

ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL

CONSEIL
ECONOMIQUE
ET SOCIAL

E/A.C.6/SR.56
4 August 1949

Dual Distribution

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Ninth Session

ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FIFTY-SIXTH MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 28 July, 1949, at 3 p.m.

Contents:

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF UNDER-DEVELOPED
COUNTRIES (Item 9 of the Council Agenda)
(Continued) pages 4 - 20

Present:

Chairman:

Mr. SANTA CRUZ

Members:

Australia

Mr. WALKER

Belgium

Mr. van TICHELEN

Brazil

Mr. de ALMEIDA
Mr. CAMPOS

Byelorussian SSR

Mr. ASTAPENKO

Chile

Mr. SCHNAKE

China

Mr. P. C. CHANG

Denmark

Mr. IVERSEN

France

Mr. de SEYNES

India

Mr. ADARKAR

Lebanon

Mr. HAKIM

New Zealand

Dr. SUTCH

Peru

Mr. TORRES BELON

Poland

Miss CZARKO

Turkey

Mr. SARPER

Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics

Mr. MOROZOV

United Kingdom

Sir Gerard CLAUSON

United States of America

Mr. THORP

Venezuela

Mr. MIRALLES

Representatives of Specialized Agencies:

International Labour Organization

Mr. RICHES

Food and Agriculture Organization

Mr. MCDUGALL

United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural
Organization

Mr. BERKELEY

International Civil Aviation
Organization

Mr. MARLIN

International Bank for Reconstruction
and Development

Mr. LOPEZ-HERRARTE

International Monetary Fund

Mr. LUTHRINGER

World Health Organization

Dr. HAFEZI

Consultants from non-Governmental Organizations:

Category (a):

International Co-operative Alliance

Mr. ODHE

Category (b):

Women's International League for
Peace and Freedom

Miss BAER

World's Young Women's Christian
Association

Miss ARNOLD
Mrs. FOX

Secretariat:

Mr. Owen

Assistant Secretary-General for
Economic Affairs

Mr. Weintraub

Director of the Division of Economic
Stability and Development

Mr. Dumontet

Secretary to the Committee.

1. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF UNDER-DEVELOPED COUNTRIES (Item 9 of the Council Agenda) (Documents E/1327/Add.1, E/AC.6/W.49)
(continued)

The CHAIRMAN asked for comments on the terms of reference of a working group to consider technical assistance for economic development proposed by the representative of the United States of America (Document E/AC.6/W.49) and requested representatives to confine their remarks to that issue.

Dr. SUTCH (New Zealand) wished to pay tribute to the impartial and objective summing up of the general discussion in plenary by the United States representative at the preceding meeting. His Government had, however, from the beginning opposed the setting up of a working group, on the grounds that a committee of the whole should have the opportunity of studying so important a problem. That did not imply that his Government objected in principle to the setting up of sub-committees or working parties, which were often both necessary and useful, especially where it was necessary to study one special aspect of a given problem.

Practical reasons of a technical order, moreover, militated against the setting up of the proposed working group. Experts would have to devote the whole of their time to its meetings, and the smaller delegations would thus be handicapped, since their experts might also be required to attend meetings of the Council, or of the Economic Committee. The United States proposal that the working group should meet continuously, even in the evening and possibly on Sundays, would be difficult to put into effect at the present stage of the Council's work. It was intended that the ninth session should end on 12 August 1949: if however, the proposed working group were to meet over a period of two weeks, reporting thereafter to the Economic Committee, which would have to discuss its recommendations before submitting them to the Council for discussion in plenary, the time limit could be observed only by giving the problem purely superficial examination; an exhaustive investigation would be impossible.

There was the further technical difficulty that there were only two pairs of teams of simultaneous interpreters. If one of those pairs were allocated to the working group, it would not be possible for any of

the other committees to meet daily, unless they practised consecutive interpretation. That again would hold up the work of the Council. Moreover, the leading economic representatives of the various delegations would be called upon to join the working group, so that the Economic Committee itself would have to make do with alternates.

