

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

FIFTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**SECOND COMMITTEE, 701st  
MEETING**

Friday, 2 December 1960,  
at 2.55 p.m.

**NEW YORK**

**CONTENTS**

*Agenda items 12, 29 and 74:*

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

*Economic development of under-developed countries (continued):*

- (a) *International flow of private capital: report of the Secretary-General and recommendations thereon by the Economic and Social Council;*
- (b) *Question of the establishment of a United Nations capital development fund: report of the Secretary-General;*
- (c) *Methods and techniques for carrying out a study of world economic development: report of the Secretary-General and comments thereon by the Economic and Social Council;*
- (d) *Promotion of wider trade co-operation among States: report of the Secretary-General*

*Land reform (continued)*

*Consideration of draft resolutions (continued) . . . . .*

333

*Agenda items 28, 30, 31 and 32:*

*Progress and operations of the Special Fund (continued)*

*Programmes of technical assistance:*

- (a) *Report of the Economic and Social Council (continued)*
- (b) *United Nations assistance in public administration: report of the Secretary-General (continued)*

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

*Question of assistance to Libya: report of the Secretary-General (continued)*

*Consideration of draft resolutions (continued) . . . . .*

335

Chairman: Mr. Janez STANOVNIK (Yugoslavia).

**AGENDA ITEMS 12, 29 AND 74**

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

Economic development of under-developed countries (continued):

- (a) International flow of private capital: report of the Secretary-General and recommendations thereon by the Economic and Social Council (A/4487, E/3325 and Corr.1-3);
- (b) Question of the establishment of a United Nations capital development fund: report of the Secretary-General (A/4488, E/3393, E/3393/Add.1-4);
- (c) Methods and techniques for carrying out a study of world economic development: report of the Secretary-General and comments thereon by the Economic and Social Council (A/4489 and Add.1, E/3379, E/3379/Add.1-7);
- (d) Promotion of wider trade co-operation among States: report of the Secretary-General (A/4490, E/3389)

Land reform (A/4439) (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.2/L.474 AND ADD.1-2) (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to continue its consideration of the draft resolution, which the Indian representative had introduced at the 694th meeting, on an accelerated flow of capital and technical assistance to the developing countries (A/C.2/L.474 and Add.1-2).

2. Mr. OMAR (Afghanistan) said that human history had entered a critical phase. The majority of mankind was living at a near-subsistence level with an annual per caput income of less than \$100 and in conditions of wide-spread malnutrition, disease and illiteracy, while the rest of the world enjoyed comparative affluence, progress and bright prospects. Such a situation could only breed social and political unrest and endanger world peace and stability. In an age of advancing technology, nations were becoming increasingly interdependent, both politically and economically, and the world community as a whole must make concerted efforts to redress the balance. Despite their feelings of disillusionment, the less developed countries were striving with determination to improve their lot, but their fund of technical skills and capital was not equal to their potentialities. They recognized that their development primarily depended on their own efforts, but while most of them possessed abundant natural resources and manpower, their feeble economies allowed little margin for investment and depended on a narrow range of primary commodities for foreign exchange. They needed international assistance to diversify and develop their economies to the point where they would have an adequate capital accumulation and would be able to continue to advance by their own efforts.

3. Fortunately they were already receiving assistance on a bilateral and multilateral basis, and it was encouraging to note that the assistance was increasing by about 15 per cent a year. Their needs were so vast and varied, however, that present assistance met only a fraction of their actual requirements in technical experts, funds and goods. Their capital needs for sustaining an annual growth rate of 2 per cent had been estimated at about 1 per cent of the gross national product of all the developed countries, or between \$7,000 million and \$8,000 million a year. Since about 9 per cent of that gross national product was at present spent on armaments, it did not seem unreasonable to expect the developed countries to make such a contribution. A considerable amount of that one per cent was already flowing to the less developed countries, and the purpose of the resolution was to encourage all developed countries to contribute at least 1 per cent of their gross national product. Such assistance clearly would not narrow the gap between the developed and the less developed countries, but it would help the under-developed countries to make a good start in improving their tragic conditions and to reach the point when they could continue to develop on a self-sustaining basis. They would then offer a valuable market for capital and consumer goods and enable the developed countries to maintain full production. Capital assistance would therefore benefit both donor and recipient countries and could be regarded as an investment in a stable and prospering world economy. The draft resolution had been formulated in the spirit of Articles 55 and 56 of the Charter, and he hoped that all Member States would find it acceptable.

