

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

FIFTEENTH SESSION
Official Records



**SECOND COMMITTEE, 709th
MEETING**

Thursday, 8 December 1960,
at 3.5 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda items 12, 29 and 74:</i>	
<i>Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapters II (sections I, II and III A, except paragraphs 189-198), III, IV and VII (section I and paragraph 645)) (continued)</i>	
<i>Economic development of under-developed countries (continued):</i>	
(a) <i>International flow of private capital: report of the Secretary-General and recommendations thereon by the Economic and Social Council;</i>	
(b) <i>Question of the establishment of a United Nations capital development fund: report of the Secretary-General;</i>	
(c) <i>Methods and techniques for carrying out a study of world economic development: report of the Secretary-General and comments thereon by the Economic and Social Council;</i>	
(d) <i>Promotion of wider trade co-operation among States: report of the Secretary-General</i>	
<i>Land reform (continued)</i>	
<i>Consideration of draft resolutions (continued)</i>	389
<i>Agenda items 28, 30, 31 and 32:</i>	
<i>Progress and operations of the Special Fund (continued)</i>	
<i>Programmes of technical assistance:</i>	
(a) <i>Report of the Economic and Social Council (continued);</i>	
(b) <i>United Nations assistance in public administration: report of the Secretary-General (continued)</i>	
<i>Opportunities for international co-operation on behalf of former Trust Territories and other newly independent States: reports of the Economic and Social Council and of the Secretary-General (continued)</i>	
<i>Question of assistance to Libya: report of the Secretary-General (continued)</i>	
<i>Consideration of draft resolutions (continued)</i>	392
<i>Economic development of under-developed countries (continued):</i>	
(a) <i>International flow of private capital: report of the Secretary-General and recommendations thereon by the Economic and Social Council (A/4487, E/3325 and Corr.1-3);</i>	
(b) <i>Question of the establishment of a United Nations capital development fund: report of the Secretary-General (A/4488, E/3393, E/3393/Add.1-4);</i>	
(c) <i>Methods and techniques for carrying out a study of world economic development: report of the Secretary-General and comments thereon by the Economic and Social Council (A/4489 and Add.1, E/3379, E/3379/Add.1-7);</i>	
(d) <i>Promotion of wider trade co-operation among States: report of the Secretary-General (A/4490, E/3389)</i>	
<i>Land reform (A/4439) (continued)</i>	
<i>CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.2/L.474/REV.2) (continued)</i>	
1. Mr. B. K. NEHRU (India) introduced the further revised draft resolution on the accelerated flow of capital and technical assistance to the developing countries (A/C.2/L.474/Rev.2). He said that the sponsors had endeavoured to incorporate in the text suggestions made by various representatives, but had been unable to take into account all the ideas which had been expressed, as some of them were not in keeping with the objective sought.	
2. In operative paragraph 1, the phrase "which, according to the definitions employed by the United Nations already runs at the rate of about 1/2 per cent of the national incomes of the economically advanced countries" had been deleted, in order to avoid any risk of controversy concerning the figure of 1/2 per cent. Furthermore, in order to dispel the misgivings of certain representatives who had thought that the figure of 1 per cent mentioned in that paragraph referred to the separate national incomes of the various countries, the sponsors had amended the last lines of the paragraph, which now mentioned approximately 1 per cent "of the combined national incomes of the economically advanced countries".	
3. In the English text of operative paragraph 2, the word "the" had been inserted between "payments of" and "less" at the end. The meaning of the expression "as much as possible", which appeared in the middle of that paragraph, was that the outflow of funds to the under-developed countries should, so far as possible, be channelled through the United Nations and its specialized agencies. But the funds thus channelled would not necessarily represent the greater part of the total flow. It was for the exporting countries to decide to what extent the funds that they supplied to the	

Chairman: Mr. Janez STANOVNIK (Yugoslavia).

AGENDA ITEMS 12, 29 AND 74

Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapters II (sections I, II and III A, except paragraphs 189-198), III, IV and VII (section I and paragraph 645)) (A/4415) (continued)

under-developed countries should go through the United Nations.

4. He hoped that the Committee would feel able to accept the draft resolution in its new form.

5. Mr. DUDLEY (United Kingdom) thought that representatives should be given a little time in which to study the implications of the draft resolution as now revised. Some delegations might have to consult their Governments again, as the question was of great importance for every country. The debate had so far borne on procedural problems, but questions of substance might subsequently arise.

6. Mr. VIAUD (France) noted that the sponsors of the draft resolution had taken account of certain observations made by various representatives during the discussion. However, he was not yet ready to vote on the revised draft, which had only just been circulated. It would have to be thoroughly studied and, if necessary, new instructions would have to be obtained in regard to some of its passages.

