

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records



**SECOND COMMITTEE, 1399th
MEETING**

Monday, 8 November 1971,
at 3.20 p.m.

NEW YORK

Chairman: Mr. Narciso G. REYES (Philippines).

AGENDA ITEM 46

Identification of the least developed among the developing countries: report of the Secretary-General (A/8403, chapter VI; A/8459)

1. The CHAIRMAN said he hoped that the historic decision taken by the General Assembly on 25 October to admit the People's Republic of China to the United Nations would enable that country to contribute to realizing the ideals of the Charter and promoting economic and social development.

2. The results of the UNDP Pledging Conference were extremely encouraging, and there were grounds for hoping that UNDP would soon be able to carry out a series of projects totalling \$600 million. He congratulated the chief donors on having shown the political will to achieve the objectives of the International Development Strategy, thus justifying the hope that UNDP would effectively be able to double its resources between now and 1975.

3. Mr. DE SEYNES (Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs) said that during the past two years there had been a very definite trend towards giving special treatment to the least developed countries. The systematic efforts made in that direction were partly bound up with the provisions of the International Development Strategy. By singling out a particular category of countries, the Member States sought to avoid laying themselves open to the charge of generalization. That was the first indication of the usefulness of the Strategy, which thus gave a precise direction to action by the international community. It did, of course, raise the problem of defining the least developed countries. In his view, that could only be done pragmatically. All the bodies that had attempted such a definition had concluded that quantitative information was inadequate and that the data available involved a margin of error; but at the same time they were of the opinion that there was no reason for abandoning all efforts and that a consensus could be reached as long as the attempt to establish too precise a definition was abandoned. The bodies in question had achieved a certain convergence of views, in spite of the different criteria used. The rough list drawn up by the Committee for Development Planning (see E/4990, chap. II) had obtained definite support from the Group of Experts of the Trade and Development Board, and, like the Economic and Social Council at its previous session and the Trade and Development Board itself, the Group of Experts had considered that there was no point in trying to produce a more precise definition and that the

General Assembly should as soon as possible confirm the list with a view to defining action in regard to the countries contained in it. In accordance with the spirit of the Strategy, the list should be essentially dynamic; it should be possible to review it if necessary.

4. While it was difficult to define precise action in favour of those countries in the field of international trade, the problem for the Organization under its aid programme was far simpler. It should be possible as of the present time to take such initial decisions as were applicable forthwith under the Strategy.

5. Mrs. THORSSON (Sweden) thanked the Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs for his statement on the important question of the least developed among the developing countries.

6. She considered it only fair to give high priority to measures in favour of those countries, since under paragraphs (56) to (58) of the International Development Strategy, the more privileged members of the international community had the compelling duty to see to it that a greater part of the resources available for development was used for those countries. The Committee for Development Planning had rightly pointed out that in view of the quite substantial difference between the poorest and the relatively more advanced developing countries failure to accord the former privileged treatment would be tantamount to discriminating against them.

7. Her delegation was glad to see that the question of defining those countries was the subject of broad agreement, and that it was therefore now possible to take concrete measures in their favour. She approved the criteria used by the Committee for Development Planning in drawing up an initial list. The list should of course be kept under constant review, including a revision, if it proved necessary, in 1975. She endorsed the concrete measures envisaged by the Committee for Development Planning, and she emphasized the need for a unified approach. She also endorsed the components of the action programmes proposed by that Committee. If the programmes were to be carried out efficiently, the executing agencies would have to be provided with the necessary resources. UNDP and IDA had special responsibilities to assist the least developed among the developing countries in increasing their absorptive capacity of all kinds of aid. The Governing Council of UNDP would have to find ways and means of channelling a greater part of the flow of resources to those countries. If the least developed countries were to be able to increase their capacity to make effective efforts and to take advantage of assistance for development, for example by improving the quality of their national planning machinery

and public administration, the Organization should assist them in the field of development planning, e.g. by establishing more development advisory teams. Her delegation was convinced that the Committee for Development Planning would continue its study, and looked forward to the proposals which UNCTD would undoubtedly wish to make in that direction at its third session.