He would submit that the whole problem be approached from a different angle. In the proposed terms of reference emphasis was laid on "types of activity". In the opinion of his delegation it would be wiser at the present stage of the work to construct the administrative and budgetary foundation for the technical assistance programme. He would, therefore, prefer to take the last three points suggested by the United States representative in his speech in a different order, namely; financial, administrative and co-ordination problems, and subsequently to devote some time to the broad types of activities.

It would be impossible to take a decision on specific "types of activity" since the kinds of requests which would come in from the various countries were as yet unknown. Consequently, from that aspect the problem could only be examined very generally. The participating agencies, as the United States representative had so felicitously termed them, had proposed some six programmes for the first year. If the working group were to study the proposals outlined in the Secretary-General's Report (Document E/1327/Add.1) in detail, any decision that it could reach would be a purely theoretical one, since the specific "types of activity" suggested by the specialized agencies and the United Nations might not ultimately form part of the expanded programme of assistance, which would ultimately depend on the nature of the applications received from the various countries. It necessarily followed that the first year's programme would be largely experimental.

It would also be premature, for similar reasons, to consider the percentage distribution of funds among various types of activities, as was suggested in paragraph (c) of Document E/AC.6/W.49. There could be no doubt that considerable differences of opinion would emerge with regard to percentage distribution. For example, the New Zealand Government was specially interested in social activities, whereas the United States held that the term "economic activities" should be applied

to cover a great many different fields. There would, no doubt, be divergencies of opinion as to the percentages to be allocated between the several specialized agencies, even between the eighteen governments already represented in the Council. It was true that any conclusions reached by the working group would be further debated in the Committee and in plenary, but in the General Assembly they would be submitted to the representatives not of eighteen, but of sixty countries. It was therefore impossible at the present stage to go beyond the determination of a global figure, for any percentage allocation of funds to the several specialized agencies made now might not correspond to the requests for technical assistance. The setting up of a central fund amounting to between 50 and 60 per cent of the total monies available would have to be pre-supposed. In the meantime, at least six months must elapse before it became known how much money would in fact be available.

Further, to fix the percentage distribution at the present stage would cause serious difficulties if, in accordance with the proposal made by the United States representative in plenary, a conference consisting of governments represented in the United Nations and in the specialized agencies was called to consider the budgetary aspects of the programme. The procedure envisaged in the United States proposal in Document E/AC.6/W.49 was manifestly too complicated, since it would suffice during the first year to examine the Secretary-General's Report (Document E/1327/Add. 1) in relation to Council Resolution 179 (VIII), to ensure that no important fields of activity had been omitted, and, in the light of that examination, to submit an appropriate global figure to the General Assembly. Finally, it should be noted that the speed with which any specialized agency spent the monies allocated to it would be determined by the nature of the applications for technical assistance received from various countries.

For those reasons he opposed the setting up of a working group.

Mr. ADARKAR (India) associated himself with the tribute paid to the United States representative with regard to the objectivity of his statement, but agreed with the New Zealand representative that the setting up of a working group would constitute a wrong approach to the problem. The issues were not as yet sufficiently crystallized to enable

the working group to make useful proposals from the three aspects mentioned in the United States proposal.

Although whole-heartedly in agreement with the New Zealand representative as to the necessity for a thorough examination of the plan, he did not consider that such examination should be postponed for one year. It should rather be entrusted to a standing committee, to a committee of the Economic and Social Council, or to the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination and any technical assistance committee which might be set up. He must note in passing that the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination had not yet examined the question.

He could not agree with the attitude taken by certain representatives, namely, that the Secretary-General's Report should be approached from the point of view of reducing the estimated amount. A detailed examination of needs for technical assistance was required. The allocation of funds would depend on the size of operations, but it was for the Economic and Social Council to give its views on financial techniques, currencies to be used and methods of co-ordination. Those indications might in due course, after being considered by the General Assembly, be transmitted to a special conference such as that proposed by the United States representative in plenary.

He considered that the correct approach to the problem would be that which had been applied in the case of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, when funds had been made available first and budgeting and allocation governed by demand. A central fund should be set up and contributions should be asked for on a dual basis, partly compulsory and partly voluntary.