4. Mr. VIAUD (France) said his delegation was not unsympathetically disposed towards the notion, put forward by the Indian representative and embodied in the draft resolution, that the developed countries should devote 1 per cent of their national income to financial and technical assistance to under-developed countries, and he pointed out that France was already extending assistance equivalent to 1.39 per cent of its national income. While, however, his delegation proceeded from the same premises as the sponsors of the draft resolution, it did not arrive at the same conclusion. From the practical point of view, the resolution was too vague and would be most difficult to apply. National accounting systems varied greatly, and the term "national income" had different meanings in different countries. Furthermore, information on financial and technical assistance was entirely inadequate, and there was not even a common terminology for the forms and elements of international assistance. The Indian representative had stated that the text allowed countries to place their own interpretation on such terms as "development capital", "national income" and even "1 per cent", but his delegation thought it would be unwise for the General Assembly to make a recommendation which was open to widely differing interpretations. The use of vague terminology in such fields as economic policy might bring into question the true value of United Nations activities. It was difficult, moreover, to see how States could take the legal and organizational steps recommended in operative paragraph 3 to achieve such nebulous objectives as those indicated in paragraph 1. He felt therefore that it would be more appropriate for the resolution to refer only in very

broad terms to the amount of capital that should be contributed.

5. Although per caput national income could in certain cases serve as a standard of comparison, it was a qualitative as well as a quantitative standard. In France, the per caput national income had risen substantially in the past twenty years, but the range of individual incomes had narrowed greatly as a result of higher wages, increased social security measures and taxation. The trend towards a more equitable distribution of the national income among the different social classes was the result of a deliberate government policy, and he hoped that all Member States would agree that that was just as desirable an aim as an aggregate increase in national income. The French taxpayer would probably be willing to accept sacrifices in the interests of the economic progress of the under-developed countries if he knew that such progress would be accompanied by greater social justice than existed in many under-developed countries at present. Any policy of economic development should take social considerations into account, but the draft resolution made no reference to such factors.

6. The draft resolution was incomplete, from the economic point of view, since it dealt only with international assistance. The economic and social progress of the less developed countries also depended, however, on the maintenance of a high level of economic activity in the industrialized countries. All financial and technical assistance to under-developed countries would be wasted if the export earnings of those countries suffered a decline as the result of an economic recession in the industrial countries that would be accompanied by a fall in commodity prices. His Government always endeavoured to maintain a balance between internal expansion and foreign aid, believing that the steady growth of its own economy contributed to the development of the less developed countries as effectively as grants of assistance. As, however, the draft resolution made no reference to the economic expansion of the developed part of the world, his delegation hesitated to support a recommendation that certain countries should devote a part of their national income to economic assistance without being allowed to judge whether such an obligation might not, in certain circumstances, risk compromising their investment policy. Although it might be argued that to appropriate 1 per cent of the national income of an economically expanding country would not affect its development, it was well to bear in mind that in an economy based on full employment, marginal factors were of considerable importance and allowed a government little latitude. The compulsory allocation of a proportion of the national income might introduce an element of rigidity into investment policy, which should always remain flexible.

7. He hoped therefore that the sponsors would consider limiting the draft resolution to a recommendation in broad terms, instead of seeking to attain a desirable objective by compulsion.

8. Mr. ABDEL-GHANI (United Arab Republic) pointed out that, as the Indian representative had already explained, it was not the intention of the sponsors to impose a form of international income tax, since that was a matter outside the scope of an international organization. The purpose of the draft resolution was to set a standard by which the assistance given by

developed countries could be judged. In most civilized communities the disparity between rich and poor was disappearing, whereas on the international plane it was growing. The under-developed countries could not continue to accept such appalling inequality and must be helped to develop their resources. Action was needed on the largest possible scale, and a resolution setting an international standard of assistance contributions should be a rallying point for all those who wished to wipe out poverty.

