



**CONTENTS**

	Page
Agenda item 27:	
Economic development of under-developed countries (continued):	
Collection of information concerning international economic assistance for the less developed countries (concluded) .....	319

**Chairman:** Mr. Mohammad MIR KHAN (Pakistan).

**AGENDA ITEM 27**

**Economic development of under-developed countries (A/3154, A/3192) (continued):**

COLLECTION OF INFORMATION CONCERNING INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE FOR THE LESS DEVELOPED COUNTRIES (A/C.2/L.295/REV.1) (concluded)

1. Mr. SOLLI (Norway) said he was afraid that the many members of the Committee who had commented on the draft resolution (A/C.2/L.295/Rev.1) at the preceding meeting were under the impression that the proposal was at least premature, if not impossible to put into effect at present. The Norwegian delegation did not think there were any grounds for that impression. The representative of the Secretary-General had said that the Secretariat was prepared to undertake the proposed survey, but had intimated that it would be better at that stage to ask for a draft report only. That suggestion was quite in keeping with the spirit of the draft resolution, and the sponsors had decided to make their intention clearer by amending the first phrase of subparagraph (b) of operative paragraph 1 to read: "To submit a draft of this survey . . .".

2. During the debate, members of the Committee had asked some questions which had remained unanswered owing to lack of time. The replies to most of those questions were implicit in the actual text of the draft resolution, but it was true that many details had yet to be settled; it would be the Secretary-General's responsibility to deal with that matter after consultation with the Economic and Social Council, to which he would submit his draft report.

3. The Egyptian and Ceylonese representatives had been particularly anxious to know how assistance provided for purely economic ends could be distinguished from military aid. The sponsors of the draft resolution had themselves felt that concern and had accordingly referred only to economic aid programmes, namely, gifts, loans and technical assistance granted by Governments and intergovernmental organizations. In that connexion, he drew the Committee's attention to the fact that the Secretariat would collect information from Governments and intergovernmental organiza-

tions only, and that Governments themselves would determine the nature of the aid they were receiving; similarly, they alone would decide whether their countries should be regarded as less developed countries for the purposes of the resolution.

4. The United Kingdom representative had said that the proposed survey should extend also to long-term private investments, and had rightly pointed out that the operative part of the draft resolution referred neither to private capital nor to commercial loans. It should be noted, however, that the question of the international flow of private capital for investment in the less developed areas was mentioned in the second paragraph of the preamble. The Economic and Social Council would of course have to consider the annual report on the international flow of private capital together with the proposed draft survey, but he did not think it was necessary to mention that in the resolution, since the Council was free to draw up its agenda as it wished.

5. The Egyptian and Ceylonese representatives had wondered whether information of the kind that it was proposed to collect was not already available; that was undoubtedly so, to a great extent. What was lacking, however, was a general survey based on official information from the Governments themselves, one of the purposes of which would be, as the Brazilian representative had suggested, to draw attention to gaps in the existing programmes. The United Nations was the proper body to undertake such a survey.

6. The Norwegian delegation considered that the United Nations would be making a serious mistake if it renounced its leadership in matters relating to international economic assistance. The proposed survey was feasible and its value undeniable; it would be a pity to delay it, in view of the great needs of the under-developed countries. The interest that had been shown in the draft resolution at the preceding meeting had been most encouraging. If the preliminary survey aroused similar interest when it was submitted to Member States, great hopes could be built upon United Nations action in that regard.

7. Mr. HALIQ (Saudi Arabia) considered that the real purpose of the draft resolution was set forth in the last paragraph of the preamble. That opinion was borne out by the statements of the sponsors and in particular by that of the Canadian representative, who had said at the preceding meeting that a survey of the kind proposed would provide information on the basis of which the United Nations could perform a useful role in assisting the preparation of economic aid programmes by its Members. That attitude to the question called for further reflection, for it implied United Nations intervention in the matter of assistance granted under bilateral agreements. That was a field in which the greatest discretion was needed, and the Committee should take care not to lead the Secretariat on to political ground which it had so far scrupulously avoided.

