

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTIETH SESSION

Official Records



SECOND COMMITTEE, 980th
MEETING

Thursday, 11 November 1965,
at 3.20 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 47:</i>	
<i>World campaign for universal literacy: report of the Secretary-General.</i>	139
<i>Agenda item 51:</i>	
<i>Consolidation of the Special Fund and the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance in a United Nations Development Programme (continued).</i>	143

Chairman: Mr. Pierre FORTHOMME
(Belgium).

AGENDA ITEM 47

World campaign for universal literacy: report of the Secretary-General (A/5830, A/6024, A/6048, A/6099; A/C.2/L.803)

1. The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the members of the Committee to the documents on the question of a world campaign for universal literacy and stressed that at the 1341st plenary meeting, the President of the General Assembly had asked all delegations to give due attention to the message from the Shahinshah of Iran (A/6024).

2. Mr. MAHEU (Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) said that the report which the Secretary-General had prepared for the nineteenth session of the General Assembly (A/5830) and which it had not been possible to consider, had been supplemented by a document (A/6048) reproducing recommendation No. 58 to the Ministries of Education approved by the International Conference on Public Education at Geneva in July 1965, and the conclusions and recommendations of the World Congress of Ministers of Education on the Eradication of Illiteracy, which UNESCO had convened at Teheran in September 1965 on the generous invitation of His Majesty the Shahinshah, to whose initiative he wished to pay a tribute.

3. Since the unanimous adoption by the General Assembly in 1963 of the principle of a mass literacy campaign (resolution 1937 (XVIII)), several regional conferences convened by UNESCO and the work of the regional economic commissions of the United Nations had brought out the need for close co-ordination between the literacy programmes and economic development plans; in addition, a committee of experts he had convened had stressed the desirability of proceeding selectively by first engaging in a few countries in intensive and not extensive activity, which would be of value as an experiment. He had

therefore submitted to the General Conference of UNESCO, in November 1964, an experimental literacy programme spread over five years, from 1966 to 1970, which the Conference had adopted unanimously and which was described in the report by the Secretary-General (A/5830).

4. Less than one year after the decision of the General Conference, forty countries had already asked to participate in the programme and UNESCO had sent missions to eight countries, at the request of their Governments, to help the national authorities in preparing requests to the Special Fund. Those missions had been financed largely by allocations from the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance.

5. Recommendation No. 58 of the International Conference on Public Education constituted a real compendium of methods to be applied in adult literacy and education campaigns.

6. The World Congress would without any doubt remain a landmark in the fight against illiteracy. From the intellectual point of view, the efforts made there to analyse data and seek solutions had resulted in agreement on a number of fundamental ideas which were clearly summed up in the general conclusions of the report of the Congress. With regard to the psychological aspect, an advance had been made from the stage of abstract affirmations to a genuine awareness: illiteracy had been recognized as a universal problem which, as such, must be solved on a world-wide scale by a concerted effort of the international community. Lastly, at the political level, that is, at the level of government policy, the main idea had emerged that literacy should be regarded and promoted as an integral part of development and should therefore take its place among the planning priorities of development, with due regard to the conditions and objectives of each country.

7. The decisive progress made at the World Congress made it possible to regard the general preparatory phase as ended and to move on to action. The problem of financing literacy campaigns was virtually solved, if they were considered a part of and a matter of priority in national development programmes; in his view, the financing should no longer be sought from additional voluntary contributions, which were by definition uncertain, but be guaranteed by regular appropriations under the over-all development budget. All Governments and primarily those of countries with a high proportion of illiteracy should therefore assign proper priority to literacy in their national development plans; that was the test of their sincerity, since no outside assistance could help countries which were not determined to make the necessary

sacrifices. It was also essential for the Governments of the developed countries, which financed large-scale programmes of bilateral co-operation, to see that those programmes reflected the priority assigned to literacy by the recipient countries; that, too, was a test of sincerity since, while it was true that no one could be rescued by someone else alone, neither could anyone decide on how to rescue others. The various international organizations providing multi-lateral aid in that field on any basis should also, each within its own terms of reference and to the extent that its resources permitted, follow the fundamental and decisive priorities set by the recipient Governments. The organizations of the United Nations system, in particular, should pool their efforts in order to participate actively in the Herculean task, by making their technical and financial resources available to interested Member States and using their moral influence to enlighten and arouse public opinion in all countries. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization was very much aware of the major responsibilities incumbent upon it in that connexion and it was entirely ready, in order to assume them, to intensify its activities intellectually, administratively and financially. It was also ready, if it was so desired, to undertake general co-ordination of the various efforts, which appeared to be essential if a minimum of concerted action was to be organized.

