

# United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTIETH SESSION

Official Records



SECOND COMMITTEE, 978th  
MEETING

Tuesday, 9 November 1965,  
at 4.30 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)* . . . . . 131

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/Rev.1, L.804)

1. The CHAIRMAN announced that, following negotiations which had taken place, he thought it preferable to withdraw the suggestion he had made at the previous meeting for the closure of the debate.

2. Mr. CVOROVIC (Yugoslavia) recalled that at the 974th meeting, the representative of Jordan had informed the Committee of the following agreement which had been reached by the developing countries concerning the distribution of seats on the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme:

"The developing countries had agreed that the nineteen seats proposed for them in the new Governing Council would be divided up as follows: during the first year, seven seats for Africa, six for Asia, five for Latin America and one for Yugoslavia; during the second year, seven for Africa, five for Asia, six for Latin America and one for Yugoslavia; during the third year and thereafter, unless and until Yugoslavia was re-elected by the developing countries, seven for Africa, six for Asia and six for Latin America."

Although that arrangement was in keeping with previous practice regarding questions of that nature, other formulae had been proposed during the official negotiations on the distribution of seats among the developed countries. Since some of those formulae included Yugoslavia, his delegation wished to make it clear that its position concerning the possibility of its election to the Governing Council continued to be determined solely by the agreement reached by the developing countries. Any other solution which would make the Yugoslav position dependent in any way on arrangements made outside of the group of developing countries would be unacceptable to his delegation.

3. Mr. TELL (Jordan) said that the representatives of the main regional groups had agreed to increase the membership of the new Governing Council to thirty-seven. The additional seat would be assigned as follows: during the first two years, to a developed country with a market economy; during the following three years, to a socialist country; during the sixth, seventh and eighth years respectively, to an African, an Asian and a Latin American country. His delegation would be grateful if the representatives of the developed countries would withdraw their amendments to the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council (A/C.2/L.792). He wished to make it clear that Yugoslavia continued to be a party to the agreement reached among the developing countries; he proposed that the formula embodying that agreement, as it had been quoted by the Yugoslav representative, should be included in the Committee's report.

4. Sir Keith UNWIN (United Kingdom) supported by Mr. ENDESHAW (Ethiopia), said that they endorsed the ideas put forward by the Jordanian representative. Of the seventeen seats allocated to the developed countries, three would go to the socialist countries.

5. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had before it a proposal to prepare on the basis of document A/C.2/L.795/Rev.1, a text incorporating the clarifications given by the representative of Jordan, together with all the points agreed upon by the three regional groups.

6. Mr. ARKADYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had participated in all the phases of the negotiations. Although some interesting and timely solutions had been rejected, his delegation would not oppose the agreed formula which had finally been worked out. That formula was not immutable and could unquestionably be revised later. Turning to the question of the withdrawal of amendments, he recalled that the representatives of the regional groups had agreed to incorporate in the final draft the third amendment submitted by the Soviet Union in document A/C.2/L.800/Rev.1 and the first sentence of the sixth amendment up to and including the words "14 October 1958". His delegation would not insist on the other points in its text, which, developing countries had assured him, would be examined during the discussion of item 39 of the agenda (Establishment of a United Nations capital development fund). It would indicate its position concerning the draft resolution as a whole and the membership of the Governing Council when the final vote was taken.

7. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that his delegation could not accept a solution which would depart even further

from the principle of the equal distribution of seats between donor and recipient countries. The explanations which had just been given could only strengthen that conviction. The proposed solution, which was unbelievably complicated, might well provoke interminable disputes within each group and was unlikely to further international co-operation.

8. Mr. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) said that, needless to say, his delegation would have preferred an equal distribution of seats within the Governing Council between the developed and the developing countries. However, since he recognized the need for a compromise and felt that the one envisaged did not infringe any principle, he would be able to support it even though it did not represent the ideal solution for his delegation any more than, in all likelihood, it did for the other delegations.

9. In response to the appeal made by the representatives of Jordan and Ethiopia, he had intended to withdraw the draft resolution which his delegation had just introduced (A/C.2/L.804). He had therefore been very disappointed to hear the Soviet representative speak of including in the final draft certain of the amendments proposed by the USSR and four other delegations (A/C.2/L.800/Rev.1). All those who had submitted amendments should withdraw them in the general interest and for the sake of orderly discussion; his own delegation would then be able to withdraw its draft resolution.

