

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records



**SECOND COMMITTEE, 1509th
MEETING**

Tuesday, 5 December 1972,
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

Chairman: Mr. Bruce RANKIN (Canada).

AGENDA ITEM 12

Report of the Economic and Social Council [chapters
III to XI, XII (sections A to G) and XVII to XIX]
(continued) (A/8703)

**OUTFLOW OF TRAINED PERSONNEL FROM
THE DEVELOPING TO DEVELOPED COUN-
TRIES (concluded)**

1. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that at the previous meeting his delegation had voted against the amendments proposed by the United States delegation because their content and purport would have made it difficult for draft resolution A/C.2/L.1271/Rev.1 to deal realistically with the problem of the brain drain. Secondly, his delegation had been obliged to vote against the amendments submitted by the Argentine delegation (A/C.2/L.1281) since they referred to proposals contained in the *World Plan of Action for the Application of Science and Technology to Development*,¹ which had not been examined by any intergovernmental body and which therefore did not have the force of recommendations approved by such a body. In the view of his delegation, it would be quite wrong and undesirable to confront the General Assembly with a fait accompli in the form of a document which neither the General Assembly nor an intergovernmental body had examined. Thirdly, his delegation had been obliged to vote against the French amendment since it referred to international agreements and bilateral agreements between capitalist and developing countries designed to exacerbate the brain drain. Moreover, the reference to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was not germane to the point at issue.

2. Nevertheless, his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole because it believed that it created a sound basis for international co-operation to solve the problem of the brain drain.

3. Mr. AL JABER (Jordan) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1271/Rev.1 because it did not agree with the implication in paragraph 2 that it was possible, or even desirable, to put an end to the outflow of trained personnel from developing countries. The brain drain was a complex phenomenon caused by numerous economic, social and political factors, and was not necessarily detrimental to developing countries which had a surplus of trained personnel and lacked employment opportunities.

¹ United Nations publication, Sales No. E.71.II.A.18.

4. Mr. DEBRAH (Ghana) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, although it had accepted many of the amendments that had been proposed. It should be borne in mind that the circumstances prevailing in different countries, regions and subregions with regard to the brain drain were not identical, and while some countries were confronted by a very real problem, others were not opposed to qualified persons leaving so long as the latter sent money back home regularly.

5. Mrs. DERRÉ (France) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it attached particular importance to the question of the brain drain, although it had not been entirely satisfied with the balance of the text, which had failed to stress that the developing countries were also responsible for the brain drain.

6. Mr. DELPRÉE CRESPO (Guatemala) said that his delegation was aware of the harm caused to developing countries by the brain drain. Nevertheless, since both article 13 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Guatemalan Constitution guaranteed freedom to leave and return to a country, his delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole, although it had voted in favour of the French amendment.

7. Mr. MORENO (Cuba) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole because it felt that the amendments incorporated into it had not destroyed the basis of the draft resolution. However, it felt that the draft resolution would have been more satisfactory from the viewpoint of the developing countries if some of the amendments, and in particular that concerning the last preambular paragraph, had not been incorporated.

8. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole, in view of its great importance, although it felt that it was strongly biased against the developed countries.

9. Mr. MASSONET (Belgium) said that his delegation was not entirely satisfied with the text of the draft resolution which, in its view, still lacked balance.

10. Mr. FINDLEY (Liberia) said that his delegation had been absent when the vote had taken place. Had it been present, it would have voted as indicated in its statement at the 1508th meeting.

UNITED NATIONS FUND FOR POPULATION
ACTIVITIES (A/8899, A/C.2/L.1283)

11. Mr. VERCELES (Philippines) introduced draft resolution A/C.2/L.1283 on behalf of the sponsors and expressed the hope that it would receive the widest possible support.

