



**CONTENTS**

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 26:	
Programmes of technical assistance ( <i>continued</i> ):	
(a) Report of the Economic and Social Council ( <i>continued</i> )	
Question of currency utilization ( <i>concluded</i> ).....	71
Question of the membership of the Technical Assistance Committee .....	72
Regulations concerning the Working Capital and Reserve Fund of the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance .....	73
Implementation and expansion of the programmes of technical assistance.....	73
Question of technical assistance in public administration .....	73

**Chairman:** Mr. Mohammad MIR KHAN (Pakistan).

**AGENDA ITEM 26**

**Programmes of technical assistance (*continued*):**  
**(a) Report of the Economic and Social Council (A/3154, A/C.2/L.189 and Add.1) (*continued*)**

**QUESTION OF CURRENCY UTILIZATION (A/C.2/L.283, A/C.2/L.291) (*concluded*)**

1. Mr. O'NAGHTEN (Cuba) said that the Yugoslav and Polish representatives had explained at the 400th meeting that they had supported the sixteen-Power resolution (A/C.2/L.291) and the Czechoslovak and Romanian joint draft resolution (A/C.2/L.283) because they felt that the object of both texts was to refer the question of currency utilization back to the Economic and Social Council for reconsideration. He, on the contrary, had voted for the sixteen-Power resolution because it neither endorsed nor rejected Council resolution 623 B III (XXII) and merely referred the records of the debate to the Council and the Technical Assistance Committee (TAC).

2. He had voted against the first USSR amendment, submitted verbally at the 400th meeting, because it would mean reopening the question dealt with in Council resolution 623 B III (XXII). While he did not agree that, as the Ukrainian representative had implied, the amended text would prevent the implementation of resolution 623 B III (XXII), he had voted against the USSR amendment because of the interpretation placed upon it by its advocates.

3. Although he would have preferred the retention of the reference, in the second clause of the preamble of the sixteen-Power draft resolution, to paragraph 6 of resolution 623 B III (XXII), he had abstained in the vote on the Egyptian amendment because the Egyptian representative had proposed it in the hope of achieving unanimity.

4. He had voted against the second USSR verbal amendment which was obviously intended to call in question the Council resolution.

5. Mr. MARIN PAREJA (Bolivia) said that his delegation had voted against the draft resolution submitted by Czechoslovakia and Romania because it considered that it reduced the effectiveness of Economic and Social Council resolution 623 B III (XXII) which was intended to provide a real solution, at least in part, to the problem of the utilization of non-convertible currencies. Despite repeated protestations of concern for the principle of multilateralism made by the delegations of Czechoslovakia and Romania and by the representative of the Soviet Union, the fact of the matter was that unless the problem of convertibility was solved there would ultimately be a reversion to bilateralism. Technical assistance would then cease to be a genuinely international co-operative undertaking independent of contributing countries since, as a general rule, a non-convertible currency could be used only in a region or group of States constituting a specific zone of influence.

6. Consequently the Bolivian delegation was prepared to support the draft resolution submitted by Argentina, Cuba and eight other countries (A/C.2/L.286), the purpose of which was to endorse and approve Economic and Social Council resolution 623 B III (XXII) which, as already explained, was an effective resolution. He would have voted for that draft, but it had been withdrawn in the course of the discussion and replaced by the sixteen-Power draft (A/C.2/L.291). The latter was intended as a compromise formula, but did not serve that purpose since it failed to deal with the substance of the question and merely postponed the issue once again, although there had been no changes in the situation since the adoption of Council resolution 623 B III (XXII) to justify its reconsideration. His delegation had been unable to vote for a text which it had considered to be wholly ineffective and dilatory, and had therefore abstained.

7. Mr. PENA (Philippines) explained that he had voted against the Egyptian amendment because it would have meant a further dilution of the sixteen-Power draft resolution, which was already a compromise formula. After the adoption of the Egyptian amendment, he had voted for the amended draft resolution in a spirit of co-operation. In his view, the Committee should have not only reiterated Council resolution 623 B III (XXII) but also recommended its application.

