

# United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SIXTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**SECOND COMMITTEE, 750th  
MEETING**

Monday, 13 November 1961,  
at 4.5 p.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 (para-  
graph 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 resolu-  
tion 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 Secre-  
tary-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 Eco-  
nomic 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: re-  
port of the Secretary-General;

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

Consideration of draft resolutions (con-  
tinued) . . . . . 201

**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, dissemi-  
nation 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.550/REV.3 AND CORR.2 AND 3) (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on  
the eight-Power draft resolution (A/C.2/L.550/Rev.3  
and Corr.2 and 3) with the modifications accepted by  
the sponsors at the 749th meeting. There were two  
amendments outstanding: the second amendment sub-  
mitted by Afghanistan (A/C.2/L.569/Rev.1) and that  
submitted by the nineteen Powers (A/C.2/L.559/  
Rev.1).

2. Mr. TABIBI (Afghanistan) said that as his second  
amendment did not seem to command unanimous  
approval he would withdraw it. Nevertheless, he still  
felt that the term "developing countries" was  
preferable to the term "under-developed countries"  
and he hoped that the Committee would ponder the  
need for making such a substitution in the future.

At the request of the representative of Tunisia, a  
vote on the nineteen-Power amendment (A/C.2/L.559/  
Rev.1) was taken by roll-call.

Cameroun, having been drawn by lot by the Chair-  
man, was called upon to vote first.

*In favour:* Cameroun, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Federation of Malaya, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Togo, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia.

*Against:* Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Peru, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil.

*Abstaining:* Canada, Cyprus, Ethiopia, Finland, Iran, Israel, Japan, Philippines, Sweden, Thailand.

*The nineteen-Power amendment (A/C.2/L.559/Rev.1) was adopted by 45 votes to 36, with 10 abstentions.*

3. Mr. WHARTON (United States) requested a separate vote on the preamble and operative paragraphs 1 to 5 of the draft resolution (A/C.2/L.550/Rev.3 and Corr.2 and 3) as amended.

4. Mr. STANOVNIK (Yugoslavia) said that while he was not opposed in principle to the request for a division, he felt that it would be much more logical to vote merely on operative paragraphs 1 to 5.

5. Mr. BERNARDO (Argentina) supported the United States motion for division.

6. Mr. VIAUD (France) also supported the motion. A similar vote had been taken at the previous session on the draft resolution on the accelerated flow of capital and technical assistance to the developing countries (A/4648, para. 128).

7. Mr. STANOVNIK (Yugoslavia) thought that if rule 130 of the rules of procedure was to be properly implemented, the Committee should first decide whether the preamble and operative paragraphs 1 to 5 did in fact constitute a part of the proposal being put to the vote.

8. Mr. GREEN (New Zealand) supported the United States motion for division for the same reason as that adduced by the French representatives and also because it would show clearly that the amended paragraph 6 had introduced a bone of contention into an otherwise unanimously accepted text.

9. Miss SALT (United Kingdom) also supported the motion because it would enable the Committee to express its opinion on the draft resolution with the exception of the new paragraph 6.

10. Mr. TABIBI (Afghanistan) felt that there was no justification for a separate vote on the preamble and operative paragraphs 1 to 5 because the Committee had already expressed itself on the amended paragraph 6.

*At the request of the representative of Greece, a vote on the United States motion for division was taken by roll-call.*

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

*In favour:* Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland.

*Against:* Indonesia, Iraq, Libya, Mali, Mongolia, Nepal, Niger, Poland, Romania, Togo, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Congo (Leopoldville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary.

*Abstaining:* India, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Yemen, Bolivia, Cambodia, Cameroun, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Ethiopia.

*The United States motion for division was adopted by 46 votes to 25, with 22 abstentions.*

*At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a vote on the preamble and operative paragraphs 1 to 5 was taken by roll-call.*

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

*In favour:* Colombia, Congo (Leopoldville), Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroun, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China.

*Against:* None.

*The preamble and operative paragraphs 1 to 5 were adopted by 93 votes to none.*

*At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a vote on the draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was taken by roll-call.*

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

*In favour:* Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Japan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Senegal, Sierra

Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Leopoldville), Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala.

*Against:* None.

*Abstaining:* Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, South Africa, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Belgium, France.

*The draft resolution (A/C.2/L.550/Rev.3 and Corr.2 and 3) as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 81 votes to none, with 11 abstentions. 1/*

11. Mr. BRUNO (Uruguay) said that his favourable vote on the draft resolution as a whole was intended as a ratification of everything he had said in the preceding debate.

