

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records



**SECOND COMMITTEE, 1398th
MEETING**

Friday, 22 October 1971,
at 3.25 p.m.

NEW YORK

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

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.1154/Rev.1 and 2, A/C.2/L.1157, A/C.2/L.1158 and Rev.1, A/C.2/L.1159 and Rev.1, A/C.2/L.1161 and Rev.1, A/C.2/L.1162 to 1164);
- (b) **United Nations Development Fund;**
- (c) **Technical co-operation activities undertaken by the Secretary-General;**
- (d) **United Nations Volunteers programme (E/5028)**

1. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom), introducing his delegation's amendments (A/C.2/L.1162) to draft resolution A/C.2/L.1154/Rev.1, welcomed the fact that the revised draft resolution did not over-emphasize the interests of certain groups of countries at the expense of others. He was pleased that the fourth preambular paragraph reflected the amendment suggested by the delegation of Trinidad and Tobago (A/C.2/L.1159). Although he sympathized with the reasons underlying the Barbadian amendment (A/C.2/L.1161/Rev.1) to the fourth preambular paragraph, he felt that the term "very small developing countries" had to be more clearly defined. Moreover, difficulties arose because there existed a number of rich small developing countries and poor large developing countries. His delegation could accept the revised version of the fifth preambular paragraph; however, it wished to emphasize that due attention should be given to priorities and efficacy at such time as the matter came under consideration. The purpose of his delegation's amendment to the seventh preambular paragraph was to emphasize that UNDP should become a major source of new development resources. His delegation welcomed the inclusion of the eighth preambular paragraph, as had been proposed in document A/C.2/L.1155. In the light of the comments of the representative of Trinidad and Tobago at the preceding meeting, he now wished to propose the deletion of both the ninth and the tenth preambular paragraphs, not because he questioned the importance of the sectors to which they referred, but because it would be unwise to single out specific sectors; moreover, the points mentioned in the paragraph were covered in the Consensus adopted by the Governing Council concerning the capacity of the United Nations development system.

2. His delegation hoped that the sponsors would accept either the United Kingdom amendment to operative paragraph 2 or the one put forward by the Netherlands in

document A/C.2/L.1164. The version of operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1154/Rev.1) represented a considerable improvement over the original text; however, the sponsors should also consider redrafting it again to reflect the suggestions made by the representative of Trinidad and Tobago at the preceding meeting. The United Kingdom amendment to operative paragraph 4 was motivated by the same concern which had led his delegation to propose the deletion of the tenth preambular paragraph. It also accepted the Netherlands amendment to operative paragraph 4. He would welcome a more thorough explanation of the phrase "intercountry indicative planning figures" in the Philippine amendment (A/C.2/L.1158). He urged the adoption of either the United Kingdom or the Netherlands amendment to operative paragraph 5.

3. He now wished to propose the deletion of operative paragraph 6, as it was very wise in scope and raised questions of policy which had not been sufficiently debated. In operative paragraph 7 the words "under the guidance of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council" were unnecessary, since no one doubted the authority of those bodies; if the phrase was to be retained, it should be placed at the end of the first clause. He supported the Norwegian amendment (A/C.2/L.1163) to operative paragraph 8. The word "all" should be deleted from operative paragraph 10 because if, as was hoped, UNDP funds increased considerably, additional resources obviously would be available for all UNDP activities and such a mandatory requirement could conflict with the request that special consideration should be given to the least developed among the developing countries.

4. The CHAIRMAN announced that the sponsors had accepted the Norwegian amendment (A/C.2/L.1163).

5. Mr. RUTTEN (Netherlands) said that his delegation still felt that it would be wiser to await further developments in UNDP pursuant to the Consensus and to recent decisions concerning restructuring and decentralizing before consideration was given to a substantive draft resolution of the kind recommended for adoption in document A/C.2/L.1154/Rev.1. However, since a majority wished to consider the draft resolution at the present stage, his delegation wished to propose a number of amendments, which were contained in document A/C.2/L.1164.