8. Mr. DE GAAY FORTMAN (Netherlands) stated that he had voted for the sixteen-Power resolution as amended by Egypt because it did not mean that the Committee endorsed or rejected the Council resolution which, as the Australian representative had pointed out, was valid in its own right.

9. Mr. ARAGON (Guatemala) stressed that the draft resolution (A/C.2/L.291) had no effect on the Council resolution, which was a well-conceived at-

tempt to solve the problem of currency utilization. He favoured the draft resolution submitted by Argentina and other delegations (A/C.2/L.286), but felt the submission of the records to the Council and TAC might facilitate further review of the currency problem.

10. The Council's main efforts were aimed at promoting voluntary international co-operation within the Expanded Programme in the most efficient manner; they did not affect the recipient countries.

11. Mr. SOLLI (Norway) said that he had abstained on the Egyptian amendment not because he disagreed with it but because it did not change the original text to any great extent. The sixteen-Power resolution was a compromise which reflected the fact that the Committee had confidence in the Council and TAC; neither rejection nor endorsement of the Council's position was implied. During its three-year term of office in the Council and TAC, his delegation had been convinced that such complex technical problems were for those bodies to solve. He was confident that the Council had at no time acted in any way which was inconsistent with the principle underlying technical assistance.

12. Mr. SARWAR (Afghanistan) remarked that he shared the views of those members of the Committee who had stressed the importance of finding a compromise formula. There had been a general feeling that the question of currency utilization should be discussed further by the Council. He had therefore voted for the sixteen-Power resolution, which took no position with regard to the Council resolution.

13. Mr. OMPI (Indonesia) said that he too had voted for the sixteen-Power resolution, the adoption of which meant that the question of the Council resolution would remain open for reconsideration at the twenty-fourth session. He felt that the problem would be solved if sufficient time were allowed. He was glad that the resolution had been adopted by a large majority, although he would have preferred unanimity. He trusted that the problem of currency utilization would be finally settled at the Council's twenty-fourth session to the satisfaction of all.

14. Mr. MOLDOVAN (Romania) considered that to link the sixteen-Power resolution with Council resolution 623 B III (XXII) implied approval of the latter, which he regarded as unacceptable and likely to impede the operation of the Programme. He hoped that as a result of the decision to refer the records of the debate to the Council and TAC the entire question would be reviewed, and that the principle of voluntary contributions would be safeguarded.

15. Mr. HALIQ (Saudi Arabia) said that his delegation understood the position adopted by the Czechoslovak, Romanian and Soviet Union delegations, since they felt that a question of principle was involved. It was clear that, for various reasons, the whole question of currency utilization called for a careful and objective scrutiny. The placing of a ceiling on the national currency content of contributions might have unfortunate consequences for those countries whose contributions were already in the neighbourhood of the equivalent of \$500,000. Again, it appeared that some countries might make a profit out of their contribution. As to the matter of the Committee's endorsement or rejection of Council resolution 623 B III (XXII), his delegation saw it not as a legal but as a practical problem; it had often happened in the past that resolutions on important topics had passed to and fro between the Committee and the Council before a text acceptable to both had been reached. In sponsoring the sixteen-

Power resolution his delegation had had no doubts about the legal position. It hoped, however, that the question of principle raised by the Czechoslovak, Romanian and Soviet Union delegations could be settled in the General Assembly; it would be a pity to engage in further fruitless debate in the Second Committee.

16. Mr. ISIK (Turkey) said that his delegation had hoped that the Committee would take a firm stand in favour of Council resolution 623 B III (XXII). It had voted in favour of the joint draft as a compromise measure in the hope that the Council would reaffirm its earlier resolution and not, as appeared to be the case with other delegations, in the hope that it would go back on that resolution. With regard to the legal effect of the resolution adopted at the previous meeting, he noted that it left the Council resolution entirely untouched, neither endorsing nor invalidating it, and did not, in fact, lay upon the Council any obligation to re-examine the resolution.

