



## ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

FIFTY-FIRST SESSION

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Friday, 23 July 1971

at 10:20 a.m.

PALAIS DES NATIONS, GENEVA

## CONTENTS

Page

Agenda item 14:	
Assistance in cases of natural disaster ( <i>concluded</i> ) . . . . .	161
Agenda item 8:	
Operational activities for development	
(a) United Nations Development Programme ( <i>continued</i> ) . . . . .	164
(d) United Nations Volunteers programme ( <i>continued</i> ). . . . .	167

*President:* Mr. DRISS (Tunisia)

## AGENDA ITEM 14

Assistance in cases of natural disaster (*concluded*)\*  
(E/4994, E/5012 (Part I), paras. 41-43; E/5038, chap. VI; E/C.2/727, E/C.2/731, E/C.2/732, E/C.2/735, E/C.2/742, E/L.1404, E/L.1425, E/L.1430, E/L.1434, E/L.1436, E/L.1437, E/L.1438/Rev.1, E/L.1438/Add.1, E/L.1440 and Corr.1, E/L.1442, E/L.1443)

1. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) introduced, on behalf of its thirteen sponsors, draft resolution E/L.1438/Rev.1, a revised version which took into account many of the suggestions made at the 1786th and 1787th meetings, in particular by the observer for Turkey. Most of the amendments were based on the provisions of resolution 2717 (XXV), which had been adopted unanimously by the General Assembly.

2. The sixth preambular paragraph had been added in order to take note of the study annexed to the Secretary-General's report (E/4994) on the legal status of disaster relief units made available through the United Nations, which had been requested by the General Assembly in operative paragraph 3, of resolution 2717 (XXV). In view of the comments of the USSR representative (1786th meeting), he pointed out that the proposals in the study were only suggestions by the Secretary-General and it was for each Member State to decide whether or not it wished to take account of them. In any case the question was not of great importance, since so far only Norway and Sweden had organized disaster relief units through the United Nations.

3. The eighth and ninth preambular paragraphs were new and they too were based on General Assembly resolution 2717 (XXV). The tenth and twelfth preambular paragraphs had not been changed. It was important to recognize the independence of the various organizations and programmes,

whether or not they were within the United Nations system, and not to restrict in any way their opportunities of collecting funds and providing immediate assistance in case of disaster. The Council merely asked them to keep the Co-ordinator informed of their activities in such matters.

4. With regard to operative paragraph 1, the sponsors regretted that they could not accept the USSR amendment (E/L.1440 and Corr.1): the functions of Co-ordinator called for the creation of a new post and should not be added to the functions of another official. The word "direct" in sub-paragraph (a) had not been deleted as requested by the French delegation in its amendment (E/L.1442). It was a question of guidance, not of restraint. Perhaps the French delegation would be satisfied if the word "direct" were translated in French as "*orienter*". Sub-paragraph (e) was new and was based on General Assembly resolution 2717 (XXV). The addition to former sub-paragraph (f), which was now sub-paragraph (g), was intended to draw the attention of the countries concerned to the fact that they would be well advised to build up their own stockpiles for use in case of disaster.

5. In order to meet the wishes of the Yugoslav delegation, the sponsors had added to former sub-paragraph (g), now sub-paragraph (h), which stated that the Co-ordinator should phase out relief operations as the stricken country moved into the stage of rehabilitation and reconstruction, wording to the effect that he would continue to interest himself in the activities of the United Nations agencies concerned with rehabilitation and reconstruction. That idea was taken from operative paragraph 5 (g) of the General Assembly resolution. Nevertheless the work of rehabilitation and reconstruction was not strictly speaking part of the Co-ordinator's functions: it was the concern of other organizations, as was indicated in the ninth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution.

6. With regard to operative paragraph 2, the sponsors regretted that they could not accept the French amendment (E/L.1442). It was necessary to specify what would be the financial implications of creating the post of Co-ordinator and the type of appointment the Secretary-General should make. The Secretary-General had stated in his statement of administrative and financial implications (E/L.1438/Add.1) that the establishment of a new post at the Under-Secretary-General level would cost \$82,000 if the office was established at New York and \$72,000 if it was established at Geneva. The United Kingdom delegation was nevertheless ready to consider any suggestion that might be made on the subject.