6. Two major considerations had prompted the amendments. Firstly, the draft resolution should not alter the Consensus; that concern had been dispelled to some extent by a number of the amendments which the sponsors had already accepted. Secondly, although he agreed that the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council should provide general guidance to UNDP, he felt that they

should not take specific decisions in matters which clearly fell within the competence of the Governing Council.

7. His delegation supported the comments of the representative of Trinidad and Tobago and the United Kingdom regarding the tenth preambular paragraph. His own delegation's amendment to operative paragraph 2 or the one proposed by the United Kingdom were equally acceptable. The Netherlands was proposing the deletion of the words "a greater number of" in operative paragraph 4 because the allocation of project funds would depend on the volume of resources available and the nature of the projects. Moreover, there was a danger that the resources allocated for each project might shrink if the number of such projects increased.

8. Operative paragraph 5 should be deleted because the General Assembly had already taken a decision in paragraph 2 of resolution 2688 (XXV) concerning what should be incorporated in the draft omnibus statute for the Programme.

9. He had certain reservations regarding operative paragraph 6. The proposal under (a) calling for "special programmes" required further study and clarification in order to ensure that it was consonant with the Consensus and UNDP regulations. The Governing Council must also decide whether it would be possible to implement the proposal under (b), depending on the progress attained in the developing countries. They might in fact prefer not to be relieved of local costs because such costs would then have to be assumed by UNDP, thus leaving less money available for other projects. Although he supported the general idea underlying the paragraph, he felt that it should either be redrafted or deleted.

10. His delegation was proposing the deletion of operative paragraph 7 because that paragraph implied that there was a conflict of authority which did not in fact exist. Lastly, he was pleased that the sponsors had accepted the Norwegian amendment to operative paragraph 8 and therefore withdrew his own amendment to that paragraph.

11. Mr. BRITO (Brazil) said that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1154/Rev.1, on whose behalf he was speaking, felt strongly that it was appropriate for the General Assembly to adopt a substantive resolution of the type now under consideration. They had heard with considerable interest the thought-provoking comments of the representative of Trinidad and Tobago concerning the ninth and tenth preambular paragraphs and were prepared to amend the latter to read as follows:

"Conscious also of the equally essential role of agricultural, pastoral, artisanal and mining development for a fully integrated and independent economy;"

Consequently, the concluding phrase of operative paragraph 4 should be amended as follows: "... with emphasis on industrial development as well as agricultural, pastoral, artisanal and mining development". To take into account the remarks of a number of representatives, the sponsors had agreed to replace the words "all country programmes" in operative paragraph 10 by the words "the Programme".

12. In operative paragraph 6, the co-sponsors agreed to the replacement of the word "full" by "optimal"

13. The co-sponsors had listened with interest to the arguments of the representative of Barbados in support of his amendments (A/C.2/L.1161). However, in their view the concept of "very small developing countries" was an extremely complex one, raising a number of problems, and a definition of its scope purely within the context of UNDP would be extremely hard to arrive at. It had already been pointed out that some of the largest developing countries were among the least developed. The concept required refinement, and it should be studied in a broader perspective. The co-sponsors were therefore not in a position to accept the amendments.

14. They were also unable to accept the amendment proposed by the Philippines (A/C.2/L.1158). The allocation of resources to the various geographical regions was an extremely complex task, and in any event the point which the representative of the Philippines wished to make was already covered by the reference in the eighth preambular paragraph to the criteria to be followed in calculating the indicative planning figures.

15. With regard to operative paragraph 3, a number of delegations had acknowledged the efforts of the co-sponsors to avoid any attempt at subverting the provisions of the Consensus concerning global, interregional, regional and subregional projects. The paragraph spoke only of "improving" them and, in his view, so many criticisms of regional projects were made that there must surely be room for improvement. Since the paragraph specifically referred to the provisions of paragraphs 21, 22 and 23 of the Consensus, there was no danger that those provisions would not be complied with.

16. The representative of the United Kingdom had submitted a number of amendments, contained in document A/C.2/L.1162. Admittedly, as the United Kingdom had maintained, UNDP was a major source of technical assistance funds but strenuous efforts were being made to place all technical assistance operations on a purely voluntary basis. The developing countries could not accept such an approach, and they were therefore unable to accept the United Kingdom amendment to the seventh preambular paragraph. The paragraph as presently worded was extremely clear; it was precisely to achieve maximization of capacity that the Consensus had been adopted. His delegation also could not agree to the United Kingdom proposal to delete the tenth preambular paragraph, which was closely integrated with and complemented the ninth preambular paragraph.