7. In operative paragraph 2, the words "as much as possible of these funds should be channelled through..." might create difficulties. The recommendation contained in operative paragraph 2 might compel the French Government to change its method of distributing its assistance to foreign countries. It would be better to word the paragraph more flexibly, by saying, for instance:

"Notes that the outflow of funds to the under-developed countries is distributed through bilateral or multilateral channels according to the preferences of the countries giving and receiving such assistance".

Some such wording would emphasize simply that the method of distributing the assistance depended on the wishes of the countries which were giving and of those which were receiving such assistance, within the framework of agreements freely arrived at. Such a text would be more acceptable to his delegation, but he was not submitting a formal amendment on the subject.

8. Mr. WOULBROUN (Belgium) said that all members of the Committee accepted the principle underlying the draft resolution, but that some of them were opposed to any mention of a percentage of national income. To prescribe an exact percentage might provoke unfavourable reactions from those delegations, and result in the desired objective not being achieved. It would be better, therefore, if the percentage were merely implied. The text of operative paragraph 1 was sure to receive the delegations' unanimous approval if it were worded thus:

"Expresses the hope that this outflow of international assistance should be increased substantially so as to reach as soon as possible a level compatible with the needs of the under-developed countries and the material potential of the industrial countries".

If operative paragraph 1 were maintained in its present form, it might be wondered how Member States could commit themselves to take appropriate measures for achieving the objective stated in that paragraph.

9. Referring to operative paragraph 2, he pointed out that the industrial countries granted aid to the under-developed countries in the form of technical assistance and pre-investment, but that they had not so far engaged in financing, in the true sense of the word. In

those circumstances, it could hardly be proposed that as much as possible of the outflow of funds to the under-developed countries should be channelled through the United Nations and its specialized agencies.

10. Mr. KORTEWEG (Netherlands) said that the title of the draft resolution was not consistent with its text. The title implied a flow of private as well as of public capital, but the text made no mention whatever of private capital.

11. It would be better for operative paragraph 4 to provide that the Secretary-General should report in the first instance to the Economic and Social Council, and not to the General Assembly. He formally proposed an amendment (A/C.2/L.540) to replace the last part of that paragraph, after the word "annually", by the following phrase: "on this question within the framework of his reporting pursuant to General Assembly resolution 1034 (XI) and Economic and Social Council resolution 780 (XXX)".

12. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that he approved, in principle, the idea expressed in the draft resolution. He would, however, have preferred no percentage to be mentioned. The draft resolution was of great importance, and it must be hoped that it would be adopted by a very large majority. There would be more likelihood of that happening if the sponsors transferred operative paragraph 1 to the preamble; in its present form, it might be thought that the draft resolution encroached upon the sovereignty of various countries.

13. He understood the difficulties to which the representative of France had referred in connexion with operative paragraph 2; he would nevertheless be prepared to vote in favour of that paragraph.

14. If operative paragraph 1 were maintained, his delegation would abstain on that paragraph, but would vote for the draft resolution as a whole.

15. Mr. FRANZI (Italy) said that, if the sponsors kept paragraph 1 in the operative part of the draft resolution, it would be better not to mention any percentage of national income. Various criteria could be adopted as a basis for estimating the national income of each country. There were even differences of opinion regarding the amount of assistance supplied to the under-developed countries: it was known that the figures quoted in that connexion by the Indian delegation did not tally with the Secretariat's figures. Since the object of the draft resolution was to increase the flow of capital and technical assistance to the developing countries, it would be better for operative paragraph 1 to end with the word "substantially". Moreover, as the title mentioned not only technical assistance but also capital, the word "capital" should appear either in the preamble or in the operative part.

16. His delegation shared the views of the French delegation with regard to operative paragraph 2. He formally proposed an amendment (A/C.2/L.541) to replace the word "States" in paragraph 3 by the words "Member States", so as to conform with the practice which had been followed in all draft resolutions so far adopted.

17. Mr. GREEN (New Zealand) said that the new revised version of the draft resolution was an improvement on the original text, and took some account of the observations made during the debate. In particular, it rightly emphasized, in the fourth preambular paragraph, a fundamental point—that the under-developed

countries themselves were, and must remain, primarily responsible for their economic development. The sponsors had also added, at the end of the preamble, a new paragraph expressing appreciation of the steady contribution already made over the years to the promotion of development by the regular outflow of international assistance. It was generally agreed that the economic development of the under-developed countries should be achieved through co-operation. That imposed obligations on the under-developed countries as well as on the industrial countries; but since that idea was expressed in the preamble, it should also appear in the operative part of the draft resolution.

