



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 the membership of the Technical Assistance Committee (<i>continued</i>).....	305
Agenda item 27:	
Economic development of under-developed countries (<i>continued</i>):	
(a) Question of the establishment of a Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development: report of the <i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee (<i>continued</i>).....	307

Chairman: Mr. Mohammad MIR KHAN (Pakistan).

AGENDA ITEM 26

Programmes of technical assistance (*continued*):
(a) Report of the Economic and Social Council
(A/3154) (*continued*)

**QUESTION OF THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE TECHNICAL
ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE (A/C.2/L.284/Rev.1)**
(*continued*)

1. Mr. GIRETTI (Italy) said that he supported the eight-Power draft resolution (A/C.2/L.284/Rev.1). It was only fair that countries which participated actively in United Nations technical assistance activities but which were not members of the Economic and Social Council should have the opportunity to voice their opinions in the Technical Assistance Committee (TAC). The Bulgarian amendment (A/C.2/L.290) was unacceptable because it would lead to political dissension in a Committee hitherto characterized by the close co-operation of its members.

2. Mr. ELEKDAG (Turkey) said that at the San Francisco Conference the Council's competence to set up whatever subsidiary bodies it considered necessary for the effective discharge of its duties had been recognized; the Council had also been given considerable authority with regard to the composition and nature of such bodies. On the other hand, nothing in the Charter of the United Nations prevented the General Assembly from making recommendations concerning any aspect of the Council's functions. Under Article 66, the Council had to perform such functions as fell within its competence in connexion with the carrying out of the recommendations of the General Assembly. As was indicated in volume III of the *Repertory of Practice of United Nations Organs*, the Council had on various occasions initiated action in regard to its subsidiary bodies independently of the General Assembly but always under the general authority of the latter, which was free to take whatever action it pleased subject to the provisions of the Charter.

3. The Bulgarian amendment was inconsistent with the requirement set forth in the eight-Power draft resolution that the members of TAC should be elected from among the Member States of the United Nations or members of the specialized agencies, and presupposed that any State was eligible for membership. The adoption of the amendment would give rise to political controversies and he would therefore vote against it.

4. Mr. DE GAAY FORTMAN (Netherlands), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the eight-Power draft resolution, announced that the word "four" in operative paragraph 1 should be amended to read "six" and the words "size and" should be inserted before the words "composition of the Technical Assistance Committee" in operative paragraph 3.

5. Mr. PSCOLKA (Czechoslovakia) announced his support of the Bulgarian amendment. He was opposed to discrimination in regard to the participation of States in United Nations technical assistance activities. Discriminatory policies had in the past prevented wider participation in the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance: for example, the substantial contribution offered by the German Democratic Republic to the Expanded Programme had been refused.

6. Mr. LYCHOWSKI (Poland) said it was unfortunate that, on the eve of the closure of the session, there was no constructive resolution on the membership of TAC for the Committee to adopt. The eight-Power draft resolution contained too many controversial points for the Committee to deal with it hurriedly. It was highly questionable, for instance, whether the Assembly was competent to recommend to the Council any new organizational measures in respect of a body which had been set up by the Council itself. Several arguments had been advanced at the previous meeting in support of the view that the Assembly was not competent in the matter.

7. He wished to draw attention to a further consideration. If the Committee recommended the election of six new members, TAC would have twenty-four members, twenty, twenty-one or twenty-two of which would be representatives of Member States of the United Nations; and if, pursuant to a decision by the General Assembly, the Council's membership was increased by four additional members, the result would be that TAC would have twenty-eight, twenty-seven or twenty-six members, depending on whether the newly-elected members of the Council had already been elected as additional members of TAC. That would be the outcome of simultaneous action by the Council and the General Assembly in respect of a body created by the Council.

8. There was no provision in the Charter to sanction the existence of a special category of States not Members of the United Nations but members of specialized agencies, although the practice so far had been to recognize the *de facto* existence of such a category.

9. It was also legitimate to ask how the Council would select the new members of TAC, taking into account the criteria set out in operative paragraph 1 of the eight-Power draft resolution. In addition, operative paragraph 3 would have the effect of depriving States of the opportunity of participating in the work of TAC.

