

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EIGHTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



SECOND COMMITTEE, 924th
MEETING

Wednesday, 13 November 1963,
at 3.40 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 39:</i>	
<i>Co-operation for the eradication of illiteracy throughout the world: report of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (continued)</i>	267
<i>Agenda item 33:</i>	
<i>Economic development of under-developed countries (continued):</i>	
<i>(d) Accelerated flow of capital and technical assistance to the developing countries: report of the Secretary-General (continued)</i>	269

Chairman: Mr. Ismael THAJEB (Indonesia).

AGENDA ITEM 39

Co-operation for the eradication of illiteracy throughout the world: report of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (E/3771 and Corr.1 and 2, A/5527, A/C.2/L.733/Rev.3 and Add.1) (continued)

1. Mr. GHEBEH (Syria) said that his delegation supported the amendment proposed by the Tunisian representative (923rd meeting) to operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution concerning a world campaign for universal literacy (A/C.2/L.733/Rev.3 and Add.1). However, in order to meet the objections of the United States representative without interfering with the intentions of the sponsors of the draft, he proposed that the words "and if necessary" should be inserted after the words "a world campaign". The principle of a world literacy campaign, which the sponsors of the draft resolution considered essential, would thus be maintained without precluding other possible measures in support of national efforts.

2. Mr. JAZAIRY (Algeria), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution, announced that, in informal consultations with the main delegations concerned, agreement had been reached on operative paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 4, which remained unchanged.

3. With regard to paragraph 5, the sponsors had decided to submit a new version which they hoped would be acceptable to all and which read as follows:

"Invites the Secretary-General, in collaboration with the Director-General of UNESCO, the Managing Director of the Special Fund, the Executive Chairman of the Technical Assistance Board and the President of the International Bank and its affiliates to explore ways and means of supporting national efforts for the eradication of illiteracy through a world campaign, and any other measure if necessary, of international co-operation and assistance, both non-

financial and financial, and to submit a report thereon, together with appropriate proposals, to the General Assembly at its nineteenth session."

4. There were two main points. First, the words "et à toute autre mesure si nécessaire" in the French text of the draft resolution had been approved by all the speakers; they left it to the translators to find the closest possible English equivalent for the words "si nécessaire". Secondly, the sponsors wished to make it quite clear that, in the text they were proposing, the words "si nécessaire" applied exclusively to "any other measure" which might be contemplated and not to the principle of a world literacy campaign, which continued to be the main objective of the draft resolution.

5. He hoped that, with the new wording of operative paragraph 5, the draft resolution would be adopted unanimously.

6. Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America) recalled that at the preceding meeting, his delegation had made a number of concessions in the hope of reaching unanimity on the draft resolution. As to operative paragraph 5, he had understood the sponsors to agree to the insertion of the words "and any other measures if advisable" after the words "world campaign". He was not authorized to agree to any other wording. If the words "if advisable" raised difficulties of translation, he was prepared to replace them by the words "if appropriate". The words "if necessary", on the other hand, would alter the sense of the proposed amendment; they were unacceptable to his delegation. Moreover, as his delegation interpreted operative paragraph 5, the words "if appropriate" applied to both the alternatives proposed, i.e., both the idea of a world campaign and the possibility of adopting other measures.

7. He regretted that, despite the hopes raised by the new compromise, it seemed impossible to reach agreement on operative paragraph 5. He therefore proposed that the Committee should proceed to vote on the second of the United States amendments (A/C.2/L.754/Rev.1).

8. Mr. JAZAIRY (Algeria) stressed that the sponsors of the draft resolution in no way wished to prejudge the English translation of the words "si nécessaire". In his opinion, the words "if appropriate" would be an acceptable translation of the French phrase.

9. As to the second objection raised by the United States representative, it was clear that the sponsors meant the words "si nécessaire" to apply exclusively to the other measures which might be taken. At the present stage, they could not accept any qualification of the principle of a world campaign.

10. Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America) reserved his delegation's right to interpret the text of the draft resolution as it saw fit. It could not be bound

by anyone else's interpretation, even that of the sponsors.

11. Mr. JAZAIRY (Algeria) recognized that the United States delegation was completely free to interpret the text of operative paragraph 5 as it saw fit. He had merely wished to stress that, so far as the sponsors of the draft resolution were concerned, the words "si nécessaire" in the French text and "if appropriate" in the English text applied exclusively to the words "and any other measure".

12. Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America) thanked the Algerian representative for the conciliatory spirit he had shown, and especially for his affirmation that each delegation was free to make its own interpretation of the text. His delegation accordingly withdrew its amendment to operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution.

13. Mr. COSIO VILLEGAS (Mexico) observed that the Committee was required to take a decision on a draft resolution which was interpreted in one way by its forty-two sponsors and in another way by the United States delegation. He asked on which of the two interpretations the sixty-eight other members were to vote.

