



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.1150, A/C.2/L.1153);
- (b) United Nations Capital Development Fund (A/C.2/L.1151);
- (c) Technical co-operation activities undertaken by the Secretary-General;
- (d) United Nations Volunteers programme (E/5028)

1. Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1145/Rev.1 concerning the United Nations Volunteers programme because, although he recognized that the developing countries supported the programme, he did not believe that it could make a substantial contribution to the cause of economic and social development. He was pleased that an amendment had been adopted stipulating that volunteers should be sent only at the express request of the Governments concerned; however, he could not endorse the Netherlands representative's view that there should be some connexion between the United Nations Volunteers programme and bilateral volunteer efforts. His country supported various United Nations activities to transfer technology to the developing countries and help them train national personnel; however, the Volunteers programme was not in a position to provide such assistance. Furthermore, the programme would require additional expenditure.

2. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to resume consideration of the draft resolution on financial contributions to the United Nations Development Programme (A/C.2/L.1150) and announced that the delegation of Madagascar had joined the list of sponsors.

3. Mr. JOSEPH (Australia) said that his delegation had been disappointed at the adoption of Economic and Social Council resolution 1615 (LI), which the General Assembly was called upon to endorse in the draft resolution now before the Committee. It could not see how an estimate of an increase in resources based on aspirations rather than a realistic projection of what contributing countries were likely to make available could do anything but harm UNDP. An inflated growth factor would not succeed in applying pressure on Governments to increase their contributions. Moreover, if the draft resolution was adopted, planning in the developing countries might be disrupted, for they

would be submitting country programmes based on indicative planning figures which had not the slightest chance of realization. His delegation would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

4. Mr. ARVESEN (Norway), speaking on behalf of his own delegation and those of Denmark and Finland, said that it would be preferable to see whether the forthcoming UNDP Pledging Conference substantiated the optimism reflected in Economic and Social Council resolution 1615 (LI) and the draft resolution now before the Committee before any attempt was made to review the realistic planning estimates arrived at after a long debate in the Governing Council of UNDP. The Governments of Denmark, Finland and Norway were major contributors to UNDP and sincerely hoped that total UNDP resources would be increased through substantially higher pledged and paid contributions, so that planning estimates ultimately could be revised upwards. Their delegations would therefore abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

5. Mr. NONOYAMA (Japan) said that his delegation would vote against the draft resolution because it could not accept paragraph 1 of Economic and Social Council resolution 1615 (LI). It would be inappropriate at the present stage to review the annual growth estimate of 9.6 per cent, since it had been established only the preceding February and country programmes were expected to be prepared on the basis of that estimate. Moreover, his delegation could not accept the assumption in that paragraph that the estimated growth rate should correspond directly to the goal of doubling UNDP's resources by 1975.

6. Mr. DIALLO (Upper Volta) said that his delegation fully supported the draft resolution before the Committee. It was imperative that all States co-operate to provide UNDP with the resources it required to carry out its tasks. In any review of the indicative planning figures, the Governing Council should take due account of the situation of the least developed among the developing countries and seek ways to increase their capacity to absorb assistance, so as to enable them to overcome their economic backwardness.

7. Mr. RUTTEN (Netherlands) said that he would have to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution because, although his delegation would welcome any development that would enable UNDP to attain its goal of \$500 million, it believed that Economic and Social Council resolution 1615 (LI) had mistakenly interpreted the 9.6 per cent growth rate. Paragraph 1 of that resolution was unrealistic; UNDP resources must be substantially increased before the estimate of 9.6 per cent could be reviewed. The forthcoming Pledging Conference might provide some indication of the extent to which resources would actually increase.

8. Mr. GATES (New Zealand) said that, although his delegation hoped that UNDP would expand substantially by 1975, it would have to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution because it sought the establishment of an increased planning estimate, which was unrealistic in the light of past performance.

9. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) recalled that at the eleventh session of the Governing Council of UNDP a number of developing countries had expressed reservations regarding the 9.6 per cent annual increase. His delegation had nevertheless supported Economic and Social Council resolution 1615 (LI).