17. The third United Kingdom amendment referred to operative paragraph 2, which was also the subject of an amendment proposed by the delegation of the Netherlands in document A/C.2/L.1164. It was clear from operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution, which commended the Governing Council, that the decision the latter had taken at its 262nd meeting was also being endorsed by the Assembly. The developing countries feared that the regional bureaux might become nothing more than intermediary bodies if the Bureau for Programme Co-ordination and the Bureau for Programme Analysis and Policy Planning were

allowed to increase in size and importance, and in that event decentralization would be meaningless. The amendment submitted by the representatives of the Netherlands and the United Kingdom shared a common approach which the co-sponsors did not believe to be desirable. Since the twin principles of decentralization and central control appeared in the decision which operative paragraph 1 endorsed, there was no reason for concern that they would be neglected.

18. With regard to operative paragraph 7, the co-sponsors could accept the United Kingdom suggestion that the words "under the guidance of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council" should be placed at the end of the first clause, but could not accept its proposal that they should be deleted.

19. The United Kingdom proposal to delete from operative paragraph 4 the words "with emphasis not only on agricultural, pastoral and artisanal development but also on industrial development" were related to the proposal of the Netherlands to delete the words "a greater number of". Since UNDP was at present conducting only two global projects, the co-sponsors felt that there should certainly be a greater number of them. Moreover, both of those projects dealt with only one important sector of the economy, namely, agriculture. The aim of the paragraph was thus rather to increase the scope of global projects; for instance, such projects seemed particularly suited to industrial development. Essentially, the co-sponsors were appealing for greater imagination on the part of the Governing Council; it was clear from the present wording of the paragraph that they envisaged no departure from the provisions of paragraphs 25 and 26 of the Consensus.

20. The representative of the Netherlands had proposed the deletion of operative paragraphs 5 and 7. The importance of paragraph 5 was clear; the new omnibus statute of UNDP should be an instrument of progress, rather than of stagnation. That was particularly vital in the context of the Second Development Decade. Before the fourteenth session of the Governing Council, when the new statute would be finalized, delegations would have a last opportunity to raise important issues for inclusion in it. That was partly the reason why the draft resolution raised a number of specific issues; it was important for the General Assembly to draw attention to them, so that the Governing Council could take them into account in its decision, which would be taken before the next session of the General Assembly. The sponsors had already commented at length on the proposal to delete operative paragraph 7, and would not repeat their views.

21. The delegation of Afghanistan had become co-sponsor of the draft resolution.

22. Mr. HILLEL (Israel), commenting on operative paragraph 3, said his delegation attached great importance to UNDP's global and interregional projects. At present, not more than 18 per cent of resources could be used for projects intended to benefit more than one country, and not more than 1 per cent for global projects. As the number of projects increased, it would be necessary to concentrate on joint projects which could benefit a number of countries or the entire developing world. His delegation commended

the trend of enabling developing countries to take the initiative in that respect and work out together projects of common interest for submission to UNDP. On the other hand, his delegation also agreed with the need stressed in operative paragraph 3 for full compatibility of such projects with country programmes and regional projects.

23. The application of science and technology to development required close involvement on the part of UNDP, which should be one of the main channels for the transfer of applied science and technology to developing countries. The emphasis should be on those branches of science and technology which could make a direct contribution to development. Those countries which had achieved promising results in the application of science to development should be asked to communicate their experience to UNDP, with a view to the widest possible dissemination of those results in developing countries. His delegation interpreted operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution in the light of those comments.

24. With regard to operative paragraph 8, it was extremely important for the Inter-Agency Consultative Board (IACB) to concentrate more on improving co-ordination of operational activities throughout the United Nations system, with a view to improving development performance in the field.

25. It must be borne in mind that UNDP's administrative budget had increased by 20 per cent in 1971, and was expected to more than double by 1976. In that context, his delegation was prepared to support the draft resolution, but wished to place on record its reservation with regard to any further restructuring of UNDP headquarters.

26. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) said that at the present stage UNDP required time to consolidate and assess the benefits gained from the various reforms which had been undertaken. His delegation was therefore concerned at the number of issues raised in the draft resolution which it thought had already been settled, or remained for consideration at forthcoming sessions of the Governing Council, rather than by the General Assembly.

27. His delegation supported many provisions of the draft, but it nevertheless felt that, especially at the present stage, UNDP activities required close co-operation between recipient and donor countries; nothing should be done which would destroy the mutual confidence built up over the past two years. Now that the co-sponsors had accepted an amendment to the fourth preambular paragraph, his delegation found the text more satisfactory, and could support it. It also endorsed the argument advanced by the representative of Brazil against the United Kingdom amendment to the seventh preambular paragraph. To make the whole of United Nations technical assistance dependent on voluntary contributions would not be desirable.

28. With regard to operative paragraph 2, his delegation stressed the Administrator's responsibility for over-all co-ordination. That co-ordinating role should not be forgotten in the emphasis placed on the importance and operational capacities of the regional bureaux. His delegation could support either the amendment proposed by the Netherlands or that proposed by the United Kingdom, since both

reflected its own attitude. However, that should not be interpreted as meaning that his delegation in any way questioned the validity of the principle of decentralization.

29. His delegation saw no incompatibility between the recommendations of operative paragraphs 3 and 4, since the former called for improving the procedures for global and other projects, while the latter requested a greater number of global projects, with emphasis on a number of specific areas of development. Nevertheless, if the projects referred to were, in accordance with operative paragraph 3, to be fully compatible with and complementary to country programmes, there was no need to emphasize the various sectors which would be involved. If the co-sponsors felt a need to stress certain sectors, such as industrial development, which his delegation agreed received insufficient attention, there must be some change in the wording of operative paragraph 3. His delegation was therefore prepared to accept the amendment submitted by the delegation of Trinidad and Tobago in document A/C.2/L.1159/Rev.1, which eliminated the reference to compatibility with country programmes. The representative of Barbados had also submitted, in document A/C.2/L.1161, an amendment to the same paragraph. The representatives of the United Kingdom and Brazil had explained the difficulty of including that amendment at the present stage. His delegation was sympathetic with the idea underlying the Barbadian proposal, but agreed that it would be premature to include a reference to very small developing countries before a formal study of the various issues involved had been prepared. The principle of the least developed among developing countries was now fully recognized and a similar process of study and debate must take place with regard to the very small developing countries. Perhaps, in order to meet the views expressed by the representative of Barbados, the text of Trinidad and Tobago for operative paragraph 3 could be amended by the addition at the end of the words "according equitable emphasis to the interests and priorities of all the countries of the region or area concerned"

30. His delegation recognized the motives of the Netherlands proposal to delete the words "a greater number of" from operative paragraph 4, since, according to the Consensus, only 1 per cent of UNDP's resources would be allocated to global projects. However, it would appear that the intention of the sponsors was to ensure a greater number of projects in the field of science and technology, in other words, an increase in the scope of global projects. For clarity, the text could be amended to read "... a greater number of global projects in the field of science and technology...". In the last phrase of paragraph 4, it seemed unnecessary to spell out the various sectors to which attention should be given; since industrial development was most important, the words "with emphasis on..." could be replaced by "... taking into account the recommendations of Economic and Social Council resolution 1615 (LI)", which dealt with the question of industrial development.

31. The representative of the Philippines had provided an able introduction to his amendment (A/C.2/L.1158/Rev.1). The amendment was an extremely important one, and would be instrumental in determining his own delegation's attitude towards the draft resolution as a whole; he therefore urged the co-sponsors to accept it.

32. The Brazilian representative had argued persuasively for the inclusion of operative paragraph 5; however, that paragraph could perhaps be worded so as to take into account the objections of the representative of the Netherlands and so that it could thus obtain general support.