18. In the first revised version (A/C.2/L.474/Rev.1) operative paragraph 1 had stated that the outflow of international assistance, according to the definitions employed by the United Nations, already ran at the rate of about 1/2 per cent of the national incomes of the economically advanced countries. That phrase had been ambiguous, as the definitions in question in fact referred only to public assistance. That particular ambiguity had been removed in the new version, but there was a further ambiguity in the English text; the title of the draft resolution included the words "flow of capital"; that word "flow" was retained in the first part of the preamble, but in the fifth preambular paragraph, and again in operative paragraphs 1 and 2, the word "outflow" was used. That word "outflow", particularly in the expression "outflow of funds", could refer only to transfers of capital from one country to another. Yet the Indian representative's statements showed clearly that the sponsors were referring to the total amount of capital and technical assistance available, and not merely to transfers of funds from the industrial to the under-developed countries. It would therefore be better to maintain the word "flow" throughout the text. Operative paragraph 1, which was the most important, was still ambiguous. He had hoped that only a target or objective in more general terms would be mentioned in that paragraph. In any event, he would have to obtain further instructions from his Government on that point, and he therefore reserved the right to speak again on that paragraph and, if necessary, to make suggestions.

19. He formally proposed the replacement of operative paragraph 3 by the following text:

"Urges the Governments of the less developed Member States to continue to take and to intensify actions designed to accelerate the pace of their economic development, including those designed to create a climate favourable to an increased flow of capital and technical assistance and to the use of such assistance in a manner serving to the optimum their economic and social development."

20. He shared the views of the representative of France with regard to operative paragraph 2, and hoped that the sponsors would amend that paragraph as suggested by the French delegation.

21. Mr. VIAUD (France) proposed formally that the words "as much as possible" in operative paragraph 2 be replaced by the words "an appropriate part".

22. Mr. DUDLEY (United Kingdom) said that his delegation was in a difficult position. On the one hand, it supported the aims of the draft resolution and was fully aware of the need to accelerate the flow and increase the volume of technical and capital assistance to the developing countries. There was no better proof

of that than the contribution to the development of the less-developed countries made in one form or another by the United Kingdom, representing about 1.2 per cent of its national income and coming for the most part from public funds supplied by the taxpayers. The United Kingdom was therefore prepared to support, by every practical means, the development of the under-developed countries. But the proposal in operative paragraph 1, even in its revised form, was impracticable.

23. The United Kingdom delegation, although it represented a country contributing more than 1 per cent of its national income, thought that the fixing of a specific percentage would only open the way to endless controversy. It was not practicable to achieve agreed assessments of the gross national products of particular countries, or agreed definitions of what constituted aid, or of the extent to which particular countries were meeting such definitions in terms of a percentage contribution. The sponsors' own statements showed that they had decided views on what constituted aid and were prepared to challenge other people's assessments. In any case it would be a mistake to impose on the Secretariat the task of taking part in competitive production of statistics. Even to ask it to define aid would involve it in endless controversy: to go further would be to ensure that however much the Committee members disagreed with each other they would combine in criticising the Secretariat. He did not want to find himself engaged year by year in a quarrel with his Soviet colleague on the relative contributions of their countries to the welfare of the under-developed countries. It was evident from Mr. Chernyshev's own comment on the resolution and his unwillingness to endorse the thesis of operative paragraph 1, that he did not relish that prospect either. They would both like to spare the Committee the prospect of precisely the kind of disagreeable debate which it so rightly disliked. It would therefore be preferable if the delegations which had submitted the draft resolution would agree to amend it in the light of the various comments put forward. His delegation could accept the preamble and operative paragraph 2, subject to the French amendment. In its view, however, the sponsors of the draft resolution would be more likely to achieve their aims if they abandoned the existing wording of operative paragraph 1.

24. The CHAIRMAN, reminding the Committee of the need to keep to its established time-table, asked the representative of India whether he proposed to submit a further revised version of the draft resolution.

25. Mr. B. K. NEHRU (India) said that the sponsors could perhaps take into account some of the new comments and amendments submitted, and amend their text accordingly. They could not, however, agree to remove the figure of 1 per cent or to transfer operative paragraph 1 to the preamble. In his view, operative paragraph 1 in its existing form was not calculated to lead to serious controversy. In 1961 the Committee would have before it the report of the Secretary-General. There might perhaps be some divergence of views, but there was no reason to expect serious misunderstandings. He therefore proposed that discussion of the draft resolution be suspended in order to enable the sponsors to prepare a new revised text.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEMS 28, 30, 31 AND 32

Progress and operations of the Special Fund (A/4415, A/4491, E/3398, E/3401 and Corr.1, SF/L.24 and Corr.1) (continued)

Programmes of technical assistance:

- (a) Report of the Economic and Social Council (A/4415) (continued);
- (b) United Nations assistance in public administration: report of the Secretary-General (A/4589, E/3370 and Corr.1) (continued)

Opportunities for international co-operation on behalf of former Trust Territories and other newly independent States: reports of the Economic and Social Council and of the Secretary-General (A/4415, A/4585) (continued)

Question of assistance to Libya: report of the Secretary-General (A/4575, A/4576) (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.2/L.460 AND ADD.1 AND 2, A/C.2/L.512) (continued)

26. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to continue its consideration of the draft resolution on United Nations assistance in public administration (A/C.2/L.460 and Add.1 and 2).