12. The CHAIRMAN announced that Japan had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

THE PROBLEM OF MASS POVERTY AND
UNEMPLOYMENT IN DEVELOPING
COUNTRIES (*continued*)* (A/C.2/L.1276/Rev.1)

13. Mr. VERCELES (Philippines) said that the following amendments to draft resolution A/C.2/L.1276/Rev.1 had been accepted by the sponsors: first, the amendment proposed by the Ethiopian delegation to add the words "and in the countries that are least developed," at the end of the sixth preambular paragraph; and, secondly, the amendment proposed by the Netherlands delegation to replace the phrase "a large proportion of whose populations have *per capita* incomes significantly lower than the average" in operative paragraph 2 by the phrase "especially those where large segments of the population have *per capita* incomes significantly lower than the national average".

14. Mr. CHANG HSIEN-WU (China), noting that many developing countries were still very poor, said that his delegation understood the desire of the sponsors of the draft resolution for the United Nations to take action to help developing countries to improve the lives of their people and believed that it was the responsibility of the Organization to make efforts in that direction.

15. However, his delegation had reservations about some of the views contained in the report of the Committee for Development Planning on its eighth session² because it believed that the massive poverty and unemployment in the developing countries were due to prolonged foreign aggression, plunder and exploitation rather than to population growth or technical innovations.

16. Furthermore, his delegation noted that paragraph 4 of the draft resolution requested the Secretary-General to formulate, in co-operation with the President of the World Bank Group, urgent measures to attack the problem of massive poverty in those developing countries a large proportion of whose populations had very low *per capita* incomes. However, the World Bank had failed to implement General Assembly resolution 2758 (XXVI) restoring all its rights to the People's Republic of China and expelling the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek from the places they unlawfully occupied at the United Nations and related organizations. His delegation would therefore not participate in the vote on the draft resolution.

17. Mr. FINDLEY (Liberia) proposed that instead of adding the words "and in the countries that are

least developed" at the end of the sixth preambular paragraph, as the sponsors had agreed to do in accordance with the Ethiopian amendment, the words "and least developed" should be inserted between the words "developing" and "countries".

18. Mr. ROUGÉ (France) said that his delegation attached particular importance to finding remedies to the problem of mass poverty. In its view, the draft resolution pursued a number of objectives. First, it sought to induce the developing countries to take internal measures to achieve better income distribution. Secondly, it drew the attention of the wealthy countries and sources of international assistance to the problem of mass poverty so that assistance programmes could be drawn up. Thirdly, it sought to channel the distribution of external financial resources to the countries where poverty was most acute.

19. His delegation fully sympathized with the first objective of the draft resolution and felt that it was perfectly appropriate to invite the developing countries to take action against mass poverty. His delegation had some doubts with regard to the second objective, since it felt that internal policies were those most likely to bring about the necessary changes and results. However, it agreed that, in some cases, assistance should be rechannelled so that the problem of mass poverty could be resolved more easily and expeditiously.

20. As far as the third objective was concerned, his delegation had serious difficulties regarding the question of the distribution of external financial resources among the various countries. It did not seem advisable to stipulate that particular attention should be given to countries where large segments of the population had low incomes. As it stood, the draft resolution questioned one of the most important resolutions adopted at Santiago, namely, resolution 62 (III), on special measures in favour of a certain number of countries.

21. In conclusion, his delegation would be able to vote in favour of the draft resolution if the distinctions leading to the establishment of new criteria were removed. Accordingly, the words "some developing countries" should be replaced by the words "the developing countries" in the eighth preambular paragraph and the words "in a number of developing countries" should be replaced by the words "in the developing countries" or "in most developing countries" in the tenth preambular paragraph. Furthermore, the words "those developing countries a large proportion of whose populations have very low *per capita* incomes" in paragraph 4 should be replaced by the words "in the developing countries" to ensure that the problem of mass poverty was attacked wherever it existed.

22. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) said he did not consider that the draft resolution identified the basic reasons for the eternal problem of mass poverty. As the representative of China had said, population growth was not always to blame, and reference should be made in the draft resolution to the possible applica-

* Resumed from the 1506th meeting.

² Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Fifty-third Session, Supplement No. 7.

tion of an unsuitable model for development or a wrong technical approach to development. In addition, paragraph 4 of the draft resolution referred to action to be taken by the Secretary-General and the President of the World Bank Group, but failed to indicate where Governments would be involved in such measures: the paragraph should be reworded to reflect the fact that the problem was one with which individual countries should deal.

