

# GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THIRTEENTH SESSION

Official Records


 Wednesday, 24 September 1958,  
at 3 p.m.

**NEW YORK**
**CONTENTS**

	<u>Page</u>
Statement by the Chairman . . . . .	3
Election of the Vice-Chairman. . . . .	3
Election of the Rapporteur . . . . .	3
Order of discussion of agenda items . . . . .	3

**Chairman: Mr. Toru HAGIWARA (Japan).**

Statement by the Chairman

1. The CHAIRMAN thanked the General Assembly for the honour it had done his country by electing him as Chairman of the Second Committee.

Election of the Vice-Chairman

2. Mr. BERNARDO (Argentina) nominated Mr. Vivian (Canada).

3. Mr. SCOTT FOX (United Kingdom), Mr. Mir KHAN (Pakistan), Mr. ALDEGUER (Philippines) and Mr. VENKATARAMAN (India) supported the nomination.

Mr. Vivian (Canada) was elected Vice-Chairman by acclamation.

Election of the Rapporteur

4. Mr. KITTANI (Iraq) nominated Mr. Flere (Yugoslavia).

5. Mr. RUYGERS (Netherlands) and Mr. MANGASHA (Ethiopia) supported the nomination.

Mr. Flere (Yugoslavia) was elected Rapporteur by acclamation.

Order of discussion of agenda items (A/C.2/198, A/C.2/L.361)

6. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to document A/C.2/L.361 which contained suggestions regarding the order in which the items of its agenda might be taken up. The suggestions were very clearly summarized in plans I and II in paragraph 9 of the document.

7. Mr. KHOMAN (Thailand), supported by U THET TUN (Burma), considered that, as item 28 (a) (Establishment of the Special Fund), which was to be taken up first, was closely related to item 28 (Economic development of under-developed countries), it would be preferable to adopt plan I, under which the general debate on item 28 would be held immediately after consideration of item 28 (a).

8. Mr. KITTANI (Iraq) felt that plan II was clearly preferable, as it would enable the Committee to have only one general debate instead of two; in accordance with the Committee's usual practice, that debate would

take place in connexion with item 12 (Report of the Economic and Social Council).

9. At the invitation of the CHAIRMAN, Mr. OWEN (Executive Chairman, Technical Assistance Board) explained that, as the Ninth United Nations Technical Assistance Conference was to be held on 16 October, the Committee should take up the consideration of item 29 (a) (Programmes of technical assistance: report of the Economic and Social Council) as soon as possible after that date.

10. Mr. RAJAPATIRANA (Ceylon), supported by Mr. CHENG (China), felt that plan II had certain advantages, as the Committee would, for practical reasons, have to take up items 28 (a) and 29 (a) first. Moreover, the Committee would obviously be bound to discuss the economic development of the under-developed countries during the general debate on item 12. It would therefore be logical to have only one general debate.

11. Mr. PHILLIPS (United States of America) said that, although he had no strong feelings on the point, he was inclined to favour plan I, which would leave the delegations of the under-developed countries greater latitude to state their views on the important question of economic development.

12. Mr. PSCOLKA (Czechoslovakia) felt that both plans were acceptable but, like the representatives of Iraq and Ceylon, would prefer plan II, which seemed more rational and would save time. However, in view of the variety and importance of the questions dealt with in the report of the Economic and Social Council, items 28 (b) (International tax problems) and 29 (c) (Establishment of an international administrative service) should not be taken up until item 12 had been debated.

13. Mr. PENTEADO (Brazil) preferred plan I for the same reasons as the representatives of Thailand and the United States.

14. Mr. SERBAN (Romania) recalled that, at the preceding session, the Committee had decided (453rd meeting) to take up item 12 first, so as to be sure of having enough time to consider it properly. Nevertheless, there was no reason why items 12 and 28 should not be discussed together in the general debate. He agreed with the Czechoslovak representative that items 28 (b) and 29 (c) should not be taken up until after item 12 had been examined.

15. Mr. VENKATARAMAN (India) shared that view.

16. Mr. CHARPENTIER (France), while not having any particular preference for either plan, concurred with the reasons given by the Chairman and by Mr. Owen that plan II might be more suitable.

17. Mr. O'NAGHTEN (Cuba), supported by Mr. RITTER AISLAN (Panama), favoured plan I. The eco-

conomic development of the under-developed countries was a subject of such importance that it warranted a separate general debate. As at previous sessions, delegations should be free to refer to item 12 during the debate on item 28 and vice versa.

18. Mr. HALIQ (Saudi Arabia) pointed out that the development of the debate would depend largely on any new points which might be brought up during the consideration of item 28 (a). It was therefore important to know whether members of the Committee intended to introduce any new ideas which would justify a general debate on economic development.

19. Mr. SOPIEE (Federation of Malaya) said that his delegation did intend to submit a proposal regarding the economic development of the under-developed countries. He was inclined to favour plan II which, he felt, answered the wishes of the majority.

20. Mr. KITTANI (Iraq) said that he would prefer the improved version of plan II proposed by the representatives of Czechoslovakia, Romania and India.

21. Mr. KHOMAN (Thailand) considered that plan I was preferable because it would be impossible for the Committee to give due attention to the question of the economic development of the under-developed countries if the general debate covered both item 28 and item 12.

22. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that after concluding its consideration of item 28 (a), the Committee would be unable to deal usefully with item 29 until after the Technical Assistance Conference. He therefore suggested, as a compromise solution, that during the intervening period, the Committee should consider any proposals on questions other than the establishment of the Special Fund submitted by delegations in connexion with item 28. During the general debate on item 12, representatives would be able to deal both with the Council's report and with the general aspects of the economic development of under-developed countries.

23. Mr. KAUFMANN (Netherlands) supported that plan and proposed that, during the intervening period, the Committee should also consider chapter I, section

VI, of the Council's report, relating to item 12, as it would have to transmit its views to the Special Political Committee, to which the question had also been referred.

24. Mr. CHENG (China) supported that proposal.

25. Mr. SCOTT FOX (United Kingdom) said that he preferred plan II, but would have accepted plan I if the majority of the under-developed countries had wanted a separate general debate on item 28. In view of the division of opinion, the plan suggested by the Chairman seemed the best solution. After considering item 28 (a) and proposals under item 28, the Committee could take up item 28 (b).

26. Mr. KHOMAN (Thailand) found the Chairman's suggestion acceptable and expressed the hope that, in their statements on proposals submitted under item 28, representatives would be able to refer to related aspects of economic development as well as to the specific subject of the proposals.

27. Mr. SOPIEE (Federation of Malaya) asked that delegations should be allowed to submit proposals on economic development when the Committee considered draft resolutions on the Council's report.

28. The CHAIRMAN observed that no rigid plan of work could be adopted because the order in which the items were taken up would depend largely on the amount of time devoted to each. He suggested that the Committee should take up item 28 (a) first and then proposals concerning item 28. Depending on the amount of time available before 16 October, the Committee might then examine item 28 (b) and chapter I, section VI, of the Council's report. After 16 October, the Committee would consider item 29, item 12—it being understood that the general debate would deal both with the economic development of the under-developed countries and the Council's report and that delegations might submit proposals on both questions—item 27 (United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency) and item 30 (Question of assistance to Libya).

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.