

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records



**SECOND COMMITTEE, 1397th
MEETING**

Friday, 22 October 1971,
at 10.55 a.m.

NEW YORK

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

AGENDA ITEM 12

Report of the Economic and Social Council [chapters III to VII, VIII (sections A to E), IX to XIV, XXI and XXII] (continued) (A/8403; A/C.2/L.1148 and Add.1)

1. Mrs. THORSSON (Sweden) stated that some new elements had emerged during the consultations concerning draft resolution A/C.2/L.1148 on regional and subregional advisory services; she suggested that the vote should be postponed till after the resumption of the Committee's session.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 44

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

- (a) **United Nations Development Programme (A/C.2/L.1146/Rev.1, A/C.2/L.1153, A/C.2/L.1154/Rev.1, A/C.2/L.1157 to 1164);**
- (b) **United Nations Capital Development Fund;**
- (c) **Technical co-operation activities undertaken by the Secretary-General;**
- (d) **United Nations Volunteers programme (E/5028)**

2. Mrs. NIKOI (Ghana), speaking on behalf of its sponsors, introduced a revised draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1146/Rev.1). In summarizing the draft resolution, she emphasized that it called for an immediate increase in the membership of the Governing Council of UNDP subject to the conditions set out in operative paragraph 1, so that the various countries could play a greater part in its activities.

3. With reference to the reasons for the proposal, she said that a considerable number of newly independent States—all of them developing countries—had been admitted to the United Nations since the creation of UNDP; moreover, as the decisions of the Governing Council were of particular concern to the developing countries, they should have an opportunity to participate in it and thereby contribute to the attainment of the objectives of the International Development Strategy, especially since, in the words of the Strategy, the primary responsibility for the development of developing countries rested upon themselves, with the co-operation, of course, of developed countries.

4. Citing the Consensus on the reorganization of UNDP, she observed that the Governing Council would in future require more information on the needs of the developing countries before drawing up programmes in accordance with their country plans. With greater participation on the part of the developing countries, the Governing Council would be better equipped to take part in the over-all assessment of the progress made in the implementation of the measures laid down in the Strategy and in the attainment of its goals and objectives. She read out operative paragraph 1 of the revised draft resolution and stressed that the sponsors had taken into account the views of a number of delegations. The draft resolution was primarily motivated by the will of the developing countries to participate in the adoption of development policies so that UNDP could better provide for their needs in carrying out its activities.

5. The CHAIRMAN said he assumed that the amendment to the original draft resolution which the United Kingdom delegation had introduced at the 1395th meeting (A/C.2/L.1153) was still valid.

6. Mr. McCLEAN (Barbados) said he wished to revise one of the amendments submitted by his delegation (A/C.2/L.1160), by the addition of the following words to the text of the proposed new subparagraph (c) of operative paragraph 1: "in those instances where these concepts are meaningful and operational".

7. The main purpose of the amendments proposed by his delegation was to ensure that UNDP maintained an equitable balance between the interests, opinions and conditions of the various countries. He recalled that that proposition was not new, for it had previously been discussed by the representative of France.

8. He explained that he had modified the text of subparagraph (c) as originally proposed because the linguistic and cultural criteria did not apply to certain groups.

9. Mr. MARMARA (Malta) read out subparagraph (b) of operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution and pointed out that Malta, though situated in Western Europe, was not an economically advanced country, so that it did not come under any of the categories mentioned in the draft resolution. He would therefore have to vote against the draft resolution if it was not changed.

10. Mr. VERCELES (Philippines) said his delegation was very pleased at the support which the developing countries had given to its proposal to enlarge the membership of the Governing Council of UNDP and at the generally favourable attitude which most advanced countries had also adopted.

* Resumed from the 1395th meeting.

11. In answer to a question by the representative of the United Kingdom (1388th meeting), he said that the enlargement of the Governing Council was undoubtedly necessary for the developing countries, since they currently had only 19 seats for 97 States, whereas it was not necessary for the developed countries since they, and particularly the major Powers, had permanent seats on the Governing Council.

12. His delegation did not think that the principle of parity between developed and developing countries should be observed in the distribution of seats on the Governing Council, for that did not reflect the actual membership of the United Nations. He therefore asked the Netherlands representative, who had raised the point at the 1387th meeting, to take into account the fact that an increase in the membership of the developing countries would not only be conducive to a balance that the Governing Council did not have but would also meet the legitimate aspirations of those countries by giving them greater influence in its deliberations.