7. In operative paragraph 3 the sponsors had inserted the word "small" before the words "permanent office", as suggested by the French delegation.

\* Resumed from the 1787th meeting.

8. Operative paragraph 5, which was new, had been included at the suggestion of the observer for Turkey. The study that the Secretary-General was asked to prepare for the Council's fifty-third session might be used as a provisional version of the first annual report referred to in operative paragraph 1 (*i*).

9. At the suggestion of the delegation of Ghana, the sponsors had added to operative paragraph 6 (former paragraph 5) the words: "and interested non-governmental organizations".

10. With regard to operative paragraph 7 (former paragraph 6), the sponsors could not accept the Hungarian amendment (E/L.1443). The words whose deletion was requested were by and large those used in all the earlier resolutions concerning natural disasters, in particular in General Assembly resolution 2717 (XXV) and in Council resolutions 1518 (XLIX) concerning the earthquakes in Peru and 1533 (XLIX) concerning the establishment of an emergency disaster fund. The question had often been discussed and there was no reason for a change of attitude on the matter. The point of the paragraph was that it behoved Member States to inform the Secretary-General with whom he should maintain contact concerning aid in case of disaster.

11. Operative paragraphs 8 and 9 replaced former paragraph 7 and defined more clearly the role of potential recipient countries and potential donor countries. Paragraph 8 was based on the recommendations in the Secretary-General's report (E/4994), which had been supported by a large number of delegations at the previous meeting. Sub-paragraphs (*b*) and (*c*) of operative paragraph 9 were based on operative paragraphs 1 and 2 of the General Assembly resolution.

12. He understood the Soviet Union's concern, in submitting its amendment to operative paragraph 3 (E/L.1440 and Corr.1), to keep expenses down, but in view of the importance of the cause the sponsors could not agree to the Co-ordinator and his assistants being appointed from among the Organization's existing staff. Moreover, as the Secretary-General had indicated in his statement (E/L.1438/Add.1), the total cost of the undertaking would be less than \$300,000 a year and would be only \$261,200 a year if the office was established at Geneva.

13. Mr. AHMED (Secretary of the Council) pointed out that foot-note 1 of document E/L.1438/Rev.1 did not apply to Peru, which was a member of the Council.

14. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) objected to the inclusion of Turkey, which was not a member of the Council, among the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1438/Rev.1. He requested that the USSR delegation's position should be recorded in the summary record of the meeting.

15. In accordance with rule 75 of the rules of procedure of the Council, any Member of the United Nations which was not a member of the Council could be invited to participate in its deliberations on any matter which the Council considered was of particular concern to that

Member and the Member thus invited was entitled to submit proposals which could be put to the vote at the request of any member of the Council. It was not stated that an observer had the right to be a co-sponsor of any draft resolution.

16. The USSR delegation maintained its amendment, the sole correct English text of which was that appearing in document E/L.1440 and Corr.1. He requested a separate vote on operative paragraphs 1, 2 and 3.

17. His delegation gave its unqualified support to the Hungarian amendment (E/L.1443): it was intolerable that there should be any political discrimination in respect of certain socialist countries, particularly on the question of humanitarian assistance in cases of natural disaster.

18. Mr. de AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) said that he wished to place on record the Brazilian delegation's view that an observer had the right to submit a draft resolution either independently or jointly.

#### *USSR amendment (E/L.1440/Corr.1)*

19. Mr. EFFAH-APPENTENG (Ghana) said that he understood the concern of the USSR delegation but did not think that it would be appropriate to assign the functions of Co-ordinator to an existing member of the Secretariat.

*The amendment was rejected by 16 votes to 5, with 4 abstentions.*

#### *French amendment (E/L.1442)*

20. The PRESIDENT pointed out that, as the French amendment to operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution had been accepted by the sponsors, it would not be put to the vote.

21. Mr. PRAGUE (France) withdrew the French amendment to operative paragraph 1(*a*) and accepted the United Kingdom representative's suggestion that the English word "direct" should be translated by *orienter* in French.

22. Mr. EFFAH-APPENTENG (Ghana) said that his delegation would abstain in the vote on the remaining French amendment because it did not see the point of it.

