

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records



**SECOND COMMITTEE, 1176th
MEETING**

Tuesday, 12 December 1967,
at 3.30 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 12:</i> <i>Report of the Economic and Social Council</i> <i>(continued)</i> <i>Consideration of the draft resolution en-</i> <i>titled "Increasing the production and use</i> <i>of edible protein" (concluded)</i>	381
<i>Agenda item 40:</i> <i>United Nations Capital Development Fund:</i> <i>confirmation of the appointment of the</i> <i>Managing Director</i>	381
<i>Agenda item 41:</i> <i>United Nations Development Decade: report</i> <i>of the Secretary-General (concluded)</i> <i>Adoption of the Committee's draft report</i>	384

Chairman: Mr. Jorge Pablo FERNANDINI
(Peru).

AGENDA ITEM 12

Report of the Economic and Social Council (continued)
(A/6703 and Corr.1, chap. I-X, XIII, XIV (sect. II
and VIII-X), XV and XVII; A/6703/Add.1, chap. I,
III and IV; A/C.2/L.993)

CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT RESOLUTION
ENTITLED "INCREASING THE PRODUCTION AND
USE OF EDIBLE PROTEIN" (concluded) (A/C.2/
L.993)

1. Mr. AHMED (Pakistan), speaking on behalf of the
sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.993, said that,
for the sake of achieving unanimity, they had agreed
to replace the existing text of operative paragraph 2
by the following:

"Welcomes the policy objectives and the technical
aspects of the proposals contained in the report
of the Advisory Committee on the Application
of Science and Technology to Development;"

2. The word "develop" in operative paragraph 6 was
to be replaced by the word "formulate" and the
words "members of the United Nations family of
organizations" in operative paragraph 7, by the words
"the organizations in the United Nations system".

3. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on
the draft resolution (A/C.2/L.993), as amended.

*The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted
unanimously.*

4. Mr. MUZIK (Czechoslovakia) asked whether the
draft resolution would have any financial implications.

5. Mr. KASSUM (Secretary of the Committee) said
that the Secretariat anticipated only minimal financial
implications. The necessary funds could, in any event,
be found within the existing United Nations budget.

6. Mr. BRADLEY (Argentina), speaking in explanation
of vote, said that the problem of protein malnutrition
required thorough study. Operative paragraph 3 of the
draft resolution, in fact, requested Governments to
take action on that question. His own Government,
which had entrusted the task to a group of highly
qualified specialists, believed that the problem should
be studied in conjunction with multilateral food aid.
Otherwise, there was a danger that the conclusions
reached might not correspond to the capacity of the
countries concerned. The question of food aid was on
the provisional agenda of the second session of the
United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
and it would accordingly be advisable not to prejudge
the results of the New Delhi Conference.

AGENDA ITEM 40

United Nations Capital Development Fund: confirma-
tion of the appointment of the Managing Director
(A/6843, A/C.2/L.996, A/C.2/L.999)

7. Mr. LUBBERS (Netherlands), introducing draft
resolution A/C.2/L.996, announced that the following
countries had become co-sponsors: Afghanistan, Al-
geria, Argentina, Ceylon, Colombia, Ghana, Greece,
Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan,
Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Nicaragua, Nigeria,
Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Sudan, Syria, Thailand,
Tunisia, United Arab Republic, United Republic of
Tanzania, Uruguay, Yugoslavia and Zambia.

8. The purpose of submitting the draft resolution was
not to reopen the debate on the United Nations Capital
Development Fund, but merely to break the existing
deadlock by taking advantage, as the Secretary-General
had suggested, of the experience and knowledge gained
by the United Nations Development Programme
(UNDP). The proposed arrangement was experimental
and provisional; it could be changed by the General
Assembly at the twenty-third session. In conclusion,
he said that the words "article II" in operative para-
graph 1 (a) should be replaced by "article IX".

9. Mr. AITKEN (Jamaica) said that draft resolution
A/C.2/L.996 dealt with a difficult question which the
Committee had been discussing for many years. It
appeared certain, in fact, that the United Nations would
have to undertake actual investment in some form
or another. UNDP's pre-investment surveys had, of
course, stimulated substantial investment, amounting
to hundreds of millions of dollars. Little information
was, unfortunately, available on the nature and scope
of the projects which had been successfully carried

out by such means and there were many projects which might not stimulate follow-up financing of that type. United Nations investment activities would not only fill that gap but would also enable the nationals of recipient countries to participate in the management of the enterprises established.