8. She hoped that the General Assembly, by taking the first step forthwith towards an action programme in favour of the least developed countries, would give proof that those countries had a great number of friends within the Organization.

9. Mr. JOSEPH (Australia) said that in his opinion the question of the least developed among the developing countries was one of the most important issues before the Committee. The need for the international community to do something for the least developed countries was becoming an article of faith in the entire United Nations development system. Specific provisions had been adopted in the International Development Strategy to bring the least developed countries to a stage of development where, along with the more advanced developing countries, they could draw benefits from the measures embodied in the Strategy.

10. In attempting to solve the difficult problems of defining the least advanced countries, the Group of Experts of the Trade and Development Board had pointed out that it was important to interpret the definition in a relative sense, since apart from the "hard core" cases which really were the least advanced, some countries could also be heavily disadvantaged within a particular region, for example by being land-locked or without a transport network, or simply by being unusually poor compared with their neighbours. The Group of Experts had further considered that where a country was overwhelmingly dependent on a single commodity which could be subject to great price fluctuations, it could be placed in the category of the least developed countries in the context of a specific sector of the economy. That distinction between hard core and relative disadvantage went to the heart of the problem, and his delegation was not sure that the dilemma had been resolved by the Committee for Development Planning in its report (E/4900) nor by the second Group of Experts of the Trade and Development Board in its report.¹

11. In its report, the Committee for Development Planning underlined the limitations and shortcomings of its approach. It referred to concepts other than those it had used, and it took note of the imperfections and inadequacies of the statistics and indicators it had chosen for defining least development. It pointed out that the generalized list of least developed countries should not preclude the formulation and use of a different classification for specific purposes. The UNCTAD Group of Experts had endorsed the list drawn up by the Committee for Development Planning, but had pointed out that it was a tentative list, and like that Committee itself it had expressed the view that the list should be supplemented by including the relatively disadvantaged countries in a specific sector or in a regional or subregional grouping of countries. It had therefore urged the need for making allowance for "hard

core" cases and giving sympathetic consideration to borderline cases. In paragraph 67 of its report, the Committee for Development Planning also noted that to exclude such large countries as India and Indonesia from the list of least developed countries would be in effect to exclude countries where there were large masses of very poor people, in many cases even poorer than the peoples of the countries included in the list.

12. Australia's approach to the problem had been a pragmatic one. In the past it had endeavoured to link the identification of least developed countries to a particular situation or particular problem area. The result had been a multi-classification of the least developed so that different countries would qualify for special treatment according to what policy measures or problems were being considered. That approach had advantages in that, first, it eased the problems of choosing acceptable indicators to express the level of development; secondly, it permitted greater flexibility than a once-for-all classification; thirdly, it helped to avoid the automatic granting of special measures in all fields to a rigid list of countries, some of which might not be necessarily least developed in a particular situation; fourthly, it obviated the risk that a particular country which could claim least developed status in a particular field would be excluded from special measures in that field because, on an over-all basis, it did not qualify as least developed. In support of the latter point, he could cite the case of the International Sugar Agreement, 1968² which provided for the establishment of a Relief Fund, with the proviso that priority in the allocation of its resources was to be given to small developing members whose export earnings were heavily dependent upon the export of sugar; that could mean special benefits to countries like Fiji, Mauritius and Jamaica—none of which, however, were included in the proposed list of 25 hard-core least developed countries. The point was that in devising special measures for the least developed countries, the approach to be adopted might be different depending on whether the problem was a commodity problem, a trading problem, or an aid or financial question.