*The French amendment to operative paragraph 2 was adopted by 10 votes to 9, with 5 abstentions.*

#### *Hungarian amendment (E/L.1443)*

23. Mr. EFFAH-APPENTENG (Ghana) considered that the Hungarian amendment was very much to the point since it was important that the Co-ordinator should maintain contact with all States and not only with States Members of the United Nations.

24. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom), Mr. ZAGORIN (United States of America), Mr. PRAGUE (France), Miss SIMBOLOTTI (Italy), Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya), Mr. HEDEMANN (Norway), Mr. ARIFF (Malaysia) and Mr. RAZAFINDRABE (Madagascar) said that they could not approve the Hungarian amendment, for they considered it essential that the Secretary-General, or the person whom he appointed to the post of Co-ordinator, should know with whom he should get into touch in order to ascertain what assistance would be available in an emergency situation.

25. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that the Government of the Soviet Union had always upheld the principle of universality and protested against the unjust discrimination practised against certain States by the Western Powers, as the discussion showed. The delegation of the Soviet Union would vote in favour of the Hungarian amendment.

26. Mr. PATHMARAJAH (Ceylon) said that he would vote in favour of the amendment, in pursuance of the principle of universality, which should be the more respected in the case of a humanitarian undertaking.

27. Mr. LENDRUM (New Zealand) endorsed the comments made by the representative of the United Kingdom and added that all countries, whichever they might be, would receive assistance if they were struck by a natural disaster, as was clear from operative paragraph 1 (d) of the draft resolution.

28. Mr. NAIK (Pakistan) said that, if his delegation had not been one of the sponsors of the draft resolution, it would have supported the Hungarian amendment in pursuance of the principle of universality. His delegation would therefore abstain in the vote on that amendment.

29. Mr. GÁL (Hungary), replying to a question from Mr. HAMID (Sudan), said that the Hungarian amendment should read as follows:

In operative paragraph 7 replace the words "with the Governments of States Members of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies and the IAEA" by the words "with all Governments".

30. Mr. CHAMMAS (Lebanon) asked that it should be noted that the Hungarian delegation was now submitting to the Council an amendment different from that which had been submitted in document E/L.1443.

*The amendment, as modified, was rejected by 14 votes to 6, with 5 abstentions.*

#### *Draft resolution (E/L.1438/Rev.1)*

31. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that, at the 1786th meeting, the delegation of the Soviet Union had made some comments on the Secretary-General's study on the legal status of disaster relief units

made available through the United Nations (E/4994, annex III). He asked that a separate vote should be taken on the sixth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution.

*The sixth preambular paragraph was adopted by 22 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions.*

*The first phrase of operative paragraph 1 was adopted by 21 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions.*

*Operative paragraph 2, as amended by the French amendment, was adopted by 22 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions.*

*Paragraph 3 was adopted by 22 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions.*

*The draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 24 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

32. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), explaining his vote, said that his delegation was not opposed to co-ordination of the assistance provided by organizations of the United Nations system in cases of natural disaster, although it considered that the best way of assisting the victims of disasters was by bilateral assistance between States. If the Hungarian amendment had been adopted, it would have enabled that co-ordination to be strengthened by associating all States, and not only the Members of the United Nations, in the assistance activities. Furthermore, the creation of new posts would not necessarily increase the effectiveness of assistance to the victims of natural disasters, but it would certainly have repercussions on the United Nations budget, on which it would be an additional burden, and on administrative arrangements, which it would make more cumbersome.

33. His delegation had been unable to vote in favour of the sixth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, for it considered it premature to express an opinion on the study in question so long as it had not been considered by the Council or by legal experts.

34. With regard to operative paragraph 9 (c), he had doubts about the possibility of informing the Co-ordinator in advance about the assistance that could be provided immediately in cases of natural disaster; in fact, the type of assistance was generally determined by the nature of the disaster and the place where it had occurred.

35. Lastly, his delegation considered that the adoption of the draft resolution did not create any obligations for countries.

36. Mr. FERNAND-LAURENT (France) said he was sorry that he had been unable to be present at the beginning of the discussion, for he would have suggested translating the English verb "direct" by *guider*, which accurately described the relationship which should be established between the Co-ordinator and the heads of the secretariats of the specialized agencies.

37. Mr. DARSA (Indonesia) said that he had felt obliged to abstain in the vote on the Hungarian amendment (E/L.1443), notwithstanding its merits, because he had been a sponsor of the draft resolution.