9. Mr. GREEN (New Zealand) said that while his Government was in sympathy with the purpose of the draft resolution, it felt that the approach which had been adopted was unlikely to achieve that purpose. As no government wished to be dependent on foreign assistance, the first aim should be to create conditions in which the less developed countries could achieve economic growth by their own efforts. That could best be done by improved terms of trade and commodity price stability, which would enable them to increase their export earnings. International institutions were already helping such countries to participate in world trade, to train experts, to utilize their manpower and resources and to establish an infrastructure of economic, administrative, educational and social services best suited to their chosen way of life. Many under-developed countries were also faced with the problem of changing social attitudes and overcoming social impediments to progress. The importance of capital investment and assistance should not therefore be unduly isolated or over-emphasized.

10. It was none the less appropriate to consider whether present foreign aid was adequate. It had been pointed out that the efforts of the past ten years had resulted in an increase in real per caput income in the under-developed countries by only 1 per cent a year, and that this rate would have to be doubled in the next ten years if tolerable progress was to be achieved. Reliable data on the size of the combined effort to be made in the decade were lacking. Concepts such as per caput national income involved assumptions difficult to prove and were sweeping generalizations which often did not reflect true comparative living conditions between countries.

11. Since foreign assistance should be a matter of conscience for each Government to decide for itself, a resolution calling for more rapid development should be couched in more general terms than the present draft, which singled out a particular group of countries as the sole means of promoting such development. The advanced countries could not in fairness be accused of failing in their duty, for they were giving large-scale assistance to the under-developed countries, and that assistance was increasing. The draft resolution referred to the net outflow of funds from the advanced countries, although his own country, for instance, was a net importer of capital and would require an increasing flow of foreign capital for its own future development. It had been claimed that former colonial Powers had an obligation to make special capital contributions to their former colonies, but in his opinion the responsibility for helping countries at an early stage of development was of a broader nature. New Zealand, for instance, assumed a special responsibility towards peoples of the South Pacific with which it had traditional ties. It had also provided during the past ten

years \$30 million in straight-out grants under the Colombo Plan, which had been instituted in 1950 by former colonial Powers and former colonies as a co-operative venture in technical and capital assistance.

12. His delegation would not, as the co-sponsor representative had suggested, look for loop-holes but would maintain its customary attitude of objectivity toward United Nations resolutions. There were appropriate and inappropriate approaches to the fixing of targets for international assistance. Although targets were usually expressed in money terms, a realistic approach had also to consider assistance in terms of the availability of trained personnel, a factor which had to be increasingly reckoned with in the Expanded Programme. His delegation did not consider it appropriate, in the light either of recent trends or of present needs, to fix national targets for foreign assistance in the discriminatory and narrow way proposed in the draft resolution.

13. Mr. TEIXEIRA PINTO (Portugal) pointed out that under-developed countries needed technical skills and experts as well as capital. He was not sure, however, that the advanced countries were prepared to restrict their own development in order to promote that of the under-developed countries, or that the less developed countries were ready to accept the burden of an accelerated development. As had already been pointed out, the principal needs were increased assistance, a fair distribution of that assistance, and its provision through multilateral channels. His delegation would also stress the effective use of such assistance, for it was often used to counter the effects and not the causes of under-development. Experience had shown that assistance granted to countries which were not ready for it had caused economic stagnation and social unrest. He did not believe that the advanced countries were ready to contribute, nor the under-developed countries to assimilate, assistance on the scale envisaged in the draft resolution. The aim of the resolution was commendable, but he doubted whether it could be achieved in current political circumstances. His delegation believed that where foreign assistance was provided, the main effort should be made by the recipient countries; that aid should be given largely in the form of low-interest loans rather than grants; and that action to promote development should be taken on a world scale.