10. The legal and other consequences of the adoption of the eight-Power draft resolution should be carefully weighed. There was no time during the remainder of the session for further scrutiny and amendment, and he therefore requested the sponsors not to press for a vote. If the text was put to the vote he would be obliged to vote against it.

11. Mr. TODOROV (Bulgaria) agreed with the Polish representative. In the interest of rallying wider support, he proposed to re-word his amendment to read "from all States". In that connexion he drew attention to the use of the words "including several non-members of the United Nations" in the first paragraph of the preamble to the eight-Power draft resolution and to General Assembly resolution 304 (IV), paragraph 5.

12. Mr. FINGER (United States of America) pointed out that the new version of the Bulgarian amendment was essentially the same as the original text and was equally unacceptable. All the States at present contributing to the Expanded Programme were Members of the United Nations or members of specialized agencies and there was no reason for altering the wording of operative paragraph 1 of the eight-Power draft resolution.

13. Mr. CHERNYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that it was apparent from the statement of the United States representative that the United States was forcing a political decision upon the Committee.

14. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Bulgarian amendment (A/C.2/L.290) as re-worded by the Bulgarian representative.

The Bulgarian amendment was rejected by 42 votes to 18, with 7 abstentions.

15. Mr. CHERNYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested a separate vote on the words "or members of the specialized agencies" in operative paragraph 1.

16. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the retention of the words "or members of the specialized agencies".

The Committee decided to retain those words by 58 votes to 8, with 3 abstentions.

17. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the eight-Power draft resolution (A/C.2/L.284/Rev.1) as verbally amended by the Netherlands representative.

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 59 votes to 8, with 1 abstention.

18. Mr. FAHMY (Egypt) said that his delegation considered that the Economic and Social Council, and not the General Assembly, was the proper organ to decide on the composition of the Council's subsidiary bodies. It had therefore been unable to support the draft resolution even with the amendments presented by the Netherlands representative on behalf of the sponsors. Its abstention was not, however, to be construed as opposition to the principle of increasing the membership of TAC. On the contrary, the proposal to add six rather than four new members improved the text, since it would enable various groups, and in par-

ticular the African-Asian countries, to be more adequately represented in the Committee: his delegation looked forward with interest to the Council's implementation of that provision.

19. Mr. HUTTON (Australia) said that his delegation sympathized with the general aims of the resolution and had voted for it. It was not convinced, however, that an increase of six in the size of TAC was necessary at the present stage, and it hoped that if and when the Council was enlarged the need to keep the Committee within reasonable and workable limits would be borne in mind. Furthermore, his delegation would have preferred that the terms of office of the new members should be the same as those of the present members of TAC, namely, three years and not two.

20. Mr. RAJAPATHIRANA (Ceylon) said that his delegation had supported the resolution. The increase from four to six in the number of additional members of TAC was welcome because it would make a more adequate geographic representation possible. He would have preferred it to be stated that the new members would be drawn from among contributing and recipient countries.

21. Sir Alec RANDALL (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had voted for the resolution, although it would have preferred the membership of TAC to be increased by four and not six if, indeed, it was to be expanded at all at the present stage. The Technical Assistance Committee was a very efficient body dealing with the practical operation of one of the most effective of the United Nations programmes; it would be a pity if that efficiency was impaired by the enlargement of the Committee to an unwieldy size. The insertion by the sponsors of the words "size and" before "composition" in operative paragraph 3 had helped his delegation to vote for the resolution, because it meant that the Council would take a comprehensive view of the matter when it came to consider it.

22. Mr. LYCHOWSKI (Poland) said that his delegation, although not in principle opposed to the enlargement of TAC, had been forced to vote against the resolution because it introduced undesirable political considerations into the matter of the composition of a body concerned solely with economic matters.

23. Mr. TURPIN (France) said that his delegation had voted for the amended resolution. At the ninth session it had recommended an increase in the membership of TAC in order to give contributing and recipient countries better representation. The increase now proposed represented, in his delegation's view, the maximum number compatible with practical efficiency. It would enable a larger number of countries to take part in the work of technical assistance, and that would encourage them to increase their contributions.

