

United Nations  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY

SEVENTEENTH SESSION

Official Records

SECOND COMMITTEE, 877th  
MEETING

Friday, 14 December 1962,  
at 10.30 a.m.



NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page	
<i>Agenda item 39:</i>		Progress and operations of the Special Fund (A/5247, E/3576, E/3646/Rev.1) (continued)
<i>Permanent sovereignty over natural resources (concluded)</i>		United Nations programmes of technical co-operation (A/5259, A/5330) (continued):
<i>Adoption of the report of the Committee (concluded) . . . . .</i>	507	(a) Review of activities (E/3680);
<i>Agenda items 12, 40, 41 and 78:</i>		(b) Confirmation of the allocation of funds under the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance (A/C.2/216);
<i>Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapter IV) (continued) . . . . .</i>	507	(c) Question of assistance to Libya: report of the Secretary-General (A/5281, A/5282)
<i>Progress and operations of the Special Fund (continued) . . . . .</i>		Rwanda and Burundi: report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1746 (XVI) (A/5283 and Corr.1, A/C.2/L.716/Add.2, A/C.2/L.716/Rev.1 and Corr.1) (continued)
<i>United Nations programmes of technical co-operation (continued):</i>		
(i) Review of activities;		
(ii) Confirmation of the allocation of funds under the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance;		
(iii) Question of assistance to Libya: report of the Secretary-General. . . . .		3. The CHAIRMAN said that, having consulted the representative of the Secretary-General, he was in a position to inform the Committee that the revised draft resolution concerning the question of technical assistance to Rwanda and Burundi (A/C.2/L.716/Rev.1 and Corr.1), if adopted by the Committee, would be referred to the Fifth Committee so that the latter could consider the relevant financial implications in their entirety and advise the General Assembly thereon prior to action in the plenary meeting.
<i>Rwanda and Burundi: report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1746 (XVI) (continued).</i>		4. Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) expressed his delegation's sympathy with the countries of Africa which were obliged to face many political, economic and social problems. With regard to Rwanda and Burundi, he noted that the Secretary-General had indicated in his report (A/5283 and Corr.1) that unless a considerable amount of foreign aid was forthcoming, it would be difficult to see how those two countries could solve their economic and financial problems. Those problems were the legacy of the forty-three years during which Rwanda and Burundi had been plundered by Belgium. The Soviet Union was in favour of assistance to those countries, but the question was what form that assistance should take. It was a ticklish question but it seemed that, since most of the developing countries were more or less at the same stage of development, it would only be fair to treat them on an equal footing and to distribute the resources available equally as part of the United Nations technical assistance activities. That would, moreover, be consistent with the Secretary-General's views as set forth in paragraph 73 of his report.

Chairman: Mr. Bohdan LEWANDOWSKI  
(Poland).

AGENDA ITEM 39

Permanent sovereignty over natural resources (concluded)

ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE  
(A/5344/ADD.1) (concluded)

1. Miss SELLERS (Canada), Rapporteur, pointed out that in paragraph 72 of the draft report (A/5344/Add.1), the words "paragraph 4" should be amended to read "paragraph 3". In addition, in the third sub-paragraph of paragraph 89, the words "amendment (b)" should be changed to read "amendment (a)".

2. Mr. FINGER (United States of America) felt that it would be preferable for that sub-paragraph to be drafted as follows: "Sub-amendment (a) now proposed that the words 'by or' should be deleted from the phrase 'by or between sovereign States'".

The report (A/5344/Add.1) as revised<sup>1/</sup> was adopted, subject to possible subsequent textual amendments.

AGENDA ITEMS 12, 40, 41 AND 78

Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapter IV)  
(A/5203) (continued)

<sup>1/</sup> The text of the modifications adopted was circulated as document A/5344/Add.1/Corr.1.

