



Saturday, 29 November 1952, at 10.30 a.m.

SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records

Headquarters, New York

CONTENTS

Page

Economic development of under-developed countries: (a) Financing of economic development of under-developed countries: report of the Economic and Social Council (A/C.2/L.162/Rev.2, A/C.2/L.162/Add.1, A/C.2/L.164/Rev.1, A/C.2/L.168, A/C.2/L.171, A/C.2/L.178, A/C.2/L.180, A/C.2/L.181 and Corr.1, A/C.2/L.182 and A/C.2/L.183) (<i>continued</i>)	191
--	-----

Chairman: Mr. Jiří NOSEK (Czechoslovakia).

Economic development of under-developed countries: (a) Financing of economic development of under-developed countries: report of the Economic and Social Council (A/C.2/L.162/Rev.2, A/C.2/L.162/Add.1, A/C.2/L.164/Rev.1, A/C.2/L.168, A/C.2/L.171, A/C.2/L.178, A/C.2/L.180, A/C.2/L.181 and Corr.1, A/C.2/L.182 and A/C.2/L.183) (*continued*)

[Item 25 (a)]*

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the Argentine draft resolution (A/C.2/L.162/Rev.2) and the amendments thereto (A/C.2/L.180, A/C.2/L.181 and Corr.1, A/C.2/L.182 and A/C.2/L.183); the Indian amendments (A/C.2/L.182) to the Argentine draft had been accepted by the Argentine representative.
2. The Committee had before it a statement on the financial implications of the Argentine draft resolution, submitted by the Secretary-General in accordance with rules 152 and 153 of the General Assembly rules of procedure (A/C.2/L.162/Add.1).
3. Mr. BLOUGH (Secretariat) said that no date had been set for completing the study on synthetic products proposed in the Indian amendments now part of the Argentine draft. If the Secretariat were allowed to fit in the study with other work there probably would be no additional expense but if it had to be completed before 1953, there probably would.
4. As regards the study and analysis referred to in paragraph 7 of the draft resolution, the financial implications would depend on the scope of the studies; the Secretariat would therefore like to have the Argentine delegation's views on that point.

* Indicates the item number on the agenda of the General Assembly.

5. Mr. BUNGE (Argentina) said that in accepting the Indian amendments, his delegation had understood that the study on synthetic products was to be submitted to the next session of the Economic and Social Council; it felt that the problem was urgent and that the work should be completed as quickly as possible.

6. As regards the estimate referred to in paragraph 7 of the Argentine draft resolution he did not think it would raise any difficulties as he gathered that the background material was already available. He merely wished to have a proper appraisal of the financial repercussions of changes in the terms of trade; as to the analysis of the distribution of income, it could be based largely on work already done by the Secretariat on that subject. The request contained in paragraph 7 merely meant, therefore, that the Secretariat should continue, but expand, its valuable surveys on those subjects.

7. Mr. JUNG (India) expressed his agreement with the Argentine delegation's view that the reports should be submitted to the next session of the Economic and Social Council. He had understood that, as some work had already been done on the subject, the cost of completing the studies by that time would only be small.

8. Mr. BLOUGH (Secretariat) replied that, apart from any financial considerations, it would not be possible to complete the study on synthetic products for submission to the next session of the Economic and Social Council, which was to take place in February and March. It would be carried out as rapidly as possible but could not be ready until the summer session of the Economic and Social Council or possibly the eighth session of the General Assembly. Since the study on changes in the terms of trade would involve only bringing up to date material that was already available, the added work could be absorbed without additional expense.

9. Mr. TOUS (Ecuador) asked whether it would be possible for the group of experts to be appointed under paragraph 8 of the Argentine draft resolution to undertake in addition the study on synthetic products.

10. Mr. BUNGE (Argentina), replying to Mr. Blough, said that his delegation would be satisfied if the study in question were finished in time for the summer session of the Economic and Social Council.

11. He thought that adoption of the suggestion of the representative of Ecuador would place too heavy a burden on the group of experts; in his view the division of work proposed in his revised draft resolution represented the best course.

12. Mr. BLOUGH (Secretariat) said that the Secretariat would endeavour to produce the study on synthetic products for the summer session of the Economic and Social Council. Neither that study nor that referred to in paragraph 7 would require additional experts; factual studies and basic analyses could be effectively produced by the Secretariat, whilst recommendations were more commonly the province of experts.