13. It might well be that the concept of a list of hard-core least developed countries had most relevance in the latter two cases. Certainly, it was Australia's view that in the matter of terms and conditions of aid the poorest countries should receive special treatment, since for those countries grant-type aid should be the principal form of aid for some time to come. The least developed countries should also benefit from special measures in export promotion, and his delegation believed that steps had to be taken to ensure that the least developed countries obtained their fair share from the generalized system of preferences, by including in the preference schedules handicraft items which were of special interest to those countries. Technical assistance should be aimed at increasing the absorptive capacity of the least developed countries by developing their institutional structures. Pre-investment assistance, pilot projects and continued assistance in the post-pilot-project phase were also important. Consideration had to be given to exempting the hard-core least developed countries from local cost assessments and from strict compliance with counterpart requirements.

¹ TD/B/399.

² United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 654, 1969, No. 9369.

14. In Australia's view, the objective criteria approach to the identification of the least developed countries and the approach which identified countries according to a particular problem or situation complemented one another.

15. In addition, Australia sympathized with the concept of the relatively least developed country in a particular geographical region to the extent that opportunities to assist such a country might arise at the regional level, or where political considerations sometimes eased the way for special measures for the least developed countries within a particular region. In accordance with the resolution passed two months previously by the Trade and Development Board, any resolution on the question of the list of hard-core least developed countries drawn up by the Committee for Development Planning should also provide for the interests of least developed countries in the context of policies and regions.

16. That list was based on an UNCTAD list of independent States and, as the Trade and Development Board had pointed out in its report, it excluded dependent territories. That was a matter of particular concern to Australia in view of its responsibilities for the Territory of Papua and New Guinea. Dependent territories were in some cases among the least developed of all countries. The United Nations had given plenty of evidence of its concern for the political welfare of dependent territories; it would be inconsistent if United Nations concern did not extend to the economic welfare of the peoples of dependent territories, inasmuch as the greater the rate of economic progress in those territories, the sooner they would accede to independence. Australia therefore hoped that the Committee would be sympathetically disposed to consider making provision for dependent territories, in the resolution to be drafted on the subject.

17. Mr. HOEUR LAY INN (Khmer Republic) observed that under the three criteria approved by the Committee for Development Planning at its seventh session the Khmer Republic did not qualify for inclusion in the list of least developed countries. What might have been true at that time, however, was no longer true owing to the war that had been imposed on the Khmer Republic.

18. The capital of his country, Phnom Penh, had seen the number of its inhabitants rise from 700,000 in 1970 to more than 1,800,000 in November 1971, i.e. a sudden increase of 1,100,000. In their flight from the horrors of the war, during which they had lost all they had had, those people were now living in the capital without any work, since the country's war economy could not absorb them. To the number of those refugees must be added the 350,000 men, women and children living in the four north-eastern provinces still occupied by the enemy, which made a total of 1,450,000 war victims out of the country's population of 7,500,000. Consequently, the *per capita* gross income, which had scarcely amounted to the equivalent of \$100 in 1970, had fallen substantially.

19. As to the share of industry in the country's gross domestic product, he pointed out that, unlike what had happened in South Viet-Nam, the aggressors had made a special effort to destroy indiscriminately his country's economic infrastructure, in particular communications and

transport facilities, plantations and industrial enterprises of every kind, including rubber-processing plants.

20. With regard to the literacy rate, he said that the problem of the Khmer Republic was on the whole less alarming, except in the four occupied provinces. In the capital, it had been possible to cope with the problem owing to the fact that provincial teachers had been among the refugees and the school buildings were being fully utilized by a system of rotation involving two or three classes a day in each room.

21. In the circumstances, his delegation asked that the name of the Khmer Republic should forthwith be included in the list of least developed countries, and it reserved the right to request at a later stage a revision of that list.

22. In conclusion, he wished to say that his country derived much hope from the understanding shown by Australia for the problems of the least developed among the developing countries.

23. Mr. CAVAGLIERI (Italy) felt that the list of least developed countries as suggested by the Committee for Development Planning ought not to be static and that the problems of the most disadvantaged countries, particularly from the point of view of regional co-operation, should be under continuous review.

