

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

SIXTEENTH SESSION

Official Records

**SECOND COMMITTEE, 741st
MEETING**

Friday, 3 November 1961,
at 11.15 a.m.



NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda items 12, 28, 29 and 30:</i>	
<i>Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapters II, IV, V (sections II-V), VI (paragraph 489) and VIII (paragraphs 650 and 651)) (continued)</i>	
<i>Economic development of under-developed countries (continued):</i>	
(a) <i>Industrial development and activities of the organs of the United Nations in the field of industrialization;</i>	
(b) <i>Establishment of a United Nations capital development fund: report of the Committee established by General Assembly resolution 1521 (XV);</i>	
(c) <i>Accelerated flow of capital and technical assistance to the developing countries: report of the Secretary-General;</i>	
(d) <i>Land reform: interim report of the Secretary-General</i>	
<i>Questions relating to international trade and commodities (continued):</i>	
(a) <i>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;</i>	
(b) <i>Improvement of the terms of trade between the industrial and the under-developed countries: report of the Economic and Social Council</i>	
<i>Questions relating to science and technology (continued):</i>	
(a) <i>Development of scientific and technical co-operation and exchange of experience: report of the Secretary-General;</i>	
(b) <i>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</i>	
<i>Consideration of draft resolutions</i>	159

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;**

(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
(E/3514, PARA. 81)**

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the draft resolution reproduced in paragraph 81 of the report of the Committee on a United Nations Capital Development Fund (E/3514), which was, chronologically, the first resolution before the Committee. In accordance with rule 154 of the rules of procedure, he drew the Committee's attention to the statement of the financial implications of the proposal contained in the annex to the Committee's report.

2. Mr. CONTE (Guinea) thought that the Committee should first take a formal decision on whether it wished to consider the proposals consecutively in the order of their submission or to consider all the proposals relating to the same question simultaneously.

3. The CHAIRMAN recalled that at its previous meeting, the Committee had decided that the proposals should be discussed consecutively, but that, at the appropriate time, the Tunisian representative was free to ask for his draft resolution to be considered concurrently with the Argentine resolution.

4. Mr. STANOVNIK (Yugoslavia) said that his delegation would support the draft resolution submitted by the Committee on a United Nations Capital Development Fund (the Committee of Twenty-Five), which had the merit of representing a compromise between the various views that had been expressed, although the principles of the United Nations Charter might have been more clearly stated. Many representatives had expressed regret that the Committee had been unable to carry out the task assigned to it by the General Assembly. It was therefore desirable that the Assembly should help the Committee to carry out its task by adopting the proposed text and should allow it the time required for the lengthy work of drafting the statute of a capital development fund.

5. The first step was to determine the principles that would govern the operation of a capital development fund so that the Governments concerned would be able to ask their Parliaments to approve contributions on the basis of a full knowledge of the facts. To adopt any other course would be contrary to the principles of the United Nations, inasmuch as it would mean that the contributing countries could set conditions and thus in fact dictate the terms of the statute, which should result from the free consent of the United Nations. Moreover, participation in the preparation of the statute would involve no commitment to make a contribution.

6. The Yugoslav delegation considered that the general principles drawn up by the Committee of Twenty-Five provided a good starting point for work on the statute. The complaint could not be made that the preparatory phase, which had lasted ten years, had not produced sufficient material on which the Committee could rely. In the opinion of the Yugoslav delegation, the Committee's task should not be to revise the work which had already been done and on which agreement had been reached, but merely to draft the requisite legal text on that basis.

7. As the principles relating to the fund had been drafted in very general terms, the Committee had rightly expected to obtain more precise instructions from the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly. The Yugoslav delegation wished to make the following points in that connexion: (1) the fund should base its general policy on the opinion of all its members meeting in conference; (2) its executive body should consist of an equal number of representatives of the developed and the under-developed countries, with due consideration for equal regional distribution; (3) all members of the various bodies of the fund should have an equal vote; (4) assistance should be granted only to Governments of Member States and on their request; (5) every Member State, whether a recipient or a donor, should be entitled to lay any complaints regarding the operations of the fund before the executive body or the conference; (6) the fund should establish close co-operation with the existing United Nations bodies and other international financial institutions with a view to co-ordinating activities so as to secure the most effective use of available resources for the assistance of under-developed countries striving for economic independence.