24. Mr. WOULBROUN (Belgium) said that his delegation had voted for the resolution; it felt that the importance of the Expanded Programme justified the enlargement of TAC. It had not voted for the Bulgarian amendment, among others, because the matter only concerned countries which participated in the Programme and not other States, non-members of the United Nations, which were members of the specialized agencies and participated indirectly in the work of the Technical Assistance Board, the organ representing such agencies. The increased membership of TAC would allow contributing and recipient countries to play a larger part in the planning and administration of the programmes of technical assistance.

AGENDA ITEM 27

Economic development of under-developed countries (A/3154, A/3192) (continued):**(a) Question of the establishment of a Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development: report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee (A/3134 and Corr.1 and 2, A/C.2/L.315/Rev.1, A/C.2/L.316, A/C.2/L.321) (continued*)**

25. Mr. KENNEDY (Ireland), introducing the draft resolution submitted by Denmark and Ireland (A/C.2/L.321), expressed the hope that it would win the support of the entire Committee. The Committee had had the thirty-nine-Power draft resolution (A/C.2/L.315) before it since 31 January. Since that date, however, the representatives of the main industrial countries, whose participation in the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development (SUNFED) would be essential to its success, had stated that they could not agree to such a resolution. The draft had since been revised, but it appeared still to contain provisions which were unacceptable to the principal industrial countries. The draft resolution submitted by Denmark and Ireland represented a final effort to devise a text which would be acceptable not only to the under-developed countries, which insisted on some positive action, but also to the industrial Powers without whose support SUNFED would be entirely ineffective.

26. Turning to the text of the new draft resolution, he pointed out that the six paragraphs of the preamble owed much to the thirty-nine-Power draft and could not, he thought, give rise to disagreement. Operative paragraph 1 was the same as operative paragraph 1 of the thirty-nine-Power draft. In that connexion he wished to pay a tribute to the *Ad Hoc* Committee for the excellent work it had done; the new tasks laid upon it in the remainder of the draft were evidence of satisfaction concerning the way it had discharged its responsibilities in the past.

27. Operative paragraph 2 was perhaps the pivotal paragraph of the whole resolution; it had been drafted with special care to meet the demands of all concerned. It did not call for the immediate drafting of a statute, since that would render it unacceptable to a number of countries whose participation was essential. It did, however, propose a realistic and practical step: to lay the groundwork for the drafting of a statute at some future time. Even if the General Assembly agreed to the drafting of a statute forthwith, such preliminary work would still be necessary. If the draft was adopted, the Economic and Social Council would have before it at its twenty-fourth session a report from the *Ad Hoc* Committee indicating a number of different patterns on which the statute of SUNFED could be based. They would probably be conflicting patterns as they emerged from the replies sent by Governments and the statements made by representatives in the Committee. It was all the more important, therefore, that they should be set forth clearly so that their full implications could be seen before any choice was made. Operative paragraph 3 authorized the *Ad Hoc* Committee to narrow down the number of possible patterns. Operative paragraphs 4 to 6 followed naturally and needed no clarification.

28. To sum up, the draft resolution, although not a dramatic step forward nor one which would satisfy

all sides fully, was a definite and practical move in the right direction and one which could, he believed—given sufficient goodwill—prove generally acceptable. The important thing was to preserve unanimity within the Committee on the next step to be taken; he did not think that Governments and the peoples for whom they were responsible would attach overriding importance to the actual wording used, whether “general patterns” or “legal structures”, or “could” or “will”. He hoped, therefore, that the Committee would be able to give its unanimous support to the practical step which the Danish and Irish delegations had proposed towards the attainment of the ultimate goal, the economic development of the under-developed countries.

29. In response to a question from the CHAIRMAN, Mr. ESFANDIARY (Iran) said that his delegation’s amendment (A/C.2/L.302) to the original joint draft resolution (A/C.2/L.300) would apply to the new forty-one-Power draft resolution (A/C.2/L.315/Rev.1). While it was a fact that any saving from disarmament would constitute an additional sum to the capital of SUNFED, the amendment was not essential to the joint draft resolution, of which his delegation was a co-sponsor, and he would not press it to a vote.