10. His delegation had supported the establishment of the United Nations Capital Development Fund under General Assembly resolution 2186 (XXI). The poor results of the pledging conference were not surprising if it was borne in mind that many countries had taken an extremely cautious and reserved position. In those circumstances, it would be unwise to confer all the attributes of a multilateral institution on the Fund from the start. On the other hand, it was essential that UNDP should not neglect pre-investment studies for the sake of direct investment. The draft resolution under discussion was very satisfactory in that respect, since it did not prejudice any decision the General Assembly might subsequently take on the matter.

11. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that his delegation had proposed its amendments (A/C.2/L.999) because draft resolution A/C.2/L.996 adopted a wrong approach to the so-called "third window" problem. The discussion on the operational activities of UNDP had convinced his delegation that the Governing Council of the Programme could, if necessary, consider the possibility of adapting its activities to the new circumstances described during the discussion of agenda item 46 on the activities of UNDP. He was afraid that approval of the draft resolution under discussion would complicate UNDP's work. The object of the amendment to operative paragraph 1 (a) was to repair an omission and to make it clear that the contributions would be handled by the Secretary-General and, under his authority, by the Administrator of UNDP in conformity with regulations 7.2 and 7.3 of the Financial Regulations of the United Nations. That amendment was motivated by a concern for good administration and sound budgetary practice. The second amendment reflected the desire of those who had not wished to participate in the establishment of a capital development fund to avoid becoming automatically involved in the discussion of matters with which they did not wish to concern themselves. From that point of view, the provisions of operative paragraph 1 (b) represented a contribution of the tactics of forcing their hand, which had not so far met with success. All decisions by the Governing Council of UNDP had hitherto been adopted unanimously and it would be advisable to delete operative paragraph 1 (b), which might adversely affect the smooth running of that Council.

12. Mr. OLUMIDE (Nigeria) said he was convinced that it was time for the United Nations to undertake investment activities in the full sense of the term. The participation of UNDP in pilot plant projects was a step in the right direction. Although the proposed arrangement was a provisional one, the provisions of operative paragraph 1 constituted further progress.

13. Mr. PISANI MASSAMORMILE (Italy) said that, in his view, the second preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1 were mutually contradictory.

It was stated in the preamble that it would "not be possible, in the first year, to give effect to resolution 2186 (XXI)" but subsequently, in the operative part, it was decided "to adopt on provisional basis the following measures in implementation of its resolution 2186 (XXI)". It might be better not to mention the resolution in the operative paragraph in question.

14. Where operative paragraph 1 (a) was concerned, his delegation would have liked to be able to ask the Administrator of UNDP whether he was in a position to undertake the additional functions assigned to him in that part of the draft resolution. It would therefore be desirable for the Administrator to be present during the current discussion.

15. Mr. LUBBERS (Netherlands) said, in reply, that he saw no contradiction between the preamble and operative part of draft resolution A/C.2/L.996. Resolution 2186 (XXI) had been adopted; it had the legal force of a General Assembly resolution and it had to be applied. Moreover, operative paragraph 1 merely provided for the application of the measures on a provisional basis and not for the implementation of the provisions of the resolution in their entirety. Lastly, operative paragraph 2 provided for the General Assembly to "review at its twenty-third session the institutional arrangements for the United Nations Capital Development Fund in the light of the experience gained during the first year of its operations".

16. Sir Edward WARNER (United Kingdom) pointed out that agenda item 40 referred only to the confirmation of the appointment of the Managing Director of the United Nations Capital Development Fund. He therefore regretted that it had been thought fit to introduce so far-reaching a draft resolution in connexion with that item at that late stage of the Committee's work. He believed that the most logical solution would be to defer consideration of the item, as well as of the elections under item 18, to the twenty-third session. His delegation had voted against General Assembly resolution 2186 (XXI) and could not therefore subscribe to action taken in implementation of it. Although the original sponsor had described draft resolution A/C.2/L.996 as a temporary measure which committed no one, he was not assured on the basis of other statements of support that the approval of that draft resolution would not constitute a first step towards the transformation of UNDP to a capital investment fund. The amendments proposed by the French delegation (A/C.2/L.999), however, considerably improved the text, and if they were accepted, his delegation would take them into account in coming to its final decision on the draft resolution as a whole.