17. Mr. MIGONE (Argentina) said that his delegation had co-sponsored the resolution in document A/C.2/L.286, thus indicating its readiness to implement Council resolution 623 B III (XXII). In view, however, of the discussion in the Committee and in the interests of a compromise solution, it had voted for the sixteen-Power resolution on the understanding that it constituted neither an acceptance nor a rejection of the Council resolution.

#### QUESTION OF THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE (A/C.2/L.284 and Corr.1)

18. Mr. ALFONZO RAVARD (Venezuela) pointed out that the General Assembly was shortly to consider the question of increasing the membership of the Economic and Social Council under item 57 of its agenda. It would be extremely difficult for the Second Committee to discuss the joint draft resolution (A/C.2/L.284 and Corr.1), which recommended an expansion of the present membership of TAC, without knowing what decision the Assembly would reach on that item. He therefore proposed that the Second Committee should postpone the discussion and the vote on the joint draft resolution until such time as the General Assembly had disposed of item 57, on the understanding that in any event the Committee would consider and vote on the joint draft before the end of the session.

19. Mr. ARDALAN (Iran) and Mr. AMADOR (Mexico) supported the Venezuelan proposal.

20. Mr. LARREA (Ecuador) regretted that he was unable to support the Venezuelan proposal and would abstain when it was put to the vote. The General Assembly was preoccupied with political problems, and the question of amending the Charter of the United Nations to increase the membership of the Economic and Social Council would require very lengthy discussion. It might be two years before any recommendation by the Assembly was put into effect. The Technical Assistance Committee urgently needed the advice and experience of the additional four members proposed in the joint draft resolution, and the Second Committee should take an immediate decision on that draft without waiting for action by the General Assembly.

21. Mr. HALIQ (Saudi Arabia) said that the Committee was concerned with two issues: the problem of increasing the membership of the Economic and Social Council, and that of electing additional members to TAC from Member States of the United Nations or of the specialized agencies who were not members of the

Council. A preliminary discussion of the whole question might facilitate the Committee's work.

22. Mr. GLOWER (El Salvador) supported the Venezuelan proposal, as the present situation with regard to membership of the Economic and Social Council was obscure and would be clarified by the Assembly's decision.

23. Mrs. WRIGHT (Denmark) supported the view of the representative of Ecuador. It seemed unnecessary to defer discussion of the joint draft resolution, the more so as any decision of the General Assembly might not take effect for some time. The Technical Assistance Committee should be enlarged immediately, and any decision reached by the Committee now could easily be modified later, if necessary, in the light of a subsequent decision by the General Assembly.

24. Mr. ALLOUNI (Syria), Mr. ISIK (Turkey) and Mr. O'NAGHTEN (Cuba) supported the Venezuelan proposal.

25. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) thought that the Committee should take up the joint draft resolution immediately, as there was already general agreement that TAC should be enlarged. No useful purpose would be served by waiting for the Assembly's decision regarding the expansion of the Economic and Social Council. The two questions were in fact quite separate.

26. Mr. SARWAR (Afghanistan) supported that view. The additional members of TAC would, according to the joint draft resolution, be drawn from non-member States who contributed to the Expanded Programme, and the Committee should therefore take its decision independently of any action by the Assembly.

27. The Chairman put to the vote the proposal by Venezuela to postpone consideration of the draft resolution.

*The proposal was adopted by 38 votes to 12, with 13 abstentions.*

#### REGULATIONS CONCERNING THE WORKING CAPITAL AND RESERVE FUND OF THE EXPANDED PROGRAMME OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (A/C.2/L.285)

28. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the draft resolution embodied in the Note by the Secretary-General (A/C.2/L.285).

*The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.*

#### IMPLEMENTATION AND EXPANSION OF THE PROGRAMMES OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (A/C.2/L.287)

29. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the draft resolution contained in document A/C.2/L.287.

