United Nations

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-FIRST SESSION

Official Records



Page

SECOND COMMITTEE, 1097th

Friday, 9 December 1966, at 3.45 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 39:	_
United Nations Development Decade: report of the Secretary-General (continued)	431
Agenda item 41:	
Activities in the field of industrial develop-	
ment (continued):	
(b) Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the	
United Nations Organization for Industrial	
Development (continued)	432

Chairman: Mr. Moraiwid M. TELL (Jordan).

AGENDA ITEM 39

United Nations Development Decade: report of the Secretary-General (continued) (A/6303, chap. II; A/6426, E/4196 and Add.1-3, A/C.2/L.931 and Corr.1 and Add.1)

- 1. Mr. VILFAN (Yugoslavia) said that his delegation had from the start unreservedly supported the designation of the United Nations Development Decade; he believed that experience would show that the General Assembly had made a wise decision on that matter. Although the results so far achieved were disappointing, the designation of the Decade had marked a turning-point in the activities of United Nations bodies and their methods of work. The concept of the Decade provided a solid foundation for evaluating international development activities; the Decade formed a very appropriate framework for channelling assistance to essential sectors; and lastly, the efforts made to achieve the targets set for the Decade had increased the effectiveness of United Nations economic and social action and encouraged the adoption of wise decisions on the role of the Economic and Social Council and the co-ordination of activities in those respects. The influence of the Decade was described in paragraph 23 of the report of the Economic and Social Council (A/6303), which summarized the interim report of the Secretary-General (E/4196 and Add.1-3). That report could play an important part in encouraging the search for new action programmes and the development of projections for future United Nations activities. The quantitative targets set at the beginning of the Decade had become obsolete and more detailed projections would have to be drawn up to enable a coherent set of aims and objectives to be adopted.
- 2. Resolution 1152 (XLI), in which the the Economic and Social Council requested the Secretary-General to consider planning for concerted action for the period after the Decade, was the first step in the right

direction and his delegation unreservedly supported it. The report which the Council had invited the Secretary-General to make was, of course, a preliminary one, but it should contain material which would enable precise aims to be defined. That was necessarily a complicated matter but United Nations development activities could be intensified only if an effort was made to lay down specific objectives.

- 3. His delegation therefore believed that the General Assembly should adopt a resolution to that effect; it was not, however, convinced of the usefulness of proposing the preparation of a charter of development. In its opinion, the principles enunciated at the first session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) expressed the concepts on which the majority of developing countries wished international development policy to be based, and the pursuit of the aims of the first Decade and of the succeeding one should lead to the gradual application of those principles. In order to ensure the success of the current Decade and the following one, the Committee should concentrate on trying to define specific targets and it should request the Secretary-General to pay particular attention, in preparing the report requested in Council resolution 1152 (XLI), to a concise and systematic survey of the objectives to be set for the period following the Decade.
- 4. Nevertheless, his delegation, despite its belief that the survey which draft resolution A/C.2/L.931 requested the Secretary-General to make was premature, would not oppose the adoption of the draft resolution. It would, however, be gratified if the sponsors would consider amending the text slightly so as to ensure that its provisions would not hinder the continuing efforts to secure general agreement on the principles laid down by the first session of UNCTAD.
- 5. Mr. BRADLEY (Argentina) said that his delegation had consistently supported the idea of the Decade and all action likely to promote development; during the twentieth session it had been, with other Latin American delegations, among the sponsors of General Assembly resolution 2084 (XX) which sought to improve co-ordination with a view to development planning and the achievement of the objectives of the Decade; again during the twentieth session and subsequently at the third session of the Trade and Development Board, it had suggested the preparation of a charter for trade, a project for which it had not yet been able to secure approval but which it had not abandoned; moreover, it had been at Argentina's instance that the General Assembly had adopted resolution 2035 (XX), in which it referred to the preparation of a declaration on social development.