27. Mr. APODACA (Mexico) said that he merely wished to recall the position taken at the outset by his delegation with regard to the OPEX programme. His country, which had always given keen support to technical assistance programmes, had from the beginning entertained some doubts as to the legality of the OPEX programme, which did not seem to it to be a form of technical assistance. The essence of technical assistance was in fact the provision of aid in the form of advice, and that was not the role of the OPEX personnel. The OPEX programme really constituted a kind of intervention, slight but none the less real, in the domestic affairs of States. It was therefore not in conformity with the principles of the Charter, and was in fact contrary to the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter. Accordingly, his delegation could not vote in favour of the draft resolution, and would abstain.

28. Mr. BERNARDO (Argentina) thanked the representatives of Sudan and Ghana for having borne his delegation's comments in mind when they had furnished the Committee, at its previous meeting, with additional explanations. His delegation hoped that it might be possible to find a solution satisfactory to all, but did not think that a compromise on the draft resolution's existing wording could emerge. The suggestion of the representative of Ghana would, however, lead to its improvement and his own delegation could more easily come to a decision if the sponsors took into account the proposals made by the representative of Spain.

29. No speaker had challenged the main argument of the Argentine delegation, which was based on the provisions of Article 100 of the Charter; and the fact that the Governments were willing to accept the experts was not enough to dispose of his delegation's objections.

30. The only way in which to establish the resources for the programme at a level appropriate to the needs was to judge by the numbers of requests for assistance, and that was what he himself had done in his previous statement.

31. Moreover, the desire to recruit competent officers could in no way justify a violation of the principle whereby experts should be recruited on as wide a geographical basis as possible. The developing countries could supply personnel who were perfectly well qualified to provide assistance, and who were better able to understand the problems of the new States than were experts coming from the more advanced countries.

32. Finally, he had been more than a little surprised at the interpretation given to his previous statement by the Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs (708th meeting). In pointing out that the Secretary-General had defended one of his old schemes tenaciously and enthusiastically, he had simply wished to say that it was the Secretary-General who had had the idea of the OPEX programme—as the representative of Sudan had also said—but his intention had been precisely to keep the Secretary-General out of the argument.

33. He also deplored the misunderstanding which had arisen from his quotation of a part of the statement made by the Commissioner for Technical Assistance (694th meeting). If the Secretariat had a certain guilt complex with regard to the OPEX programme, which caused it to speak up in its own defence at every mention of that programme, that was nothing to do with his own delegation. The latter would have found it more satisfactory if the Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs, instead of replying to imaginary attacks, had explained the Secretariat's views on the legal problem arising from the application of Article 100 of the Charter, and had indicated the Secretary-General's reasons for not mentioning the General Assembly recommendation for the utilization, within the framework of the OPEX programme, of training centres for public administration (resolution 1385 (XIV)).

34. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) recalled that his delegation had from the outset favoured the establishment of an international administrative service, and had always considered the OPEX programme as an integral part of technical assistance programmes. He thought that it was not important to discuss whether the programme was of a continuing nature or not. What was sometimes called temporary had a way of lasting and it was enough that the programme should last as long as the under-developed countries thought it could be of use to them.

35. At the previous meeting, the delegations of Argentina, France, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic and Sudan had raised certain questions which had not been satisfactorily elucidated—those, for instance, of the legal status of the OPEX programme, of the training of local personnel, of the co-ordination of the Secretary-General's activities with those of the specialized agencies, and of the recruitment of highly-qualified officers. In that respect, paragraph 270 of the report of the Economic and Social Council (A/4415), which stated that no difficulties had arisen regarding the availability of qualified personnel, seemed to be at variance with the experience of the representative of Sudan.

36. With regard to the geographical distribution of experts by nationality and the use of the human and institutional resources of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, he would like the Commissioner for Technical Assistance to explain what he meant by his statements (694th meeting) that intentions and motives

had often been wrongly interpreted and that the difficulties arising from legislative requirements were not always fully realized. The question of the recruitment of experts and of the use of the contributing countries' resources was of great importance for the programme's future.

