

GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

TWELFTH SESSION

Official Records

Wednesday, 13 November 1957,
at 3.15 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Tribute to the memory of Mr. Zapotocky, President of the Czechoslovak Republic	195
Agenda item 29:	
Programmes of technical assistance:	
(a) Report of the Economic and Social Council (continued)	
Examination of draft resolutions (concluded)	195

Chairman: Mr. Jiří NOSEK (Czechoslovakia).

Tribute to the memory of Mr. Zapotocky, President of the Czechoslovak Republic

1. Mr. HAGIWARA (Vice-Chairman) said that he was certain that he was speaking on behalf of all members of the Committee in expressing their profound sympathy to the Chairman and his Government on the occasion of the death of Mr. Antonín Zapotocky, President of the Czechoslovak Republic. He proposed that the Committee should observe one minute's silence.

It was so agreed.

The Committee observed one minute's silence in tribute to the memory of Antonín Zapotocky, President of the Czechoslovak Republic.

AGENDA ITEM 29

Programmes of technical assistance:

(a) Report of the Economic and Social Council (A/3613, A/3661, A/C.2/196, A/C.2/L.347, A/C.2/L.348/Rev.1) (continued)

EXAMINATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.2/L.347, A/C.2/L.348/REV.1) (concluded)

2. Mr. ROGERS (Canada) said that while his delegation would vote for the four-Power draft resolution (A/C.2/L.347), its vote was not to be construed as committing his Government to increase its contributions to the Expanded Programme. The Canadian Government would seek parliamentary approval for a contribution of \$US 2 million to the Expanded Programme in 1958, the same amount as it had contributed for 1957.

3. He hoped that the revised nine-Power joint draft resolution (A/C.2/L.348/Rev.1), which embodied suggestions made by several delegations, would receive unanimous support. In connexion with operative paragraph 2 of the original draft (A/C.2/L.348), he explained that it had not been the intention of the sponsors that there should be any interference with the rights of the Governments of recipient States to work out, with the Technical Assistance Board (TAB), technical assistance programmes most suited to their own needs.

To avoid any possible confusion, however, the paragraph had been deleted and replaced by a paragraph reproducing the substance of paragraph 3 of the original draft. He trusted that the amendment would prove acceptable to the representative of El Salvador.

4. Mr. CARRILLO (El Salvador) thanked the Canadian representative for his explanation which had removed his delegation's misgivings concerning the original draft. He was prepared to support the revised draft.

5. Mr. BANNIER (Netherlands), in answer to certain questions raised by the representatives of China and Cuba at the 488th meeting, observed that the Expanded Programme was jointly implemented by the United Nations and the specialized agencies, which meant that responsibility for the Programme was divided between no less than eight participating organizations. Technical assistance questions received thorough consideration at the meetings of the seven specialized agencies, but that was not the case with that part of the Expanded Programme which was administered by the United Nations. Sub-division of the question of technical assistance into two agenda items was, therefore, clearly desirable in order to permit full review of the work of the Technical Assistance Administration (TAA). A few years ago, the agenda had included two sub-items on technical assistance, one on the work under the Expanded Programme and one on the work done by TAA; he strongly urged that the Committee should revert to that practice. That solution would give TAA the status it deserved and enable it to function more effectively in its normal fields of economic development, public administration and social welfare.

6. Mr. MARTINEZ CABAÑAS, (Secretariat), pointed out that TAA was engaged in two parallel lines of endeavour, the regular United Nations Programme of Technical Assistance and the portion of the Expanded Programme directly administered by the United Nations. TAA reported directly to the Council and, through it, to the General Assembly on its work under the regular programmes. It did not report directly to either body, however, on its share in the Expanded Programme. That share was covered only in a general way in TAB's Annual Report to the Council and subsequently in the section of the Council's report to the General Assembly devoted to the Expanded Programme as a whole. Thus, whereas the activities of each specialized agency under the Expanded Programme were subject to detailed scrutiny by its governing body, there was no comparable review of TAA's part in the Programme at any stage. That was the gap the sponsors of the draft resolution appeared to be trying to fill. If the Assembly wished to act as governing body in relation to TAA's activities under the Expanded Programme, operative paragraph 4 offered the correct formula. He doubted, however, whether the Assembly itself would wish to undertake such a detailed over-all review. It would be preferable, in his view, if the Com-

mittee were to request the Council to incorporate in the relevant chapter of its report a special section dealing with TAA's activities under the Expanded Programme.

