

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THIRTEENTH SESSION

Official Records


 Thursday, 30 October 1958,
at 10.50 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Agenda item 29:	
Programmes of technical assistance (continued):	
(a) Report of the Economic and Social Council	
Examination of draft resolutions (continued)	107

Chairman: Mr. Toru HAGIWARA (Japan).

AGENDA ITEM 29

Programmes of technical assistance (continued):

(a) Report of the Economic and Social Council (A/3848, chap. III, part B, A/3909, part A, A/C.2/L.371/Rev.1, A/C.2/L.372-374)

EXAMINATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.2/L.371/Rev.1, A/C.2/L.372-374) (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the revised seven-Power draft resolution concerning the gradual expansion of the Expanded Programme (A/C.2/L.371/Rev.1).

2. Mr. RAJAPATIRANA (Ceylon) was surprised that the sponsors of the draft resolution had deleted operative paragraph 1 of the original text (A/C.2/L.371) without explanation. He had thought the paragraph useful and had wished to make an addition to it. The Technical Assistance Committee had noted in its report that financial resources remained quite inadequate to meet the needs (E/3175, 1/ para. 39); it therefore seemed necessary to express the hope that the resources prospectively available would permit a higher level of operations in 1959.

3. Further, the Executive Chairman of the Technical Assistance Board (TAB) had said (536th meeting) that the Board was aware that some contributions had not yet been fully utilized, and recognized the need to make the very best use of the resources available and would try to remedy the situation. In the circumstances, it would seem desirable, as he himself had suggested at the 537th meeting, also to express the hope that the funds pledged would be fully and effectively used. The problem of currency convertibility was, of course, serious and could only be solved gradually by international co-operation, but that was no reason for emasculating the draft resolution. Any impression that the proposed clause implied criticism of the administrators of the programmes, could be removed, if the General Assembly noted with appreciation the remarks of the Executive Chairman of TAB regarding the need to use the resources available to the best possible effect.

4. Mr. BOIKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that he had always felt that the draft resolution

1/ Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Twenty-sixth Session, Annexes, agenda item 8.

should clearly show that the General Assembly recognized the need to make full use of the available resources and he had, therefore, been in favour of the Ceylonese representative's suggestion. The deletion of operative paragraph 1 placed his delegation in a difficult position, as his Government was being asked to contribute more without even a reference to the fact that its contribution was not being properly utilized at the present time. He hoped his comments would be taken into account. His delegation's position on the draft resolution would be determined at a later stage.

5. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that he had supported the Ceylonese representative's suggestion at the preceding meeting and had hoped it would be accepted by the sponsors. Nevertheless, he would be unwilling to reopen the debate on the thorny question of currency convertibility or to criticize the administrators of the programmes, even indirectly. If the sponsors could not accept the Ceylonese representative's suggestion, he would resign himself to voting for the revised text.

6. Mr. SZITA (Hungary) supported the Ceylonese representative's suggestion. It was generally recognized that the available resources were insufficient to meet all requests and it was a fact that all the contributions had not been fully utilized. It was therefore necessary that contributions should be increased and that they should be more fully utilized, as the Executive Chairman of TAB had recognized. In expressing the hope to remedy the situation, the Assembly would in no way criticize the administration. It was not, in his view, necessary to link the question with that of currency convertibility, which posed no real difficulties.

7. He proposed the insertion, after the third preambular paragraph, of an additional paragraph reading: "Bearing in mind the necessity of the fullest possible use of all available resources,". He hoped that that text would be unanimously approved by the Committee.

8. Mr. CHENG PAONAN (China) said that, as he understood it, the revised draft resolution related only to the total volume of contributions to the Expanded Programme. The utilization of the available funds raised another question, which should be the subject of a separate draft resolution. If that course were followed, needless complications would be avoided and the Committee would be able to adopt the revised draft resolution unanimously.

9. Mr. Gopala MENON (India) said that, although he had been unable to consult all the sponsors of the revised draft, he felt that they would be willing to insert an additional paragraph after the fourth preambular paragraph reading: "Noting with appreciation the efforts which are being made to make the very best use of the resources available,". He proposed that amendment in the hope that the new text would meet with

unanimous approval. If the amendment was accepted, it would be desirable to reinstate operative paragraph 1 of the original draft in the text of the revised draft.