24. His Government was studying ways and means of aiding such countries both bilaterally and multilaterally, and the Italian delegation could therefore endorse the conclusions reached by the Secretary-General in his report (A/8459).

25. Mr. RASOLOMANANA (Madagascar) suggested adding to the list in the Secretary-General's report a list of countries that were relatively disadvantaged in certain sectors of their economy; while some of those countries did not meet the three criteria laid down by the Committee for Development Planning, they none the less showed obvious symptoms of under-development.

26. Mr. PARIS (Costa Rica) did not consider the criteria of the Committee for Development Planning adequate for identifying the least developed countries; they should be supplemented by some further criteria relating to such factors as monetary reserves, volume of imports and the economy in general. As for the figure for *per capita* income, he believed it was too low.

27. His delegation was prepared to endorse the list suggested by the Committee for Development Planning on the understanding that it was only provisional.

28. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) observed that at its eleventh session the Trade and Development Board had adopted resolution 82 (XI) in which, *inter alia*, it had approved, without prejudice to future consideration, the list of countries identified as the hard-core least developed. It was now for the General Assembly to endorse that list. To that end he would submit to the Committee a draft resolution in which the General Assembly would approve the list of countries identified as the hard-core least developed, recognize the need for a continuing review of the criteria

for the purposes of adding other countries to the list and with a view to a review in 1975 of the progress achieved in the context of the International Development Strategy, invite all the developed countries to implement the provisions of the Strategy in favour of the least developed among the developing countries, and invite other United Nations organizations to work out action-oriented programmes in favour of those countries so that they might be able to benefit as early as possible from the measures taken in favour of the developing countries as a whole.

29. It was the divergence of views among the developing countries which had led to the unduly prolonged discussion of the question of identification of the least developed among the developing countries. In any event, the participants in the Second Ministerial Meeting of the Group of Developing Countries, held at Lima, had considered that question and had reached agreement on the attitude to be adopted on the matter, an attitude which was reflected in the draft resolution which would be put before the Committee. He expressed the hope that the Committee would approve the draft resolution; thanks to the increased aid which it would enable the least developed countries to receive, those countries would be able to overcome their relative backwardness and enjoy an equitable share of the advantages of the Second United Nations Development Decade.

30. Mr. JOSEPH (Australia) said that he thought the question of identification of the least developed countries was essentially one which should be settled by the developing countries themselves and he asked whether the formula produced by the representative of Sudan also covered the relatively disadvantaged countries either on sectoral or regional grounds.

31. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) said that when the question had been under consideration by the Trade and Development Board at its eleventh session, emphasis had been placed on the need to revise the criteria used to identify the least developed countries in order to include some marginal countries, in other words countries which met only two criteria. In its resolution 82 (XI), the Trade and Development Board had recognized the dual need to revise the criteria and to undertake work to identify the relatively disadvantaged countries in the context of a geographical region, taking into account the existence of critical major economic sectors. He said that at Lima the Group of 77 had felt that the question of the relatively disadvantaged countries should be considered in the context of geographical regions and that therefore, the measures to be taken in favour of the least developed countries at the global level would be hard to apply to the relatively disadvantaged countries in the context of a given geographical region. The identification of the latter should therefore be done at the regional level, in consultation with the regional economic commissions and taking into account the advantages they already enjoyed under regional or subregional agreements.

32. Mr. CAVIGLIA STARICCO (Uruguay) agreed with the Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs that the three criteria selected should be considered in a flexible and dynamic spirit since it was an extremely complex operation to measure the degree of development. It was now necessary to proceed with haste and to adapt

aid to the current priority needs of the least developed countries without, however, losing sight of the need to review the criteria as progress was achieved in those countries. The Trade and Development Board should therefore continue its work in that direction and study the possibility of adding new criteria to those which had already been selected. The first criterion, i.e. *per capita* gross domestic product, could undoubtedly be an important indicator but it had to be carefully analysed if it was to perform that function properly; the same was true of the second criterion, which also had to be supplemented with further economic parameters in order to bring the problem into true focus from that point of view.