13. The draft resolution appeared to be a logical response to the strengthening and restructuring of UNDP both at headquarters and at the country level; and his delegation wondered, moreover, why the United States considered it timely to enlarge the membership of the Economic and Social Council but not of the Governing Council of UNDP. In his view, the idea was justified in both cases, and for precisely the same reasons.

14. A number of delegations from developed countries had indicated that the question of enlargement of the Governing Council of UNDP ought first to be taken up by the Council itself at its thirteenth session, and that was the main purpose of the proposed amendment of the United Kingdom delegation (A/C.2/L.1153). His delegation considered that those countries were thereby attempting to have the proposal rejected altogether: since the Governing Council arrived at its decision by the consensus method, the proposal would have no chance of being adopted there, precisely because of the present composition of the Council. He recalled that, at the Council's twelfth session, a proposal to place the question of enlargement of the Council on the provisional agenda of the thirteenth session had been rejected; on that occasion, the representative of the Netherlands had said that a decision on the matter might be taken subsequently at the level of higher United Nations bodies. His delegation noted with appreciation the comment made by the representative of Australia to the effect that the Second Committee might as well consider the matter at its current session so as to eliminate the prospect of having three separate debates. The United Kingdom representative had also referred to resolution 1622 (LI) of the Economic and Social Council, stating that all economic, social and related questions should first be taken up by the Council and then be transmitted to the General Assembly. However, that resolution of the Economic and Social Council was still only a recommendation since it had not yet been endorsed by the General Assembly.

15. With regard to the argument that the question should be considered initially by the Governing Council of UNDP because not all its members had stated their position on the

question, he wished to reiterate that it had been discussed at the twelfth session and, what was more, all the members of the Governing Council, with the exception of the Federal Republic of Germany and Switzerland, were represented in the Second Committee; he was not sure whether those two delegations had expressed their views on the matter at the Council's twelfth session but for obvious reasons they would not be able to participate in the final consideration by the General Assembly.

16. The argument that an enlarged Council would work less efficiently seemed hypothetical. It might be asked why a group of 51 members should be any less efficient than one of 27 members. The same argument had been raised with regard to the Economic and Social Council and had been rejected by a majority of the members of that body.

17. He concluded by stating that Malta, though one of the States of Western Europe, was nevertheless also a developing country.

18. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that Lebanon had become a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1146/Rev.1.

19. Mr. PATAKI (Hungary) said that the Governing Council was discharging its functions efficiently, but because of the new tasks entrusted to it as a result of the adoption of the International Development Strategy he agreed that its membership should be enlarged.

20. His delegation would, however, like to see the membership raised, not to 51, but to 45, as in the case of the Industrial Development Board of UNIDO and other bodies.

21. If the Committee did not reach a consensus, he would see no objection to referring the question of the enlargement of the membership to the Governing Council itself. In that event, the Council would submit a report to the fifty-third session of the Economic and Social Council, and that would give delegations time to deal with the difficulties.

22. His delegation felt that a decision on a question of such importance should be reached by consensus, since it concerned all States.

23. Referring to subparagraph (b) of operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution, he said that he would prefer a different and more specific wording.

24. Mr. PARIS (Costa Rica) said he wished to consult the other members of his group and requested the adjournment of the discussion on the revised draft resolution and the relevant amendments.

25. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) and Mr. AUBAME (Gabon) spoke against the motion.

26. Mr. MOLINA DUARTE (Venezuela) and Mr. CAVIGLIA STARICCO (Uruguay) spoke in favour of the motion.

In accordance with rule 117 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly the motion for adjournment of the debate was put to the vote.

The motion was adopted by 54 votes to 30, with 15 abstentions.

