

would be complementary. His delegation also welcomed the interest which the Japanese Government had shown in the University, and particularly its offer of funds and premises.

90. His delegation's understanding was that acceptance of the new paragraph 5 of the draft resolution, referring to official languages, would not exclude the possibility that countries whose languages were not yet used in the United Nations system might achieve appropriate representation through the use of their languages in one of the centres to be established as part of the University. His delegation fully supported the draft resolution, which it hoped would be adopted unanimously.

91. Mr. MBÉDO (Central African Republic) said that his delegation's apprehensions, which were based on facts, had not been dispelled by the assurances of the Under-Secretary-General for Inter-Agency Affairs and Co-ordination. The first sentence of section 4 in appendix II to annex I of document A/9149 referred to both the University Centre and to other institutions and programmes. It was the criteria for establishment of the latter which were of concern to his delegation. The trend in the United Nations system was towards decentralization but the practical result was that new centres were grouped in a small number of countries on the grounds that they possessed a solid infrastructure. That trend was undesirable, and should not be followed in the case of the University.

92. Mr. HACHANI (Tunisia) said that the merger of paragraphs 1 and 2 of the draft resolution guaranteed that the adoption of the draft Charter would not be an irreversible step. His delegation particularly welcomed the addition of the new paragraph 5, relating to official languages. It would not only vote for the draft resolution, but wished to become a sponsor of it.

93. Mrs. DERRÉ (France) said that her delegation interpreted the compromise accepted in response to its

amendment to the original paragraph 1 of the draft resolution as meaning that the draft Charter was not considered perfect and would be reviewed in two years' time. Her delegation saw its adoption as provisional, although that was not specifically stated in the text. Her delegation had had difficulties with the word "examine" in the original paragraph 2, but its concern was fully met by the new text.

*Draft resolution A/C.2/L.1300, as revised, was adopted by 98 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.*

94. Mr. NARASIMHAN (Under-Secretary-General for Inter-Agency Affairs and Co-ordination), replying to the comments of the representative of the Central African Republic, said that while the first sentence of section 4 in appendix II to annex I of document A/9149 referred to the location of the University Centre and other institutions and programmes, it went on to say that such location could not be determined without taking into account various factors, notably the nature of offers from countries to host them and the criteria which would determine such location. The Secretary-General had decided to leave consideration of those factors to the University Council, which would ensure that there was a proper balance in the distribution of the various institutions and programmes. The criteria referred to later in the same section related only to the location of the headquarters of the University, and would not affect the location of the institutions and programmes.

95. Mr. SHEMIRANI (Iran) said that his delegation wished to reserve its position with regard to subparagraph (b) of a reply received from a Member State, which appeared on page 6 of annex II of document A/9149.

96. Mr. PAUL (Haiti) said that, had his delegation been present during the voting, it would have voted for the draft resolution.

*The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.*

## 1552nd meeting

Thursday, 8 November 1973, at 11 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Zewde GABRE-SELLASSIE (Ethiopia).

A/C.2/SR.1552

### AGENDA ITEM 48

United Nations Industrial Development Organization  
(continued)\* (A/9003 and Corr.1, chap. XII, A/9016, A/9072, A/C.2/L.1293/Rev.1, A/C.2/L.1294/Rev.1, A/C.2/L.1301):

- (a) Report of the Industrial Development Board;
- (b) Second General Conference of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization: report of the Executive Director

1. The CHAIRMAN announced that Romania and the Upper Volta wished to join the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1293/Rev.1 which was being considered by the Committee.

\* Resumed from the 1541st meeting.

2. Mr. HAMID (Sudan), introducing the revised draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1293/Rev.1) on behalf of the sponsors, said that they had endeavoured to take into account the suggestions and proposals made to them. The revised text of the draft resolution was therefore a compromise; while it did not fully satisfy all delegations, it should nevertheless be acceptable to all.