8. The two principal documents before the Committee were a balance-sheet of the work done by the United Nations organs during the past two years and an analysis of the situation with regard to the attitudes of Member States. Both were encouraging. It was for that reason that UNESCO, as a specialized agency and technical adviser and agent of the General Assembly, appealed to the Assembly to make its decision of principle adopted in 1963 into a decision to take effective action. The time had come solemnly to declare that the eradication of illiteracy was a problem which concerned all mankind, that literacy was not only a moral duty but also an essential element of national and international development and that it was in the measures adopted to remedy under-development that the practical solutions required should be sought.

9. Mr. POLIT ORTIZ (Ecuador) declared that the initiative behind the draft resolution under consideration (A/C.2/L.803) came from His Majesty the Shahinshah of Iran, who was most actively concerned with the economic development of his country. He announced that the Argentine and Iraqi delegations wished to become sponsors of the draft.

10. The Second Committee was particularly well qualified to consider the problem of illiteracy because illiteracy was the source of most of the problems of economic development.

11. In an excellent volume published a few years ago, UNESCO had given the illiteracy rates recorded during the censuses taken in 1950 and it was quite likely that, with the exception of a half-dozen countries which had made an extraordinary literacy effort,

those rates had changed very little since.^{1/} In the majority of the developing countries, the rate of population growth was so high and the per capita income so low that the efforts made were necessarily inadequate. The same UNESCO volume had stressed that the per capita income and the illiteracy rate were closely interrelated, and it was easy to see why, since a population of illiterates could not apply modern techniques or understand structural and administrative problems, let alone solve them so as to make better use of the country's natural resources.

12. The draft resolution submitted to the Committee invited Governments to give high priority in their economic development plans to the elimination of illiteracy and also invited countries which had solved that problem to give every possible assistance to countries where the problem still existed so as to enable them through such international co-operation, to increase their technical and financial resources.

13. Ecuador had received from the international financial institutions in Washington and from the United States Government substantial assistance for its campaign to eradicate illiteracy. Yet probably no developing country was receiving all the assistance it needed in that field and he therefore hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted unanimously.

14. Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) announced that the delegation of Guinea wished to join in sponsoring the draft resolution.

15. Iran, which had long been concerned with the eradication of illiteracy, was now studying the problem within the context of its economic development plans, having come to realize that economic resources were not the only factor in development, which hinged on a much more valuable asset—human capital. There was no longer any doubt that education was one of the factors, if not the most important factor, in economic and social advancement; that was obviously so, since man was at once the agent and the object of development. It was perhaps surprising that it had taken so long for that obvious fact to be recognized, although it had been foreseen by the authors of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, who had included the right to education among the most important human rights. If education was a fundamental human right, it was also a productive investment for the community. Although that fact was recognized in theory, in practice one important sector continued to be neglected—that of adult education. In order to obtain effective and immediate results in economic development, adult illiteracy must be eradicated at the same time as school education was made more universal.

16. His country had learned that lesson by practical experience, when its development plans had come up against the wall of illiteracy and when in evaluating its second Plan it had found that the bottleneck disclosed had been caused more by a lack of knowledge than by a shortage of funds. The structural revolution which Iran had begun by means of land reform and

^{1/} United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, Monographs on Fundamental Education, XI, World Illiteracy at Mid-Century: A statistical study, Paris, 1957.

laws ensuring profit-sharing for the workers could not truly bear fruit unless the intellectual level of the entire population was raised, and the first step in that process was the eradication of adult illiteracy. The conventional methods hitherto employed to combat ignorance were no longer suited to the accelerated development of the modern world, which tended to widen the gap between the developing and the developed countries. Iran had accordingly resorted to new methods and three years ago had created the army of knowledge to direct the campaign against illiteracy and speed up the development of primary education. That organization, staffed by young recruits and financed in part under the armed forces' budget, had obtained encouraging results and its scope was to be widened. In addition, a national anti-illiteracy committee had been set up to tackle the evil at its root.

