

ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCILCONSEIL
ECONOMIQUE
ET SOCIALE/CN.1/SR.59
10 May 1948

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

ECONOMIC AND EMPLOYMENT COMMISSION

MASTER FILE

THIRD SESSION

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FIFTY-NINTH MEETING

Lake Success, New York
Monday, 3 May 1948, at 2:30 p.m.

Chairman:	Mr. R. WILSON	Australia
Members:	*Mr. J. WOULBROUN	Belgium
	*Mr. J. G. TORRES	Brazil
	*Mr. V. A. BAKOUNOV	Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic
	*Mr. S. POLLOCK	Canada
	Mr. F. HO	China
	**Mr. I. TABORSKY	Czechoslovakia
	*Mr. T. de CLERMONT-TONNERRE	France
	*Mr. D. P. KARMARKAR	India
	Mr. G. BOE	Norway
	*Mr. G. LUTOSLAWSKI	Poland
	Mr. A. P. MOROZOV	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
	Mr. R. L. HALL	United Kingdom
	Mr. I. LUBIN	United States of America

Representatives of Specialized Agencies:

Mr. A. A. EVANS	International Labour Organization
Mr. S. V. ARNALDO	United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization

Consultants from Non-Governmental Organizations:

Mr. P. GARVAN	American Federation of Labor
Mr. J. BOTTON	International Federation of Christian Trade Unions

Secretariat:

Mr. D. WEINTRAUB	Secretary of the Commission
------------------	-----------------------------

*Alternates for the Third Session

**Observer

NOTE: Any corrections of this record should be submitted in writing, in either of the working languages (English or French), and within twenty-four hours, to Mr. E. Delavenay, Director, Official Records Division, Room CC-119, Lake Success. Corrections should be accompanied by or incorporated in a letter, on headed notepaper, bearing the appropriate symbol number and enclosed in an envelope marked "Urgent". Corrections can be dealt with more speedily by the services concerned if delegations will be good enough also to incorporate them in a mimeographed copy of the record.

CONTINUATION OF THE DISCUSSION ON AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAFT REPORT ON
THE REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMISSION ON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (Document E/CN.1/W.33)

The CHAIRMAN, speaking as representative of Australia, recalled that he had suggested that sub-paragraph (a) of paragraph 3, page 2 (document E/CN.1/W.33) should read as follows: "Need for diversification of economic activities within national economies".

Mr. TORRES (Brazil) proposed the addition of "in order to avoid mono-production".

Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) thought that the Australian and Brazilian amendments might be combined.

Mr. KARMARKAR (India) and the CHAIRMAN pointed out that the term "mono-production" was not clearly understood in all parts of the English-speaking world.

Mr. HALL (United Kingdom) felt that the wording as amended by the representative of Australia was sufficiently expressive.

Sub-paragraph (a) of paragraph 3 was adopted, as amended by the Chairman.

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) considered that sub-paragraph (b) should either be deleted or redrafted in such a way as to indicate that the co-ordination of economic development should be carried out by Governments.

The CHAIRMAN tentatively proposed the inclusion of the words "for Governments to co-ordinate".

/Mr. POLLACK

Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) considered that sub-paragraphs (a) to (e) inclusive were covered by amendments to the text already adopted. It would be quite appropriate to delete the lettered sentences and the introductory sentence or to delete (c), (d) (e), leaving only (a) and (b).

Mr. KARMARKAR (India) disagreed with the view of the Canadian representative.

Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) pointed out that the whole report was intended for Governments and that the sentence preceding sub-paragraph (a) to (e) might be changed to read "the considerations which should generally guide Governments in their economic development."

In answer to a question by Mr. BAKOUNOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) referred to item (d) on pages 12 and 13 of the report of the Sub-Commission on Economic Development (document E/CN.1/47) for the exact meaning of sub-paragraph (b).

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) held that the item under consideration amounted to an interference in the measures which a government might take.

Mr. WOULBROUN (Belgium) supported by Mr. de CLERMONT-TONNEPPE (France), maintained that the item would become clearer by deleting the reference to "co-ordinating economic development".

Sub-paragraph (b) amended to read "the need for the stimulation and strengthening of the incentive behind economic effort" was adopted.

The Commission approved sub-paragraphs (c) and (d) without comment.

The CHAIRMAN reminded the Commission that, at its fifty-eighth meeting, it had approved sub-paragraph (e) with a Cuban amendment, by seven votes to two.