13. The CHAIRMAN said that, under rule 129 of the rules of procedure, the Committee would vote first on the amendments to the Argentine draft resolution, beginning with those contained in document A/C.2/L.181 and Corr.1.

14. Mr. BUNGE (Argentina) said his delegation had no objection to the first two amendments.

15. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the third amendment (A/C.2/L.181) concerning sub-paragraph 3 (c) of the Argentine draft resolution.

The amendment was rejected, there being 20 votes in favour, 20 against and 11 abstentions.

16. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the fourth amendment of the eleven Powers (A/C.2/L.181) as corrected by document A/C.2/L.181/Corr.1, concerning sub-paragraph 3 (d) of the Argentine draft.

17. Mr. BUNGE (Argentina) requested a roll-call vote.

A vote was taken by roll-call as follows:

The Philippines, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Sweden, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Canada, China, Denmark, France, Greece, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway.

Against: Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Iran, Liberia, Mexico, Nicaragua, Peru.

Abstentions: Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Thailand, Haiti, Iraq, Israel, Pakistan, Paraguay.

The amendment was rejected by 30 votes to 16 with 8 abstentions.

18. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the fifth amendment contained in document A/C.2/

L.181 proposing a new text for sub-paragraph 3 (f) of the Argentine draft resolution.

19. Mr. BUNGE (Argentina) requested a roll-call vote.

A vote was taken by roll-call as follows:

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

In favour: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Greece, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Against: Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Liberia, Mexico, Nicaragua, Peru, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Abstentions: China, Ethiopia, Haiti, Israel, Pakistan, Paraguay, Philippines, Thailand.

The amendment was rejected by 31 votes to 15, with 8 abstentions.

20. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the sixth amendment contained in document A/C.2/L.181, proposing to add a sub-paragraph 3(g) to the Argentine draft.

21. Mr. FACIO (Costa Rica) requested a roll-call vote.

A vote was taken by roll-call as follows:

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

In favour: Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Australia, Belgium, Canada, China, Denmark, France, Greece, Israel, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden.

Against: Afghanistan, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Iran, Mexico, Nicaragua, Peru, Saudi Arabia.

Abstentions: Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Haiti, Iraq, Liberia, Pakistan, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Thailand.

The amendment was rejected by 22 votes to 19, with 13 abstentions.

22. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the seventh amendment contained in document A/C.2/L.181, proposing a new text for sub-paragraph 4 (a) of the Argentine draft resolution (A/C.2/L.162/Rev. 2).

23. Mr. BUNGE (Argentina) requested a roll-call vote.

A vote was taken by roll-call as follows:

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

In favour: Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Canada, China, Denmark, France, Greece.

Against: Liberia, Mexico, Nicaragua, Peru, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq.

Abstentions: Pakistan, Paraguay, Philippines, Syria, Thailand, Haiti, Israel.

The amendment was rejected by 32 votes to 16, with 7 abstentions.

24. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the eighth amendment contained in document A/C.2/L.181. He suggested that the vote should merely be on the deletion of sub-paragraph 4 (b), since the question of the new paragraph 5 would be covered by the vote on amendment 11.

It was so decided.

25. Mr. NURADI (Indonesia) requested a roll-call vote.

A vote was taken by roll-call as follows:

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

In favour: Sweden, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Canada, China, Denmark, France, Greece, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway.

Against: Peru, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Thailand, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Liberia, Mexico, Nicaragua.

Abstentions: Paraguay, Haiti, Israel, Pakistan.

The amendment was rejected by 35 votes to 16, with 4 abstentions.

26. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Argentine delegation had already accepted the first Indian amendment (A/C.2/L.182) and so suggested that accordingly the ninth amendment contained in document A/C.2/L.181 need not be put to the vote.

It was so decided.

27. The CHAIRMAN suggested that no vote was necessary on the tenth amendment, as renumbering only was involved.

It was so decided.

28. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the eleventh amendment (A/C.2/L.181) proposing a new text for paragraph 5 of the Argentine draft.

29. Mr. DIAS CARNEIRO (Brazil) and Mr. ABDELRAZEK (Egypt) requested a roll-call vote.

A vote was taken by roll-call as follows:

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

In favour: Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Canada, China, Denmark, France, Greece.