10. He rejected the argument that it was unrealistic to call for an increase in indicative planning figures on the grounds that the required resources might not be forthcoming. The 9.6 per cent annual growth estimate—which had not been attained over the past year—had been based on only one element of the Consensus reached on the capacity of the United Nations development system (General Assembly resolution 2688 (XXV), annex). Moreover, a review of the planning estimates “at the first possible opportunity” would not disrupt country programming. It was the sponsors’ intention that such a review would take place once contributions to UNDP increased. The developing countries felt that it was only by calling for higher planning estimates that they could impress upon the developed countries their concern that the latter had not adhered to the principles of the Consensus and that even the 9.6 per cent target they were so vehemently defending now had not been attained.

11. Mr. GOBBA (Egypt) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution because it considered Economic and Social Council resolution 1615 (LI) to be consonant with the assumption in the Consensus that the resources of the Programme would increase at least at the same rate as the average of the past few years.

12. Mr. FERNANDEZ-VILLAVARDE (Spain) said that he would abstain in the vote on the draft resolution because, in seeking to reverse a realistic decision, the draft resolution threatened to compromise UNDP. His delegation had already expressed its aspirations regarding future increases in UNDP resources.

13. Mrs. DERRE (France) said that, although her delegation favoured the maximum possible increase in UNDP resources, it considered the 9.6 per cent growth rate established by the Governing Council to be the most realistic objective in the present circumstances. Her delegation would therefore abstain.

14. Mr. BERLET (Canada) said that, although his delegation hoped that the lofty ideals of the draft resolution and of Economic and Social Council resolution 1615 (LI) would be achieved, the calculation of indicative planning figures on a basis other than that already agreed upon would be unrealistic and contrary to the conciliatory spirit of the Consensus adopted by the Governing Council. He would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

15. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) said he was sure that no delegation would disagree with the view expressed

in the first preambular paragraph of the draft resolution that the programme of UNDP should be expanded. However, to quote a precise figure for that expansion was another matter. The indicative planning figures had been established after a great deal of discussion in the Governing Council, which had felt that UNDP could use them as a realistic basis for its programmes and that Governments could be reasonably confident that the targets set could be achieved.

16. Under the terms of Economic and Social Council resolution 1615 (LI), the indicative planning figures would have to be revised upwards if the draft resolution was approved. In that event, the question of resources would become crucial, since a failure to meet the heightened expectations might prove extremely damaging. His Government certainly did not argue that UNDP should not enjoy increased resources—indeed, it had recently raised its own contribution by 33 1/3 per cent. However, any Government made its voluntary contributions out of disposable income, and if such income was taken to derive from the growth in gross national product, a figure of 9.6 per cent was already high: only two or three Governments represented in the Committee enjoyed such a rate. Even if, as was desirable, it was assumed that the rate of increase in aid should be, for example, double the rate of increase in gross national product, the latter was still required to increase at a rate of 4.8 per cent if the target already set by the Governing Council was to be achieved. Few Member States had in fact achieved such a growth rate. A realistic approach was essential if false expectations were not to be raised with regard to future resources. Disappointment by donors could cause reactions leading to disillusion among donors, and that could bring about disastrous failure. If realistic targets were set, some contributors might exceed them, which would be extremely gratifying. His delegation had voted against the Economic and Social Council resolution, and would also vote against the present text.

17. Mrs. THORSSON (Sweden) said her delegation was prepared to vote for the draft resolution. It was motivated by the statement of the Administrator of UNDP concerning the Programme’s currently under-utilized delivery capacity. The present planning figure of 9.6 per cent constituted a form of commitment which Member States, once they had approved it, had a moral obligation to honour. Any future upward revision of that figure must be realistic; some form of agreement between major contributors and recipients must be reached in the Governing Council if it was to have any practical effect. Moreover, any further increase in resources should be reserved primarily for the least developed among the developing countries.

18. She wished to remind the Committee of her delegation’s suggestion that the Governing Council should consider additional means of providing the Programme with a sound longer-term financial basis, such as, for example, the arrangements for periodic replenishment made within the International Development Association.

19. Mr. MASSONET (Belgium) said his delegation could not support a draft resolution which contradicted a decision of the Governing Council. It was unreasonable to base future development of UNDP on a projection different from that contained in the Consensus. His Government had

adopted a target for aid to developing countries of 0.75 per cent by 1975, and was accordingly increasing its contribution to UNDP.

20. Miss BENNATON (Honduras) said her delegation would vote for the draft resolution. Her Government's contribution to UNDP would be increased at the forthcoming Pledging Conference by \$2,500.

21. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) said his delegation had supported Economic and Social Council resolution 1615 (LI), and would accordingly vote for the present draft. The sole purpose of the text was to urge the international community, especially the developed countries, to increase their contributions to UNDP. If there was a chance of agreement on the level of such an increase, it might be as well not to continue the debate at the present stage.

22. Mr. McCLEAN (Barbados) said his delegation agreed that the resources of UNDP must be increased. However, it found paragraph 1 of Economic and Social Council resolution 1615 (LI) unclear. Perhaps a co-sponsor of the draft resolution before the Committee would explain the causal connexion between a review of planning estimates and the doubling of the resources of the Programme. His delegation would also welcome an explanation of the way in which UNDP would adjust to a shortfall in income, on the one hand, or to excess revenues, on the other.

23. Mr. KAMBA (United Republic of Tanzania) said his delegation would support the draft resolution, since it had a vested interest in any proposal aimed at increasing UNDP's resources. He urged developed countries to show a greater spirit of co-operation and understanding by increasing their contributions to UNDP.

24. Mr. VERCELES (Philippines) said his delegation would support the draft if a vote was taken on it. Neither the present text nor the Economic and Social Council resolution 1615 (LI) contained anything new; the ideas they expressed had been advanced at the eleventh session of the Governing Council, where there had been a consensus concerning increased contributions to UNDP. However, in view of the fact that some delegations seemed to have problems with a simple draft endorsing old concepts, it might be as well to postpone the vote. The draft resolution could be considered again after the forthcoming Pledging Conference, when it could be amended in the light of developments at that meeting.

25. Mr. BRITO (Brazil) said that the draft resolution was of great importance to developing countries. It must be seen in the context of the *Study of the Capacity of the United Nations Development System*,¹ which had aimed at enlarging the capacity of that system and thus justifying increased contributions. The Study had shown that the system had an annual growth capacity of some 15 per cent, while the average increase in contributions had been only 9.6 per cent. Paragraph 13 of the Consensus made clear the assumption that the resources of the Programme would increase at least at the same rate as the average of the last few years. In his delegation's view, the Governing Council had been somewhat pessimistic at its eleventh session.

Indeed, its decisions had been somewhat contradictory. In decision I (E/4954 and Corr.1, para. 71) it had expressed its awareness that, with a growth rate of 9.6 per cent per annum, eight to ten years would be needed to double current resources; it had then taken note of the Administrator's statement that the doubling of the programme by 1975 was a realistic goal. In decision II, on the other hand, it had taken note of the use for the purpose of forward programming of an estimated annual increase of 9.6 per cent during the five-year period 1972-1976.

26. In approving resolution 1615 (LI), the Economic and Social Council had exercised its authority in a perfectly proper manner. In the introduction to the Council's report (A/8403), the President of the Council particularly stressed the adoption of that resolution. The basic point at issue was simply that resources should match delivery capacity. The Governing Council had taken a minimum figure of 9.6 per cent, which meant that part of the 15 per cent annual growth capacity was wasted. All the developing countries were seeking was for the inbuilt growth capacity of the system to be used to the fullest possible extent. If the volume of international aid did not increase faster than the gross national product of developed countries, the targets of the International Development Strategy would never be achieved.

27. Economic and Social Council resolution 1615 (LI) was in no way inflexible, since it merely requested the Governing Council to review the planning estimates at the first possible opportunity. He therefore urged those delegations which had reservations with regard to the draft resolution to reconsider their position.

28. Mr. HOEUR LAY INN (Khmer Republic) said his delegation was not in principle opposed to the draft resolution. However, in view of the state of war with which his Government was currently confronted, it would be obliged to abstain in the vote, since it was not in a position to make any increase in its contribution to the UNDP.

29. Mr. CAVIGLIA STARICCO (Uruguay) said that his delegation would support the draft resolution. An increase in resources was essential both to the future of the UNDP and to the development of the developing countries. Moreover, his delegation had supported the Economic and Social Council resolution 1615 (LI). If UNDP's resources were to be doubled within the next four years, the estimate of 9.6 per cent annual growth must be increased, or stagnation would result.