10. Mr. FINGER (United States of America) said that, as a co-sponsor of the draft resolution, he was prepared to accept the Indian representative's amendment in the hope that the draft resolution could be adopted unanimously. He proposed the addition of the words "and of the International Atomic Energy Agency" at the end of the last operative paragraph.

11. Mr. PENTEADO (Brazil) proposed that the words "the States members of the participating organizations" should be used at the end of the last paragraph, as being equally exact and more concise.

12. Mr. ARKADEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) was surprised that the Indian representative wished to refer to "the efforts being made". The reference appeared to be inconsistent with the facts and the statements of representatives regretting the failure to make full use of certain contributions.

13. Mr. Gopala MENON (India) said his delegation had drafted its amendment in the light of the statement made by the Executive Chairman of TAB at the 536th meeting, that TAB was aware that some contributions had not been fully utilized, recognized the need to make the very best use of the resources available and was trying to remedy the situation.

14. Mr. ARKADEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that the Assembly should not refer simply to the present. It might be possible to complete the Indian amendment by the addition of a statement that the Assembly would be happy if efforts were continued in the future.

15. Mr. BANNIER (Netherlands) said that he was prepared to accept the Indian representative's amendment. Any addition might give the impression that the Committee was questioning the Executive Chairman's statement and finding fault with TAB.

16. Mr. O'NAGHTEN (Cuba) thought that the reference to the "efforts which are being made" was unfair to TAB, because the wording appeared to imply that TAB had not made an effort to make the best use of all contributions in the past, whereas, in fact, the situation had improved over the previous two years. It would be better to refer simply to the "efforts of TAB".

17. Mr. GIRETTI (Italy) said that he was prepared to accept the text proposed by the Indian representative, the more so, because the word "efforts" immediately suggested the future, for there was always a certain time lag before the efforts made produced results.

18. Mr. HADWEN (Canada) congratulated TAB on the efforts it had made in difficult circumstances to make the best use of contributions to the Expanded Programme.

19. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that he hoped the draft resolution would be adopted unanimously and that he supported the Indian proposal. It would, however, be ungracious of the Committee not to recognize that the situation of Governments, whose contributions had not been fully used, was all the more disagreeable in that they were being invited to make larger contributions. In order to make allowance for that situation, the Committee might perhaps introduce into the revised draft resolution, following the Indian amendment, the text of

the amendment proposed by the Hungarian representative.

20. Mr. RAJAPATIRANA (Ceylon) said that he was gratified that the sponsors of the draft resolution and other delegations had tried to take his proposal into account. He drew the Committee's attention to the statement by the Executive Chairman of TAB and suggested that the Indian amendment would be in closer accord with that statement, if it was worded as follows: "Noting with appreciation that efforts are being made to make the very best use of resources available,". The Hungarian delegation's proposal seemed to him excellent, but he would not press for its adoption if the Committee accepted the Indian amendment.

21. Mr. URQUIDI (Mexico) said that he would accept the version of the Indian amendment as proposed by the Ceylonese representative, and the Greek representative's suggestion that the amendment proposed by Hungary, should be included in the draft resolution. He would, however, prefer that text to be worded as follows: "Bearing in mind the advisability of the best possible use of the available resources,".

22. He could not accept the Cuban representative's proposal, because it was not, in point of fact, the efforts of TAB alone that were involved, but also those of Governments.

23. Mr. ARKADEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, while it was natural that mistakes should be made, it was also natural that the Governments who suffered from them, should wish the situation to be improved. The text of the draft resolution should take their wishes into account. The Hungarian representative's suggestion was entirely reasonable and those of the Greek and Mexican delegations were also satisfactory.

24. The CHAIRMAN proposed that consideration of the draft resolution should be suspended, whilst the sponsors prepared a new revised version.

