

SECOND COMMITTEE: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FOURTH MEETING

Held at the Capitol, Havana, Cuba, on Wednesday, 3 December 1947, at 4.00 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Ramon BETETA (Mexico)

The CHAIRMAN invited the attention of the delegations to the amendments to Chapter III submitted by Argentina, Burma, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, India, Italy, Turkey, and the United States of America, and to three papers prepared by the Secretariat with reference to Article 10, paragraph 2, (E/CONF.2/C.2/3), the Responsibilities and Activities of the United Nations in the Field of Economic Development (E/CONF.2/C.2/2), and the Functions and Activities of Specialized Agencies of the United Nations in the Field of Economic Development (E/CONF.2/C.2/4). He also informed the Committee of a recommendation made by the General Committee for the guidance of all Committees to avoid, as far as possible, all annotations and interpretative notes the substance of which should be incorporated within the integral text of the Charter. Only unavoidable annotations should be permitted to form part of the Charter.

He then suggested that in the event of no agreement being reached on any Article, a small Sub-Committee should be appointed to study and report back to the Committee where the general debate would then be resumed. Individual Representatives who were not members of the Sub-Committee would be allowed to participate or attend its sessions.

Mr. BRIGNOLI (Argentina) moved that the Spanish Language be adopted as a working language together with English and French and said that similar motions had been made in other Committees.

The CHAIRMAN informed the Argentine Representative that facilities for simultaneous interpretation would soon be made available but that in view of the inability of the Secretariat to provide for consecutive interpretation into Spanish, the ruling of the General Committee would have to be followed. This ruling provided that only English and French were to be the working languages of the Conference. He also recalled the motion made by the delegation of China that if Spanish were adopted as a working language, Chinese would have to be used too; this, the CHAIRMAN explained, would necessarily retard the work in hand.

/After

After a protracted discussion on this language question, in which Mr. OLDINI (Chile), Mr. LIEU (China), Mr. ABELLO (Philippine Republic) and the CHAIRMAN participated, the Chairman ruled the discussion out of order and invited discussion of Article 8.

Mr. SHACKLE (United Kingdom) expressed agreement with the substance of the Article but called attention to the footnote to Chapter III on page 12 of E/PC/T/186, regarding the inclusion of the word "reconstruction" wherever the terms "economic development" or "industrial and general economic development" were used. Since this intention of inclusion had already found expression in Article 9, he thought that the footnote might be dispensed with.

Mr. SPEEKENBRINK (Netherlands), supported by Mr. KOJEVE (France), Mr. d'ANNA (Italy), and Mr. WILGROSS (Canada), thought that it was premature to decide on the elimination of this footnote and suggested that this point be discussed again after a Drafting Committee had had time to study and report on it.

Mr. OLDINI (Chile) felt that entering into a discussion of Article 8 would be very difficult before the deadline for the submission of amendments (6 December 1947) had been reached. A general discussion could, of course, profitably be entered into, but decisions should await the time when all amendments had been submitted.

Mr. BRIGNOLI (Argentina) supported the Chilean representative and added that no Article should be discussed until at least 24 hours after modifications or amendments thereto had been presented to the Commission.

Mr. WILGROSS (Canada), supported by Mr. HEIDENSTAM (Sweden), suggested that the discussion should continue and that Articles should be provisionally accepted, in the nature of a first reading, so as not to waste valuable time.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that since the general debate on Chapter III had already closed there was no choice but to adjourn if the Committee felt the same way as the representatives of Chile and Argentina. He urged, however, that the discussion should be continued without making final decisions.

Mr. OLDINI (Chile) regretted the Chairman's interpretation of his words as a move to adjourn and clarified his point of view as being much the same as that of the representative of Canada. He had only wished to prevent the taking of a final decision on the footnote to Chapter III, inasmuch as this point, or any other, might have to be reconsidered in the light of new amendments offered, even if at the present time everybody seemed to be in agreement. No adoption should be automatic, as the Chairman had suggested, and no decision should be made provisionally or finally until after the second reading. He approved of a continued discussion of Chapter III article by article.