27. Mr. VERCELES (Philippines) wished to know when discussion of the question would be resumed. It might be possible to hold consultations in the afternoon.
28. Mr. VIAUD (France) explained that he had abstained from the vote because the question of postponing discussion of the draft resolution had been badly put, inasmuch as those for and against the draft resolution, and those who disagreed with the allocation of seats proposed in the draft resolution, had not been able to vote in different ways. He, too, wished to know when discussion of the draft resolution would be resumed.
29. Mr. GOBBA (Egypt) said that he had voted against the motion. Even if no decision could be taken at the present meeting he had thought it preferable to continue discussion of the draft resolution so as to make it easier to arrive at a decision later on.
30. Mr. RUTTEN (Netherlands) said he had voted for the motion, not only because prior consultations were necessary but also because he had to obtain fresh instructions from his Government, since a revised draft resolution had been submitted.
31. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) explained that he had voted against the motion since a new text would be ready in the afternoon and would make it easier to reach a decision.
32. Mr. AUBAME (Gabon) asked when discussion of the item would be resumed. He also asked if it would not be possible to save time by postponing the presentation of the new version of the draft resolution so as to permit further consultations.
33. Mr. FLEMING (Argentina) felt that it would be advisable to consult the chairmen of the various regional groups before deciding to resume the discussion.
34. Mr. MALIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he had voted in favour of the motion since the revised draft just submitted contained some new ideas which he had not been able to study.
35. The CHAIRMAN stated that he was not in a position to say when the discussion would be resumed since he would first have to consult the members of the Committee and, as the representative of Argentina had suggested, the chairmen of the regional groups.
36. Mr. BRITO (Brazil) felt that the discussion on improving the capacity of the United Nations development system had been most encouraging and he hoped that a decision on that question could be taken quickly.
37. In introducing draft resolution A/C.2/L.1154/Rev.1 on behalf of the sponsors, he explained that the fourth preambular paragraph had been reworded in view of the suggestion made by the representative of Trinidad and Tobago; the word "regions" referred to the world's three main developing regions. While the sponsors fully appreciated the concern of the representative of Barbados in proposing an amendment to take account of the interests of very small developing countries, they had been unable to include that concept in their text, since it was not yet sufficiently clear. Nor could they accept the proposed amendment of the representative of the United Kingdom to the seventh preambular paragraph (see A/C.2/L.1162, para.1) since that amendment would imply that all development aid should be channelled through UNDP. He emphasized that he considered that paragraph very important. The ninth preambular paragraph had been reworded in accordance with the very relevant suggestion of the representative of Mauritania. It was indeed important to emphasize that development should be fully integrated and that, consequently, industrial development was only one of the features of such integrated development.
38. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom), speaking on a point of order, observed that it was difficult to examine simultaneously all the changes introduced orally by the representative of Brazil. Moreover, his delegation's amendment, to which the representative of Brazil had just referred, had not yet been presented.
39. The CHAIRMAN informed the representative of the United Kingdom that he intended to give the floor to all sponsors of amendments.
40. Mr. BRITO (Brazil) said that the eleventh preambular paragraph had been inserted to ensure that the important concept of the absorptive capacity of the developing countries was borne in mind. The fourteenth session of the Governing Council of UNDP had been mentioned in operative paragraph 3, taking account of that body's work programme. The sponsors had no intention whatever of amending the Consensus by referring to paragraphs 21, 22 and 23 in operative paragraph 3; on the contrary, they were trying to improve it. The words "and in fact complementary to" had been replaced by the words "while according priority to the interests of the least developed among the developing countries". Operative paragraph 4 had been amended because in the course of the discussion some representatives had expressed fears that it might prove detrimental to country programming as well as national and subregional programmes if too much importance was accorded to global projects; that was certainly not the sponsors' intention. In the light of the suggestions made by the representatives of Mauritania and Ecuador, the words "not only" had been deleted and the words "but also" had been replaced by the words "as well as". Operative paragraph 6 had been inserted to reflect two new ideas which expressed the view of all developing countries. In operative paragraph 7, the words "Reiterates its confidence in the" had been replaced by "Reiterates the authority of the". In the same paragraph, the words "should receive" had been replaced by the words "would receive". Furthermore, it was necessary to reaffirm in that paragraph that the Governing Council of UNDP was under the authority of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council. The sponsors were prepared to reformulate operative paragraph 8 in accordance with the Norwegian amendment (A/C.2/L.1163). It was clearly important to adapt and redefine the role of IACB in the context of paragraph 65 of the Consensus.
41. Mr. VERCELES (Philippines) noted that since the Consensus had been adopted less than a year ago and

consequently had not had time to bear fruit it would be premature to amend it. However, as some developing countries apparently wished to do so, he was obliged to overcome the misgivings he would have had in other circumstances with regard to a draft resolution such as the one introduced by the Brazilian representative.