12. Mr. VIAUD (France) explained that his delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole because of the adoption of operative paragraph 6. In its view, a resolution on international trade could be really useful only if it was approved unanimously and, in particular, if it had the support of the largest trading countries. In the absence of such unanimity, his delegation had considered that it would be best to leave the preparation of an agenda for 1962, when the proposed consultations with Governments would have been carried out.

13. Mr. CRITCHLEY (Australia) said that his Government had doubts about the value of an international trade conference at that stage. He had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole since it was of value to the developing and under-developed countries. However, that did not imply that Australia accepted the desirability of calling an international conference at present.

14. Mr. DIPP GOMEZ (Dominican Republic) said that he had supported the vote by division because he did not think any delegation's right to request such a vote should be restricted. He had voted against the amendment appearing in document A/C.2/L.559/Rev.1, which amended operative paragraph 6, because the procedure proposed in it was too complicated, but he had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole since he supported the general principles it contained.

15. Mr. PRIMELLES (Cuba) said that his delegation had been happy to vote in favour of the draft resolution as amended because it considered that the amendments had improved the text.

16. Mr. KAKITSUBO (Japan) said that he had abstained in the vote on new operative paragraph 6 because he considered that the first stage in the process of convening an international trade conference should be to consult not only the Governments of Member States but such international organizations concerned with trade as FAO and GATT, and because, in his view,

it was only after those consultations had taken place that the next step should be considered by the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly. His delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole on the understanding that the problems to be discussed at any international trade conference would include the problem of trade in the industrial goods produced by developing countries, a problem whose importance was not adequately reflected in the draft resolution.

17. The draft resolution, as adopted, referred to under-developed, developing and developed countries and thus established a kind of tripartite classification which, whatever else might be said of it, offered certain advantages for the case of a country like his own, which lay on the borderline between rich and poor.

18. Mr. LAVRICHENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the draft resolution just adopted decided what all members of the Committee agreed was a vitally important question. The Secretariat should therefore make the preparations for an international conference requested in operative paragraph 6 a matter of high priority. His delegation did not share the view expressed by some representatives that the arrangements proposed in paragraph 6 were over-hasty; in its opinion, all Governments would have ample time to prepare for the conference. Nor could his delegation accept the Japanese representative's remarks concerning the draft resolution's tripartite classification of countries; as the draft resolution made clear, the essential purpose of the conference proposed in paragraph 6 must be to assist the under-developed countries. In connexion with the references to IMF and GATT made in the draft resolution, he would point out that his country was a member of neither organization. His delegation also understood operative paragraph 1, which was somewhat ambiguously worded, to mean that the interests of the under-developed countries should be promoted. Lastly, it regretted that, in spite of all the efforts made by representatives to achieve an agreed text, some States had abstained in the final vote and had voted against the inclusion of the new operative paragraph 6. He hoped that it would be possible to achieve a unanimous vote when the draft resolution was taken up at a plenary meeting of the Assembly.

19. Mr. DE SEYNES (Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs)<sup>2/</sup> said that he had not wanted to speak before the vote, because he had not wished to introduce into the debate considerations of a practical nature which might seem rather narrow in comparison with the general ideas that had been developed in the Committee. The question of world trade was certainly very important, but the text which had just been adopted was worded in such a way that he felt it would be in order to submit certain comments. For several days he had been disturbed by the number of draft resolutions which called for studies, reports, or the services of groups of experts or governmental groups, all within a very short period of time, usually before the thirty-fourth session of the Economic and Social Council or the seventeenth session of the General Assembly. That accumulation of new work, in addition to the demands imposed by previous decisions, created very serious problems. There came a time when programmes had

<sup>1/</sup> The text of the draft resolution as adopted by the Committee was subsequently circulated as document A/C.2/L.583 and Corr.1.

<sup>2/</sup> The complete text of the statement made by the Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs was circulated as document A/C.2/L.570.



to be tailored to resources. Even if the Fifth Committee were to allocate the resources necessary for undertaking the studies proposed in draft resolutions, practical recruiting difficulties would arise which it would probably not be possible to overcome in the stipulated time. That comment was not meant to apply to one resolution in particular, as opposed to another. As for the draft resolution which had just been adopted, he had himself laid too much stress on the major importance of the problem of international trade in the coming years for it to be thought that he would not want to give effect as soon as possible to the wishes expressed by the Committee. But there were certain practical problems which should be kept in mind when resolutions were adopted. In particular, he thought it was essential to keep the time-table fairly flexible, so that the work could be organized and spaced out in the manner best designed to meet the requirements put forward in the Committee or in the Economic and Social Council. He was not declaring that certain things were impossible. He merely wished to sound a warning note in connexion with a certain tendency which was absolutely natural and in certain respects extremely encouraging, but which posed practical problems which could not be ignored.

