

# GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THIRTEENTH SESSION

Official Records


 Monday, 3 November 1958,  
at 3.20 p.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) . . .	121

**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.374/Rev.1, A/C.2/L.375/Rev.2)

EXAMINATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.2/L.374/REV.1, A/C.2/L.375/REV.2) (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to resume its consideration of the revised draft resolution concerning international co-operation in the field of technical assistance (A/C.2/L.374/Rev.1).
2. Mr. GIRETTI (Italy) said that he had been impressed by the force of the arguments advanced at the 540th meeting concerning the phrase "consistent with the integrity and economic and political independence of the less developed countries". "Integrity" was obviously not the right word and there was little connexion between technical assistance and the territorial integrity of recipient countries. On the other hand, all members of the Committee recognized that the primary objective of technical assistance was to help those countries to strengthen their economies, with a view to promoting their economic and political independence in the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations, and that it should not be a means of foreign economic or political interference in their internal affairs. Those fundamental principles were stated in paragraphs 1 and 2 (d) (i) of annex I to Economic and Social Council resolution 222 A (IX) on the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance. The Committee might, therefore, replace the phrase in question by the words "in conformity with the general principles stated in Economic and Social Council resolution 222 A (IX)", or insert a new sub-paragraph in the preamble referring to the relevant paragraphs of that Council resolution.
3. Mr. SERBAN (Romania) said that he felt that the Italian representative's second suggestion was preferable, but would like to know the exact wording he proposed, as a mere reference to Council resolution 222 A (IX), which covered many questions, would not be specific enough. The sponsors of the draft resolution and the Italian representative might perhaps discuss the matter with a view to preparing a new text.

4. The CHAIRMAN observed that the sponsors had agreed at the previous meeting to delete the word "integrity" on the proposal of the Turkish representative. As Council resolution 222 A (IX) referred to the economic and political independence of the less developed countries and those words appeared in the draft resolution, the Committee might perhaps keep the text as it stood, with the word "integrity" deleted, without inserting a reference to the Council resolution.

5. Mr. PSCOLKA (Czechoslovakia) said that he saw no objection to the Chairman's suggestion.

6. Mr. HAYTA (Turkey) pointed out that he had proposed either that the word "integrity" be deleted or that the adjective "territorial" be added.

7. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that there appeared to be little connexion between the territorial integrity of recipient countries and programmes of technical assistance and that his delegation would therefore be prepared to support the Italian representative's suggestion. An indication that the draft resolution was intended to refer to the general principles set out in paragraphs 1 and 2 of annex I to Council resolution 222 A (IX) would be sufficient.

8. Mr. MENDOZA LOPEZ (Bolivia) pointed out that the notion of independence obviously included that of integrity, in regard both to political and economic relations between States. It was clear that the interdependence of States meant the interdependence of their freedoms and not an interdependence which would make one nation subject to another.

9. Mr. KAMENOV (Bulgaria) said that, while the Italian representative's suggestion was satisfactory, the Chairman's was perhaps better.

10. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the delegations concerned should consult together concerning the draft resolution (A/C.2/L.374/Rev.1), and that the Committee should go on to examine the revised draft resolution concerning fellowships and centres for the training of high level national personnel (A/C.2/L.375/Rev.2).

11. Mr. PENTEADO (Brazil), introducing the revised draft resolution, said that the sponsors had made every effort to take into account the suggestions made to them at the 539th meeting, in so far as the suggestions were consistent with the essential purpose of the draft resolution and were not likely to weaken it. They had, accordingly, replaced the fourth preambular paragraph by a sentence reproducing almost exactly the third preambular paragraph of resolution 699 (XXVI), which had been adopted unanimously by the Economic and Social Council. In the last paragraph of the preamble and in operative paragraphs 2 and 3, the word "higher", before the word "educational", had been deleted.

12. With regard to the original text of operative paragraph 1, he pointed out that it had not been the

intention of the sponsors to seek to limit the sovereign rights of States, as some delegations had seemed to fear. Nevertheless, in order to remove any doubt on that score and to take into account the Australian representative's cogent observations, the sponsors had agreed to replace the unacceptable text by a sentence which was also taken almost verbatim from Council resolution 699 (XXVI).

13. He thanked delegations for their suggestions and expressed the hope that the Committee would be able to adopt the new text unanimously.

14. Mr. KAMENOV (Bulgaria) observed that, during the debate, his delegation had emphasized its particular interest in the problem of training high level national personnel. In common with many others, it had also expressed regret at the decrease in the number of fellowships awarded under the Expanded Programme and, accordingly, warmly welcomed the draft resolution of which it had become a co-sponsor.

