

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

TWENTIETH SESSION

Official Records



SECOND COMMITTEE, 975th
MEETING

Friday, 5 November 1965,
at 12.5 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 51:

*Consolidation of the Special Fund and the
Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance
in a United Nations Development
Programme (continued)* 121

Chairman: Mr. Pierre FORTHOMME
(Belgium).

AGENDA ITEM 51

Consolidation of the Special Fund and the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance in a United Nations Development Programme (*continued*) (A/5755, A/6015; A/C.2/L.792, L.793, L.795/Rev.1, L.799/Rev.1, L.800)

1. Mr. OSOGO (Kenya) expressed surprise that the developed countries, in contrast with the developing countries, had not succeeded so far in deciding how the seats allocated to their group should be distributed. The USSR representative had made an interesting suggestion at the previous meeting that the membership of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme should be increased to forty-one. That figure did not, however, appear in the amendment submitted by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries (A/C.2/L.800), which provided for the establishment of a single inter-governmental committee of thirty-six members. The text of that amendment, which was not clear on many points, would obviously gain by being commented on paragraph by paragraph by the USSR representative, who, at the same time, might explain how his delegation had come to propose the figure of forty-one.

2. The developed countries now found themselves in an impasse which they seemed incapable of resolving. If some superstitious fear of the figure thirteen prevented them from conceding four seats to the socialist countries out of the seventeen assigned to their group, that situation might perhaps be remedied by giving a permanent seat to Yugoslavia, thus leaving twelve for the developed countries with market economies.

3. The suggestions made by the Maltese representative (974th meeting) could be very useful if no rapid solution of the problem was forthcoming.

4. The amendment to paragraph 4 of the draft resolution submitted in document A/C.2/L.793, would become superfluous if the Committee accepted the "nineteen-seventeen" formula. It was encouraging to note that, in his last statement, the United Kingdom representative had pointed out (974th meeting) that

the position of his delegation was very close to that of Jordan.

5. Mr. VIAUD (France) recalled that during the Committee's recent meetings, his delegation had clearly indicated its preference for an equal distribution of seats between developing and developed countries and had supported the amendments in document A/C.2/L.793. It could not, on the other hand, accept the proposals in document A/C.2/L.795/Rev.1, even if they were to be amended in the manner indicated at the previous meeting, because the "nineteen-seventeen" formula raised both practical difficulties and difficulties of principle.

6. Equal representation had the advantage of simplicity. The refusal to accept it had led to confused bargaining which had already gone on for more than two weeks. At the last meeting, the representative had spoken of the possibility of a Pyrrhic victory. The French delegation did not know whether there would be winners and losers in such a battle. France would not consider itself a loser if the "nineteen-seventeen" formula was finally accepted, for what was at stake was not its national interest but its conception of the general interest. It was to be feared that the adoption of the "nineteen-seventeen" formula would leave behind it a feeling of uneasiness because equality of representation was, in the final analysis, the best method of ensuring the desirable co-operation between donor and recipient countries. Such equality would also encourage that emulation without which technical assistance programmes might become a matter of mere routine. If, however, the idea of equality was rejected, geographical distribution might logically be used as another objective criterion although his delegation would not be able to accept it. However, the attitude of his delegation was not prompted by hostility towards any group of States but merely by a desire to preserve the efficiency of technical assistance activities and to ensure that the resources available were used to the best interests of those in need of them.

7. Mr. KONE (Upper Volta) expressed his Government's gratitude for the assistance it had received under the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance and the Special Fund. He approved of the consolidation of the two programmes and hoped that the Special Fund would soon be able to finance investments proper. The consolidation would make it possible to achieve administrative economies and to draw up priorities on a sounder basis. The membership of the Governing Council of the new Programme must ensure impartiality in the allocation of resources. His delegation would vote for the draft resolution of the Economic and Social Council (A/

C.2/L.792) together with the amendments which appeared appropriate, particularly the amendment in document A/C.2/L.799/Rev.1 which was designed to enable all recipient countries to sit in turn on the Governing Council. He hoped that the sponsors of the various amendments could quickly reach a compromise.

