

UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL



GENERAL

E/CN.1/SR.132
20 June 1951
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

ECONOMIC, EMPLOYMENT AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
SUMMARY RECORD OF THE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-SECOND MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Monday, 4 June 1951, at 2.30 p.m.

CONTENTS:

Draft report of the Commission to the Economic and Social
Council (E/CN.1/L.20, E/CN.1/L.20/Add.1 and E/CN.1/L.20/Add.2)
(continued)

Chairman:

Mr. MUNES GUILMARAES

Brazil

Members:

Mr. BUNGE

Argentina

Mr. BURY *

Australia

Mr. WOULBROUN *

Belgium

Mr. WOLFSON *

Canada

Mr. CHA *

China

Mr. NOSEK *

Czechoslovakia

Mr. DAYRAS *

France

Mr. SAKSENA

India

Mr. GARCIA

Philippines

Mr. SZYMANOWSKI *

Poland

Mr. CHERNYSHEV

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Mr. WILSON *

United Kingdom of Great Britain
and Northern Ireland

Mr. STINEBOWER

United States of America

Mr. LANG

Yugoslavia

Representative of a specialized agency:

Miss BANOS Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)

Representatives of non-governmental organizations:

Category A:

Miss KAEN World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU)

Category B:

Miss SANSON International Chamber of Commerce (ICC)

Mr. BROPHY International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU)

Secretariat:

Mr. WEINTRAUB Secretary of the Commission

DRAFT REPORT OF THE COMMISSION TO THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (E/CN.1/L.20, E/CN.1/L.20/Add.1 and E/CN.1/L.20/Add.2) (continued)

Paragraph 22: (E/CN.1/L.20/Add.1)

Mr. WILSON (United Kingdom) suggested that the first sentence of paragraph 22, which he considered unsatisfactory should be amended by placing a full stop after the word "indivisibility" and deleting the rest of the sentence.

Mr. CHA (China) thought that the second sentence in paragraph 22 as it stood emphasized that the under-developed countries agreed that the developed countries must maintain a high level of economic activity and employment. It should also be made clear, however, that the under-developed countries must also maintain a high level of employment, and the sentence should therefore be changed.

Mr. WOLFSON (Canada) said that the paragraph would become meaningless if the under-developed countries were mentioned. The present form of words merely meant that only developed countries whose economic activity was maintained at a high and stable level could effectively help the under-developed countries. It was too readily assumed that the developed countries could assist the under-developed countries regardless of their economic condition.

/Mr. BURY

Mr. BURY (Australia) agreed with the substance of the Chinese representative's remarks. However, paragraph 22 dealt with the national measures to be taken by developed countries.

Mr. BUNGE (Argentina) approved of the paragraph as amended. The word "indivisibility" in the second line removed any possibility of tendentious interpretation as it took into account the inter-relatedness of the various specific and general factors of world economic development.

The CHAIRMAN, speaking as representative of Brazil, agreed with the Argentine representative. Paragraph 22 stated that one of the most important factors in the economic development of the under-developed countries was the achievement of a high and stable level of economic activity in the developed countries. That was due to the inter-relatedness of world economy. Many under-developed countries would suffer, particularly in regard to imports, if there was an economic crisis in one of the developed countries.

Mr. WOLFSON (Canada) suggested that the word "prerequisites..." in the eighth line of the paragraph should be replaced by the word "elements..."

Paragraph 22, as amended by the United Kingdom and Canadian representatives, was adopted.

Paragraph 23:

Mr. WEINTRAUB (Secretary of the Commission) thought that the quotation marks in the last line of the paragraph should be deleted.

Mr. CHERNYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that the paragraph had already been discussed, and he had made certain comments which had led to the adoption of an amendment. He asked that the reference to Article 16 of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade should be deleted. The Commission had not considered that question and therefore could not deal with it in the report.

/Mr. WOLFSON

Mr. WOLFSON (Canada) suggested putting a full stop after the words "in the Council's resolution 341 A (XII)" and adding words to the effect that "some members had also drawn attention to that matter", which might satisfy the USSR representative.

Mr. CHERNYSEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) accepted the Canadian representative's proposal.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) did not think the amendment wise. The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, which had already been accepted by many states and to which the Commission was perfectly entitled to draw attention, should be mentioned in the report.

Mr. CHERNYSEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) could not understand why the United States representative refused to accept either the Canadian proposal or his amendment. He requested that his delegation's view on the matter should be included in the summary record.