*The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.*

#### QUESTION OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION (A/C.2/L.292)

30. Mr. ARDALAN (Iran) introduced the draft resolution submitted by his delegation (A/C.2/L.292). It was hardly necessary to put forward arguments in support of the draft, as most delegations had expressed their whole-hearted approval of technical assistance activities in the field of public administration during the general debate on technical assistance and had endorsed the Secretary-General's request for further funds (A/C.2/189 and Add.1). It was clear that all the under-developed countries needed sound public administrations and trained public servants to administer their countries in all the critical phases of their eco-

nomie development. He therefore hoped that the draft resolution would win the unanimous support of the Committee.

31. Mr. ISIK (Turkey), Mr. DE GAAY FORTMAN (Netherlands), Mr. DAMLUJI (Iraq) and Mr. GLOWER (El Salvador) welcomed the Iranian delegation's initiative in submitting the draft resolution, and were glad to give it their unqualified support.

32. Mr. CROLL (Canada) also supported the draft resolution, but reminded members of the Committee that it would be pointless for their delegations to support such a resolution in the Second Committee and then to turn about and refuse to vote the necessary funds for its implementation in the Fifth Committee.

33. Mr. AMADOR (Mexico) said that his delegation was naturally sympathetic to the idea behind the Iranian draft resolution, but would regretfully have to abstain in the vote, because the adoption of that draft would entail an increase in the total budget of the United Nations. There were many urgent humanitarian demands on the limited resources available, and in his delegation's view, problems of public administration, though deserving of every sympathy, ought to be left in abeyance until such time as funds became available within the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance. His delegation would adopt the same position in the Fifth Committee.

34. Mr. BRINSON (United Kingdom) asked whether the Secretary-General's request for additional funds for technical assistance in public administration was under consideration either by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions or by the Fifth Committee. If so, his delegation would be compelled to abstain in any vote in the Second Committee until the results of such consideration became known.

35. Mr. KEENLEYSIDE (Director General, Technical Assistance Administration) said that, as was stated in the opening paragraph of document A/C.2/189/Add.1, the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions had considered that request at an earlier date and had recommended the reduction of the additional appropriation by \$100,000. It had since taken up the matter again, but he was unable to say whether a decision had been reached.

36. Mr. KARIM (Pakistan), Mr. KHOGALI (Sudan) and Mr. LARAKI (Morocco) said that they would support the draft resolution, since technical assistance in the field of public administration was one of the urgent needs of newly independent countries.

37. Mr. FINGER (United States of America), Mr. OMPI (Indonesia), Mr. DIPP GOMEZ (Dominican Republic), Mr. RECABARREN (Chile) and Mr. KRISHNA MENON (India) said that, as their delegations had indicated in the general debate on technical assistance, they would support the Iranian draft resolution.

38. Mr. ARDALAN (Iran) thanked all those representatives who had supported his delegation's draft resolution. He did not think that there was any cause to fear that the Fifth Committee would act differently from the Second Committee in the matter, since it was composed of the same delegations. He sympathized with the Mexican representative's difficulties, but felt that Mexico would be more likely to gain than to lose by the adoption of the resolution. To the United Kingdom representative he would point out that the draft resolution merely endorsed the Secretary-General's request; by the time it came before the Fifth Committee, the

Advisory Committee's views would be known and a decision could be taken accordingly.

39. Mr. SABATIER (France) said that his delegation had every sympathy with the desire to increase the funds available for technical assistance in the field of public administration, but in view of the fact that the matter was under consideration by the Advisory Committee it did not at present feel able to adopt a position on the Iranian draft resolution.

40. Mr. FAHMY (Egypt) felt that further discussion was unnecessary, as the attitude of the majority of delegations in the Committee, including his own, had long been clear. He therefore moved that the Committee should proceed to a vote on the draft resolution submitted by Iran.

*The Egyptian motion was rejected by 27 votes to 8, with 28 abstentions.*

The meeting rose at 5.25 p.m.