- 6. His delegation therefore fully agreed with both aspects of the draft resolution before the Committee; it fully supported it and hoped that the sponsors would be able to take into account the constructive amendments proposed or suggested.
- 7. Mr. KILLION (United States of America) observed that the discussions had been predominantly concerned with financial questions, despite the fact that resolution 1710 (XVI), in which the General Assembly had designated the United Nations Development Decade, went considerably beyond the matter of the flow of financial resources. Although less susceptible to precise measurement, achievements in other areas deserved to be taken into consideration. The enlargement of the membership of the Economic and Social Council and the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) had enabled needs to be better known and the idea of collective international responsibility to become more widely accepted. The United Nations Development Programme was, since the merger of the Special Fund and the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance, a more effective weapon against hunger, poverty and disease. The developed countries were showing an increasing awareness of the gravity of the problems confronting the developing countries and that attitude was discernible in the work of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. In 1966, the United States had welcomed 85,000 foreign students, and some universities, among them the University of California, provided courses in other languages for non-English-speaking students from developing countries. While much remained to be done, much had already been done.
- 8. The world had learned a great deal about the connexion between the population problem and food supply, since food consumption had exceeded production for the previous six years. The United States was gratified that both countries which supplied aid and recipient countries were moving towards more aggressive policies and programmes which could help to restore the balance and eliminate the scourge of famine. Moreover, in addition to the measures it had taken to encourage all States to contribute to the World Food Programme to an extent which would enable it to secure \$275 million for 1966-1968, the United States Government had recently launched a new Food for Peace programme under a bill which authorized the donation or sale-on non-commercial credit terms-of \$2,500 million in food-stuffs during the following two years; it was to be hoped that the proceeds of the new programme would be utilized in the execution of food aid programmes in the recipient countries. Other Member States had demonstrated, by their actions, their desire to solve that fundamental problem, and it might be well for the international community to concentrate its efforts in the immediate future on the fulfilment of a small number of objectives in order to solve priority problems.
- 9. For that reason his delegation would prefer the Committee to attack the specific tangible problems on which world progress depended, rather than to devote its energies to the abstract problem of the preparation of a charter of development, which would

- probably raise the same difficulties as the drafting of instruments of the same kind which had already been considered by international bodies; moreover, the decision to create a new development decade was a serious one and warranted more consideration than the mere reference made to it in the third preambular paragraph of the draft resolution.
- 10. His delegation did not, however, mean to understate the importance of the problem of the volume and utilization of financial resources; it had spoken at length on them in connexion with question on the United Nations capital development fund and had stressed the role of both public and private investment. If the targets set for UNDP, the World Food Programme, the International Development Association and other bodies were reached, and progress in the formulation and administration of programmes continued, the cause of balanced and rational advance would have been served. Much of the distance separating the world from that goal had been covered and his delegation did not share the pessimism of some members of the Committee. Progress towards a better future would continue if all nations showed themselves able to deal with the problems confronting them.

AGENDA ITEM 41

Activities in the field of industrial development (<u>con-</u>tinued)*:

- (b) Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the United Nations Organization for Industrial Development (continued)** (A/6368 and Add.1, A/6369 and Add.1 and 2, A/6415 and Add.1, A/6468 and Add.1, A/6473 and Add.1, A/6474 and Add.1, A/6489, A/6504, A/6531 and Add.1, A/C.2/232, A/C.2/L.935)
- 11. Mr. AHMED (Pakistan) observed that the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) could not begin its work properly without an Executive Director and a headquarters. The first requirement had been met and his delegation welcomed the appointment of the Commissioner for Industrial Development to the post of Executive Director. The second matter should be decided by the General Assembly rather than by the Industrial Development Board, because all developing countries, which were primarily interested in UNIDO, could thus participate in the decision. Unless the decision was taken at the twentyfirst session, UNIDO might remain for one year a mere industrial development centre with a different name, and the urgency of the problems to be solved required that the new organization should be able effectively to play the part it should as soon as possible. The Committee had received a number of generous offers from Governments which were ready to be host to UNIDO, and the United States and Swiss Governments had expressed their interest in it. The Committee would soon be informed of the financial implications of the various offers, which the Secretary-General was preparing, and it should therefore be able to reach a decision.
- 12. Mr. MacLAREN (Canada) said that, in spite of the reasons advanced by the Pakistan representative,

^{*}Resumed from the 1089th meeting.

^{**}Resumed from the 1067th meeting.

his delegation remained convinced that it would be better to ask the first session of the Industrial Development Board to consider the question of the site of the new organization, in the light of the information gathered in the meantime by the Secretary-General, and to make recommendations to the General Assembly at its next session for final decision. In deciding on the site, the only concern should be what was best for the organization itself, in order to enable it to assist the developing countries in the most effective way possible. If the question of selecting the site was hastily settled in an atmosphere of political considerations without an objective review of all relevant factors, the fledgling organization would not have a very auspicious beginning and the administrative and technical problems inherent in constituting any new international organization would only be compounded. An institution intended in part to promote the careful planning which was an essential component of industrial development should not be launched without the accumulation of the facts necessary for decision or their proper assessment.