17. He did not share the view which the Netherlands representative had expressed, in the context of resolution 2186 (XXI), namely, that General Assembly resolutions had legal force, and he felt bound to query what he had said on that point.

18. Mr. LUBBERS (Netherlands) replied that he had not intended to say that General Assembly resolutions had absolute legal force, but that they had legal force as resolutions of the General Assembly, in other words, subject to all the limitations inherent in their character.

19. Mr. DEWULF (Belgium) said that he shared the United Kingdom representative's view in regard to the observation of the Netherlands representative. He, too, had some doubt about the legal force of General Assembly resolutions, irrespective of the majority by which they were adopted. Moreover, in the case under discussion, General Assembly resolution 2186 (XXI) was of an unprecedented character, since previous decisions on the establishment of new bodies had always been taken unanimously. From a legal point of view, therefore, that resolution offered no solution to the problem of the competence of the General Assembly. Furthermore, when the Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs said, as he had recently, that the establishment of the United Nations Capital Development Fund constituted a recognition of the fact that, under the Charter, the Organization could not be permanently prevented from undertaking certain activities, he was expressing an opinion on the Charter, not on the General Assembly's powers of decision.

20. He asked that the reservations he had just expressed should be mentioned in the Committee's report.

21. Mr. NEDIVI (Israel) asked whether draft resolution A/C.2/L.996 would have any financial implications if adopted. The delegation of Israel had abstained in the vote on article IV, paragraph 2, of General Assembly resolution 2186 (XXI), relating to the administrative expenses of the United Nations Capital Development Fund, and there had been no change in its position.

22. Mr. DE SEYNES (Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs) said that, following consultations with the Administrator of UNDP on that question, he was able to state that the draft resolution would have no financial implications.

23. Mr. NEDIVI (Israel) said that in that case his delegation would vote in favour of it.

24. Mr. KOVALEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that, at the twenty-first session of the General Assembly, his delegation had voted against article IV, paragraph 2, of resolution 2186 (XXI) and had abstained on the resolution as a whole. The Soviet delegation had then indicated that it could not accept any financial commitments connected with the establishment of the United Nations Capital Development Fund: its position on that matter remained unchanged. It also wished to remind members of the Committee of the proposal it had submitted at the twentieth session of the General Assembly^{1/} for the amalgamation of the Special Fund and the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance into a capital development fund within which each of the two components would retain its own characteristics. In that connexion, the transfer of the administrative and operational functions of the United Nations Capital Development Fund to UNDP which was proposed in the draft resolution would establish favourable conditions for the establishment, within UNDP, of a third category of activities concerned with investments in industrial and agricultural undertakings in developing

countries. On that understanding, the Soviet delegation did not oppose the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/L.996.

25. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the meeting should be suspended to enable the sponsors of the draft resolution to consider the amendments proposed by the French delegation.

It was so decided.

The meeting was suspended at 4.45 p.m. and resumed at 5 p.m.

26. Mr. CVOROVIC (Yugoslavia) said that, in order to meet the wishes of the Italian delegation, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.996 were prepared to insert the word "full" before the word "effect" in the second preambular paragraph.

27. The sponsors had established that the French delegation's amendments (A/C.2/L.999) were based on concepts that differed from, and seemed difficult to reconcile with, their own. They did not, therefore, find those amendments acceptable and appealed to the French delegation to withdraw them. With regard to the first of those amendments concerning operative paragraph 1 (a), he wished to draw the French delegation's attention to article XI of General Assembly resolution 2186 (XXI) concerning financial administration.

28. Mr. PISANI MASSAMORMILE (Italy) said that the amendment proposed orally by the sponsors did not meet his objection. In his view, the measures envisaged in operative paragraph 1 should not be adopted in implementation of General Assembly resolution 2186 (XXI).

29. Mr. VIAUD (France) agreed that a question of concepts was involved in his second amendment regarding operative paragraph 1 (b), and his delegation would therefore not press it to the vote. On the other hand, it wished to maintain its first amendment.

30. Mr. CUMES (Australia) said that his delegation had reservations regarding operative paragraph 1 (c) and requested a separate vote on that sub-paragraph.

31. Mr. LUBBERS (Netherlands), supported by Mr. DELGADO (Senegal), pointed out with reference to operative paragraph 1 (c) that if the draft resolution were adopted, two pledging conferences would have to be convened in any case. That sub-paragraph did not go into any detail on that point, since it was understood that it would be for the competent authorities to make the necessary administrative arrangements. The provisions of the draft resolution were therefore not restrictive.