38. Miss SIMBOLOTTI (Italy) thanked the sponsors of the draft resolution and welcomed its adoption.

39. Mr. PATHMARAJAH (Ceylon) said that he recognized the cogency of the comments made by the USSR representative but had felt that he should concur in the general opinion, which had been in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

40. Mr. LAZAREVIC (Yugoslavia) said that he had abstained in the vote on operative paragraph 1, since the co-ordination of assistance for the victims of natural disasters could be ensured within the framework of the specialized agencies, without it being necessary to create a special post for that purpose. He had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole, however, since it dealt with a particularly important question.

41. Mr. CHAMMAS (Lebanon) said that, although he was one of the sponsors of the draft resolution, he had abstained in the vote on the French amendment (E/L.1442, item 2), which had enabled the Council to adopt that amendment by 10 votes to 9. His delegation considered that the Secretary-General must be free to give the Disaster Relief Co-ordinator the rank of his choice, and, furthermore, he had been struck by the example of the effective work done by the Assistant Secretary-General for Inter-Agency Affairs, which the representative of France had referred to at an earlier meeting.

42. Mr. PEREIRA da FONSECA (Brazil) said that he wished to make it clear that in his delegation's view the United Nations resources referred to in operative paragraph 1 (f) were those available as a consequence of General Assembly resolution 2435 (XXIII) and other relevant General Assembly resolutions.

43. Mr. EFFAH-APPENTENG (Ghana) said that he had voted in the same way as the representative of Lebanon and for the same reasons.

44. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) warned the representative of Lebanon against any explanation of vote which might tend to interpret the Council's decision. Moreover, the USSR's vote had played as decisive a role as that of Lebanon.

45. Mr. CHAMMAS (Lebanon) said that he had only tried to explain his vote and not to interpret the Council's decision. Every delegation was entitled to explain its point of view on the question under consideration.

46. The PRESIDENT said that, in his view, it lay with the Secretary-General to draw the conclusions from the Council's decision and to take the necessary action.

47. Mr. KULIN (Observer for Turkey), speaking under rule 75 of the rules of procedure, thanked the sponsors of the draft resolution for allowing Turkey to join them as a sponsor, in accordance with rule 75 of the rules of procedure. He welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution,

which constituted a decisive turning-point in United Nations efforts in cases of natural disasters.

48. The PRESIDENT said that the statement by the observer for Turkey did not commit the Council in regard to any future decisions which it might take with regard to the participation of observers in draft resolutions.

49. Mr. MCCARTHY (United Kingdom) said that he was glad that the Council had adopted the draft resolution almost unanimously. Thanks were due to the Secretary-General, as also to the League of Red Cross Societies and the bodies responsible for assistance to the victims of natural disasters, which had helped to prepare an extremely clear report (E/4994) and had thus made it easier to draw up the draft resolution.

50. Mr. RAZAFINDRABE (Madagascar) said that he was particularly happy that the draft resolution had been adopted, since Madagascar was subject to natural disasters such as cyclones. It was not for lack of interest in the question that he had not spoken in the general debate but because he had felt that he could add nothing to the detailed statements which had been made.

51. The PRESIDENT congratulated the Secretariat on its work and thanked all the specialized agencies which were making a considerable effort to assist the victims of natural disasters. He paid a particular tribute to WHO, which was helping Spain to avert the threat of cholera.

#### AGENDA ITEM 8

##### Operational activities for development:

(a) *United Nations Development Programme (continued)* (E/4954 and Corr.1, E/5043, E/L.1439/Rev.1, E/L.1444, E/L.1445)

52. The PRESIDENT invited the members of the Council to consider the revised draft resolution E/L.1439/Rev.1 and the United States amendments to it (E/L.1445).

53. Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya), introducing the revised draft resolution, explained that in order to take account of the comments made at the previous meeting the sponsors of the draft resolution had condensed the last three preambular paragraphs into one. He hoped that that change would make the draft resolution acceptable to the delegations which had felt some doubt about it.