25. Mr. KAMENOV (Bulgaria) suggested that the sponsors of the draft resolution should invite the delegations which had submitted amendments and those with other suggestions to offer, to collaborate with them in drawing up the new text. The Greek representative's proposal certainly opened the way to a compromise solution. For his part, he would propose that the Indian amendment should be brought into still closer accord with the Executive Chairman's statement and should be worded as follows: "Taking note with satisfaction of the statement of the Executive Chairman of TAB on the need to make full use of the available resources,".

26. Mr. BERNARDO (Argentina) said that he supported the Chairman's proposal as amplified by the Bulgarian representative.

27. Mr. SZITA (Hungary) said that he saw no objection to the substitution in his amendment of the word "advisability" for the word "necessity", as suggested by the Mexican representative.

28. Mr. HAYTA (Turkey) said that, if operative paragraph 1 of the original seven-Power resolution were reintroduced, it might not be necessary to retain the words "fourteen of which represent increases over their 1958 pledges", which had been added, at the request of the representative of Ireland, to the third preambular paragraph of the revised draft resolution.

29. After a brief exchange of views, in which Mr. BANNIER (Netherlands), Mr. JAZAIRI (Libya) and Mr. ALFONZO RAVARD (Venezuela) took part, the CHAIRMAN proposed that consideration of the draft resolution should be suspended to give the sponsors an opportunity to revise their text, taking into account the amendments and suggestions submitted.

It was so decided.

30. The CHAIRMAN invited the members of the Committee to consider the draft resolution concerning the regular programme of technical assistance (A/C.2/L. 372).

31. Mr. BOIKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that he had no reason to feel appreciative, as, so far, no experts had been recruited in the Ukrainian SSR and no fellowship holders had been sent to Ukrainian educational institutions. He could, therefore, only accept the draft resolution, if his remarks were taken into account.

32. The CHAIRMAN invited the members of the Committee to consider the draft resolution concerning the training of middle level technical personnel (A/C.2/L. 373).

33. Mr. CHENG PAONAN (China) proposed that the words "the primary problem" in the first preambular paragraph should be replaced by the words "one of the primary problems". With regard to the third preambular paragraph, he was sure that the proposed expansion would involve a considerable increase in expenses, whether the training in question was given abroad or locally.

34. Mr. BERNARDO (Argentina) said that he supported the amendment proposed by the Chinese representative. He proposed that the words "and in other countries where facilities are available" should be inserted after the words "within the framework of the normal professional training in the more developed countries" in the operative paragraph.

35. Mr. YRIART (Uruguay) seconded that proposal. As far as the cost of expanding professional training of qualified workers was concerned, he shared the view of the Chinese representative. The aim of the draft resolution was sound, but certain points needed clarification.

36. Mr. ALFONZO RAVARD (Venezuela) also thought that the tone of the third preambular paragraph was too optimistic. Experience showed that training abroad entailed substantial expenses. In the case in point, the workers would not only have to make an expensive journey, but, in most cases, would also have to learn a foreign language. It might be preferable to send experts, who could train a large number of workers in their native land, using the language of the country.

37. Mr. BARNES (United Kingdom) said that he appreciated the intention behind the draft resolution, but was not very clear about its practical scope. Moreover, there were no details about the financial implications. In the operative paragraph, the word "extending" would be preferable to the word "establishing", in view of the fact that the type of training in question was clearly being carried out under the Expanded Programme.

38. Mr. VIVIAN (Canada) thought that that change would improve the text. He proposed in addition that in the English text the words "a scheme" should be replaced by the plural "schemes".

39. Mr. RONAN (Ireland) said that, in the English text of the draft resolution, he would prefer the term "semi-professional" to the term "middle level", which seemed to him ambiguous.

40. Mr. TALAAT (United Arab Republic) expressed support for the draft resolution, which answered a real need. Since the object was merely to give technical training to the labourers required for carrying out development programmes, it was doubtful whether expenses would reach exorbitant proportions. As regards the wording of the draft resolution, he favoured the amendments proposed by the Chinese and Canadian representatives.

41. Mr. SULIMAN (Sudan) said that the draft resolution offered a means of bridging the gap which existed in the under-developed countries between unskilled labourers and professional people. However, in view of the fact that, even if language problems were disregarded, it would be just as expensive to send a worker abroad as a student, it would undoubtedly be better if the training in question were given by instructors in the countries concerned.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.