33. With regard to the first part of operative paragraph 6, he agreed with the representative of the Netherlands that the phrase "special programmes" was too vague; he would be glad if the sponsors could clarify what kind of programmes were meant and how they were to be financed. The suggestion in the second part of the paragraph, even if it were approved by the Governing Council, would be of doubtful benefit to the least developed countries. Funds for local costs would have to come from somewhere, and adoption of the suggestion would, in any case, result in lower indicative planning figures for the countries concerned.

34. The differences that had arisen over operative paragraph 7 seemed to concern the implications of the paragraph rather than its substance. To resolve them, he proposed that the word "main" before the words "policy-formulating body" should be deleted. He agreed with the United Kingdom's suggestion that the phrase "under the guidance of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council" would be more suitable at the end of the paragraph, and proposed that the phrase should be amended to read "under the general guidance of the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly".

35. Operative paragraph 8, as amended by the Norwegian delegation, was completely acceptable to his delegation.

36. His delegation preferred operative paragraph 10 in its original form, but could accept the changes just announced by the representative of Brazil.

37. Mr. DIALLO (Upper Volta) said he was grateful to the sponsors for having taken into account his delegation's suggestion concerning the first part of operative paragraph 7. That part of the paragraph should be interpreted in the light of paragraph 27 of the Consensus, which referred to the necessity for meeting unforeseen needs and special needs of the least developed countries and for financing unanticipated projects. The projects would not necessarily be part of country programming. With regard to the second part of the paragraph, it was his understanding that UNDP already granted certain countries partial or total exemption from the payment of local costs. Perhaps the UNDP representative could confirm that point. Obviously such exemption would not affect the indicative planning figures of the country in question.

38. While there was some question as to the intention behind the Philippine amendment (A/C.2/L.1158/Rev.1), he was confident that it merely reaffirmed a provision of the Consensus, and it was therefore difficult to reject it. UNDP was doing what it could to ensure that resources were distributed equitably among various regions. Clearly, however, all regions were not at the same level of development, and they could not all be treated on the same footing. He was confident that UNDP, in the implementation of intercountry programming, would take into account the needs of particular countries that were among

the least developed as well as the needs of the least developed regions.

39. The representative of Barbados had almost convinced him of the need to deal with the question of the very small developing countries raised in his amendments (A/C.2/L.1161). However, not all small developing countries were at the same level of development. He could offer the Barbados representative his sympathies, but, on the other hand, the developing countries appeared to be fighting over a dish that had not yet been served. It had not yet been determined which developing countries were the least developed, much less what measures should be taken in their favour.

40. Mr. ZAGORIN (United States of America) said his delegation needed more time to consider all amendments fully and to seek its Government's guidance on some of them. He therefore proposed that, when all the speakers on the Chairman's list had made their statements, the debate should be adjourned and resumed on another day.

41. His delegation agreed that preambular paragraphs 9 and 10 should be deleted, and supported the United Kingdom and Netherlands amendments to operative paragraph 2. However, he wished to have more time to study the reply of the sponsors concerning that paragraph.

42. In operative paragraph 4, it appeared that a position was being taken on matters that should properly be decided by Governments. The representative of Trinidad and Tobago had rightly emphasized that the developing countries should decide their own needs and priorities and determine what projects should be financed within their borders. The Governing Council had not yet agreed on specific criteria for planning, and there was no need to limit its range of choice. The Consensus already outlined general criteria.

43. His delegation supported the proposal to delete operative paragraph 6. The meaning of the word "relieve" was too vague; the Consensus already contained a clear provision in paragraph 32 for "full or partial waivers of local costs".

44. He supported the proposal to delete the word "main" from operative paragraph 7. Paragraphs 35 and 36 of the Consensus explicitly defined the responsibilities of the Governing Council, and there was no need to go over that ground again. In fact, since it was unnecessary for the General Assembly to reiterate its confidence in the Governing Council, he would be in favour of deleting the whole paragraph.

45. Mr. McCLEAN (Barbados) said his delegation would be content if the fourth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 3 were deleted. If not, it wished to maintain its amendment to preambular paragraph 4 and to change its amendment to operative paragraph 3 to read "having due regard to the significance of these projects for the very small developing countries and for the least developed among the developing countries". It also wished to propose a new operative paragraph 11 and a new operative paragraph 12 (A/C.2/L.1161/Rev.1).