Against: Mexico, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Liberia.

Abstentions: Paraguay, Poland, Syria, Thailand, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Haiti, Israel.

The amendment was rejected by 29 votes to 16, with 10 abstentions.

30. The CHAIRMAN then invited the Committee to vote on the Brazilian amendment to paragraph 5 of the Argentine draft, contained in document A/C.2/L.183.

31. Mr. TOUS (Ecuador), on a point of order, asked whether the Argentine representative would be prepared to accept the text of document A/C.2/L.183 and incorporate it in his own draft resolution.

32. Mr. BUNGE (Argentina) explained that the Brazilian amendment had some bearing on amendments prepared by other delegations; it was not for him, therefore, to take any decision in that connexion.

33. Mr. DIAS CARNEIRO (Brazil) asked for a roll-call vote.

A vote on the Brazilian amendment was taken by roll-call as follows:

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

In favour: Nicaragua, Peru, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Mexico.

Against: Pakistan, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Greece, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand.

Abstentions: Norway, Paraguay, Poland, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Afghanistan, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, India, Liberia.

The amendment was adopted by 27 votes to 13, with 15 abstentions.

34. Mr. DE SEYNES (France), explaining his vote, said that he had been obliged to vote against the Brazilian amendment because, although as the Brazilian representative had pointed out, France had certain agreements with Brazil and other countries which might be considered as falling within the scope of the proposed bilateral international agreements or arrangements, those agreements had been concluded by France

more for reasons of expediency than of principle. The principle proposed in the Brazilian amendment would conflict with that of multilateral agreements which the French Government supported and was practising in some other cases.

35. Furthermore, the Brazilian amendment had introduced at the last moment a new concept which had not been discussed; he therefore considered the proposal premature.

36. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the twelfth amendment contained in document A/C.2/L.181, proposing to add a new paragraph after paragraph 7 of the Argentine draft resolution.

37. Mr. GINOSSAR (Israel), on a point of order, asked whether the sponsors of the joint amendment (A/C.2/L.181) would be willing to accept the Indian wording for that proposed paragraph, which differed only in that it added the words "for submission to the Economic and Social Council and to the General Assembly", and the addition of the word "important" before "synthetic products".

38. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Argentine delegation accepted the amendment as submitted by the Indian delegation in document A/C.2/L.182. That being so, perhaps the sponsors of the joint amendment (A/C.2/L.181) might wish to withdraw paragraph 12 of that text.

39. Mr. JOCKEL (Australia), on behalf of the sponsors of the joint amendments, agreed that it was unnecessary to vote on their twelfth amendment.

40. The CHAIRMAN accordingly announced that the twelfth amendment in document A/C.2/L.181 was withdrawn.

41. He requested the Committee to vote on the joint amendment submitted by Denmark, Norway and Sweden (A/C.2/L.180) to replace paragraphs 8 and 9 of the Argentine draft by a new text.

The amendment was rejected by 27 votes to 17, with 7 abstentions.

42. Mr. ENCINAS (Peru) explained that he had abstained because the amendment requested the Economic and Social Council to undertake a function which was already part of its recognized procedure.

43. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Czechoslovak representative had requested that the revised draft resolution submitted by the representative of Argentina (A/C.2/L.162/Rev.2) should be voted on paragraph by paragraph.

44. The CHAIRMAN put the first paragraph of the Argentine revised draft resolution (A/C.2/L.162/Rev.2) to the vote.

The first paragraph was adopted by 38 votes to none, with 14 abstentions.

45. The CHAIRMAN put the second paragraph to the vote.

The second paragraph was adopted by 41 votes to none, with 13 abstentions.

46. The CHAIRMAN put sub-paragraph 3 (a) (formerly sub-paragraph 3(b) (A/C.2/L.162/Rev.2)) to the vote.

Sub-paragraph 3 (a) was adopted by 37 votes to none, with 17 abstentions.

47. The CHAIRMAN put sub-paragraph 3 (b) (formerly sub-paragraph (a) (A/C.2/L.162/Rev.2)) to the vote as amended by the second amendment contained in document A/C.2/L.181.

Sub-paragraph 3 (b) was adopted by 38 votes to none, with 16 abstentions.

48. The CHAIRMAN put sub-paragraph 3 (c) to the vote.

Sub-paragraph 3 (c) was adopted by 33 votes to 8, with 12 abstentions.