37. The representative of the Byelorussian SSR had said that a certain number of requests for assistance had been withdrawn, and it would be interesting to know whether that had come about because of the nationality of the experts proposed, or for other reasons.

38. The Commissioner for Technical Assistance could give the Committee information on several points, but the recipient countries themselves were in the best position to reply to the questions raised. Since some of them were submitting the draft resolution and the others had made no comments, there was reason to think that they were all satisfied with the assistance which they had received under the OPEX programme. That was an added inducement to his delegation to support the draft resolution.

39. Mr. CHA (China) recalled that the Commissioner for Technical Assistance had pointed out that the fact of placing the OPEX programme on a continuing basis did not mean that it was to become a permanent programme. The objective of that programme was to train personnel in the recipient countries; that training process might take more time or less time, according to the job, but it might be that in ten years the programme would have achieved its objectives and would have no more reason for existing. It therefore seemed necessary and logical to organize it on a continuing basis as long as it had a part to play.

40. In order to increase the resources of the programme, which was financed from the ordinary United Nations budget, recourse might be had also to voluntary contributions, which might be made by Governments, by foundations or by private persons.

41. With regard to the geographical distribution of experts by nationality, his delegation was sure that the secretariats of the United Nations, of the specialized agencies and of the International Atomic Energy Agency did everything in their power to recruit experts in all countries. But the secretariats could only try to persuade Governments to accept a particular expert, for, in the last analysis, it was up to Governments to choose the experts who suited them best.

42. Mr. WODAJO (Ethiopia) said that, although his Government had made a request for assistance under the OPEX programme, he had never regarded it with much enthusiasm; it did not seem to him to offer the best possible solution for remedying the present lack of personnel pending the training of cadres in the various countries. Governments could just as well recruit experts themselves where they saw fit, and the OPEX programme did not offer an absolutely indispensable service. It would be better for the human and financial resources of technical assistance not to be dispersed over too large a number of fields, and the technical assistance bodies would render greater service to the under-developed countries by concentrating on a limited number of specific problems. The under-developed countries ought not to be willing to accept whatever cure the United Nations recommended. Besides, the needs which the OPEX programme could satisfy were not among the most urgent ones.

43. His delegation would vote in favour of the programme being placed on a continuing basis, but not on a permanent basis. It hoped that the United Nations would periodically carry out a critical examination of that programme, so that Member States could assess the results obtained.

44. Mr. GEH (Federation of Malaya) said that an OPEX specialist was at present stationed in his country and was rendering extremely valuable service, because he was acting as head of the Department of Statistics, a department which had to supply the statistics which were indispensable for a rational preparation of the development programmes. Special arrangements had been made for the expert to train local personnel, and the results obtained in that field were satisfactory. That was the kind of assistance which the under-developed countries needed most, apart, of course, from financial assistance. The comments from recipient Governments appearing in the report by the Secretary-General to the Economic and Social Council (E/3370 and Corr.1) showed that the OPEX programme had proved itself and that it enabled Governments to meet needs which would not disappear overnight. He was therefore in favour of the programme being placed on a continuing basis.

45. Mr. GALLEGOS (Ecuador) stated that his delegation, although it had always given enthusiastic support to all the technical assistance programmes, could not, for reasons of principle, vote in favour of the present plan. Operational and executive personnel in public administration had to take decisions for which only a national of the country could assume the responsibility. A foreigner might act as adviser, but he could not carry out operational or executive functions in public administration.

46. During the fifteenth session of the Assembly the representative of Ecuador, with other delegations, had urged the United Nations to recruit OPEX specialists from among the personnel trained in the public administration training centres which existed in several countries. He was therefore surprised that that question was not mentioned in the draft resolution. His delegation would abstain from voting.

47. Mr. HEURTEMATTE (Commissioner for Technical Assistance) said that he intended to reply to some of the comments which had been made by recalling certain fundamental principles which governed all technical assistance activities. The OPEX programme, like the other technical assistance programmes, rested on the sacred principle that it was for Governments to decide whether or not to accept the assistance which was offered to them at their request. Ultimately it was the Governments themselves that determined the nature, the details and the characteristics of the assistance extended by the United Nations and the specialized agencies. The Secretariat merely responded to specific requests for assistance and, when a Government asked for an expert in public administration, the Secretariat sent an OPEX officer only if the Government expressly so requested. Whether the expert was to render advisory services or executive services was solely for the Governments themselves to determine. Thus, whether an OPEX post or another type of post was required was again solely within the sovereign rights of a Government to decide, without interference of any sort from the Secretariat or from any other external source.