Mr. LUTOSLAWSKI

Mr. LUTOSLAWSKI (Poland) thought that in view of the Commission's previous decision to insert in the preamble a Belgian amendment dealing with improved techniques of agriculture, the first part of sub-paragraph (e) might be deleted as unnecessary duplication.

Mr. BAKOUNOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) suggested that the first part of sub-paragraph (e) should be changed to read: "The need for due attention to the development of agriculture on the basis of industrialization of the country in national development programmes".

Mr. TORRES (Brazil) preferred to keep (e) in its present form. There seemed to be no real duplication, as the Belgian amendment dealt with agriculture from a different point of view. It was, moreover, better to retain the expression "particularly the production of food", as the world food situation was so serious.

After a short discussion, the CHAIRMAN ruled that in view of the fact that the procedure at the previous meeting had not been completely clear to all members, and in order to save time, he would put the proposed Byelorussian amendment to the vote even though paragraph (e) had already been voted upon.

The Commission rejected the draft Byelorussian amendment by seven votes to six.

The CHAIRMAN asked for discussion of the Brazilian amendment which should be added on page 2 as sub-paragraph (f) (document E/CN.1/W.35).

Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) doubted whether the sub-paragraph should be added. He felt that the needs enumerated in the amendment were applicable not only to economic development but to all items.

/Mr. TORRES

Mr. TORRES (Brazil) agreed that his amendment might be inserted at a different place in the report.

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) considered that the place in the report at which the amendment was to be inserted was not insignificant because it had a bearing on the substance of the matter.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Brazilian representative should confer with the Secretary of the Commission in order to select the proper place in the report in which the amendment could be most logically inserted.

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed the deletion of the sentence: "The Commission agrees that there should be some machinery which would promote the objectives mentioned by the Sub-Commission in paragraph 15 of Part V of its report."

Mr. LUTOSLAWSKI (Poland) recalled that the Drafting Committee had, during a meeting at which the representative of India was not present, agreed to delete the sentence in question. The USSR proposal might therefore be considered a proposal of the Drafting Committee if the representative of India did not object.

Mr. KARMARKAR (India) agreed to the Polish representative's suggestion.

As there was no objection, the CHAIRMAN stated that the sentence would be deleted, with the understanding that there was no implication that the part of the resolution referring to the substance contained in the sentence would also necessarily be deleted.

/Mr. MOROZOV

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), supported by Mr. BAKOUNOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), thought that the statement in the draft report, "However, some Commission members were of the opinion that the report of the Sub-Commission tended to identify the term 'economic development' with 'industrialization'", was not accurate.

Mr. LUBIN (United States of America), and Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) and Mr. HALL (United Kingdom) believed that the clause correctly expressed the view of some Commission members.

The CHAIRMAN suggested the alternative wording: "Notwithstanding the Sub-Commission's statement that 'economic development cannot be treated as identical with industrialization', some Commission members thought that greater emphasis could be placed upon economic development in its broader sense", followed by the rest of the sentence in its present form.

The Commission adopted the wording proposed by the Chairman.

Mr. KARMARKAR (India) withdrew the revisions he had suggested for page 3, line 2 and line 9 of the draft report. (Document E/CN.1/II.35)

The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the proposal of the representative of Poland to replace the word "interdependence", line 13, page 3, by "co-operation".

Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) pointed out that the Sub-Commission had meant to stress the idea of "interdependence".

/Mr. LUTOSLAWSKI

Mr. LUTOSLAWSKI (Poland) replied that the present text was no longer the report of the Sub-Commission but represented the views of the members of the Commission.

Mr. Lutoslawski considered that interdependence between economically strong and weak countries was apt to change to dependence of the latter. The use of the term "co-operation" seemed much more appropriate.

The CHAIRMAN, as the representative of Australia, agreed with the representative of Poland.

The Commission agreed to substitute "economic co-operation" for "economic interdependence".

Mr. KARMARKAR (India) asked for a decision on the suggestion of the Drafting Committee that the report should include the names of the Commission members who subscribed to the statement: "Some Commission members also questioned the historical accuracy of the statement that 'in the case of non-self-governing territories political dependence has been a major factor in the retardation of economic development', pointing out historical examples to the contrary."

Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) thought it preferable not to establish the precedent of listing names.

Mr. TORRES (Brazil) agreed that it was better not to specify names. After some discussion he proposed that the whole question be sent to a drafting committee which would prepare a substitute sentence on which there would be general agreement. Since his proposal was not accepted he/ that

/in the

in the hope of securing general agreement he would propose the following alternative sentence: "In considering the historical accuracy of the Sub-Commission's statement that 'in the case of non-self-governing territories political dependence has been a major factor in the retardation of economic development', the Commission was of the view that even though this might have been the case in certain instances, there were nevertheless examples to the contrary."