8. Mr. AIKEN (Canada) said that Canada firmly supported the principle of providing international aid to the developing countries, and was confident that its opposition to the establishment of a new fund would give rise to no misunderstanding. It felt that the objectives for which the pioneers of a Special United

Nations Fund for Economic Development (SUNFED) had long striven had largely been achieved. Increased aid was being made available to the developing countries through the use of the multilateral machinery of the United Nations and its specialized agencies, as evidenced by the increasing resources of the Technical Assistance Programme and of IBRD, and by the establishment of the Special Fund. Finally, the International Development Association (IDA) provided loans on terms approaching those envisaged for a capital development fund.

9. Canada hoped that such aid would increase, bilaterally as much as multilaterally through the United Nations, and was anxious to co-operate in making it more effective. In that connexion, Member States should study carefully the Secretary-General's forthcoming evaluation of the external, financial and capital resources required for the promotion of accelerated development, and his assessment of the impact of existing financial institutions. Canada had already indicated its strong support for the concept of a United Nations Decade of Development.

10. In its considered view, the establishment of a new capital development fund would result in wasteful competition and would mean that neither the new fund nor the existing IDA, whose full potential had yet to be exploited, could become a highly effective instrument. So long as the major potential contributors remained unwilling to support the early establishment of a new capital development fund, Canada was convinced that it would be a mistake to press ahead in the manner suggested in the draft resolution before the Committee, and that it was much too early to make any such recommendations. Accordingly, his delegation would be unable to support the draft resolution.

11. Mr. KITTANI (Iraq) said that his country's views were so well known as to need no repetition. He would merely state once and for all that the decision of the General Assembly embodied in resolution 1521 (XV) was a historical landmark and that the question could not be reopened.

12. Since that resolution had been adopted, the Committee on a United Nations Capital Development Fund, although it had not succeeded in completing the task entrusted to it, had undoubtedly done useful work by drawing up the general principles annexed to the draft resolution.

13. However, he wished to point out that by refraining from taking any action on the recommendations contained in the draft resolution adopted by the Committee, the Economic and Social Council had given proof of a regrettable lack of initiative. Nor had the Council given the Committee any instructions which might guide it in its future work.

14. The delegation of Iraq fully endorsed the measures proposed in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution. It hoped that the General Assembly would extend the Committee's mandate and would specifically ask it to complete its task in the shortest possible time.

15. Mrs. WRIGHT (Denmark) said that her delegation supported the draft resolution because it felt that, in existing circumstances, the establishment of a capital development fund was the best approach to the problem. The draft resolution would also prolong the mandate of the Committee, which was desirable in view of the possibility that the United Nations Decade of Development might give rise to new factors which might have an effect on the Committee's work.

16. Her delegation considered that before drafting the statute, it was necessary to make a detailed study of the comprehensive report on the financial needs of less developed countries and on the impact of existing financial institutions. She hoped that all the contributing countries would co-operate actively in the work of the Committee, especially countries such as the United States, which had suggested the establishment of a new financial service to assist the developing countries in finding sources from which to meet their most important needs for capital investment.

17. In closing, she wished to emphasize that constructive possibilities should not be forfeited by undue haste in attempting to reach the desired goal.

18. Mr. LINGAM (India), reviewing the background of efforts to assist in financing the economic development of the under-developed countries, noted that in 1954 the General Assembly had expressed the hope that a special United Nations fund for economic development would be established as soon as practicable (resolution 822 (IX)). The advanced countries had hitherto not been convinced of the need to set up a separate fund and, although the Special Fund had admittedly been established, it was not that institution's function to supply the capital development needs of the under-developed countries.