33. He thought that it was a serious error to use the literacy rate as a criterion since in some countries, in fact, there was only a pseudo-literacy rate. The level of education and the degree of culture of the population also had to be taken into account; in other words, it was important to take into consideration the percentage of students at all educational levels, particularly the number of elementary schools, secondary schools, universities and other institutions of learning in relation to the population since it was that percentage which should enable the rate of real participation of the population in development to be evaluated. In order to calculate the degree of development, account should also be taken of such factors as housing conditions, health services, administrative organization, means of communication and other really relevant indices. He therefore thought that the list of the least developed countries suggested in the Secretary-General's report should be accepted for the time being as forming a nucleus of countries that were clearly relatively less developed and urgently required assistance, but it should subsequently be reviewed and amplified, where necessary, in accordance with more rational criteria.

34. Mr. DIALLO (Upper Volta) expressed the view that whatever reservations might be made by delegations as to the validity of the criteria selected by the Committee for Development Planning and the Group of Experts, it was essential to draw up a list of the least developed countries; that in no way diminished the need for those two bodies to continue their work with a view to establishing whether other countries should be included in the list. Since some countries could unquestionably be classified as hard-core under-developed countries, it was important at the current stage, as the representative of Sudan had just said, to define some specific measures which could be applied by United Nations organizations and by the developed countries in favour of the least developed countries. His delegation was ready to join with other delegations in formulating such measures so that in the very near future the expression "the least developed among the developing countries" would go out of fashion. He expressed the hope that, as soon as measures had been worked out, the rich countries would provide aid to those countries either directly or through the United Nations. In the interests of those countries, both groups should accept the list suggested in the Secretary-General's report.

35. He himself thought that the measures to be taken in favour of the countries included in the initial list would not necessarily be applicable to countries which would subsequently be included in an additional list because of the

backwardness of some sectors of their economy. It was therefore important to consider forthwith what measures could be taken in favour of the latter so that all countries would soon be able to benefit from the aid made available to the developing countries as a whole.

AGENDA ITEM 44

Operational activities for development: reports of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme (continued) (A/8399, A/8403, chap. VIII (sects. A to D); E/4954 and Corr.1, E/5043/Rev.1):

- (a) United Nations Development Programme (A/C.2/L.1146/Rev.2, A/C.2/L.1153);
- (b) United Nations Capital Development Fund;
- (c) Technical co-operation activities undertaken by the Secretary-General;
- (d) United Nations Volunteers programme (E/5028)

36. Mr. VERCELES (Philippines), introducing draft resolution A/C.2/L.1146/Rev.2, observed that in the new text the number of members of the Governing Council of UNDP had been reduced from 51 to 48. In order to achieve that reduction, each of the three regional groups of developing countries had been given one seat less than in draft resolution A/C.2/L.1146/Rev.1. Accordingly, 11 seats were allocated to African countries, 9 to Asian countries and Yugoslavia, and 7 to Latin American countries. In addition, the sponsors of the draft resolution had taken account of the amendment proposed by the representative of Barbados; the new text therefore stated that the composition of seats in each group of countries should at all times give due expression to adequate subregional representation.

37. Operative paragraph 1 of the new draft resolution was designed to modify the provisions of General Assembly resolution 2029 (XX) concerning the number of members of the Governing Council of UNDP and the allocation of seats, while respecting paragraph 5 of that resolution dealing with the need to ensure "equitable and balanced representation of the economically more developed countries, on the one hand, having due regard to their contribution to the United Nations Development Programme, and of the developing countries, on the other hand, taking into account the need for suitable regional representation among the latter". He drew attention to the fact that China, one of the five permanent members of the Security Council, should always be represented but observed that, although the population of Asia represented one half of the world's population, the new draft resolution provided for only 9 seats for Asian countries and Yugoslavia. He also observed that by allocating 21 seats to economically more advanced countries, the sponsors of the new draft resolution had paid due regard to the contribution of those countries to the United Nations Development Programme and in particular to the fact that several of those countries had recently announced an increase in their contributions.