42. He recalled that at the 1393rd meeting he had submitted an amendment (A/C.2/L.1158) to the original text of the draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1154) which had been accepted by the sponsors, together with an amendment proposed by the Indian representative. Since the sponsors had taken no account of it in the revised draft resolution, he wished to submit a further amendment providing for the insertion in A/C.2/L.1154/Rev.1 of a new operative paragraph 4 which, to some extent, would paraphrase paragraph 21 of the Consensus. The new amendment would read:

“4. *Reaffirms* that the Governing Council in the implementation of intercountry programming should take into account the equitable distribution of resources among regions in accordance with paragraph 21 of the annex to General Assembly resolution 2688 (XXV) including the need to study the possibility of establishing intercountry indicative planning figures at the fourteenth session of the Governing Council;”.

43. In draft resolution A/C.2/L.1154/Rev.1 the sponsors placed the emphasis on the least developed among the developing countries. He could certainly understand the needs of those countries and was pleased to recall that at the twenty-fourth session he had been the first to draw attention to their situation by stressing the need to draw up a list of those countries. That had been done, since the list had recently been published in the report of the Committee for Development Planning on its seventh session (E/4990). While he did not question the need to give special treatment to those countries when allocating aid for economic and social assistance, he felt it was necessary to ensure an equitable distribution of that aid among the different regions. Although the needs of the least developed among the developing countries—the majority of which were situated in Africa—must be met, special attention must also be given to the huge populations of Asia. However, the report of the twelfth session of the Governing Council of UNDP revealed that out of twelve regional projects only one was concerned with Asia and, what was more serious, that that project was the smallest.

44. Mrs. AUGUSTE (Trinidad and Tobago) thanked the sponsors for taking account in their revised text of one of the amendments she had proposed in document A/C.2/L.1159, but said she was unable to accept the wording of operative paragraph 3 of the revised draft resolution. Since she felt that paragraphs 21, 22 and 23 of the Consensus were satisfactory, she saw no need to call for improved procedures for intercountry projects in particular. At its eleventh session, the Governing Council had decided “to undertake a comprehensive review of the organization, methods and general procedures of the UNDP at its fourteenth session in the light of the experience gained in the interim period” and in view of that decision she saw no justification for the request expressed in operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution.

45. Noting a contradiction between the ninth and tenth preambular paragraphs of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1154/Rev.1, she observed that in the ninth paragraph industrial development was said to be one of the essential features of development, whereas the tenth paragraph spoke only of the importance of agricultural development; furthermore, according to the ninth paragraph, industrial development was essential at every stage of development, while the tenth paragraph stated that agriculture was considered merely as the first step in the direction of development. She was unable to accept the wording of those two paragraphs.

46. Commenting on operative paragraph 10, she said that mention should be made of intercountry programmes as well as of country programmes.

47. With regard to the oral amendment submitted by the Philippine representative, which, *inter alia*, envisaged the possibility that the Governing Council might establish intercountry indicative planning figures at its fourteenth session, she pointed out that the Governing Council had already established such figures at its eleventh session (see E/4954 and Corr.1, annex III).

48. Mr. McCLEAN (Barbados) introduced an amendment (A/C.2/L.1161) providing for the inclusion in the fourth preambular paragraph and in operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution a new idea concerning the need to promote the interests of the very small developing countries, for which regional projects were of capital importance. Those countries should be referred to specifically, since some of the least developed among the developing countries were very large and, consequently, their needs were very different from those of the very small countries like Barbados, which required assistance in the form of regional projects to develop their economy.

49. He was aware that his amendment might create difficulties, since it introduced a new concept which gave rise to problems of definition and implementation; he was therefore prepared to withdraw it if need be and to propose to the sponsors of the draft resolution the insertion of an additional paragraph which would read:

“11. *Requests* the Governing Council of UNDP to initiate activity leading to a definition of small countries (i.e. small economies) and to the identification of the significance of regional projects for these countries.”

50. The amendment he had proposed in document A/C.2/L.1161 did not depart from the provisions of the Consensus, and should be considered as an amplification of it. He realized that he would find it difficult to enlist the support of the other least developed countries for his amendment, because they tended to fear that the concessions which they had already succeeded in obtaining might be eroded. The sole aim of his amendment was to gain recognition of the significance of regional programmes for the very small countries.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.