14. Mr. AYARI (Tunisia) stressed that operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution called only for the exploration of ways and means of supporting national efforts for the eradication of illiteracy. It did not propose any specific practical measure. It was so worded as to leave full freedom of action to those who would be responsible for the proposed exploration. At the present stage, therefore, there could be no conflict of interpretation of such a nature as to prevent members from deciding how to vote.

15. The CHAIRMAN said that he would put to the vote the draft resolution (A/C.2/L.733/Rev.3 and Add.1), as amended. Before doing so, however, he would call upon those members of the Committee who had expressed the wish to explain their votes in advance.

16. Mr. GHEBEH (Syria), speaking on a point of order, pointed out that he had submitted a sub-amendment at the beginning of the meeting; he regretted that the procedure laid down in rule 92 of the rules of procedure had not been followed. Nevertheless, in a spirit of co-operation, his delegation, which was one of the sponsors, would support the text submitted, on the understanding that the sponsors interpreted the words "if appropriate" in operative paragraph 5 to apply only to "any other measure" and not to the world campaign itself.

17. Mr. VIAUD (France), speaking in explanation of his vote, said that during the debate on the distressing problem of illiteracy, he had given the Committee detailed information on the efforts France had made to disseminate education in the world at large. He had done so mainly in order to show the importance which his country attached to a task so urgently necessary as to require concerted action by all peoples and Governments.

18. The French Government felt that, by allocating substantial resources in manpower and money every year to programmes designed to bring education and culture within the reach of more and more people, it was making an effective contribution to the eradication of illiteracy throughout the world. His delegation had therefore warmly welcomed the initiative taken by the sponsors of the draft resolution before the Committee.

19. In view of the efforts which France had already made, and which were greater than those of many other countries, it was natural that he should ask for certain provisions of the draft resolution to be made more specific. Operative paragraph 2, which invited Member States in whose territories mass illiteracy was no longer a major problem to contribute technical and/or financial assistance, seemed to his delegation to leave the Governments concerned free to choose the type of assistance that suited them best. That meant, *inter alia*, that those Governments which were already providing significant technical assistance had in a sense complied in advance with the provisions of the draft resolution. It also meant that countries which for historical or cultural reasons lacked the means to provide appropriate technical assistance were asked to provide financial assistance.

20. Having said that, his delegation did not believe that the idea of a "campaign" presented any particular advantages or dangers. If the words "world campaign" meant international action to mobilize public opinion and give free rein to good intentions, it was clear that, in the campaign against illiteracy, France should be given credit for all the cultural programmes it had undertaken. If the explorations to be carried out by the Secretary-General and UNESCO showed that further efforts were needed, France would not refuse to discuss the scope of such efforts and how they should be applied, but in so doing it would be concerned to ensure that the costs of the campaign against illiteracy were shared among the nations as equally and fairly as possible.

21. Mr. STEWART (Canada) announced that his delegation would be able to vote in favour of the draft resolution. However, it was clear that the decision to launch a world campaign could not be taken until ways and means had been explored and the means were actually available. His delegation would also be prepared to accept operative paragraph 5 as it stood if a separate vote was requested, for the sponsors had made it clear that what they had in mind was a world campaign against illiteracy, in other words, a venture launched simultaneously by various countries using methods suited to their problems. It could not, therefore, be a campaign in the strict sense of the word.

22. Mr. ZELLEKE (Ethiopia) said that Ethiopia, which was one of the countries with the highest illiteracy rate, attached great importance to the world campaign against illiteracy and would support the draft resolution. Indeed, his country had launched its own national campaign against that scourge. Illiteracy was one aspect of under-development and its elimination would have tangible economic consequences. It would be an investment designed to develop human resources as a factor in social and economic development in general. In its struggle against illiteracy, Ethiopia had had to overcome the usual difficulties besetting a country with limited resources.

23. One of the main concerns of the Conference of African States on the Development of Education in Africa which was held at Addis Ababa in 1961 had been the extent of illiteracy in the countries of the African continent. Eighty-five per cent of the total population of Africa could neither read nor write. In addition, only 16 per cent of the children of school age were currently attending school. In one of the recommendations it had adopted, the Conference had recognized that education was an integral part of

national development efforts. His delegation shared that view. The Conference had also recognized the need for international co-operation in the field of education and in the struggle against illiteracy. His delegation was glad to note that those two principles had been endorsed by a great many delegations during the debate and were reflected in the draft resolution.

24. The CHAIRMAN said that the United Kingdom delegation had requested a separate vote on operative paragraph 5.

25. Mr. CHAMMAS (Lebanon) asked whether, in the circumstances, a motion for division was admissible under the rules of procedure. If so, his delegation would request a separate vote on the words "and any other measure if appropriate".