10. Mrs. WRIGHT (Denmark) announced that the sponsors of the amendments contained in document A/C.2/L.793 had, even though some of them preferred the principle of equal representation, authorized her to withdraw the amendments.

11. Mr. DELPRAT (Netherlands) said that his delegation had preferred a more limited membership for the Governing Council in the interests of the efficiency of the technical co-operation programmes but had nevertheless agreed to the figure of thirty-six. It had wished to uphold the principle of equal representation, in view of the volume of contributions made, but it had also agreed to the allocation of nineteen seats to the developing countries and seventeen to the developed countries on the understanding that fourteen of the latter group of seats would be reserved for the Western countries and three for the countries with planned economies. The improvised arrangement that was now being proposed to the Committee added another member to the Governing Council and no longer took account of the need for equilibrium between the main donor countries and the others. Since it attached great importance to the principle of equality, his delegation could not endorse the compromise, which was no longer based on any principle.

12. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that a compromise could never satisfy everyone completely. If the Committee rejected the one which had been proposed, it would have to go back to all the texts before it and reach a decision on them and it was very doubtful that such a procedure would be more satisfactory. There was no question that the consolidation desired by a majority of the Committee could best be achieved through joint efforts, and he appealed to all repre-

sentatives to take into account the sacrifices made by most delegations, particularly those which had always opposed the consolidation.

13. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that he unreservedly shared the opinions expressed by the representatives of France and the Netherlands. He had no other solution to offer, but he felt that the one envisaged, based as it was on bargaining between the regional groups, involved serious danger for the future because of the disputes to which it might give rise. Perhaps it would be better not to carry out the merger at all than to risk the consequences described by the French representative.

14. Mr. TELL (Jordan) observed that representatives of the developing countries felt it was they who were agreeing to a compromise, since the membership of a body was being linked for the first time to financial contributions rather than to strict geographical distribution. Moreover, he believed that the compromise was acceptable to nearly all delegations, the exceptions being those which took a rigid position on the question of equality. He wished to thank the sponsors of the amendments contained in document A/C.2/L.793 for withdrawing them and the Maltese delegation for withdrawing its amendment (A/C.2/L.798) several days earlier. While endorsing most of the five-Power amendments (A/C.2/L.800/Rev.1), he thought it preferable to include them in the text which the Committee would adopt on the question of a capital development fund. He therefore appealed to the sponsors of those amendments to withdraw them all, thus enabling the United States delegation to withdraw its draft resolution. The Committee would then have to take a decision only on the draft resolution of the Economic and Social Council (A/C.2/L.792) together with the twenty-six-Power amendments (A/C.2/L.795/Rev.1). In those amendments, the number thirty-six would be replaced by the number thirty-seven, the manner in which the thirty-seventh seat was to be allocated being specified in the Committee's report.

15. Mr. ARKADYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) expressed surprise at the shift which seemed to have taken place since the negotiations held during the morning. At that time, the representatives of the Western countries had not raised any objections to the two amendments of which he had spoken earlier. The sudden change of position jeopardized the whole agreement achieved during the morning, and his delegation would like an explanation.

16. Mr. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) stressed that there was no question of a retreat from positions taken in the informal discussions. The negotiations had not resulted in a final decision for, towards the end of the meeting, the Soviet representative had appealed to the developing countries to consider the possibility of including in the final text certain other amendments contained in document A/C.2/L.800/Rev.1. It was for that reason that the United States delegation had submitted its draft resolution. In a spirit of conciliation, the United States was willing to agree to the amendment proposed in the third amendment of the five-Power amendments (A/C.2/L.800/Rev.1) with the changes agreed to, and since it had voted for the first two General Assembly reso-

lutions mentioned in the sixth amendment it was also prepared to agree to the insertion of the first part of the sixth amendment up to and including the words "14 October 1958", provided that in the new paragraph the words "the ways and means" were replaced by the words "the conditions". The two General

Assembly resolutions stated that the Assembly would not enter into the field of capital development until it considered the resources available to be sufficient.

Owing to a power failure,  
the meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.