

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
 ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-THIRD SESSION

Official Records



**SECOND COMMITTEE, 1249th  
 MEETING**

(Closing meeting)

Friday, 13 December 1968,  
 at 9.50 p.m.

**NEW YORK**

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 45: <i>Multilateral food aid: report of the Secretary-General (concluded)</i> . . . . .	1
Agenda item 37: <i>United Nations Development Decade: report of the Secretary-General (concluded)</i> <i>Adoption of Part II of the Committee's draft report</i>	5
Agenda item 38: <i>International Education Year: report of the Secretary-General (concluded)</i> <i>Adoption of the Committee's draft report</i>	5
Agenda item 46: <i>Increase in the production and use of edible protein: report of the Secretary-General (concluded)</i> <i>Adoption of the Committee's draft report</i>	5
Agenda item 47: <i>Outflow of trained professional and technical personnel at all levels from the developing to the developed countries, its causes, its consequences and practical remedies for the problems resulting from it (concluded)</i> <i>Adoption of the Committee's draft report</i>	5
Completion of the Committee's work . . . . .	6

Chairman: Mr. Richard M. AKWEI (Ghana).

AGENDA ITEM 45

Multilateral food aid: report of the Secretary-General (concluded) (A/7203/Add.1, chap. III; A/7246, A/C.2/L.1040/Rev.1, A/C.2/L.1051-1055, E/4538 and Corr.1)

1. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) said that the revised draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1040/Rev.1) was open to serious misinterpretation in that the opening words of operative paragraph 2 could be taken as meaning that every developing country would have to become self-sufficient in food production before multilateral food aid could come to an end. His own country was not self-sufficient in food production but was able to meet its food requirements by purchase. Some developing countries might, in the future, find themselves in a similar position. It was for that reason that his delegation had submitted an amendment to operative paragraph 2, (see A/C.2/L.1055) which would replace the words "as a measure of assistance until the developing countries become self-sufficient in their production" by the words "as a measure of temporary assistance

to developing countries until they are in a position to meet their own food requirements".

2. Mr. VIAUD (France) said it had become United Nations practice since the establishment of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) to speak of stabilizing commodity prices "at a profitable level". The purpose of his first amendment, namely, to replace the words "commodity price stabilization objectives" by the words "objectives of commodity price stabilization at a profitable level" in operative paragraph 2 (d) (see A/C.2/L.1054, para. 1) was thus simply to bring the draft resolution into line with past resolutions.

3. The second amendment (*ibid.*, para. 2) was more important. His delegation could not accept the words "an integrated approach" in operative paragraph 6 (b). Apart from anything else, he did not understand what the words meant. If, however, they signified that the food aid question should be co-ordinated through the United Nations, his delegation could not accept them. His country would have to vote against the revised draft resolution if those words were not changed.

4. Mr. LYNCH (New Zealand) said that most of the amendments submitted were acceptable to the sponsors. The draft resolution was not intended to reflect the views of any one group of countries but to give a balanced reflection of the many views which existed in the Committee on the subject of food aid.

5. In the case of amendment A/C.2/L.1051, which was a revised version of the original amendment submitted orally by Pakistan at the preceding meeting (see 1248th meeting, para. 38), the new operative paragraph 9 went rather beyond what the sponsors had intended the draft resolution to be. They were not convinced that that paragraph would be appropriate in a resolution on multilateral food aid. However, since it appeared from the discussion that many delegations did not agree, they were prepared to accept the amendment, with a few minor changes in wording. In the first place, they preferred the words "in the context" to the existing wording: "within the framework". Moreover, in view of the objections raised by the representative of France, the term "concerted measures" might be preferable to "an integrated approach".

6. The Indian amendments to operative paragraph 5 (see A/C.2/L.1052) would make some simple procedural changes which were perfectly acceptable to the sponsors and, in fact, improved the text.