54. In reply to the objections made previously, he pointed out that the draft resolution did not seek to repudiate the UNDP Governing Council's decision to gather more information on the question. It was not the Council's intention to deny it the time necessary to do so; it merely wished to ensure that resolution 1572 B (L) would be implemented and to make it easier for the Secretary-General to consider that resolution. Moreover, those who opposed the draft resolution were forgetting that, in terms of hierarchy, the Economic and Social Council was a



superior body to the UNDP Governing Council. Many delegations, including that of the United States, had stressed the need to strengthen the authority of the Economic and Social Council and to entrust it with a directing and co-ordinating role in establishing co-operation between the developed and the developing countries. That was precisely the aim of the text under consideration and he hoped that the United States representative and other delegations would endorse it, for its intention was not to repudiate the UNDP Governing Council, but to rationalize the relationship between that body and the Economic and Social Council.

55. Mr. ZAGORIN (United States of America) said that his delegation's amendments (E/L.1445) were designed to harmonize and co-ordinate the work of United Nations bodies with a view to making an effective contribution to development. The UNDP Governing Council had not asked the Economic and Social Council to delay consideration of the subject of advisory services, but had requested it to postpone a decision until a later date so that the UNDP Governing Council could undertake a more thorough consideration of the question at its thirteenth session, when it would have before it the necessary documents and in particular the comprehensive report which the Secretary-General and the UNDP Administrator were to prepare. He saw no reason for not complying with that request. Nothing would be gained by obliging UNDP to adopt hasty measures which would not serve the interests of development and which would prejudice the co-ordination of UNDP's and the Council's efforts.

56. In order not to prolong the discussion, he would agree to withdraw his amendments, but was not convinced by the changes which the sponsors had made in their draft resolution. It was unwise to embark upon a programme of advisory services without having first made a thorough study of the question and without knowing the views of the UNDP Governing Council. Consequently, he could not subscribe to the last preambular paragraph, according to which the joint study by the Secretary-General and the Administrator of UNDP need not hold up the launching of the special natural resources advisory services. For the same reasons, he could not accept operative paragraph 1 and considered that only operative paragraph 2 should be retained.

57. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) said that he was well aware that the decision taken by the Council at its fiftieth session created difficulties for UNDP in that certain experts who would be called upon to provide special advisory services on natural resources were already engaged in carrying out projects financed by UNDP. Draft resolution E/L.1439/Rev.1, of which Pakistan was a sponsor, was nevertheless essential because the Council had not made the implementation of resolution 1572 B (L) dependent upon harmonizing the establishment of the special advisory services with the customary activities of UNDP. The aim of the draft resolution was merely to reaffirm the Council's decision and request its implementation, because it was a general policy decision and the Economic and Social Council was

superior to the UNDP Governing Council. It was understood that, in requesting the Secretary-General to implement Council resolution 1572 B (L) without delay, the Council was aware that it would nevertheless have to take into account the difficulties that UNDP was experiencing and that they would have to be overcome before the next session of the Governing Council.

58. Mr. PRAGUE (France) agreed with the United States representative that the efforts made by the sponsors of the draft resolution to take into account the objections to which the first version (E/L.1439) had given rise were inadequate.

59. By resolution 1572 B (L), the Council had, as a matter of principle, taken a firm and irrevocable decision to establish special advisory services on natural resources and, on the practical question of the machinery to be established, had asked UNDP to prepare a report on how that decision of principle could be put into effect. The French delegation had supported the Council resolution because that resolution enabled UNDP to give its opinion and have its views taken into account. By adopting draft resolution E/L.1439/Rev.1, the Council would be disregarding UNDP's opinion and that would be contrary to the spirit of resolution 1572 B (L). Moreover, the fact that the latter resolution was quoted in an abbreviated form in the draft resolution was not evidence of complete good faith.

60. Furthermore, in its revised form the draft resolution was incoherent and contradictory, since it stated in the last preambular paragraph that the joint study by the Secretary-General and the Administrator of UNDP need not hold up the launching of the special natural resources advisory services, when it was not even known on what practical bases - and on what financial basis in particular - the system would be able to work.

61. To overcome the difficulty, the French delegation was proposing three amendments.<sup>1</sup> The first, which was in line with the suggestions made by the United States representative, was to delete the last part of the final preambular paragraph, from the words "and that the joint study". The second amendment was to invert the order of the two operative paragraphs. The third was to replace the words "as stipulated" at the end of the new operative paragraph 2 by "in the light of the conclusions of the study referred to in the preceding paragraph". Those amendments would restore the proper order of things and would make the draft resolution gain in coherence what it would lose in haste.