30. Mr. ABHYANKAR (India) said his delegation hoped that the General Assembly would endorse the conclusions of Economic and Social Council resolution 1615 (LI). During the past few days the Committee had heard many warm tributes to the retiring Administrator of UNDP, but in his delegation's view the best form which such a tribute could take was deeds, rather than mere words. Mr. Hoffman had hoped that the Programme's resources would be doubled by 1975, and that hope should be translated into a reality. Unfortunately, recent events furnished no reasonable expectation that such an increase was possible. The Second Development Decade was already showing signs of being condemned to the fate of the First Development Decade. If that was to be avoided, all Member States must

¹ United Nations publication, Sales No.: E.70.I.10.

take stock of the present situation, and separate long-term interests from short-term difficulties. His delegation recognized that as a result of the current monetary crisis, many countries were faced with transitional problems, but it did not understand why they could not, at least in principle, reiterate their commitments to the Second Development Decade. In that context, his delegation particularly welcomed the intention of Sweden to make a substantial increase in its contribution to multilateral economic development efforts, and hoped that many other delegations would take a similar constructive attitude.

31. A number of points should be borne in mind with regard to Economic and Social Council resolution 1615 (LI), which the Committee was called upon to endorse. The whole exercise of country programming using indicative planning figures depended on a reasonable assurance of financial stability for UNDP; otherwise, countries could not undertake a rational programming exercise. Moreover, that stability should not be at the lowest possible level of contributions. That the resources of UNDP would increase at least at the same rate as the average of the past few years was, according to paragraph 13 of the Consensus, only one of the assumptions which must be made, but in fact even that minimum increase had not been attained. Without any assurance that the international community was ready to honour the moral commitments into which it had entered, the whole exercise of international multilateral co-operation would be endangered. His delegation therefore earnestly commended Economic and Social Council resolution 1615 (LI) which introduced nothing new, but merely reiterated accepted principles and asked Governments to act on them.

32. The representative of the Netherlands had implied that paragraph 1 of that resolution was unrealistic. However, that was not the case, since the paragraph in question merely requested the Governing Council to review the planning estimates at the first possible opportunity. He therefore hoped that all delegations would reconsider their position and vote for the draft resolution.

33. Mr. RAJOHNSON (Madagascar) said that his delegation was a co-sponsor of the draft resolution, which involved nothing more than a reaffirmation of points which had already been made. If the international community accepted that it must provide valid aid to developing countries, it was only logical to endorse Economic and Social Council resolution 1615 (LI). His delegation noted that a number of the draft resolutions before the Committee referred to the desirability of an increase in the resources available to UNDP. In that situation, there was no reason why the present draft should not be adopted.

34. Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation well understood and supported the just demands of the developing countries for a substantial increase in the amount of assistance granted to them by the developed capitalist countries, particularly because the latter bore a heavy responsibility for the economic backwardness of the developing countries. However, it was important to eliminate flaws in UNDP and the other organizations in the United Nations system involved in the development effort, and in that connexion he wished to draw attention to the fact that the financial contributions

of the Soviet Union were still not being used to the full. Specifically, 15 million roubles contributed by the USSR to UNDP had remained unutilized. In considering the scope and amount of assistance which it would grant, his country could not fail to take that and other flaws into account, and his delegation would therefore abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1150.

35. Mr. RUTTEN (Netherlands) observed that several sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1150 had referred to paragraph 1 of Economic and Social Council resolution 1615 (LI), and specifically to the expression "at the first possible opportunity". Those speakers had implied that that expression possessed a very special meaning, and he would welcome clarification as to how they interpreted the phrase. In any event, the present text of the draft resolution did not make their intentions fully clear, and should be revised in order to do so.

36. Moreover, paragraph 1 of Economic and Social Council resolution 1615 (LI) implied that the Programme's resources could be doubled merely by reviewing the planning estimates, which was clearly an impossibility. Again, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1150 should indicate what they had in mind.

37. The CHAIRMAN announced that draft resolution A/C.2/L.1150 would be put to the vote.

38. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) requested a recorded vote to be taken on the draft resolution.

39. Mr. KITCHEN (United States of America) said he was slightly surprised at the haste with which the vote was being taken. The representative of Barbados had put three very pertinent questions which his delegation hoped would be answered before the voting, while the representative of Sudan had indicated the possibility of making the draft resolution more flexible. Neither issue had as yet been resolved.