49. The CHAIRMAN put sub-paragraph 3 (d) to the vote, with the inclusion of the oral Indonesian amendment already accepted by the Argentine delegation (219th meeting), namely the addition to the text in document A/C.2/L.162/Rev.2 of the words "... and so hampers not only the acquisition of the necessary amounts of external means of payment, but also the formation of sufficient domestic savings".

Sub-paragraph 3 (d) as amended was adopted by 37 votes to 5, with 11 abstentions.

50. The CHAIRMAN put sub-paragraph 3 (e) to the vote.

Sub-paragraph 3 (e) was adopted by 34 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

51. The CHAIRMAN put sub-paragraph 3 (f) to the vote.

Sub-paragraph 3 (f) was adopted by 37 votes to 9, with 6 abstentions.

52. The CHAIRMAN put sub-paragraph 4 (a) to the vote.

53. Mr. BUNGE (Argentina) requested a roll-call vote.

A vote was taken by roll-call as follows:

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

In favour: Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Liberia, Mexico, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Against: Denmark, France, Greece, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Canada.

Abstentions: China, Haiti, India, Israel, Pakistan, Thailand.

Sub-paragraph 4 (a) was adopted by 33 votes to 15, with 6 abstentions.

54. The CHAIRMAN put sub-paragraph 4 (b) to the vote.

Sub-paragraph 4 (b) was adopted by 36 votes to 2, with 15 abstentions.

55. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Argentine representative had accepted the Indian proposal (A/

C.2/L.182, first amendment) that sub-paragraph 4 (c) should be deleted.

56. He then put sub-paragraph 4 (d) of the Argentine draft to the vote which if adopted would become sub-paragraph 4 (c).

57. Mr. BURR (Chile) requested a roll-call vote.

A vote was taken by roll-call as follows:

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

In favour: Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Liberia, Mexico, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Abstentions: Canada, Colombia, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Israel, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela, Australia, Belgium.

Sub-paragraph 4 (d) was adopted by 37 votes to none, with 18 abstentions.

58. Mr. BUNGE (Argentina) remarked that the words "reasonable, fair and equitable" in sub-paragraph 5 (a) should be amended to read "adequate, just and equitable", the words used in sub-paragraph 4 (a).

59. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Committee had already adopted the Brazilian amendment to the first part of paragraph 5 (A/C.2/L.183). He put sub-paragraph 5 (a), as amended, to the vote.

Sub-paragraph 5 (a) was adopted by 29 votes to 14, with 11 abstentions.

60. The CHAIRMAN put sub-paragraph 5 (b) to the vote.

Sub-paragraph 5 (b) was adopted by 33 votes to 3, with 17 abstentions.

61. The CHAIRMAN put paragraph 6 to the vote.

Paragraph 6 was adopted by 40 votes to none, with 14 abstentions.

62. The CHAIRMAN put paragraph 7 to the vote.

Paragraph 7 was adopted by 43 votes to none, with 12 abstentions.

63. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Argentine delegation had accepted the Indian amendment (A/C.2/L.182, second amendment) to include an eighth paragraph.

64. Mr. ENCINAS (Peru) asked that, since it had been decided that the results of the study mentioned in paragraph 8 should be transmitted to the eighth session of the General Assembly, the number of the session should be specified in the text of the paragraph.

65. Mr. JOCKEL (Australia) thought it was not in order to propose a substantive amendment during the voting.

66. Mr. BUNGE (Argentina) said that it was clear from the spirit of the Indian amendment that the text referred to the eighth session of the General Assembly.

67. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph 8 as contained in document A/C.2/L.182.

Paragraph 8 was adopted by 36 votes to none, with 18 abstentions.

68. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph 8 (A/C.2/L.162/Rev.2) which if adopted would become paragraph 9.

Paragraph 8 (A/C.2/L.162/Rev.2) was adopted by 32 votes to 10, with 10 abstentions.

69. The CHAIRMAN put paragraph 9 of the Argentine draft to the vote. If adopted it would become paragraph 10.

Paragraph 9 was adopted by 30 votes to 3, with 17 abstentions.

70. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Argentine revised draft resolution as a whole as amended.