The preliminary examination of the programme should be carried out by the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination in conjunction with a technical assistance committee. An interim committee might also be set up by the Council for that purpose. That committee could begin its work before the forthcoming session of the General Assembly opened and should study the proposed programme in detail in conjunction with the other two committees he had just mentioned. After the General Assembly had examined that committee's recommendations, and made its own, a

special conference could consider them anew. Both from the administrative and psychological points of view such a procedure would be preferable. He fully agreed with the New Zealand representative that the amounts to be allocated to the various specialized agencies should not be pre-judged.

Mr. CHANG (China) commended the three-fold method of presentation of the problem adopted in the United States proposal (Document E/AC.6/W.49), but endorsed the arguments adduced, to the effect that practical considerations militated against the setting up of a working group. He also agreed that consideration of the "types of activity" must be closely inter-linked with the problem of methods of financing. Ultimately the Committee's decision must rest on the fundamental attitude adopted towards the whole programme of technical assistance: should it be built up like any other programme or should traditional procedure be subordinated to the over-riding factor of urgency? That was a very important choice. The administration which would be called upon to deal with the programme did not as yet know the number or the nature of the calls that would be made upon it or whence they would come. It was certain, however, that needs would be tremendous and that technical assistance would be required on all sides. Consequently the first and foremost task should be to prepare trained staff who would not only know how to use available equipment but would also be able to assist the under-developed countries in defining their needs. Such funds as became available would undoubtedly be only too easily expendable; what mattered far more was the formation of a cadre of investigators capable of studying needs and of assisting the responsible authorities in the under-developed countries to formulate their requests in the best and most constructive way. That would be by no means an easy task, and he had known instances of highly educated persons who had been unequal to it. The proposals outlined in the Secretary-General's Report (Document E/1327/Add.1) were excellent, but they should be supplemented by the formation of an advance guard of technical assistance who would participate in the great task of gradually subjugating natural forces to the needs of man.

Unless such an advance force were available, there would be a risk that the technical equipment involved would not be properly used, or

that it might be used for purposes not wholly in keeping with the intentions of Council Resolution 179(VIII). He would, therefore, urge the Committee to consider the programme in terms of its urgency, and would stress, in conclusion, that needs existed everywhere and that it was of the utmost importance to build up a dynamic service which would answer calls for help with the speed and efficiency of a fire brigade.

Mr. IVERSEN (Denmark) supported the proposal that a working group should be set up. It would be wise to have a general review of the Secretary-General's Report (Document E/1327/Add.1), together with a proposal for a global figure expendable during the first year.

He would draw the attention of the New Zealand representative to the fact that the fixing of a global amount of necessity implied a tentative percentage distribution between the different fields of activity.

In the opinion of his delegation, the accomplishment of the Committee's task would be speeded up if the working group were to undertake a general review of the plans for technical assistance, while the Committee itself was examining other aspects of the problem. Moreover, the Secretariat had advanced no insuperable arguments against holding an increased number of meetings daily. He assumed, therefore, that it would be possible to service the working group. He feared that, without its assistance, the work of the Committee might not come sufficiently close to the realities of the situation. He, for his part, did not believe that any useful purpose would be served by considering the aspect of demand, since in the first year demand would undoubtedly be far greater than the resources available. The bottle-neck would occur in trained personnel, training centres, laboratories, research institutions, etc.

It was the duty both of the Committee and of the Council to submit a workable plan for the first year to the General Assembly.

The CHAIRMAN explained the technical and administrative Secretariat aspects of the setting up of another body, which could not enjoy the services of a team of simultaneous interpreters unless one or another of the Council's committees was deprived of such services.