17. While making a considerable effort at the national level, Iran had recognized that illiteracy was an international problem, being the prime cause of the inequality which divided mankind into two parts and constituted a permanent threat to peace. It was for that reason that His Majesty the Shahinshah had advocated the convening of the World Congress. That Congress, as the Director-General of UNESCO had pointed out in his admirable statement, had recognized the international aspect of the problem of illiteracy. It had also unanimously endorsed the idea of functional literacy; literacy must be regarded and carried out as an integral part of development and be given adequate priority in general development planning. Without rejecting the efforts of men of goodwill, the Congress had discarded the romantic notion of a "general and immediate campaign": what was needed now was an international scientific programme for which the recommendations in the Congress report were an indispensable guide. The conclusions of that report and recommendation No. 58 of the International Conference on Public Education formed a very complete document (A/6048) and he wished to commend UNESCO and the International Bureau of Education for their efforts.

18. Nevertheless, a perusal of that document revealed a gap between methods and ideas on the one hand, and practical achievement on the other. Nothing could be done without money and almost all the developing countries had other problems to solve with their limited resources. Now that the main lines of a realistic approach had been laid down, other means of execution must be found than appeals to international organizations and bilateral aid and the pilot projects under study within the Special Fund programme, since those means continued to be inadequate. In his inaugural address at the Teheran Congress, His Majesty the Shahinshah had suggested the application at the international level of a method successfully employed in Iran under the army of knowledge scheme. World military expenditures had been estimated in 1962 at more than \$120,000 million. If all Governments agreed to devote each year even a very small fraction of their military budget to literacy work they would make it possible for illiteracy to be eradicated quite rapidly and they would be financing an historic enterprise that would yield the greatest return in world peace and human happiness. His country had made

that sacrifice at the national level and was ready to extend it to the international plane. Other sources of financing were also available and it was to promote the general mobilization of human and material resources that the Shahinshah had addressed a message to the President of the General Assembly and to the Secretary-General (A/6024). Moreover, there seemed to be some grounds for optimism since powerful and authoritative voices, including those of Pope Paul VI and President Johnson, had recently been heard at the Teheran Congress.

19. The revolution through which mankind was passing called today for an equitable distribution not only of material wealth but also of knowledge, both within each nation and among the nations themselves. Development must not only be economic, it must be a real emancipation of man, the prerequisite for which was literacy. Nobody was more competent to take the decisive step now necessary, than the Second Committee, whose debates were concentrated particularly on development, and it must therefore be hoped that the Committee would unanimously adopt the draft resolution before it.

20. Sir Keith UNWIN (United Kingdom) agreed that the World Congress of Ministers of Education held in September at Teheran had been an important milestone on the road towards universal literacy. The Congress had provided an opportunity for countries to exchange and pool experience of literacy teaching. As a result of the resolutions adopted, UNESCO's clearing-house arrangements should become more effective.

21. There had been general acceptance at the Congress that literacy should not be taught in a void but should be closely related to general development plans, worked out after careful study of manpower needs and the relationship between literacy and increased productivity.

22. The Congress had also recognized that in any largely illiterate country the education of children in schools and efforts to further literacy among adults could and should be developed simultaneously. The two forms of development were complementary and should be closely integrated in national educational planning.

23. It had been accepted that while bilateral and multilateral help from outside was needed, the prime responsibility for assessing the problem of illiteracy, deciding the priority to be given to it and providing the resources for tackling it lay with the countries where the problem existed.

24. Recognition had been given at the Congress to the importance of research into the techniques and equipment needed and of adequate and suitable follow-up action. Similarly, although impatience had sometimes been expressed at the restricted scope of the programme being carried out by UNESCO, the wisdom of the "intensive and selective" approach had been endorsed. The Congress had also given full recognition to the role which social and other groups could play in initiating and supplementing the efforts of Governments. Lastly, it had been accepted that illiteracy was a world-wide problem in which the resources and expertise of multilateral agencies and

bilateral donors should be made available with a view to a concerted and co-ordinated approach.

25. The draft resolution before the Committee admirably followed up the Congress. Illiteracy could not be conquered by a short-lived, glamorous campaign, even if it was world-wide. Such a method would require the diversion of resources of such magnitude that, particularly in countries where the illiteracy problem was the greatest, no resources would be left to tackle other pressing economic and social problems.