5. In addition, operative paragraph 1 of the revised draft resolution authorized the Secretary-General to continue the programme started in 1962, but omitted to mention the maximum amount of \$513,600 specified in the original text, to which should be added the expenditure of \$800,000 for 1962, mentioned by the Secretary-General in paragraph 2 of his statement of the financial implications (A/C.2/L.716/Add.2) of the

draft resolution. Hence a substantial amount was involved and the Soviet Union was opposed to its being charged to the regular budget which was considered to cover the current United Nations expenditure. In that connexion, he pointed out that the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions had approved commitments not exceeding \$250,000 and had suggested that the balance of \$550,000 should be covered outside the regular budget. The existing resources were already scarcely sufficient to cover the needs of the United Nations; if they were constantly drawn upon, the United Nations treasury could be compared to the cask of the Danaids. The assistance to those countries should be provided under the technical co-operation programmes and by the Special Fund, the financing of which depended on voluntary contributions.

6. So far as the use to be made of the resources of the regular budget was concerned, the statement of financial implications indicated that an amount of \$288,000 would be devoted to the development and training of national forces. The Soviet Union considered that the authority thus vested in the Secretary-General under operative paragraph 1 far exceeded that conferred upon him by the United Nations Charter; that authority probably derived from General Assembly resolution 1746 (XVI), but that resolution had been intended to deal with a special case which was no longer justified since the emergency no longer existed.

7. In paragraph 73 of his report, the Secretary-General pointed out that there was every reason to believe that financial and technical assistance would be forthcoming from the European Economic Community and the Belgian Government and he was astonished that the sponsors of the draft resolution had not thought it possible and necessary to take that statement into account in their text. Thus the Committee was placed in an embarrassing position: first, it was being asked to consider the possibilities of granting technical assistance to those two countries and, secondly, no mention was made of the party primarily responsible for the plight of the two countries now suffering from the aftermath of Belgian colonialism. The Belgian representative had said that the end of the trusteeship had marked the end of Belgian responsibility but that Belgium had wished to continue its assistance on a footing of absolute equality. But on a footing of absolute equality with whom? With countries like Afghanistan, Iraq, Indonesia or Algeria which needed assistance themselves? Those countries were in no way responsible for the plight in which Rwanda and Burundi now found themselves. Hence it seemed that the sponsors ought to have stated the point clearly by compelling Belgium to increase its contribution to the Special Fund or even to grant special assistance to the territory which it had administered. That would be the fair solution for the peoples of Rwanda and Burundi. It was high time to tell Belgium that it had to pay for the misdeeds of its policy of pillage. The Secretary-General had stated that Belgium had agreed to pay a contribution of \$6 million; obviously that amount bore no relation to the requirements or to the profits which Belgium had reaped and continued to reap from those territories. But the representative of Burundi had said that even that amount had not been paid and that there were political strings to its disbursement. The time had come to demand that Belgium compensate Rwanda and Burundi for at least part of the wealth which it had looted.

8. In conclusion, he observed that it had been the intention of the Soviet Union to draw attention to some of the complex problems raised by the draft resolution and he hoped that the sponsors would understand the spirit in which his comments had been made. The Soviet Union was in favour of assistance to Rwanda and Burundi, whether bilateral or provided by voluntary contributions to the United Nations technical assistance programmes, but it did not wish that assistance to be a charge on the regular budget of the Organization. That was why his delegation had criticisms to make with regard to operative paragraphs 1 and 4. The principle of universality should not be applied for the provision of that assistance and the principal party responsible should not be ignored. The Committee could adopt the procedure followed in the case of assistance to Libya. As it had done in the case of Libya, the Soviet Union would be prepared to consider the requirements of Rwanda and Burundi and therefore to make a contribution to the Expanded Programme and to the Special Fund.

9. Mr. FORTHOMME (Belgium), exercising his right of reply, reminded the representative of the Soviet Union that neither Rwanda nor Burundi had any mineral resources. Its agricultural resources had increased thanks to the modern farming methods introduced by Belgium; much, of course, remained to be done—Belgium did not claim to have transformed a country in the short period of its administration—but it should be borne in mind that those countries had a population of approximately 5 million inhabitants living in an area comparable to that of Belgium; no other African country had such a high population density and that fact could explain the difficulties facing the two countries. The Soviet delegation declared itself in favour of any assistance to those countries which had been linked to Belgium by colonial ties, but the truth of the matter was that the Soviet Union contribution to the Expanded Programme had in fact been very small. Moreover, the amount that Belgium intended to contribute to the two countries was \$10 million and not \$6 million. Lastly, he felt that it was pointless to revert to the question of assistance to Burundi, as he had already explained in detail the reasons which had led Belgium to suspend that assistance temporarily.

10. Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) replied that Belgium always refused to contribute to the economic and technical assistance which its former trust territories required, although its conscience should prompt it to make amends for the havoc wrought by colonialism. Referring to the statement made at the preceding meeting by the representative of Burundi, he asked the Belgian Government to keep its promises, to grant the necessary assistance and to cease interfering in the internal affairs of Rwanda and Burundi. The former administering authority would thereby fulfil a moral obligation, that of returning at least some of the wealth plundered by colonial exploitation.

11. The Belgian representative had stated that the USSR contribution had been extremely small. That was not so; the USSR had provided large-scale assistance both under United Nations programmes and bilaterally. In any event, the former colonial Powers could not be placed on the same footing as a State which had never taken part in the looting of Africa. The Soviet Union's contribution consisted of money earned honestly: it was the fruit of the efforts of a people that was proud of its labour.

12. It might also be mentioned that for many years Belgium had made no contribution. That was why a clear reply must now be demanded: the Belgian representative must be called upon to cease seeking refuge in polemics and to state without ambiguity how much assistance Belgium was prepared to provide. As several delegations had pointed out, by looting its former colonial territories, Belgium had been able to proceed with its own economic development and, in all justice, part of that wealth should be restored to the plundered inhabitants.

13. Mr. FORTHOMME (Belgium) protested against the assertion that Belgium had not given the assistance expected of it. He said that although differences of opinion had, to be sure, forced it to postpone concluding the treaty of assistance with Burundi, assistance provided by Belgium was continuing and the Belgian technicians supplying services, the doctors and the teachers in Burundi had not been withdrawn. It could not therefore be claimed that Belgium had ceased to give technical assistance, and it was equally wrong to speak of interference in the internal affairs of a State. Furthermore, although there had been much talk about "pillage", and although the Empire of the Czars, for obvious geographic and historical reasons, had not taken part in the so-called pillage of Africa, one could expatiate at length on the numerous cases of pillage perpetrated by Russia in other regions which were nearer and easier of access.

14. Mr. GASSOU (Togo) submitted, on behalf of the sponsors, the revised draft resolution (A/C.2/L.716/Rev.1 and Corr.1). In comparison with the original text (A/C.2/L.716), the new text had undergone some changes of a technical nature. In particular, it had seemed preferable to eliminate any indication of a figure in operative paragraph 1, and the sponsors had preferred simply to refer to the estimates contained in paragraph 75 of the Secretary-General's report. Moreover, as some delegations had pointed out, if the draft resolution was adopted, it would be for the Fifth Committee to determine the necessary appropriations. It would be noticed, however, that the essential idea remained, namely, to pursue the action already initiated. Paragraph 2 had been completely altered, and it had been thought preferable to use the usual formula in such cases and to address the resolution directly to the Governments of Member States. The sponsors thought that those modifications would satisfy the delegations which had put forward criticisms or suggestions. The former paragraph 4 had become the new paragraph 3, and because the former paragraph 3 had been cut out, former paragraph 5 had become the new paragraph 4, with a small alteration concerning the financial years in order to correct an error which appeared in the first text.

15. In the light of the explanations provided by the sponsors, the debate on questions of principle should make it possible to come to an agreement. The sponsors understood the difficulties experienced by some delegations, but the adoption of the draft resolution would in no way imply the abandonment of a position of principle. It was in fact clear that the special situation of Rwanda and Burundi, in view of the quite exceptional action undertaken by the United Nations to give them assistance, demanded that a special solution should be adopted. The United Nations had a moral responsibility which it could not evade. That was why the sponsors were appealing to delegations as a whole by asking

them to shun all controversy and to remain faithful to the spirit of General Assembly resolution 1746 (XVI).

16. Mr. TSHIMBALANGA (Congo, Leopoldville), calling attention to the wording of operative paragraphs 1 and 4 of the draft resolution, asked the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics not to persist in his opposition. It was above all a matter of authorizing the Secretary-General to continue to carry out the programmes already under way, and the adoption of the draft resolution would in no way signify the abandonment of principles.

17. Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked for separate votes to be taken, first on operative paragraph 1, and then on the second part of paragraph 4, beginning with the words "...and to include in the budget estimates...".

18. Mr. MALHOTRA (Nepal) asked whether the emergency funds available to the Technical Assistance Board would not make it possible to provide some of the aid for Rwanda and Burundi.

19. Mr. COOMARASWAMY (Secretariat) stated that a sum of \$1 million had already been granted and that the Technical Assistance Board would do everything it could to provide further aid. There seemed, however, to be no possibility that the total amount could be taken from the TAB funds earmarked for cases of emergency.

20. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution (A/C.2/L.716/Rev.1 and Corr.1).

*At the request of the representative of Togo, a vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Haiti, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Liberia, Madagascar, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sweden, Tanganyika, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Leopoldville), Cyprus, Dahomey, Denmark, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Guinea.

*Against:* Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.

*Abstaining:* Japan, New Zealand, Syria, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Cambodia, Canada, Cuba.

*Operative paragraph 1 was adopted by 53 votes to 8, with 10 abstentions.*

21. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the second part of operative paragraph 4, beginning with the words "...and to include in the budget estimates...".

*At the request of the representative of Chad, a vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Iceland, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* India, Iran, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Liberia, Madagascar, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Tanganyika, Togo, Turkey, Venezuela, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Leopoldville), Cyprus, Dahomey, Denmark, Ecuador, Ethiopia, France, Ghana, Greece, Guinea.

*Against:* Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Hungary.

*Abstaining:* Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Philippines, Syria, Thailand, United Arab Republic, United States of America, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Australia, Burma, Cambodia, Canada, Cuba, Finland.

*The second part of operative paragraph 4 was adopted by 45 votes to 9, with 19 abstentions.*

22. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the draft resolution as a whole (A/C.2/L.716/Rev.1 and Corr.1).

*At the request of the representative of Togo, a vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Ethiopia, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Ethiopia, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Madagascar, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Tanganyika, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, United Arab Republic, United States of America, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Leopoldville), Cuba, Cyprus, Dahomey, Denmark, Ecuador.

*Against:* None.

*Abstaining:* Hungary, Mongolia, New Zealand, Poland, Romania, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Australia, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 60 votes to none, with 13 abstentions.*

23. Mr. FINGER (United States of America), in explaining his delegation's vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole, paid a tribute to the clarity of the Secretary-General's report (A/5283 and Corr.1) submitted by the Under-Secretary in charge of Congo Civilian Operations (872nd meeting). The conditions of peace and stability which had existed in the Kingdom of Burundi and the Republic of Rwanda since their independence was a particularly encouraging feature, and the United States delegation was happy to note that the populations in question were well aware that determined hard work and great sacrifices were required to bring prosperity to their countries.

24. The United States considered that as much technical assistance for economic development as possible should come from sources other than the regular budget of the United Nations, which was made up of the

contributions of the Member States as a whole, some of which possessed very meagre resources. Consequently, assistance of that nature should be provided primarily by the Expanded Programme and the Special Fund. It should be noted, however, that the attitude of the United States was not due to any desire to reduce its own contribution. Indeed, it might seem to it to be advantageous, if it considered only its own interests, to have such assistance financed by the Member States as a whole, and not merely by voluntary contributions, as the size of the voluntary contribution of the United States was known to everyone. Nevertheless, in view of the difficulties which the newly independent countries had to solve, the United States and the United Kingdom had vigorously supported, in 1960, a proposal to provide \$5 million from the regular budget to cover the expense of giving urgent assistance to the new Member States.

25. Returning to the draft resolution which had been adopted, the delegation of the United States wished to express its appreciation for the spirit of compromise of the sponsors, which had enabled the number of controversial points to be reduced to a minimum. The United States had voted for the draft resolution on the understanding that the assistance activities envisaged would be financed, as much as possible, from the funds available in part V (Technical programmes) of the regular budget and within the framework of the Expanded Programme and the Special Fund. In the case of activities which could not be financed in that way, the Secretary-General should proceed to implement the relevant projects only after having obtained resources from outside the regular budget. Finally, as far as operative paragraph 4 was concerned, the United States delegation considered that the financial estimates for 1964 and 1965 should relate only to programmes which fell within part V of the budget.