48. Similarly, the observance of the principle under which the experts should be recruited on as wide a geographical basis as possible did not depend on the will, the whims or the decisions of the Secretariat, but on the decisions of the recipient Governments. It was therefore not within the province or the authority of the Secretariat to determine the geographical distribution of the experts by nationality. The Secretariat's procedure was as follows: it received the requests for assistance, drew up a full and precise description of the duties which the experts were to undertake, and then sent those descriptions to all possible sources of recruitment, in particular to the national technical assistance committees, after which the Governments proposed their candidates and the Secretariat in its turn proposed them to the requesting Governments. In the final instance, it was for the latter to select the candidates who suited them. The Secretariat was the first to wish for an improvement in the geographical distribution of the experts, and it hoped that the future selections of the recipient countries would in fact improve the geographical distribution in line with the wishes of the Second Committee and the Secretariat.

49. He wished to stress, however, for the benefit of the representative of Greece, that certain legislative provisions concerning the time-limits within which the candidatures were to be submitted to the recipient Governments were creating administrative difficulties for the Secretariat. Recalling the statement he had made to the Committee, he pointed out that the administrative infrastructure of technical assistance had to be improved in order to enable the countries mentioned in that statement, namely Eastern Europe and the USSR, to submit more candidates before the expiration of present deadlines and in time for them to be accepted by the recipient countries.

50. All the contracts placed the OPEX officials under an obligation to train national personnel, but it had never been seriously suggested that such training could or had to take place within one year or within any other specific period. It was very obvious that the experimental nature of the programme did not permit contracts of longer than a year's duration; but in fact it was expected that all of those contracts would be extended, and there was nothing wrong or sinful about the extension of contracts, as had been insinuated. Extensions were, in fact, normal, expected and in every sense a correct procedure. The duration of an assignment would depend on a multitude of factors: the difficulty of the work, the competence of the counterpart personnel offered by the recipient Government for training, etc.; but there again, in the final analysis, it was the recipient Government that would have the primary authority for determining the duration of a mission.

51. With respect to the insinuation that an OPEX expert might become a lever with which the Secretariat could influence or exert pressures on the recipient country, the members of the Committee should realize that as soon as the OPEX specialist had signed his contract, he had severed all ties with the Secretariat; he was from then on a civil servant of the country to which he had been sent, and no longer obeyed any orders except those of the Government which he had agreed to serve. He no longer received any instructions from the United Nations Secretariat, and indeed it could be said that the Secretariat intervened much less in the internal affairs of the country to which

the OPEX specialist was posted than in the case of the ordinary technical assistance expert, who was responsible for advising the Government and who continued to depend on the technical assistance bodies, which in their turn examined, vetted and approved beforehand whatever reports he made to the recipient Government.

52. He reminded the representative of Argentina that the Secretary-General had been acting in accordance with the resolutions concerning the OPEX programme adopted by the General Assembly, and that the fact of implementing those resolutions would not constitute a violation of the Charter, unless, of course, the resolutions themselves violated the Charter, a notion which would appear to have very little support.

53. The Secretariat had never wilfully ignored any provision of General Assembly resolution 1385 (XIV), as had been charged, but it appeared that the nature of the training institutions referred to in that resolution had been misunderstood. Those institutions had as their main purpose in the field of public administration, the training, generally at a middle level, of civil servants who had a definite place in their own respective administrations and who were being better fitted for their jobs. The civil servants who graduated from those institutions were not the highly qualified, highly experienced experts in specific and technical fields who were requested under the OPEX programme. Quoting from the Secretary-General's report (A/4589), he read out the first five posts on the list in Annex II and pointed out that highly qualified and experienced technicians in such highly specialized fields were not available from any of the training institutions mentioned.

54. Mr. OMAR (Afghanistan) said that the sponsors needed to consult together and that they would prepare a revised text of the draft resolution for the next meeting.

55. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the draft resolution on the possibilities of increasing voluntary contributions to the operational fund of the IAEA (A/C.2/L.512), submitted by Brazil, Ghana, India and Yugoslavia.

56. Mr. MARIZ (Brazil) congratulated the Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency on the report he had submitted covering the Agency's programme for 1960.^{1/} With regard to the part of the report relating to the budget, however, it would be useful to have more details and more precise information in future on the distribution of income and expenditure. With regard to the supplying of fissionable materials, it should be borne in mind that one of the main purposes of the Agency was to supply those materials to States that required them. While the United States had volunteered to supply large quantities, certain other States, instead of enlarging their contributions, had tried to bring politics into the Agency. Such an attitude was regrettable from the point of view both of the Agency and of the member States which needed the materials for setting up atomic medical research centres or atomic power plants.