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

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

Programmes of technical assistance:

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

Opportunities for international co-operation on behalf of former Trust Territories and other newly independent States: reports of the Economic and Social Council and of

the Secretary-General (A/4415, A/4585, A/C.2/L.509/Rev.2) (continued)

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

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.2/L.509/REV.2) (continued)

14. Mr. SULE (Nigeria) said that the sponsors of the revised draft resolution on assistance to former Trust Territories and other newly independent States (A/C.2/L.509/Rev.2) had agreed to incorporate the Japanese amendment (A/C.2/L.533). They believed that any effort to strengthen the Economic Commission for Africa, as well as other regional economic commissions, would benefit the countries of the areas concerned, and hoped that ECA would, so far as was possible, be made responsible for the execution as well as the planning of the programmes referred to in operative paragraph 3. On that understanding, they had agreed to incorporate the third of the three-Power amendments (A/C.2/L.527), subject to the insertion of the words "and wherever appropriate through" after the words "in co-operation with" in the latter part of that amendment. They wished to state once again that it was not the intent of the draft resolution to preclude or prejudice the extension of any form of assistance to countries other than the newly independent ones. They nevertheless wished to retain the preamble as it stood, and had therefore been unable to agree to the Argentine proposal (A/C.2/L.534) for the deletion of the third and fifth preambular paragraphs. They had also been unable to reach agreement on the incorporation of the other amendments suggested, and thought that it would be best to leave a decision on them to the Committee. They had, however, decided to add, after the word "Council" in operative paragraph 5, the words "and the regional economic commissions concerned". They proposed that the second of the three-Power amendments (A/C.2/L.527) should be voted on before the United States amendment (A/C.2/L.525).

15. The CHAIRMAN said that the request for a prior vote on the three-Power amendment was in keeping with rule 131 of the rules of procedure.

16. Mr. KAKITSUBO (Japan) thanked the sponsors for incorporating his delegation's amendment and withdrew his request for a separate vote on the third preambular paragraph.

17. Mr. FINGER (United States of America) said that his delegation agreed fully with the Chairman's decision on the order in which the amendments were to be voted on.

18. Mr. DUDLEY (United Kingdom) agreed to the addition of the words "and wherever appropriate through" in operative paragraph 3 of the revised draft, and to the proposed order of voting.

19. Mr. BERNARDO (Argentina) regretted that the sponsors had been unable not only to agree to the deletion of the third and fifth preambular paragraphs but even to provide the assurance he had requested that the incorporation of those paragraphs would in no way constitute even tacit approval of the Secretary-General's proposals, in his reports on the subject (E/3387 and Add.1 and A/4585). His delegation would therefore maintain its amendment (A/C.2/L.534) proposing the deletion of those paragraphs,

the vote on which would determine its position on the draft resolution as a whole. It would vote against the three-Power amendment.

20. Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that while his delegation was in favour of increased assistance to the new African States, it considered that the regular budget of the United Nations, which was already critically overburdened, should not be used for that purpose. In view of the needs of the new African States, the best source of increased aid to them would be the Expanded Programme and the other voluntary United Nations assistance programmes. If the draft resolution omitted reference to the use of the regular budget and provided that the assistance to be given to the newly independent States should be through the voluntary programmes of the United Nations, his Government would be prepared to add another 5 million roubles to its contribution to those programmes. In view of those considerations, and of his delegation's attitude towards the Secretary-General, who would be responsible for the disposal of the additional funds to be provided under the regular United Nations budget, his delegation would vote against the three-Power amendment.

21. Mr. CAMARA SIKHÉ (Guinea) said that it was important to bear in mind, in connexion with the draft resolution, that the newly independent States required assistance from the rich countries primarily because they had throughout history been the victims of spoliation. His delegation agreed that the assistance now being given to other countries should be continued, and that the contributions of the countries which had grown rich through colonialist domination should be largely channelled through the United Nations. It considered, however, that the needs not only of the States which had been admitted to the United Nations at the General Assembly's fifteenth session, but also of all the newly independent States, must be met on an urgent basis in order to enable them to transform and stabilize their political and economic structures and thus make further assistance unnecessary. In that connexion, his delegation felt that political independence, while it should not be the sole condition for receiving assistance, must be a necessary one. His delegation shared the hope that ECA would become a powerful force in the economic life of that continent, and it would point out that the Economic and Social Council had confirmed the view that ECA should take part in the planning of all assistance to Africa.