3. The most important changes were those made to paragraphs 2 and 3. In paragraph 2, the sponsors had agreed to remove the two examples of basic problems of industrialization to be dealt with by the Second General Conference of UNIDO: the development of industrial technology in conditions more suitable to the requirements of the developing countries, and the development of basic guidelines for a new international

division of labour related to industry. The sponsors had felt that, instead of giving a necessarily incomplete list of the areas to be covered by the Conference, it would be better to use the more general wording "the basic problems facing those countries in the field of industrial policies and planning".

4. Since some delegations had stressed the need to avoid prejudging the results of the work being done to draft a charter of economic rights and duties of States, the sponsors had deleted all references to the charter from paragraph 3. In addition, contrary to what some representatives appeared to think, the sponsors did not want the Second General Conference to formulate an international declaration on industrial development and co-operation, but simply to establish basic principles which could subsequently be used in a declaration.

5. He hoped that it would be possible to adopt the revised draft resolution by consensus.

6. Mr. ABHYANKAR (India) said that he appreciated the reasons which had led the sponsors to revise paragraph 2, but regretted that they had removed any reference to the examples of basic problems facing the developing countries in the field of industrial development.

7. The draft resolution should specify the contribution which the international community could make to the industrialization process in the developing countries; he therefore proposed the addition at the end of paragraph 2 of the phrase: "with particular attention to the exchange of experiences and increased co-operation amongst the developing countries themselves".

8. Mr. HAMID (Sudan) said that the sponsors accepted that amendment but would prefer to use the word "due" instead of "particular".

9. Mr. ABHYANKAR (India) agreed that that change improved the text.

10. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there were no objections, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.2/L.1293/Rev.1, as orally revised, without taking a vote.

*The draft resolution, as orally revised, was adopted.*

11. Mr. ALLEN (United States of America) said that his Government would have preferred the Second Committee to postpone a decision on paragraph 3; he had nevertheless supported the draft resolution, since the principles to be considered at the Second General Conference of UNIDO in no way prejudged the results of the work on a charter of economic rights and duties of States.

12. Miss COURSON (France) said that she had supported the draft resolution, although her delegation had reservations about paragraph 3; it did not think it desirable at that stage to speak of the international division of labour and would have preferred to use wording similar to that used in paragraph 19 of the International Development Strategy. There was a danger that there might be a rift between developing and developed countries, which would not necessarily be to the advantage of the former.

13. Mr. ABHYANKAR (India) thanked the sponsors for accepting his amendment to paragraph 2. He was also glad that the sponsors had revised the text of

paragraph 3 so as not to prejudge the result of the work on the charter of economic rights and duties of States.

14. Mr. MACKENZIE (United Kingdom) said that he had followed the majority view, but that he had reservations about the text of paragraph 3, which went beyond what had been agreed at the seventh session of the Industrial Development Board. The references to an international declaration on industrial development and co-operation and to the international division of labour were open to varying interpretations, some of which were not acceptable to his delegation.

15. Mr. VAN GORKOM (Netherlands) said that he had supported the draft resolution and had particularly welcomed the emphasis placed on co-operation between developing countries and on a new international division of labour. He had a slight reservation, however, with regard to paragraph 3, since he believed that countries did not need an international declaration on industrial development and co-operation as much as a formulation of the principles and guidelines which might be incorporated in the International Development Strategy at the time of the review scheduled for the mid-point of the Decade.

16. Mr. GARCIA BELAUNDE (Peru) said that, in the Spanish text, the term "international division of labour" should have been translated "*división internacional del trabajo*".

17. Mr. HAMID (Sudan) said that the reservations expressed by various delegations would be taken into account at the Second General Conference of UNIDO.

