



CONTENTS

<i>Agenda item 31:</i>	<i>Page</i>
<i>Programmes of technical assistance (continued):</i>	
<i>(a) Report of the Economic and Social Council;</i>	
<i>(b) United Nations assistance in public administration: report of the Secretary-General</i>	<i>109</i>
<i>Consideration of draft resolutions</i>	<i>109</i>

Chairman: Mr. Marcial TAMAYO (Bolivia).

AGENDA ITEM 31

Programmes of technical assistance (continued):

- (a) Report of the Economic and Social Council (A/4143, chap. III, sect. X - XII, A/C.2/L.413, A/C.2/L.415);
- (b) United Nations assistance in public administration: report of the Secretary-General (A/4212 and Corr.1 and Add.1, A/C.2/L.414)

1. Mr. UMARI (Iraq) said that he had listened carefully to the statements of the Executive Chairman of TAB, the Commissioner for Technical Assistance and the Director of the Office for Public Administration (601st meeting). Like them, he thought that the country programming procedures represented an improvement over former arrangements. However, everything was not yet perfect. It was not really right to ascribe all the defects of the present programme to Governments. While it was true that Governments made their actual requests, it was the participating organizations and TAB which approved the programmes to be carried out and determined the sums to be allocated to each country. Admittedly, eighty-two Governments could not be asked to divide the funds between the various projects themselves, but perhaps an attempt could be made to improve the present procedure for allocating those funds.

2. Mr. BERNARDO (Argentina) observed that the Executive Chairman of TAB had, in his statement, duly noted the various suggestions which had been made during the discussion, including the Swedish representative's suggestion (595th meeting) concerning assistance in family planning. His Government did not think that TAB's terms of reference permitted it to give assistance of that kind; in order to do so, it would have to request the authorization of the General Assembly. If a resolution were submitted to that effect, his Government would oppose it, considering it to be a violation of the principles of the United Nations Charter.

**CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS
 (A/C.2/L.413-415)**

3. Mr. BANNIER (Netherlands) introduced the seventeen-Power draft resolution on the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance (A/C.2/L.413). After drawing attention to the preambular paragraphs, he commented briefly on the paragraphs of the operative part. Paragraph 1 ought not to raise any objections. In paragraph 2, by "increased efficiency" in the operations of the Programme the seventeen Powers meant operations which would be both simpler and more flexible. In paragraph 3, they had noted the Council's decision on the subject of longer range planning in programming procedures in order to give it full emphasis. In paragraph 4, they had tried to take into account the efforts TAB was already making to ensure the fullest possible use of contributions. Sub-paragraph 5 (a) embodied the terms which the Committee had used in its resolution concerning the Special Fund, and in sub-paragraph 5 (b) the sponsors of the draft had made special mention not only of the newly independent countries but also of the countries which were in a similar economic and social condition, since their requirements were just as great, while at the same time they had pointed out the necessity of not reducing assistance to other under-developed countries, something which could be avoided if the programme's resources were increased.

4. He hoped that that draft resolution would be adopted unanimously.

5. Mr. ZELLEKE (Ethiopia) said that the draft resolution on the regular programme of technical assistance (A/C.2/L.415), of which his country was a sponsor, was practically identical with the one which the Committee had adopted at the thirteenth session of the General Assembly. In congratulating the Secretary-General, the seven Powers had wished to pay a tribute, through him, to all the members of the Secretariat and, in particular, to the Commissioner for Technical Assistance, who had done so much to speed up the implementation of the regular programme.

6. He hoped that that draft resolution would receive the unanimous support of the members of the Committee.

7. Mr. OMAR (Afghanistan), introducing the draft resolution on assistance in public administration (A/C.2/L.414) on behalf of its sponsors, recalled that the need for furnishing countries with assistance in public administration had long been evident. As the question had been raised in the General Assembly and the Second Committee during the last few years, the Economic and Social Council had decided, following a proposal by the Secretary-General, to seek the views of Member States. Fifty-five Governments had approved the idea of a programme of possible assistance and the Economic and Social Council, in its resolution 681 (XXVI), had recommended that such a programme