7. Mr. O'NAGHTEN (Cuba) thanked the sponsors of the nine-Power draft resolution for taking most of his delegation's suggestions into account in the revised text. The new fourth preambulatory paragraph met his delegation's objection to the earlier version, although he continued to believe that the paragraph could usefully have included a reference to the specialized agencies. As the Expanded Programme had been created by the United Nations the latter had every right to give some direction to the specialized agencies in its implementation. With regard to operative paragraph 2, he could accept the new wording if the phrase "United Nations programmes of technical assistance" was intended to cover the Expanded Programme as well as the United Nations regular programmes.

8. He still had doubts, however, concerning operative paragraph 4, despite the redrafting of the text and the explanations given by the representative of the Netherlands and the Deputy Director-General of TAA. He could not see the advantage of dividing the technical assistance item in the way suggested. It was true, as the Netherlands representative had said, that the subject had in the past been studied in two parts, but the two parts had then been the Expanded Programme as a whole and the United Nations regular programmes as a whole. It appeared to be the intention under the present draft resolution to split the consideration of the Expanded Programme into two parts, seven-eighths of which—the share of the seven associated specialized agencies—would be considered under sub-item (a) and the remaining eighth—the share of the United Nations—under sub-item (b). That did not seem a very profitable procedure, and there would be a temptation to discuss the United Nations share in the Expanded Programme under both sub-items; in any event, the debates on the two sub-items would bear a marked resemblance to each other. Furthermore there was no clear distinction in practice between the two halves of the technical assistance venture; technical assistance activities after all constituted a single complex whole. Nevertheless, as the Netherlands representative had pointed out, it was a fact that whereas the specialized agencies' activities under the Expanded Programme were reviewed by their respective governing bodies that was not done in the United Nations itself for the United Nations own share in the Expanded Programme. It would be appropriate, therefore, to find some means of rectifying that omission. But the method indicated in operative paragraph 4 was not, he submitted, the best way; it would be better to request the Economic and Social Council to give a more detailed evaluation of the operations of TAA in that part of its report devoted to the technical assistance programmes. That, he was sure, was the real intention of the sponsors of the draft resolution and if they felt that the method they suggested would achieve that objective, he would not oppose the paragraph.

9. Mr. QUINTERO (Panama) said that his delegation had found the original text of the nine-Power draft, particularly of operative paragraph 5, somewhat unsatisfactory, but was prepared to accept the revised text. He agreed to some extent with the Cuban representative's observations but felt that the division of

the item was desirable for the sake of orderliness in the discussion. As the Deputy Director-General of TAA had said, there was a gap in the supervision of the Expanded Programme in that the United Nations share in the Programme was not given thorough examination by any body. The best method of rectifying that omission might be for the Committee to include in its report a request to the Economic and Social Council to devote a special section in future reports on technical assistance programmes to the part of the Expanded Programme administered by the United Nations. The Committee's intention in operative paragraph 4 would then become clear.

10. Mr. Gopala MENON (India) said that his delegation had no difficulty in supporting the revised nine-Power draft. As for the construction to be placed on the concluding words of operative paragraph 2, his delegation understood them to refer both to the Expanded Programme and to the regular United Nations programmes of technical assistance, and he felt that that was how the sponsors of the draft intended them to be read. After hearing the explanations of the representative of the Netherlands and the Deputy Director-General of TAA he found operative paragraph 4 entirely acceptable.

11. Mr. ARDALAN (Iran) said that his delegation supported the four-Power draft resolution (A/C.2/L.347) without hesitation; the Programme's precarious financial future warranted just such a resolution. Turning to the nine-Power draft resolution, he said that his delegation approved of the changes in the first paragraph of the preamble and the deletion of the second operative paragraph of the earlier draft. With regard to operative paragraph 4, however, he had some doubts: there appeared to be no substantial difference between the activities conducted under the regular and under the Expanded Programmes and all the reports submitted on the work of TAA, and the technical assistance activities of the specialized agencies were scrutinized by the Economic and Social Council and the Technical Assistance Committee (TAC). There would therefore appear to be no point in adopting the procedure indicated in operative paragraph 4. The only useful action would be to request the Economic and Social Council to include in its report to the General Assembly a separate section covering the work of TAA under both the regular and the Expanded Programmes. If the Committee wished to retain operative paragraph 4, however, his delegation would not object to it.