57. He reminded the Committee that the Agency had two budgets: a regular budget, based upon the scale of

^{1/} Annual Report of the Board of Governors to the General Conference, 1 July 1959—30 June 1960 (Vienna, July 1960). Transmitted to Members of the General Assembly by a note of the Secretary-General (A/4531 and Corr.1 and Add.1).

assessments for Members of the United Nations, and an operational budget dependent on voluntary contributions. The reluctance of some economically advanced nations to increase their quotas to the operational fund was disquieting, for technical assistance activities were financed largely from that fund. The Agency was devoting a substantial part of its means to technical assistance programmes and should continue to do so. Brazil could testify to the success of that policy, which should be encouraged. Brazil, which had pledged \$30,000 to the operational fund for 1961, felt that it could appeal to the economically developed member States to increase their voluntary contributions. The Agency had already achieved encouraging results, but the sponsors of the draft resolution realized that the operational fund for 1961 would not allow any expansion of the Agency's technical assistance programme.

58. He wished to make it clear that his appeal was not directed either to the United States or to the United Kingdom, which had pledged \$500,000 and \$140,000 respectively for 1961. He was sure that, once the Algerian question was settled, France would also be able to increase substantially its contribution to the Agency. Unfortunately, other economically advanced member States had not followed that encouraging example, and it was to them that the sponsors of the draft resolution were addressing their friendly request.

59. The CHAIRMAN invited the representative of the International Atomic Energy Agency to comment on the draft resolution.

60. Mr. FREEMAN (International Atomic Energy Agency) gave a brief account of the Agency's technical assistance activities, which consisted primarily in organizing fellowships, exchange and training; in providing the services of experts; in furnishing limited quantities of technical equipment; and in undertaking the preliminary surveys that were often needed to prepare for large-scale technical assistance. The Agency's activities in 1959 and 1960 under the last of those headings had included visits by preliminary assistance missions to study the atomic energy needs of some Latin American countries and of the Federation of Mali, Greece, the Ivory Coast, Morocco, the Sudan and Tunisia.

61. Those preparatory efforts had given good results. In 1959 and 1960, fifty-eight experts had been sent to various countries for a total of 559 man-months. Furthermore, under the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance, the Agency was carrying out a programme in 1960 involving the provision of the services of twenty-six experts for a total of 180 man-months. The Agency also made research grants in certain member States to encourage and facilitate research in national and regional institutions. The most important activity, however, had been the fellowship programme: the Agency had offered more than 1,000 fellowships during the first three years of its existence. Some people might wonder why such emphasis had been placed on fellowships and training. The reason was the present shortage of atomic energy specialists, not only in the less developed countries, but also in the technically advanced countries. To remedy that situation, the Agency had organized a broad programme of fellowships and scholarships, of exchange of professors and experts, and of training courses.

62. The Agency's activities were financed by voluntary contributions to the General Fund; by donations in

kind, including the provision of the services of experts, the granting of fellowships and scholarships and the supply of equipment; and by funds made available to the Agency as a result of its participation in the Expanded Programme. The Agency's activities, unlike those of the specialized agencies, were largely dependent upon the voluntary contributions of member States. Unfortunately, the target figure set by the General Conference had never been reached since the Agency's establishment. In the year 1959, for which the target figure had been \$1,500,000, the total amount pledged had been \$1,183,044. The target figure for 1960 had been the same, but the amount thus far pledged by member States was \$996,949. The General Conference had set a target figure of \$1,800,000 for 1961, and \$1,079,408 had thus far been pledged.

63. The status of the Agency's operational budget for technical assistance was not reassuring. Judging by the requests for the year 1961 addressed to the Agency by member States, it looked as if the Agency would be short by \$250,000 of the amount needed to meet those requests, even if the target figure of \$1,800,000 was reached. Requests had been received under the Agency's regular programme to a total of about \$1,500,000, and the requests that would be submitted to the Board of Governors for approval would amount to only \$513,000: owing to the Agency's limited resources, it had had to put off the examination of a considerable number of applications. In the light of the contributions pledged, it was probable that the operational fund would receive only \$1,139,000, and not \$1,800,000. The Agency would therefore probably be able to carry out only two-thirds of the projects to be considered by the Board of Governors.

64. Mr. VIAUD (France) remarked that the draft resolution raised the problem of the relations between the United Nations and a body like the Agency, which had an organization, a technical assistance programme and means of financing of its own, on which the Committee had no detailed information. It would have been easier for the Committee to take a decision on the important question referred to in the draft resolution if the matter had first been studied by the Economic and Social Council's Co-ordination Committee, on which the specialized agencies and the Agency were represented. The draft resolution raised a number of practical questions, such as the nature and scope of the technical assistance programmes, the total contributions pledged and the total contributions needed to carry out the programmes—all of them technical matters that called for study. He therefore suggested that the question should be referred to the Council, so that the Co-ordination Committee could study it and make recommendations which would enable the General Assembly to take a decision on the basis of a more detailed knowledge of the facts.

65. Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) regretted that the Brazilian representative had mentioned only the United Kingdom and the United States as major contributors to the operational fund, although other countries were also making an important contribution to the Agency's programme. The USSR delegation would not oppose the draft resolution, but it felt that the Agency should make use of all the available contributions; no use had been made of the contributions of some countries, including those of the USSR.

66. Mr. FLERE (Yugoslavia) reminded the French representative that the Administrative Committee on

Co-ordination had considered the Agency's programme. That Committee submitted an annual report to the Council which was discussed by the Council's Co-ordination Committee, mentioned by the French representative. The Agency's programme had already been communicated to the Council. Every member of the Second Committee was aware of the importance of the activities undertaken by the Agency under its operational programme. Those activities deserved the Committee's support and the sponsors of the draft resolution were accordingly unable to accept the French representative's suggestions.

67. Mr. MARIZ (Brazil) pointed out that the purpose of the draft resolution was to draw the Committee's attention to the importance of the Agency's technical assistance programmes and to the inadequate funds at its disposal for their execution. The financial position of the Agency, as explained by its representative, fully justified an appeal to Member States. Such an appeal might evoke a favourable response in the economically advanced countries and lead to their co-operating more actively.

68. Mr. WOULBROUN (Belgium), replying to the representative of Yugoslavia, pointed out that the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination was the competent organ for co-ordination at the Secretariat level, in other words, when inter-Governmental decisions had already been made. The Co-ordination Committee of the Council was competent before that and at a higher level, namely, that of Government decisions. Belgium did not deny the importance of the Agency's programme, since, for a small country, it was taking an active part and playing quite an important role in the field of atomic energy. However, it should not be forgotten that the Committee had recently made many appeals for various kinds of assistance by the industrialized countries; so it might be advisable to space them out a little. The French representative's suggestion might offer the best solution. In the opinion of the Belgian delegation, the Committee needed to ponder the matter and it would be preferable to postpone the vote on the draft resolution to the following day.

69. Mr. FLERE (Yugoslavia) supported the Belgian representative's suggestion that the vote on the draft resolution should be postponed to the following day. In the meantime, the sponsors would try to convince those who still had some doubts about the importance of the question. They hoped that their efforts would be successful and that the draft resolution would be adopted unanimously.

70. Mr. GARCIA TEJEDOR (Spain) said that the draft resolution was acceptable to him, because the funds which the Agency had at its disposal were obviously insufficient to meet the requests made to it. It was therefore to be hoped that the sponsors of the draft resolution would be able to find a text that was acceptable to all delegations.

71. Mr. ROBERTSON (Australia) said that his delegation would support the draft resolution, which aimed at increasing contributions to the Agency's operational fund; an increase was indispensable if the Agency was to expand its technical assistance activities and meet the requirements of member States. In 1960, the Australian Government's contribution had been double its contribution for 1958.

72. Mr. FRANZI (Italy) emphasized the importance which the under-developed countries attached to atomic energy. For that reason, the Italian delegation was in favour of the draft resolution. However, it suggested that the word "Urges" in the operative portion should be replaced by the word "Invites". It would also prefer operative paragraph 2 to be addressed not only to economically developed countries, which were already making large contributions, but to all the countries that were interested in the Agency's programme. Paragraph 2 might be reworded to read as follows: "Invites States Members of the United Nations or members of the International Atomic Energy Agency to increase their voluntary contributions to the operational fund of the Agency". That wording omitted the word "substantially".

73. Mr. KAUFMANN (Netherlands) said that his delegation would vote for the draft resolution. It felt, however, that the French representative had made a pertinent suggestion which might be met by the insertion of a new paragraph in the preamble. That paragraph might be worded as follows: "Taking into account the role of the Economic and Social Council in co-ordinating assistance programmes".

74. Mr. VIAUD (France) pointed out that there was a difference between the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination, which was composed of international civil servants, and the Council's Co-ordination Committee, the members of which were representatives of Governments. In his view, a procedure which would involve a decision by the Second Committee on a question it had not considered would be improper. The Netherlands proposal had the merit of recognizing the Council's role, but that did nothing to alter the fact that the normal procedure was not being followed. In the view of his delegation, the Committee could not take up a draft resolution urging countries to increase their contributions to the Agency when the Agency's report had not been given detailed consideration and the Council had made no recommendation. The French delegation would therefore be obliged to abstain on the draft resolution.

75. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the sponsors of the draft resolution should meet and consider the suggestions that had been made, with a view to deciding whether they could submit a revised text.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.