71. Mr. BUNGE (Argentina) requested a roll-call vote.

A vote was taken by roll-call as follows:

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

In favour: Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Liberia, Mexico, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Greece, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Sweden, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstentions: Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Czechoslovakia, Haiti, Israel, Poland, Thailand, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The revised draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 29 votes to 16, with 9 abstentions.

72. Mr. ARKADYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), explaining his vote on the Argentine draft resolution and amendments thereto, said he had been in sympathy with the aim of the resolution, with the faith in the justice of its position shown by the Argentine delegation throughout the discussion.

73. Although his delegation had supported some of its important provisions, it had not been able to vote in favour of the appointment of a group of experts, for reasons which had already been explained. It was also opposed to the amendments made to sub-paragraph 4 (a) of the resolution by the eleven Powers (A/C.2/L.181 and Corr.1). In his delegation's view, the working group had altered the original Argentine draft resolution to such an extent that it would have been detrimental to those very interests of the under-developed countries which it was intended to promote.

74. The original draft resolution, for example, had called for measures to establish an equitable relation between the prices of primary products and manufactured goods, which would enable the under-developed countries to make the maximum use of their domestic savings and thus raise their standards of living. The working group, however, had altered that recommenda-

tion to make the establishment of fair wage levels and the raising of the standard of living in under-developed countries dependent on the implementation only of national economic development programmes. The industrialized countries would thus have been relieved of the responsibility they ought to bear for the economic development of under-developed countries. His delegation, therefore, had been unable to support those parts of the draft resolution which had been changed by the working group.

75. It had also been unable to support the joint amendment submitted by Denmark, Norway and Sweden (A/C.2/L.180). Those amendments had referred to the Havana Conference for an international trade organization as a positive achievement, whereas it was well-known that that Conference had been held solely in the interests of the United States and had made no contribution to the development of world trade as a whole.

76. His delegation had been unable to support the reference to the report of the group of experts on *Measures for International Economic Stability* (E/2156), since it could not agree that the report was valuable or constructive. In its comments on the report at the fourteenth session of the Economic and Social Council, his delegation had pointed out¹ the defects in the report's proposals, which would place the fate of the under-developed countries in the hands of United States agencies such as the Export-Import Bank and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

77. Mr. KAZEMI (Iran) said his delegation had voted for the Argentine revised draft resolution because it believed it would have beneficial effects by leading to a fuller understanding of the factors affecting the terms of trade and general development of the under-developed countries. Like some other delegations, it would have liked to have seen changes made in some of the provisions; for example, it thought the study on synthetic materials should be carried out by the group of experts rather than by the Secretariat. Nevertheless, the resolution was a constructive proposal which would have a favourable effect on world public opinion, and he congratulated the Argentine representative on his far-sighted and pioneering spirit.

78. Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) requested the right to reply to the USSR representative under rule 114 of the rules of procedure. He had understood that the floor was open only for explanation of votes. The USSR representative, however, had taken the opportunity to cast aspersions on the Governments of the United States and other countries. The representative of a government which had forcibly taken over the assets of other countries as the USSR has done in the case of Hungary and Romania was scarcely qualified to make such statements.

79. Mr. BLUSZTAJN (Poland), on a point of order, objected to the attempt made by the United States representative to re-open the debate on the USSR's commercial policies. The USSR representative, in explaining his vote, had referred to the paragraphs of the Argentine draft resolution which his delegation

could or could not support, and in so doing had been obliged to refer to certain facts previously mentioned in the Committee.

80. The CHAIRMAN said he had given the United States representative the floor to explain his vote under rule 127 of the rules of procedure. Since the general debate was already closed, he could not grant the United States representative the right of reply under rule 114.

81. Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) appealed against the Chairman's ruling.

82. The CHAIRMAN put the appeal to the vote under rule 112.

The appeal was upheld by 29 votes to 5, with 10 abstentions.

83. Mr. GARCIA (Philippines) said he had voted against the Chairman's ruling with great regret but he had been unable to do otherwise since he had understood that the United States representative had asked for and been given the floor under rule 114.

84. Mr. BLUSZTAJN (Poland) explained that he had voted in support of the Chairman's ruling because it was his understanding that the Chairman always applied the rules of procedure correctly. He could not see that the United States representative had any right to re-open the debate, or that the latter's statement had had any connexion with an explanation of his vote.