19. He pointed out that the General Assembly had taken decisions at its fourteenth and fifteenth sessions concerning the establishment of a capital development fund and said that the Committee's inability to prepare the necessary statute for the fund in accordance with the terms of reference was the fault of the advanced countries, which had not given their support to the project. They had found the general principles acceptable, but had voted against the draft resolution in which those principles were embodied. The Committee of Twenty-Five proposed that the General Assembly should extend its mandate; India urged the members of the Second Committee to support that proposal; in that way the Committee of Twenty-Five could continue its work on the basis of the twelve general principles which had been accepted by the advanced countries in the Sub-Committee and which constituted a good starting point.

20. In the view of his Government, the assistance which the fund would be called upon to furnish should be predominantly in the form of grants-in-aid, since that would be consistent with the existing United Nations practice and philosophy and would avoid overlapping with other agencies which were already active in that field and were functioning on a different basis. The Committee of Twenty-Five should also ensure that the size and nature of the contributions of the less developed countries should not be such as to hamper their own development plans; that aspect of the problem had been recognized in principle 9. His Government also thought that the operations and activities of the fund should not be controlled by its members in proportion to their contributions but on the basis of equal voting rights for all.

21. Mr. BERNARDO (Argentina) said that his delegation, which had participated in the work of the Committee on a United Nations Capital Development Fund, would support the draft resolution, which genuinely reflected the efforts which that Committee had made to carry out its mandate. It was true that that Committee had had little time and that it had had to consider the position of various countries. The general principles annexed to the proposal, therefore, represented only

part of the task which had been assigned to it in General Assembly resolution 1521 (XV). For that reason, it seemed logical and appropriate to extend the Committee's mandate so that it could complete its work. His delegation thought that the general principles should serve as a basis for drafting the statute and that, in spite of the large number of existing financing institutions, an agency such as the fund was necessary, since it would be able to fulfil certain functions which did not come within the purview of other agencies. His delegation attached great importance to paragraph 4 of the draft resolution on devising an arrangement for inter-governmental control and for voting which would inspire the confidence of all States participating in the fund. In view of the urgency of the matter, it regretted that the Economic and Social Council had confined itself to taking note of the Committee's report, as its observations would certainly have facilitated the solution of the problem.

22. Mr. BOLIN (Sweden) observed that in its draft resolution the Committee on a United Nations Capital Development Fund had limited itself to the question of the extension of its mandate and the preparation of the statute of the fund. The question of establishing the fund and of its operations had therefore not yet arisen. Unfortunately, it appeared from the Committee's report that the countries which were called upon to make the largest contributions were unwilling to participate in the establishment of the fund. His delegation had already drawn attention to the need for ensuring close co-ordination of the activities of the various existing financing agencies and for avoiding any duplication of effort. It therefore welcomed the suggestions contained in the draft resolution submitted by the United States, together with a number of other countries (A/C.2/L.555 and Add.1), which was designed to expand the activities of the Special Fund in the field of financing. It also thought valuable the decision taken by IBRD to set up an economic and financial service. Sweden was very much aware of the need for increased financial assistance to the under-developed countries, and was also aware of the obligations of the industrialized countries in that respect. What was now under discussion was only an extension of the mandate of the Committee on a United Nations Capital Development Fund in order to give it time to propose the drafting of statutes for a future capital development fund. The Swedish delegation had no objections to such a decision under the present circumstances. It would therefore vote for the draft resolution.

23. Mr. EL BANNA (United Arab Republic) said that, as a result of the priority given by the various regional and international bodies to consideration of the capital needs of the less developed countries, a number of institutions such as IDA had been established. Nevertheless, the setting up of a United Nations capital development fund would be a major project of international co-operation in which countries with different ideologies would take part. It was difficult to see how a new financing institution would involve duplication or wasteful competition, as the representative of Canada had said. On the contrary, the fund would make it possible for under-developed countries unable to obtain the necessary capital from the existing agencies to obtain it through the United Nations. The new body would not compete in any way with the existing institutions, whether regional, bilateral or multilateral. In resolution 1521 (XV), the General Assembly had requested the Committee of Twenty-Five to consider all concrete preparatory measures, including draft

legislation, necessary for the establishment of a United Nations capital development fund. That Committee's draft resolution, based on that General Assembly resolution, contained nothing new; it was drafted in moderate terms and he hoped that it would be adopted unanimously.