18. Mr. ARUEDE (Nigeria), introducing revised draft resolution A/C.2/L.1294/Rev.1, announced that Yemen had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

19. He recalled that in the letter from the President of the General Assembly (A/C.2/286) which had been read at the 1544th meeting, the portions of the Industrial Development Board's report that came within the respective spheres of competence of the Second Committee and the Fifth Committee had been specified. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1294/Rev.1 had understood the reasons behind the decisions appearing in subparagraphs (a) (i) and (a) (ii) of the letter but not the reasons for decision (a) (iii). In their view, the question of the administrative autonomy of UNIDO was primarily a political question, which should have been considered by the Second Committee before being referred to the Fifth Committee. They thought that all the parts of decision II (VII) formed a whole, with the sole objective of increasing the administrative autonomy of UNIDO in order to enhance its effectiveness. The sponsors therefore did not see why the various parts of that decision should be considered by different committees. It was the first time that the Second Committee had been forbidden to comment on certain parts of the report of the Board; that should not create a precedent.

20. The sponsors therefore requested the Rapporteur to include the following recommendation in the report to the General Assembly:

"1. The Second Committee transmits to the Fifth Committee for its consideration the following draft proposal:

"Requests the Secretary-General to prepare a report on the questions of the separate preparation and

submission of the programme and budget of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, and the administrative autonomy for the United Nations Industrial Development Organization covered, respectively, in paragraphs 1 and 3 of decision II (VII) of the Industrial Development Board and to submit the report to the General Assembly at its twenty-ninth session;

“2. The Committee furthermore expresses the strong hope that, in the event that the Fifth Committee decides to adopt the above-mentioned draft proposal, and in the event also that the General Assembly approves it, the report of the Secretary-General on the above questions will be made available, at the twenty-ninth session, to the Second Committee before its consideration by the Fifth Committee so as to enable the Fifth Committee to have before it the comments of the Second Committee on the report”.

The sponsors considered that the draft proposal and the draft resolution formed a whole.

21. He drew attention to the changes made in the wording of paragraphs 3 and 4 of the revised draft resolution. When the original draft resolution had been introduced at the 1540th meeting, the representative of France had said that the decisions of the Board which had not been adopted by consensus should not simply be endorsed by the General Assembly, but that it should continue to consider them. The sponsors agreed about the need to continue discussions, but not indefinitely; they could not agree to the Assembly not taking a decision on the pretext that there had been no consensus in the Board, since the Assembly was not required to take its decisions by consensus. In addition, the representative of France had expressed the fear that draft resolution A/C.2/L.1294 was designed in fact to make UNIDO into a specialized agency. If that had been the intention of the sponsors, they would have said so. The very fact that fears of that kind existed clearly showed that the question of the autonomy of UNIDO was primarily a political question.

22. The delegation of the USSR had spoken against the proliferation of trust funds within the United Nations. In fact, according to paragraph 3, it was not a question of proliferating but of regrouping funds. The Soviet delegation had also opposed an increase in the administrative budget of UNIDO. The sponsors hoped that the Soviet delegation was not referring to paragraph 2, which concerned an increase in the budget of the regular programme of technical assistance and not administrative expenditures. The regular programme of technical assistance had not been expanded for seven years and the proposed increase of \$500,000 was therefore modest. Moreover, since the supplementary resources would be devoted to special measures in favour of the least developed among the developing countries, the result would be a net reduction in the funds available to other developing countries.

23. Mr. JOSEPH (Australia) said that the Fifth Committee would certainly report to the General Assembly on its consideration of the matter. In that case, it would be useless for the Second Committee to consider the matter again.

24. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Committee) said that, as he understood it, the second part of the proposal submitted by Nigeria meant that, if the pro-

posal was adopted at the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly, the report of the Secretary-General would be submitted to the twenty-ninth session.

25. Mr. MACKENZIE (United Kingdom), supported by Miss COURSON (France) and Mr. ALLEN (United States of America), asked that the proposal of the representative of Nigeria be distributed in writing since it raised a very important constitutional problem concerning relationships between the Committees.

26. Mr. ARUEDE (Nigeria) said that his delegation had the text of the proposal and could make it available to representatives.

27. Mr. MAKEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) and Miss COURSON (France) asked that Russian and French versions of the text be distributed.

28. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Committee) said that the versions in the various working languages would not be ready until the following morning.

29. The CHAIRMAN suggested that in the circumstances the vote on the proposal of the Nigerian representative be deferred until the following day, but that the Committee should nevertheless vote on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1294/Rev.1.

30. Mr. ARUEDE (Nigeria) recalled that, for the sponsors of the draft, the proposal was an integral part of the draft resolution and could not therefore be put to the vote separately.

31. The CHAIRMAN said that he saw no difficulty in deferring the vote on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1294/Rev.1 also to the following day.

32. Turning to draft resolution A/C.2/L.1301, concerning the revision of the lists of States eligible for membership in the Industrial Development Board, he said that the draft resolution had been submitted in accordance with established constitutional procedure and the Committee should therefore be able to adopt it without a vote.

*Draft resolution A/C.2/L.1301 was adopted.*

#### AGENDA ITEM 51

**United Nations Conference on Trade and Development**  
(*continued*)\* (A/9003/Add.1 (part I), A/9015, A/9142, A/9213, A/C.2/L.1295-1297):

##### (a) Report of the Trade and Development Board

33. The CHAIRMAN announced that the delegation of Morocco wished to join the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1295.

34. Mr. PAUL (Haiti) said that he wished to explain briefly the reasons why his delegation had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1295 which, he hoped, would be adopted by consensus. His delegation attached special importance to the task entrusted to the Working Group on the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States. Indeed, the meetings of the Group of Eminent Persons appointed to study the impact of multinational corporations, the work of UNCTAD concerning a code of conduct for liner conferences and the discussions of the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly on the sovereignty of States over their natural resources had convinced his delegation

\* Resumed from the 1547th meeting.

that such a charter would be useful and would fill long-standing gaps in international trade law. His delegation was therefore in favour of extending the Working Group's mandate.

35. In all economic co-operation among States, the latter must be aware of their economic rights and duties, and that was why basic rules for such co-operation should be laid down. His delegation did not therefore share the view of those who felt that the charter should simply be a declaration of intent. It must be a binding legal instrument if it was to protect the rights of all States.

36. Mr. KANÉ (Mauritania) reminded the Secretariat that his delegation wished to become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1295.

37. The CHAIRMAN asked whether the Committee was prepared to adopt draft resolution A/C.2/L.1295 without a vote.

*It was so decided.*

*Draft resolution A/C.2/L.1295 was adopted.*

38. Mr. SANDERS (United States of America) said that his delegation had been very happy to join the consensus. It looked forward to the results of the Working Group on the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, because it saw the charter as offering occasion for a historic contribution to the integration of the approaches of developing and industrialized countries to the problem of achieving greater prosperity for all mankind. The charter must be a kind of universal declaration of mankind's right to economic progress, parallel to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In his delegation's view, the latter should serve as a model in drafting the charter of economic rights and duties of States. The scope of that charter would be considerably reduced if it was regarded as a codification of norms of international law. Indeed, there was relatively little existing international law to codify on many of the issues under discussion in the Working Group. Accordingly, the endeavours of the Working Group would be facilitated if there was an early consensus among Member States to the effect that the charter would not be an instrument declaratory of international law.

39. His delegation wished to make clear its view that draft resolution A/C.2/L.1295 did not commit States to approve the terms of the charter, since those terms were as yet unknown. Nor did it commit them to treat the charter, once it was adopted, as a binding legal instrument. The draft resolution referred to "norms" (third preambular paragraph), in other words principles. The phrase "first step in the codification and development" (paragraph 4) did not imply a declaration that would be binding. If the Assembly and its members did not wish a resolution to be in the exceptional category of a text expressing international legal obligations, the resolution under discussion could not be in that category. His delegation would approach the drafting of the charter in that spirit.

40. Mr. MASSONET (Belgium) said that his delegation would have voted for the draft resolution if it had been put to the vote.