85. Mr. DE SEYNES (France) said he had voted less against the Chairman's ruling than against the Polish representative's attempt to deprive a representative of the right of reply.

86. Mr. LUBIN (United States of America), resuming his remarks, said he also had failed to understand how the slanderous statements made by the USSR representative could be construed as an explanation of the USSR vote.

87. The USSR had taken over control of the terms of trade of certain governments by seizing and controlling the assets of companies in the countries concerned. It was not even necessary for those companies to make any profit for the USSR to obtain dividends for them; it had seen to it that profits were guaranteed, whether earned or not and that they were transferred even before they had actually been earned. The USSR had shown no concern for the terms of trade of other countries when, in the past, it had become a member of certain international cartels, the sole purpose of which was to injure the commercial exchanges of other countries. It had even compelled certain cartels to accept it as a member by dumping its products on the market and thus depressing prices.

88. Mr. GURINOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), on a point of order, said he understood that when a representative had been granted the right to reply he could only reply to points which had been raised in the original statement. He therefore failed to see the United States representative's justification for continuing to enlarge on the Soviet Union's trade policies, when the USSR representative had made only a passing reference to the United States.

89. Mr. SALAMANCA FIGUEROA (Bolivia), on a point of order, said the United States representative

¹ See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Fourteenth Session, 629th meeting.*

had been given the right to speak. He should be allowed to do so freely and without interruption.

90. Mr. LUBIN (United States of America), resuming, referred to the deep concern expressed by the USSR representative with regard to the terms of trade of under-developed countries. But over a five-year period the USSR had extracted almost \$1,000 million worth of goods and services from the Austrian economy; 70 per cent of the goods had been transferred to the USSR, while in the case of the remaining 30 per cent the proceeds of their sale had also been transferred to the USSR.

91. Mr. BUNGE (Argentina) emphasized that when his delegation had submitted its draft resolution, it had pointed out that no political implications were involved and that the resolution should be judged solely on its merits. If adopted by the General Assembly a great step would have been taken towards a fuller understanding of the problem.

92. Mr. ARKADYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, since the rules of procedure had been violated by the United States representative's re-opening of the substance of the debate, he would request a similar opportunity to reply to the United States representative.

93. His country had no reason to be ashamed of the trade policies and practices it followed because those practices were based on the principle of equality and no attempt whatever was made to obtain special privileges in its relations with other countries. It was well known, however, that the position of the United States was entirely different. American monopolies were plundering the economies of under-developed countries and extorting the utmost they could obtain. It was that very situation which had driven the under-developed countries to take a stand against the practices of the United States. Despite what the Argentine representative had said with regard to the absence of political implications in his delegation's draft resolution, that resolution obviously represented a protest against the pressure applied by the United States through its monopolistic policies.

94. In his explanation of his delegation's vote he had stated why it did not agree with certain concrete statements in the Argentine proposal, and had not in any way violated the rules of procedure.

95. Mr. BOTHA (Union of South Africa), explaining his delegation's vote on the Argentine draft resolution, said it had voted for those parts of the resolution which it could accept. It had voted against subparagraph 3 (f) because it could not accept the principle, which appeared to be implied by that paragraph, that highly industrialized nations should be authorized to intervene in the domestic affairs of others. It had voted against sub-paragraph 4 (a); he had already explained its objections to that paragraph (218th meeting). It had voted against sub-paragraph 4 (b) because it considered it too vague. It had voted against paragraph 5, as amended, because it felt that the introduction of the idea of bilateral arrangements was a retrograde step. It had also voted against paragraph 9, because that paragraph called for a new study which appeared superfluous, and transferred to another body what should be a function of the Economic and Social Council.

96. He regretted that his delegation had been compelled to vote against the draft resolution as a whole because it had much sympathy with its objectives.

97. Mr. ABDELRAZEK (Egypt) said it was traditional for the Second Committee to set aside political conflicts and concentrate on the discussion of economic questions in order to achieve constructive ends. He had therefore abstained in the vote on the appeal against the Chairman's ruling. In view, however, of the explanations given by several representatives of their vote on that motion, he proposed the adoption of a vote of confidence in the Chairman. He also moved the adjournment of the meeting, under rule 117.

98. The CHAIRMAN put the motion for adjournment to the vote.

The motion was adopted by 40 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 1.55 p.m.