7. Of the three amendments proposed orally by Canada at the preceding meeting (see 1248th meeting, para. 51) and submitted in document A/C.2/L.1053, the first had been withdrawn and the other two were acceptable to the sponsors.

8. The two French amendments (see A/C.2/L.1054) created greater difficulties. The first amendment (see para. 2 above) was quite acceptable to the sponsors themselves but the question had been considered in discussions with other delegations and the co-sponsors feared that it might endanger the draft resolution's chances. In the circumstances, they would leave it to the Committee to decide.

9. The second French amendment to operative paragraph 6 (b) was not acceptable to the sponsors. However, the French position might be met by changing "an integrated approach" into "concerned measures to meet".

10. The co-sponsors found the United Kingdom amendment to operative paragraph 2 (A/C.2/L.1055) quite acceptable. In the same paragraph, however, the words "where appropriate" had been inadvertently omitted. They should be inserted in operative paragraph 2 (d) after the words "arrangements designed".

11. Mr. COX (Sierra Leone) said his delegation had indicated its intention of co-sponsoring the revised draft resolution, but certain of the changes just made had rendered it impossible. The French amendment (see A/C.2/L.1054, para. 1) to introduce the words "at a profitable level" was unacceptable. Food aid should not be a basis for profit-making. There was no question of preventing countries from disposing of their food surpluses at a profitable level, but that was a different matter.

12. The United Kingdom amendment (A/C.2/L.1055) was highly pertinent and his delegation would support it.

13. The amendment in document A/C.2/L.1051 would be acceptable if the words "designed to be beneficial to the developing countries" were added at the end of the new operative paragraph 9.

14. The first Canadian amendment would have been unacceptable but had been withdrawn and the remaining amendments (see A/C.2/L.1053, paras. 2 and 3) were acceptable.

15. The Indian amendments (A/C.2/L.1052), which had been accepted by the sponsors, were acceptable to his delegation on the assumption that the words "Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations" in operative paragraph 5 meant the secretariat of that specialized agency.

16. Mr. VIAUD (France) said he was astonished at the meaning the representative of Sierra Leone had read into his amendment to operative paragraph 2 (d) (see A/C.2/L.1054, para. 1). The purpose of that amendment, which was fully in line with traditional French policy, was to insist that commodity prices should be stabilized at a level remunerative to the producer. It should be remembered that most producers of commodities were in developing countries. Nothing could be further from his delegation's policy than an attempt to make a profit out of food surpluses used as food aid.

17. Mr. AHMED (Pakistan) said that he had already accepted a sub-amendment to his amendment to operative paragraph 9 (A/C.2/L.1051), whereby it ended at the words "an integrated approach". That had been

acceptable to the sponsors of the revised draft resolution. It was most surprising, therefore, that after an amicable compromise had been reached, he should be told to change his amendment yet again. The question of deleting the words "an integrated approach" was different in kind from the other changes. The previous concessions he had made related to shades of meaning. The furthest he could go towards a compromise on the subject was to say "an integrated approach towards solution".

18. He regretted that his delegation could not accept the United Kingdom amendment to operative paragraph 2 (A/C.2/L.1055).

19. Mr. BRADLEY (Argentina) said that the representative of New Zealand, on behalf of the sponsors, had already said (see para. 8 above) that the decision on the French amendment to operative paragraph 2 (d) was to be left to the Committee. Since the whole paragraph dealt with the interests of the developing countries, he hoped that the representative of Sierra Leone would not press for the inclusion of redundant language, especially in view of the resistance shown by the representative of Pakistan.

20. The second French amendment (see A/C.2/L.1054, para. 2) was not a problem for the sponsors. Their spokesman, the representative of New Zealand, had simply suggested that the use of the term "concerted measures" in operative paragraph 6 (b) might meet the views of France and also be acceptable to the sponsors of the amendment to operative paragraph 9 (A/C.2/L.1051). Since it clearly was not, the matter would have to be decided by a vote.