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) was certain that the millions who had been subject to colonial regimes would not agree to the historical accuracy of the sentence suggested by the representative of Brazil. It was inappropriate for a body of the United Nations to attempt to justify colonial regimes.

Mr. POLLACK (Canada) supported the Brazilian suggestion.

Mr. BAKOUNOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) felt that the prestige of the Commission was at stake. It was a historical fact that colonial regimes had retarded economic development. The names of those who did not recognize that fact should be listed.

Mr. WOULBROUN (Belgium) pointed out that the present sentence in the draft report should have been begun, "Some Commission members denied the historical accuracy..."

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Brazilian amendment which, if adopted, would obviate the necessity of listing names.

The Commission adopted the Brazilian amendment by eight votes to four, with one abstention.

Mr. BAKOUNOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that ethical considerations had prompted his vote against the Brazilian amendment, and asked that his negative vote be recorded in the minutes.

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) could not approve the apparent intention on the part of some members of the Commission to avoid meeting issues of principles squarely, because of undue respect for the feelings of others.

Mr. TORRES (Brazil) did not think issues could always be described in black and white. It was often a scientific necessity to qualify statements. As the representative of Brazil, he acted independently of the political and economic theories of others.

Mr. LUTOSLAWSKI (Poland) thought that the phrase in the Brazilian amendment "might have been the case" was completely inadmissible as there was ample proof that such cases did in fact exist. He wished to make sure that his name would in no way be connected with the amendment.

Mr. HALL (United Kingdom) supported the right of the representative of Poland to express his disagreement with the amendment just adopted.

Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) recalled that the majority of the Commission had thus far adopted certain statements of substance with which he was not in agreement. If the Polish representative insisted upon including a reservation on the point just adopted, he himself reserved the right to submit reservations on many other points in the report.

Mr. LUTOSLAWSKI (Poland) did not wish to make a reservation on every statement with which he disagreed, but the Brazilian amendment represented a point of principle of such importance that he could not remain silent.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the amendment should be changed to read "...the majority of the Commission was of the view..."

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed there should be no limitation to the right of a member to make a reservation on any subject.

He agreed with the Chairman that the words "the majority of the Commission" should be substituted for "the Commission", especially since the amendment had been adopted by only eight votes.

Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) agreed with the USSR representative that the representative of Poland had every right to state his disagreement with the amendment adopted. He did not feel, however, that an additional sentence should be included in the text, which would have the effect of changing the meaning of the sentence adopted by the majority.

Mr. KARMARKAR (India) pointed out that the question was one on which feelings were necessarily very strong. Although in most cases it was preferable to omit the names of members of the Commission, in the present case he suggested that there should be a footnote stating which members of the Commission agreed with the statement made by the Sub-Commission. He wished his own name to be included in that list.

Mr. LUTOSLAWSKI (Poland) agreed to the Indian proposal, but reiterated his particular objection to the words "might have been the case" in the Brazilian amendment.

Mr. TORRES (Brazil) expressed his willingness to change the words "might have been" to "was".

Mr. LUTOSLAWSKI (Poland) still could not agree with the Brazilian text, although he thought the suggested change would be an improvement.

At the suggestion of Mr. Hall (United Kingdom), the CHAIRMAN stated that the representative of Poland would be given the opportunity at a later date to submit to the Commission a possible additional sentence to the paragraph, or whatever other suggestion on the question which he might like to make.

Mr. KARMARKAR (India) said that even though the Commission should agree to change the words "might have been" to "was", he still wished the report to include the footnote he had proposed.

The CHAIRMAN said that the representative of India, or any other member of the Commission, might, at a later meeting, make reservations on the point under discussion.

Referring to sub-paragraph (a) of paragraph 4, Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought it unnecessary and proposed its deletion.

Mr. KARMARKAR (India) and Mr. TORRES (Brazil) preferred to retain sub-paragraph (a).

Mr. HALL (United Kingdom) agreed with the USSR representative that the sub-paragraph was not needed, since the Sub-Commission's report had been distributed to Members of the United Nations.

The Commission decided to delete sub-paragraph (a) by nine votes to three, with one abstention.

The CHAIRMAN opened discussion of the amendment suggested by the representative of FAO to paragraph 4 (b) of the draft report (document A/CN.1/W.35/Add.1). He pointed out that it could only be considered if a members of the Commission moved its adoption.