46. Mr. GOBBA (Egypt) thanked the sponsors for incorporating the fifth preambular paragraph, which embodied an idea put forward by the Egyptian delegation.

47. He agreed to a large extent with the comments made at the preceding meeting by the representative of Trinidad and Tobago on the ninth and tenth preambular paragraphs but he would prefer to see them combined, so as to avoid emphasis on any particular field of activity. His country was particularly interested in industrial development which was of vital importance to its whole development; but agriculture, mining and other fields were important to other countries.

48. With regard to the Barbadian representative's amendment to the fourth preambular paragraph (A/C.2/L.1161), he understood his concern about the very small developing countries but thought that the idea was out of place in the present context and would be more appropriate under agenda item 46. Economic needs could apply to other criteria as well, such as countries with a *per capita* income of less than \$300 per annum or countries with a certain degree of economic development.

49. He approved of operative paragraph 1, although he would prefer to see it combined with operative paragraph 7, since both were concerned with the importance of the Governing Council, as stressed in the Consensus.

50. A large number of amendments had been submitted to operative paragraph 3, but in his opinion the references to paragraphs 21, 22 and 23 of the Consensus made any amendment unnecessary. He was satisfied with the paragraph as it stood.

51. With regard to operative paragraph 4 he shared the concern expressed over the possibility of "a greater number of global projects" but pointed out that, taken in the context of paragraph 26 of the Consensus, the phrase did not imply an increase in global programmes.

52. Regarding operative paragraph 6, he understood the concern expressed by a number of representatives, but considered that the international community should have a special obligation to the least developed among the developing countries, which were unable to bear local costs. He therefore proposed the deletion of the words "as long as their special situation requires this" at the end of the paragraph.

53. He could support the revised version of operative paragraph 10 because it would accommodate the views of certain countries, although he preferred the paragraph as it stood.

54. The CHAIRMAN said that, after the remaining speakers on the list had spoken, he would put to the vote the United States representative's proposal for the adjournment of the debate.

55. Mr. ILONIEMI (Finland), speaking on behalf of the representatives of Denmark, Iceland, Norway, Sweden and his own country, said that the Nordic delegations had played an active part in the preparatory work leading to the Consensus. In view of the complex issues revealed by the

discussion, they considered that the subject needed careful consideration in the Governing Council and the Economic and Social Council and that it would not be in the interests of the developing countries or UNDP for the Committee to take a decision at the present stage. The draft resolution raised certain difficulties for the Nordic countries and they would abstain from voting unless some of the major amendments submitted were accepted.

56. Mr. BRITO (Brazil) said he wished to reply to the comments made on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1154/Rev.1. He did not agree with the suggestion that operative paragraph 3, which was designed to improve projects, was incompatible with operative paragraph 4, which was designed to increase the number of projects. On the question of whether such an increase was feasible if the enlarged resources referred to in operative paragraph 10 materialized, there would be a corresponding increase over the 1 per cent now devoted to global projects. With regard to the suggestions that the emphasis at the end of the paragraph should be on industrial development, the last two lines had been drafted to meet the wishes of a number of developing countries that certain other sectors also deserved mention. He had not incorporated the Philippines amendment (A/C.2/L.1158/Rev.1) since its meaning was already covered in paragraph 4.

57. With regard to the Egyptian representative's suggestion that operative paragraphs 1 and 7 should be combined, it was important to have the reaffirmation of the Governing Council's authority (paragraph 7) in a separate paragraph.

58. The sponsors of the draft resolution agreed with the idea embodied in the Barbadian amendment (A/C.2/L.1161) but found it difficult to introduce at the present stage in view of reservations by other delegations.

59. Mr. MALIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the revised draft resolution did not contain any serious departures from the Consensus and he was sure that there was no reason to fear that its adoption would conflict with the provisions of General Assembly resolutions. Unfortunately for the developing countries, the reorganization of UNDP was dragging on, but the draft resolution would help to accelerate it.