13. In his introduction to the budget estimates for 1967, 1/2 the Secretary-General had made some cogent observations, which he read out, on the administrative and technical problems involved in setting up a new international organization. In that connexion, the Canadian delegation wished to ask some questions. It would like to have a full statement of the financial implications of establishing UNIDO at a site other than United Nations Headquarters. It also wished to know, in the case of each site offered, the dates when all the necessary temporary or permanent facilities would be available. Perhaps the Secretary-General could give his views on whether it would be easier to establish an efficient group of expert personnel at United Nations Headquarters than at the other sites offered, because the question of recruiting skilled personnel was relevant. The new organization should be action-oriented and establish close relations with the World Bank group and UNDP, so that presumably if its headquarters were to be somewhere other than at United Nations Headquarters, a liaison office would be required in New York and its financial and administrative implications should be made known. Finally, in the light of the Secretary-General's comments, what would be the operational and possibly financial advantages of setting up UNIDO at United Nations Headquarters so that it could draw on central administrative and financial services?

- 14. The choice of the site also depended on many other questions to which answers should be forthcoming by the first session of the Industrial Development Board, which would then be able to address itself to the matter. For those reasons, his delegation proposed that the Committee should refer further consideration of the subject of the site of UNIDO's headquarters to the first session of the Industrial Development Board for study and recommendation to the General Assembly at its twenty-second session.
- 15. Mr. SAHLOUL (Sudan) agreed with the Pakistan representative that the Assembly should choose the site for UNIDO at its current session. The decision

should be taken not by the Industrial Development Board but by the General Assembly, of which UNIDO was a subsidiary organ, and in which all Members were represented. To postpone the decision to the next session would delay by more than a year the beginning of the new organization's actual operations, from which the developing countries were anxious to benefit. The additional information very quickly provided by the Governments which had generously offered to be host to UNIDO showed that some of them were prepared to provide the necessary facilities immediately and, in some cases, free of charge. In addition, the Committee would soon have the statement of the financial implications prepared by the Secretary-General which, incidentally, were more a matter of concern to the Fifth Committee.

- 16. His delegation therefore proposed that the Committee should vote on the matter at the current session by secret ballot according to a procedure that it would itself decide upon. He personally felt that the decision should be taken by an absolute majority.
- 17. Mr. CAMAZ DE MAGALHAES (Brazil) whole-heartedly agreed with the Pakistan and Sudanese representatives. While appreciating the Canadian delegation's concern, he felt that each delegation had probably already decided on its own position, which could not be changed by any postponement. Postponement would only result in delaying UNIDO's operations.
- 18. Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (United Republic of Tanzania) said that he would limit himself to some preliminary comments on the important item under discussion. The first requirement was to know whether the Committee should take a decision on the matter at the current session and, if so, to determine the voting procedure and select the city in which UNIDO's headquarters was to be established.
- 19. He expressed his gratitude to all the Governments which had generously offered to be host to the new organization. It was also to be hoped that those Governments intended to finance the installation of the headquarters in one way or another. Recalling the bitter experience of choosing the site for UNCTAD's headquarters, he trusted that such painful debates would not be repeated in the Second Committee and that the discussion would be free from politics. It was, however, obvious that, if it was decided to set up UNIDO's headquarters at a site other than at United Nations Headquarters, it would be necessary to take a political decision on whether its headquarters should be established in a developed or in a developing country and in which continent. Without indicating its preference and limiting itself to a discussion of principles, his delegation wished to avoid a political discussion in which its choice would be strictly limited, but for the moment it could detect no political element in the discussion so far. In making a choice, the primary consideration should be the smooth operation and development of UNIDO, the efficiency of its secretariat and the welfare of its staff. Its headquarters must also be easily accessible to all participating Governments, and the Industrial Development Board should be able to meet regularly without difficulty and to have all necessary facilities at its disposal. Lastly, the comfort of the delegations

^{1/} See Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-first Session, Supplement No. 5.

participating in the work of UNIDO and its Board must also be taken into account. In view of those considerations, his delegation, like those of the Sudan and Brazil, would prefer a decision to be taken at the current session, because it would not be in UNIDO's interest to refer to the Industrial Development Board a decision, which would then have to be endorsed by the General Assembly at its twenty-second session. His delegation had maintained that position since the start of the session.

