

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

TWENTIETH SESSION

Official Records



SECOND COMMITTEE, 1002nd
MEETING

Friday, 3 December 1965,
at 11 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 37:</i>	
<i>Report of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (continued)</i>	271
<i>Agenda item 50:</i>	
<i>United Nations programmes of technical co-operation (continued):</i>	
(a) <i>Review of activities;</i>	
(b) <i>Confirmation of the allocation of funds under the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance</i>	271

Chairman: Mr. Pierre FORTHOMME
(Belgium).

AGENDA ITEM 37

Report of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (continued) (A/5838, A/5852, A/5870/Rev.1, A/5886, A/6003/Add.1, A/6023 and Add.1-2, A/6121)

1. The CHAIRMAN, inviting the Committee to resume its consideration of the agenda item, said that he had no list of speakers.
2. Mr. OSOGO (Kenya) suggested that, as no draft resolution had been submitted, the Committee should simply take note of the report of the Trade and Development Board (A/6023 and Add.1 and 2).
3. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that one of the reasons for the inclusion of the item in the agenda was to give countries not members of the Trade and Development Board an opportunity of expressing their views on the report in question.
4. Mr. BRADLEY (Argentina) said that a draft resolution was being prepared and would be submitted very shortly. It would therefore be appropriate to suspend the debate on the subject, rather than close it, and to take up another agenda item in the meantime.
5. The CHAIRMAN welcomed the announcement that a draft resolution was soon to be submitted, and expressed the hope that the sponsors might speed up its preparation. In accordance with the Argentine representative's suggestion, he put it to the Committee that the examination of the item should be suspended.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 50

United Nations programmes of technical co-operation (continued)*

- (a) Review of activities (A/6083; A/C.2/L.801, L.827);
- (b) Confirmation of the allocation of funds under the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance (A/C.2/228)

6. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to examine the memorandum by the Secretary-General on the confirmation of the allocation of funds under the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance (A/C.2/228), as well as the note by the Rapporteur (A/C.2/L.827) concerning technical assistance in international law. He drew the attention of the delegations to paragraph 4 of that note which mentions a consensus in the Second Committee reached on that subject.

7. Mr. INGRAM (Australia) said that he would like to study that paragraph more closely, and suggested that its examination should be deferred.

8. Mr. DIAKITE (Mali) said that he was unable to express any opinion on the document, for the French text had not been circulated.

9. The CHAIRMAN proposed that, in view of the Australian representative's suggestion and the Malian representative's observation, the meeting should be suspended.

It was so decided.

The meeting was suspended at 11.15 a.m. and resumed at 11.50 a.m.

10. Mr. THAPA (Nepal) said that his country had always interpreted the legislation governing technical assistance programmes in the manner indicated in paragraph 4 of document A/C.2/L.827. Nepal had the benefit of the services of experts in international law, although it was feeling the effects of the recruiting difficulties. He approved the text of document A/C.2/L.827.

11. Mr. BLAU (United States of America) said that confirmation of the allocations of funds under the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance was an action formally required of the General Assembly under the Economic and Social Council resolution 222 (IX) establishing the Technical Assistance Committee; that action had now to be taken for the last time, since the responsibility would in future fall on the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme. His delegation supported the draft resolution set forth in the document A/C.2/228.

*Resumed from the 985th meeting.

12. In regard to the note by the Rapporteur, his delegation had maintained, both in the Sixth Committee and in the Second Committee, that the problem referred to did not exist. The basic resolutions had in practice been interpreted in such a way that requests for technical assistance in the field of international law to which Governments attached the proper priority, or for the financing of such assistance under part V of the regular budget, could hardly ever be rejected. He would interpret paragraph 4 in that sense of the text cited in document A/C.2/L.827, and his delegation could hence approve it.

13. Sir Keith UNWIN (United Kingdom) said that he would vote in favour of the draft resolution set forth in document A/C.2/228. As to document A/C.2/L.827, he associated himself with the United States representative's remarks and proposed that, in order to state the facts more accurately, the words "should be interpreted" in paragraph 4 should be replaced by the words "is in practice interpreted".

14. Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) observed that there was general agreement on document A/C.2/228. As to document A/C.2/L.827, he found it surprising that in every discussion of technical assistance attention was drawn to the extreme paucity of resources available and, at the same time, proposals were made to extend the scope of technical assistance. In the case of technical assistance in the field of international law, it had been pointed out that such assistance affected development; but that was essentially true of

any human activity. In his opinion the Committee should proceed with caution and leave the decision on the subject to the competent body. His delegation endorsed the interpretation of paragraph 4 given by the United States representative.

15. Mr. NEDIVI (Israel) reminded the Committee that his delegation had raised the question because it wondered whether the existing legislation could be interpreted in the sense indicated by the United States representative. He proposed that the word "should" in paragraph 4 should be replaced by the word "can".

16. Mr. INGRAM (Australia) and Mr. BACKES (Austria) supported the United Kingdom representative's proposal.

17. Sir Keith UNWIN (United Kingdom) agreed to the replacement of the word "should" by the word "can".

18. The CHAIRMAN observed that, subject to the remarks made and the amendment proposed, which the Rapporteur would be able to take into account in the final drafting of the passage in question, the document seemed an accurate reflection of the general opinion and the tenor of the discussion. He accordingly suggested that the Committee should adopt the draft resolution set forth in document A/C.2/228 and approve document A/C.2/L.827.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 12.20 p.m.