41. His delegation felt that the elaboration of a final draft charter could be definitive only if the Working Group could produce a text which was acceptable to all

countries, including those which were not members of the Group. He therefore considered that the word "final" (paragraph 4) was superfluous, the more so since the draft must be considered by the Trade and Development Board which would take the final action on the text to be submitted to the General Assembly, in accordance with established procedure.

42. Furthermore, it was not for the Working Group, but for the General Assembly to decide upon the nature and scope of the document under consideration. That would only be possible with a text on which all countries could agree. Therefore, his delegation would undoubtedly have preferred a slightly different text which asked the Working Group to do everything possible to complete its work so that the draft charter could be considered by the General Assembly at its twenty-ninth session.

43. Mr. CAVAGLIERI (Italy) said that his delegation supported the draft resolution. However, in order to facilitate the work of the Working Group, the General Assembly should first decide whether the charter would be legal in nature. Furthermore, the draft resolution should have stated that the charter should be drafted on the model of earlier documents of the same type adopted by the United Nations.

44. Mr. GATES (New Zealand) welcomed the fact that the draft resolution had been adopted by consensus, but wished to point out that the questions to be covered in the proposed charter came within the terms of reference of the Economic and Social Council, to which the charter should be submitted as soon as the measures outlined in the draft resolution had been completed.

45. Mr. ABHYANKAR (India) said that he was pleased that a consensus had been obtained and expressed his appreciation to the Mexican delegation for its fruitful work.

46. Mr. MAKEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation would have cast an affirmative vote for the draft resolution had a vote been taken, since it was in favour of the preparation of the document in question and therefore of extending the mandate of the Working Group established to draft the document. However, with regard to paragraph 4, the term "codification" could not be interpreted as prejudging the legal nature of the charter, which would have to be defined at a later stage on the basis of the results of the Working Group's endeavours.

47. His delegation had a number of reservations regarding the financial implications presented in document A/C.2/L.1296, which it considered excessive, particularly since the secretariat of UNCTAD should be able to assume the responsibility for the work.

48. Mr. MACKENZIE (United Kingdom) said that he was pleased that the Committee had adopted the draft resolution by consensus. His delegation interpreted paragraph 4 as calling solely for the elaboration of a draft charter in the form of a declaration to be adopted by the General Assembly. It reserved its position with respect to further steps in codification and development going beyond the declaration of a draft charter formulated on the basis of a general agreement.

49. Mr. ROUGET (Federal Republic of Germany) said that the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus was a very important step. With respect to

paragraph 4, the expression "as the first step in the codification" should not prejudice the legal status of the charter.

50. Mr. KRYGER (Denmark) said that he had been pleased to join in the consensus but wished to emphasize that paragraph 4 of the draft resolution should not prejudice the legal status of the charter.

51. Miss COURSON (France) said that her delegation welcomed the consensus and considered that paragraph 4 had no meaning other than that indicated by the Mexican representative, in particular that the Working Group would cease to exist once its task had been completed and that the codification in question should not prejudice the legal status of the charter.

52. Mr. O'RIORDAN (Ireland) thanked the Mexican delegation for its initiative and welcomed the fact that the draft resolution had been adopted by consensus. He added that in paragraph 4 the term "final" should not prejudice anything.

53. Mr. DELIVANIS (Greece) said that, although he was in favour of the draft resolution which had been adopted, he had the same reservations concerning it which the French representative had expressed.

54. The CHAIRMAN invited the members of the Committee to consider draft resolution A/C.2/L.1297 and said that Gabon had become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

55. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Committee) announced that the document had no financial implications.

56. Mr. BONNICK (Jamaica), suggesting a technical change in the fourth preambular paragraph, said that the word "and" should be inserted between the words "international trade" and "the flow", and the word "as" between "capital" and "investment". He requested that a recorded vote or a roll-call vote should be taken on the draft resolution.