should be carried out on a limited and experimental basis. After careful consideration, the General Assembly, in resolution 1256 (XIII), had decided that that assistance would be provided using the existing machinery of the United Nations Secretariat and without any increase in administrative costs. The relations between the United Nations, the experts and the Governments concerned had then been defined and Governments had been assisted in the preparation and submission of their requests. The programme undoubtedly met a real need, since by 10 September 1959 the Secretariat had received 106 requests from thirty countries. However, as the Secretary-General's resources were very limited, he had been able to appoint only twenty-five experts. In his report (A/4212 and Corr.1 and Add.1), he had accordingly asked that the officers who had been appointed in 1959 for one year should be retained through another year, in all cases where the Government concerned so desired, and that some increase in the number of appointments should be authorized in 1960. In its resolution 739 (XXVIII), the Economic and Social Council had recommended to the General Assembly that the experiment be continued, taking into account the views expressed in the Technical Assistance Committee.

8. Recognizing that the programme was so new and of such limited scope that no conclusions concerning it could yet be drawn, and believing that it was necessary to meet the urgent needs of countries and not to confine the Secretary-General within too close limits, the four Powers requested, in operative paragraph 1, that the programme should be continued and that the Secretary-General should be allowed adequate scope in carrying it out; nevertheless, they left it entirely to the Fifth Committee to decide the exact sum to be allocated to the Secretary-General.

9. He hoped that that draft resolution would be adopted unanimously, since the programme for the provision of operational, executive and administrative personnel (OPEX) had already proved that it would help to accelerate the economic and social development of the under-developed countries by providing them with the requisite administrative staff until their own nationals had received the necessary training.

10. Mr. KAMENOV (Bulgaria) submitted an amendment (A/C.2/L.416) to the seventeen-Power draft resolution (A/C.2/L.413) on behalf of his country and the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic. The principle of universality, which he had already defended in the Committee in connexion with the Special Fund, should also be observed with respect to the Expanded Programme. The German Democratic Republic had twice made a sum of 400,000 marks, or the equivalent of \$360,000 in all, available for technical assistance and it was regrettable that those offers had been refused. Those sums had remained unused for reasons which were not in conformity with the statute of the Expanded Programme, with the decisions of the General Assembly, or with the principles of technical assistance. The German Democratic Republic had accordingly discontinued its contributions. Thus, the interests of the under-developed countries had been sacrificed for reasons completely foreign to the very principles of technical assistance. That refusal was all the more inexplicable as the representatives of the German Democratic Republic had been permitted to sit with the Foreign Ministers at the Geneva conference in the summer of 1959 and as Economic and Social

Council resolution 222 (IX), unlike General Assembly resolution 1240 (XIII) concerning the Special Fund, did not specify that the only Governments permitted to contribute were States Members of the United Nations or members of the specialized agencies.

11. Bulgaria and the Byelorussian SSR, therefore, could not agree that the General Assembly should address itself solely to those States which had already made contributions to the Expanded Programme. They hoped that their amendments would be adopted unanimously, so that a final solution could be provided for a situation which was prejudicial to the common work of technical assistance and so that all States which desired to do so could contribute to the Expanded Programme.

12. Mr. BERNARDO (Argentina) said that the Spanish version of sub-paragraph 5 (b) of the seventeen-Power draft resolution did not correctly convey the meaning intended by the sponsors. They had drafted the sub-paragraph in such a way as to take into account the concern expressed by the delegations which had drawn attention to the need not only to give more assistance to the new States but also to increase the assistance given to other under-developed countries. As a matter of fact, the amount of aid granted to Latin America, for example, had decreased by 25 per cent, while the resources of the programme had dropped by 5 per cent. Accordingly the English phrase "the possibility of further assistance" should be translated in Spanish by "la posibilidad de dar mayor asistencia".

13. Mr. WOULBROUN (Belgium) thought that operative paragraph 5 of the seventeen-Power draft resolution was open to criticism. Its meaning was not sufficiently clear and it emphasized a political factor, whereas the Committee should deal essentially with social and economic matters. Moreover, the reference to the possibility of further assistance to under-developed countries seemed to imply that such further assistance was not required for newly independent countries and countries in a similar economic and social condition. The authors had really meant to express the hope that the Expanded Programme would be so conducted as to meet the needs of all the less developed countries, giving priority to countries in a particularly difficult situation and especially to newly independent countries, without forgetting countries in an intermediate position. He thought that the idea might be expressed more clearly and he offered the following text, simply as a suggestion:

"Expresses the hope that Governments will give increased support to the Expanded Programme in order to allow of the sustained execution of the tasks entrusted to it and urges the Technical Assistance Board to give priority to satisfying the needs of countries in a difficult economic and social condition and especially of newly independent countries."