24. U HTIN AUNG (Burma) pointed out that U Thant had been Chairman of the Committee of Twenty-Five. The Burmese delegation had spared no effort to promote the establishment of a United Nations capital development fund and had explained the reasons for its attitude on many occasions so that there was no need to restate them. He would confine himself to saying that he entirely endorsed the comments made by the representatives of Yugoslavia, Iraq and India. The Burmese delegation would therefore vote for the draft resolution.

25. Mr. KANO (Nigeria) said that his delegation, which had been a member of the Committee of Twenty-Five, felt that the Committee's mandate should be extended, because, despite some disagreement, sufficient progress had been made, particularly with regard to the general principles, to justify the continuation of its work. He believed that there were grounds for optimism and that the fund might be established in the near future. There was universal recognition of the need to give increased financial assistance to the under-developed countries, and the Second Committee should not hesitate to strengthen the authority and practical usefulness of the United Nations by promoting multilateral assistance with no political or other conditions attached. From the outset, the fund should have sufficient resources to make a substantial contribution to the economic growth of the under-developed countries, and the principle of equal voting rights as between industrialized and under-developed countries should be respected. He hoped that the Committee would adopt the draft resolution and that the fund would be formally established at the seventeenth session of the General Assembly.

26. Mr. CONTE (Guinea) felt that the question was a very simple one. The Committee of Twenty-Five had been entrusted with a task which it had not been able to complete. There was no need to reopen the question of establishing the fund, since there was a specific General Assembly resolution on the subject. The only matter to be decided was whether the Committee's mandate should be extended, as it had not been able to complete its work. There had been little change in the attitude of the various countries. The rich countries were unwilling to contribute to the fund and claimed that it would duplicate other existing institutions. He did not see, however, how the capital development fund could duplicate either the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance or the Special Fund.

27. Miss SALT (United Kingdom) recalled that her delegation's position had been clearly indicated in paragraph 9 of document E/3514. In the past, the United Kingdom had not opposed the establishment of the capital development fund as a matter of principle, but it had not thought that the resources to establish such a fund effectively were available or likely to be available in the foreseeable future. Its position remained unchanged. In the past three or four years the United Kingdom had doubled its economic assistance provided from public funds to the less developed countries. Furthermore, IDA had recently been established, and some Governments were already suggesting that its resources should be increased. There was no doubt that when sufficient resources became available, the

drafting of legislation for a United Nations capital development fund would not present much difficulty. But to draft legislation for the fund at a time when it could not operate effectively in meeting the needs of the under-developed countries would be a waste of time and effort. Consequently, the United Kingdom delegation would vote against the draft resolution as it had done in the Committee of Twenty-Five. That should not be taken to imply that the United Kingdom underestimated the importance which should be attached to the development of the less developed countries, for it was prepared to that end to use all available bilateral and multilateral existing agencies.

28. Mr. PROKOFYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation was in favour of the draft resolution. The Committee of Twenty-Five had done useful work since the general principles could serve as a basis for the efforts that would lead to the establishment of the fund. It had not succeeded however in fulfilling the task assigned to it by the General Assembly. The principles were too general and not sufficiently specific, and certain important principles had been omitted. The USSR delegation had already expressed its opinion in that respect, and that opinion was on record in paragraph 14 of the Committee's report (E/3514). Contributions to the fund should be voluntary, and assistance should be in the form of long-term, low-interest loans. Under-developed countries should, moreover, be able to repay the loans in their national currency. The fund should be established in accordance with the principle of the equality of rights of all countries wishing to participate in it, and all States wishing to afford assistance to under-developed countries should be free to do so. The fund's policy-making and executive organs should be organized according to the principle of equal representation of the principal contributors, on the one hand, and of the under-developed countries, on the other hand, with due regard for equal representation for the various groups of States in the world—the neutralist States, the socialist States and the capitalist States members of Western alliances. The USSR delegation supported the draft resolution calling for the extension of the mandate of the Committee and the preparation of draft legislation (statute) for the fund. In drafting the principles, it should also be borne in mind that the colonial Powers were responsible for the situation in which a large number of the less developed countries now found themselves.