23. Mr. ZAGORIN (United States of America) expressed general support for the draft resolution. However, he believed that it laid insufficient stress on a matter which had been referred to by the President of the World Bank Group, namely, the need for developing countries to institute changes themselves in order to establish the institutional framework for dealing with such problems. That framework could not be imported, but had to be laid down by the developing countries themselves. The point was reflected in paragraph 2, but paragraph 5 seemed to place too much reliance on the benefits of increased assistance, for example, by the use of the word "enable", where his delegation would have preferred the word "help". Additional resources could play an important role, but there were certain steps which had to be taken by the developing countries themselves.

24. He shared the concern expressed by the representative of France over the wording of the eighth preambular paragraph; perhaps the problem could be solved by deleting the word "some". Further, the problem raised by the representative of Liberia in connexion with the sixth preambular paragraph might perhaps be settled by changing the order a little, so that the end of that paragraph would read: "particularly in the least developed countries and in the developing countries with the largest aggregate population".

25. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) stressed the truth of the statement of the President of the World Bank Group that if no steps were taken to correct unsatisfactory income distribution in the developing countries, inputs of external assistance would be to no avail. For that reason, his delegation welcomed a draft resolution on the subject. However, the representatives of Brazil and China had stressed the responsibilities of Governments of developing countries, and his delegation agreed that the draft resolution as it stood left those Governments little scope for action and little responsibility. His delegation also shared the concern expressed by the representatives of France and the United States in the matter of categorization, especially in connexion with the countries with the largest aggregate population, and the least developed countries. It was a fact that some countries with large populations were dealing satisfactorily with their problems, while some countries with smaller populations had qualitatively greater problems. Perhaps the references in the sixth preambular paragraph and in operative paragraph 5 should simply be to "some countries". In addition, he supported the suggestion that the word "some" should be deleted in the eighth preambular paragraph.

26. In paragraph 2, he welcomed the improvements made by the sponsors of the draft resolution, but thought that the word "urgently" should be inserted before the phrase "to consider" in accordance with the emphasis placed by the representative of Brazil on the responsibility of countries to solve their own problems themselves.

27. In paragraph 3, he agreed with previous speakers who had stressed that additional assistance on concessionary terms would not necessarily solve the problem of the maldistribution of income. His delegation would not oppose that paragraph, but he pointed out that his Government and others had already drawn up a set of new recommendations which would result in the provision of aid in the future on highly concessionary terms. In paragraph 4, the words "urgent measures" should be replaced by the words "policy guidelines". With regard to paragraph 5, he fully shared the doubts expressed by the representatives of France and the United States, and believed that the word "enable" should be replaced by the word "help".

28. However, the criticisms so far made of the draft resolution went too deep to be dealt with by means of amendments. The draft's objective was correct but its general emphasis was not yet so. Perhaps some improvements in the formulation could be achieved if a day was allowed for a second revision of the draft resolution.

29. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) observed that the draft resolution concerned an important subject, and that it was important that it should be carefully formulated. More time would be needed to produce a second revised text.

30. Most of the suggestions for the modification of the draft resolution related to points on which his delegation too had felt concern. In the ninth preambular paragraph, in accordance with general practice, the reference to the statement made by the President of the World Bank Group should be deleted. In addition, that paragraph should appear immediately after the reference to Economic and Social Council resolution 1727 (LIII), and the existing seventh preambular paragraph should immediately precede the paragraph referring to that resolution. The changes suggested by the representative of the Philippines to operative paragraph 2 constituted an improvement, but had not solved all the problems involved. The formulation of paragraph 4 seemed to duplicate part of paragraph 5. The organizations referred to in paragraph 5 received their funds from Governments, which were referred to separately in paragraph 3; those paragraphs should be reformulated to avoid repetition. He supported the suggestion that the sponsors of the draft resolution should confer with those delegations which had suggested changes, so that it might be further revised.