- 20. Without fully concurring in the Canadian delegation's position, he thought that the important points raised by that delegation should be taken into account, especially that referring to the cost of establishing UNIDO's secretariat elsewhere than at United Nations Headquarters. In that connexion it was essential to make a comparative cost analysis before arriving at a conclusion.
- 21. So far as the procedure for voting on the choice of the headquarters site was concerned, he favoured a decision by the absolute majority of States Members of the United Nations, in other words, sixty-one votes plus one. Some representatives were in favour of a majority of those present and voting. The result would be virtually the same because, given the importance of the matter, there were grounds for believing that all the Members would be present during the vote, although the possibility must be kept in mind that some delegations might be absent or might not wish to participate in the vote.
- 22. In any case, the delegation of Tanzania hoped that the debate would show a division not between the developed countries and the developing countries but between the countries which favoured the new organization, and its concepts and objectives and which gave it tangible support, and those which gave it only lip-service. In the case of UNCTAD, the distressing debate on the location of its headquarters not only had opposed the developed countries to the developing countries but also had split both the developed and the developing countries.
- 23. In short, he suggested that the Committee should take a decision at the present session, carefully studying some of the questions raised by the Canadian delegation, and taking into account the criteria he had suggested. Of course, other criteria could be put forward, but the main thing was that objectivity should govern the choice of the headquarters rather than political considerations. Moreover, in the interests of UNIDO, the Committee should not let itself be drawn into a bitter debate.
- 24. Mr. FERNANDINI (Peru) announced that the Government of Peru had informed the Secretary-General that it was withdrawing the candidature of Lima as the headquarters of UNIDO (A/6415/Add.1). It would be best for the organization if the number of candidates was as small as possible.
- 25. U THET TUN (Burma) said that he had been requested by the thirty-member co-ordination group to consult the Asian countries. It was the unanimous desire of the Asian countries that the question of the new organization's headquarters should be settled at the present session through a vote by secret ballot. In the opinion of the Burmese delegation, the decision

on that question should be taken in the light of such elements as working atmosphere, geographical conditions and physical facilities. The choice should not be made by a body which did not include all of the States Members of the new organization. Some representatives had argued against a so-called hasty decision. However, the Committee had already succeeded during its consideration of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on UNIDO in quickly settling the jurisdictional conflict between the new organization and the ILO, and it was in a position to deal with the head-quarters question before the end of the present session.

- 26. Mr. DELGADO (Senegal) felt that the election of the Industrial Development Board and a decision on UNIDO's headquarters were indispensable for the success of the new organization. The Executive Director had just been appointed by the Secretary-General, so that the headquarters question had become more pressing than ever.
- 27. He thanked the representatives of India and Peru for having facilitated the Committee's task by withdrawing as candidates. However, the fact that there were still eight candidates, all of whom were friends of Senegal, made the choice a delicate problem. It was nevertheless the duty of each delegation to shoulder its responsibility. The Senegalese delegation had taken note with interest of the technical information in the Secretariat documents concerning the facilities offered by the various countries. Without forgetting that the choice of a headquarters site would be a political decision, his delegation would, indetermining its position, take into account all relevant factors, including geographical and economic conditions, facilities and cost of living. The decision on the headquarters should be made at the current session, by secret ballot and by a simple majority of those voting. If several votes should prove necessary, it would be best to eliminate one or more of the candidates who had received the smallest number of votes.

Mr. Reisch (Austria), Rapporteur, took the Chair.

28. Mr. FRANZI (Italy) said that the previous speakers had only worsened the dilemma of his delegation. A decision on the location of UNIDO's headquarters would most probably have very significant consequences for the organization. It had taken years to settle the problems raised by UNIDO's creation and now some delegations would like to dispose of so important a question as that of its headquarters in a matter of hours. While the question did have its political aspects, those were not by any means the only consideration. The Committee must not ignore the opinion of those bodies that would have to work closely with the Executive Director of UNIDO. Industrial development was a tremendous task and it could not be properly handled without the co-operation of the United Nations and the specialized agencies, which were interested organizations. There was no justification for haste, especially as only one meeting of the Industrial Development Board and two meetings of its subsidiary bodies had been scheduled for 1967. Consequently, there was no administrative urgency since the meetings could be held without the Committee's having decided the question of headquarters. In view of the highly technical nature of that question,

its final decision should not depend on sentimental considerations.