He approved of the term "expresses the hope", for his Government was already making substantial financial and technical contributions to the Expanded Programme.

14. Mr. FINGER (United States of America) regretted that the Bulgarian and Byelorussian delegations had chosen to bring into the discussion political considerations which had no connexion with the aim of the Programme or the needs of the under-developed countries. Everyone knew that the so-called German

Democratic Republic had tried to make a contribution to the Expanded Programme; it might with advantage make that sum available to the Federal Republic of Germany to help meet the needs of the two million Germans who had left Eastern Germany.

15. The Bulgarian and Byelorussian delegations were mistaken in trying to base their position on Economic and Social Council resolution 222 A (IX), for in paragraph 13 (b) that resolution referred to "all Members of the United Nations and all other Governments members of any specialized agency participating in the programme".

16. The Expanded Programme had been set up not for the purpose of facilitating the recognition of certain régimes by the international community or of providing employment for the experts of certain countries, but in order to grant technical assistance to under-developed countries. The Executive Chairman of TAB and the Commissioner for Technical Assistance had stated plainly that no State which had expressed a desire to receive a Soviet expert had complained of not having received satisfaction.

17. The main problem was to increase the resources of the Programme. Those who spoke, in that connexion, of the principle of universality and of the utilization of contributions were only putting up a twofold smoke screen to obscure the fact that the Soviet bloc's contribution to the Expanded Programme and the Special Fund constituted only 4 per cent of the total contributions and that the sum contributed by the Soviet Union amounted to only one-twentieth of the amount pledged by the United States of America.

18. While it was understandable that under-developed countries could not make contributions in readily convertible currencies, it was very difficult to believe that the Soviet Union was unable to furnish \$1 million in convertible currency, which would give recipient countries a free choice of their source of aid.

19. If the amendment proposed by the Bulgarian and Byelorussian delegations were adopted, the United States delegation would be compelled to withdraw from the list of sponsors of the draft resolution.

20. Mr. MOANACK (Venezuela) announced that his delegation was preparing an amendment to the seventeen-Power draft resolution and hoped to be able to submit it at the next meeting.^{1/}

21. Mr. STANOVNIK (Yugoslavia) expressed the hope that the discussion would not be continued along political lines; all States should try to agree on the subject of technical assistance. There were no blocs in the United Nations; it was composed of independent States, which made their decisions individually.

22. The sponsors of the seventeen-Power draft resolution had prepared the text with the greatest care, in the hope that it would be acceptable to all the members of the Committee, including delegations which, like his, had reaffirmed their attachment to the principle of universality. The first sentence of paragraph 5 represented an advance on the resolution adopted regarding the special Fund, for it referred simply to "Governments", without any qualification or restriction.

23. In sub-paragraph 5 (b) the sponsors had tried to take into account the basic concerns which had been expressed during the general debate.

24. Although the wording of that sub-paragraph was not perfect, the text proposed by the Belgian representative did not overcome all the difficulties and it might, he feared, give rise to a number of sub-amendments, which would complicate the situation still more.

25. Mr. GURINOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the Byelorussian and Bulgarian delegations had approached the question of the resources of the Expanded Programme from a practical and concrete standpoint, with primary concern for the interests of all the under-developed countries. It was the United States delegation, which had no desire to understand the intentions of the sponsors of the amendment, that had diverted the discussion to political issues, perhaps in the hope of rallying its supporters. If there was to be any talk of blocs, it would be easy to show that, in that realm, the United States had nothing to learn from anyone. The situation in the German Democratic Republic was not on the Second Committee's agenda, but it would be equally easy to show that the situation of workers in that country was better than in the United States, for they were not faced with the spectre of unemployment. Nor was there any unemployment in the other Socialist countries; if they sent experts to under-developed countries, it was certainly not to give them employment but in order to assist the under-developed countries and to help redress a historical wrong for which the Socialist countries were not responsible.

26. The passage from Economic and Social Council resolution 222 A (IX) cited by the United States representative referred only to the States which should have the right to vote at the Technical Assistance Conference. In annex II of that resolution, however, the General Assembly invited "all Governments" to make as large voluntary contributions as possible to the special account for technical assistance.

