious as it was to respect the principle of univer-  
sality and to secure more rational assistance for the  
developing countries, without regard to any political  
consideration.

*Mr. Lewandowski (Poland) took the Chair.*

8. Mr. RENAUD (France) said that his delegation  
wanted to join in the congratulations to the Managing  
Director of the Special Fund, the Executive Chairman  
of the Technical Assistance Board and the Commis-  
sioner for Technical Assistance. The statements of  
those senior officials (870th meeting) had given the  
Committee a better appreciation of the scope of the

programmes for which they were responsible and of the spirit in which the programmes were conceived, and had enabled it to define more precisely the tasks to be carried out. His delegation, which was concerned about efficiency, considered it essential not to lose sight of the guiding lines which would make it possible to avoid duplication and overlapping; it therefore awaited with interest the results of TAC's work. France had already drawn attention to the excellent results of multilateral aid in that field, but, linked as it was to other States by a complex of historical, sentimental and economic ties, it had undertaken a number of assistance programmes which could only be carried out successfully on the bilateral level; it was not possible to move from one system to another with impunity, because co-operation was first and foremost a matter of sustained effort and improvisation was fatal to it. That was why his delegation continued to support the principle of voluntary contribution, since it enabled each State to adapt the part it took to its methods of operation. It had voted for the text which the Committee had had before it, but it considered the phrase "in the immediate future" in operative paragraph 1 to be too peremptory and could therefore only interpret it as the expression of a wish.

*Mr. Allana (Pakistan), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.*

9. Mr. HU (China) associated himself with the congratulations to the Managing Director of the Special Fund, the Executive Chairman of the Technical Assistance Board and the Commissioner for Technical Assistance. By its affirmative vote, China had shown its sincere desire to promote international co-operation in the field of technical assistance.

10. Mr. AMIRMOKRI (Iran) said that his country attached special importance to the activities of the Special Fund. At the present time, under five pre-investment projects, Iran was receiving substantial credits (\$5 million), the services of numerous experts, a number of fellowships and a large amount of equipment. In its desire to contribute as far as its means would allow to the success of the technical co-operation programmes, his country had decided to increase its contribution for 1963, which would amount to the equivalent of \$300,000.

11. It was in that spirit that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution. For reasons similar to those indicated by the representative of Tunisia, he had been obliged to abstain during the vote on the two-Power amendment.

12. Mr. TOMEH (Syria), who had been absent during the voting, said that he would have supported the draft resolution; with regard to the two-Power amendment, Syria associated itself with the remarks made by the representative of the United Arab Republic and considered that all States should have been invited to contribute to the extent their means allowed. In pursuance of the principle of universality, it was necessary to call on all available resources, and his delegation would have voted for the amendment, which seemed to it to be free of any political consideration.

#### AGENDA ITEM 38

**Population growth and economic development (A/4849, A/5059, A/5222, A/C.2/L.657/Rev.2) (continued)**

13. Mr. BERNARDO (Argentina) asked for a separate roll-call vote to be taken on each of the five-Power

amendments (A/C.2/L.709/Rev.2) to the draft resolution (A/C.2/L.657/Rev.2).

*Mr. Lewandowski (Poland) resumed the Chair.*

14. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the first amendment.

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

*In favour:* Cameroon, China, Colombia, El Salvador, France, Gabon, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iran, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mexico, Netherlands, Niger, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Spain, Togo, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil.

*Against:* Ceylon, Chile, Costa Rica, Denmark, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Iceland, India, Japan, Mali, Morocco, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia, Algeria, Australia,

*Abstaining:* Canada, Chad, Cuba, Cyprus, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Hungary, Indonesia, Iraq, Israel, Jamaica, Mauritania, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia.

*The amendment was adopted by 36 votes to 27, with 29 abstentions.*

15. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the second amendment.

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

*In favour:* El Salvador, France, Gabon, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Iran, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Netherlands, Niger, Nigeria, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Spain, Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Cameroon, Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Dahomey.

*Against:* Denmark, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Iceland, India, Iraq, Japan, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Republic, Australia, Ceylon, Cyprus.

*Abstaining:* Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Hungary, Indonesia, Israel, Jamaica, Libya, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Tanganyika, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, Costa Rica, Cuba.