- 29. The documentation provided by the various candidate countries failed to explain why they had put themselves forward. What was more, the Committee had not studied the question whether UNIDO should have its headquarters in an industrialized country or in a developing country. Moreover, in spite of the stress that was laid on the problem of co-ordination, the advisability of establishing UNIDO near the Headquarters of the United Nations had not been examined. It was surprising in that connexion that the Fifth Committee had not been in a position to suggest whether or not free offers of land should be accepted. That would make it all the more difficult for the Second Committee to make a choice among the offers, whose possible consequences for the future of UNIDO would be difficult to exaggerate. His delegation's doubts had been increased by the unexplained withdrawal of some candidatures, particularly that of Peru. Under the circumstances, it would be advisable to postpone a decision on the location of the headquarters to the General Assembly's special session in April 1967.
- 30. Mr. LOUYA (Democratic Republic of the Congo) expressed the view that the effectiveness of UNIDO would depend not only on the professional and intellectual qualities of its staff but also on the location of its headquarters. The choice of a headquarters should be dictated by practical rather than theoretical considerations. There was no reason why a decision could not be taken at the present session. The Executive Director of UNIDO, whose opinion it would be interesting to hear, had been appointed and the information requested by the Secretariat had been supplied by the candidate countries.

Mr. Tell (Jordan) resumed the Chair.

- 31. Mr. BRADLEY (Argentina) pointed out that the Committee had begun its work with the question of industrial development and that for some time now it had had before it offers from Governments that were prepared to accommodate UNIDO. Now that the new organization had an Executive Director, it was time to decide on the location of its headquarters and, in his view, no new factor that could affect that choice was now likely to appear.
- 32. The confusion in which the Committee seemed to find itself was due, he thought, to the fact that it had failed to draw a necessary distinction between deciding whether the choice of a headquarters should or should not be made at the present session and actually making that choice. As to the first decision, it was hardly possible that any new arguments could be forthcoming in addition to those which had already been so clearly presented.
- 33. The Argentine delegation therefore suggested that the Committee should first decide on the prior question. If it decided to choose the location of the headquarters at the present session, it would then determine the method of voting and proceed to the vote as soon as it received the Secretary-General's statement on financial implications, which was the only element still lacking.

- 34. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) felt that in spite of the complexity of the problem, whose importance and political significance were obvious to everyone, a decision on the location of the headquarters could be taken at the present session. The data relating to the problem were known and had been studied at length. The choice of UNIDO's headquarters should be determined by the relative advantages offered by the various candidates. The representative of Burma had mentioned the elements that should enter into the Committee's decision, and the Committee should now scrutinize each candidature. It had the necessary documentation at its disposal and it could take a decision by 13 or 14 December. As to the question of voting, that was purely a technical matter and the most reasonable solution would appear to be a decision by a simple majority in a vote by secret ballot.
- 35. Mr. BELEOKEN (Cameroon) said that his delegation was ready to vote on the site of UNIDO's headquarters at the present session. Its vote would not, however, be based on sentimental considerations but on purely objective criteria. He agreed with the Senegalese representative's suggestions concerning procedure.
- 36. Mr. GALLARDO MORENO (Mexico) expressed his delegation's thanks to the Governments which had offered to act as host to UNIDO. He agreed with the representative of Argentina that all the relevant arguments had been presented as to when the choice should be made. On the other hand, he thought that the financial implications were not the only element lacking and that, at its first session, the Industrial Development Board might consider other aspects of the question which would facilitate the decision.
- 37. Mr. NATORF (Poland) supported the proposal that the site of UNIDO's headquarters should be decided on at the present session. There could be no compromise regarding that proposal, and the question had been subjected during the past few weeks to sufficiently careful study on the part of the host countries and the Secretariat for the Committee to be able to take a considered decision. All the delegations had asked themselves the questions which had been raised by the Italian representative and, with a few exceptions, had apparently found satisfactory answers. His delegation was in favour of a vote by secret ballot.
- 38. Mr. VIAUD (France) thought that the site of UNIDO's headquarters should be chosen at the present session. With regard to the voting procedure, the Committee should follow as closely as possible the customary rules and practices of the United Nations in such cases. There was nothing against a vote by secret ballot. On the other hand, there were no legal or practical grounds for a vote by an absolute majority of all Members. The rules of procedure provided that decisions should be taken by a simple majority of the members present and voting. The rule of absolute majority only applied in the election of judges to the International Court of Justice. The imposition of such a rigid rule would restrict the freedom of choice of delegations, which might wish to hand in a blank ballot or not participate in the vote. Failing a majority, the decision would be deferred