31. Mr. HAMID (Sudan) observed that the draft resolution under consideration introduced a number of new elements compared with Economic and Social Council resolution 1727 (LIII), including a new categ-

ory of "the poorest 40 per cent", and an element of interference by the United Nations in the internal policies of sovereign States which was implicit in paragraph 2. The introduction of a new category of countries seemed to be intended to divert the attention of the international community from the implementation of certain measures in favour of some extremely poor countries. It would have been preferable to concentrate on measures to benefit the least developed countries, and not the poorest 40 per cent of the population of countries.

32. Paragraph 2 left nothing for a country to decide for itself. It was unacceptable for developing countries to be told by the United Nations to consider programmes designed to achieve better income distribution. In brief, his delegation would be unable to support the draft resolution as it stood.

33. Mr. EKBLOM (Finland) said that his delegation supported the draft resolution. However, he shared the difficulties experienced by the representative of France concerning paragraph 3, and failed to see a natural link between concessionary assistance and the capacity of developing countries to redistribute their income. In addition, he had reservations about establishing a new category of developing countries. If the suggestions made by the representative of France could be incorporated into the draft resolution, his delegation would be able to vote for it, since its basic purpose was a constructive one.

34. Mr. DIALLO (Upper Volta) agreed with preceding speakers that income redistribution was a matter for the individual country concerned. It could be achieved by national ownership of natural resources, by agrarian reform or by other measures which were already being implemented under the International Development Strategy, as indicated in the Charter of Algiers,³ which made specific reference to the right of individual countries to plan their own development.

35. The objectives set out in paragraph 2 would best be achieved by going beyond the outlines indicated by the President of the World Bank Group. There were other bodies within the United Nations system which were better suited for such work than those mentioned in paragraph 5.

36. The difficulties his delegation was experiencing with the draft resolution should not be taken to signify opposition to the principle of special measures to benefit the poorest sections of developing countries. The problem should be further examined, especially by the Committee for Development Planning which might propose specific measures taking due account of the responsibilities of developing countries and of international bodies. He hoped that the sponsors of the draft resolution would agree to reformulate it, taking his observations into account, and stress that the measures envisaged should be implemented by the individual countries concerned.

³ *Proceedings of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, Second Session*, vol. I and Corr.1 and 3 and Add.1 and 2, *Report and Annexes* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.68.II.D.14), p. 431.

37. Mr. PANGGABEAN (Indonesia) observed that some delegations appeared to believe that domestic efforts were adequate to solve the problem of mass poverty by ensuring a more equitable distribution of income. While many developing countries were trying to introduce social justice through their development programmes, low national income could frustrate that aim. Economic growth should be balanced with social equity, and for domestic efforts to be successful there should be an increase in external assistance, as suggested in paragraphs 3 and 5. His delegation supported the draft resolution, which was important and timely.

38. Mr. GEBRU (Ethiopia), referring to the suggestion made by the representative of Liberia, said that it was not true that there were some countries with large populations among the least developed countries; the major characteristic of the least developed countries was their small population. He urged that his own original amendment, as incorporated into the revised draft resolution by the representative of the Philippines, should be retained.

39. Mr. JOSEPH (Australia) said that he and the other sponsors of the draft resolution would need to consult together on the suggestions which had been made. However, in connexion with the alleged establishment of a new category of countries, referred to by the representatives of France, the United States, the United Kingdom and the Sudan, he said that the aim of the draft resolution was not to establish a new category, but to bring the international community to accept responsibility for all the developing countries, and not merely the least developed among them. Some of Australia's neighbours in Asia, while not facing the same problems as the least developed countries, encountered equal or even greater economic problems in their development.

40. His delegation had been struck, during the Committee's debate on agenda item 46, by the statement by the representative of India that less than 14 per cent of UNDP's projected resources were allocated to meet the requirements of 50 per cent of the total population of the recipient countries. His delegation had checked and had ascertained that indeed 17 per cent of UNDP's resources were intended to meet the needs of 55 per cent of the population of the developing world. UNDP assistance was directed to a total population of 1,900 million people, but seven recipient countries accounted for a population of 1 thousand million. In other words, those countries accounted for 55 per cent of the total population of developing countries, but received only 17 per cent of UNDP resources. The value of recent statements by the President of the World Bank Group had been to focus attention on the poor populous countries which had large pockets of deprived people whose incomes might often be significantly below even those in the least developed countries.