*The second amendment was adopted by 44 votes to 23, with 29 abstentions.*

16. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the third amendment.

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

*In favour:* Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mexico, Netherlands, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Togo, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Cameroon, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, El Salvador, France, Gabon, Guatemala, Honduras, Iran, Ireland, Italy, Lebanon.

*Against:* Mali, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia, Algeria, Australia, Burundi, Ceylon, Chile, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Iceland, India, Iraq, Japan.

*Abstaining:* Libya, Mauritania, Mongolia, Niger, Panama, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Tanganyika, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Cuba, Ethiopia, Haiti, Hungary, Indonesia, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica.

*The third amendment was rejected by 32 votes to 30, with 35 abstentions.*

17. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the draft resolution as a whole (A/C.2/L.657/Rev.2), as amended.

18. Mr. DELGADO (Senegal) requested a separate vote on the first part of operative paragraph 6, up to and including the words "...of their economic and social development problems".

19. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Netherlands representative had requested a separate vote on the second part of operative paragraph 6, starting with the words "and that the United Nations ...".

20. Mr. BRILLANTES (Philippines) requested a separate vote on the words "as well as other aspects" in operative paragraph 6.

21. Mr. AYARI (Tunisia) said that his delegation was opposed to any separate vote on operative paragraph 6 and requested, under rule 130 of the rules of procedure, that the Committee vote on the matter.

22. Mr. VIAUD (France) and Mr. BERNARDO (Argentina) spoke in favour of the motion for division.

23. Mr. TEZEL (Turkey) and Mrs. PANGALOS (Greece) spoke against the motion for division, in support of the Tunisian representative's request.

24. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the Argentine motion for division.

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

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

*In favour:* Brazil, Burundi, Cameroon, China, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, El Salvador, France, Gabon, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Ireland, Italy, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mexico, Netherlands, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Spain, Togo, United

Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia.

*Against:* Ceylon, Chile, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Iceland, Iraq, Japan, Mali, Morocco, Nepal, Norway, Pakistan, Rwanda, Sweden, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia, Algeria.

*Abstaining:* Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Cuba, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Mauritania, Mongolia, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Tanganyika, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America, Afghanistan, Albania, Australia.

*The motion for division was adopted by 37 votes to 25, with 36 abstentions.*

25. Mr. DELGADO (Senegal) said that in view of the request for a separate vote made by the Netherlands representative, he would withdraw his own request.

26. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the phrase "as well as other aspects" in operative paragraph 6.

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

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

*In favour:* Japan, Mali, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United States of America, Yugoslavia, Algeria, Australia, Burundi, Ceylon, Chile, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Haiti, Iceland, India, Iraq.

*Against:* Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, China, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, El Salvador, France, Gabon, Guatemala, Honduras, Iran, Ireland, Italy,

*Abstaining:* Jamaica, Libya, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Niger, Panama, Poland, Romania, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Tanganyika, Togo, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Afghanistan, Albania, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Cuba, Ethiopia, Hungary, Indonesia, Israel, Ivory Coast.

*The phrase was adopted by 37 votes to 27, with 34 abstentions.*

27. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the second part of operative paragraph 6, starting with the words "and that the United Nations ...".

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

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

*In favour:* Denmark, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Haiti, Iceland, India, Iraq, Japan, Libya, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia, Algeria, Australia, Burundi, Ceylon, Chile, Costa Rica, Cyprus.

*Against:* Dahomey, France, Gabon, Guatemala, Honduras, Iran, Ireland, Italy, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Netherlands, Peru, Portugal, Senegal, Spain, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Cameroon, Colombia, Czechoslovakia.

*Abstaining:* Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Hungary, Indonesia, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Mexico, Mongolia, Niger, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Tanganyika, Togo, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Afghanistan, Albania, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Cuba.

*The second part of operative paragraph 6 was adopted by 37 votes to 27, with 35 abstentions.*

28. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the draft resolution as a whole (A/C.2/L.657/Rev.2), as amended.

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

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

*In favour:* Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Japan, Libya, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Australia, Burma, Burundi, Ceylon, Chile, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Federation of Malaya, Finland.

*Against:* Ireland, Italy, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Uruguay, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Colombia, France.

