United Nations

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SIXTH SESSION

Official Records

THIRD COMMITTEE 356th MEETING

Wednesday, 28 November 1951, at 3 p.m.

Palais de Chaillot, Paris

CONTENTS

Chairman: Mrs. Ana FIGUEROA (Chile).

Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapter IV) (A/1884, A/C.3/L.155, A/C.3/L.162/Rev.1) (*continued*)

[Item 11]*

JOINT DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY FRANCE, PAKISTAN AND YUGOSLAVIA (A/C.3/L.162/Rev.1) (*concluded*)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to hear explanations of some of the votes.

2. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) pointed out that his amendment (A/C.3/L.168) to the joint draft resolution, consisting in the deletion of the words "those urgent" and "early" in paragraph 1 of the operative part, had not been put to the vote. He would not however press the point.

3. Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic) said that she had not spoken in the course of the discussion on the joint draft resolution, because her delegation had already expressed its views on the important activities of the Economic and Social Council and the Social Commission in the course of the general debate. The delegation of the Dominican Republic had voted for the draft resolution because it considered it an important one for the Economic and Social Council and the Social Commission. It would vote for any draft resolution submitted in the future which had the effect of maintaining and reinforcing any other organ of the Council working in the social field.

4. The delegation of the Dominican Republic had voted against the first part of the amendment submitted by the USSR (A/C.3/L.160), because it contained accusations against the Economic and Social Council. On the other hand, it had voted for sub-paragraphs (*b*) and (*c*) of the amendment because they were based on principles which the delegation of the Dominican Republic had always supported.

5. Her delegation had voted against point 1 of the amendment submitted by the United Kingdom (A/C.3/L.163), consisting in the addition of the words "and of the resources available" in paragraph 1 of the operative part of the draft resolution, because it considered that that amendment would limit the scope of the draft resolution. However, it had voted for point 3 of the United Kingdom amendment, consisting in the addition of the words "as soon as practicable", since it believed that that would have the effect of enabling the time limits within which the programme was to be submitted to the General Assembly to be fixed with greater flexibility.

6. Although the representative of Chile had defined the words "under-developed countries" with sufficient latitude to allow of their application to all territories, whether self-governing or not, the delegation of the Dominican Republic had, in the interests of exactitude, voted for point 2 of the amendment submitted by Syria (A/C.3/L.171) whereby the words "both self-governing and non-self-governing" were added after the words "under-developed countries" in the third paragraph of the preamble. It had likewise voted for point 1 of the Syrian amendment, consisting in the addition of the words "and its commissions" in the first paragraph of the preamble, in order that all the Council's activities might be covered by the resolution.

7. Her delegation had voted for the amendments submitted by the United States (A/C.3/L.167) and the United Kingdom (A/C.3/L.163), concerning the specialized agencies, in order to make it clear that the specialized agencies merited consideration. Finally, she had voted for the amendment submitted by Saudi Arabia (A/C.3/L.169), whereby the words "and the Non-Self-Governing Territories" were added in order to make it clear that the Economic and Social Council's work should extend to all regions in which it was needed.

8. Mrs. BEGTRUP (Denmark) gave her reasons for voting against the USSR amendment (A/C.3/L.160). Denmark was a member of the International Labour Organisation and supported its work. That organiza-

* Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.

tion had assembled materials on the question of social insurance with a view to enabling improved international conventions to be drafted. It was therefore already carrying out the task which the USSR delegation had wished to see mentioned in the draft resolution.

JOINT DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY AFGHANISTAN, AUSTRALIA, BRAZIL, NEW ZEALAND, URUGUAY AND YUGOSLAVIA (A/C.3/L.155)[1]

9. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.155) concerning the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund, and the amendment thereto submitted by Lebanon (A/C.3/L.175).

10. Mr. DA COSTA REGO (Brazil), associating himself with a previous statement by the Uruguayan representative, supported the joint draft resolution. He appealed to all governments to increase the resources of UNICEF in order to enable it to give assistance to thousands of children.