41. The draft resolution was not meant to compete with other resolutions favouring the least developed countries. It would give rise to no new claims or challenges against the least developed countries, as the

representative of France feared. For example, the sixth preambular paragraph was intended to cover other poor countries besides the least developed countries.

42. In his delegation's view, the draft was also a balanced one. Operative paragraph 1 endorsed a decision adopted by the Economic and Social Council, which had itself been a balanced text. Paragraph 2 placed the onus on developing countries to do something positive about the less prosperous parts of their population, but, although it stressed matters relating to their internal jurisdiction, it did no more than invite Governments to take action. The representative of Upper Volta had rightly pointed out that developing countries were already applying the relevant policies; that point could be covered by replacing the word "consider" by the word "continue". The balanced presentation of the draft continued in operative paragraph 3 with a request aimed at developed countries, but stressing the self-help concept, in that it invited them to enhance the capacity of developing countries to eradicate mass poverty and unemployment. Paragraphs 4 and 5 were addressed to international organizations; there was a difference of concept between what was requested of the Secretary-General and IBRD in paragraph 4 and what was required of other organizations in paragraph 5; however, the paragraphs could if necessary be reworded to meet the concern expressed by the representative of Greece. As far as operative paragraph 6 was concerned, although his delegation was not in favour of automatically ending resolutions with a request for further reports, it believed that in that instance a brief report, of 10 pages or less, was warranted; such a report could perhaps elaborate on the points made by the President of IBRD in relation to social equity and economic growth.

43. Mr. FINDLEY (Liberia) said that his delegation could support the change suggested by the representative of the United States in the sixth preambular paragraph if the words "with the largest aggregate population" were deleted.

44. Mr. OKELLO (Uganda) said it was clear that extensive revision of the draft resolution was required. The problem which it raised, that of mass poverty and unemployment in developing countries, was an extremely important one requiring action at the national and the international levels. His delegation would therefore support the main thrust of the draft, but had two serious reservations. In the first place, the draft resolution, in particular paragraphs 2 and 4, had serious implications with regard to the internal policies and prerogatives of States, while in the second place, it appeared to his delegation to embody a subtle attempt to establish a new category of countries, consisting of the poorest 40 per cent. If that was to be done, the procedure used to define the least developed among the developing countries must be followed; the question should be referred to the Committee for Development Planning, which would report, with recommendations, through the Economic and Social Council to the General Assembly. There was no reason at that stage to set up another category which might lead to a duplication of the measures currently being taken in favour of the least developed countries.

45. Mr. CISSÉ (Senegal) said his delegation considered the draft resolution unbalanced. There was clearly a link between the creation of employment opportunities and the current world trade situation. In his delegation's view, the draft resolution should call for redistribution of income in the developing countries and also for the adoption by developed countries and the international organizations concerned of the measures necessary to improve the terms of trade. If those terms were not improved, the developing countries would not possess the means to assist the poorest segments of their population. Accordingly, the words "and to create new employment opportunities" should be deleted from paragraph 2, and the words "and the competent organs of the United Nations to take measures which will put an end to the deterioration in the terms of trade, so as to enable the developing countries to create new employment opportunities;" should be added to paragraph 3 after "Invites developed countries".

46. Mr. ABHYANKAR (India) said that, in his delegation's view, further consultation was required on the draft resolution. A number of speakers had forcefully stressed the responsibility of developing countries themselves to take measures to remedy mass poverty and unemployment, but it was arguable whether or not the text under consideration spelt out that responsibility clearly. His delegation did not believe that the draft attempted to create a new category of countries; it was essentially the "peoples of the United Nations" who were involved in the development process, and not merely nation States. What the draft resolution attempted to do was focus attention on a problem which had been somewhat lost sight of as a result of the entirely laudable attempts to concentrate on the problems of the least developed and the land-locked developing countries.