*Abstaining:* Guatemala, Hungary, Iran, Israel, Jamaica, Madagascar, Mexico, Mongolia, Netherlands, Niger, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Tanganyika, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela, Albania, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon,

*The draft resolution (A/C.2/L.657/Rev.2), as amended, was adopted by 43 votes to 14, with 42 abstentions.*

29. The CHAIRMAN proposed, under rule 129 of the rules of procedure, that explanations of vote should be limited to ten minutes each.

*It was so decided.*

30. Mr. LUBBERS (Netherlands) considered that the debate had been both interesting and instructive. The

Netherlands delegation, for its part, had drawn two conclusions from the discussions. The first was that the problem had not yet reached the stage at which the United Nations could usefully deal with it. During the debate, the complexity of the relationship between population growth and economic development had become increasingly apparent and it would be an oversimplification to say that the various aspects of the problem had been fully elucidated. The experience of the Netherlands which, despite a very high population density, enjoyed full employment and attracted foreign labour, should suffice as a warning against the dangers of hasty generalization. The second conclusion was that problems might indeed arise in that field in developing countries, varying, furthermore, from one country to another.

31. The Netherlands delegation, whose position had been defined during the debate (866th meeting), had no objection to the draft resolution as such, but only to paragraphs 4 and 5 of the original text (A/C.2/L.657): it was grateful to the sponsors for having accepted many amendments submitted by France and other countries and for taking into account its own comment on paragraph 4. On the other hand, since the wording of paragraph 6 of the revised draft was acceptable to many delegations, the Netherlands had had no alternative but to vote for the five-Power amendment proposing its deletion; when that amendment had been rejected, the Netherlands had asked for a separate vote on the last part of the paragraph. Since that paragraph had been retained in toto, the Netherlands delegation, out of respect for its own convictions as well as those of others, had had no alternative but to abstain from voting on the draft resolution as a whole.

32. Mr. SERAFIMOV (Bulgaria) said that population growth was a positive factor of economic development, since that growth was synonymous with the growth of productive forces. Moreover, all the developed States were trying to increase their populations. Bulgaria, which had been an under-developed country before the establishment of its socialist system, suffered from over-population, especially in the agricultural regions. Although the birth-rate was lower than it had been before, the population was now expanding, owing to an increase of longevity; the same situation prevailed in the Western countries, including the Scandinavian countries.

33. Demographic growth was therefore not the real problem and there was no justification for blaming it for the difficulties encountered by the developing countries in their economic advancement. Those difficulties were mainly due to economic backwardness, to the exploitation from which those countries had suffered at the hands of the capitalist countries and to the ineffectiveness, in some cases, of their policy of accelerated development. The problem could be solved only through resolute effort and radical economic and social reforms. The countries concerned should, in the first place, effectively mobilize natural forces and increase the rate of technological progress and of investments, for that would help to speed up their economic development. Neo-Malthusian theories were now out of date, and neither those theories nor, still less, religious reasons could be invoked to explain the backwardness of the developing countries. Since the question of population had little importance for the developing countries and still less for the developed countries, the Bulgarian delegation had abstained from voting on the draft resolution and on the amendments.

34. Mr. GARDNER (United States of America) said that his delegation had supported the first and second of the five-Power amendments, which did not alter the substance of the draft resolution, in order to take into account as many opinions as possible. It had abstained from voting on the third amendment because operative paragraph 6 neither extended nor restricted in any way the power already held by the United Nations to grant technical assistance at the request of Member States. In the sector under discussion, that assistance should primarily comprise three aspects which were generally recognized to be important: it should consist, first, in providing information on population questions; secondly, training personnel for demographic studies; and thirdly, encouraging the discussion of population problems. The United States had voted for the retention of the phrase "as well as other aspects" in paragraph 6 because the United Nations should help countries wishing to obtain basic data and to undertake studies on all aspects of economic development. It had abstained from voting on the second part of paragraph 6 for the reason that had prompted it to abstain on the deletion of that paragraph. Lastly, the United States delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole because of the importance it attached to the interrelationship of population growth and economic development.

35. Mr. AMADOR (Mexico) said that he had abstained from voting on the draft resolution as a whole because Mexico considered that other urgent problems relating to the development of the developing countries should be given priority in the apportionment of the funds available for technical assistance.