The Canadian amendment was adopted.

Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) said that he had already pointed out that the report should faithfully reflect the debates in the Commission. The USSR representative's proposal was therefore justified. The whole Commission had not drawn attention to Article 16 of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, but only some of its members. He therefore could not agree to the Commission's report referring to that instrument. He wished his views to be included in the summary record.

It was so decided.

Paragraph 23, as amended on the suggestion of the Secretary of the Commission, was adopted.

Paragraph 24:

Paragraph 24 was adopted.

/Paragraph 25:

Paragraph 25:

Mr. WEINTRAUB (Secretary of the Commission) thought that the words "in a section" in paragraph 25 might be replaced by the words "in a separate section".

Mr. WOLFSON (Canada) proposed two amendments: (a) that the words "this recommendation might be included in a section..." should be replaced by the words "if the Council should decide in favour of such a resolution then it might be included in a separate section..." and (b) that the words "of goods and" in line 3 of paragraph 25 should be deleted.

Mr. DAYRAS (France) thought that the wording of the first sentence of paragraph 25 gave the impression that the problem was already solved, which was not the case. It would be clearer to say that recommendation 11 should (a) take account of the possibilities of the developed countries exporting capital and (b) also be addressed to the under-developed countries. There were two different ideas there, and a distinction should be made between them.

Mr. WILSON (United Kingdom) proposed a return to the formula adopted for paragraph 18. The sentence beginning with the words "This recommendation might be included" should be amended accordingly.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) thought that it would be more harmonious either to delete the word "both" in the English text or to replace the words "as well as" by the word "and".

Paragraph 25 was adopted with the Canadian representative's amendment and the change suggested by the Secretary.

/Paragraph 26:

Paragraph 26:

Mr. LANG (Yugoslavia) proposed that the following sentence should be added after the words "appreciably accelerated" in line 8: "it is the view of the Commission that attention should be paid to the study of augmenting the international flow of capital through United Nations agencies." The words in parentheses would then be deleted.

Mr. WOLFSON (Canada) proposed the formula "through United Nations specialized agencies" in order to eliminate any ambiguity. The formula proposed by Mr. Lang would automatically imply the International Bank.

Mr. WEINTRAUB (Secretary of the Commission) proposed the formula "through international organizations of the United Nations".

Mr. GARCIA (Philippines) proposed that the word "public" should be inserted before the word "capital" in line 5.

Mr. WOLFSON (Canada) proposed the deletion of the word "international" which recurred at a later point in the text.

Mr. WILSON (United Kingdom) did not find the Philippine representative's suggestion satisfactory because it contradicted subsequent paragraphs. What mattered most was to increase the flow of private capital.

Mr. GARCIA (Philippines) said that he would not press his proposal.

Mr. WOLFSON (Canada) said that there should be an amendment to the clause "that this increased volume of foreign exchange has been obtained through the operation of factors... in the under-developed countries".

/Mr. WEINTRAUB

Mr. WEINTRAUB (Secretary of the Commission) suggested that the Commission should take up the drafting of that clause when it had decided on the subsequent paragraphs.

It was so decided.

Paragraph 27:

Paragraph 27 was adopted.

Paragraph 28:

Mr. WEINTRAUB (Secretary of the Commission) suggested that an asterisk should be placed after the words "recommendation 15" referring to a footnote indicating that recommendation 14 was discussed in paragraphs 31, 32 and 33 below.

Paragraph 28 was adopted with the change suggested by the Secretary.

Paragraph 29:

Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) thought that the report should make it clear that the Commission had taken a vote on the recommendation for the establishment of an international finance corporation and should indicate the number of votes in favour and the number against.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that a footnote to that effect appeared at the bottom of page 5.

Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) said that that explanation was satisfactory.

Paragraph 29 was adopted.

Paragraph 30:

Mr. WEINTRAUB (Secretary of the Commission) suggested that the words "this possibility" in the twelfth line should be replaced by the words "the possibility of financing such projects."

Paragraph 30 was adopted with the change suggested by the Secretary.

Paragraph 31

After a brief discussion in which Mr. WOLFSON (Canada), Mr. SAKSENA (India), Mr. LANG (Yugoslavia) and Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) took part, the Commission decided not to consider the following proposals: (a) the Australian representative's proposals; (b) the United Kingdom representative's proposal for the insertion of a preamble at the beginning of paragraph 32, and (c) the Canadian representative's proposal for the insertion in paragraph 32 of a clause indicating that some members had considered that the question dealt with in paragraph 32 had been sufficiently discussed in the Commission.