26. The exploratory missions of UNESCO embodied the right approach and should be followed up with energy and enthusiasm. The United Kingdom delegation therefore supported the draft resolution and hoped that it would be adopted without dissent.

27. Mr. O'HARA (United States of America) proposed the addition at the end of sub-paragraph b of the fourth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution of the words "and in particular its resolution on the mobilization of human resources", and the deletion in operative paragraph 6 of the phrase "in particular those mentioned in the report and the resolutions adopted by the Congress at Teheran". Those changes had been accepted by the sponsors, and if its amendments were adopted by the Committee the United States would join in sponsoring the draft resolution.

28. The struggle against poverty, ignorance and disease was a task which called for the mobilization of all energies, and which brooked no delay. It was a field in which the differences between the peoples of the world were small, and in which any setback would bring with it the threat of a general regression. The Congress and the President of the United States had recently adopted highly important decisions in the sphere of education, decisions designed to give every American child the opportunity of acquiring an education as complete as possible. The United States would do everything in its power to ensure that the benefits of education were extended to other countries.

29. In his report on the world campaign for universal literacy (A/5830), the Secretary-General had endorsed the selective, progressive and experimental approach to the problem which UNESCO had approved. The United States delegation agreed with the Secretary-General's appraisal. Only through a series of pilot projects and careful analysis of their results could information be obtained on the operation of such projects and their relation to economic and social development.

30. The United States delegation was glad to see that the Governing Council of the Special Fund was to consider several projects relating to the literacy campaign, in January 1966, and that several more similar projects were at present under study. He hoped that the successes achieved and the failures experienced would be rapidly communicated to UNESCO and to all countries and agencies concerned. The United States fully supported the conclusions of the Teheran Congress. As the Congress had stressed, literacy was not an end in itself; it should be a preparation for social, civic and economic functions which went beyond the elementary accomplishments of

reading and writing. The Congress had also rightly declared that literacy should be closely linked to economic and social priorities and to present and future manpower needs.

31. At the moment, the United Nations lacked the resources to initiate an unrestricted world-wide literacy campaign, and was therefore compelled to be selective. Each country should assign literacy projects a priority within its national development plans, compatible with its own resources and should be prepared to provide a substantial portion of the funds required. At the same time, the United States delegation felt that countries with literacy projects of high relative priority in their national development plans should be encouraged to request the competent international bodies for technical assistance in that field. As the Secretary-General had emphasized, such requests should satisfy all the criteria laid down by the various agencies for other projects connected with economic and social development. Literacy efforts must not be treated as something apart, as any attempt to set up a special fund for financing literacy projects would be a grave mistake.

32. Mr. BRADLEY (Argentina) said that his delegation had asked to join the sponsors of the draft resolution, the text of which rightly emphasized that literacy was an essential element of development.

33. Mr. FERNANDINI (Peru) commended UNESCO on the contribution it was making to the advancement of mankind. He requested that the statement of the Director-General of UNESCO should be circulated as an official Committee document.

It was so decided.^{2/}

34. Mr. BOIKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) asked that Mr. Maheu's statement should be issued in English, French, Russian and Spanish.

35. Mr. RAMACHANDRAN (India) said that it was vitally important to eradicate illiteracy in his country, which had nearly 300 million illiterates. Progress in achieving literacy had not been uniform in India but had varied from one part of the country to another. To speed up the process, much more substantial resources would be required. Although primary education was free and compulsory in most of the Indian provinces, it was difficult to enforce the system in some isolated areas and in agricultural areas, where children of school age were regarded as a reserve of cheap manpower. Generally speaking, the shortage of teachers and the lack of adequate financial resources were the main obstacles to the eradication of illiteracy. His delegation felt that 80 per cent of international financial assistance should be earmarked for adult literacy programmes and only 20 per cent for other activities such as regional conferences, technical seminars and foreign study fellowships.