Sir Gerard CLAUSON (United Kingdom) said his delegation supported the United States proposal. He fully agreed that the questions before the Committee fell into two distinct categories, namely: those referred to in paragraph 5(1) of Council Resolution 180 (VIII); and those referred to in paragraphs 5(2) and (3). Those two categories required, respectively, close study and general discussion, which could proceed simultaneously. He feared that the New Zealand representative was under a misapprehension as to the nature of the review to be made. It should be the task of the working group to make a broad examination of programmes, and to decide on the relative value of types of projects. He agreed with the representative of India that such examination might reveal gaps and overlapping. The working group would be wise to begin by spending one day discussing projects with representatives of each of the specialized agencies concerned, and to conclude its work by suggesting what the balance between the various elements in the programme should be, since Council Resolution 180 (VIII) requested the Secretary-General to prepare a report for the ninth session of the Council setting forth a comprehensive plan for an expanded co-operative programme of technical assistance for economic development through the United Nations and its specialized agencies, paying due attention to questions of a social nature which directly conditioned economic development.

Mr. de SEYNES (France) said he would like to be associated with the congratulations addressed by various delegations to the United States representative on the excellent statement he had made at the morning meeting. He wished to say in particular how much he appreciated the United States representative's analysis of the nature of the problems under study, and the conclusions he had drawn from them as to the working methods to be adopted.

The French delegation was prepared to support the United States draft resolution both as a whole and in each of its parts, but he could not help regretting that some delegations had fallen into what he would call "the sin of being too much on the side of the angels." A search for perfection would certainly be premature at the present stage, and it must be recognised that the decisions to be taken that year on the programmes of technical assistance would of necessity be to some extent

arbitrary. There was no need, however, to be unduly alarmed about that, as the New Zealand representative seemed to be. He had indeed been astonished to hear the New Zealand representative state that the Committee would not be in a position to take a decision on the programmes because it was not sufficiently informed either as to the cost of the technical assistance that would be requested or as to the countries which would submit those requests. He thought the proposals submitted by the specialized agencies and included in the Secretary-General's Report were far from fantastic, and that they were in point of fact based on reliable data and on the experience of the specialized agencies. For that reason he would be surprised if the Committee were not already able at the present stage to assess the requests that might be submitted within the restricted limits of available credits. He was therefore ready to support the United States proposal, subject to certain drafting amendments in paragraph (c), the wording of which did not seem to him very felicitous.

Mr. WALKER (Australia) said his delegation had no objection the setting up of a working group, but thought that the latter's terms of reference merited further consideration and that the Committee should perhaps discuss certain matters beforehand for the guidance of the group. His delegation also paid tribute to the United States representative's statement at the previous meeting, but thought he should have placed more emphasis on the overwhelming importance of viewing programmes as a direct response to requests for technical assistance from governments, as the New Zealand representative had pointed out. It was generally hoped that the plan, as it was then taking shape, would be launched in time for the next session of the General Assembly. Governments would begin sending in requests in the near future, and the competent authority would have to decide whether a particular request qualified for technical assistance, and to make a selection between the requests accepted. The immediate concern of the Council should be to develop before the Assembly met a body of principles calculated to facilitate the process of selection, and indeed of rejection. Such a step would be necessary whether the implementation of programmes was decentralised or not. He would add that the rejection of a particular project need not mean that the requesting country received no help, since various specialized agencies

and the United Nations itself could still meet such requests out of their regular budgets.

The first step to be taken should be to decide whether the Secretary-General's Report (Document E/1327/Add.1) represented a reasonable guide to the types of requests for assistance which were likely to be accepted. The second step should be to establish a scale of priorities for the requests most likely to qualify for assistance, since, as the Chinese representative had pointed out, all governments, even those of some relatively developed countries, would undoubtedly find in the report pointers to types of technical assistance which they desired, and it would be quite impossible to meet all requests at once. In other words, it would be necessary within the next few months to single out the types of requests for technical assistance which would merit high priority. There were also considerations of geographical equity, and of the facilities of the specialized agencies for meeting particular requests. Paragraph (a) of the proposal before the Committee suggested that the United States delegation had something of that nature in mind. The working group would be more suitable for joint discussions with representatives of the specialized agencies than the whole Council or one of its Committees. Nevertheless he thought that there should perhaps be prior discussions within the Committee, for example, with regard to the precise definition of "economic development" for the guidance of the working group.

Generally speaking, the basic question to be considered by the working group was what results could be hoped for within one year. In his view the working group might consider the magnitude of the programme not in terms of the budget, but in terms of what was practicable in the light of potential personnel and technical facilities.