Mr. WEINTRAUB (Secretary of the Commission) drew attention to the Council's procedure in considering recommendations in the reports of its Commissions. The Council considered itself seized of any recommendation submitted in those reports unless it was stipulated that a recommendation was submitted by the minority, in which case the Council gave it no consideration.

Mr. WOLFSON (Canada) said that in the circumstances he would accept the Indian representative's proposal.

Mr. WILSON (United Kingdom) proposed that the words "were of the opinion" should be substituted for the words "were of the view", at the beginning of paragraph 32.

Mr. WEINTRAUB (Secretary of the Commission) proposed that the word "payment", in line 16 (page 2) should be replaced by the word "payments". The amended text of paragraph 32 would then read: "Some members of the Commission, who dissented from the majority views contained in paragraph 31 above, were of the opinion that the Council's desire expressed in paragraph 3 of its resolution 341 (XII) to consider practical methods in conditions and policies for improving or augmenting the existing sources of external finance, both private and public, with a view to achieving an adequate expansion and a

/steadler

steadier flow of foreign capital, in order to meet the financial needs of the economic development of under-developed countries could best be given effect by the adoption of a resolution. Such a resolution would invite the General Assembly to establish..... development programmes. These members felt that such a resolution would also invite the General Assembly to set before the United Nations development authority as one of its tasks....."

Paragraph 32 was adopted as amended.

Paragraph 26 (E/CN.1/L.20/Add.1)(continued)

Mr. SAKSENA (India) said that he had wished it to be indicated, in the fourth sentence of paragraph 26, that some under-developed countries had achieved a favourable balance of payments only by making great sacrifices, such as substantial reduction of their imports, and that use of such foreign exchange earnings for economic development would do nothing to lessen the inflationary pressures created by the restriction of imports -- in fact, quite the contrary.

Mr. WOLFSON (Canada) could accept ~~the~~ sentence except that the second part might be open to dangerous misinterpretation. He therefore proposed that the part beginning with the words "and that these earnings of foreign exchange... should be deleted. In any case, the clause added nothing to the meaning.

Mr. BURY (Australia) pointed out that inflationary pressures were created whenever national resources were used for economic development. The question was therefore how to counteract such pressures by means of other measures, such as taxes.

The CHAIRMAN wondered whether it might not be indicated that inflationary tendencies would be strengthened unless all or a part of the foreign exchange earnings were used to buy consumer goods.

/Mr. WILSON

Paragraph 31 (E/CN.1/L.20/Add.2)

Mr. WOLFSON (Canada) proposed the insertion of the words "the capital from" before the words "these sources" in the fourth line.

Mr. WEINTRAUB (Secretary of the Commission) recalled that the Chairman had proposed that the word "permanent" in the ninth line should be replaced by the word "normal". He also suggested that in the eleventh line of the English text the word "contributing" should be replaced by the word "distributing".

Paragraph 31 was adopted with the amendments of the Chairman and the United Kingdom representative and with the change suggested by the Secretary.

Paragraph 32

Mr. WEINTRAUB (Secretary of the Commission) suggested the insertion of the words "such a resolution would also" after the words "development programmes" in the sixth line of page 2 of the English text, and the addition of the words "it would further" before the word "recommend" in the thirteenth line.

Mr. WOLFSON (Canada) wondered whether the Commission could invite the Council to consider the adoption of a resolution for which it suggested a text. It might be better merely to draw the Council's attention to the question and leave it to the Council to decide what steps should be taken.

Moreover, the report should make it clear that a number of members had expressed a different view on the matter. He therefore proposed that a sentence drafted as follows should be added to paragraph 32: "Many members were, however, of the opinion that the matters discussed in this paragraph had been adequately discussed in the Commission and that the views of the Commission have been incorporated in various parts of the report."

Mr. SAKSENA (India) pointed out that paragraph 31 covered the Canadian representative's point of view. There was no need to mention it again in paragraph 32.

/Mr. BURY

Mr. BURY (Australia) thought that the views set forth in paragraph 32 should appear in the report before the views given in paragraph 31. The order of the two paragraphs should therefore be reversed so that the report would be better balanced.

Mr. Bury's proposal was rejected.

Mr. WILSON (United Kingdom) proposed the deletion of the word "however" in the first line and the insertion of the following clause after the word "Commission": "who dissented from the majority view as expressed in paragraph 31".

