



Chairman: Mr. Narciso G. REYES (Philippines).

AGENDA ITEM 44

Operational activities for development: reports of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme (continued) (A/8399, A/8403, chap. VIII (sects. A to D), E/4954 and Corr.1, E/5043/Rev.1):

- (a) United Nations Development Programme (A/C.2/L.1146, A/C.2/L.1153, A/C.2/L.1154, A/C.2/L.1155);
- (b) United Nations Capital Development Fund;
- (c) Technical co-operation activities undertaken by the Secretary-General;
- (d) United Nations Volunteers programme (E/5028)

1. Mr. DO RIO-BRANCO (Brazil) announced that Uruguay had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1154 on the capacity of the United Nations development system. After a rapid review of all the provisions, he pointed out that the draft resolution set forth general principles which would be of great value to the Governing Council from its thirteenth session onwards. He hoped that it would be adopted unanimously.

2. Mr. KHANACHET (Kuwait), speaking also on behalf of the delegations of Cuba, Kenya, Libya and Venezuela, submitted some amendments (A/C.2/L.1155) to the draft resolution before the Committee. The first amendment consisted in inserting a new fourth preambular paragraph recalling the decision taken by the Governing Council of UNDP at its eleventh session on the question of regional bureaux and taking the wording used by the Governing Council in its report. The adoption of that amendment would facilitate the activities of the Governing Council.

3. The second amendment concerned the indicative planning figures. At the outset, in calculating the indicative planning figures, no account had been taken of the needs of the developing countries, but only of the experience of the preceding years. As the Governing Council had decided at its eleventh session to review the criteria to be followed in calculating indicative planning figures, the sponsors of the amendment proposed to insert a new paragraph in the preamble recalling that decision.

4. The representatives of Brazil, Chile and Colombia seemed to be in favour of the amendments and he hoped that they would include them in the draft resolution.

5. Mr. CAVIGLIA STARICCO (Uruguay) said that draft resolution A/C.2/L.1154 summed up his delegation's views on the agenda item. Both the preambular and the operative provisions were designed to expand the activities of UNDP

and to integrate all the elements of assistance to developing countries in accordance with Economic and Social Council resolution 1617 (LI). He was particularly pleased that the draft resolution stressed the duty of the United Nations to aid the developing countries in a dynamic way, by adjusting to changes in conditions, and the need to improve the definition and implementation of subregional, regional and interregional projects, having regard to the country programmes, and to instil new vigour into them. His delegation also endorsed that part of the draft resolution which concerned the institutional aspects of UNDP and which defined the spheres of competence of the various bodies participating in development activities.

6. For all those reasons he would support draft resolution A/C.2/L.1154 and the amendments proposed to it (A/C.2/L.1155).

7. Mrs. AUGUSTE (Trinidad and Tobago) said that at the eleventh session of the Governing Council of UNDP it had been proposed that part of the UNDP resources reserved for inter-country projects should be allocated by country, whereas paragraphs 21, 22 and 23 of the Consensus of June 1970 (General Assembly resolution 2688 (XXV), annex) did not contemplate that method of assistance but merely spoke of inter-country programming. For that reason her delegation, though agreeing with much of the draft resolution under consideration, was opposed to those provisions which seemed to be inconsistent with the principles of the Consensus with regard to interregional, regional and subregional projects.

8. For example, in her delegation's opinion operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution implied that the changes in the situation since the adoption of the Consensus called for a new definition of procedures. Similarly, with regard to paragraph 2 she repeated her delegation's view that the adoption of that paragraph would run counter to the provisions of the Consensus that related to interregional, regional and subregional projects.

9. With regard to operative paragraph 4, it was impossible to promote a greater number of global projects without prejudice to the country programmes. Recalling paragraph 26 of the Consensus, she emphasized the provision that "the amount to be allocated for global projects should not exceed 1 per cent of the net resources available for programming". According to the figures submitted to the Committee, that percentage had already been allocated to global projects and that should be sufficient.

10. She hoped that her views would be taken into consideration. She proposed to submit an amendment.

11. Mr. VERCELES (Philippines) submitted two amendments to the draft resolution, which he recognized as important for the Governing Council of UNDP. His first amendment concerned operative paragraph 5, in which he proposed the insertion, after the word "new", of the words "matter or". The second amendment consisted in the addition of a new operative paragraph 5, which would read:

"Further requests the Governing Council to study the possibility of establishing more equitable regional indicative planning figures taking into account the needs and degree of development of the various geographical areas."

During the debates at the eleventh and twelfth sessions of the Governing Council a more equitable allocation of resources had already been discussed.

12. With reference to the amendments submitted by the representative of Kuwait, he saw no reason why they should not be included in the draft resolution. He hoped that the Committee would be able to take into consideration the comments of the representative of Trinidad and Tobago.