27. Nobody could contend that the United Nations and the under-developed countries would not benefit if the Expanded Programme received contributions from the German Democratic Republic and from other States which were ready to participate in financing the Programme and had not done so only because the United Nations had refused the contribution of the German Democratic Republic. When it was a question of furnishing assistance to all those that needed it, political considerations should not enter into play.

28. Mr. PENTEADO (Brazil) thought that the text of sub-paragraph 5 (b) was not clear and that the Belgian representative's suggestion would improve it.

29. Mr. ARKADEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the advice which the United States representative had seen fit to give to certain countries on the manner in which they should act was not likely to facilitate the settlement of the question of technical assistance. The amendment presented by the Byelorussian SSR and Bulgaria represented, as several representatives had stressed, a practical means of increasing the technical assistance furnished to under-developed countries. The German Democratic Republic knew how it should use the funds at its disposal. It spent considerable sums in settling and finding employment for all the Germans who came from Western Germany. It had offered a contribution to the Expanded Programme but that had been refused by the policy-makers of the United Nations. There was noth-

^{1/}Subsequently distributed as document A/C.2/L.418

ing to justify that refusal, which was contrary to the provisions of the Charter and was prompted by political considerations. Such unfair arbitrary action impaired the prestige of the United Nations and was prejudicial to the material welfare of the less developed countries. What explanation was there for the fact that the Government of Western Germany was permitted to participate in the Programme while the offers of the German Democratic Republic were refused? Western Germany also was not a Member of the United Nations. The same question arose with regard to the People's Republic of China and other countries willing to place funds at the disposal of the Expanded Programme. The USSR delegation had protested against such practices and would continue to press for their discontinuance and for the elimination of the political considerations which should not enter into a project of international co-operation.

30. The attempt to ascribe certain intentions to the countries which defended the principle of universality was futile. Those countries were not trying to find employment for their experts. In the USSR, 19,000 people received engineering diplomas every year but even that number was not enough. When the USSR sent engineers and experts abroad, it was depriving itself of services which would be very useful to its economy.

31. The USSR therefore supported the Byelorussian-Bulgarian amendment, the sole aim of which was to remedy a deplorable situation which was contrary to the interests of the United Nations and of the under-developed countries.

32. Mr. DUDLEY (United Kingdom) said that he appreciated the good intentions of the Belgian representative, but he thought it would be difficult at that stage to introduce important changes into a draft which had been produced after long consultations between its sponsors. The United Kingdom delegation did not think that the existing text of the seventeen-Power draft resolution raised any problems. It contained nothing which might be interpreted as a comparison between the levels of development of the different under-developed countries. The only dis-

tinction between those countries was political: and the wish to make that distinction was understandable, for it was possible that the countries which had only recently acquired independence might not be fully aware of the possibilities open to them. He was nevertheless prepared to agree that the sponsors of the draft resolution might meet in order to consider how their text could be improved.

33. So far as the amendment presented by the Byelorussian SSR and Bulgaria was concerned, he considered that, despite the denials of the delegations from the Soviet bloc, it raised a primarily political issue. That was proved by the observations of the Byelorussian and USSR representatives regarding Eastern Germany. In fact, the introduction of that amendment had been bound to give rise to a political discussion. The Bulgarian representative had cited a passage from Economic and Social Council resolution 222 A (IX) which, in his opinion, showed that all Governments without distinction could take part in the Expanded Programme. That passage, however, appeared in annex II. The United States representative had cited the text of the resolution itself — paragraph 13 (b) — which spoke of the Members of the United Nations and all other Governments members of any specialized agency participating in the programme. The text of the annex could not justify an interpretation inconsistent with the contents of the resolution itself.

34. In conclusion, he quoted a passage from annex I, according to which the technical assistance furnished was not to be a means of foreign economic and political interference in the internal affairs of the country concerned and not to be accompanied by any considerations of a political nature — a moral which might well be taken to heart by the Committee in its debates.

35. After an exchange of views, the CHAIRMAN proposed that the sponsors of the seventeen-Power draft resolution and the Venezuelan representative should confer together before the Committee's next meeting, on the understanding that all interested delegations would be able to take part in that consultation.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.