57. Mr. VAN GORKOM (Netherlands), speaking on a point of order, said that he had received the relevant file only the previous day and that he wished to study it before presenting his observations to the Committee. He therefore urged the Jamaican delegation to postpone the vote on the draft resolution.

58. Miss COURSON (France), Mr. SKOGLUND (Sweden), Mr. ROUGET (Federal Republic of Germany), Mr. CAVAGLIERI (Italy) and Mr. O'RIORDAN (Ireland) said that they believed that the draft resolution was complex and should be studied carefully, and endorsed the request of the Netherlands representative.

59. Mr. PINO SANTOS (Cuba) emphasized the importance of the study dealt with in the draft resolution and said that the study should contribute to efforts to solve the trade problems of the developing countries. However, he regretted that IBRD was mentioned in the draft resolution, for in Cuba's experience that institution was not sufficiently independent to be accorded a role in the preparation of such a complex study. Nevertheless, since it would ultimately be the task of the Secretary-General of UNCTAD to prepare the study, his delegation had decided to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

60. Mr. DIALLO (Upper Volta) said that although he would have been prepared to vote on the draft resolution at the current meeting, in view of the wish expressed by other delegations he agreed to postponement of the vote. He hoped that the delegations concerned would consult with the sponsors of the draft resolution, take a decision and agree to proceed to the vote.

61. His own delegation firmly supported the proposal calling for the preparation of a study on the indexation of prices in order to check the deterioration of the terms of trade, and wished to thank the delegations which had taken the initiative.

62. Mr. BONNICK (Jamaica), recalling that the draft resolution under consideration had been introduced the previous Thursday, said that he could not believe that the delegations of the developed countries had been unable to consult their Governments on the question. Moreover, the proposal was not new, for Indonesia had already submitted a draft on the indexation of prices to UNCTAD in 1971. Accordingly, he had the impression that the developed countries which wished to postpone the vote were insincere, and the sponsors of the draft resolution could not agree to their request.

63. Mr. VAN GORKOM (Netherlands) said that 10 days earlier his delegation had submitted a proposal with a view to co-operating with the developing countries and that his suggestion to defer the vote was by no means insincere. As he had already stated, he had received the relevant file only the previous day and had not had time to study it. He therefore strongly urged the Jamaican delegation to accept the request for postponement and permit a discussion to take place before the vote.

64. Mr. MBÉDO (Central African Republic) supported the statement of the representative of the Upper Volta and requested that, in the consultations to take place between the representatives of the developed countries and the sponsors of the draft resolution, no changes be made in the draft resolution.

65. Mr. JOSEPH (Australia) joined the Netherlands representative in urging the representative of Jamaica to alter his position. The draft resolution posed a special problem for Australia, 75 per cent of whose exports consisted of commodities.

66. He thanked the representative of the Upper Volta for his understanding and clarification and said that he would request instructions from his Government.

67. The CHAIRMAN, speaking less as the Chairman than as the representative of a developing country, asked the representative of Jamaica to reconsider the request of several delegations and agree to postpone the vote until the following day.

68. Mr. BONNICK (Jamaica) said that the time had come to take a decision on the draft resolution, which dealt with a subject that had already been considered in various forums. He therefore failed to see how further discussions on the matter could prove useful. Furthermore, a number of representatives of developed countries had suggested that, instead of taking a vote on the draft resolution, the Committee should transmit the document to the Secretary-General of UNCTAD for his views on the subject; such a step would be pointless in his opinion, since UNCTAD's views were already

known. The sole objective of the sponsors of the draft resolution was to obtain an increase in the level of living of the people of the developing countries; in no case were they prejudging the contents of the study. Having said that, he agreed to a postponement of the vote, but

insisted that there be no further discussions on the draft resolution and that the document not be sent to the Secretary-General of UNCTAD for consideration.

*The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.*

## 1553rd meeting

Friday, 9 November 1973, at 3.20 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Zewde GABRE-SELLASSIE (Ethiopia).