/Mr. LIMA

Mr. LIMA (El Salvador) thought that the footnote on page 12 should be omitted for two reasons, (1) because of its contradiction to the meaning of Article 8 which, as it stood, referred to the economic development of undeveloped countries as apart from reconstruction, and (2) because the general discussion had shown that there existed important differences between reconstruction and economic development.

Mr. d'ANNA (Italy) pointed out that his delegation attached the utmost importance to the necessity of the reconstruction of the economies of war-devastated countries.

Mr. OLDINI (Chile) re-affirmed his opinion that the question could not be resolved until a careful study had been made of the entire Chapter. He recalled that at Geneva there had been a tendency to place economic development and reconstruction on an equal footing, mainly in order to avoid a cumbersome text and to avoid unnecessary repetition. It was not imperative to follow the recommendation of the General Committee to embody footnotes in the relevant Articles and the Committee had full right to determine whether such footnotes should be eliminated or maintained.

Mr. NASH (New Zealand) suggested that a small drafting committee should be formed to decide on a new text to be submitted for approval by the full Committee. He was convinced that the question of reconstruction should be included in the field of activity of economic development outlined in Article 8.

Mr. COOMBS (Australia) explained that the problem arose because the Charter first had been written with an eye to economic development in the more limited sense. It was later realized that the problems of reconstruction and economic development were much the same. He referred to Article 9 where reference was specifically made to reconstruction, and to paragraph 1 of Articles 13, 14 and 15 where both economic development and reconstruction were mentioned. Late in the proceedings it was discovered that specific reference had not been made in all places. At the same time he was satisfied that it would be preferable to incorporate specific reference to reconstruction in the places where it properly belonged, rather than to cover both questions in a footnote.

The references to development (in Article 8) could not literally be read to cover the case of countries whose economies had been impaired by the war, but it seemed desirable that this article should cover such cases. The desirable thing was for a small sub-committee to examine each Article and see where it was necessary to include reference to reconstruction. It was better to be precise rather than to leave any meaning in doubt. Results should be submitted for approval to the full Committee. Perhaps the footnote should be left provisionally during the re-drafting of the Articles.

/Mr. NOVQA

Mr. NOVCA (Mexico) felt that the terms "economic development" and "reconstruction" although similar in meaning should be separately expressed. He thought that the best solution would be for a Sub-Committee, consisting of members of war devastated countries should prepare a new draft article which would answer their specific needs.

Mr. KOJEVE (France) believed that there was disagreement on the substance of the text to be incorporated. It was difficult to ask a drafting committee to incorporate the footnote into the text of Article 8 since its contents were contested. He suggested that the word "reconstruction" should be added into Article 8. This modification was admissible. It would be difficult to achieve the aims of the Charter if war devastated countries were not given the possibility of reconstruction.

Mr. COOMBS (Australia) formally suggested that a drafting committee be asked to prepare, for the consideration of the full Committee, drafts of the various articles in Chapter 3 as they would read after the elimination of the footnote on page 12. If those drafts proved unsatisfactory, an alternative solution to the problem could be sought.

Mr. FRESQUET (Cuba) agreed with the representative of Mexico that the two ideas of reconstruction and economic development could not be embodied in the same text.

Mr. RUBIN (United States of America) said of the two proposals, namely that of Mexico for the establishment of a Sub-Committee to redraft a new Article covering the needs of those countries interested in reconstruction, and the Australian suggestion to study the possibilities of incorporating the footnote in the text, the latter seemed the easier solution. He stated that while he was prepared to agree that the two concepts of reconstruction and economic development might be different, there was always the possibility of the two ideas being embodied in the same Article. He suggested the adoption of the Australian proposal.

A long discussion ensued in which the representatives of Cuba, Haiti, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and Chile took part.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that a Sub-Committee be appointed consisting of representatives of Australia, Chile, the United Kingdom, El Salvador and France to examine the proposals. At the suggestion of the representative of Chile, Mexico was substituted for Chile.

After further discussion it was decided to reach a decision at the next meeting of the Committee.

The meeting rose at 7.30 p.m.