15. Mr. FARHADI (Afghanistan) considered the draft resolution very valuable and hoped that the Committee would have no difficulty in adopting it. At the same time, it seemed somewhat illogical to remind recipient countries of the advantages they would obtain by making wider use of fellowship facilities, when those countries were in fact calling for the expansion of the facilities in question. The text, as it stood, appeared to take the recipient Governments to task for having disregarded offers of fellowships, whereas, in fact, they had, in many cases, been prevented from making full use of them. In the circumstances, it might perhaps be more tactful to transfer the paragraph to the preamble, and word it as follows:

"Noting that Governments benefiting by the United Nations technical assistance programmes show an increasing appreciation of the advantages they could obtain by making wider use of the fellowship facilities afforded them under those programmes."

16. Mr. ARKADEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) felt that the Afghan representative had made a good point. It would be wrong to give the under-developed countries the impression that they were being blamed for the decrease in the number of fellowships offered, when that undesirable development was certainly due to other causes. The bodies responsible for the administration of the technical assistance programmes might have made mistakes in preparing the programmes and, in the case of the Trust Territories, for instance, the Administering Authorities had certainly not done everything possible to increase the number of fellowships awarded. The Committee should, accordingly, accept the Afghan representative's suggestion, which would improve the draft resolution that was on the whole very satisfactory.

17. Mr. BARNES (United Kingdom) explained that his delegation's amendment (A/C.2/L.377) was intended simply to reaffirm the fundamental principle of the country programming procedure.

18. His country did not underestimate the value of fellowships and training centres, as was shown by the fact that, in 1957, under the Expanded Programme, more fellows had studied in the United Kingdom than in any other country except the United States, where the number of fellows had been exactly the same as in the United Kingdom.

19. Miss HARELI (Israel) was in favour of the draft resolution and of the United Kingdom amendment, which she considered necessary to ensure that operative paragraph 1 was interpreted correctly; she considered, however, that a certain ambiguity might be removed if the words "allows for" in the English text of the third preambular paragraph were replaced by the word "ensures" and the words "work of experts" by "work done by experts". Further, in the last preambular paragraph and in operative paragraph 2, the word "specialists" might be qualified by the words "highly qualified" in order to bring out the difference between the draft under consideration and the draft resolution contained in document A/C.2/L.373/Rev.1. In the second preambular paragraph, the words "skilled personnel" might also be replaced by the words "highly skilled specialists".

20. Mr. PHILLIPS (United States of America) associated himself with the Soviet representative in supporting the amendment proposed by the Afghan representative. The draft resolution should not give the impression that an attempt was being made to impose a particular course of action on the under-developed countries. Under the country programming procedure, the choice of types of assistance was made by the recipient countries themselves and it would, therefore, also be unfair to criticize those responsible for administering technical assistance for the decrease in the number of fellowships, which was, in large part, due to the inadequacy of resources. It seemed unlikely that the funds available for the Expanded Programme would make it possible to consider the establishment of new centres: that would be rather the province of the Special Fund. It would therefore be better to refer merely to existing facilities and to replace the word "have" in the fifth preambular paragraph, by the word "utilize".

21. Mr. KAKITSUBO (Japan) drew the Committee's attention to paragraphs 456 and 457 of the annual report of the Technical Assistance Board (E/3080 and Add.1) which analysed the preferences of Governments for the different types of technical assistance. The decrease in the number of fellowships was attributable to the fact that there were other sources from which they could be obtained outside the United Nations programmes. There was therefore some point in reminding Governments of the advantages they could obtain by making wider use of the facilities offered them under those programmes. In operative paragraph 3, he felt it would be better to replace the words "give particular importance to projects" by the words "pay due attention to project requests", since the type of assistance furnished was determined by the applicant Governments and not by the organizations administering the programmes. The United Kingdom amendment would remove any doubt on that point. He agreed with the United States representative that the establishment of new centres was more within the province of the Special Fund.

22. Mr. MORALES (Argentina) remarked that, in the past, it had been believed in some quarters that the training of skilled personnel in under-developed countries should be in step with their economic development and begin with the lowest categories rising progressively to the highest levels. In practice, the reverse process was desirable, since higher level personnel, once trained, could continue the work un-

dertaken, perhaps better than the experts themselves, who were not always familiar with the individual problems of the countries to which they were sent. Unfortunately, the training of skilled personnel was almost entirely dependent on the fellowships awarded by the more developed countries, a situation that entailed certain disadvantages. There could be no doubt that the ideal solution would be to send all fellowship holders to high level centres in the region. Even if the establishment of new centres was more the responsibility of the Special Fund, it should be possible to envisage the wider use of existing centres for the training of "highly skilled specialists" under the Expanded Programme.

23. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) emphasized that operative paragraph 1 was not intended to criticize or even persuade the recipient Governments; its sole purpose was to remind them of certain advantages, just as General Assembly resolution 1218 (XII) on the study of international commodity problems invited them to avail themselves of certain facilities in another field. He was prepared to accept the Israel and United Kingdom amendments, but believed that the Afghan amendment would weaken the draft resolution. The amendment proposed by the Japanese representative seemed acceptable, but the sponsors would need time for consultation before expressing a final opinion.