22. Mr. EL-MUTWALLI (Iraq) said that he found it difficult to accept the three-Power amendment because it seemed motivated by political considerations which were out of place in the Second Committee. While his delegation in no way opposed the conclusions reached in the Secretary-General's report (A/4585), it considered that, as a matter of principle, a decision on them should be left to the Fifth Committee. His delegation would abstain on the three-Power amendment as well as on the United States amendment; the latter would, it felt, be more appropriate in a resolution on assistance in general.

23. Mr. BRILLANTES (Philippines) said that there was clearly no general agreement in the Committee regarding the financial implications of the draft resolution. His delegation would therefore request a separate vote on the last clause of the additional



paragraph proposed by Japan (A/C.2/L.533) and accepted by the sponsors, beginning with the words "and the decision".

24. Mr. HASSAN (Sudan) said that his delegation strongly supported the proposals made by the Secretary-General because it believed that the best way to increase assistance to the newly independent States was to expand both the regular and the Expanded Programme of technical assistance and also because it had implicit confidence in the Secretary-General. It regretted that the Soviet representative had found it necessary to introduce a political issue in connexion with the three-Power amendment and to make his Government's offer of increased assistance conditional on support of its point of view on a political question. The Sudanese delegation would support the Secretary-General in the Fifth Committee but would abstain in the vote on the three-Power amendment because it did not think that the Second Committee should involve itself in a political dispute.

25. Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), replying to the Sudanese representative, said that all members of the Committee were agreed on the need to increase assistance to the new African States; the difference of opinion hinged not on a political question but on the procedures by which that assistance should be extended. His delegation considered that it would be a more logical and appropriate procedure to extend that assistance through the voluntary programmes rather than the regular United Nations budget. His delegation was not the one which had introduced a breath of the cold war into the Committee. It had replied and would continue to reply to any attacks made on the Soviet Union and the socialist countries, but its actions in that respect should not be confused with its position on the question of assistance to the newly independent States.

26. Mr. HASSAN (Sudan) said that his delegation would not presume to judge which delegation had been the first to inject political questions into the Committee's discussion; his objection had been to the conditional character of the offer of increased assistance made by the Soviet delegation, and to its reference to the role of the Secretary-General, which was a political question.

27. Mr. GURINOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the Committee could not properly vote on the amendments of the three-Powers and of the United States in the absence of a clear statement of what the financial implications would be. Moreover, as the Argentine representative had said (700th meeting), those amendments involved not only a budgetary increase of \$5 million but also the establishment of a new principle. The emergency assistance extended by the United Nations in the past had never been made a part of its regular budget; to do so in the case of the assistance to newly independent States would create a dangerous precedent. What was more, such action was entirely unnecessary and would have the effect not of increasing the potential assistance extended to the new States but of reducing it. If that aid was channelled through the voluntary programmes, each State could contribute as much as it wished, but no State would be able to shirk its special responsibility by arguing that it need contribute only its assessed quota.

28. Mr. WODAJO (Ethiopia) said that the three-Power amendment struck his delegation as a rather

casual introduction of a new principle which deserved careful consideration and should therefore be presented in a separate draft resolution. As he could not commit his Government to that principle without specific instructions, he would abstain in the vote on the amendments.

29. Mr. B. K. NEHRU (India) said that his delegation was not necessarily opposed to the principle of assistance being financed from the regular United Nations budget but felt that the matter should be discussed in the Fifth Committee. It would therefore abstain in the vote on the three-Power amendment.

30. Mr. DE SEYNES (Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs) said that he was not certain whether he could explain the financial implications of the joint draft resolution in a manner satisfactory to the Byelorussian representative. To his knowledge, there was no strict rule concerning the form in which the financial implications of draft resolutions should be presented; sometimes they were explained orally and sometimes in the form of a document. In any event, the financial implications of the draft resolution were fully set out in paragraph 23 of the Secretary-General's report (A/4585). It was difficult to see how any new document could further enlighten Governments; the result, indeed, might be only to complicate matters. The discussion of the draft resolution had added no further elements relating to financial implications, and the Fifth Committee would, of course, have to decide on the total sum to be allocated to the Secretary-General for the implementation of the draft resolution. Some delegations might be placed in a difficult position when it came to the vote if a new document on financial implications was submitted to the Second Committee.

