

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

SIXTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**SECOND COMMITTEE, 774th  
MEETING**

Tuesday, 5 December 1961,  
at 11.10 a.m.

**NEW YORK**

**CONTENTS**

Agenda items 12, 28, 29 and 30:

*Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapters II, IV, V (sections II-V), VI (paragraph 489) and VIII (paragraphs 650 and 651)) (continued)*

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

(a) *Industrial development and activities of the organs of the United Nations in the field of industrialization;*

(b) *Establishment of a United Nations capital development fund: report of the Committee established by General Assembly resolution 1521 (XV);*

(c) *Accelerated flow of capital and technical assistance to the developing countries: report of the Secretary-General;*

(d) *Land reform: interim report of the Secretary-General*

*Questions relating to international trade and commodities (continued):*

(a) *Strengthening and development of the world market and improvement of the trade conditions of the economically less developed countries: report of the Economic and Social Council;*

(b) *Improvement of the terms of trade between the industrial and the under-developed countries: report of the Economic and Social Council*

*Questions relating to science and technology (continued):*

(a) *Development of scientific and technical co-operation and exchange of experience: report of the Secretary-General;*

(b) *Main trends of inquiry in the natural sciences, dissemination of scientific knowledge and application of such knowledge for peaceful ends: report of the Economic and Social Council*

*Consideration of draft resolutions (continued) 323*

*Organization of the Committee's work . . . . . 324*

**Chairman:** Mr. Blasco LANZA D'AJETA (Italy).

**AGENDA ITEMS 12, 28, 29 AND 30**

**Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapters II, IV, V (sections II-V), VI (paragraph 489) and VIII (paragraphs 650 and 651)) (A/4820 and Corr.2, A/4911) (continued)**

**Economic development of under-developed countries (A/4820 and Corr.2) (continued):**

**(a) Industrial development and activities of the organs of the United Nations in the field of industrialization;**

Page

(b) **Establishment of a United Nations capital development fund: report of the Committee established by General Assembly resolution 1521 (XV) (A/4878, E/3514, E/AC.6/SR.305-309);**

(c) **Accelerated flow of capital and technical assistance to the developing countries: report of the Secretary-General (A/4906, E/3556);**

(d) **Land reform: interim report of the Secretary-General (A/4850)**

**Questions relating to international trade and commodities (A/4820 and Corr.2, E/3452/Rev.1, E/3466, E/3468, E/3486, E/3497) (continued):**

(a) **Strengthening and development of the world market and improvement of the trade conditions of the economically less developed countries: report of the Economic and Social Council (A/4885, E/3519, E/3520 and Add.1, E/3530);**

(b) **Improvement of the terms of trade between the industrial and the under-developed countries: report of the Economic and Social Council**

**Questions relating to science and technology (A/4820 and Corr.2) (continued):**

(a) **Development of scientific and technical co-operation and exchange of experience: report of the Secretary-General (A/4904, E/3515);**

(b) **Main trends of inquiry in the natural sciences, dissemination of scientific knowledge and application of such knowledge for peaceful ends: report of the Economic and Social Council (A/4898)**

**CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.2/L.563/REV.3) (continued)**

1. The CHAIRMAN invited those delegations who wished to do so to explain their votes on the Polish draft resolution (A/C.2/L.563/Rev.3), which had been adopted at the 773rd meeting in its revised form.

2. Mr. CALAMARI (Panama) explained that his delegation had voted in favour of the Polish draft resolution as representing an important step in furthering the industrialization of the under-developed countries. He had abstained on the New Zealand sub-amendments (A/C.2/L.602/Rev.1) while recognizing that they were right to stress the competence of the Economic and Social Council in the matter of establishing a new specialized agency and the importance of taking into account the work of existing specialized agencies. His delegation had voted in favour of operative paragraph 5, which had originated in the seven-Power amendments (A/C.2/L.600/Rev.1), and trusted that the encouragement which that paragraph gave to hopes of still further progress in industrialization would be fully justified.

3. Mr. KORTEWEG (Netherlands) explained that his delegation had voted against the new operative paragraph 5 because the New Zealand sub-amendment to that paragraph had been rejected. The Netherlands had abstained on the resolution as a whole because it felt that the proposal contained in the new operative paragraph 5 was premature.

4. Mr. ZADOTTI (Italy) explained that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole but had abstained on the new paragraph 5 because its wording was mandatory and because, in any case, the establishment of a new agency seemed premature.