13. Mr. OULD BOUNA MOKHTAR (Mauritania) said that he had no difficulty in accepting the entire draft resolution and the amendments before the Committee, but he would like to make some comments.

14. In his view the draft resolution considered only one aspect of development. The pastoral sector was often the key sector in the least developed among the developing countries, a fact that the United Nations should bear in mind. His delegation therefore proposed that draft resolution A/C.2/L.1154 should be amended to that effect. In the seventh preambular paragraph the words "an essential feature" should be replaced by the words "one of the essential features" and the paragraph would then read: "*Conscious of the fact that industrial development constitutes one of the essential features of development policies and planning at every stage of development,*". Moreover, in operative paragraph 4 the words "agricultural development" should be replaced by the words "the development of agricultural and pastoral activities".¹

15. He whole-heartedly supported the amendments submitted by Kuwait.

16. Mr. RAMIREZ-OCAMPO (Colombia), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution, said that the amendments submitted by the Kuwait delegation were very helpful and that the sponsors accepted them. With regard to the comments of the representative of Trinidad and Tobago, he said that the sponsors of the draft resolution had not the slightest intention of minimizing the importance of subregional, regional and interregional programmes since, as members of the Andean Group of Countries, his country and Chile were particularly interested in programmes of that nature. Operative paragraph 4 had to be read in conjunction with operative paragraph 9, for the two paragraphs complemented and explained each other. The amendments proposed by Trinidad and Tobago should be

submitted in writing so that they could be more carefully studied.

17. The sponsors accepted the amendments proposed by the Philippine delegation. With regard to those proposed by Mauritania, he said that industrial development was closely linked with agricultural development and, although agriculture and animal husbandry were the main source of income in most developing countries, it was nevertheless true that the latter should give priority to industrial development.

18. Mr. KHANACHET (Kuwait) thanked the representatives of Brazil, Chile and Colombia for accepting the amendments in document A/C.2/L.1155. The sponsors of those amendments would join in sponsoring the draft resolution, as amended.

19. Mr. DIALLO (Upper Volta) said that draft resolution A/C.2/L.1154 was too important to be accepted quickly, especially as many members of the Committee were not members of the Governing Council of UNDP and could not immediately understand the full significance of the text. He was grateful to the representative of Trinidad and Tobago for the useful comments she had made. There would have to be consultations with the sponsors of the draft resolution so that they would take into consideration all the reservations that had been expressed.

20. In view of the low absorption capacity of the least developed among the developing countries, the draft resolution should include a request to the Administration and the Governing Council of UNDP that they should consider and take specific steps to meet the needs of those countries when they came to review the indicative planning figures. The draft resolution should also include provisions respecting systematic prospecting for unexploited natural resources, especially in the least developed among the developing countries. As had been pointed out by the representative of Yugoslavia, special provision should also be made for those countries with regard to the payment of local costs; they might be purely and simply exempted from those costs. He hoped that, since the amendments he had just proposed were not inconsistent with the spirit of the draft resolution, they could be included in it.

21. Mr. HOEUR LAY INN (Khmer Republic) announced that, in keeping with the position it had stated in the 1390th meeting, his delegation supported draft resolution A/C.2/L.1154. It also supported the amendments submitted by the delegation of Kuwait (A/C.2/L.1155), the amendments proposed by the Philippine delegation and the suggestions by the representative of Upper Volta concerning exemption of the least developed among the developing countries from local costs.

22. Mr. CABEZAS (Ecuador) said that he shared the views of the representative of Colombia. Moreover, he thought it would be useful to include the idea of handicraft production, which was of particular importance in Ecuador, in the draft resolution. His delegation proposed to consult the sponsors of the draft resolution on that point.

23. Mr. FARHANG (Afghanistan) agreed with the representative of Upper Volta that it would be wrong to consider

¹ The amendments were subsequently circulated in document A/C.2/L.1157.

the draft resolution hastily. His delegation intended to submit amendments but would first have to consult the sponsors. He therefore proposed that any decision on the draft resolution should be postponed.

24. Mr. MORAN (Peru) supported the draft resolution and the amendments in document A/C.2/L.1155. His delegation wished to become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

25. Mr. RAJOHNSON (Madagascar) agreed with the representatives of Upper Volta and Afghanistan that the draft resolution should not be examined too hastily. He approved of the text as a whole but would like to see the following phrase inserted in operative paragraph 3, after the words "Calls upon the Governing Council of UNDP to consider, at the earliest opportunity": "the exemption of countries receiving UNDP assistance from counterpart payments for local costs". The contributions which recipient countries had to pay placed too heavy a burden on their resources and the Governing Council had already on several occasions had to rule on requests for waivers.