8. Mr. CROLL (Canada) admitted that the proposal gave rise to problems which could not be solved immediately; that applied to any new undertaking. The Secretariat had stated, however, that it would be able to carry out the proposed survey; there was therefore no reason why the experiment should not be tried, on the understanding that it would be suspended or given a different orientation if the results were unsatisfactory. The Canadian delegation had stated the real purpose of the survey in the statement to which the Saudi Arabian representative had referred: in its opinion, the time had come to reassess the position with regard to the assistance that was being provided in promoting the economic development of the less developed countries, and the United Nations was the organization best qualified to do so. The sponsors of the draft resolution had no other intention in mind.

9. Mr. HILL (Secretariat) confirmed that, in the Secretary-General's opinion, the task was not only feasible but was also calculated to strengthen action for the economic development of under-developed countries. The preparation of a survey of the kind proposed would certainly require much work, and many difficulties would have to be overcome, but the Secretariat hoped to fulfil the task with the co-operation of Governments and of the Economic and Social Council.

10. Mr. SOLLI (Norway) stressed the provisional nature of the survey which the Secretariat would be asked to prepare.

11. The Greek representative had expressed concern about the expenditure the survey would entail; as the Secretary-General had not submitted a paper on the financial implications, it was to be presumed that the Secretariat could perform the task with the funds already available.

12. The Greek representative had also wondered whether the period to be covered by the survey should not be extended. The sponsors had thought that the survey would be particularly useful in describing the existing situation; for that purpose, it would be enough to go back to 1953.

13. Mr. ANIS (Egypt) said that the difficulties of the task which was to be entrusted to the Secretariat were obvious to everyone. Before undertaking a survey of that kind, it was essential to define the norms accurately; on that point the draft resolution was far from adequate. That being so, it was questionable whether the desired results would be obtained. He therefore hoped that the sponsors would not press their proposal and that the Committee would refer the question to the Economic and Social Council, so that the latter could study it in greater detail at its twenty-fourth session and could give the Secretariat the precise directives which were needed for any well-grounded statistical survey. He therefore proposed that the operative part of the draft should be replaced by a single paragraph couched in the following terms:

*"Requests the Economic and Social Council to consider at its twenty-fourth session, in connexion with the item of financing of economic development, the question of collection of information concerning international economic assistance for the less developed countries"*.

14. Mr. OMPI (Indonesia) supported the Egyptian proposal.

15. Mr. RAJAPATHIRANA (Ceylon) said that although he had followed the discussion carefully he still

had some doubts on the matter. It would be a pity to burden the Governments and the Economic and Social Council with a project which was not yet fully prepared. Considerable preliminary work would have to be done before the survey could be properly undertaken. That did not mean that the Ceylonese delegation did not fully approve the principle of the proposed survey; on the contrary, it was in order to ensure the success of the survey that it wished to avoid any premature decision.

16. Mr. Gopala MENON (India) pointed out that Canada and Norway were among the States which gave the most generous assistance to under-developed countries. The Indian delegation had therefore hesitated considerably before reaching the conclusion that it could not support the proposal in its present form. It considered that the Economic and Social Council should be asked to examine the question in the first place; it was for the Council to decide whether such a survey was really necessary and, if in the affirmative, to define the methods to be followed. The value of such a survey would be even more apparent if it was requested, for example, by the Technical Assistance Committee or by the Council itself. If those bodies, which followed United Nations technical and economic assistance programmes very closely, had decided that the lack of information on international economic assistance to the less developed areas of the world hampered the effective execution of such programmes, they would certainly have made known their opinion. That, however, did not seem to be the case. The Indian delegation therefore preferred to take a prudent course and would support the Egyptian representative's proposal that the whole question should be referred to the Economic and Social Council.

17. Mr. CROLL (Canada) pointed out that the sponsors of the draft resolution were simply proposing that the Council should be asked to say whether the project to be submitted to it was practicable and should be proceeded with.

18. Mr. RECABARREN (Chile) thought that a question of substance arose: namely, what method would be used and what form the proposed survey would take.