12. Mr. ARKADEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had voted for the adoption of Economic and Social Council resolution 659 B (XXIV) and would vote for the nine-Power draft resolution which included a reference to that resolution of the Council. It would, however, abstain in the vote on the four-Power draft resolution because a vote in favour would entail an obligation upon the Soviet Government to reconsider its pledged contribution of four million roubles for the year 1958, which it could not do at present because of its budgetary and other formal procedures. He would point out that his Government was not decreasing its contribution in the coming year; the figure was the same as that of its contribution in the previous year. Moreover, there had been difficulties in utilizing the whole of its contribution in the past. Furthermore, it was relevant to remind the Committee

that the Soviet Union was disbursing considerable funds under bilateral agreements for the provision of economic and scientific assistance to under-developed countries.

13. Mr. STANOVNIK (Yugoslavia) assured the Soviet Union representative that it was not the intention of the four-Power draft resolution, of which his delegation was a sponsor, to commit any delegation voting for it to any financial obligation. The sole object of the draft, as the Committee had been informed, was to draw the attention of Governments to the precarious financial situation of the Expanded Programme.

14. With regard to the nine-Power draft resolution he suggested that in view of the possible constitutional implications of operative paragraph 4 it would be better to embody the substance of the paragraph in the Committee's report. The practical effect would be the same.

15. Mr. RAJAPATIRANA (Ceylon) thanked the sponsors of the nine-Power draft resolution for amending the first paragraph of the preamble along the lines he had suggested at the previous meeting. His delegation could now support that paragraph, but still had some difficulties about operative paragraph 4. The statement of the Deputy Director-General of TAA had seemed to suggest that some constitutional issue was involved. If that were so, he would be glad to have some further elucidation of it. If not, his delegation was ready to support the present text since the General Assembly could always revert to the earlier procedure if the experiment of subdividing the item proved unsuccessful.

16. Mr. WOULBROUN (Belgium) said that as he had made clear in earlier statements the contribution his Government had pledged, subject to parliamentary approval, for 1958, represented the most it could do at present towards the financing of the technical assistance programmes. The representatives of the Netherlands, France and Yugoslavia had stated that in their view the purpose of the draft resolution was simply to draw the attention of Governments to the present situation. He personally thought that the text went much further than that. It specifically appealed to Governments to consider the possibility of increasing the financial resources of the Programme. His Government had considered that possibility, with the results that he had already stated. In those circumstances he could not vote for the draft resolution, although he was sure that his Government would give the matter further consideration at a later date.

17. Mr. ARKADEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that although the retention in the nine-Power draft resolution of operative paragraph 4 would not affect his delegation's attitude to the draft as a whole, he considered the Yugoslav representative's suggestion sound, especially as it appeared from the remarks of the Deputy Director-General of TAA that there was no fundamental distinction between the regular and the Expanded Programmes and consequently no special need to consider them separately. The sponsors might perhaps agree to the transfer of that paragraph from the draft resolution to the Committee's report.

18. Mr. HASSAN (Sudan) said that his delegation approved of the revisions which had been made in the nine-Power draft text and was grateful for the various explanations given.

19. His delegation supported the four-Power draft resolution and itself appealed to all Member Governments to increase their pledges. Sudan had made a token increase in its contribution as an indication of its confidence in the technical assistance programmes and hoped that other countries would follow its example.

20. Mr. SERBAN (Romania) said that his delegation considered that the objectives of the four-Power draft resolution were praiseworthy but in view of the fact, already pointed out in the general debate, that the contributions of some Members, including Romania, were not being fully utilized, his delegation would have to abstain in the vote on that draft. That consideration applied also to the nine-Power draft resolution, but if the sponsors could agree to the amendment of the fourth paragraph of the preamble to read: "Further recognizing that continued efforts should be made to use all the available technical resources as effectively as possible...", his delegation could support it.

21. Mr. BRADLEY (Argentina) said that his delegation would vote for both draft resolutions but it would like it to be understood, in connexion with the four-Power draft, that its approval did not commit the Argentinian Government in any way regarding a possible increase in its contribution in the near future.