11. Mr. PLEIC (Yugoslavia), speaking as a co-author of the draft resolution, made certain explanations concerning the work of UNICEF. He said that as a result of the adoption by the General Assembly of resolution 417 (V), the Executive Board of UNICEF had assigned a sum of $US30 million for programmes applicable to Africa, Asia, the Eastern Mediterranean countries, Europe and Latin America, and for such emergency assistance as UNICEF might be called upon to furnish.

12. In order to give an idea of the benefits provided by the organization, he furnished some details on the milk conservation programme which UNICEF had carried out in Yugoslavia, and which was to be extended to the Eastern Mediterranean countries and Latin America. In Yugoslavia, powdered milk factories and dairies, the construction of which had been undertaken or completed with UNICEF assistance, had enabled the country's milk production to be considerably increased. The programme also involved measures for milk protection and conservation, especially in areas poor in transport facilities. UNICEF had spent $US819,000 on the construction of powdered-milk factories and dairies, and the Yugoslav Government, on its side, had furnished seventeen times as much. The health of mothers and children had been appreciably improved. Thanks to the increase in the quantity of milk available, the Government had been able to impose stricter milk protection regulations and to impress on mothers the importance of milk in children's diet. On the strength of that experience, the representative of Yugoslavia felt justified in stating that the milk conservation programme was of outstanding importance.

13. The United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund had therefore done well to allocate a sum of $US4 million in its budget for the milk conservation programme in the under-developed countries. The aid rendered by UNICEF was modest, but it was none the less valuable on that account, and it had the further advantage of stimulating social work in the countries benefiting from it. The difficulty encountered by UNICEF, the activities of which had just been re-grouped as a result of the adoption by the General Assembly of resolution 417(V), was to find the funds which would enable it to implement that programme, that is, to obtain financial support from governments. However, contributions to UNICEF were falling, and the organization had been able to distribute only about a third of the allocations planned. The joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.155) calling the attention of governments to the decline in UNICEF's resources gave a clear idea of the problems facing the organization; the only purpose of the draft resolution was to enable UNICEF to continue its good work.

14. Mr. DAVIN (New Zealand), speaking in support of the draft resolution, referred to his earlier statement (348th meeting) that the New Zealand Government had recently announced a further contribution of £100,000 sterling. He assumed that could be taken to complete his country's contribution for 1951-52 since he was not in a position to say what his Government's position would be towards future contributions. He hoped the appeal confirmed in the draft resolution would find a ready response especially from countries which had not hitherto found it possible to contribute or which had contributed only to a limited extent

15. Mr. HARRY (Australia), also a co-author of the draft resolution, lent his support to the appeal for UNICEF launched during the general debate by the Australian Minister for External Affairs.

16. Mr. DEHOUSSE (Belgium) supported the joint draft resolution and paid a tribute to the work of UNICEF, to which his country had always contributed to the full extent of its means. He pointed out, however, that Belgium bore a heavy responsibility with respect to maternal and child welfare at home and in the colonies, and stated that the Belgian Government had not yet decided whether to pay its contribution direct to UNICEF or through the United Nations Appeal for Children. That decision would largely depend on the attitude of other governments.

17. Mr. MANI (India) lent his whole-hearted support to the draft resolution and recalled that he had already expressed his warm appreciation of the work of UNICEF in the general debate.

18. Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan), a co-author of the joint draft resolution, regretted that his country, the resources of which were limited, had been unable to furnish a higher contribution to UNICEF. He also extended his thanks to UNICEF not only on behalf of the 7 million Afghan children, but also on behalf of all those who benefited from UNICEF assistance. He laid particular stress on one aspect of the matter which, in his opinion, had not received sufficient prominence. General Assembly resolution 417(V) was intended not only to impart a universal character to UNICEF assistance, but also to make UNICEF a permanent organization. He thought that failure to accord a permanent character to UNICEF would nullify all that

[1] See 348th, 349th and 351st meetings.

had hitherto been accomplished. Governments, private organizations and individuals would contribute more generously to UNICEF if they knew that the organization was intended to serve the permanent needs of children.