19. One of the points which had most concerned his delegation when the original text had been submitted to the Committee had been the question of military assistance, which was liable to become confused with economic assistance. Very clear limits should be laid down for the survey of economic assistance, and the question of the expense such assistance entailed for the under-developed countries should also be studied. His delegation, like many others, thought that the proposed survey should give a very clear idea of the assistance needed by the under-developed countries. It therefore proposed the addition of the following new subparagraph after subparagraph (a) of the operative paragraph 1:

*"(b) To consider exclusively in this study the economic assistance furnished and to determine if it had been in the form of donations, loans or by some other process, specifying in each case the assistance furnished and the cost incurred by the beneficiary country."*

20. His delegation asked that its amendment should be put to the vote if the Egyptian proposal was not adopted.

21. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) suggested that two sub-paragraphs of operative paragraph 1 should be redrafted to read:

“(a) To make a preliminary study on the principles and methods of foreign economic assistance for future surveys and report to the Economic and Social Council;

“(b) To request the Economic and Social Council to consider this report at its twenty-fourth session;”.

22. Mr. CROLL (Canada) requested that the meeting should be suspended for a short time.

*The meeting was suspended at 4.30 p.m. and resumed at 5 p.m.*

23. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) announced that his delegation would withdraw its amendment and would associate itself with the Egyptian proposal.

24. Mr. SOLLI (Norway) saw no great difference between the Egyptian proposal and that embodied in the draft resolution (A/C.2/L.295/Rev.1). If the draft resolution were adopted it would enable the Economic and Social Council to obtain factual material, without which it could do little.

25. Mr. ANIS (Egypt) pointed out that during the suspension of the meeting the delegations of Indonesia and Yugoslavia as well as that of Greece had associated themselves with his delegation in submitting the amendment. That amendment made no change in the substance of the draft resolution. The difference lay merely in the question of method. The measure proposed was very sensible, but the Committee could not take a decision on the projected survey straight away. The matter required further reflection.

26. Mr. MORALES (Argentina) pointed out that the purpose of the draft resolution was to obtain concrete and objective information on the amount and geographical distribution of the economic assistance furnished throughout the world. There was no question of making an analysis of the assistance or of the conditions under which it was furnished; it was simply a matter of collecting factual material. His delegation therefore failed to see what difficulties that work could involve for the Statistical Office.

27. The Egyptian proposal was not acceptable to his delegation, for the effect of its adoption would be to cause unnecessary delay in a basic task which was essential if one of the Council's debates was to serve any purpose. There was no question of a hasty survey, and the compilation of the necessary material was a purely objective task. While statistics were published on national income, balance of payments and foreign trade, there were no data available on economic assistance, a field in which the United Nations was proposing to undertake action on a large scale. It was accordingly only logical to ask the Secretary-General to prepare a preliminary survey which would enable the Council to take its decision in full knowledge of the facts.

28. Mr. FLERE (Yugoslavia) asked the sponsors of the draft resolution to take into account the spirit in which the delegations of Egypt, Greece, Indonesia and Yugoslavia were submitting their amendment. No one was against the basic concept behind the draft resolution, which was designed to ensure that the action taken by the United Nations in the field of international economic assistance should be on methodical lines, but several speakers had expressed doubts about the timeliness of the step. Economic assistance was an important

and permanent feature of international relations. It was accordingly logical that the United Nations should deal with it. As the debate had shown, however, the four-Power proposal could achieve results only if certain conditions were fulfilled. In particular it must be ascertained whether various Governments were prepared to give such action by the United Nations a positive orientation. That was not certain.

29. At the preceding meeting several questions had been raised to which it seemed hard to find an answer, and if the Secretary-General undertook a survey without detailed instructions he would have a very difficult task to perform. It was to be feared that a hasty survey might lead to a discussion in the Economic and Social Council which could prove detrimental to the future work of the United Nations. It would accordingly seem advisable for the Committee to enable the Council to make a detailed examination of the varied and delicate aspects of international economic assistance. That was the purpose of the proposed amendment.