21. Mr. VARELA (Panama) said that his delegation would support the French amendment to operative paragraph 2 (d) (see para. 2 above), which was most appropriate. There could be no better incentive for agricultural producers than the knowledge that their products would command a profitable market price. Indeed, other incentives might even be regarded as supplementary. In that connexion, he understood that the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development was prepared to give its support to policies designed to secure profitable prices for agricultural products.

22. Mr. COX (Sierra Leone) withdrew his comments on the French amendment to operative paragraph 2 (d); a misunderstanding had arisen through the late receipt of documentation.

23. Mr. ABE (Japan) observed that his Government's views on the World Food Programme had already been explained in various international forums. His delegation would nevertheless again stress that the ultimate solution of the world food problem lay in increased food production in food deficit countries with the co-operation of the developed countries. Recognizing that such was the case, the second session of UNCTAD had urged developed States to give food aid to the developing countries. His country, convinced of the value of such aid as an interim measure, supported the efforts of developed States in that respect; although an importer of food, it was prepared to co-operate in meeting the immediate economic and humanitarian needs of developing countries as they arose.

24. His delegation was grateful for the understanding shown by the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1040/Rev.1 with regard to a number of points which had caused it some difficulty. It nevertheless maintained its reservations in respect of operative paragraph 2 (d), in view of the juxtaposition therein of two quite distinct elements, food aid and international commodity arrangements. Obviously, both were important to development—but in different contexts. His Government appreciated the need for commodity price stabilization in the interests of the developing countries and its participation in the International Sugar Agreement was proof of its active concern with the problem. His delegation however, considered that food aid could not and should not be a factor in the pursuit of such stabilization. It would therefore prefer the deletion of operative paragraph 2 (d) and, should that not be possible, it would request that its explicit objection to that sub-paragraph was duly recorded.

25. By the same token, his delegation reserved its position on operative paragraph 6 (c). His Government was not a signatory of the International Grains Arrangement of 1967 but it had undertaken food aid measures to the extent provided for under that Arrangement, for the very reason that it was convinced of the importance of food aid.

26. His delegation was not opposed to operative paragraph 4 and his Government would continue to cooperate with the World Food Programme; it could not, however, be expected to increase that contribution.

27. The United Kingdom amendment (A/C.2/L.1055) was apt and he could accept it. He suggested that the French amendment to operative paragraph 2 (d) should read: "at an equitable and remunerative level", in accordance with the usual wording of commodity arrangements and to ensure the balance of the paragraph as a whole. The French amendment to operative paragraph 6 (b) (see A/C.2/L.1054, para. 2) was acceptable, as were those Canadian amendments which had not been withdrawn (see A/C.2/L.1053, paras. 2 and 3) and the Indian amendments in document A/C.2/L.1052. He would reserve his position on the amendment in document A/C.2/L.1051 until the definitive wording of operative paragraph 9 had been established.

28. Mr. WOODWARD (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations) wished to suggest a drafting amendment to operative paragraph 5. FAO had been making long-range projections of prospective food deficits and food aid needs for a considerable time and, earlier during the current year, its Director-General had introduced the so-called "early warning system". He therefore suggested that the words "making appraisals" should be replaced by "further refinement in forecasts and appraisals".

29. Miss BROOKS (Liberia), sharing the Pakistan delegation's views (see para. 18 above) on the United Kingdom amendment (A/C.2/L.1055), requested a separate vote on the part of operative paragraph 2 in which it was to be embodied. She could support the French amendment to operative paragraph 2 (d).

30. Mr. DUBEY (India) could not accept the sponsors' suggestion (see para. 9 above) to replace the words "an integrated approach" in operative paragraph 6 (b)

by "concerted measures to meet". An integrated approach implied general policies affecting a wide range of activities, whereas concerted measures implied joint action by a number of countries—a totally different concept.