36. Material for massive programmes for the eradication of illiteracy was, on the whole, available locally, but international financial assistance was necessary to provide reading material for newly literate persons, printing machinery and equipment, audio-visual aids, etc.. Such assistance could be either multilateral or

^{2/} The full text of the statement made by the Director-General of UNESCO was subsequently circulated as document A/C.2/L.807.

bilateral, and international organizations could play an important part in providing it, although the resources available under the Expanded Programme, the Special Fund and the World Food Programme might prove inadequate. The elimination of illiteracy was the very basis of economic and social development, and the advanced countries should make a special effort to help the developing countries solve that problem.

37. His delegation would support the draft resolution that was before the Committee.

38. Mr. CUHRUK (Turkey) said that illiteracy was unquestionably one of the greatest afflictions of the modern world; it prevented millions of human beings from playing their full part in the social, economic and political life of their country. The elimination of illiteracy, which was at present a major obstacle to progress, was both a national and an international problem. Turkey was making a great effort to increase school enrolment and promote literacy, but its efforts clearly needed to be supplemented by international action. In that connexion, his delegation supported the selective, intensive programme proposed by the Director-General of UNESCO for 1966-1968. That programme, if successful, would make it possible to launch a campaign for universal literacy under favourable conditions. His delegation supported the draft resolution and wished to be listed among its sponsors.

AGENDA ITEM 51

Consolidation of the Special Fund and the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance in a United Nations Development Programme (continued) (A/5755, A/6015; A/C.2/L.792, L.795/Rev.2, L.799/Rev.1)

39. The CHAIRMAN asked the sponsors of the amendment contained in document A/C.2/L.799/Rev.1 whether they wished to withdraw or press the amendment.

40. Mr. DEVENDRA (Nepal) agreed, on behalf of the sponsors, to withdraw the amendment, it being understood that the Rapporteur would include in his report a passage to the effect that at the time of re-election to the Governing Council, the principle of rotation shall be fully taken into account and would indicate that the amendment had been submitted and then withdrawn in the interests of unanimity.

41. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee now had before it two texts: the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council (A/C.2/L.792) and the revised amendments to it contained in document A/C.2/L.795/Rev.2.

42. Mr. TELL (Jordan) said he wished to assure the representative of Nepal that in the revised amendments the word "re-election" implied that the principle of rotation would be taken into account in accordance with the wishes of the main regional groups. He announced that Australia, Italy, New Zealand, Spain, Turkey and the United Kingdom had agreed to join the sponsors of the revised amendments. The new text took into account the agreement reached at the previous meeting and the amendments of the

socialist countries, as modified in accordance with the United States representative's suggestion. It also took into account the question of the rotation of the thirty-seventh seat and was more satisfactory from a legal standpoint. In the annex, it was stated that the developing countries had agreed to accommodate Yugoslavia. The sponsors' intention was to allay the apprehensions of the various groups, especially the African countries; in that connexion, he read out a passage of his statement from the summary records of the 974th meeting, dealing with the distribution of the nineteen seats allocated to the developing countries. On behalf of the sponsors, he appealed to all delegations to make it possible to take a vote forthwith.

43. Mr. PARDO (Malta) requested that each amendment and each paragraph of the draft resolution should be put to the vote separately.

44. Mr. BLUSZTAJN (Poland) said that his delegation had also intended to request a separate vote on amendment 4, which would mean voting on the annex at the same time.

45. The CHAIRMAN said that the proposal for a separate vote on each of the revised amendments was quite acceptable. With regard to the draft resolution itself, however, rule 130 of the rules of procedure provided that if objection was made to a request for division, the motion for division should be voted upon. He therefore wished to know whether the members of the Committee agreed to the request of the representative of Malta.

46. Mr. CHAMMAS (Lebanon) said that it might be simpler if the representative of Malta explained his vote, indicating what his position would have been if a separate vote had been taken on each paragraph of the draft resolution.

47. Mr. PARDO (Malta) said that he would take that suggestion into consideration; he urged, however, that a separate vote should be taken on the part of operative paragraph 1 reading: "the special characteristics and operations of the two programmes as well as two separate funds will be maintained, and that".

48. Mr. ARKADYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested a separate vote on the second preambular paragraph.

49. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that it would in fact be more expeditious not to take a separate vote on each paragraph of the draft resolution. His delegation had abstained from the vote on the draft resolution in the Economic and Social Council and would continue to do so, regardless of any amendments made to it.

50. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) recalled that he had asked at the previous meeting that the annex should be included in the Committee's report. He requested a vote on that proposal.