29. Mr. AHMED (Sudan) did not think that it would serve any useful purpose to recall the well-known position of his Government, for it had made that position sufficiently clear when it had proposed that the General Assembly should adopt the text which had subsequently become resolution 1521 (XV) and also by participating in the work of the Committee of Twenty-Five. The draft resolution submitted by that Committee was very simple and should not cause any difficulties. It was logical that the Committee's mandate should be extended, since the Committee had unfortunately been unable to fulfil its task to the full. Consequently, the Sudanese delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution.

30. Mr. WODAJO (Ethiopia) was of the opinion that the General Assembly had taken an historic decision when it had approved the principle of establishing a United Nations capital development fund. The Committee of Twenty-Five, on which the Ethiopian delegation had served, had not succeeded in preparing draft legislation for the fund, presumably because it had not

had sufficient time in which to reconcile somewhat divergent points of view. Hence, its mandate should be extended. In that respect, it was encouraging to note that some of the countries which would later be called upon to contribute to the capital development fund no longer raised any objections on grounds of principle. The discussions in the Committee of Twenty-Five had also shown that the only problems at issue were of a practical nature and that, consequently, an agreement was by no means impossible. The Ethiopian delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution and hoped that the Second Committee would adopt it unanimously.

31. Mr. STANOVNIK (Yugoslavia) said that he was happy to note that once again the United Kingdom had raised no objections on grounds of principle to the establishment of a United Nations Capital development fund. The United Kingdom representative had none the less expressed doubts that the resources necessary for the establishment of the fund were available. The fact, however, that the total amount of assistance credit made available to the under-developed countries had increased—and, in particular, that the United Kingdom had recently doubled its contribution—was proof that the fundamental question was no longer whether the resources were there but rather whether they could be channelled through the United Nations. The time had come to ask whether or not it was desirable for the United Nations to become an instrument for international economic co-operation and whether there was readiness to recognize that the Charter applied to the economic as well as to the political and social spheres. The confidence placed by people in the United Nations Charter was so great that there should be no doubt as to the reply.

32. The United Kingdom representative had also expressed the fear that the preparation of the draft legislation for the fund might be premature or might entail loss of time and effort. The discussion in the Second Committee had shown, however, that there was no lack of intelligence or inventiveness and that progress in the field of international economic co-operation was possible. The United Nations should not put off the preparation of the draft legislation until agreement had been reached among all countries, any more than it had deferred work on the draft International Covenants on Human Rights until it had been certain that all the States would ratify them. To adopt the opposite approach on the pretext that it would be easy to prepare draft legislation when it became certain that the necessary funds would be available, would be a dangerous procedure, for it was to be feared that at that stage the equality of all the States as required under the United Nations Charter could not be ensured. In any case, the countries that would take part in drafting the legislation would not thereby be committing themselves to contributing funds. The main issue was to reconcile the different points of view concerning the international aid machinery and not to compel acceptance or to restrict anyone's freedom of choice.

33. There was likewise no need to wait for the Secretariat to prepare the report on the financial needs of less developed countries and on the impact of existing financial institutions, as proposed by the Committee of Twenty-Five. That Committee itself had specifically stated in paragraph 70 of its report (E/3514) that the preparation of such a report "should in no way constitute a substitute for the Committee's work but rather a way of facilitating it, and that it should supplement, not duplicate, the work already done in this field". Yugoslavia was in favour of that study and was

not opposed to having it discussed in the Committee of Twenty-Five. Without wishing to anticipate its results, his delegation was certain that, in any case, the experts would once again stress the urgent needs of the under-developed countries and the inability of the existing agencies to cope with those needs. The usefulness of a United Nations capital development fund was therefore obvious.