Mr. WOULBROUN (Belgium) proposed the insertion of the words "these members were also of the opinion that this resolution should" before the words "invite the General Assembly" in the thirteenth line, thereby amending the text suggested by the Secretary.

Mr. CHERNYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted that the USSR delegation had voted against Recommendation 14. The report should certainly indicate the minority view as expressed during the discussion.

Mr. BURY (Australia) considered it essential to indicate the views of the minority and proposed the addition of the following sentence at the end of paragraph 32: "The minority views stated in this paragraph were originally embodied in a draft resolution which was not pressed because of insufficient support from members of the Commission."

Mr. SAKSENA (India) proposed that the beginning of paragraph 32 should be replaced by the following text which embodied the United Kingdom proposal in part: "Some members of the Commission who dissented from the majority view as expressed in paragraph 31 were of the view that the Council's desire expressed in paragraph 3 of resolution 341 (XII) could best be given effect by the adoption of a resolution. Such a resolution would invite the General Assembly...."

/After

Mr. WILSON (United Kingdom) also expressed some dissatisfaction with the wording of the passage and proposed the following revision: "...and that these earnings of foreign exchange, if diverted to economic development purposes might strengthen domestic inflationary pressures....."

After a brief discussion, in which Mr. WOLFSON (Canada), Mr. WILSON (United Kingdom) and Mr. SAKSENA (India) took part, Mr. WEINTRAUB (Secretary of the Commission) suggested that it should be left to the Secretariat to prepare a text reconciling the various points of view.

Mr. SAKSENA (India) said that he was entirely satisfied with the United Kingdom representative's amendment. If that wording were to be modified, the text would have to be lengthened considerably. Nevertheless, he would accept the suggestion of the Secretary of the Commission.

The suggestion of the Secretary of the Commission was adopted.

Paragraph 20 (E/CN.1/L.20) (continued)

Mr. WILSON (United Kingdom) was dissatisfied with the present wording of paragraph 20. At the moment, all that it said was that economic development was an excellent thing, which was an established fact. The text should state that the eradication of debilitating diseases was of importance to the economic development effort itself. Accordingly, he proposed the retention of the first sentence and the substitution of the following for the remainder of the paragraph: "It suggests that the Council might adopt a recommendation urging the under-developed countries to proceed with all speed with measures of public health, social welfare and the eradication of debilitating diseases".

The CHAIRMAN supported the United Kingdom proposal. Such diseases were an important factor in the backward condition of the economy of the under-developed countries.

/Mr. SAKSENA

Mr. SAKSENA (India) had no objection to the proposal, but suggested that the new text should be inserted after the second sentence of the paragraph, which should be retained. Thus only the last sentence would be deleted.

Mr. DAYRAS (France) did not see the need for a statement regarding the effect of the eradication of diseases on the standard of living. That effect was obvious. His proposal at an earlier meeting for a milder wording had been made in order to satisfy representatives who had pressed for inclusion of that idea.

Mr. WILSON (United Kingdom) proposed as a compromise, that the following text should be inserted after his first amendment: "The Commission recognizes that public health and economic development act and react upon one another and that the highest standards of health are unattainable without considerable prior progress in economic development, particularly without a rise in the standard of living. On the other hand, economic development itself depends on progress in public hygiene for its success."

Mr. CHERNYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the text suggested by the Indian representative, with the first United Kingdom amendment, would be acceptable. It was necessary to relate the health of a country's population to its economic development, without making that development purely a question of public hygiene. The Indian representative was right in wishing to retain the sentence which stressed that relationship.

The CHAIRMAN proposed the further addition of the following sentence: "In this respect, attention is drawn to the availability of the services of the World Health Organization."

/Mr. GARCIA

Mr. GARCIA (Philippines) accepted the United Kingdom amendments, but proposed that in the first the words "with all speed" should be replaced by the words "with all possible speed".

Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) did not consider it necessary to refer to the World Health Organization. The text already laid too much emphasis on the medical aspect of the problem and not enough on its economic and social aspects. A reference to the World Health Organization would increase that emphasis still further.

The CHAIRMAN pressed for adoption of his amendment, which seemed to him entirely justified.

Paragraph 20 was adopted as amended.