51. Mr. BRADLEY (Argentina), supported by Mr. CVOROVIC (Yugoslavia), observed that, since the annex had been submitted as an integral part of the draft resolution and was mentioned in amendment 4, it would be difficult to separate them.

52. The CHAIRMAN thought it would be preferable to keep to the decision taken previously. The amendments contained in document A/C.2/L.795/Rev.2 were put to the vote.

The first amendment was adopted by 99 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The second amendment was adopted by 99 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The third amendment was adopted by 84 votes to none, with 15 abstentions.

The fourth amendment and the annex to the draft resolution were adopted by 71 votes to 1, with 25 abstentions.

The fifth amendment was adopted by 91 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.

The sixth amendment was adopted by 90 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.

53. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the draft resolution of the Economic and Social Council (A/C.2/L.792). At the request of the representative of the USSR, a separate vote would be taken on the second preambular paragraph.

The second preambular paragraph was adopted by 82 votes to 8, with 9 abstentions.

54. The CHAIRMAN said that, at the request of the representative of Malta, a separate vote would be taken on the first part of operative paragraph 1, up to and including the words "it being understood that".

The first part of operative paragraph 1 was adopted by 80 votes to none, with 15 abstentions.

55. Mr. PARDO (Malta) requested a roll-call vote on the second part of the same paragraph from the words "the special characteristics" to "will be maintained, and that".

56. After an exchange of views between Mr. CHAMMAS (Lebanon), Mr. VIAUD (France) and Mr. PARDO (Malta), the CHAIRMAN said that a vote would be taken by a show of hands on that part of operative paragraph 1 which reads as follows: "the special characteristics and operations of the two programmes as well as two separate funds will be maintained, and that".

That part of operative paragraph 1 was adopted by 67 votes to 11, with 8 abstentions.

57. Mr. PARDO (Malta) requested a separate vote on the word "regular" in sub-paragraph a of operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution.

The word "regular" was retained by 69 votes to 8, with 11 abstentions.

Draft resolution (A/C.2/L.792) as a whole, as modified by the revised amendments (A/C.2/L.795/Rev.2), was adopted by 89 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.

58. Mr. TOIV (Mongolia) said that his delegation had voted against the second preambular paragraph because the consolidation, as it had been proposed, did not take into account the recommendations of the Great Assembly and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development concerning the need to create a capital development fund. His delegation

thought that operative paragraph 4, which related to the composition of the Governing Council, had been greatly improved, especially with regard to the number of seats allocated to the developing countries; however, his delegation could in no circumstances agree that special conditions should be established, in election to the Governing Council, for those countries which made the largest contributions. As an Asian country, Mongolia felt that it was fully entitled to occupy a seat. His delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

59. Mr. BLUSZTAJN (Poland) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on operative paragraph 4 and the annex. It felt that the formula which had finally been adopted discriminated against States which wished to participate in the new Programme but which were not Members of the United Nations or members of the specialized agencies. Moreover, the distinction made between the developed countries and the developing countries was arbitrary. His delegation did not think that the criterion of representation based on their contribution to the Programme could be applied to the former while only the criterion of geographical representation was applied to the latter. His delegation supported the draft resolution as a whole.

60. Mr. MURGESCU (Romania) said that his delegation's vote was the logical sequel to Romania's vote at the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development on recommendation A.IV.8 concerning the gradual transformation of the Special Fund.^{3/} It was to be hoped that the consolidation would result in increased resources, better utilization of resources and greater administrative efficiency. The recommendations of the Conference had, however, been only partially implemented, since they had called for investment activities and the creation of a capital development fund. Nevertheless, his delegation, sympathetic as it was to all measures taken in the interests of the developing countries, had voted for the draft resolution as a whole, which, in its opinion, represented an important step in that direction.

61. On the other hand, his delegation had been unable to vote for operative paragraph 4 and the annex, since it felt that the proposed composition of the Governing Council did not satisfy the requirements of equitable geographical representation.

62. Mr. POLIT ORTIZ (Ecuador) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on the second preambular paragraph as well as on operative paragraphs 1 and 2 because it considered that the consolidation would not result in greater efficiency and would have little effect on the budget.

63. Mr. ILONIEMI (Finland) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on operative paragraphs 3 and 4 because it thought that equal representation would have better served the interests of the Programme.