until 1967 and the establishment of UNIDO delayed by a year.

- 39. Mr. MUZIK (Czechoslovakia) associated himself with the comments of the Pakistan representative. His delegation was in favour of the secret ballot and the elimination process proposed by the Senegalese representative. A political decision was to be taken, and UNIDO should operate in a favourable political climate. In choosing the site of its headquarters before the close of the present session, the Committee would not be showing undue haste, and his delegation, for one, was prepared to take a considered decision.
- 40. Mr. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) asked whether the Secretariat was able to answer the questions put by the Canadian representative, or at least whether it would be able to do so before the Committee proceeded to vote. In its communication on the location of UNIDO's headquarters (A/6548), his delegation had raised some of the same questions as had been asked by the representatives of Canada and Mexico. The opposition to referring the decision to the first session of the Industrial Development Board was partly due to the fear of thereby delaying any decision for a year, which many delegations considered excessive. However, the first session of the Board was scheduled for March-April 1967; and in April there would be a special session of the General Assembly. The Committee could quite well request that the question of the site of UNIDO's headquarters should also be included in the agenda. That would mean a delay of only four months, which would allow time for an unhurried consideration of the proposed sites, the particulars of which had been brought to the Committee's attention only a few days earlier.
- 41. Moreover, he was under the impression that the Canadian representative had made a formal proposal, which must consequently be discussed and voted on first. If such was the case, his delegation would propose to modify the proposal submitted by Canada by adding that the Trade and Development Board submit its recommendation to the next session, special or regular, of the General Assembly.
- 42. With regard to the proposal that the decision should be taken by absolute majority, the Committee, contrary to the view advanced by the French representative, was perfectly justified in establishing its own rules of procedure and deciding the type of majority required. Since voting by secret ballot was not a normal procedure of the Committee, it would have to spell out the consequences of its decision so to vote.
- 43. The CHAIRMAN asked the representative of Canada whether or not he had made a formal proposal.
- 44. Mr. MacLAREN—(Canada) said that he had not intended to ask for a vote on the question whether or not the Committee should decide immediately on the site of UNIDO's headquarters. He had hoped that a consensus would be reached on the matter, as the Committee did not have before it all the necessary data for taking such a decision. If the majority wished to proceed to the vote without those data, it had the right to do so, but his delegation disapproved of such a procedure. The suggestion that a decision should be

- taken at the present session of the General Assembly had been made by the representative of Pakistan, who should be asked whether or not he pressed his proposal.
- 45. The CHAIRMAN remarked that the representative of Canada had apparently not made a formal proposal. Delegations which wanted the Committee to take an immediate decision would no doubt make their wishes known.
- 46. Mr. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) read out the following passage from the printed text of the Canadian representative's statement: "We should like to propose formally that the Committee vote on the question of whether to remit...". At all events, his delegation was prepared to support any consensus which might be reached in the Committee.
- 47. Mr. HUSSEIN (United Arab Republic) thought that, as all the viewpoints had been freely expressed, the time had come for the Committee to take a decision. He therefore formally proposed that the Committee should vote by roll-call on the question whether the decision regarding the site of UNIDO's head-quarters should be taken at the present session of the General Assembly or not.
- 48. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that, under the rules of procedure, the Committee should proceed to vote on that formal proposal. However, he intended first to give the floor to all the speakers on his list.
- 49. Mr. DELGADO (Senegal), speaking on a point of order, said that he would like to add to the proposal of the delegation of the United Arab Republic, a proposal for the closure of the debate.
- 50. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that he had originally thought that the Committee should take a decision at the current session, but after having heard the discussion, he was now prepared to consider any proposal. In fact, the crux of the matter was whether the Committee wished to take a political decision, which could be done immediately, or whether it wished to take into account the technical factors also, in which case it would need time to study the data and figures relating to each offer.
- 51. Most of the delegations had certainly not had time to compare the figures and arguments relating to the various offers. The purpose of asking the Secretary-General to make inquiries of the Governments which had made the offers was so that the Committee could compare the data they supplied and even perhaps send experts to the various sites to consider the offers at first hand. Some countries had stated that they would not be able to underwrite the expenses of UNIDO's secretariat building, a factor which could not be disregarded. The Committee could perhaps also discuss whether the headquarters should be established in a developed country or in a developing country. But if what was involved was a political decision, there was little point in asking the countries which had made offers for precise technical details. The decision must be based, at least partly, on technical grounds.
- 52. On the question of procedure, he was in favour of secret ballot, but he did not have any definite opinion on the type of majority required. Account would have