26. The CHAIRMAN said that, under rule 130, parts of a proposal or of an amendment could be voted on separately.

27. Mr. AYARI (Tunisia) expressed regret that the fruit of hard work by the sponsors, in co-operation with the United States delegation, was now being called into question. The sponsors had gone a long way to meet the views of others and it was surprising to find that a delegation, one of whose amendments had been accepted by the sponsors, was now complicating an already difficult task. It would mean opening the door to a series of requests for separate votes or even for roll-call votes. In view of the current difficulties, he asked the United Kingdom delegation not to press for a separate vote on operative paragraph 5.

28. Mr. TELL (Jordan), speaking on a point of order, said that the motion for division was prompted by a difference of interpretation. If the members of the Committee were given an assurance that they would be voting on the text rather than on a particular interpretation of that text, they would be in a much better position.

29. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the motion for division on operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution.

The motion was rejected by 56 votes to 7, with 30 abstentions.

30. Mr. CHAMMAS (Lebanon) withdrew his motion for division.

31. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the draft resolution as a whole (A/C.2/L.733/Rev.3 and Add.1), as amended.

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 98 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

32. Mr. UNWIN (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had had no idea of opposing a draft resolution which commanded such general support in the Committee. However, operative paragraph 5 was obscure and the different interpretations placed upon it did not make it more understandable. If that paragraph had been put to the vote separately, his delegation would have abstained. It had, however, voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole because it supported the idea of a world campaign against illiteracy so long as it was part of the United Nations Development Decade. If such a campaign was launched on the basis of the Secretary-General's report concerning proposals for the Development Decade (E/3613 and Corr.1 and 2), his delegation understood the present wording of the draft to mean that the campaign, or any other

measures taken, would supplement national efforts within the framework of the Development Decade. His delegation attached great importance to both those points.

33. Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America) said that his delegation was glad to acknowledge the spirit of compromise which had prevailed during the discussion and the considerable efforts made by the sponsors of the draft resolution who, in order to reach unanimity, had taken into account ideas which did not coincide entirely with their own. Admittedly, the text adopted represented a very general statement by the Committee, expressing its concern over the problem of illiteracy and its desire to see more effective efforts made at the national and international level to combat that scourge.

34. His delegation still believed that a world campaign of the type referred to in the UNESCO report (E/3771 and Corr.1 and 2) would not be feasible because it could not be undertaken with sufficient resources. However, his delegation had no objection to the exploration of ways and means of undertaking a different type of world campaign or, alternatively, such other measures as could be taken at the international level.

35. Like any compromise solution, the draft resolution just adopted did not entirely satisfy anybody. If there had been a separate vote on operative paragraph 5, his delegation would have abstained because, as the United Kingdom representative had said, the paragraph was open to various interpretations. It was not the first time that had happened in the United Nations. However, the resolution did not constitute a decision to launch a world campaign of the type envisaged in the UNESCO report and in resolution 1.2531 of the General Conference of UNESCO. If it had, his delegation would have been unable to vote for it. That was why it had had to insist on the use of certain language; according to its interpretation, the words "if appropriate" referred both to the world campaign and to the other measures.

36. His delegation had proposed an amendment (A/C.2/L.754/Rev.1) to operative paragraph 3. It had not pressed that proposal but, in its view, that paragraph did not confer on any non-governmental organization a status which it did not already possess. The paragraph merely invited non-governmental organizations to collaborate whenever possible in the task of achieving universal literacy.

AGENDA ITEM 33

Economic development of under-developed countries (A/5532) (continued):

(d) Accelerated flow of capital and technical assistance to the developing countries: report of the Secretary-General (A/5546, A/C.2/L.739/Rev.1 and Add.1 and 2) (continued)

37. Mr. BRADLEY (Argentina) expressed the hope that the draft resolution (A/C.2/L.739/Rev.1 and Add.1 and 2) would not give rise to a prolonged debate and would be adopted unanimously.

38. International technical and financial assistance was considered a vital factor in accelerating the development of the developing countries. It had often been stressed that in order to achieve a balance in those countries' terms of trade, it was essential to modify the structure of international trade, but that

it was no less essential that those countries should industrialize. Being unable to attain that goal with their own unaided resources, they required increased technical and financial assistance, but the international flow of capital and assistance was still very inadequate. Numerous resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council had stressed how important it was to accelerate that flow. According to some approximate figures given in an ECLA publication, foreign investment in Latin America for the period 1955-1961 had amounted to \$7,800 million. During the same period, however, the loss of foreign earnings inflicted on the countries of the region by the disequilibrium in their trade balance had reached \$7,300 million. The same situation had prevailed in other under-developed parts of the world. The figures showed that the flow of capital and technical assistance to the less developed countries had done practically nothing to accelerate their economic development. That fact was disturbing and even threatening when viewed against the background of the United Nations Development Decade, towards whose goals no observable progress was being made. On the contrary, capital flows must be expected to fall a long way behind capital requirements. The developing countries would be compelled to make a complete overhaul of their development schemes in order to adjust to the existing flow of capital and assistance.