Paragraph 21 (E/CN.1/L.20)

Mr. WOLFSON (Canada) proposed that, in the second sentence of the French text of paragraph 21, the word "qui" should be deleted, and that the sentence should end with the words "by the Population Commission". The text would then continue with the words: "Although the Commission is of the view that it would be premature to make any specific recommendations to the Council on this matter until more adequate factual information is made available on this subject, it suggests ...".

Mr. CHERNYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that the last sentence of paragraph 21 should be deleted so as to reflect the discussion on the subject more clearly. The sentence recalled the obsolete theory that there was a close relationship between the economic development of a country and the size of its population.

He further proposed that the first sentence should end with the words "rate of population growth".

Mr. WOLFSON (Canada) did not oppose the USSR amendment to the first sentence, but urged that the last sentence should be retained.

/Mr. CHERNYSHEV

Mr. CHERNYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the question had already been discussed at length and asked for a vote on his proposal.

The CHAIRMAN suggested the adoption of a text stating that the Commission recognized that there was a relationship between the size of a country's population and its economic development, but that the relationship was not the same in all countries; that the Population Commission was devoting its attention to that problem; and that consequently, the Economic, Employment and Development Commission, not having sufficient information on the question, did not find it possible to make any recommendation to the Council on the subject.

Mr. CHERNYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Chairman's proposal would not improve the original text to any noticeable extent, and did not meet his own fundamental objection.

Mr. WOUÛBROUN (Belgium) did not consider the last sentence of the paragraph particularly important, and thought that its wording should be satisfactory to all members of the Commission. Moreover, the Population Commission had made important studies of the inter-dependence of demographic and economic factors.

Mr. DAYRAS (France) said that the Chairman's proposal was of interest because it contained a more concrete idea than the original text. It also seemed to him to embody the idea which the USSR representative wished to include.

Mr. WOLFSON (Canada) asked for confirmation that the Population Commission was in fact concerning itself with the inter-relationship between the size of population and economic development. If that were so, he would accept the Chairman's proposal.

/Mr. WILSON

Mr. WILSON (United Kingdom) opposed the Chairman's suggestion. It would involve too great an expansion of the paragraph. He preferred the present text. He recalled that the majority of the Commission had not accepted the USSR representative's argument that there was no connexion between economic development and the size of the population. In some countries, such as Italy, Canada and Australia, much importance was attached to that inter-relationship.

Mr. CHERNYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that his Government's attitude on demographic policy was illustrated by the fact that mothers of five children received state awards. He asked, in the first place, for a vote to be taken on his proposal.

Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) emphasized that the basic aim of economic development was to increase the population's wellbeing. It would therefore be of no use to bring demographic considerations into the matter.

Mr. WOLFSON (Canada) proposed that the Council should ask the Population Committee to study the problem.

The CHAIRMAN, speaking as representative of Brazil, said that he would not press his proposal which had simply been intended to bring out that there was general agreement that a connexion existed between population and economic development; the Commission could not submit specific recommendations on the matter for lack of adequate information.

Mr. DAYRAS (France) stressed that the Chairman's proposal had the merit of covering the two aspects of the problem -- inadequate population and surplus population.

The CHAIRMAN, speaking as representative of Brazil, withdrew his proposal on condition that a statement noting the inter-relationship between population and economic development was adopted.

/Mr. WILSON

Mr. WILSON (United Kingdom) noted that the problem was of very great importance and that all the members of the Commission but three were agreed in recognizing the existence of the inter-relationship. As the Population Commission was not at present dealing with it and the Council was currently contemplating a re-organization of the work of its Commissions the problem should be brought to the Council's attention.

The CHAIRMAN put the USSR representative's proposal to the vote.

The USSR proposal was rejected by 7 votes to 4, with 4 abstentions.

Mr. CHERNYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) accordingly asked that the words "the majority of the Commission" should be substituted for "the Commission" in paragraph 21.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) suggested that a statement should be inserted after the first sentence in the paragraph, to replace the remainder of its original text, to the effect that the Commission was unable to make specific recommendations on the subject, but recommended that the Council and the Population Commission should study it.

Mr. WOLFSON (Canada) considering that the wording proposed by the United States representative could be adopted only if the Population Commission was already dealing with the matter. If that was not so the Council should be asked to invite the Population Commission to study the problem.

Mr. WOULBROUN (Belgium) found the wording proposed by the United States representative adequate. He read an extract from the Population Commission's report, making reference to both demographic and economic factors.