A/C.2/SR.1553

### AGENDA ITEM 48

**United Nations Industrial Development Organization (concluded)** (A/9003 and Corr.1, chap. XII; A/9016, A/9072, A/C.2/L.1294/Rev.1, A/C.2/L.1303):

- (a) Report of the Industrial Development Board;  
(b) Second General Conference of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization: report of the Executive Director

1. Mr. MAKEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) suggested that the Committee should vote first on the draft proposal in document A/C.2/L.1303, to be transmitted to the Fifth Committee, concerning draft paragraphs for inclusion in the Committee's report to the General Assembly.

*The proposal was adopted by 72 votes to 9, with 11 abstentions.*

2. Mr. OLIVERI LOPEZ (Argentina) and Mr. CHABALA (Zambia), speaking as sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1294/Rev.1, and Mr. BA-ISA (Democratic Yemen), Mrs. DE GROSSMAN (Dominican Republic), Mr. KANE (Mauritania), Mr. BENNANI (Morocco), Mr. THAPA (Nepal), Mr. HAMID (Sudan), Mr. BOMANI (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. CHELLE (Uruguay) and Mr. KIRSHI (Yemen) said that, had they been present for the vote, they would have voted in favour of the proposal.

3. Mr. RASAPUTRAM (Sri Lanka) said that he had had to abstain in the vote, failing specific instructions from his Government, as he had only received document A/C.2/L.1303 the previous day.

4. The CHAIRMAN announced that Madagascar, Mauritania, and Togo had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1294/Rev.1.

5. Mr. EKBLOM (Finland) said that his delegation had already explained in the Economic Committee on 12 July 1973 (638th meeting), during the resumed fifty-fifth session of the Economic and Social Council, its reasons for abstaining in any votes on the proposals in document A/C.2/L.1294/Rev.1. While he appreciated the efforts of the sponsors to make the draft resolution more acceptable, since the essence of the decisions of the seventh session of the Industrial Development Board had been maintained, he would abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

6. Mr. GONZALEZ ARIAS (Paraguay) said that special measures in favour of the land-locked developing

countries should be mentioned in paragraph 2 of the draft resolution. Although a proposal along those lines had been previously put forward, and rejected by the Industrial Development Board, he wished to point out that there were in fact only three land-locked developing countries which were not included in the list of the 25 least developed countries, namely Bolivia, Paraguay and Zambia, and that in other United Nations bodies, measures had been taken in their favour. The Board should support all the developing countries, and at its eighth session it should take into account the needs of the land-locked developing countries, which were amongst the least developed. He would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1294/Rev.1.

7. Mr. VALDES (Bolivia) agreed with the representative of Paraguay. A reference to the land-locked countries would be in accordance with paragraph 59 of the International Development Strategy. At its eighth session, the Industrial Development Board should take the special needs of those countries into account.

8. Mr. PAGUAGA (Nicaragua) and Mr. CHABALA (Zambia) supported the remarks of the representatives of Bolivia and Paraguay.

9. Mr. SCHMID (Federal Republic of Germany) said that he agreed in principle that UNIDO should have greater independence in the implementation of programmes, in personnel administration and in publications, since time and work could thus be saved in New York. The prerequisite for greater independence was that UNIDO should submit a more detailed account of its work to the Industrial Development Board. He saw no need at the moment, however, to grant UNIDO complete administrative and financial autonomy.

10. The establishment of an industrial development fund, comprising all the voluntary contributions to UNIDO—with the exception of UNDP funds—could in future lead to a pooling of different trust funds, possibly including resources from the United Nations Capital Development Fund. Once the work on a long-range strategy for UNIDO and on the Second General Conference had been completed, then such a fund could be properly discussed. It could be used to finance projects, particularly interregional and world-wide projects, which did not qualify for UNDP funds. However, in the event of such a fund being created, UNIDO would have to be accountable for the use of its resources to the Board.

11. His Government maintained its reservations regarding an increase in the regular programme of technical assistance of UNIDO from \$1.5 to \$2 million as of