38. He also explained that if the new draft resolution was adopted its provisions would be incorporated in the draft omnibus statute.

39. The sponsors of the new revised text had not been able to take into account the amendment (A/C.2/L.1153)

proposed by the United Kingdom delegation to draft resolution A/C.2/L.1146, since that amendment did not implicitly accept the principle that the number of members of the Governing Council should be increased. Accordingly, the sponsors of the new draft resolution appealed to the United Kingdom delegation to withdraw its amendment.

40. Mr. BRADLEY (Argentina) noted that the developing countries would have liked to deal with the question now before the Committee at the Lima Meeting but that they had not had time. He observed that the draft resolution under consideration raised problems for the group of Latin American countries which would like to have time to study what attitude they should adopt. He therefore thought that it would be inopportune to put the draft resolution to the vote during the current meeting since that would force one group of countries to adopt a negative position.

41. The CHAIRMAN assured the representative of Argentina that he had no intention of putting the draft resolution under consideration to the vote at the current meeting.

42. Mr. MALIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he was considering draft resolution A/C.2/L.1146/Rev.2 from the viewpoint of the tasks which UNDP was called upon to perform as an international organ for co-operation in the field of development. It was for the Governing Council to organize international co-operation within UNDP. His delegation was ready to support in principle the idea of enlarging the membership of the Governing Council of UNDP as presented in the two first versions of the draft resolution on the question. It realized that the present membership of the Governing Council needed to be adapted to changing circumstances, but some of the provisions of the revised text were in its view unacceptable. It could not accept the underlying philosophy of operative paragraph 1, since it introduced an element of discrimination against certain States, which ran counter to the interests of the developing countries. It was because of such discrimination that the German Democratic Republic was excluded from UNDP's activities. He therefore opposed the adoption of that wording, the more so since it was in contradiction with the provisions of paragraph 1 (c), which conversely was based on the principle of equitable geographical distribution.

43. He also drew attention to the fact that under the terms of the draft resolution seats were allocated not according to the principle of equitable geographical distribution but on the basis of a division between developing and developed countries. Furthermore, the distribution of seats raised serious doubts, since only 4 seats out of 48 were allocated to Eastern European countries, while 6 out of 55 seats on the Trade and Development Board and 5 out of 45 on the Industrial Development Board of UNIDO, were allocated to the socialist group of States. It would be logical to re-establish a fair balance, since UNDP, UNIDO and UNCTAD were all linked to the Economic and Social Council and were concerned with development questions. His delegation felt that the fairest solution would be that adopted by the Industrial Development Board of UNIDO, where 5 seats were allocated to socialist countries, 25 to developing countries and 15 to Western European and other States.

44. He urged the sponsors of the draft resolution to redraft the text in such a way that it could be adopted unanimously.

45. Mr. KANKA (Czechoslovakia) associated himself with the recommendation by the representative of Hungary to increase the number of Member States on the Governing Council of UNDP to 45. The important thing was not the number of members but wider representation of the developing countries. In considering that question, his delegation took as its starting-point the principle that UNDP was a democratic institution for the implementation of international co-operation. Even though the German Democratic Republic was not a member, UNDP was based on the principle of universality, and he could not support the restrictive wording of operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution. He therefore appealed to the sponsors to adopt the principle of equitable geographical distribution, which had proved useful in the case of the Industrial Development Board of UNIDO, for example.

46. For reasons of principle, his delegation too was unable to accept the division of States proposed in operative paragraph 1.

47. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that the comments made by the representatives of the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia were not without logic, and he recalled that his delegation had always opposed any increase in the number of representatives serving on United Nations bodies because it did not believe that an enlargement of their membership could increase their effectiveness. He was prepared to accept any number, provided it did not exceed 48. In that regard, he considered that the views of the Governing Council itself should be sought, as the United Kingdom delegation had proposed.

48. He proposed rather that a broader representation of the different groups of countries should be achieved by prohibiting the immediate re-election of the members of the Governing Council. He therefore proposed a new operative paragraph 1 to the effect that elections to those 48 seats should be for a term of three years, except for countries that were permanent members of the Security Council, and that retiring members should not be eligible for re-election immediately after the expiry of their three-year term.

49. Mr. JOSEPH (Australia) noted that the proposal in the draft resolution to have the General Assembly decide the issue of enlargement of the Governing Council caused no difficulties for Australia even though, in effect, the Governing Council itself was bypassed in the decision-making process. That was an unusual procedure, but there were some advantages in it if it succeeded in reducing the number of meetings devoted to the subject, eliminating the requirement for extra conference papers, translation services, etc. Accordingly, that part of the draft resolution caused no difficulty for Australia. Australia was also not against expansion *per se*. The only difficulty it had had with the original proposal was that the balance in the proposed new Governing Council between developing countries, socialist countries and developed market economy countries inadequately reflected the respective positions of contributors and recipients in the programme. The new

division of seats now proposed represented, in the view of his delegation, a better balance. In particular, the major contributing countries, the Group B countries, would receive an extra seat. On the basis of the new balance proposed, his delegation could therefore support the draft resolution and hoped that other countries would be able to do so as well.

50. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) expressed misgivings at the rigid position adopted by the Soviet and Czechoslovak delegations; the membership of the Governing Council of UNDP was and should be governed by considerations appropriate to UNDP. He noted that the Soviet Union talked about the socialist countries, which extended to South America and Asia and not merely Eastern Europe, whereas Czechoslovakia talked about Eastern Europe. The arithmetic varied according to which definition was in question; the four seats arose from the narrower definition.

51. With regard to the comments made by the Philippines representative, he pointed out that in drafting its amendment his delegation had weighed its words carefully. He had volunteered that his amendment would prevent immediate decision, but his delegation had said from the outset that it was open-minded on an enlargement: it had never been the intention to prevent that altogether. The operative paragraph 1 proposed in document A/C.2/L.1153 would be equally valid for draft resolution A/C.2/L.1146/Rev.2.

52. Mr. AL-BAGHDADI (Iraq) said he was convinced that an increase in the number of Member States on the Governing Council of UNDP would be an equitable measure, since many developing countries had become Members of the United Nations since the establishment of UNDP, and it was only fair that those countries should have an opportunity to express their views. Moreover, an enlargement of the membership of the Governing Council of UNDP would be a step towards the achievement of the objectives of the Strategy. Accordingly, his delegation would support the draft resolution.

53. Mr. SINGH (India) said he would confine his comments to operative paragraph 1 (c) and reserved the right to speak on the draft resolution as a whole the following day. He considered the word "subregional" unclear, and he proposed that the subparagraph be deleted in order to avoid any ambiguity.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK

54. The CHAIRMAN suggested that consideration of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1154/Add.3 should be postponed, because the sponsors needed extra time to consider the amendments which had been proposed.

It was so decided.

55. Mrs. THORSSON (Sweden) informed the Committee that draft resolution A/C.2/L.1148 on regional and sub-regional advisory services was currently the subject of informal consultations and that a new version of the text would be submitted the following day.

56. The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that it had decided at its 1292nd meeting on 28 November 1969, to

authorize the Rapporteur to submit his reports direct to the General Assembly, except where the Committee specifically decided otherwise; he suggested that that practice be retained.

57. After a procedural discussion, in which Mr. CARANICAS (Greece), Mr. VIAUD (France), Mr. McCARTHY

(United Kingdom) and Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) took part, the CHAIRMAN said that if there were no objections he would take it that the Committee reaffirmed that decision.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.