47. Mr. ALI (Pakistan) agreed with the comments of the representatives of Australia and India. The title of the draft resolution referred to the problem of mass poverty and unemployment in developing countries, and it was impossible for the Committee to address itself to that problem without addressing itself to those parts of the world where the problem was encountered. No new classification of countries was being sought; rather, attention was being drawn to the mass of extremely poor people in the world, whatever their country.

48. Mr. VERCELES (Philippines) said that, as a sponsor of the draft resolution, he wished to make a number of general comments before the informal consultations took place. The draft resolution in no way infringed upon the internal jurisdiction of Governments, since they were simply invited to take relevant action; Economic and Social Council resolution 1727 (LIII) had in fact used stronger wording, and had recommended that Governments should act. In that context, paragraph 2 should be seen merely as a reminder to the developing countries of the action generally felt to be necessary. On the question which had been raised concerning categories, the draft resolution was also perfectly clear. The third preambular paragraph

reiterated paragraph 7 of the International Development Strategy (General Assembly resolution 2626 (XXV)), with its reference to improvement in the well-being of the individual. The purpose of the draft resolution was to bring about measures which would benefit the poorest 40 per cent of the population of the developing countries, a subject which had first been raised by the President of IBRD. In that context, it was the well-being of individuals which was of primary importance and the question of countries was only secondary.

49. Although the eighth preambular paragraph, which had given rise to comment, merely stated a factual situation, he believed that the sponsors would be able to agree to the suggestion which had been made. He thought they would also be in a position to take into account the amendment to operative paragraph 4 proposed by the representative of Brazil, and produce a wording which would be acceptable to him. On the other hand, acceptance of the amendments proposed by the representative of France, which would have the draft resolution refer only to the developing countries in general, and not to some among them or to segments of their population, would undermine the whole purpose of the draft resolution, which was to introduce an extremely important concept that had not appeared in Economic and Social Council resolution 1727 (LIII).

50. As the representative of Uganda had stated, mass poverty and unemployment in the developing countries constituted an extremely important problem, and its solution was primarily the responsibility of the developing countries themselves. That responsibility was acknowledged in the International Development Strategy, and was implicitly recognized in paragraph 2 of the draft resolution. What was important, however, was to draw the attention of the international community to the problems of those countries in which a large proportion of the population was desperately poor. The elimination of such poverty was a vital task.

51. Mr. FARHANG (Afghanistan) said that his delegation did not oppose the main idea of the draft resolution. Afghanistan was sympathetic towards the problems of the countries referred to by the representa-

tive of the Philippines, shared their difficulties, and believed that measures should be devised to assist them.

52. However, his delegation believed that the first essential was for some organ of the United Nations, perhaps the Committee for Development Planning, to try to identify the countries concerned. The problem was not everywhere the same; some developing countries might have a gross national product sufficiently large to enable them to assist the poor segments of their population, but remain unable to do so because of their income distribution system or because their approach to development was incorrect. Moreover, the special assistance measures to be taken in favour of those countries, once identified, must also be studied. To call on Governments and international organizations to take such measures, without first specifying the areas in which assistance was needed and the form it should take, would not achieve the desired results. Finally, it was essential that any special measures taken should not prejudice or injure in any manner the interests of the least developed among the developing countries, or the special measures devised in favour of them. If those three points were taken into account by the sponsors, his delegation would be able to support the draft resolution.

53. The CHAIRMAN announced that Sri Lanka had become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1276/Rev.1.

54. Mr. LEKONGA (Zaire) said that his delegation sympathized with the desire of the sponsors to have the General Assembly adopt a resolution dealing with the problems of the poverty-stricken masses in developing countries, since the Government of Zaire was itself engaged in a continuing effort to better the lot of those so afflicted in that country. Nevertheless, his delegation would welcome an explanation of how the provision of additional resources to the countries affected by that problem would help to achieve a more satisfactory distribution of income in them. In its view, the situation regarding income distribution was no worse in the developing countries than in the developed countries.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.