20. Mr. COFFEY (Ireland) said that his delegation had voted against the amendment in document A/C.2/L.559/Rev.1, because it had thought it premature to consider determining the agenda for a future conference which would require long and detailed preparatory work. It had felt compelled to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

21. Mr. AYARI (Tunisia) regretted that it had not been possible to reach a compromise regarding the fundamental issue in the amendment of which his country was a co-sponsor (A/C.2/L.559/Rev.1), and emphasized that, in a desire to co-operate with the other delegations, the sponsors of the amendment had studied very carefully all the alternative texts which had been submitted. It was essential that all countries should reflect in the future on the possibility of an international trade conference. The sponsors had never intended to commit countries to the definite convening of such a conference and, in that connexion, the drafting and punctuation of the amendment might have given rise to a misunderstanding. In order to make it clear that that had not been the sponsors' intention, it would be better to have a comma after the words "if need be", in the amendment. Alternatively, the order of the words could be reversed so that the relevant phrase read "and, if need be, to determine ...".

22. It was true that time was needed for the consideration of the possibility of holding a conference. The Secretary-General could send Governments a questionnaire on the advisability of holding the conference and prepare a report reproducing all or some of the replies for the next session of the Economic and Social Council. The agenda of the conference could be prepared at a later stage in the light of those replies, as they were received. The usefulness or otherwise of the conference would be demonstrated by the Secretary-General's report. As far as the difficulties facing the United Nations Secretariat were concerned, the sponsors of the amendment had not specified a rigid time-table or demanded that an exhaustive study should be made. The draft resolution which had just been adopted represented concrete progress towards solving international trade problems, and it was to be hoped that before that text was

discussed in the General Assembly there would be a change in the views of some delegations; it was regrettable that the efforts towards co-operation made by the sponsors of the amendment had met with a negative response in some cases.

23. Mr. ZADOTTI (Italy) said that his delegation had been prepared to support the draft resolution and had voted in favour of the preamble and operative paragraphs 1 to 5. However, it had had doubts regarding the second half of the amendment which had been adopted, since some of its provisions appeared to be somewhat premature. The establishment of a committee to study the agenda for the conference should have been made dependent upon the results of the Secretary-General's consultations. His delegation had therefore voted against the amendment and that attitude had determined its abstention in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

24. Mr. FINGER (United States of America) said that the unanimous adoption of the preamble and operative paragraphs 1 to 5 reflected the identity of views in the Committee as far as the practical measures embodied in the resolution were concerned. It was to be hoped that before the draft resolution was discussed in the General Assembly it would be possible to reach a more general agreement on the subject as a whole. The representative of the Soviet Union had referred to the Committee's decision to hold an international trade conference, but the representative of Tunisia had made it clear that no definite decision was implied in the resolution. The voting on paragraph 6 had revealed a real difference of opinion, with countries in all stages of economic development voting against the text, so that the draft resolution did not constitute a mandate from all the States Members of the United Nations.

25. Mr. WOULBROUN (Belgium) explained that in the opinion of his delegation the text of operative paragraph 6 as amended prejudged the replies of Governments to the question of the advisability of holding the conference. The paragraph mentioned a preparatory committee and a provisional agenda for a conference, the principle of which had not yet been approved. It was premature to expect Governments to decide on the matter before the thirty-fourth session of the Economic and Social Council. His delegation had therefore abstained in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole and wished to be associated with the comments made by the representative of France.

26. Mr. NESTEROVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution because of the important contribution it would make to improving international trade. In view of the remarks made by the Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs, he wished to express the hope that the draft resolution, and also the equally important question of disarmament, would be given priority among the tasks of the Secretariat. Although funds were scarce, they should be distributed so as to meet the most important needs.

27. Mr. LAVRICHENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought that his delegation's interpretation of the amended operative paragraph 6 was correct. The Committee had adopted a decision and, in establishing its priorities of work, the Secretariat should select the most important problems, which included those of international trade and disarmament.

28. Mr. DE SEYNES (Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs) pointed out that he had not said that the task created by the adoption of the draft resolution was beyond the powers of the Secretariat; he had merely expressed doubts about its ability to carry out within the time limits specified both the projects already approved and those which would be approved in the future. He had asked for flexibility in specifying the time available to the Secretariat.

29. Mr. STANOVNIK (Yugoslavia) said that his delegation's views on the draft resolution and the amendment had already been expressed. His country was conscious of the difficulties involved and it would support the United Nations Secretariat in fully implementing the resolution.

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.