31. He endorsed the Japanese representative's comments (see para. 27 above) on the French amendment to operative paragraph 2 (d). The words "at a profitable level" would reflect only the interests of producers. The customary UNCTAD terminology "at an equitable and remunerative level" was more balanced and, if the French delegation agreed he could accept that.

32. He could not agree to the FAO representative's suggestion with regard to operative paragraph 5; it was certainly not a mere drafting amendment. The assessments to be made by FAO had been widely discussed and it was well known that they were of three kinds—long range projections for 1970–1975 based on two different rates of growth, those to be made under the "early warning system", and those involved in the annual reviews which were now proposed. The assessments with which operative paragraph 5 was concerned, however, were to be intermediate and the Secretary-General's purpose in suggesting them was quite novel in that they were intended to influence governmental policies and thereby to introduce an element of international planning. In view of the extensive discussion of the Secretary-General's proposal, it was most extraordinary that the FAO representative should have introduced such an amendment—quite apart from the question as to whether he was entitled to do so—and he would ask him not to press it.

33. Mr. KING (Barbados) said that a possible solution of the Pakistan representative's difficulties with regard to the United Kingdom amendment to operative paragraph 2 (see para. 1 above) would be to replace the words "to meet their own food requirements" by the words "to produce their own food requirements".

34. Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT (United States of America) said that another solution would be to change the final part of the United Kingdom amendment to operative paragraph 2 to read "until they have solved their food problems".

35. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that the new wording which the sponsors had suggested for operative paragraph 6 (b) (see para. 9 above) would enable his delegation to withdraw its amendment to that operative paragraph, on the understanding that the sponsors' version was accepted.

36. As to the Indian representative's comments on the French amendment to operative paragraph 2 (d) (see para. 31 above), his own delegation had felt that the notion of equitable remuneration was already contained in the phrase "reflecting the interest of both primary producers and consumers" of that paragraph. If, therefore, that phrase were deleted and the words "at an equitable and profitable level" added after "objectives of commodity price stabilization", the text would be clearer and his delegation could accept it. If the Indian delegation could not agree, his delegation would maintain its amendment unchanged, without the addition of the word "equitable".

37. The effect of the second Indian amendment to operative paragraph 5 (see A/C.2/L.1052, para. 2) would be to invite FAO to report to the Council of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations; he wondered whether the Committee had any right to take such a step.

38. Mr. DUBEY (India) could accept the French amendment to operative paragraph 2 (d) as re-worded by the French representative. As to the latter's comment on the Indian amendment to operative paragraph 5, his delegation had intended that the FAO secretariat should be invited to report to the Council of FAO. He suggested that the Secretariat should redraft the amendment in order to overcome the French delegation's objections.

39. Mr. DERESSA (Ethiopia) said that the preamble of the revised draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1040/Rev.1) rightly referred to the consideration already given to the over-all problem of food aid, notably as a result of General Assembly resolutions 2096 (XX) and 2300 (XXII). The role of food aid was of paramount importance and was of special significance to his country. He wished particularly to stress the view in operative paragraph 1 that the ultimate solution to the food problem of the developing countries lay in increased production in the food deficit developing countries in the context of their general economic development. His Government was investing 600 million Ethiopian dollars in the agricultural sector of its economy between 1967 and 1972 and, as a result, would be able to make a major contribution to world food supplies by producing an extra 500,000 tons of cereals by 1972. The investment would revolutionize outmoded methods by the provision of, for example, training and pesticides. His delegation also endorsed the principle set forth in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution. Despite recent report of increased food production in various parts of the world, the long-term threat of a food crisis was still present and had been confirmed by various demographic forecasts. It was all the more vital, therefore, that food production should be increased.

40. Mr. LYNCH (New Zealand) suggested that the Committee should proceed to vote on the revised draft resolution. As a co-sponsor, his delegation would prefer to maintain the text of operative paragraph 2 (d) as it stood. The suggestion of the FAO representative with regard to operative paragraph 5 (see para. 28 above) was helpful and the text might be altered to take account of it.