64. Mr. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) said that his delegation had voted for the draft reso-

^{3/} See *Proceedings of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development*, volume I: *Final Act and Report* (United Nations publication, Sales No.: 64.II.B.11).

lution of the Economic and Social Council, as amended, because it felt that the technical assistance activities of the United Nations and the specialized agencies would meet the needs of the developing countries more effectively within the framework of a combined programme. His delegation was still of the opinion, however, that a somewhat smaller Governing Council with a slightly different composition would have better served the interests of the combined programme.

65. He wished to thank the Committee and the Soviet representative for accepting his suggestions with regard to amendment 6 submitted by the socialist countries. He still wondered whether it was wise to impose on the Governing Council the task of determining whether circumstances justified revision of the scope and future activities of the programme. That task was reserved for the General Assembly, and the Governing Council should not allow itself to be diverted from its normal functions.

66. With regard to the question of a capital development fund, his Government did not think that the conditions laid down in the relevant General Assembly resolutions had been fulfilled and did not see any prospect that they would be in the near future. His delegation therefore hoped that the Governing Council would not allow itself to be drawn into fruitless discussions on the subject.

67. Representatives of Governments were entitled to ask themselves certain questions regarding the validity of the objectives of the organizations to which they made voluntary contributions and regarding the effectiveness of the means used to attain those objectives. It was in that spirit that his delegation had thought it advisable to remind the Committee that the questions under consideration were necessarily linked to the willingness of donor Governments to continue to support the voluntary programmes of the United Nations. That statement had not been either an open or an implied threat but simply a frank presentation of the problems which his Government had to face. His Government hoped that, within the framework of the arrangements which had just been approved, the programmes would continue to aid the developing countries by means of suitable technical assistance and pre-investment measures. With that in mind, his Government reaffirmed its support of those programmes.

68. Mr. PETROV (Bulgaria) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution because it felt that, in spite of the concessions made by the socialist countries, the agreement reached was not satisfactory, particularly with regard to the need for equitable geographical distribution.

69. Mr. TIGOUÉ (Togo) said that his delegation had abstained on most of the provisions because it considered that the consolidation of the two programmes did not meet the main aspirations of the developing countries, particularly with regard to investment activities.

70. Miss MEAGHER (Canada) said that her delegation, while it had voted for the draft resolution as a whole, had abstained in the vote on amendments 3 and 4 because it thought that the formula proposed did not faithfully reflect the principle of association

and co-operation which should link the donor and the recipient countries.

71. Mr. MUŽIK (Czechoslovakia) said that his delegation abided by the previous resolutions of the General Assembly and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development with regard to the need to transform the Special Fund into a capital development fund. The membership arrangements proposed for the new Governing Council were undemocratic and represented a serious departure from the Charter, from the principle of equitable geographical distribution. He recalled in that regard that, at the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, the socialist countries together with the developing countries had rejected the idea of the so-called equal representation of developed and developing countries on the Trade Board. The new formula for membership to the Governing Council tended to prevent a considerable number of countries from active participation in the technical assistance programme. He had in mind particularly those countries which, although not among the major contributors, were interested in the programme. For those reasons his delegation had abstained in the vote on operative paragraph 4 and the draft resolution as a whole.

72. Mr. OSOGO (Kenya) said that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution as a whole but had abstained on amendment 4 as well as on the annex, because it felt that the rotation proposed for the thirty-seventh seat was not fair. A fifteen-year cycle should have been taken as the basis, and the seat should have been rotated among the various regions, each of which would have occupied it for three years. His delegation had also voted against the phrase in operative paragraph 1 reading "that the special characteristics and operations of the two programmes as well as two separate funds will be maintained, and that", for its adoption meant that there could be no true consolidation.