36. Mr. GOLSALA (Chad) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on the draft resolution as a whole because it was difficult to take a position on a text which implied limitation of births or birth control. For Chad, with a population of only two persons per square kilometre, the problem of population should be solved only in relation to economic and social development; that did not mean, however, that Chad was unaware of the other aspects of the problem. In view of the absence of specific data, it might be best to recognize that every Government should be left to establish its own policy in the matter.

37. Mr. UNWIN (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had not taken part in the debate because it had no well-defined views to express. It had, however, supported the draft resolution in the belief that it dealt satisfactorily with a vital problem. There could be no doubt that rapid population growth was one of the most urgent problems for countries which wished their economic development efforts to succeed. The whole question was as yet too little explored, and the United Nations had its part to play in promoting and assisting the preparation of studies and statistics in that sphere. The draft resolution seemed likely to strengthen that role of the Organization. The United Kingdom delegation had not voted for the last five-Power amendment because it might have eliminated from the text certain positive elements important to the developing countries. The United Kingdom had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole, on the understanding that it in no way affected the principle that technical assistance was to be granted by the United Nations only at the request of the countries concerned and only in the spheres to which they attached the greatest importance.

38. Mr. FARHADI (Afghanistan) said that his country, although not over-populated, was nevertheless aware of the problem that over-population presented for many countries. The Afghan delegation had abstained from voting on the amendments which sought to limit the scope of the draft resolution, because it had thought it important first to ascertain the general feeling in the Committee. It had then voted for the draft resolution as a whole, since it reflected the position of the majority of the developing countries and that of the majority of Member States.

39. Mr. BERNARDO (Argentina) said that his delegation had supported the five-Power amendments because they offered a compromise solution. He regretted that the most important amendment, to delete paragraph 6, had not been accepted, and he feared that, in approving paragraph 6, delegations had yielded to propaganda pressure rather than to a soundly based argument. His delegation had therefore been obliged to vote against the draft resolution as a whole, since it continued to regard it as invalid. It was regrettable that, in adopting it, the Committee had abandoned the principle of the neutrality of the United Nations and had thus established a dangerous precedent.

40. Mr. BRILLANTES (Philippines) said that he had voted for the amendments because they would have placed reasonable limits on the action of the United Nations in that field. As operative paragraph 6 had been retained, the Philippine delegation had been obliged to ask for a separate vote on the phrase "as well as other aspects", since the other aspects in question appeared to be out of place in the draft resolution. His delegation had then abstained from voting on the paragraph in question because it did not accord with the conclusions reached by the Population Commission, and it had likewise abstained from voting on the draft resolution as a whole.

41. Mr. TOMEH (Syria) said that the question under consideration had given rise to one of the Second Committee's most interesting discussions. The experts of the Population Commission would be dealing with population growth for a long time to come, in view of the critical importance of the problem for a large number of countries. It should be pointed out once more that the conclusions which could be arrived at were a matter of perspective: from the point of view of the developing countries, their economic progress was jeopardized by population growth, as the representative of the United Arab Republic had pointed out; but that opinion was obviously not shared by the countries in which the problem was not so acute. However, as the representative of the United Arab Republic had also said, among others, economic development and a demographic policy were not necessarily contradictory or incompatible. In any event, the problem could not be ignored, and the Population Commission had been quite right to say that it was for each Government to establish its own policy and work out programmes of action to solve demographic problems and problems of economic and social development, and that, in particular, each Government should decide for itself whether or not it was necessary to take measures to modify demographic evolution in order to help solve those problems.

42. Mr. HAJOUJ (Morocco) said that his country was not faced with any great difficulties as regards economic development and demographic problems. While he had no wish to start a discussion on the merits of Malthusianism, he considered that a rapidly growing

population could promote economic development in some cases and hinder it in others. However, economic development and population growth were certainly interrelated and the delegation of Morocco had felt it its duty to support the draft resolution in so far as it left Governments complete freedom to decide what programmes to undertake in that field. His delegation considered that the emphasis should be put on the role of the United Nations, which should be able to furnish

all desirable assistance to States requesting it, with the assurance that they would make use of it in accordance with their own interests.

43. Mr. KANO (Nigeria) said that the remarks which he had addressed to the United Kingdom at the preceding meeting had really been directed at the United States of America.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.