32. In reply to a question put by Mr. AITKEN (Jamaica), Mr. CUMES (Australia) said that he maintained his reservations.

33. In reply to a question put by Mr. OLUMIDE (Nigeria), Mr. VIAUD (France) explained that he was withdrawing the second amendment contained in document A/C.2/L.999, but requested a separate vote on operative paragraph 1 (b). He maintained the first amendment.

^{1/} See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twentieth Session, Second Committee, 971st meeting, para. 22.*

34. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the amendment submitted by the representative of France (A/C.2/L.999) to operative paragraph 1 (a).

The amendment was rejected by 39 votes to 14, with 32 abstentions.

35. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on sub-paragraph (b) and (c) of operative paragraph 1 on which a separate vote had been requested by the representatives of France and Australia, respectively.

Operative paragraph 1 (b) was adopted by 71 votes to 10, with 11 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 1 (c) was adopted by 72 votes to 9, with 10 abstentions.

36. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the draft resolution (A/C.2/L.996), as a whole, as amended.

At the request of the representative of the United Arab Republic, the vote was taken by roll-call.

Peru, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan.

Against: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Belgium, Canada, France, Japan, Luxembourg, New Zealand.

Abstaining: Portugal, Sweden, Australia, Austria, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Malta, Norway.

The draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 73 votes to 8, with 11 abstentions.

37. Mr. CHAMMAS (Lebanon) said that, since his delegation was a sponsor of the draft resolution just adopted, it had abstained on the French amendment to operative paragraph 1 (a) in a spirit of solidarity. Article XI of General Assembly resolution 2186 (XXI) did in fact contain an omission which could have been filled by that amendment.

38. Mr. NEDIVI (Israel) recalled that his delegation had abstained in the vote on article IV, paragraph 2, of General Assembly resolution 2186 (XXI). It had voted against the French amendment and voted for the draft resolution as a whole, on the understanding that it would entail no financial implications.

39. Mr. ABE (Japan) said that his Government continued to oppose any involvement by the United Nations in financial assistance. It still believed that the expansion of multilateral financial assistance must

be achieved by strengthening existing institutions such as the World Bank Group and the regional development banks. No useful purpose could be served either by creating a new institution or by imposing additional work on UNDP outside its terms of reference. Consequently, his delegation had voted against the draft resolution, even though its consequences would only be provisional.

40. Mr. SVENNEVIG (Norway) recalled that his delegation had voted against General Assembly resolution 2186 (XXI) on which the draft resolution just approved was based. His delegation, therefore, had not found it natural to cast a positive vote for the further steps proposed, but had abstained. He wanted, however, to emphasize that his delegation appreciated the motives of the sponsors of the draft resolution in trying to find a solution to the situation which had arisen as to the United Nations Capital Development Fund.

41. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Rapporteur should be authorized to report directly on the item to the General Assembly.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 41

United Nations Development Decade: report of the Secretary-General (concluded)

ADOPTION OF THE COMMITTEE'S DRAFT REPORT (A/C.2/L.997)

42. Mr. CHADHA (India), Rapporteur, introducing the draft report on agenda item 41 (A/C.2/L.997), announced that the following changes should be made in that document. The following sentence should be added at the end of paragraph 12 (d):

"Subsequently, the delegation which had abstained requested that its vote be changed to an affirmative vote, in order to enable the draft resolution to be adopted unanimously."

The following new sub-paragraph (a) should be inserted in paragraph 17:

"(a) The third paragraph of the preamble was amended to read:

"'Recognizing the urgent need for a more effective mobilization of efforts in education and training as an essential element of a successful strategy of international development,' "

The other sub-paragraphs should therefore be re-numbered, and the third preambular paragraph of draft resolution II in paragraph 23 of the draft report should be amended accordingly.

43. Lastly, the words "32 voix" in the French text of paragraph 22 (a) of the draft report should be altered to "30 voix".

44. Mr. CHTOUROU (Tunisia), supported by Mr. OULD SIDI (Mauritania), said that he would like the report to reflect the position of the delegations which had submitted an amendment to operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.2/L.992/Rev.1. He was prepared to approve the draft report with that reservation.

45. The CHAIRMAN said that that request would be met. He suggested that the Committee should adopt the draft report, as amended.

The draft report (A/C.2/L.997), as amended, was adopted.

The meeting rose at 6.25 p.m.