26. Mr. TELL (Jordan) said that while his delegation would be the last to raise any objection to the granting of assistance to the developing countries, it had always considered a unified fund to be the best way of dispensing technical assistance—a principle which had already been adequately explained by the United Kingdom representative. It was for that reason that the delegation of Jordan had taken no part in the discussion or the vote.

27. Mr. MALHOTRA (Nepal) thanked the Under-Secretary in charge of Congo Civilian Operations for his statement (872nd meeting) which had removed the fears aroused by certain unfortunate events and had shown that the Governments of Rwanda and Burundi were co-operating to the fullest extent in the work which had been undertaken.

28. As far as operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution was concerned, his delegation considered that the implementation of the programme begun in 1962 should continue even if, in order to achieve that, the regular budget had to be drawn upon. The Fifth Committee had already approved an appropriation of \$800,000 for two urgent projects, and there might possibly be a slight surplus from that sum which could be used for the training of national forces, a project which did not fall within the programmes of technical assistance. His delegation hoped that the Technical Assistance Board would manage to make a few small savings in order to cover the modest cost of the projects falling within the category of technical assistance programmes, which would amount to \$36,000, and he wished to express his thanks to the representative of

TAB for his assurance that the Executive Chairman would do his best to meet the requirements of those various projects and of any new ones.

29. He considered any resolution for earmarking technical assistance funds to be bad on principle, but pointed out that resolution 1528 (XV) on assistance to Libya constituted a precedent. Moreover, for special cases, the United Nations had responsibilities towards countries which had formerly been under trusteeship and were not yet in a position to overcome their difficulties without its aid. He also considered that the revised text of the draft resolution was considerably better than the original text, particularly in respect of operative paragraph 2, which more or less repeated the wording of paragraph 1 of resolution 1528 (XV).

30. Mr. RENAUD (France) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, first, because of France's interest in the two African countries which, on the morrow of their independence, were in need of international assistance, and also because the wording used, especially in operative paragraphs 2 and 3, appeared to preserve two important ideas—the voluntary character of the contributions and the flexibility of the programmes. The resolution should constitute an appeal to all States Members of the United Nations and members of the specialized agencies to help those two young States in every possible way to establish themselves securely. France, for its part, was ready to take part in such an effort of solidarity.

31. Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia) thanked the Secretariat for having prepared document A/C.2/L.716/Add.2, which had facilitated the work of the sponsors of the draft resolution. He also thanked the Under-Secretary in charge of Congo Civilian Operations for his statement and for the documentation he had submitted. The Liberian delegation had expected that the Belgian representative would have given the Committee a fuller account of the assistance which his country was offering Rwanda and Burundi, and it hoped that such information would be forthcoming shortly. With regard to operative paragraph 2, he assured the Governments concerned that his Government would give the appeal it contained the most sympathetic consideration. His delegation was happy to note that the two Governments had applied for membership in the International Bank and the International Monetary Fund. The assistance which those two agencies could furnish them, however limited, was essential. He concluded by expressing the hope that the aid provided by Belgium to the two African States would never be associated with any intention to influence their internal affairs or obstruct the freedom of their foreign relations.

32. Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, for the reasons given, his delegation had voted against operative paragraph 1 and the second part of paragraph 4, and had abstained on the draft resolution as a whole. His delegation was strongly in favour of assistance to Rwanda and Burundi, but considered that it should be provided under programmes financed by voluntary contributions, namely, the Expanded Programme and the Special Fund, and not through an unwarranted increase in the regular budget of the Organization, which, as a number of representatives had pointed out, was intended for other purposes. His delegation therefore did not consider itself bound by the decisions embodied in the terms of the draft resolution, particularly in so far as operative para-

graph 1 and the second part of paragraph 4 were concerned.