30. Mr. OMPI (Indonesia) hoped that the sponsors of the draft resolution would accept the Egyptian amendment. During the debate, several countries which were receiving economic assistance had indicated that they would like the question to be studied in greater detail.

31. Mr. RAJAPATHIRANA (Ceylon) was grateful to the sponsors of the draft resolution for having placed the question before the Committee, but there were many points still to be clarified. The Secretary-General would have a difficult task, for he did not even know the intentions of the Committee. The draft resolution was very sensible, but it was hard to see how it could be put into effect. The decision would lie with the Governments; later, the Secretary-General might have to place his experts at their disposal in order to make the work effective.

32. His delegation accordingly thought that it would be better to request the Economic and Social Council to consider the question at its twenty-fourth session, as proposed in the Egyptian amendment.

33. Mr. CROLL (Canada) felt that the Egyptian delegation had submitted not so much an amendment as an entirely new proposal.

34. Mr. LOPEZ VILLAMIL (Honduras) endorsed the intention of the draft resolution, but thought that the Chilean amendment should be incorporated in it. The amendment submitted by Egypt, Greece, Indonesia and Yugoslavia would entail the deletion of the entire operative part. That meant that it was a new proposal, and as such it could not be voted upon first.

35. Moreover, in view of the various opinions expressed in the debate, he thought that the Committee should not adopt a resolution which might add to the confusion. It would therefore seem appropriate to request the Economic and Social Council to study the question.

36. Mr. Gopala MENON (India), referring to rule 131 of the rules of procedure, pointed out that the proposal by Egypt, Greece, Indonesia and Yugoslavia was certainly an amendment. Moreover, it was the furthest removed in substance from the original proposal. It should therefore be voted on first.

37. Mr. BRINSON (United Kingdom) pointed out that the essential part of a proposal was its operative part, not its preamble. To reduce a proposal to its preamble was to eliminate it. Rule 131 stated that an amendment referred merely to part of a proposal.

38. The United Kingdom delegation would vote for the revised four-Power draft resolution. It felt that the instructions given to the Secretariat should have been more specific, but it realized that under the existing circumstances it was impossible to formulate detailed instructions. As he understood it, the intention of the draft resolution was that the problem should be approached empirically and with caution, and that the Secretariat would consult Governments, which would have an opportunity to comment both before and at the twenty-fourth session of the Economic and Social Council.

39. The proposal had not been made at the last minute; the members of the Committee had been able to study it for over two months. To refer it to the Council would be equivalent to putting it off, since the Council would be in the same position as the General Assembly and would probably be unable to do any more than instruct the Secretariat to make the preliminary survey which the Committee could request of the Secretariat at once.

40. Mr. EPINAT (France) said he agreed that a proposal reduced to its preamble was no longer a proposal. He would vote for the four-Power draft resolution and against the Egyptian amendment.

41. Mr. MORALES (Argentina) announced that the sponsors of the draft resolution were prepared to accept the first part of the Chilean amendment, which read: "To consider exclusively in this study the economic assistance furnished and to determine if it had been in the form of donations, loans or by some other process". They felt that that was a very useful supplement to their draft.

42. The sponsors also agreed with the Chilean representative that it would be of great interest to estimate the assistance furnished in respect of expenses incurred by the recipient Governments; but they did not feel that the Secretariat should be asked to undertake such a study immediately, since, by complicating the problem, it might delay the collection of the essential information on the amount of assistance furnished. Perhaps the Secretary-General could simply be asked to state in his preliminary report how the study requested by the Chilean representative could be carried out.

43. Mr. RECABARREN (Chile) thanked the Argentine representative and the other sponsors of the draft resolution for having incorporated the first part of his amendment in their text. He withdrew the second part of the amendment, but reserved the right to revert in the near future to the highly important question of the net amount of economic aid.

44. Mr. STIBRAVY (United States of America) said that the proposal for the collection of statistical information on the various economic aid programmes as put forward by the sponsors of the draft resolution, was a useful one that might be helpful to future discussions of the problems of financing economic development. He agreed that the draft resolution left many questions unanswered, but pointed out that for the time being all that was being asked was a preliminary survey, which would be submitted to the Economic and Social Council for consideration. He was therefore in favour of the four-Power draft resolution.