62. Mr. ZVEZDINE (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he too considered that it would be premature to adopt draft resolution E/L.1439/Rev.1 before the UNDP Governing Council, by whom the special advisory services would be financed, had been able to study the subject in detail. Although the UNDP Governing Council had not been in a position to submit its observations to the Council at its fifty-first session as requested in resolution 1572 B (L), it was prepared to do so later and he could see

<sup>1</sup> Subsequently issued as document E/L.1450.

no reason why the Council, with inconsiderate haste and showing an unfortunate taste for more and more new services, should commit the Secretary-General to considerable expenditure without even knowing its precise objective or the results it was likely to produce.

63. If draft resolution E/L.1439/Rev.1 was voted upon paragraph by paragraph, the USSR delegation would vote against the second preambular paragraph, against the last preambular paragraph and against operative paragraph 1, and it would abstain on the draft resolution as a whole.

64. The PRESIDENT drew attention to rule 56 of the rules of procedure and asked the Council whether it insisted upon the substantive amendments proposed during the meeting being submitted in writing, for that was likely to delay its work.

65. Mr. ANTOINE (Haiti), speaking on a point of order, pointed out that the purpose of the amendments proposed by the French representative was to make the proposals already submitted clearer.

66. In the French text of the first preambular paragraph and in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, it would be clearer to speak of the *prestation* of special advisory services rather than the *fourniture* of such services.

67. Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya) recalled that on the previous day he had asked the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1439 and all delegations wishing to suggest amendments to that text to meet informally to work out a text acceptable to the majority of delegations. The French delegation had not taken part in those consultations. The Council should refuse to discuss the substantive amendments which that delegation was submitting at that late stage in the work.

68. Mr. RAZAFINDRABE (Madagascar) said that, in his opinion, before the Council took a decision on a text it should settle two questions of substance, one concerning the fact that a decision of the UNDP Governing Council would be called into question and the other the fact that it was not perhaps wise to propose more and more studies, committees and services.

69. The PRESIDENT pointed out that draft resolution E/L.1439/Rev.1, which was the only text before the Council since the United States delegation had withdrawn its amendments (E/L.1445), was in fact designed to reply to the questions of substance that arose.

70. The Council, bearing in mind rule 56 of the rules of procedure, should settle the procedural problem raised by the submission of amendments to draft resolution E/L.1439/Rev.1 during the meeting.

71. Mr. PRAGUE (France) pointed out, from the point of view of procedure, that the revised version of the draft resolution had been circulated only at the beginning of the current meeting; his delegation could therefore invoke rule 56 of the rules of procedure and request that the Council should take no decision on the proposal until twenty-four

hours later. Moreover, rule 56 simply authorized the Council either to demand a period of twenty-four hours before any amendments were discussed and put to the vote, or to decide to discuss such amendments immediately, without waiting until they had been handed in in writing. The Council was not, however, entitled to disregard amendments.

72. The discussion had revealed points of disagreement on substances and the Council would bring discredit upon itself if it refused to take a decision.

73. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should adjourn the discussion until the next meeting, so that it would have the proposed amendments before it in writing.  
*It was so decided.*

74. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to continue its consideration of the draft resolution submitted by Brazil, Kenya, Pakistan, the USSR and Yugoslavia (E/L.1444).

75. Mr. de AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) recalled that he had submitted the draft resolution at the preceding meeting. The sponsors had accepted the suggestion that the words "Decides to request" and "Further decides to request" at the beginning of operative paragraphs 1 and 2 should be replaced by the words "Requests" and "Further requests", respectively.

76. In operative paragraphs 1 (b) and 2, the words "its June sessions" should be replaced by "its June session".

77. Mr. CHAMMAS (Lebanon) pointed out that the plural form should be retained since the UNDP Governing Council would be called upon to consider a report on the implementation of industrial development projects not only at its next June session, but at all its June sessions.

78. Mr. ZAGORIN (United States of America) raised a question of procedure: in his view, it was not seemly for the Council to tell another body (in the present instance the UNDP Governing Council) what to place on the agenda of its periodic sessions. It was for the UNDP Governing Council to decide how to deal regularly with the matter. The Council should confine itself to issuing guidelines concerning the contents of the report to be prepared by the Administrator of UNDP. Operative paragraph 2 should therefore be deleted.