31. Mr. GURINOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that he regarded as very significant the Under-Secretary's statement that the submission of a document explaining the financial implications of the draft resolution would further complicate the issue and make it difficult for some delegations to vote in favour of the text. Such a statement should serve to put the Committee on its guard.

32. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the second of the three-Power amendments (A/C.2/L.527), to insert into the draft resolution a new operative paragraph 2 which, having been further amended, read as follows:

*"Notes with satisfaction the proposals of the Secretary-General contained in the report of 22 November 1960 (A/4585) for increased assistance to these States from the regular budget of the United Nations."*

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

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

*In favour: Denmark, Finland, France, Gabon, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Canada.*

*Against: Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Argentina, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.*

**Abstaining:** Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Italy, Ivory Coast, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Austria, Brazil, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Cuba, Cyprus.

*The three-Power amendment, as modified, was adopted by 18 votes to 9, with 49 abstentions.*

33. Mr. FINGER (United States of America) confirmed that the United States amendment (A/C.2/L.525) had been withdrawn.

34. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Argentine amendment to delete the third and fifth paragraphs of the preamble (A/C.2/L.534).

*The amendment was rejected by 39 votes to 11, with 20 abstentions.*

35. Mr. AKYAMAC (Cyprus) requested a separate vote on the fifth preambular paragraph.

*The fifth preambular paragraph was adopted by 47 votes to 12, with 12 abstentions.*

36. Mr. BRILLANTES (Philippines) requested a separate vote on the concluding clause of the Japanese amendment (A/C.2/L.533) beginning with the words "and the decision...".

*The clause was adopted by 73 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

37. The CHAIRMAN explained that the revised draft resolution now included a new operative paragraph 2 as a result of the adoption of the second of the three-Power amendments. It also included the Japanese amendment (A/C.2/L.533). The sponsors had accepted the third of the three-Power amendments (A/C.2/L.527) to former paragraph 3, now paragraph 4, as further amended. Finally, in operative paragraph 5 the sponsors had agreed to accept the insertion of the words "and the regional economic commissions concerned" after the words "Economic and Social Council".

*At the request of the Sudanese representative, a vote on the draft resolution as a whole (A/C.2/L.509/Rev.2), as amended, was taken by roll-call.*

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

**In favour:** Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Cambodia, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand.

**Against:** None.

**Abstaining:** Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Argentina, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary.

*The revised draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 67 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.*

38. Mr. ABDEL-GHANI (United Arab Republic) said that he had abstained on the three-Power amendment not because he opposed the Secretary-General's proposals, but because he felt that the financial implications of the joint draft resolution should be discussed in the Fifth Committee.

39. Mr. BERNARDO (Argentina) explained that he had voted against the three-Power amendment because it completely altered the basic aim of the joint draft resolution. Since the Argentine amendment to delete the third and fifth preambular paragraphs had been rejected, he had been compelled to abstain on the draft resolution as a whole, even though his delegation shared the generous motives underlying it. The sole reason why Argentina had maintained its amendment was that it objected to the proposal to finance the additional assistance for the newly independent States from the regular budget; there was no question of Argentina not having confidence in the Secretary-General or the Technical Assistance Board. Finally, through a misunderstanding he had thought that the separate vote on the fifth preambular paragraph had actually been on operative paragraph 5. His vote therefore should be recorded as a vote against and not as an abstention.

40. Mr. DUDLEY (United Kingdom) expressed regret that political issues had been injected into the discussion of the draft resolution. His delegation had voted for that draft because of its intrinsic value and for no other reason. His delegation had also been careful not to raise any cold war issues or even to reply to accusations that had been levelled against the United Kingdom and its motives.

41. Mr. OMAR (Afghanistan) explained that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution because it had always supported the struggle of States to gain both political and economic independence. He had abstained on the three-Power amendment because the question to which it related should really be considered by the Fifth Committee.

42. Mr. SILVA SUCRE (Venezuela) said that he had been unavoidably absent during the vote on the draft resolution as a whole and wished his name to be added to those who had supported it.

