

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SIXTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



SECOND COMMITTEE, 740th
MEETING

Thursday, 2 November 1961,
at 11 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*

General debate (concluded). 155

Order of consideration of draft resolutions. 157

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)*

GENERAL DEBATE (concluded)

1. Mr. Lychowski (Poland), exercising his right of reply in connexion with the statement made at the 739th meeting by the United Kingdom representative, said that he was grateful to her for providing him with an opportunity to clarify certain aspects of the role of international trade in the economic development of the under-developed countries.

2. The United Kingdom Minister of State for Foreign Affairs, whom the United Kingdom representative had quoted in her statement, had not just been trying to prove that the industrialized countries were the biggest markets for exports from the under-developed countries—a contention which the Polish representative was quite willing to admit—and that the various rationalization measures taken by the industrial countries encouraged the expansion of international trade rather than hindered it—a contention which he himself disputed—but he had also argued that the socialist countries were far from developing their trade with the under-developed countries as much as they claimed and that the expression "economic grouping" could be

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;*

applied more fittingly to them than to the countries of western Europe. In support of that thesis, the United Kingdom representative had cited the case of Czechoslovakia and Romania, referring to the statistics given in the Economic Bulletin for Europe for August 1961. That, however, was only one aspect of the matter. Table 14 of the Bulletin showed that imports by Hungary from the under-developed countries, as a percentage of total imports, had increased between 1959 and 1960 from 4.1 to 4.6, those by Poland from 5.5 to 7.4 and those by the Soviet Union from 9.7 to 11.3. The value of imports from the under-developed countries by the four eastern European socialist countries and the USSR had risen by some 25.5 per cent between 1959 and 1960. What was more, imports by the socialist countries from the under-developed countries as a percentage of their total imports had increased in one year from 8.5 to 10 per cent, whereas that total itself had grown by 12.2 per cent. In other words, imports from the under-developed countries represented a rapidly growing part of a rapidly expanding total.

3. While seeming to agree on the need to establish a new international division of labour, the United Kingdom representative had accused the socialist countries of not making an effort to import more industrial products from the developing countries. One was entitled to ask why it was necessary to import industrial products in particular, when the most obvious way of increasing the export revenue of primary producers was to buy their raw materials. Before they could export industrial goods, they would have to become industrialized, and they could only do that by using the revenue from the export of the commodities which they produced at present.

4. It was by no means obvious that agriculture must be protected, and, in that connexion, he agreed with the United Kingdom representative when she said that all countries must change and that in doing so they would gain much even if they might also lose a little. As to the contribution of the socialist countries to the new international division of labour, those countries' share in the world output of manufactured goods had increased from 5.4 per cent about thirty years previously to more than one-third at the present time. The imports of the socialist countries were expanding rapidly, whereas the markets for non-industrial products in the highly developed capitalist countries were stagnating, and in addition those countries had a tendency to strengthen their barriers against other countries.

5. That was why his delegation advocated international action in the field of trade. In order to integrate the socialist division of labour into the new world division of labour, in which the under-developed countries could gradually come to play the part which was their due, the highly industrialized capitalist countries must end their "splendid isolation" and their merely limited participation in the Special Fund, IBRD and similar bodies and must join with the rest of the world in giving international trade a new structure. In view of the threat to extend a particular "closed grouping", whose imports before the war had been about 23 per cent of world imports, to include the United Kingdom, whose imports had been 16 to 17 per cent of world imports, it was not surprising that the under-developed countries were anxious and other countries disturbed.

6. He was surprised to be attacked on the question of international trade by the representative of the United Kingdom, a country with which Poland had just con-

cluded a three-year economic agreement providing for a considerable expansion of trade. World economic problems should be solved on the world level with the assistance of the United Nations, and an effort must be made to avoid introducing half-truths, which had already created so much confusion in the field of politics, into the discussion of economic problems.

7. Mr. ERROCK (United Kingdom) pointed out that according to the statistics given by the United Kingdom Minister of State for Foreign Affairs, the value of United Kingdom imports in 1959 had been \$10,130 million, of which 40 per cent represented imports from under-developed countries. The Polish representative had just said, basing his remarks on the figures published in the Economic Bulletin for Europe, that imports by the five communist countries mentioned in table 14 had in 1960 reached a total of \$10,549 million, of which \$1,009 million, or 9.6 per cent, represented imports from the under-developed countries. However, the population of those five communist countries was about 300 million, whereas that of the United Kingdom was about 50 million, or one-sixth of that of the communist countries. If the latter had imported the same percentage per caput as the United Kingdom, their imports from the under-developed countries would be, not \$1,000 million, but \$24,000 million. Obviously an increase of that size would completely transform the situation of the developing countries; in particular, it would lead to an increase in the price of primary commodities.

8. Mr. LAVRICHENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the socialist countries did not have to prove that they were each year expanding their trade with the less developed countries without imposing any conditions of an economic, military or political nature. As far as the Soviet Union was concerned, its trade with those countries had shown an eight-fold increase during the past four years. Furthermore, the Soviet Union, with due regard for its own economic development, was concentrating on expanding its trade with the less developed countries, and in its planning it made provision for broadening its trade relations with them. Formerly, the imperialist and colonialist countries which had seized those territories had monopolized their trade and forbidden them to have trade relations with other countries. Although the United Kingdom had only 40 million inhabitants, the population in its colonies, for example India, had been very large. Now that those countries were independent, they could trade freely, although they remained to a certain extent under the economic domination of the former metropolitan countries, which were hindering their economic development instead of taking measures to facilitate their trade.