8. Mr. THAPA (Nepal) said that the diversity of the proposed amendments reflected not only a lack of unanimity but also inadequate consultations among the Committee members. His delegation had joined the sponsors of the amendment contained in document A/C.2/L.799/Rev.1 because it believed that the rotation of Member States within the Governing Council of the new Programme was a fair arrangement acceptable to all delegations.

9. The amendments in document A/C.2/L.800 contained some very interesting points; consultations were going on, and the Committee should not take a hasty decision which might prevent the inclusion of some useful ideas in the final text.

10. Mr. ARKADYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out, in reply to the comments made by the representative of Kenya on the amendments proposed by five socialist countries (A/C.2/L.800), that the seventh of those amendments was only one element in the series and was still the subject of informal negotiations. That amendment was aimed at basing the membership of the Governing Council of the new Programme on that of the General Committee of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development—which consisted of fourteen representatives from Group A, ten from Group B, six from Group C and four from Group E—and at adapting that membership to the thirty-six seats allocated. There was, moreover, a mistake in paragraph 7 of document A/C.2/L.800, and a revised text would be circulated. The first six amendments were all aimed at stressing the need for the new programme to undertake investment activities pending the establishment of a capital development fund and included points from the draft resolution submitted on that subject (A/C.2/L.796 and Add.1). A choice could perhaps be made from among the various amendments proposed to the preamble, which all referred to the same principle. The eighth amendment was aimed at improving the administrative structure of the new programme by ensuring a fair distribution of high-level posts.

11. He hoped that the amendments would receive the support of the developing countries, for it was solely in their interest that they had been put forward.

12. Mr. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) said he wished to make it clear that the amendments proposed by the Soviet Union and other States of Eastern Europe were completely unacceptable to his Government. He recalled that the funds pledged by his Government to the Special Fund and the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance were dependent on the current policies and procedures of the two programmes being maintained. Should the nature of the programmes be changed as provided in the amendments, the United States Government would have to re-examine its position completely and might have to

seek other means of putting those funds at the disposal of the developing countries.

13. The proposals which had just been submitted to the Committee would give rise to enormous difficulties for many delegations. The Committee should try to find a satisfactory solution without digressing from the question under consideration. It should take a decision on the draft resolution which the Economic and Social Council had recommended for adoption (A/C.2/L.792) subject, of course, to the possibility of incorporating in it certain appropriate amendments. As to the question of establishing a United Nations capital development fund and the promotion of investment activities, that was a separate agenda item and would be taken up at the proper time.

14. As was clear from the statements made at the United Nations Pledging Conference on the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance and the Special Fund, the governing bodies of the Special Fund and of the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance, as well as their respective operations, enjoyed general support. If the Committee introduced the question of investment activities into the Council's draft resolution, it might undermine the harmonious relationships which had been established between the recipient countries and those which contributed to the two programmes and might deal a death blow to the machinery that had been so carefully developed. The United States delegation therefore urged all delegations to try to reach a satisfactory decision as soon as possible. It might be futile to seek unanimity which could not, in any event, be achieved at the expense of losing the support of the contributors. What could not, moreover, be tolerated was that those who had perhaps contributed less than anybody to the progress of technical assistance should insist on having their own way.

15. Mr. ARKADYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the point which should really interest the Committee was the possibility of the new Programme being concerned with investment activities, particularly in the field of industrial development. The developing countries which for fifteen years had, with the support of the socialist countries, resolutely defended the idea of establishing a capital development fund must not let pass the unique opportunity they now had of seeing their hopes realized. Naturally, the proposed merger would constitute only a stage—but an important stage—in the establishment of a genuine capital development fund. The proposals put forward by the socialist countries were intended solely to pave the way towards the achievement of that goal.

16. Mr. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) said that, whatever position his delegation might adopt with regard to the establishment of a capital development fund, it was not refusing to discuss the issue. It would do so when the Committee was officially called upon to deal with the matter. If the Committee took up the question now, it would merely destroy what had been so carefully built up. His delegation therefore appealed to the Committee to take a de-

cision on the proposal clearly formulated by the Economic and Social Council and to ignore all irrelevant questions.

17. Mr. M'BAYE (Guinea) recalled that during the Pledging Conference his delegation had stressed that

it considered the proposed merger as an important stage in the establishment of a capital development fund. It therefore favoured certain of the amendments in document A/C.2/L.800.

The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.