19. Mr. REYES (Philippines) supported the joint draft resolution. The Philippines Government had launched a national UNICEF campaign which had been carried into the remotest villages by more than 100,000 volunteer workers. The campaign, which had recently been extended to 15 December 1951 by presidential proclamation, was being directed by the Vice-President of the Republic of the Philippines and the national Commissioner for Social Welfare. It was an expression of the gratitude of the people of the Philippines to UNICEF, the invaluable work of which they fully appreciated.

20. Mr. PAMONTJAK (Indonesia) said that his delegation had described the work of UNICEF in Indonesia during the general debate. As a member of the Executive Board of UNICEF, Indonesia realized the difficulties encountered by that organization and appealed to the generosity of all governments.

21. Mr. KAYSER (France) paid a tribute to the work of UNICEF. He was in favour of the joint draft resolution.

22. Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) said that aid to children was one of the most important activities of the United Nations, because of its practical value as a permanent proof of the effectiveness of United Nations action and as a factor tending to bring the peoples closer together politically. His country regretted that because of the influx of refugees from Palestine it had been prevented from making a larger contribution to the UNICEF budget.

23. He proposed an amendment (A/C.3/L.175) to the first paragraph of the preamble to the joint draft resolution. That paragraph recalled the second paragraph of the preamble to General Assembly resolution 417(V). After mentioning in that paragraph the necessity for action to assist children in countries devastated by war and other calamities, the General Assembly had throughout the remainder of its resolution stressed the need for assisting children in the under-developed countries. That was the essential object of the resolution which, although it did not completely transform the work of UNICEF, directed it along new lines. The intentions of the General Assembly would therefore be misinterpreted if the draft resolution cited a paragraph from the General Assembly resolution which did not fully state those intentions. Other passages of the General Assembly resolution should be mentioned, in particular the paragraphs referring to the need for assisting under-developed countries and paragraph 6 (*b*).

24. He proposed (A/C.3/L.175) that the first paragraph of the preamble of the joint draft resolution should be replaced by the following text:

"*Whereas* the General Assembly at its fifth session decided that the Executive Board of the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund should take all necessary steps to meet emergency and long-range needs of children and their continuing needs, particularly in under-developed countries,".

25. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) was not opposed to the Lebanese amendment (A/C.3/L.175) and would examine it when he had the text before him. However, the work of UNICEF had a twofold purpose: to provide relief for children suffering from the consequences of war and to assist children in the under-developed countries. It would be dangerous not to preserve the unity of the activities of UNICEF and that unity should be underlined in the resolution. The essential point remained the decrease in the resources of UNICEF. In that connexion, he appealed to the generosity of all States.

26. Mr. CORLEY SMITH (United Kingdom) said that earlier in the general debate, the representative of the United Kingdom had indicated the United Kingdom's goodwill with regard to the programmes of UNICEF. His delegation would vote for the joint draft resolution.

27. At the same time he wished to make it quite clear that its affirmative vote did not commit his Government in any way as regards a contribution to UNICEF during the following financial period. It was, moreover, probable that the new government would wish to review the entire question of United Kingdom contributions to extra-budgetary United Nations funds, taking up a position in the light of the relative importance of the activities concerned and the circumstances prevailing at the time.

28. Mr. DE ALBA (Mexico) associated himself with the tributes paid to UNICEF. The generous work undertaken by that organization showed that the modern generation recognized its errors and was attempting to prevent the innocent from bearing the burden of those errors.

29. The appeal for voluntary contributions made in the joint draft resolution would enable certain privileged countries to relieve the sufferings of children in poorer or economically less advanced countries.

30. He would vote for the joint draft resolution.

31. Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq) unreservedly supported the substance of the joint draft resolution, recalling that thousands of Arab children had been enabled to live throughout the winter months owing to the unstinted aid given by UNICEF.