45. Mr. RAJAPATHIRANA (Ceylon) said that a proposal constituted a whole, and could not be reduced to either the preamble or the operative part of a draft resolution. In the present instance the proposal before the Committee was that contained in the four-Power

draft. The Egyptian amendment changed that proposal, but was not complete in itself; it was therefore undoubtedly an amendment, and not a new proposal. Since the Egyptian amendment was further removed from the original proposal than the others, it should be put to the vote first.

46. Mr. FLERE (Yugoslavia) associated himself with the Ceylonese representative's remarks. The proposal Egypt had presented was certainly an amendment, since its sponsors were not opposed to the original proposal but were merely asking for caution.

47. The CHAIRMAN said that under the rules of procedure he could either give a ruling himself on a point of order or put it to the vote. He intended to do the latter.

48. Mr. Gopala MENON (India) said he would like to hear the opinion of the representative of the Office of Legal Affairs on the meaning of the term "amendment". For himself, he was convinced that an amendment could completely change the sense of a proposal.

49. Mr. SCHREIBER (Secretariat) said that the last sentence of rule 131 of the rules of procedure had been adopted in order to make it impossible for a new proposal submitted in the form of an amendment to be put to the vote before another proposal which had been submitted earlier. From the purely formal standpoint, there was nothing to prevent two or more paragraphs of a draft resolution from being replaced by a new paragraph, by way of an amendment. As for the replacement, by way of an amendment, of all the paragraphs of the operative part of a draft resolution, that posed a more complex problem which so far as he knew had not been definitely settled by the General Assembly or its committees on procedural matters. Since the essential object was that the Committee should be able to express itself with complete clarity on all the proposals submitted to it, and that the majority view should prevail, he thought it was consistent with the spirit of the rules of procedure that, if need be, the order of voting should be determined by a ruling of the Chairman, confirmed if necessary by the Committee, or by a preliminary vote of the Committee itself.

50. Mr. WOULBROUN (Belgium) said that the representatives of India and Canada were in agreement on one point: the Egyptian amendment would leave nothing remaining of the substance of the original proposal. It was therefore definitely a new proposal, to which rule 132 of the rules of procedure should be applied.

51. Mr. LOPEZ VILLAMIL (Honduras) said it was clear from rule 130 of the rules of procedure that the essential part of a proposal was its operative part; according to that rule, if all operative parts of a proposal had been rejected the proposal was to be considered to have been rejected as a whole.

52. Mrs. WRIGHT (Denmark) stated that, in accordance with rule 91, a proposal was rejected as a whole if the entire operative part was rejected. Therefore the proposal which completely deleted the operative part of the four-Power draft could not be considered as an amendment to a non-existing resolution, but must be dealt with as a separate proposal.

53. Mr. GURINOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said he wondered whether there was no way other than a vote out of the present procedural debate, the subtle purpose of which was only too apparent.

54. Mr. SOLLI (Norway), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the original proposal, said he wished to propose a compromise solution. The Egyptian amendment would be accepted if the following words were added "on the basis of such information as the Secretary-General may provide bearing in mind the comments of delegations at the eleventh session of the General Assembly".

55. Mr. ANIS (Egypt) said he accepted that proposal on behalf of the sponsors of the amendment he had submitted.

56. Mr. BRINSON (United Kingdom) said he would like to know how the Secretariat would interpret such a resolution.

57. Mr. DE SEYNES (Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs) said that the Secretariat was

prepared to carry out the survey provided for in the original draft resolution. The adoption of the new proposals would be of help to it, since it was no longer being asked for an authoritative survey but for a working document. The Secretariat could therefore undertake to furnish statistical information and a concise statement of the methodological problems that might arise in carrying out surveys of the kind envisaged.

58. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the four-Power draft resolution (A/C.2/L.295/Rev.1), as amended by Egypt, together with the addition submitted by Norway.

*The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 52 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.*

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.