73. Mr. ARKADYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that when the consolidation of the Expanded Programme and the Special Fund had been considered (971st meeting), the Soviet delegation had made clear and specific proposals under which the consolidation would be taken as the basis for the establishment of a United Nations capital development fund. It continued to believe that a unique opportunity to establish such a fund was being offered to the developing countries. Those countries had for many years been calling for the establishment of a capital development fund, and it was well known that the socialist countries had always supported such a proposal. The Soviet Union had pointed out to the developing countries that the relevant decisions of the General Assembly and the recommendations of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development must be borne in mind when the two programmes were consolidated. The delegations of the socialist countries had, in particular, drawn the attention of the developing countries to the fact that the consolidation of the Expanded Programme and the Special Fund would make it possible to devote a part of the considerable resources at their disposal to the industrialization of the underdeveloped countries, without prejudice to the funds available under the regular programme. In making

those proposals, the Soviet Union had been guided solely by the interests of the developing countries. However, the representatives of a number of those countries had preferred to disregard the possibilities thus offered to them and had ignored the warnings concerning the hasty and unsatisfactory nature of the draft resolution submitted by the Economic and Social Council. Furthermore, insufficient account had been taken of the need to indicate that the consolidation, regardless of how unsatisfactory it might be, was a step towards the establishment of a capital development fund and that therefore appropriate provision should be made within the framework of the United Nations Development Programme for investment activities in the industries of the developing countries, that the administration of the Programme should be organized along democratic lines and that the participation of the developing countries and socialist countries in that administration should be ensured.

74. His delegation considered certain provisions of the draft resolution to be unacceptable. In its view, it was not essential for the consolidation of the Expanded Programme and the Special Fund to be based on the principles set out in the second and fourth preambular paragraphs. The Soviet Union had submitted a series of amendments (A/C.2/L.800/Rev.1) which would have improved the draft resolution considerably. Strange as it might seem, however, those amendments had not been supported by a number of developing countries. The composition of the Governing Council likewise gave no cause for enthusiasm. For those reasons, his delegation had considered it necessary to vote against the second preambular paragraph and to abstain on the draft resolution as a whole. It was certain that those proposals would continue to be the subject of careful study on the part of the developing countries and that their importance and practical value for the industrialization of those countries would be understood.

75. His delegation considered that all the countries of the world and not only the States Members of the United Nations or members of the specialized agencies should participate in the United Nations Development Programme. It was unjust and improper that countries such as the People's Republic of China, the German Democratic Republic, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and so forth should be prevented from providing material and technical assistance to the developing countries.

76. Mr. ABE (Japan) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution. With regard, however, to the composition of the Governing Council, he believed that it should be based upon a distinction, not between developed and developing countries, but rather between those countries which were net donors and those which were net recipients. Each of those

groups should enjoy equal representation, for the decisions of the Governing Council, one of the most important functions of which would be the allocation of funds to each project, should not be dictated by the wishes of the donor countries or by the numerical majority of the recipient countries. In addition, it was essential that there should be equitable geographical distribution among the representatives of the recipient countries, so that the needs of all would be reflected in the Governing Council.

77. His delegation regretted that those criteria had not been taken sufficiently into consideration by the sponsors of the revised amendments (A/C.2/L.795/Rev.2); it had abstained on amendment 4. It had voted for the draft resolution as a whole because of the sincere efforts made by the different groups and in a spirit of conciliation; however, it maintained its position of principle.

78. Mr. KONE (Upper Volta) said that he had voted in favour of the resolution as a whole. He had, however, voted against amendment 4, for he would have liked the annex to be included in the Committee's report rather than in the text of the resolution. He had also voted against the retention, in operative paragraph 1, of the words "the special characteristics and operations of the two programmes as well as two separate funds will be maintained, and that", because he considered that that provision conflicted with recommendations A.IV.7 and A.IV.8 of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. He would, indeed, like the Special Fund to engage as soon as possible in investment operations in the true sense.

79. Mr. N GOIE (Democratic Republic of the Congo) said that he had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole not only because he felt that the consolidation met a rational need, but chiefly because he hoped that it would constitute a step towards the gradual transformation of the Special Fund into a capital development fund, which was desired by everyone in the interest of economic development. If that objective was to remain remote, the draft resolution which the Committee had just adopted would become meaningless.

80. His delegation had abstained on the second part of operative paragraph 1, since its implications did not seem to be very clear.

81. Mr. CHAMMAS (Lebanon) wished to convey to the Chairman the gratitude felt by the sponsors of the revised amendments (A/C.2/L.795/Rev.2) for the impartial and constructive role he had played in the agreement that had finally been reached; his thanks were addressed also to the Vice-Chairman of the Committee.

The meeting rose at 6.45 p.m.