Mr. WEINTRAUB (Secretary of the Commission) quoted a draft resolution from the report of the Population Commission to the thirteenth session of the Economic and Social Council, in which reference was made to the inter-relationship of economic, social and demographic factors.

/Mr. WOLFSON

Mr. WOLFSON (Canada) thought that the studies of the matter contemplate by the Population Commission were merely theoretical and had no direct connexion with what the Commission was discussing. The Council should invite the Population Commission or other appropriate bodies to carry out more detailed studies.

The Commission adopted the text proposed by the United States representative, with amendments, reading as follows:

"The Commission is unable to make any specific recommendation on this subject. However, the majority of the Commission considers that the Council, itself or through such organs as it may specify, should keep the relationship between population growth and economic development under study as a matter of importance."

Paragraphs 33 to 35 (E/CN.1/L.20/Add.2)

Paragraphs 33 to 35 were adopted.

Paragraph 26 (continued) (E/CN.1/L.20/Add.1)

Mr. WEINTRAUB (Secretary of the Commission) announced that the Secretariat had drafted a text which he read; it was supported by the representatives of Brazil, India and the United Kingdom.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America), while he could not object to a text stating only the opinions of other representatives, he wished to have it noted in the summary record that, in his opinion, the text contained economic inaccuracies and impaired the quality of the report.

Mr. WOLFSON (Canada) shared the United States representative's opinion. He considered the text faulty both in substance and in form.

Mr. SAKSENA

Mr. SAKSENA (India) agreed with the United States representative's criticisms and suggested adoption of the amendment previously submitted by the United Kingdom representative -- his approval of which he had already signified.

The Commission adopted the text proposed by the United Kingdom representative, with a number of drafting amendments, to the following effect:

"That these earnings of foreign exchange, if directed to economic development purposes, might aggravate domestic inflation in under-developed countries."

Adoption of the report as a whole

Mr. CHERNYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) wished to state, before the vote was taken on the report as a whole, that the report of the Group of Experts which the Commission had been considering was a harmful document and could not serve as basis for a thorough consideration of the problem of economic development; the USSR delegation had already expressed its view on the subject at the meeting of 17 May. The Commission's report which was based on the report of the Group of Experts, advised the under-developed countries without justification to make use of foreign capital rather than of their domestic resources. Some statements in the Commission's report were even stronger than the recommendations of the Group of Experts, in particular, the statements concerning land tenure adopted at the morning meeting. The USSR delegation would therefore be compelled to vote against the report.

Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) also wished to explain his delegation's attitude towards the Commission's report. The Czechoslovak delegation had already stated its objections to certain recommendations of the Group of Experts during the discussion of items 3 and 4 of the agenda. Since the Commission's report repeated the basic recommendations of the Group of Experts, his delegation was compelled to vote against it.

Mr. SZYMANOSKY (Poland) agreed with the USSR and Czechoslovak representatives. The Commission had the important function of drawing the Council's attention to means of promoting economic development. The Commission's report, however, endorsed the ideas of the Group of Experts to which the Polish delegation had already taken exception. The Polish delegation would accordingly have to vote against the Commission's report.

/Mr. SAKSENA

Mr. SAKSENA (India), speaking on a point of order, observed that the members of the Commission were not being asked to approve the recommendations of the Group of Experts by their votes, but merely the Commission's report, containing a summary of the discussions that had taken place in the Commission and their outcome.

The CHAIRMAN, speaking as representative of Brazil, asked for his view to be recorded in the summary record that the report of the Group of Experts was a valuable contribution to the study of the basic problem of economic development. The report covered all important aspects of the problem. Undoubtedly it had faults, but they were slight in comparison to its very real qualities. He paid a tribute to the Experts, and to the Secretary-General who had chosen them, and declared that the report would form the basis for future detailed studies.

He put the Commission's report as a whole to the vote.

The report was adopted by 12 votes to 3.

Before adjourning the meeting and closing the session, which might be the Commission's last, the CHAIRMAN thanked the representatives for their collaboration and observed that, whatever its fate, the report would testify to the spirit of co-operation that had prevailed in the Commission. He also thanked the representatives of the specialized agencies and the non-governmental organizations, and the Secretariat, in particular Mr. Weintraub, the Secretary of the Commission, for their valuable collaboration.

Mr. WOLFSON (Canada), on behalf of the Commission, thanked the Chairman, the other officers of the Commission and the Secretariat.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that he should send messages, in the name of the Commission, to its past Chairmen, Mr. Wilson and Mr. Frisch.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.