79. There was also a question of substance: to request the Administrator of UNDP to give "special attention" to requests from developing countries relating to industrial development, as in operative paragraph 1, meant that the Administrator would have to pay greater attention than he usually did to such requests from developing countries; that seemed incompatible with the firmly established principle that UNDP and countries should consider jointly all the factors to be taken into account within the framework of national development programmes. Moreover, both the UNDP Governing Council and he himself had on various occasions stressed the need to foster the growth of the least developed among the developing countries; the provisions of operative paragraph 1 (a) did not take that concern into

account. He therefore proposed that the beginning of operative paragraph 1 (a) should be amended to read: "to give due attention".

80. Mr. CHASE (United Kingdom) agreed that it would be inappropriate to ask the UNDP Administrator to give "special" attention to requests concerning industrial development, since all requests, no matter what their object, from the developing countries received equal attention from UNDP and it was not for the Council to prejudge the UNDP Governing Council's appraisal of the situation.

81. With regard to the submission of reports on the implementation of industrial development projects, operative paragraphs 1 (b) and 2 lacked clarity: it should be enough for the Administrator of UNDP to present a single report on the implementation of projects in that field.

82. Moreover, for the reasons already stated by the United States representative, operative paragraph 2 was hardly satisfactory and he, too, would rather it were deleted.

83. On the whole, the draft resolution dealt with matters of which UNDP was the best judge. It was no doubt useful that the Council should give an opinion, but the UNDP Governing Council had not given it sufficient information on which to base a valid opinion.

84. Mr. GAL (Hungary) said that his delegation supported draft resolution E/L.1444. Industrialization was of fundamental importance to all the developing countries, and the sponsors of the draft resolution were merely asking the UNDP Governing Council, which did not meet all the requests for aid addressed to it, to give special consideration to requests designed to foster industrialization.

85. Whether operative paragraphs 1 (b) and 2 referred to "its June session" or "its June sessions", it should be understood that the Administrator of UNDP would be required to submit to the Governing Council in June each year a report on the implementation of projects relating to industrial development.

86. Mr. de AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) drew attention to two factors which he considered decisive. The first was that it lay with the Council, as many delegations had constantly reiterated, to determine general policies with regard to development. The second was that industrialization was an absolute necessity for the developing countries if they wished to achieve economic independence one day. In the light of those two considerations, the Council was perfectly justified in giving UNDP guidelines and asking its Administrator to give greater attention, in other words "special" attention, to requests relating to industrial development; all countries would benefit from a directive of that kind, which, moreover, was in line with a recommendation

adopted unanimously on 8 June 1971 by the Special International Conference of UNIDO.<sup>2</sup>

87. The provisions of operative paragraphs 1 (b) and 2 should be interpreted as meaning that a report was to be presented each year to the UNDP Governing Council at its June session.

88. Unlike some representatives, he did not think it was possible to question the Council's right to take the decision set out in operative paragraph 2, since such a decision was well within the competence of a body qualified to determine general policies.

89. Mr. RAZAFINDRABE (Madagascar) proposed that the words "the least developed among" should be added before the words "the developing countries" in operative paragraph 1 (a).

90. The PRESIDENT requested delegations which wished to amend draft resolution E/L.1444 to submit their amendments in writing so that the Council could consider them at its next meeting.

91. He suggested that, independently of the draft resolutions before it in connexion with agenda item 8 (a), the Council should adopt the following resolution:

*"The Economic and Social Council*

*"Takes note of the reports of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme on its eleventh and twelfth sessions (E/4954 and Corr.1 and E/5043)."*

*It was so decided.*

#### AGENDA ITEM 8

##### Operational activities for development:

##### (d) United Nations Volunteers programme (continued) (E/5028, E/C.2/740, E/L.1446)

92. The PRESIDENT suggested that, independently of the draft resolution before it in connexion with agenda item 8 (d), the Council should adopt the following resolution:

*"The Economic and Social Council*

*"Takes note of the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Volunteers programme (E/5028) and transmits it to the General Assembly at its twenty-sixth session."*

*It was so decided.*

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

<sup>2</sup> See ID/SCU/4 [and Corr.1-3], chap. II, sect. A (document transmitted to the Council under the symbols E/5042 and Corr.1 and 2).