5. Mr. ERROCK (United Kingdom) regretted that his delegation had been unable to support the Polish draft resolution and had had to abstain during the vote because the introduction of the new operative paragraph 5 appeared prejudicial to the future work on industrialization to be carried out by the United Nations and its related organs. Nevertheless, the United Kingdom delegation to the Committee for Industrial Development would approach the question of establishing a new agency with an open mind.

6. Mr. THAJEB (Indonesia) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the revised draft resolution, including the new operative paragraph 5. It had voted against the New Zealand sub-amendments because they introduced only minor changes to the text. It had voted against the Italian amendment (A/C.2/L.607) because it believed in the principle of universality.

7. Mr. DANGEARD (France) expressed surprise that several delegations, while explaining their votes, seemed to have given the impression that a decision had already been taken in favour of establishing a new specialized agency. France had voted for the Polish draft resolution only on the understanding that such a decision had not yet been reached and that several alternatives would be considered by the Committee for Industrial Development.

#### Organization of the Committee's work

8. The CHAIRMAN asked for the views of the Committee as to how it should conclude the remaining business on its agenda in the short time available.

9. Mr. AIKEN (Canada) proposed that discussion of the urgent and essentially humanitarian item "Provision of food surpluses to food-deficient peoples through the United Nations system" (item 28 (e)) should begin on 8 December with a statement by the Director-General of FAO, on the understanding that such a decision would not prejudice the Committee's right either to adopt any draft resolution which might already be under discussion at that time or to proceed with any other item concurrently if any interval should arise in its discussion of item 28 (e).

10. Mr. FIGUERERO ANTEQUEDA (Argentina) thought it would be difficult for the Second Committee to organize its future work without knowing whether the General Assembly was to resume its sixteenth session after the Christmas recess. The Committee could, however, inform the General Committee, which was shortly to discuss that matter, of its views on the desirability of holding a second part of the session in order to enable it to continue discussion of important economic items. The Argentine delegation would favour such a resumed session.

11. Mr. NATORF (Poland) felt that it was undesirable to hold a resumed session of the Second Committee because the current session had already been long

and the schedule of meetings for the Economic and Social Council and its subsidiary organs was already crowded during the early part of 1962. Rather than establish priorities for certain items—a complex and lengthy undertaking—the Committee should allot an equal amount of time, say two meetings, to the remaining items and draft resolutions on its agenda. Any items which could not be concluded within that time should be postponed.

12. Mr. COFFEY (Ireland) agreed with the Polish representative that a procedural debate on the order of the remaining items should be avoided, but felt that it would be far better to deal adequately with a smaller number of draft resolutions than superficially with all of them. His delegation supported the Canadian proposal and was opposed to a resumed session.

13. Mr. TABIBI (Afghanistan) said that he was opposed to a resumed session. Although he had no objections to the Canadian proposal and agreed that item 32 (c)—Confirmation of the allocation of funds under the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance—must be dealt with before the end of the session, he felt that it would be difficult for the Committee to decide on the order of priority to be assigned to the remaining items. It might therefore be better to leave the matter to be settled by informal consultation between the Committee's officers and the sponsors of the various draft resolutions. In his delegation's view it was also most important for the Committee to deal with the item concerning the Committee on Permanent Sovereignty over Natural Resources (item 87), as that Committee's mandate would expire unless the necessary action was taken.

14. Mr. VIAUD (France) agreed that the Committee should not hold a resumed session in view of the very heavy work programme scheduled for the first months of 1962. He fully supported the Polish representative's suggestions, but did not think it would be necessary to set a formal time limit for speakers.

15. Mr. KAKITSUBO (Japan) felt that the Committee should deal first with those items which required immediate action, i.e., items 28 (e), 31—Progress and operations of the Special Fund—and 32 (c). He was opposed to a resumed session.

16. Miss HARELI (Israel) said that her delegation was against a resumed session of the Second Committee. As a matter of principle, it would prefer that the Committee deal first with the items having an operational character or practical implications, including items 28 (e), 31 and 32 (c). However, as it would be difficult to reverse the Committee's earlier decision (716th meeting) on the order in which items should be taken up, it would be best to adopt the procedure suggested by the Polish representative. It might also be useful to invoke rule 115 of the rules of procedure and to fix a time limit for speakers. Delegations desiring fuller discussion of the draft resolutions they had submitted might consider withdrawing them for resubmission at a later date.