60. In connexion with the comments made on operative paragraph 7, he did not agree that it was superfluous. The paragraph reaffirmed the authority of the Governing Council as the main policy-making body of UNDP under the authority of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council. It did not conflict with facts, as would be seen from paragraph 36 of the Consensus, Article XXX of the draft omnibus statute,¹ General Assembly resolution 1240 (XIII) and Economic and Social Council resolution 222 (IX). It was in the tradition of the United Nations to stress the principles of international co-operation for the purposes of development and he supported operative paragraph 7. He would not object to redrafting it on the lines suggested by the United Kingdom representative, but its deletion would be detrimental to the draft resolution.

61. He supported the Norwegian amendment to operative paragraph 8 (A/C.2/L.1163).

62. Subject to his delegation's well-known reservations concerning the question of increasing resources, mentioned in operative paragraph 10, he would vote for the draft resolution.

63. Mr. LAGOS (Chile), speaking on a point of order, moved the closure of the debate under rule 118 of the rules of procedure. The documents had been available since the beginning of the week. The Committee had had a useful discussion and could now vote on the draft resolution: it would be difficult to resume discussion after a break of three weeks.

64. Mr. ZAGORIN (United States of America), speaking on a point of order, moved the adjournment of the meeting under rule 119 of the rules of procedure.

The motion to adjourn the meeting was rejected by 40 votes to 33, with 12 abstentions.

65. Mr. RAMIREZ-OCAMPO (Colombia), speaking against the Chilean motion for the closure of the debate on the revised draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1154/Rev.1), said that it would be a pity to defer a decision precisely when all the positions on the question had been clarified and most delegations appeared to be ready to vote. If the debate was not resumed until after the Meeting of the Group of 77, it would lose its momentum and the Committee, with an extremely heavy agenda left to consider, would not have time to do productive work.

66. Mr. RUTTEN (Netherlands) favoured an adjournment of the debate in order to enable the sponsors of the revised draft resolution to work out an agreed text with the authors of the many amendments. It would be regrettable if the draft resolution was adopted with a large minority having voted against it.

67. Mr. VERCELES (Philippines) said his delegation wished to continue the debate so that it might have another opportunity to persuade the sponsors of the draft resolution to accept its revised amendment (A/C.2/L.1158/Rev.1).

68. Mr. OULD BOUNA MOKHTAR (Mauritania) felt that the sponsors of the revised draft resolution had taken into account the many amendments submitted and that there was no justification for further delaying the vote. The vote would record the positions of all Governments and indicate those which were reluctant to help the developing countries.

69. The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the United States motion for adjournment of the debate under rule 117 of the rules of procedure.

The motion for adjournment of the debate was adopted by 41 votes to 38, with 10 abstentions.

70. Mr. GOBBA (Egypt), explaining his vote, said that he would have preferred to continue the debate on the revised draft resolution and had therefore abstained on the motion for adjournment.

71. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) drew attention to the second revised text of the draft resolution on the increased

¹ DP/L.177/Add.1.

participation of Member States in the Governing Council of UNDP (A/C.2/L.1146/Rev.2) and reviewed the further changes introduced in order to take account of the views of various delegations. The sponsors fully recognized the unique character of UNDP and had endeavoured, in the second revised text, to ensure that the enlarged membership of the Governing Council would provide balanced representation of the developed and developing countries. They would spare no effort to secure adoption of the new text by consensus.

Mr. Brito (Brazil), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

72. Mr. VERCELES (Philippines), observing that the consideration of Economic and Social Council resolution 1622 (LI) might require more discussion than had been anticipated, moved the adjournment of the meeting.

The motion was adopted unanimously.

73. The CHAIRMAN, replying to a request made by Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom), said that the Secre-

tariat would issue a new revised text of the draft resolution on the capacity of the United Nations development system, incorporating all amendments and revised amendments.

74. Without prejudice to the decision to adjourn the meeting, he read out the text of a communication concerning the current monetary crisis from the representative of Peru, acting in his capacity as Chairman of the Group of 77. In accordance with United Nations practice, the communication would be issued as a Committee document.²

75. Mr. KITCHEN (United States of America) questioned the status of the statement just made in view of the decision to adjourn and added that he wished to reserve the right of his delegation to comment on the communication when the Committee resumed its meetings.

The meeting rose at 7.10 p.m.

² Subsequently circulated as document A/C.2/L.1166.