41. Mr. AHMED (Pakistan) said that his delegation could support the French amendment to operative paragraph 2 (d) (see para. 36 above). It could not, however, accept the text of operative paragraph 6 (b) as now re-worded by the sponsors (see para. 9 above) because it would entail the deletion of the words "an integrated approach". He therefore proposed, as a formal amendment, that the words "an integrated approach" should be restored.

42. Mr. VARELA (Panama) formally proposed the closure of the debate and suggested that the Committee should proceed to vote on the amendments, as sub-amended, to the revised draft resolution.

*It was so decided.*

43. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the amendment (A/C.2/L.1051), as orally sub-amended, to draft resolution A/C.2/L.1040/Rev.1.

*The amendment, as sub-amended, was adopted by 53 votes to none, with 12 abstentions.*

44. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the Indian amendments (A/C.2/L.1052) to draft resolution A/C.2/L.1040/Rev.1.

45. Mr. LYNCH (New Zealand) said that, since FAO was already giving consideration to possible ways for making appraisals of prospective food deficits and food needs, it would be more appropriate to insert the words "to continue" after the words "other interested organizations" in the first Indian amendment to operative paragraph 5 (see A/C.2/L.1052, para. 1).

46. Mr. DUBEY (India) disagreed with the New Zealand suggestion and was afraid that further discussion might damage the delicate compromise that had been reached.

47. Mr. VIAUD (France), speaking on a point of order, said that the Committee might well leave it to the Secretariat to make whatever corrections were necessary to make that text more coherent.

48. The CHAIRMAN said that the Secretariat would consult with the delegations concerned before preparing a final text on that understanding, he informed the Committee that the Indian amendments were accepted by the sponsors.

49. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the first French amendment (see A/C.2/L.1054, para. 1), as orally sub-amended, to draft resolution A/C.2/L.1040/Rev.1.

*The first French amendment, as sub-amended, was adopted by 33 votes to none, with 38 abstentions.*

50. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the United Kingdom amendment, as orally sub-amended, (A/C.2/L.1055) to draft resolution A/C.2/L.1040/Rev.1.

51. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) said that she preferred the original wording of operative paragraph 2.

*The United Kingdom amendment, as sub-amended, was adopted by 55 votes to 1, with 11 abstentions.*

52. Mr. ABE (Japan) requested a separate vote on operative paragraph 2 (d), as amended, of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1040/Rev.1.

*Operative paragraph 2 (d), as amended, was adopted by 59 votes to 1, with 9 abstentions.*

53. Mr. AHMED (Pakistan) said that, before the motion for the closure of the debate, he had objected to the words "concerned measures to meet" whose insertion the sponsors had suggested in order to meet the French representative's objections to operative paragraph 6 (b). He had formally proposed, however, that the original words "an integrated approach" be reinstated.

54. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that, when the sponsors had agreed to use the words "concerted measures" instead of "an integrated approach" in operative paragraph 6 (b), his delegation had withdrawn its formal amendment (see A/C.2/L.1054, para. 2) to that paragraph. If the original words were to be reinstated,

he would have to insist on a vote being taken on his amendment.

55. After further discussion in which Mr. LYNCH (New Zealand), Mr. LUBBERS (Netherlands), Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT (United States of America), Mr. VIAUD (France), Mr. VERCELES (Philippines) and Mr. LAWREY (Australia) took part, the CHAIRMAN suggested that the final drafting of operative paragraph 6 (b) should be left to the Secretariat.

*It was so decided.*

56. The CHAIRMAN said that, on that understanding, he would invite the Committee to vote on the second French amendment (see A/C.2/L.1054, para. 2) and on the revised draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1040/Rev.1), as a whole, as amended.