32. The Iraqi Government hoped that UNICEF would continue to receive government contributions and thought that that body, which represented one of the United Nations' most successful achievements, should be established on a permanent footing. Her Government hoped that contributions for the year 1951 would suffice to enable UNICEF activities to be continued on a scale that would lead to unanimous acceptance, in principle, of its permanent existence when the question of its fate again came up for discussion.

33. Mr. TSAO (China), referring to the preamble to the joint draft resolution and the Lebanese representative's suggestion, recalled that, in its resolution 417 (V), the General Assembly had adopted three principles in determining the general policy of UNICEF, which had served as a guide to the Executive Board in apportioning allocations: the Assembly had recognized the necessity for continued action to relieve the sufferings of children, particularly in underdeveloped countries and countries that had been subjected to the devastation of war and other calamities; it had reaffirmed its approval of the policy of the Executive Board of UNICEF to devote a greater share of UNICEF resources to the development of programmes outside Europe; lastly, it had decided that the Executive Board of UNICEF should allocate UNICEF resources for the purpose of meeting emergency and long-range needs of children, particularly in under-developed countries.

34. The Chinese delegation deemed each of those three principles equally important: nevertheless, it endorsed the wording of the first paragraph of the preamble, embodying only one of those principles, because the General Assembly resolution had dealt with the general policy of UNICEF, whereas the sole object of the joint draft resolution was to make an appeal to governments and private persons to contribute to UNICEF. Hence, it fully answered its purpose.

35. He considered that one of the surest ways of obtaining concrete results from the implementation of the resolution would be to ask members of the Committee to present their respective governments with a list of the activities of UNICEF, at the same time inviting them to contribute to that organization.

36. He recalled that, despite grave financial difficulties, China had made a contribution to UNICEF. His country had unbounded admiration for UNICEF and complete confidence in it.

37. Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic) stated that her country had been among the first to answer the appeal made by UNICEF on behalf of children. The Dominican Republic had already made a contribution equivalent to half a million dollars and it intended to continue its efforts.

38. She whole-heartedly supported the joint draft resolution, because she considered it the duty of governments and private persons to seek to improve the lot of suffering children, and hence to assist UNICEF in its humanitarian activities by providing it with the requisite funds. She hoped that the resolution would be implemented as rapidly as possible.

39. Mr. MENDEZ PEREIRA (Panama) wished to stress, as the Uruguayan representative had done, the fundamental nature of aid to children as an integral part of any action in the social sphere.

40. Panama, a young country, was persuaded that education was the surest means of securing the emancipation of a people. It had endeavoured to promote the education of its children by instituting free primary education, special child welfare services, including juvenile courts, and child health clinics. More than a quarter of the national budget was devoted to education, and schools for every stage had been opened in large numbers.

41. The Panamanian delegation believed that any country truly desirous of aiding must perforce endorse the substance of the joint draft resolution and that aid to children, to be effective, required the co-operation and concerted efforts of all countries. He hoped that no country would refuse to contribute to UNICEF.

42. Mr. ALTAF HUSAIN (Pakistan) noted the statement in the second paragraph of the preamble to the joint draft resolution that UNICEF aid was currently going to projects that would benefit 42 million children. Since the purpose of the draft was to solicit contributions from governments so that those projects might be executed, the paragraph in question could, with advantage, be amended slightly to say that UNICEF was contributing to programmes which, "if carried out", would benefit 42 million children.

43. He thought it should be stated that UNICEF was appealing to the generosity of governments, and therefore suggested replacing the words "within the limits of their possibilities" in the second operative paragraph by the words "with the utmost possible generosity".

44. Those were mere suggestions, not formal proposals, which he hoped might be accepted without the need of a vote.

45. Mrs. MARSHALL (Canada) observed that the Canadian Government had time and again demonstrated, by the contributions it had made, its desire to aid the children of the whole world by raising their living standards and relieving the sufferings endured by some of them as a result of the war and other calamities. It could therefore support the appeal to governments set out in the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.155). The new appeal was already assured of the sympathetic consideration of the Canadian Government, but it might nevertheless need to be thoroughly examined.