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring to the United States proposal, said the two questions before the Committee were: the type of organisation best suited for that task; and the terms of reference of the body selected. With regard to the former, his delegation did not attach great importance to whether the task was performed by a working group or by the Committee as a whole. The type of discussions that took place and the results of those discussions were all-important. At the same time weight should be given to the views

expressed in the Committee, especially by the smaller delegations, who foresaw difficulties arising out of the setting up of a Working Group. Secondly, with regard to the terms of reference, the United States proposal seemed to indicate that the working group would make recommendations as to the types of activity to be undertaken by the specialized agencies as well as by the United Nations. In that connection his delegation had emphasized previously that the decisive element in the field of technical assistance must be the requests received from the various countries. The extent to which requests from countries had been taken into account must therefore be known before the general report was drafted. His delegation thought that any attempt at the present stage to divert technical assistance from the immediate needs of particular countries would be quite unacceptable. A co-ordinated programme based on abstract plans would inevitably fail, and co-ordination must therefore be based on requests for real and concrete assistance.

With regard to paragraph (c) of the United States proposal, which referred to a percentage distribution of funds among various types of activities, he would point out that, in his delegation's view, the activities of a particular specialized agency were entirely a matter for that agency itself.

Mr. SARPEN (Turkey) paid tribute in his turn to the United States representative's statement, which had very clearly summarized the problems the Economic Committee had to tackle, including the question of the technical assistance to be granted to under-developed countries.

There were already several draft plans of technical assistance which would have to be studied in detail, and for that reason the Turkish delegation approved the proposal to set up a working group which might make a preliminary examination of those plans. There could of course be no question of finding a perfect solution to begin with, but it might be possible to make a start and fill in later, in the light of experience, any gaps that might become apparent.

Mr. CAMPOS (Brazil) said he wished to comment briefly on the advisability of setting up a Working Group, and on the functions of such a Group or of any alternative body. The proposal to set up a Working Group was superficially attractive, but it had been his experience that the

ability of a United Nations organ to take decisions varied in direct ratio to its size. It was doubtful whether a working group would be more efficient than a committee of the whole. For example, delegations which were not represented in the group might insist on being heard by it, and there would be a net overall loss of time if the same discussions had to be repeated by the working group, the Economic Committee and finally by the Council itself.

He nevertheless agreed with the terms of reference set forth in the United States proposal. Misgivings arising from the element of uncertainty regarding the range of magnitude of programme, which would depend on the number and type of requests from governments, were not justified. An attempt should be made to reach agreement on the range of magnitude and on the allocation of funds. A central fund could be set aside to ensure flexibility and it might be possible to balance requests since, as the French representative had said, the plans of the specialized agencies were presumably based on experience and on a clear conception of the form requests from governments were likely to take. He therefore supported the proposed terms of reference, but thought that decisions should be taken at committee level since he had little faith in the efficacy of small groups in that particular direction.

Mr. van TICHELEN (Belgium) reminded the meeting that in order to simplify the discussion on Item 9 of the Agenda, the Committee had taken the wise course of examining the programme of technical assistance, and to that end it had envisaged two possibilities: either that the problem should be studied at plenary meetings or that a working group should be established to make a preliminary study of the question. The Belgian delegation was of the opinion that only a small working group could do useful work in that field, and thought the terms of reference proposed in the United States resolution sufficiently precise. In connection with paragraph (a) of that document, in which it was stated that the working group would consider "what activities are likely to be feasible in the first year" he assumed that what the author of the proposal had in mind was the definition of types of activities which might be undertaken rather than an enumeration of specific projects.

He pointed out that the Australian representative had taken up the suggestion made in the Council by the Belgian delegation, which sought to

establish criteria for deciding whether requests for technical assistance were acceptable or not. In his opinion the wisest course would be to establish a principle of equity with regard to the geographical distribution of technical assistance; it would moreover be desirable that the executive body entrusted with the preparatory work and the examination of applications should be able to apply certain criteria. That was of course an initial task, the dimensions of which would doubtless increase as the work progressed, and it would be possible for the Council, in the light of experience, to modify or enlarge any criteria so adopted.