24. Mr. RAJAPATIRANA (Ceylon) said that he could support operative paragraph 3, but was unable to accept the other two paragraphs. He recognized that the number of fellowships accepted had fallen off in 1956 and 1957, but he did not believe that the Committee could give advice to recipient Governments on the subject before it had considered the reasons for their action. It might well be that recipient Governments had, like Ceylon, availed themselves of fellowships offered them under programmes other than those of the United Nations, that they considered that, their own resources being limited, priority should be given to other projects, or that, in view of the programme's limited resources, they did not feel justified in requesting fellowships in preference to other types of assistance. In any event, it did not seem necessary to remind Governments or draw the attention of Governments to the advantages offered by fellowship programmes and training centres, as they were perfectly aware of them. In his view, it would be better to delete the first two operative paragraphs and retain the third, which expressed a constructive idea. His delegation supported the United Kingdom and Israel amendments.

25. Mr. BANNIER (Netherlands) believed that the draft resolution would be improved if it was amended on the lines suggested by the Ceylonese representative. He would, however, support the draft even in its present form, since it had already received the approval of many countries needing assistance in the field in question. He would also vote for the United Kingdom amendment as a reaffirmation of one of the cardinal principles of programming, although it could not be regarded as a summary of the procedure as a whole, since it was necessary to remember the part played by the participating organizations under Economic and Social Council resolution 542 B (XVIII). In order to avoid any confusion between the training of high level personnel and education in general, he

proposed that the word "educational" in preambular paragraph 5 and operative paragraph 2 be deleted and that, in operative paragraph 3, it should be replaced by the word "training".

26. Mr. ENCINAS (Peru) regretted that the draft resolution appeared to overlook one essential aspect of the question: the situation that would arise if the under-developed countries submitted so many requests that they could not all be met through lack of funds. That possibility should be borne in mind and should be taken into account in the operative part. For example, the technical assistance services might be invited to review the entire fellowship programme, with a view to finding ways and means of meeting an increase in requests.

27. Mr. KITTANI (Iraq) noted that, despite their efforts, the sponsors had been unable to produce a draft of operative paragraph 1 acceptable to all delegations, and suggested that it might be better to delete the paragraph. If that could not be done, his delegation would support the Afghan representative's suggestion. He supported the Netherlands amendment, which took up a suggestion he himself had made earlier (539th meeting), and hoped that the sponsors would be able to accept the Japanese amendment to operative paragraph 3. He felt it would be preferable to substitute the word "through" for the words "with the help of" in the fifth preambular paragraph.

28. Mr. PENTEADO (Brazil) accepted the United Kingdom amendment on behalf of his own delegation and those of Argentina, Bulgaria, France and Greece. He had no major objection in principle to the Afghan proposal, but felt that the criticism levelled at the sponsors should be addressed to the Economic and Social Council, as the words objected to already appeared in Council resolution 699 (XXVI).

29. Mr. FARHADI (Afghanistan) felt it was important not to give the impression that the under-developed countries were solely responsible for the failure to make full use of fellowship facilities, as there were a variety of reasons for that situation. In his view, it would be better to express the idea contained in paragraph 1 in the preamble rather than in the operative part and in a different form. The moral force of the draft resolution would not be weakened by the change.

30. Mr. JAZAIRI (Libya) agreed with the representatives of Ceylon and Japan that it would be unfair to accuse the Governments of having neglected the facilities available to them without inquiring why fellowships had not been used. The draft did not take sufficient account of the normal prerogatives of the recipient countries as independent States. The affirmation in the second preambular paragraph was much too categorical and did not leave Governments freedom to determine their own course of action. On the other hand, the underlying idea that countries would not be fully independent until they could dispense with the assistance of experts was an excellent one. He hoped that the text would be modified to make it generally acceptable.

31. Mr. ALVAREZ RESTREPO (Colombia) said that his country greatly appreciated the fellowships offered to it and had used them all, because it believed it to be essential to train senior officials to discharge important functions satisfactorily. That was an aim of

which Governments might well be reminded. The sponsors of the draft resolution had shown a most understanding attitude in accepting the amendments proposed and the text was entirely satisfactory.

32. The CHAIRMAN declared the debate on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.2/L.375/Rev.2 closed and proposed that the vote be deferred to enable the delegations concerned to produce a final text.

It was so decided.

33. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the draft resolution concerning international co-operation in the field of technical assistance (A/C.2/

L.374/Rev.1). The sponsors, the Romanian and Czechoslovak delegations, had decided to delete from the operative part the words "consistent with the integrity and economic and political independence of the less developed countries" and to substitute the words "being guided in particular by the principles contained in paragraphs 1 and 2 (d) (i) of annex I to resolution 222 A (IX) of the Economic and Social Council". The contents of those paragraphs would appear as a footnote.

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted unanimously.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.