26. Mr. ABHYANKAR (India) said that the number of amendments and suggestions showed how important the draft resolution was. It would therefore be better to postpone any decision until a later stage so that all the amendments and suggestions could be considered. The new operative paragraph 5 proposed by the delegation of the Philippines was extremely useful, but it could be worded more concisely; the phrase beginning "taking into account" seemed superfluous after the words "more equitable". Although his delegation well understood the concern that had prompted the Mauritanian amendment, it felt that, since the specific purpose of the draft resolution was to promote industrial development, emphasis on agricultural and pastoral development was out of place. There had often been criticism of the excessive participation by FAO and the low level of participation by UNIDO and UNCTAD in UNDP projects. The fundamental idea of Economic and Social Council resolution 1617 (LI) was the need to promote the growth of industrial projects.

27. Mr. ČABRIĆ (Yugoslavia) agreed with the representatives who had requested more detailed consideration of the draft resolution. The proposals of the representative of Upper Volta concerning the least developed among the developing countries should be taken into account in the draft resolution.

28. Mr. DIAW (Mali) said that he too thought that there should be further consultations on the draft resolution, in view of its importance.

29. Mr. NTAKABANYURA (Burundi) congratulated the sponsors of the draft resolution and of the amendments in document A/C.2/L.1155. He supported the amendment submitted by the delegation of Madagascar.

30. Mr. LAGOS (Chile) said that he was pleased that draft resolution A/C.2/L.1154 had led to a constructive debate, since it was of great importance for future UNDP activities.

31. On behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution, he accepted the amendments submitted by the representative of the Philippines, with the change suggested by the representative of India.

32. With regard to the proposal by the representative of Mauritania concerning the seventh preambular paragraph, the sponsors agreed to replace the words "an essential feature" by the words "one of the essential features"

33. The sponsors accepted the proposals of the representatives of Mauritania and Ecuador with regard to operative paragraph 4. The words "agricultural development" would therefore be replaced by "agricultural, pastoral and artisanal development"

34. The sponsors welcomed the proposal by the representative of Madagascar and invited that representative and the representatives of Yugoslavia and Trinidad and Tobago, as also any other delegations which would like some amendments made to the draft resolution, to join them in working out a revised text.

35. With regard, more specifically, to the remarks of the representative of Trinidad and Tobago, there was no contradiction between the provisions of paragraphs 21 and 22 of the Consensus and those of operative paragraphs 3 and 4 of the draft resolution. What the sponsors intended was to ensure that the provisions of the Consensus were implemented, and not to place more emphasis on sub-regional, regional, interregional and global projects at the expense of national projects.

36. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) said that, while he supported the draft resolution, he had some reservations concerning the priorities which it established. He feared that by placing greater emphasis on global projects, as provided in operative paragraph 4, UNDP would have to reduce the funds it allocated to national projects.

37. He did not approve of the wording of the end of operative paragraph 4 and proposed that it should be amended to read: "with emphasis on agricultural development and related matters, as well as on industrial development;"

38. He saw no need for the General Assembly to reiterate its confidence in the Governing Council of UNDP and proposed that operative paragraph 6 should be deleted altogether. Nor could his delegation see the usefulness of operative paragraph 9.

39. He approved of the amendments proposed in document A/C.2/L.1155. Because of the many suggestions that had been made, he felt that draft resolution A/C.2/L.1154 would have to be revised completely. He therefore proposed that the Committee should take the question up again in three weeks' time, after the recess which would be necessary when the Economic and Social Council resumed its fifty-first session.

40. Mr. RAJOHNSON (Madagascar) and Mr. OHIAMI (Togo) supported the proposal to postpone a decision on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1154.

41. Mr. RUTTEN (Netherlands) and Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) supported the proposal to continue consideration of the draft resolution but to withhold a decision for the time being. They would be unable to take a position until they had received instructions from their respective Governments.

42. Mr. RAMIREZ-OCAMPO (Colombia), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution, said that he regretted that he could not endorse the proposal of the representative of the Sudan that further consideration of the question should be postponed until November. In particular, that would be after the meeting of the Group of 77, to be held at Lima. Moreover, the Committee's work programme following the conference would be very heavy.
43. Mr. AYOUB (Tunisia) endorsed the Sudanese representative's remarks. Some amendments were needed, for example, in operative paragraph 7, which his delegation felt should be revised.
44. He did not share the view of the representatives who had said that the draft resolution was focused mainly on industrial development; he felt, on the contrary, that it dealt with many UNDP activities.
45. He proposed that the debate should be adjourned and resumed at the end of the week.
46. Mr. KITCHEN (United States of America) thought that it would be unwise to take a decision on the draft resolution at once and he endorsed the proposal to adjourn the debate. He reserved the right to revert to the question at the appropriate time.
47. The CHAIRMAN said that it would be desirable to complete the consideration of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1154 before the Lima conference. He hoped that the Committee would be able to complete its consideration of all draft resolutions pertaining to item 44 within a relatively short time.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.