34. Mr. GUNASEKERA (Ceylon) shared the Yugoslav representative's view; the time had come to implement the General Assembly resolution and to extend the mandate of the Committee of Twenty-Five so that it might be able to finish its task. The under-developed countries, which were waging a desperate struggle against poverty, were not likely to be content with the mere proclamation of a United Nations Decade of Development in lieu of the establishment of a capital development fund. He also endorsed the objections by the representative of the United Arab Republic to the Canadian representative's arguments, and he associated himself with all those who had asked the Second Committee to adopt the draft resolution unanimously.

35. Mr. DA FONSECA (Brazil) recalled that his country had always given full support to the idea of establishing a United Nations capital development fund and that it had had the opportunity of participating in the work of the Committee of Twenty-Five. He would vote for the draft resolution before the Committee as he thought that the establishment of a United Nations capital development fund would be the first step towards making the United Nations Decade of Development a concrete reality.

36. Mr. DIPP GOMEZ (Dominican Republic) said that he would vote for the draft resolution since he was in favour of all measures aimed at increasing assistance funds and favouring the economic expansion of the under-developed countries.

37. Mr. GREEN (New Zealand) said that his delegation's abstention from the vote on the operative part of the draft resolution should not be interpreted as meaning that the New Zealand Government did not recognize the importance of increasing the amount of aid to the under-developed countries. New Zealand had contributed to numerous multilateral programmes and given considerable aid, as measured against the size of its population, through bilateral plans and also, in particular, through the Colombo Plan. It supported in principle the idea of establishing a United Nations capital development fund but did not believe that the draft resolution was in the real interests of the under-developed countries, for the main countries in a position to contribute to the capital development fund were not prepared to take part in it or to promise to make a contribution later. The adoption of the draft resolution might result in causing disappointment without arousing goodwill. No new body should be created so long as it was impossible to obtain the necessary capital. Unlike the Yugoslav representative, he thought that the Secretariat, in the report requested by the Committee of Twenty-Five, should appraise not only the needs of the under-developed countries but also the means available to meet those needs, particularly through existing institutions.

38. Mr. VIAUD (France) thought that the Committee of Twenty-Five had done useful work in drafting the general principles which it considered applicable to the problem of financing economic development. His delegation did not therefore object to extending the mandate

of that Committee, for it could render further services in connexion with the financing of economic development or the possible adaptation of existing United Nations bodies. On the other hand, France thought that it would be premature to prepare draft legislation for the capital development fund because of the position taken by certain Member States and also because of the efforts which those countries, including France, had recently made for the purpose of establishing financial bodies. His delegation would therefore be unable to vote for the draft resolution, especially operative paragraphs 2 and 3.

39. Mr. CRITCHLEY (Australia), explaining why his delegation would be obliged to abstain, said that Australia felt that the flow of aid to the under-developed countries should by all means be speeded up and had emphasized in the general debate how much importance it attached in that regard to a greater volume of trade. As that aid could take other forms, including the provision of capital, there was some advantage in extending the Committee's mandate.

40. The main capital-owning countries did not, however, at that stage seem inclined to contribute and it would be premature to prepare draft legislation for the fund. To do so would amount to a decision to set up the fund. A decision to that effect would take into account neither the real risks of duplication and additional expenditure, nor the danger of diverting funds from institutions which had already proved their usefulness.

41. Mr. ZADOTTI (Italy) said that his delegation's vote should be interpreted in the light of the observations in paragraph 56 of the report of the Committee of Twenty-Five and those which had been made up by the Italian delegation in the general debate. In participating in the work of that Committee, the Italian dele-

gation in no way undertook to approve in advance the results of that work.

42. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the draft resolution E/3514, para. 81.

At the request of the representative of Brazil, a vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Leopoldville), Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Austria.

Against: France, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, Ireland, Japan, New Zealand, Spain, Australia.

The draft resolution was adopted by 70 votes to 4, with 7 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.