46. The members of the Third Committee, like the members of the Economic and Social Council, were unanimous in their approval of the reorientation of UNICEF's activities towards programmes to meet emergency needs, rather than long-term programmes. However, the Canadian delegation hoped that UNICEF, in the course of that development, would not overlook the importance of carrying out programmes likely to give concrete results in a comparatively short space of time.

47. The Canadian Government also hoped that further encouragement might be given to the principle of mutual aid between contributing and receiving countries. Increased collaboration between UNICEF representatives and the authorities of the countries in which it was operating would make the work of UNICEF doubly effective and would arouse greater interest among the peoples of those countries in UNICEF programmes and in all other projects for assistance to children.

48. There was a tendency in Canada to regard the activities of UNICEF as one aspect of the technical assistance programme. The adoption of the principle of mutual aid might possibly permit of a more practical, more economical and more effective solution of the problem of child welfare, through action within the expanded framework of technical assistance rather than by the payment of contributions to a specific body such as UNICEF.

49. Canada was also concerned about the equitable distribution of the financial burden entailed by UNICEF activities. It attached great importance to a just apportionment between governments of the financial burdens of the projects, an apportionment which would be based on the number of contributing and receiving governments, but which would also take into account the total contribution those governments might reasonably be expected to make.

50. She wished to make it clear that the Canadian Government had not so far committed itself to a further contribution to UNICEF. One of the important considerations influencing its decision would be the way in which other governments responded to the appeal made to them. The Canadian Government and Canadian people considered that humanitarian activities, and especially aid to children, should be given a greater and wider welcome than in the past.

51. Mr. JIMENEZ LOPEZ (Colombia) observed that he had watched from afar, but with interest, the progress of the work carried out by UNICEF. He strongly approved the joint draft resolution submitted by six delegations and hoped that there would be unanimous agreement on it. He deemed it important that efforts should be devoted to improving the tragic lot of children, not only on humanitarian grounds, since children were the weakest and most innocent of human beings, but also for practical reasons, because only well nourished and healthy children could bring peace and security to the world. For that reason, the representative of Colombia enthusiastically endorsed the joint draft resolution, and the Colombian Government would contribute within the limits of its possibilities to the work of UNICEF, which had already benefited his country.

52. Mr. RAADI (Iran) stated that he would vote for the joint draft resolution. He wished nevertheless to express his delegation's hope that the children of the Middle East would in future, through a more judicious and equitable distribution of the resources of UNICEF, receive assistance equal to that granted by UNICEF to children in other parts of the world.

53. Mr. MUFTI (Syria) said that the joint draft resolution had the whole-hearted support of his delegation. Syria had already given tangible proof of its interest in aid to children by developing social services within its own territory and providing considerable assistance to the children of the Palestine refugees, actions which taken together absorbed a large part of the national revenue. However, since the joint draft resolution included a financial undertaking for the year 1952, the Syrian delegation was obliged to make its approval dependent upon what it regarded as an important reservation.

54. The Syrian delegation's attitude was also influenced by the fact that Syria would not be represented on the Executive Board of UNICEF, and it was difficult for it to subscribe to work which was in general outside the basic preoccupations of Syria in the field of child welfare.

55. That did not mean that the Syrian delegation would not vote for the joint draft resolution, but it would only do so if the Committee accepted the Lebanese representative's amendment (A/C.3/L.175) to the first paragraph of the preamble.

56. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) did not think that he need again stress his country's interest in the work of UNICEF, and he supported the joint draft resolution.

57. In reply to the argument adduced by the Lebanese representative in explanation of his amendment, he pointed out that the draft resolution submitted by the six delegations in no way signified a further change in the policy adopted by the General Assembly. On the other hand, the Lebanese amendment seemed to be designed to deny the assistance of UNICEF to countries devastated by the war and other calamities, which had certainly not been the intention of the General Assembly.