30. The CHAIRMAN announced that document A/C.2/L.302 was therefore no longer before the Committee.

31. Mr. Gopala MENON (India) was glad to be able to introduce the revised text of the joint draft resolution (A/C.2/L.315/Rev.1) on behalf of its forty-one sponsors. He had on earlier occasions (413th and 435th meetings) expressed his delegation’s view that it was a matter of urgent necessity to set up SUNFED. The possibility had been under discussion for some six years, and no one any longer doubted the desirability of creating a new capital fund to provide economic assistance. All countries, the industrialized and the under-developed alike, as well as those with diametrically opposed economic and political systems, had accepted the principle of establishing a fund. The difficulties now remaining solely concerned the practical application of that principle. The main question was one of time. Should SUNFED be set up at once, or should there be a further postponement? The under-developed countries, for their part, were convinced that after six years’ discussion the time had come for action. The minimum steps which could be taken were set forth in the operative part of the draft resolution.

32. The main difference between the original and the revised text of the draft resolution was that in the former the *Ad Hoc* Committee had been requested to prepare a draft statute for SUNFED while in the latter it was requested to prepare the legal structures on which SUNFED would be established as a step immediately prior to the final drafting of the statute. The draft resolution proposed by Denmark and Ireland spoke of “general patterns” rather than “legal structures”, and the Irish representative himself had stated that there seemed to be little difference between the two terms. He appealed to the Irish representative to accept the draft agreed upon by a large majority of the Committee. The use of the word “could” in sub-paragraph (a) of paragraph 2 of the Danish-Irish draft raised doubts as to whether SUNFED should be established at all, whereas it had long been accepted that it was both necessary and desirable. The sponsors of the forty-one-Power draft resolution had gone a long way towards meeting the desires of the minority, and

* Resumed from the 436th meeting.

hoped that the revised text would receive general approval.

33. Mr. RECABARREN (Chile) said that the Latin-American countries had hoped to secure general agreement on the draft resolution providing that the *Ad Hoc* Committee should prepare a draft statute for SUNFED. With that purpose in mind his delegation would vote in favour of the forty-one-Power revised draft resolution and would continue its efforts to achieve the establishment of SUNFED as soon as possible.

34. Mr. CHAUVET (Haiti) expressed his delegation's profound disappointment, due to the fact that after nearly four years of effort to establish SUNFED there was still opposition to the proposal. It had been objected that SUNFED should not be established because of existing political tensions, but political tension would continue to exist so long as there were men on earth, and the only way to lessen it was to promote economic co-operation of the kind required to put SUNFED into effect. The argument concerning disarmament had also been proved false. A saving of two or three cents on every dollar spent on armaments, or the price of a single aircraft carrier, would be enough to launch SUNFED.

35. It had also been argued that a decision to draft the statute of SUNFED might raise false hopes, although a preliminary step which would not commit any delegation—the drafting of a statute—would in fact encourage public opinion by demonstrating that

something practical was being done. The peoples of the world would be deeply disappointed if, after four years of discussion, the scheme were allowed to sink into oblivion. He still cherished the hope that the United States, the United Kingdom, Australia, Canada and New Zealand would associate themselves with France and collaborate with other countries in order to make SUNFED a reality.

36. His delegation was a sponsor of, and would vote for, the forty-one-Power revised draft resolution. The Committee should shoulder its responsibilities and, following the advice of the experts it had appointed, move forward towards the establishment of an institution which would be a living example of international co-operation and an instrument of real assistance to the under-developed countries.

37. Mr. KENNEDY (Ireland) said that the representative of India appeared to have misinterpreted his previous statement. He had not said that the wording of the draft resolutions before the Committee mattered little to his delegation. He had meant that Governments and peoples reading those resolutions would not be unduly concerned about the subtleties of the text. The real danger was that the Committee might insist upon adopting a text which would drive representatives of the important industrialized countries from the *Ad Hoc* Committee. Such a step would be very serious.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.