

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTIETH SESSION

Official Records



**SECOND COMMITTEE, 977th  
MEETING**

Monday, 8 November 1965,  
at 3.35 p.m.

**NEW YORK**

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 51:</i>	
Consolidation of the Special Fund and the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance in a United Nations Development Programme ( <i>continued</i> ) . . . . .	129
Organization of the work of the Committee . .	130

*Chairman:* Mr. Pierre FORTHOMME  
(Belgium).

AGENDA ITEM 51

Consolidation of the Special Fund and the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance in a United Nations Development Programme (*continued*) (A/5755, A/6015; A/C.2/L.792, L.793, L.795/Rev.1, L.799/Rev.1, L.800/Rev.1)

1. The CHAIRMAN said that the time had come to close the debate on agenda item 51 and to decide when and how the Committee intended to take a final decision. The Committee could choose between two alternatives: either it could vote on the draft resolutions submitted or it could authorize the Chairman to seek a comprehensive solution. If it chose the second alternative, it should try to recover some of the time it had lost by taking up other agenda items in the interval. The plenary meetings and the informal talks would go on simultaneously.

2. Mr. AGUIRRE (Costa Rica) said that there was little likelihood of agreement on a single text, since the negotiations which had been going on had remained deadlocked for two weeks. He therefore suggested that the Chairman should declare the closure of the debate on agenda item 51 and put to the vote the various draft resolutions before the Committee.

3. The CHAIRMAN said that, under rule 118 of the rules of procedure, when a motion for closure had been submitted, permission to speak could be accorded only to two speakers opposing the closure, after which the motion must be put immediately to the vote.

4. Sir Keith UNWIN (United Kingdom) said that the representative of Costa Rica had only made a suggestion. He asked whether the Chairman himself was formally proposing the closure of the debate.

5. Mr. AGUIRRE (Costa Rica) confirmed that he had not formally proposed the closure of the debate, since the discussion would necessarily be resumed when the single text was considered.

6. The CHAIRMAN said that he proposed the closure of the debate under rule 108 of the rules of procedure.

7. Mr. ARKADYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, as a result of the numerous interruptions in the debate on item 51, the delegations which had sponsored the various amendments had not had an opportunity to make their views fully known. His delegation, for example, would like to know the opinion of other delegations on its own amendments (A/C.2/L.800/Rev.1). As the statements on those amendments had been few, it would be premature to declare the closure of the debate. The Committee could leave the discussion open while taking up other items on the agenda as it had done at the previous meeting. His delegation fully supported the Chairman's proposal concerning the elaboration of a single text on the basis of the various amendments. The Chairman himself might give his attention to the preparation of such a text.

8. The CHAIRMAN felt that if the Committee did not take an immediate decision on the proposals before it, it should try to consider other items on its agenda. It might, for example, take up the item concerning the establishment of a United Nations capital development fund, which might perhaps throw some light on the question of the consolidation. Consequently, he formally proposed the closure of the debate on item 51, on the understanding that a vote would take place the following afternoon either on the different texts or on a single text elaborated with the help of the Chairman himself.

9. Mr. FRANZI (Italy) said that he failed to understand why the representative of the Soviet Union objected to the motion for closure. That representative had asserted that the question had not been sufficiently debated, but if that was the case, there was reason to ask what purpose had been served by the informal talks which had been going on for two weeks. As those talks could, in fact, be considered to have taken the place of the debate, he himself favoured the motion for closure.

10. Mr. DELGADO (Senegal), speaking on a point of order and supported by Mr. BARIGYE (Uganda), said that before a decision was taken for or against the closure, it would be helpful to have some information about the negotiations which were in progress. India, Chile and Zambia, which had been appointed spokesmen by their respective groups, could perhaps throw some light on that subject.

11. The CHAIRMAN said that, under the rules of procedure, once the closure of the debate had been moved, permission to speak was accorded only to two speakers opposing the closure.

12. Mr. TELL (Jordan) said that he objected to the motion for closure. He, too, considered that the amendments submitted had not been sufficiently dis-

cussed. The consultations had not, however, been unproductive, and they might enable a vote to be taken on a compromise text at the following afternoon's meeting.

13. Mr. CHAMMAS (Lebanon) proposed that the meeting should be suspended for an hour. As the consultations which had taken place had cleared the ground, the spokesmen for the three main groups of developing countries and the representatives of the developed countries could meet with each other under the chairmanship of the Chairman of the Committee in an attempt to solve the final difficulties. If those final negotiations produced no result, the Chairman could then declare the closure of the debate.

14. The CHAIRMAN said that under rule 120 of the rules of procedure, the motion which had just been made had precedence over the motion for the closure of the debate.

15. Mr. ARKADYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking on a point of order, said that it would be preferable not to vote on motions of that kind but rather to follow the established practice.

16. Mr. CHAMMAS (Lebanon) said that he had proposed a suspension of the meeting because he feared that an immediate closure of the debate might prevent discussion of any new text which might emerge from the negotiations. He therefore suggested that the Committee should adjourn the debate to the following afternoon.

17. The CHAIRMAN took up that suggestion but proposed that the Committee should in the meantime turn to a consideration of other agenda items.

18. During a discussion of items which the Committee might take up, Mr. TELL (Jordan), supported by Mr. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) and Mr. WILMOT (Ghana), expressed the view that it would be better not to take up item 39 (Establishment of a United Nations capital development fund), until the Committee had come to a decision on item 51.

19. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should adjourn the debate on item 51 to the following afternoon.

*It was so decided.*

#### Organization of the work of the Committee

20. The CHAIRMAN asked whether the Committee wished in the meantime to begin consideration of other items.

21. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that, in order not to cause undue delay in its work, the Committee should take up agenda items 40 (Activities in the field of industrial development) and 41 (The role of the United Nations in training national technical personnel for the accelerated industrialization of the developing countries) and should meet as often as it could, since it appeared that the informal consultations would inevitably involve some loss of time. He also expressed the hope that the Chairman would take no part in the informal negotiations, in order not to prejudice his authority.

22. Mr. WILMOT (Ghana), supported by Mr. DELGADO (Senegal), suggested that, in order to expedite its work, the Committee should immediately begin consideration of other non-controversial items of the agenda.

23. Mr. KITTANI (Secretary of the Committee) said that the Secretariat, for want of sufficient notice, was unable during the period of the meeting to make the necessary arrangements for the consideration of other items, with the possible exception of the item relating to the establishment of a capital development fund.

24. Mr. CHAMMAS (Lebanon) said that, although recognizing the need for the Committee to accomplish its work quickly, he feared that the consideration of other items would inevitably impede the negotiations on item 51. He therefore moved, under rule 119 of the rules of procedure, that the meeting should be adjourned to the following afternoon.

25. Mr. ALLANA (Pakistan) supported the motion by the representative of Lebanon and thanked the Chairman for his patience and competence in directing the Committee's proceedings.

*The motion of Lebanon was adopted.*

The meeting rose at 4.45 p.m.