Mr. MIRALLES (Venezuela) said he was hesitating between the United States and New Zealand proposals, each of which had its advantages. After having heard the Brazilian representative's statement, however, he was inclined to oppose the setting up of a working group. Apart from the Brazilian representative's argument, there was also the consideration that there might be insufficient personnel for the operation of the working group, a point made by the New Zealand representative which had strongly impressed the delegation of Venezuela. The Australian representative's proposal to proceed in the first place to a general discussion of the question and subsequently refer it for detailed examination to a working group was attractive at first sight, but on reflection he felt that such a procedure would complicate and prolong the work unnecessarily. He would therefore vote for the New Zealand proposal.

Mr. SCHNAKE (Chile) supported the United States proposal, which, he considered, offered a solution which would lead to practical results. The arguments advanced against the setting up of a working group were out of order; particularly the argument that the Committee must ascertain what funds were available before drafting a programme. That had nothing to do with the matter before the Committee, of which the primary task was to delimit the field in which technical assistance could be effective; a task in which it could obtain the assistance of the specialized agencies. There also appeared to be a tendency, as the French representative had pointed out, to forget that the specialized agencies were already well aware of the needs of the countries concerned through their permanent relations with Governments Members of the agencies.

It would be a mistake to believe that the problem of technical assistance was being dealt with for the first time.

The International Labour Organization, the World Health Organization, and the Food and Agriculture Organization, had all made surveys of the needs of the under-developed areas, which would provide the Committee with a sound basis for discussion. The working group could therefore render useful service by determining the methods of technical assistance. If it were later found that available funds were inadequate to finance the programmes proposed by the specialized agencies, the requests for technical assistance could be reduced to appropriate proportions when the time came. That problem would not, he believed, arise during the first year.

To meet the Chinese representative's point that certain under-developed countries might not, for lack of technical knowledge, be able to express their requirements, he thought that two stages of technical assistance might be contemplated. The first stage would be to provide countries, at their request, with experts to assist them in assessing their needs, and the second to draw up the programme of technical assistance proper.

In spite of the observations made by the representatives of Venezuela and Brazil he considered that the working group proposed by the United States representative would considerably facilitate the work of the Economic Committee. He would therefore vote for the United States proposal.

Mr. P.C. CHANG (China) thanked the Chilean representative for his observations with regard to the Chinese delegation's rather inadequate statement. He agreed that a few countries had already made requests for technical assistance, but regarded such requests rather as a proof of his previous statement that many other countries were not clear as to the type of assistance they required; he hoped that those which experienced difficulty in formulating requests for assistance would not be neglected. The metaphor he had employed earlier had been intended to show clearly that the Committee could tackle what he would call the what, the how, and the wherewithal in the matter. But he would remind the Committee just how long the United Nations Secretariat and the specialized agencies had taken to agree to disagree. Yet the proposed working group

was expected to solve all difficulties in the short period of two weeks remaining. Since the task was obviously impossible he proposed that the general problem should be discussed by the Committee. There would, of course, be no time to examine all the technical details, the more so since, in his view, the scheme was too ambitious. While appreciating the Chilean representative's observations, he felt that the working group would not yield results. Discussion of the what, the how, and the wherewithal by the Committee might meet the objection raised by the Australian representative, and might show whether anything could be achieved, which he doubted.

Mr. ADARKAR (India) said that his delegation regarded the United States proposal as unfortunate from the technical point of view, and because of the difficulties it entailed for the smaller delegations.

Any results achieved by the working group would all be discussed in the Committee, in the Council, and in the General Assembly; but no final verdict could be given on the range of magnitude of programmes. Moreover, the financial implications would present too vast a problem for a mere working group to handle. From a close study of the United States proposal he doubted whether its sponsor expected a decision with regard to timing and allocations at that stage. He would point out, also, that the proposals contained in the Secretary-General's Report on technical assistance for economic development (Document E/1327/Add.1) had not been sufficiently examined by governments. Therefore, even if it were proper to allow the decisions referred to in the United States proposal to be taken by a working group, it was inadvisable that they should be taken now.