33. Mr. CASTON (United Kingdom) said that the draft resolution did not bear on the universally approved principle of assistance to Rwanda and Burundi but on the manner in which such assistance was to be given. The revised version of the text, especially with regard to operative paragraph 2, and the assurances given by the representative of Togo, had dispelled certain doubts which the United Kingdom delegation had expressed.

34. Other doubts remained, however, concerning the two passages on which a separate vote had been taken. Paragraph 1 was not explicit as to whether the necessary expenditure was to be absorbed within the funds at the disposal of the Secretary-General. Had it been made clear in the Fifth Committee that that was the case, his delegation's attitude would have been different, for it hoped that the Secretary-General would continue the programme of assistance, and his Government would naturally honour all the obligations which it might incur under a relevant decision of the General Assembly. Furthermore, the second part of paragraph 4 advocated a method which his delegation held to be erroneous for the continuation of technical assistance to the two African countries.

35. Mr. MURGIAN (Somalia), having been absent when the vote was taken, said that he would have voted in favour of the draft resolution.

36. Mr. ZADOTTI (Italy) thanked the sponsors of the draft resolution for having drafted it in a form which his delegation could fully accept. In his delegation's view, operative paragraphs 1 and 4 meant that the United Nations had decided to continue to furnish assistance to the two countries, in addition to the aid already provided from other sources. Italy's vote in favour of paragraph 4 should not, however, be interpreted as meaning that it approved in advance any proposal made to the Fifth Committee in respect of specific sums of money to be included in the budgets for 1964 and 1965.

37. Mr. YAKER (Algeria) welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution, for it was only just that the two African countries in question, which had lived for many years under colonial domination, should receive economic, technical and financial assistance that would contribute to their development and the strengthening of their economic independence.

38. His delegation wondered, however, whether the case in point reflected a principle that should be taken into account in similar cases, for other countries which had suffered colonial exploitation also deserved the attention of the General Assembly. Algeria, which had gained its independence after eight years of destructive war, was a country which warranted the Organization's attention if specific cases were to be taken into consideration. He recognized that France was giving his country all possible help and that other countries were offering it substantial assistance. As bilateral aid was, however, insufficient, his delegation was asking for any international aid that might be given to Algeria in its present situation. The Special Fund, the technical assistance services, the Expanded Programme and the specialized agencies were already showing Algeria all the interest that could be expected of them.

39. Mr. MIYAKAWA (Japan) stated that his delegation had every sympathy for the economic difficulties of the two newly independent African countries and agreed that every effort should be made by the United Nations and its related bodies to give them as much economic and technical assistance as possible. His delegation appreciated the efforts made by the Secretary-General to that end and hoped that he would be enabled to continue them, as stated in the draft resolution. It nevertheless had shared the doubts expressed by the United Kingdom representative, not about the general purport of the draft resolution, but concerning the procedures by which the necessary assistance was to be rendered, and had hoped that the sponsors would accommodate such views. The revised text, however, although an improvement over the original text, did not take those viewpoints fully into account. That was why his delegation had abstained in the vote on operative paragraphs 1 and 4. It had nevertheless voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole because it was not opposed in principle to endorsing a general policy that the United Nations continue to render assistance to the two countries.

40. Mr. EL BANNA (United Arab Republic) said that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution, having always encouraged United Nations assistance to newly

independent countries. As the representative of Algeria had said, individual cases should be carefully considered, particularly those of newly independent countries that had long suffered under colonialism. The Powers which had exploited the wealth of those countries should bear the brunt of the assistance provided. That assistance should not only be continued but should be given at a faster tempo.

41. Mr. GOLSALA (Chad) thanked the delegations which had supported the draft resolution, of which Chad was a co-sponsor. The two African countries concerned were in an exceptional and alarming situation, and their recent independence did not absolve the United Nations from its moral responsibilities towards them. He also thanked the Secretary-General for his efficient action.

42. Mr. DELGADO (Senegal), who had been absent at the time of the vote, said that his delegation would have voted in favour of the draft resolution, which it had co-sponsored. He was happy to note that there had been almost complete unanimity on the question but regretted that, despite the spirit of conciliation that had reigned, certain delegations had felt it necessary to abstain in the final vote.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.