43. Mr. VIAUD (France) explained that his delegation had voted both for the three-Power amendment and for the draft resolution as a whole. He recalled that operative paragraph 1 of Economic and Social Council resolution 768 (XXX) commended the Secretary-General for his report and endorsed the directives and principles contained therein. That resolution had been adopted unanimously by the Council, Bulgaria, Poland, and the Soviet Union having voted in favour of it. It was regrettable that the unanimity displayed in the Council had not been maintained in the Second Committee.

44. Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he had abstained on the draft resolution, while fully supporting its aims, because of one

unacceptable point, namely, the three-Power amendment. In the interests of a unanimous vote, his delegation would have favoured the proposal by the United Arab Republic that the question of financing should be dealt with in a separate draft resolution. It was regrettable that that suggestion had not been followed and that the three-Power amendment had been adopted. The countries responsible for conditions in the newly emerging States should vastly increase their share of the aid to those States and thus give back what they had taken from them. If the extra funds had had to be raised by voluntary contributions, then the imperialist countries would have been under a moral obligation to subscribe much more. The Soviet Union would have been willing to advance 5 million roubles solely to help the newly independent States. It could not agree to the suggested method whereby the Secretary-General would be allowed to use the funds of the regular United Nations budget. It would reserve its position on that question in the Fifth Committee.

45. Mr. NATORF (Poland) said that Poland's sympathy for the newly independent States was well known. His delegation therefore regretted that it had been compelled to abstain on the joint draft resolution because of the incorporation of the three-Power amendment. The regular budget of the United Nations had certain definite functions, and it should not be used for the implementation of a resolution when the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance and the Special Fund could discharge the task much more satisfactorily.

46. Mr. ZENKER (Austria) said that he had abstained on the three-Power amendment because he regarded the Fifth Committee as the competent body to decide whether the extra funds should come from the regular budget or the funds of the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance.

47. Mr. HERZI (Somalia) said that he had abstained on the three-Power amendment not because he opposed the Secretary-General's recommendations but because he felt that the matter should be taken up in the Fifth Committee.

48. Mr. JAMBOR (Czechoslovakia) said that his delegation, although it had been a sponsor of the draft resolution, had been compelled to abstain in the vote because the three-Power amendment had introduced a completely new element. The obstinacy of the United Kingdom delegation in maintaining that amend-

ment had only complicated the situation and, as the Sudanese representative had pointed out, had injected a regrettable political issue into the discussion.

49. Mr. HAJOUÏ (Morocco) explained that he had voted in favour of the draft resolution because he strongly sympathized with its noble aims. He had, however, abstained on the three-Power amendment, not because of political considerations or of any attitude of hostility towards the Secretary-General, but because he felt that the question was one for the Fifth Committee.

50. Mr. MAHDAVI (Iran) explained that his delegation, although it had not spoken in the debate, had voted whole-heartedly in favour of the draft resolution.

51. Mr. BRILLANTES (Philippines) said that he had voted for the draft resolution as a whole but had abstained on the three-Power amendment because of the financial implications involved.

52. Mr. SERAFIMOV (Bulgaria) said that the incorporation of the three-Power amendment had compelled his delegation to abstain on the draft resolution as a whole even though it fully supported the principles embodied in that draft.

53. Mr. WOULBROUN (Belgium) said that his delegation favoured voluntary and disinterested aid on behalf of under-developed countries but did not accept the somewhat tendentious explanations that had been advanced to justify the argument that certain countries were under an obligation to give such aid. He was glad that Mr. de Seynes had stressed that the final amount to be spent on the execution of the resolution would be determined by the Fifth Committee.

54. Mr. SHAIKH (Pakistan) said that his delegation had abstained on the three-Power amendment because it would reserve its position on the question of finance until that matter came up in the Fifth Committee.

55. Mr. HASSAN (Sudan), replying to the Czechoslovak representative, said that he had not been trying to determine who was responsible for injecting political considerations into the discussion but had merely expressed regret at the turn which the discussion had taken. His delegation had hoped that the debate on the draft resolution would be confined solely to its economic aspects.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.