39. A group of countries, realizing the importance of that problem and wishing to bring it under continuous study, had submitted the draft resolution now before the Committee. The sponsors were convinced that adequate machinery must be established to keep the flow of capital and technical assistance under constant review in order to adjust it to the needs of the developing countries. Furthermore, a comprehensive and meaningful presentation of the data on capital flows and aid would make possible a better assessment of the prospects for accelerating the economic development of the developing countries.

40. From the Secretary-General's note (A/C.2/L.761), it appeared that the financial implications of the draft resolution were not very great. The text raised only an administrative problem which could be solved within the scope of existing work programmes as regards both the standing committee and the committee of experts.

41. Mr. COSIO VILLEGAS (Mexico) said that the flow of capital and technical assistance was beyond question an extremely important factor in accelerating the tempo of development. However, it would be necessary to consider whether the creation of a new body was really justified.

42. The proposed standing committee could make no more useful contribution in the matter than could the Economic and Social Council. It was true, however, that because of its very heavy agenda, the Council would be unable to examine the problem as closely as a standing committee specially set up for that purpose. At the same time, the cost of a new body must be taken into account. Since the Economic and Social Council, particularly at its summer session, almost automatically set up two main committees—the Economic Committee and the Social Committee—and often a co-ordination committee as well, consideration should be given to the possibility of convening a special committee for two or three days at the summer session to deal solely with the question of the flow of capital and technical assistance.

43. Moreover, the real problem was not to examine the flow of capital and assistance as though watching a watercourse; it was to increase that flow to the volume necessary at a given time. The draft resolution instructed the standing committee to advise the Council on matters relating "to the nature and volume" of the flow of international assistance and capital, but his delegation wondered whether the committee in question would really be able to take effective action to increase that volume or would have to rest content with observing the facts and giving advice.

44. Mr. LUBBERS (Netherlands) thought that the draft resolution was fairly flexibly worded and could be adopted without any major controversy.

45. With regard to the financial implications of operative paragraph 2, the Secretary-General's note (A/C.2/L.761) pointed out that the meetings of a committee of experts in 1964 and 1965 would entail expenditures of \$69,600. According to the note, part of that expenditure could be met within the limits of the appropriations requested for 1964, but the Secretary-General would in any case be obliged to request an additional credit of \$18,600 for the 1964 meeting of the committee of experts. The Netherlands representative on the Third Committee had voted against the proposal to convene the Commission on Human Rights in 1964. The expenses involved in the draft under study, albeit on a smaller scale, nevertheless raised difficulties with regard to operative paragraph 2. True, the paragraph did not specify the dates on which the committee of experts was to meet, and if arrangements could be made to ensure that not all the expenses in question would be incurred during the financial year 1964, the paragraph would be more readily acceptable. Furthermore, he wondered whether the Secretary-General would really need the services of the committee of experts. If fuller use was made of the data which organizations like the International Bank, the International Monetary Fund and the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development could supply, the expenditure would be less.

46. Mr. PERERA (Ceylon) observed that the question of the international flow of technical assistance and long-term capital to the developing countries was of such crucial importance that it should be kept under review at all times and not merely for the duration of the United Nations Development Decade. According to the Secretary-General's study entitled International Flow of Long-term Capital and Official Donations, 1959-1961 (A/5195/Rev.1), there had been a very modest improvement between 1960 and 1961 in the net flow of long-term capital and official donations from the developed countries, representing, as a percentage of the combined gross domestic product of those countries, an increase from 0.7 per cent in 1960 to 0.8 per cent in 1961. In 1962, there had been a decline in the net flow, although in that year the combined gross national product of the developed countries had increased by approximately 5 per cent. The Secretary-General had drawn attention to that regrettable fact in his report on progress achieved in 1962 (A/5546). On the other hand, while the flow of long-term funds supplied under bilateral agreements had declined, multilateral financing had more than doubled in volume between 1961 and 1962. Moreover, there had been a pronounced shift in 1961 in the geographical distribution of the flow towards certain regions and away from others. The Secretary-General's reports also focussed attention on the increasing importance of the public

sector as a source of long-term funds for the developing countries and on the declining share of private capital in the total flow of such funds. The disturbing developments were the tendency for private capital to move to the developed countries, at the expense of the developing countries, and the fact that what little aid went to the latter countries tended to be concentrated in particular countries or regions.

47. All those factors should be kept under constant review, for they influenced the formulation of policies and measures of international economic assistance. His delegation considered that appropriate machinery should be set up, and it therefore supported the recommendations made in the draft resolution.

The meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.