/Mr. TORRES

Mr. TORRES (Brazil) withdrew his own amendment (document E/CN.1/W.35) on the corresponding paragraph of draft resolution A and adopted the amendment suggested by the representative of FAO as his own.

Mr. EVANS (International Labour Organization) suggested the omission of the words "any specific technical" in the penultimate line of the FAO amendment.

Mr. de CLERMONT-TONNERRE (France) also suggested some slight modifications, to the effect that any nation would have the right to request help from the Secretary-General if, in its own opinion, it needed such help.

Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) questioned the use of the expressions "an overall review" and "overall teams". He wished to know whether that meant the preclusion of countries which had certain specific problems to solve.

Mr. LUTOSLAWSKI (Poland) pointed out that the "overall" aspect of the assistance should not be overemphasized since for some countries help in the solution of special problems might be more important. On the whole he did not see any reason for the draft Brazilian amendments.

Mr. TORRES (Brazil) agreed to the deletion of the expression "overall",

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) considered that it would be an imposition on Governments to tell them from whom they should request help. Every country should be entitled to make its decision in that respect.

The CHAIRMAN put the amendment suggested by the representative of FAO and proposed by the representative of Brazil, as revised in the course of the discussion, to a vote by a show of hands.

The amendment was rejected by seven votes to six.

The CHAIRMAN announced that the rejection of the first section of the FAO Brazilian amendment, (Doc.E/CN.1/W.35/ADD.1), automatically cancelled its second section.

After some discussion in which Mr. EVANS (International Labour Organization), the CHAIRMAN and Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) took part, the following modifications were introduced in the original sub-paragraph (b) on page 4: line 4, "assist them in" was changed to read "arrange for"; line 10, the word "single" was deleted.

In connection with sub-paragraph (b), Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he would propose no formal amendment dealing with the expenses of assistance rendered by the United Nations to Member Governments if the Commission agreed that it was understood that expenses so incurred would be reimbursed to the United Nations by the recipient countries.

In reply to a question by Mr. POLLOCK (Canada), Mr. WEINTRAUB Secretary of the Commission explained that the Economic and Social Council had adopted a resolution (96 V) taking note of the Secretary-General's report on financial policy, in which it had been stated that the countries receiving assistance would reimburse the United Nations for the expenses incurred when personnel on loan to them had to be replaced.

Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) feared that the USSR suggestion might be interpreted in such a way as to limit to some degree the Secretary-General's power to extend assistance to Member Governments and the Commission might be reversing a decision of the Council.

/Mr. LUBIN

Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) thought that the question of expenses was sufficiently covered in paragraph 4, sub-paragraph (c) of draft resolution A, by which the Secretary-General would make known to the Governments "the terms" under which assistance would be available.

Mr. HALL (United Kingdom) suggested that the Commission should not take action on a point which had been dealt with by a higher authority.

Mr. TORRES (Brazil) did not wish to do anything which would interfere with the procedure already established. He was especially anxious to avoid any action which would make it more difficult for the Secretary-General to render assistance to countries.

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that the Secretary-General's report to the fifth session of the Economic and Social Council on the subject had been merely a preliminary one and the discussion in the Council had not been final. His suggestion would in no way contradict a decision of the Council. The question of who would bear the expenses should be made perfectly clear.

The CHAIRMAN, speaking as the representative of Australia, thought the Commission should not take any action which would prejudge a question sub-judice in the Council. The provisions of paragraph 4, sub-paragraph (c), in draft resolution A seem sufficient for the present.

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) suggested that the Commission might point out that during its discussion it did not consider the financial aspects of assistance to Member Governments but left that question entirely to the Economic and Social Council.

As there was no objection, the CHAIRMAN asked the Secretariat to draft a sentence along the lines proposed by the USSR representative.

The Commission approved sub-paragraph (6) of paragraph 4.

/The CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN directed the Commission to consider the revision submitted by the representative of the ILO, suggesting the substitution of a new paragraph for the present paragraph 5 of draft resolution A on page 5, (Doc.2/CN.1/W.35) as it affected paragraph 4 (c) of the text.

Mr. KARMARKAR (India) adopted the ILO proposed amendment as his own.

Mr. ARNALDO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) associated himself with the representative of the ILO.

The CHAIRMAN, speaking as the representative of Australia and supported by Mr. WOULBROUN (Belgium), considered the revised text of paragraph 4(c) and the corresponding text of the draft resolution A preferable to the original.

The amendment proposed by the representative of India, was adopted.

The meeting rose at 6:05 p.m.