However, in the opinion of his delegation, the question of technical assistance for economic development could not be left to a working group, but was a matter for the Council and for all the countries concerned. With regard to the latter, he would point out that the views of recipient countries, some of which were not represented in either the Council or the Assembly, were unknown. The Indian delegation's proposal had unfortunately been rejected. He would now suggest that an interim committee be set up to meet just before the next General Assembly, with specific instructions to consider the views of the specialized agencies and recipient countries. In all the circumstances, it would be

best to begin by setting up a fund, and thereafter to have all projects thoroughly examined by as many competent bodies as possible, for example, the interim committee he had proposed, the General Assembly, the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination etc. The aim should be to provide the largest possible fund, and to leave it to whatever authority was appointed to decide in respect of what projects assistance should be granted.

Mr. THORP (United States of America) said he wished to comment on two points which had been raised in the Committee. First, there had been some misunderstanding in the matter of the programme. Of course programmes could not and should not be forced on countries. But it must be remembered that the need for technical assistance for economic development was tremendous, and could not be assessed in its totality. The final programme adopted would be much smaller than the total assistance likely to be asked for. The question was not new and the specialized agencies, in the light of their experience, were in a position to form a valid judgment as to what was possible. The Report of the Secretary-General (Document E/1327/Add.1) showed what could be done with available resources. The governments which were represented on the specialized agencies knew what should be done and what could be done. He agreed with the New Zealand representative that the problem of providing broad indications as to programmes was a difficult one. But the fact that the Council might lay down various types of activities would not imply any freezing of activities. Furthermore, allocations for the ensuing year would not prejudice allocations for, say, three years from now. He shared the Indian representative's view as to the Council's responsibility in the matter, but thought no final judgment was possible at the present stage. Since the Council had to prepare a broad expanded programme for the General Assembly, it should endeavour to produce as good a programme as possible, a programme covering substantive as well as fiscal and administrative aspects of the problems of technical assistance. In addition, it should be remembered that governments would be expected to make contributions. Therefore needs should be made as clear and comprehensible as possible. Even the United Nations itself must have a specific budget and, despite the special difficulties in the present case, an attempt should be made to approach that ideal as closely as possible.

The object of the United States' proposal was merely to stress that the problems he had outlined must be faced. He appreciated the difficulties which had been pointed out by other representatives, but thought the setting up of the Working Group would save time, since its attention would be focussed on a specific assignment. In conclusion, he hoped that the Committee would now be in a position to vote on his delegation's proposal.

The CHAIRMAN asked the United States representative whether he wished to amend his proposal to indicate the number of members to be included in the working group.

Mr. THORP (United States of America) replied that the first question to be decided by the Committee was whether it wished to set up the working group.

Replying to the CHAIRMAN, Mr. WALKER (Australia) said that his delegation did not wish to move any formal amendment.

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that the Committee should avoid further complications by proceeding to a vote on the United States proposal.

The CHAIRMAN said that the United States delegation had proposed the setting up of a working group with certain terms of reference. However, he interpreted the observation of the Soviet Union representative as a request for an initial vote on whether the working group should be set up.

Mr. de SEYNES (France) wished to point out, before the vote was taken, that he had announced his intention of submitting an amendment to the form of paragraph (c). He now wished also to submit an amendment of substance, since the paragraph contained a number of ideas which he thought inopportune; namely, the concepts of "percentage" and of "levels of activity". He therefore proposed that paragraph (c) of the United States proposal be deleted and replaced by the following text:

"(c) Determination, within the framework of the funds appropriated for the general programme, of the range of magnitude of the sums to be allocated to the various types of projects, such as those

proposed by the United Nations, the Food and Agriculture Organization, the World Health Organization, the International Labour Organization, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, and the International Civil Aviation Organization."

The Committee rejected the United States proposal that it set up a working group to consider Technical Assistance for Economic Development by 9 votes to 8.

On the proposal of Mr. P.C. CHANG (China), the Committee unanimously agreed that, at the next meeting, the following questions should be discussed, and in that order: types of activity; administration and co-ordination; and procedure for financing.

The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.