58. He was therefore afraid that if the amendment was maintained, the representatives of the war-devastated countries would engage in lengthy debate in an attempt to prevent their countries from being deprived of UNICEF assistance. He also thought that if the Committee adopted the amendment, it would be falsifying the intention of the General Assembly, which was certainly not to abandon those countries, for they were still in need of UNICEF assistance, and it would be unfair to refuse it.

59. He therefore urged the Lebanese representative to withdraw his amendment.

60. Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) said that the ideas of General Assembly resolution 417 (V) must not be distorted, no matter how slightly. If the Committee wanted to quote a passage from that resolution, it should choose not the first paragraph of the preamble but the basic paragraph, that is, the one in the operative part which emphasized the need to allocate UNICEF resources for the purpose of meeting the needs of children in the under-developed countries.

61. The fact that the children of countries devastated by war or other calamities were not specifically mentioned must not be taken to mean that they were cut off from UNICEF assistance, but simply that the General Assembly had wished to give special emphasis to assistance to children in the under-developed countries.

62. By quoting that last paragraph, the Committee would simply be expressing more faithfully the wish of the General Assembly.

63. However, as the question was not one of defining or modifying the policy of the General Assembly, he

would be willing to withdraw his amendment, if the sponsors of the draft resolution would agree to replace the first paragraph of the preamble by the following:

"*Whereas* the General Assembly in resolution 417 (V), adopted at its fifth session, confirmed the necessity for continued action to relieve the sufferings of children".

64. Mr. ROY (Haiti) recalled that his country, which had already received assistance from UNICEF and had seen it at work, had taken a stand in its favour at the fifth session of the General Assembly. He could not let slip the new opportunity of joining in the appeal to governments and private persons for their contributions.

65. Mrs. LIONAES (Norway) said that her country had followed the work of UNICEF closely and felt that it would help considerably in the establishment of a lasting peace. Norway had contributed to UNICEF as generously as its means allowed . She had no information regarding the amount of the contribution which her country would be able to make in the next financial year and she could not give any undertaking on behalf of the Norwegian Government on that point. She would, however, vote for the joint draft resolution.

66. Mr. ORTIZ LINARES (Bolivia) recalled that his country had received aid from UNICEF and had contributed to it as generously as it could. Bolivia was a member of the Executive Board, and knew therefore how difficult it was to meet all requests for help. It was aware that no matter how large the resources of UNICEF were, they could never cover more than a small part of the needs.

67. In conclusion, he said that he would vote for the draft resolution submitted by the six delegations.

68. Mr. HARRY (Australia) said that, although he could not fully appreciate the arguments of the Lebanese representative, he was ready to accept the Lebanese amendment and the amendment of Pakistan.

69. Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan), together with Mr. DAVIN (New Zealand) and Mr. PLEIC (Yugoslavia), thought that the Lebanese and Pakistani amendments improved the text of the draft resolution and accepted them.

70. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.155), as amended by the representative of Lebanon.

The draft resolution was approved by 51 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Draft resolution submitted by Greece (A/C.3/L.161/Rev.2)

71. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the draft resolution submitted by Greece (A/C.3/L.161/Rev.2) concerning housing and town and country planning, and the amendment thereto proposed by Chile (A/C.3/L.174).

72. Mr. ACRITAS (Greece) said that he had already stated in the general debate (349th meeting) his reasons for submitting a draft resolution on housing and town and country planning.

73. After consultation with other delegations and with the Secretariat of the United Nations, he had twice revised his draft resolution. Thus, he had made it plain that housing facilities should be increased for people in the lowest income groups in particular.

74. In addition, in the latest draft, he had provided for recourse to all appropriate machinery, whether or not attached to the United Nations, and had modified his conception of co-operation with the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, taking into account the agreement concluded between the United Nations and the Bank.