*The second French amendment was adopted by 19 votes to 16, with 29 abstentions.*

*The draft resolution, as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 62 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.*

57. Mr. GARCIA PINTOS (Uruguay) said that the revised draft resolution had been adopted in a spirit of constructive co-operation and hoped that it would bring about an integrated approach. He reserved his right to comment on it and draw attention to its positive points in the plenary meeting of the General Assembly.

58. Mr. RANKIN (Canada) said that, in view of the difficulties experienced in the adoption of the revised draft resolution, he wondered whether it might not have been better merely to have taken note of the Secretary-General's report (E/4538 and Corr.1) and refer it to the Economic and Social Council for implementation.

59. Mr. ABE (Japan) said that, although his delegation had voted in favour of the revised draft resolution, it was against combining international commodity arrangements with measures to provide food aid as put forth in operative paragraph 2 (d). He wished that an explicit reservation on that point would be put on the records.

60. Mr. BRADLEY (Argentina) said that, as one of the sponsors of the revised draft resolution, his delegation had worked hard to achieve a compromise. He considered that the draft had been well-balanced until the vote had been taken on the second French amendment (see A/C.2/L.1054, para. 2), but that it now went too far. Although the Committee as a whole had agreed to incorporate that amendment in the draft, his delegation wished to absolve itself from any responsibility in the matter.

61. Mr. DUBEY (India) said that his delegation had all along held the view that the draft resolution, as originally submitted, did not reflect the interests of the majority of the countries. The recommendations in the Secretary-General's report (see E/453 and Corr.1) had been selected in a discriminatory manner, since the draft ignored some and passed negative judgements on others. He felt sure that the majority would have preferred that the draft resolution had

contained suggestions for further action on all the recommendations proposed in the Secretary-General's report.

#### AGENDA ITEM 37

United Nations Development Decade: report of the Secretary-General (concluded)

ADOPTION OF PART II OF THE COMMITTEE'S DRAFT REPORT (A/C.2/L.1020/ADD.1)

#### AGENDA ITEM 38

International Education Year: report of the Secretary-General (concluded)

ADOPTION OF THE COMMITTEE'S DRAFT REPORT (A/C.2/L.1046)

#### AGENDA ITEM 46

Increase in the production and use of edible protein: report of the Secretary-General (concluded)

ADOPTION OF THE COMMITTEE'S DRAFT REPORT (A/C.2/L.1047)

#### AGENDA ITEM 47

Outflow of trained professional and technical personnel at all levels from the developing to the developed countries, its causes, its consequences and practical remedies for the problems resulting from it (concluded)

ADOPTION OF THE COMMITTEE'S DRAFT REPORT (A/C.2/L.1050)

62. Mr. COX (Sierra Leone) said that at the 1248th meeting the Committee had been on the point of adopting the draft reports on agenda items 37, 38, 46 and 47 when the Congolese representative had intervened to request a postponement of the vote. He therefore formally proposed that those draft reports should be adopted.

63. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled his request (see 1248th meeting, para. 54) that a new paragraph be added after paragraph 10 of part II of the draft report on the United Nations Development Decade (A/C.2/L.1020/Add.1). The paragraph could be phrased: "Statements of delegations in explanation of vote on the draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1028 and Add.1-3) and the amendments thereto (A/C.2/L.1036) are contained in the Second Committee's records", the number of the summary record in question being inserted (1242nd and 1243rd meetings). There were precedents for such a procedure.

*It was so decided.*

64. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there were no objections, he would take it that the Committee had decided to adopt the Committee's draft reports on agenda items 37, 38, 46 and 47.

*It was so decided.*

65. The CHAIRMAN said that certain draft reports were still outstanding, and he suggested that the Rapporteur be instructed to report directly on such items to the plenary.

*It was so decided.*

Completion of the Committee's work

66. After the customary exchange of courtesies, the CHAIRMAN declared that the Committee had completed its work.

*The meeting rose on Saturday, 14 December,  
at 12.50 a.m.*