9. In that connexion, the Soviet Union had nothing with which to reproach itself. To the detriment of its own resources and at the price of certain sacrifices, it had during recent years placed large amounts of capital at the disposal of the countries of Asia and Africa for the construction of factories and dams, the training of key personnel and the establishment of institutes and universities. However, its methods differed from those of the countries which had possessed colonies, because the Soviet Union took action only when requested to do so. In the economic sphere, the essential index was the per caput income. While that of the United Kingdom was \$700, that of the less developed countries remained at \$50. That being so, it might be wondered what was the precise nature of the trade between the United Kingdom and the less developed countries. The commercial

principles of the socialist countries were obviously totally different from those applied by the imperialist countries. The socialist countries based their commercial relations on co-operation and concerned themselves with the economic development of their trade partners, as could be seen from their methods of buying and selling as set forth in treaties and conventions.

ORDER OF CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS

10. The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that six draft resolutions on agenda items 12, 28, 29 and 30 had been submitted. The first draft resolution had been submitted by the Committee on a United Nations Capital Development Fund and was contained in paragraph 81 of the Committee's report (E/3514). The question arose of the order in which the draft resolutions would be considered. It was possible for them to be taken up in the order in which they had been submitted, the responsibility for taking a decision to that effect resting with the Committee.

11. Mr. STANOVNIK (Yugoslavia) agreed with the Chairman that the Committee should consider the draft resolutions one by one, in the chronological order in which they had been submitted, since the texts which had been submitted first were undoubtedly those which it had been easiest to prepare. In that case, the Committee would consider first the draft resolution of the Committee on a United Nations Capital Development Fund, which was in fact a procedural resolution; furthermore, the subject of the creation of a United Nations capital development fund was not a new one.

12. Mr. AYARI (Tunisia) announced that his country would join with other countries in submitting a draft resolution concerning the same problem as that dealt with in the draft resolution which had been submitted by Argentina (A/C.2/L.550). He would ask for it to be considered at the same time as the Argentine draft resolution.

13. Mr. BERNARDO (Argentina) recalled that one of the principles to be followed in procedural matters was that of taking draft resolutions in the chronological order in which they had been submitted, unless the Committee decided otherwise. He therefore reserved the right to claim the second place for his draft resolution, that being the priority to which it was entitled. Furthermore, if the representative of Tunisia was proposing a separate draft resolution and not amendments to the Argentine draft resolution, the contemplated objectives were undoubtedly different, so that, at first sight, it appeared difficult to deal with both texts together.

14. Mr. AYARI (Tunisia) said that he had not asked for the Tunisian draft resolution to be given priority over the Argentine draft resolution, but had merely remarked that it would be convenient to consider together two texts dealing with the same question. That was not an extraordinary occurrence, since two other draft resolutions (A/C.2/L.551 and A/C.2/L.552) both dealt with economic planning. The Committee was in no way bound to adopt only one resolution per agenda item. In order to cover a subject fully, the procedure might be either to make amendments to a proposal already submitted or to submit a new proposal dealing with aspects not provided for by the first.

15. Mr. STANOVNIK (Yugoslavia) thought that the Committee should abide by rule 132 of the rules of procedure which stated:

"If two or more proposals relate to the same question, a committee shall, unless it decides otherwise, vote on the proposals in the order in which they have been submitted. A committee may, after each vote on a proposal, decide whether to vote on the next proposal."

16. Mr. MAHDAVI (Iran) did not think that rule 132 was applicable, since the representative of Tunisia was requesting, not that his draft resolution should be given priority in the voting, but that it should be considered at the same time as the Argentine draft resolution. The Committee could easily grant that request and abide by rule 132 when a vote was taken on the draft resolutions.

17. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) was afraid that the Committee was embarking on the discussion of a question which would remain academic until the tenor of the Tunisian draft resolution became known. It should abide by the chronological order of submission on the understanding that it could modify its decision later if it saw fit.

18. Mr. BRILLANTES (Philippines) wanted to know whether the various sponsors were to be made to introduce their draft resolutions in chronological order or whether each new draft resolution was to be considered only after the previous draft resolution had been examined and put to the vote. In the first case, the question of priority did not arise; in the second case, the remarks of the representative of Tunisia appeared pertinent.

19. Mr. TABIBI (Afghanistan) emphasized that, for the time being, only the proposal by the representative of Yugoslavia was before the Committee. The representatives of Tunisia and Argentina could not propose a motion until the Tunisian text had been circulated.

20. Mr. KANO (Nigeria) requested that the Committee should abide by the chronological order, subject to a subsequent reconsideration of its decision.

21. Mr. KITTANI (Iraq) said that the discussion of the draft resolutions should not be confused with the voting on them. Since there was nothing to prevent the Committee from considering the draft resolutions in the order in which they had been submitted, he asked that the Committee should suspend its procedural debate in order immediately to turn to the consideration of the draft resolution submitted by the Committee on a United Nations Capital Development Fund.

22. Mr. KANO (Nigeria) supported that proposal.

23. Mr. AYARI (Tunisia) was prepared to abide by a decision of the Committee to respect the chronological order of submission. When the Tunisian draft resolution had been circulated, he would ask the Committee to consider it at the same time as the Argentine draft resolution.

24. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should decide in principle to respect the chronological order in which the draft resolutions had been submitted, but that each delegation should have the opportunity to propose subsequently that the order should be modified.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 12.25 p.m.