22. Mr. LICHTENECKER (Austria), referring to the four-Power draft resolution, recalled his delegation's statement, in the general debate on the item, of its keen awareness of the fruitful work of the Programme and of the Programme's financial needs, in recognition of which it had decided to increase its contribution for the coming year by 50 per cent. But that, his Government felt, was the limit to which it could go in present circumstances. His delegation would therefore be compelled to abstain in the vote on that text.

23. MR. MENDOZA LOPEZ (Bolivia) said that his delegation fully supported the four-Power draft. Bolivia had increased its contribution by 20 per cent; it hoped, however, that technical assistance funds would soon no longer depend on the whim of the contributors but would bear a fixed relationship to the national resources of the countries concerned.

24. With regard to the nine-Power draft resolution, his delegation would have preferred the elaboration of the original operative paragraph 2 in the manner suggested by the representative of Saudi Arabia at the 488th meeting. With regard to operative paragraph 3 he entirely agreed that account should be taken of all the suggestions put forward by delegations during the twelfth session of the General Assembly.

25. He wished particularly to express the gratitude of his Government to the Deputy Director-General of TAA for all that he had done to help the Bolivian people and Government overcome their difficulties.

26. Mr. MARTINEZ CABAÑAS, (Secretariat), said that operative paragraph 4 of the revised nine-Power draft was procedural rather than substantive in nature. It was concerned with the manner in which the General Assembly, as the governing body of the United Nations, could best be given an opportunity of evaluating the activities of the United Nations under the Expanded Programme.

27. Mr. KAMENOV (Bulgaria), commenting on the four-Power draft resolution, said that while his delegation favoured the enlargement of the Expanded

Programme's resources, there seemed to be little point in voting in favour of an increase in resources if no commitment was assumed. As his Government's contributions had not been utilized, it could hardly undertake to increase its pledge. His delegation would therefore abstain.

28. With regard to the revised nine-Power draft, he supported the Yugoslav representative's suggestion concerning operative paragraph 4 and the Romanian representative's suggestion concerning the utilization of funds.

29. Mr. BANNIER (Netherlands) pointed out that it was the view of the sponsors of the four-Power draft that in voting for the draft delegations would not commit their Governments to increase their contributions. In the light of that explanation, he hoped that the Soviet Union representative would reconsider his position.

30. With regard to the nine-Power draft, he observed that the Deputy Director-General of TAA seemed to agree that a separate discussion on programmes implemented by TAA would allow more thorough review of TAA's work and had suggested that the Council should be requested to include in its report on the technical assistance programmes a special section on United Nations activities under the expanded and regular programmes. That view had been supported by the representatives of Cuba and Panama and his delegation was inclined to support the Yugoslav representative's suggestion that operative paragraph 4 be deleted and that the substance be embodied in the Rapporteur's report. The report might also include a recommendation that the Council devote a special section in its report to United Nations technical assistance activities as a whole.

31. Mr. PSCOLKA (Czechoslovakia) said that his delegation would support the revised nine-Power draft resolution but would be obliged to abstain in the vote on the four-Power draft resolution as the Czechoslovak Government had already announced its contribution to the Expanded Programme for 1958. Despite its decision to abstain, his delegation favoured an increase in the financial resources of the Programme and consideration of the possibility of increasing them in future years.

32. Mr. HADWEN (Canada), Rapporteur, suggested that if operative paragraph 4 were deleted, a paragraph might be included in the Committee's report to the effect that the Committee considered that paragraph 4 of the nine-Power draft resolution might be more suitably dealt with by requesting the Economic and Social Council that in its future reports to the General Assembly on United Nations programmes of technical assistance, a section be prepared dealing with that part of the Expanded Programme administered by the Secretary-General as well as the regular programmes of the United Nations. That would mean that the parts of the Council's report dealing with (a) the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance and (b) the programmes administered by TAA could be considered as separate sub-items of the technical assistance item on the agenda of future sessions of the General Assembly.

33. Mr. STANOVNIK (Yugoslavia) expressed the view that the wording of the proposed paragraph should be discussed when the Committee considered its report, as it had no bearing on the position taken by delegations on the remainder of the joint draft resolution.

The meeting was suspended at 5.25 p.m. and resumed at 5.40 p.m.