to be taken of various other possibilities, such as the consideration of a third candidacy in case the two more popular candidacies received an equal number of votes. The Committee must also have a clear idea of the financial implications, which should be presented, if possible, in a way which would facilitate comparison. In view of the present financial situation of the United Nations, it would be interesting to know who would pay for the permanent installations of UNIDO.

53. Mr. VARELA (Panama), speaking on a point of order, formally moved the adjournment of the meeting. The discussion had turned into political channels. If a political decision had to be taken, delegations should vote for the policy most favourable to UNIDO, not to one or another country. In the absence of any precise information on the financial implications, the Committee could take no decision.

54. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Panamanian representative's motion for adjournment.

The motion for adjournment was rejected by 38 votes to 28, with 15 abstentions.

- 55. Mr. PIÑERA (Chile) asked whether the Committee could take an immediate vote on the question whether the decision on UNIDO headquarters should be taken at the Assembly's current session or not.
- 56. The CHAIRMAN said that the delegation of the United Arab Republic had made a proposal to that effect, which would be put to the vote as soon as the list of speakers had been exhausted.
- 57. Mr. KARMARKAR (India) said it had always been his view that UNIDO headquarters should be located in a developing country, and it was for that reason that India had proposed New Delhi. At the time of doing so, however, it had not had a complete picture of all the other offers made. When it had obtained that information, India had withdrawn its candidature (A/6368/Add.1) in favour of Kenya's, for reasons of Afro-Asian solidarity. But that did not mean that India had no interest in the development of the new organization; on the contrary, its enthusiasm had in no way diminished. The Committee should take a decision on the location of UNIDO headquarters by secret ballot at the present session.
- 58. Mr. MacLAREN (Canada) said his delegation was convinced that the Committee could not possibly take a sound decision on the location of UNIDO head-quarters without having all the necessary information; and it would certainly be unable to obtain that information in the course of the next week. To take a decision when the Committee was not even in possession of objective information and no attempt had even been made to reply to the questions raised by the Canadian and Italian delegations would be extraordinary.
- 59. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the United Arab Republic representative's proposal that the Committee

should take a vote on the question whether the decision on the location of UNIDO headquarters should be taken at the Assembly's present session.

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

The Congo (Brazzaville), having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, France, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sudan, Syria, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia.

Against: Denmark, Finland, Ireland, Italy, Philippines, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Canada,

Abstaining: Greece, Honduras, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Sweden, Thailand.

The proposal was adopted by 64 votes to 10, with 11 abstentions.

- 60. Mr. MUZIK (Czechoslovakia) observed that the Committee's task was precisely to take political decisions, since delegations were responsible for defending the political interests of their Governments. Moreover, the countries which had offered to act as hosts to UNIDO headquarters had also done so for reasons of prestige and politics. To be sure it was also necessary, as the Greek representative had pointed out, to take account of other important considerations, including technical factors, and to come to a decision on the basis of precise information. He hoped that the figures would be available before the Committee took its decision, and wished to express his appreciation of Greece's generous offer (A/6473 and Add.1).
- 61. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) thanked the Czecho-slovak representative.
- 62. Mr. WILMOT (Ghana) asked whether, in view of the decision just taken, the vote on the site of UNIDO headquarters would be taken in the Second Committee or in plenary session of the General Assembly.
- 63. The CHAIRMAN said that the vote would be taken in the Second Committee.

The meeting rose at 7.10 p.m.

· ·		