17. Mrs. LINDSTRÖM (Sweden) said that she would like to hear the Chairman's views on how the problem should be solved. In principle, her delegation felt that no change should be made in the order of priority already decided on by the Committee, although it realized that there were practical difficulties involved. If consideration of the four important remaining items was postponed until the Assembly's seventeenth session, the Committee would begin that session with a

backlog of at least four weeks' work. Another possibility was to deal with them at a resumed session. If her delegation received assurances that the item entitled "Population growth and economic development" (item 84) would be taken up at such a session, it would not oppose the granting of priority to the other items. However, until the General Committee's decision on a resumed session was known, her delegation would not support waiving priority for that item.

18. Mr. EL-MUTWALLI (Iraq) said that the Committee could decide its course of action after learning the General Committee's decision on a resumed session. He shared the Afghan representative's views on the importance of item 87 and accordingly felt that representatives should be given an opportunity to discuss it at greater length, although the two-meetings formula might well be applied to the remaining items.

19. Mr. MAHDAVI (Iran) said he did not think it would be fair to deny the sponsors of the remaining draft resolutions the same full discussion as had been given to the preceding drafts. However, although consideration of the remaining draft resolutions should not be limited to two meetings each, rule 115 might well be invoked.

20. Mr. AYARI (Tunisia) supported the request made by the representative of Sweden for guidance from the Chair and agreed with the representative of France that it would be arbitrary to establish an order of priority. It might be possible to discuss all the remaining items if additional meetings were scheduled and a time limit was imposed on speeches. The Tunisian delegation suggested that the Canadian proposal should be adopted, but that all the draft resolutions submitted should be considered. It was true that there were difficulties involved in a resumption of the session.

21. Mr. FIGUERERO ANTEQUEDA (Argentina) thought that, after the General Committee had decided whether or not there should be a resumed session of the General Assembly, the Chair should submit written proposals regarding the organization of the Second Committee's work, on which a decision could then be taken. It was possible that, if only one or two of the Committees needed to resume their work, the requirements could be met by the members of the permanent missions in New York.

22. Mr. AZIZ (Federation of Malaya) supported the Canadian proposal and the solution suggested by the representative of Israel. His delegation was opposed to the idea of a resumed session, and any items which had not been disposed of should be postponed until the seventeenth session.

23. Mr. CRITCHLEY (Australia) agreed that the Chair should present the Committee with suggestions, which should take the Canadian proposal into account. If it was necessary to establish an order of priority, it would be possible to single out items which required an operational decision. It would be better to limit the length of speeches rather than the number of meetings devoted to any particular item.

24. Mr. NATORF (Poland) said that, in the light of the views which had been expressed by the members

of the Committee, it might not be advisable to divide the time equally between the different items, since some required more thorough consideration than others. The Chair could make proposals to change the existing order of priority, but only in exceptional cases. Any time limit imposed upon the length of speeches should not be too rigid, since certain questions could not be dealt with in only five minutes.

25. Mr. LAVRICHENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) supported the Polish proposal and did not agree that there should be a time limit for speeches. The questions before the Committee, some of which comprised many different aspects, could not be set aside or considered superficially.

26. Mr. ERROCK (United Kingdom) agreed that proposals from the Chair would be useful, although they should not be expected to establish an order of priority. It was true that certain items appeared to be of more intrinsic importance, but the allocation of time between them should be made on an approximately equal basis. It should be possible to make exceptions to the time limit for speeches.

27. Mr. LINGAM (India) said that certain items involving operational programmes required urgent attention and that the Canadian proposal merited serious consideration. After concluding its consideration of item 28 (e), the Committee should take up item 32 (c). It would then know the decision of the General Committee.

28. Mr. AMADOR (Mexico) said that, since it was not yet known whether or not there would be a resumed session, it might be necessary to schedule more or longer meetings. The establishment of an order of priority would involve considerable difficulties and waste of time. Different items would require a different number of meetings and speeches of varying lengths, depending on the importance attached by each delegation to the item under discussion.

29. Mr. GUERREIRO RAMOS (Brazil) thought that an order of priority should not be established until the General Committee had reached a decision. The number of meetings and the length of speeches depended on the importance of the different questions under discussion. Any items which had not been disposed of should be postponed until the seventeenth session.

30. Mr. LIMA (Cameroun) welcomed the Canadian proposal. The Polish proposal might result in a waste of time and effort, since certain items required continuous discussion and a reopening of the discussion at a later stage would involve a repetition of ideas already expressed. Full consideration should be given to all the items and any items not disposed of should be referred to the resumed session, which should be held if necessary, or to the seventeenth session.

31. The CHAIRMAN said that he would make practical suggestions concerning the organization of work, taking into account the views expressed by the members of the Committee.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.