75. Lastly, the resolution envisaged an appeal to other financial institutions, not necessarily international.

76. Mr. DA COSTA REGO (Brazil) noted with satisfaction that the Social Commission had devoted attention to housing problems. He thought that the appropriate agencies of the United Nations should work in close co-operation with Member States. He also felt that the Secretariat should avoid overloading the questionnaire.

77. Mrs. MARSHALL (Canada) thought that the United Nations should play a part in the field of housing techniques and programmes. It was her intention to vote for the Greek draft resolution, although she felt that it was more a matter for the Second Committee or the Joint Second and Third Committee. She wished, however, to make it clear that the resolution should not in any circumstances be interpreted as justifying an expansion of the Secretariat services and that the work would have to be done within the limits of existing resources.

78. Mr. BARODY (Saudi Arabia) was in favour of the draft resolution submitted by Greece. He wished, however, to make one objection to sub-paragraph (*c*) (i) of the operative part. On the one hand, the adjustment of taxes and subsidies would have the disadvantage of encouraging only one group of *entrepreneurs*, those in the building trade. On the other hand, it would be unfair to encourage private investment and at the same time to remove all the risks involved. Moreover, it lay with the parliaments of the countries concerned to take such decisions, in which the United Nations could not interfere ; it would create a dangerous precedent if it were to meddle with the fiscal policy of Member States.

79. He therefore suggested that the words "tax adjustments, subsidies and the introduction of incentives to private investors" should be deleted from sub-paragraph (*c*) (i).

80. He asked for a separate vote on the sub-paragraph and said that if his amendment were rejected, he would have to abstain on the draft resolution as a whole.

81. He also wished to associate himself with the comment of the Canadian representative and to point

out that the draft resolution was more a matter for the Second Committee or the Joint Second and Third Committee.

82. Mr. MENEMENCIOGLU (Turkey) said that the progress achieved in building was trifling in comparison with the progress in other industries. It was, of course, an industry subject to cycles and was by its very nature hard to organize. Those facts, however, went to prove that international action would be useful in trying to remedy the situation and obtain concrete results. It might even be possible to set up a specialized agency to devote itself to a matter which was as important as, for example, civil aviation.

83. He realized that the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, the Social Commission and a sub-committee of the Economic Commission for Europe had already worked in that field with success. He understood that the author of the draft resolution wished to bring into play all the appropriate technical and regional machinery, but he was afraid that, in practice, to refer the same question to several agencies might involve considerable waste of time.

84 He would support the draft resolution in principle. However, he would not commit himself on paragraph 4 of the operative part, because he was not sure of the interpretation which should be placed on it. He hoped that the rest of the discussion would make that point clear, and reserved the right to speak again later.

85. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) said that the housing situation had become worse during the last few years as a result of the growing world population, the consequences of the war, and the economic difficulties arising from it. The housing crisis raised not only social but health and other problems, such as the spread of tuberculosis.

86. He emphasized that despite the interest taken in the subject by the Economic and Social Council and the Secretariat's studies, plans were still at the preparatory stage. He therefore approved in principle the Greek draft resolution. However, he recalled the objections made by certain delegations with regard to the draft resolution in general and certain points in particular. He felt, therefore, that for the time being detailed recommendations should be avoided and that the resolution should remain general.

87. He submitted an amendment (A/C.3/L.174) to the Greek draft resolution and made an oral proposal to replace the whole of sub-paragraph (*c*) of the operative part by the following: "Assistance to governments in developing practical methods of financing housing programmes by national and international means."

88. He also suggested that sub-paragraph (*d*) of the operative part should be deleted. In point of fact, the Chilean delegation regarded the Economic and Social Council as the principal organ which should fix the terms of reference of subsidiary organs and it felt that the General Assembly should not paralyse the work of the Council by giving it detailed recommendations.

89. Mr. ROY (Haiti) submitted a motion for the adjournment of the meeting.

The motion was adopted by 27 votes to 6, with 10 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.

Printed in France SPI—93250—December 1951—3,600