



ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Tuesday, 12 April 1960,
at 3.30 p.m.

Twenty-ninth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 7:</i>	
<i>Consideration of the establishment of a commission for industrial development (concluded)</i>	55

President: Mr. C. W. A. SCHURMANN
(Netherlands).

Present:

Representatives of the following States: Afghanistan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Denmark, France, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Spain, Sudan, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela.

Observers for the following Member States: Albania, Argentina, Australia, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Mexico, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Tunisia, United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia.

Observers for the following non-member States: Federal Republic of Germany, Holy See.

Representatives of the following specialized agencies: International Labour Organisation; Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations; United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; International Monetary Fund; World Health Organization.

The representative of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

AGENDA ITEM 7

Consideration of the establishment of a commission for industrial development (E/L.851, E/L.860/Rev.2) (concluded)

1. Mr. SOSA RODRIGUEZ (Venezuela), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the amendments submitted in document E/L.863, thanked the sponsors of the draft resolution for having included three of those amendments in their revised text (E/L.860/Rev.2). With regard to their proposed amendment to sub-paragraph 1 (b) (ii) of the terms of reference, it had been suggested as a compromise solution that the words "inter alia" should be inserted after the words "bearing in mind". That solution was not satisfactory, as the amended text would still set forth a principle of balanced development that was unacceptable to the three delegations which had submitted the amendments. The proposed committee should be given more freedom of action.

2. Mr. FINGER (United States of America) said that as the sponsors of the draft resolution wished to give

full weight to the views expressed in the Council, they would also accept the first of the amendments proposed by Chile, Costa Rica and Venezuela, relating to sub-paragraph 1 (b) (ii). The committee would thus have more freedom of action and would be able to consider, among other factors, those that had been referred to in the original text of the draft resolution.

3. Mr. SOSA RODRIGUEZ (Venezuela) said that in that case there was no longer anything to prevent Chile, Costa Rica and Venezuela from joining the sponsors of the draft resolution.

4. Mr. SCHWEITZER (Chile) regretted that a statement he had made had been incorrectly interpreted by the USSR representative at the previous meeting. The Chilean Government had no doubts as to the Council's right to establish a standing committee rather than a commission if it so wished. The report of the Second Committee of the General Assembly was perfectly clear on that point, since it merely referred to "new machinery".^{1/} The consultations that the Chilean representative had suggested were for the sole purpose of defining the powers, membership and activities of the "machinery" in question. In view of the importance of establishing that body without further delay, the Chilean delegation would not insist that those consultations should take place.

5. Mr. Lychowski (Poland) pointed out that the General Assembly, in its resolution 1431 (XIV), had asked the Economic and Social Council to give consideration in accordance with Article 68 of the Charter of the United Nations to the prompt establishment of a commission for industrial development, taking into account the views expressed during the discussion. Contrary to the clear mandate of the Assembly, the draft resolution before the Council proposed the establishment of a standing committee. The two arguments that had been advanced to justify the present distortion of the mandate received from the Assembly were that the action thus taken was the result of consultations between the five sponsors of the draft resolution and that it represented an inevitable compromise. The fact was that more than five delegations had been prepared to co-operate in giving effect to the Assembly's instructions but, despite all efforts, such co-operation had proved to be impossible. As to the compromise that was supposed to justify the proposed text, the need for compromise was difficult to understand, since the importance of industrialization was universally recognized. There was therefore no reason not to comply with the Assembly's instructions.

6. The sponsors of the draft resolution had accepted a number of amendments, but had rejected the other amendments (E/L.862) without any discussion or explanation. The amendments that had attempted to clarify the terms of reference of the new body had been dismissed as unnecessary, and others had been

^{1/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Fourteenth Session, Annexes, agenda items 30 and 12, document A/4321, para. 111.

rejected on the ground that they were out of place in a resolution on industrialization. That could not be justified unless the intention was to establish a body dealing exclusively with problems similar to those of technical assistance. Moreover, the Council had passed over in silence the admirable work done in 1959 by the Advisory Committee on the Work Programme on Industrialization.

7. The industrialization of the under-developed countries was the most important problem of the century. The General Assembly had given the Council specific instructions to help in solving that problem, but the draft resolution which purported to carry out those instructions had made them largely meaningless. In the circumstances, the Polish delegation would be obliged to abstain from voting if the present text was put to the vote, since it had no wish to attend the fifteenth session of the Assembly with a feeling of guilt because it had not complied with clearly defined instructions.