34. Mr. ROGERS (Canada) announced that the sponsors of the nine-Power draft resolution would accept the Romanian amendment to the fourth paragraph of the preamble. They considered that "available resources" meant the resources that were available in accordance with established procedures. They did not consider that the insertion of the word "all" added anything, but they had no objection to it.

35. In reply to the points raised by the Cuban and Indian representatives, he explained that the sponsors intended operative paragraph 2 to refer to the Expanded Programme and all other United Nations programmes of technical assistance. Perhaps the Rapporteur could include a sentence to that effect in his report.

36. On behalf of the sponsors, he withdrew operative paragraph 4 on the understanding that an appropriate paragraph would be included in the Rapporteur's report. That paragraph would, of course, be discussed in detail at a later stage.

37. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) felt that the deletion of operative paragraph 4 should not be conditional upon the insertion of a similar paragraph in the Rapporteur's report. The paragraph should be considered on its merits.

38. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the two joint draft resolutions.

The four-Power draft resolution (A/C.2/L.347) was adopted by 59 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

The nine-Power draft resolution (A/C.2/L.348/Rev.1) was adopted unanimously.

39. Mr. CUEVAS CANCINO (Mexico), explaining his vote on the four-Power draft resolution, said that his delegation had supported the draft on the understanding that it was an appeal to countries that had not increased their contributions at the recent Pledging Conference to reconsider their position. His delegation did not interpret the draft resolution as being directed to countries such as his own which had endeavoured to increase their contributions.

40. Mr. FLORES MORA (Uruguay) pointed out that his delegation had voted for both joint draft resolutions as an expression of its support of all technical assistance activities. His country had made great efforts to support the Expanded Programme and ranked high among the contributors.

41. Mr. HAYTA (Turkey) observed that his Government had already twice increased its contribution to the Expanded Programme and hoped to do so again in relation to any increase in its own financial position. His delegation had voted for the four-Power draft on the understanding that an affirmative vote did not imply any financial commitment.

42. Mr. O'NAGHTEN (Cuba) said that his delegation had voted for the four-Power draft resolution on the understanding that it did not commit the Cuban Government's position as to the substance of the question, to which his country would give careful consideration.

43. In supporting the nine-Power draft resolution, his delegation understood that the fourth paragraph of the preamble implied that all the available technical assistance resources were being used as effectively

as possible, bearing in mind the recent appeals of United Nations bodies in that connexion.

44. Mr. THOMSON (Australia) said that in voting for the four-Power draft resolution his delegation was expressing the hope that financial difficulties would not prevent the steady growth of technical assistance activities. Its vote should not be construed to mean that Australia would be able to increase its current contribution to the Expanded Programme.

45. Mr. CHA (China) said that his delegation had voted for the revised nine-Power draft resolution because the co-sponsors had agreed to delete operative paragraphs 2 and 4, to which he had raised objections.

46. Mr. LOUGH (New Zealand), explaining his delegation's vote on the four-Power draft resolution, said that his Government had already increased its contribution for 1958. Some countries had been more generous than others in response to the appeal for funds, and his delegation had been disappointed that the resources available in 1958 might prove to be less than those available in 1957.

47. In voting for the four-Power draft resolution, his delegation had borne in mind the statements of the Netherlands and Yugoslav representatives that an affirmative vote did not place any Government under an obligation to increase still further its pledge for 1958.

48. Sir Alec RANDALL (United Kingdom) said that

his delegation's vote in favour of the four-Power resolution did not involve any additional financial commitment on the part of his Government, which had already pledged a very considerable contribution for 1958. His delegation had already clarified the position at the recent Technical Assistance Conference and in the Committee.

49. Mr. DILLON (Ecuador) pointed out that his delegation's vote in favour of the four-Power draft resolution did not imply that his Government would undertake to increase its contribution.

50. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) observed that in view of the explanations of vote that had been given, the four-Power resolution seemed of limited value, the more so in view of the United States delegation's press release of 11 November 1957 announcing its intention to introduce a resolution on a technical assistance fund. The Committee might again have to ask Member Governments to increase the resources of the Expanded Programme. Since a question of principle was involved, his delegation had voted in favour of the four-Power resolution.

51. Mr. SEN (Pakistan) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the four-Power draft resolution because it agreed with the text in principle. Its vote did not imply any additional financial commitment at the present stage.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.