8. Mr. KAUFMANN (Netherlands) said that there was no doubt that General Assembly resolution 1431 (XIV) left the Council free to act as it thought fit. He thanked the sponsors of the draft resolution for the clarifications they had given, particularly with regard to paragraphs 2, 6 and 7 of the proposed terms of reference. He approved of the amendment proposed by Chile, Costa Rica and Venezuela to sub-paragraph 1 (b) (ii), which had now been accepted by the sponsors. However, it might be useful to stress the importance of balanced economic growth, perhaps by inserting the words "as part of balanced economic growth" in the second preambular paragraph after the words "of under-developed countries". He pointed out that he had not used the words "their balanced economic growth" because economic growth need not necessarily be balanced in the case of each individual country.

9. Mr. GREEN (New Zealand) stated that in setting up a new body it was important to place its work in the proper context. The draft resolution should state that context from the point of view of the Economic and Social Council. The Council was responsible for an over-all view of economic development within which it was proposed that more emphasis be given to industrialization. It seemed desirable, therefore, when placing on record that new emphasis, that the preamble of the resolution should at the same time make it plain that in the Council's view it should be regarded "as part of balanced economic growth". That by implication would acknowledge the Council's wider responsibilities. For example, industrialization created problems of urbanization, housing, education and provision of social services. It was further recognized that from the point of view of individual countries their economic growth might not be and perhaps could not be balanced at the present time. He therefore agreed with the Netherlands representative that the suggested amendment need not refer to "their balanced economic growth" but simply to the broad principle.

10. Mr. SOSA RODRIGUEZ (Venezuela) said that the sponsors of the amendments regretted that they could not accept the suggestion of the Netherlands representative, since it gave rise to the same objections as the part of sub-paragraph 1 (b) (ii) that the sponsors of the draft resolution had agreed to delete.

11. Mr. KAUFMANN (Netherlands) said that the part of sub-paragraph 1 (b) (ii) that had been deleted re-

lated to the balanced development of various sectors of industry, whereas the formula that he had suggested referred to the balanced development of the economy as a whole.

12. Mr. SOSA RODRIGUEZ (Venezuela) said that while he understood the point of view of the Netherlands representative, he considered that the basic idea—that of balanced development—was the same in both cases and therefore gave rise to the same objections.

13. Mr. AHMED (Sudan) thanked the United States representative for the reply he had given at the previous meeting to his suggestion with respect to the membership of the proposed committee. That suggestion had been intended merely to facilitate, by expressly providing for, a possible change in the membership of the committee as the result of altered circumstances. As numerous under-developed countries, and more particularly African countries, would become Members of the United Nations in the near future, the representation of the under-developed countries on the committee would clearly have to be increased. Furthermore, in spite of the arguments advanced by a number of delegations, he continued to believe that the establishment of a commission for industrial development, instead of a committee, would have accorded more closely with the wishes of the under-developed countries, and with the terms of General Assembly resolution 1431 (XIV).

14. The PRESIDENT pointed out that all the amendments contained in document E/L.863 had been incorporated in the revised draft resolution. He therefore invited the members of the Council to vote on the amendments submitted by Bulgaria (E/L.862). In view of the changes made in the text of the draft resolution, the second Bulgarian amendment would delete from paragraph 4 of the proposed terms of reference the words "or members of the specialized agencies or the International Atomic Energy Agency". The Bulgarian representative had asked for separate votes on the first two amendments.

The first amendment was rejected by 13 votes to 5.

The second amendment was rejected by 13 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions.

The remaining amendments were rejected by 13 votes to 4, with 1 abstention.

15. The PRESIDENT invited the members of the Council to vote on the revised draft resolution (E/L.860/Rev.2), with the amendment accepted by the sponsors during the meeting.^{2/}

16. Mr. ARKADEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked for a separate vote on the words "or members of the specialized agencies or the International Atomic Energy Agency" in paragraph 4 of the proposed terms of reference.

17. The PRESIDENT pointed out that a vote had already been taken on those words and that the Council could not vote twice on the same issue.

18. Mr. ARKADEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, in those circumstances, he would ask for a separate vote on paragraph 4 as a whole, though his delegation objected only to the words "or

^{2/} The amended text of the draft resolution was subsequently distributed as document E/L.860/Rev.3.

members of the specialized agencies or the International Atomic Energy Agency".

Paragraph 4 was adopted by 13 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions.

The draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 15 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

19. Mr. ARKADEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had voted against paragraph 4 because it contained the words "or members of the specialized agencies or the International Atomic Energy Agency", a phrase wholly unprecedented in a resolution establishing an organ of the Council. Those words introduced a regrettable political

element into the resolution and implied discrimination against certain States, such as the German Democratic Republic.

20. The USSR delegation had abstained on the draft resolution as a whole in the conviction that it did not conform to the General Assembly's recommendations. The fact that it had been impossible to achieve unanimity on the proposal clearly showed that, in adopting it, the Council had not taken the right course. Indeed, there was a distinct possibility that the Council's attitude on the matter might be criticized at the next session of the General Assembly.

The meeting rose at 4.35 p.m.