40. The CHAIRMAN said that discussion on the draft resolution had been exhaustive and he felt obliged to invoke rule 129 of the rules of procedure, which stated that after the Chairman had announced the beginning of voting, no representative could interrupt the voting except on a point of order in connexion with the actual conduct of the voting. He invited the Committee to proceed to a recorded vote on the draft resolution.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Bahrain, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cuba, Cyprus, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Canada, Japan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, France, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Khmer Republic, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Draft resolution A/C.2/L.1150 was adopted by 81 votes to 5, with 25 abstentions.

41. Mr. McCLEAN (Barbados) said that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution despite certain misgivings concerning the wording of Economic and Social Council resolution 1615 (LI). Draft resolution A/C.2/L.1150 was aimed at harmonizing the projections of the Programme with the anticipated expansion in UNDP resources. If that expansion was achieved, he was sure that the additional resources would be well utilized; if it was not, the gap between planned expenditure and actual revenue would dramatize the failure of the world community to assist the developing countries adequately.

42. Mr. BRADLEY (Argentina) said that his delegation had abstained in the voting because it believed that Economic and Social Council resolution 1615 (LI) and draft resolution A/C.2/L.1150 were insufficiently clear. However, he wished to point out that Argentina had substantially increased its contributions to UNDP during recent years and that at the forthcoming Pledging Conference it would be raising its contribution by \$100,000, to a figure of \$800,000.

43. Mr. RUTTEN (Netherlands) said that his delegation had abstained in the voting for reasons which he had explained during the debate. It was regrettable that more time had not been allowed for discussion and for a possible compromise to be reached, and he hoped that the course taken with regard to draft resolution A/C.2/L.1150 would not be a precedent for future decisions of the Second Committee or the General Assembly.

44. The CHAIRMAN said that he would have recognized any delegation wishing to submit a formal proposal on the draft resolution for the Committee's consideration. However, the objections raised to the draft resolution had been more in the nature of suggestions or expressions of hope.

45. Mr. KITCHEN (United States of America) said he wished to associate himself with the remarks made by the representative of the Netherlands. The Consensus had been adopted after considerable discussion and it was clear that Governments would need some time to satisfy themselves on the full implications of the restructuring of UNDP which had been undertaken. Furthermore, it should be emphasized that the Consensus was far from complete. The growth rate projection of 15 per cent was based only on the four chapters of the Capacity Study to which the Governing Council had been able to address itself thus far. His delegation had therefore seen no alternative but to vote against the draft resolution.

46. Mr. AMIRMOKRI (Iran) said that his country had been a notable contributor to UNDP in the past and that it intended to increase its contribution by at least 70 per cent in 1972.

47. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider draft resolution A/C.2/L.1151 concerning the United Nations Capital Development Fund.

48. Mr. RUTTEN (Netherlands) said that it was not logical to express the hope, in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, that the report to be presented by the Administrator to the Governing Council of UNDP would make possible the beginning of the effective operation of the United Nations Capital Development Fund, while at the same time appealing to Member States, in operative paragraph 5, to provide substantial contributions to the Fund so as to make it operational and effective. The appeal expressed in operative paragraph 5 would be more effective if discussion on the matter in the Governing Council had produced positive results. Accordingly, his delegation would like a separate vote to be taken on operative paragraph 5. Although it would abstain in that vote, it would vote for the draft resolution as a whole, since it wished to give its support in principle to the idea of having a third form of development aid. However, prospects for making the Fund effective depended on the outcome of further discussions in which he hoped delegations from developing and developed countries alike would join in seeking a positive solution to the frustrating state of affairs which now existed.

49. Mr. AYOUB (Tunisia) said he hoped the developed countries would give their support to the United Nations Capital Development Fund at the next session of the Governing Council, so that a positive decision could be taken on the matter at the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly.

50. Mr. GATES (New Zealand) requested a recorded vote to be taken both on operative paragraph 5 and on the draft resolution as a whole.

51. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) said that he would vote both for operative paragraph 5 and for the draft resolution as a whole. However, he felt that the objections raised by the representative of the Netherlands had some merit; the problem might be overcome by deleting the word "effective" in operative paragraph 2.

52. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) drew attention to the fact that the Fund had already been operating for several years, although not effectively. It would therefore be factually incorrect to delete the word "effective" in operative paragraph 2.

53. Mr. VERCELES (Philippines) said that, in the light of the comments made by the representative of Pakistan, it would be appropriate to insert the word "more" before "effective".

54. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) said that, since the Fund was already operating, the words "the beginning of" in operative paragraph 2 should be deleted.

55. Mr. AYOUB (Tunisia) said that the deletion of the word "effective" in operative paragraph 2 was unacceptable. Nor did he see the need to add the word "more", as suggested by the representative of the Philippines. Furthermore, he found the representative of Sudan's suggestion to delete the words "the beginning of" unjustified. He therefore hoped that those representatives would not press their amendments.

56. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) said that the words "the beginning of the effective operation of the United Nations Capital Development Fund" had a particular significance in the light of the Fund's history. Operative paragraph 2 stated that the Fund was operating, but not effectively. Operative paragraph 5, on the other hand, made it clear that the Fund would not become fully operational and effective unless Member States provided substantial contributions. In order to meet the objections raised by the representatives of the Sudan and the Philippines, he would be prepared to add the word "fully" before "operational" in operative paragraph 5.

57. Mr. SINGH (India) said that operative paragraphs 2 and 5 expressed two distinct ideas, both of which should be incorporated in the draft resolution. He suggested that operative paragraph 2 should be left as it stood and that the words "so as to make the Fund operational and effective" in operative paragraph 5—an idea already expressed in operative paragraph 2—should be deleted.

58. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) said that he could accept the deletion proposed by the representative of India. If, however, it was decided to retain the last phrase in operative paragraph 5, the word "more" should be inserted before "operational".

59. Mr. LAGOS (Chile) said he failed to see any contradiction between operative paragraphs 2 and 5, which dealt with two separate ways of making the Fund more effective. However, he could agree to the insertion of the word "more" before "operational" in operative paragraph 5.

60. Mr. SIBAJENE (Zambia) said that the two operative paragraphs in question dealt with two separate subjects: past performance and future performance. In order to retain the full meaning, the last phrase in operative paragraph 5 should be amended to read "so as to make the Fund fully operational and more effective".

61. Mr. SINGH (India) explained that he had suggested the deletion of the last phrase in operative paragraph 5 merely in order to meet the objections raised by some delegations and in the hope that the representative of the Netherlands might withdraw his request for a separate vote on that paragraph.

62. Mr. RUTTEN (Netherlands) said that the problem was not just one of semantics. The main consideration was that no substantial contributions to the United Nations Capital Development Fund would be forthcoming unless the developed and developing countries reached a new agreement concerning the status of the Fund. While he hoped that progress would be made in that direction, until such time as a new approach to the Fund was evolved, he was sceptical about the possibilities offered by an appeal to

Member States. He recalled that in the past the developing countries as well as the developed countries had contributed very little to the Fund. Until all countries concerned took a fresh look at the problem, it was of doubtful value to appeal to Member States for substantial contributions, whether or not the last phrase in operative paragraph 5 was included.

63. Mr. DIALLO (Upper Volta) said that the impression should not be given that it was the developing countries and not the developed countries which bore the responsibility for making the United Nations Capital Development Fund more effective. The developing countries had done much to accommodate the wishes of the developed countries on the matter, but their conciliatory attitude had not been reciprocated. It was quite true that the contributions of the developing countries to the United Nations Capital Development Fund had been low: that reflected the fact that the resources of those countries were extremely limited. If the developed countries persisted in their intransigent attitude, it was doubtful whether the developing countries would feel able to abandon the Capital Development Fund, even if it proved to be a chimera. However, he believed that the Fund would prove extremely valuable in the future, and he hoped the developed countries would display the goodwill necessary to work out a solution acceptable to all parties concerned.

64. He could accept the amendment to draft resolution A/C.2/L.1151 proposed by the representative of India if that amendment induced more delegations to vote for the text and made it possible for the representative of the Netherlands to withdraw his request for a separate vote on operative paragraph 5.

65. Mr. GOBBA (Egypt) said that the differences of opinion which had arisen were purely over matters of style; it was generally agreed that the Fund should start to operate effectively.

66. His delegation agreed with the representative of the Netherlands that developing countries had as yet made only a limited contribution to the Fund. However, the reason for that situation was that up to the present the Fund's operations had been ineffective. The beginning of effective operations would be accompanied by an increase in contributions.

67. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) said his delegation had felt that the reasons for the Fund's lack of success were so well known that there was no need to reiterate them. However, the comments of the representative of the Netherlands might create the impression that the failure of the Fund was due to lack of enthusiasm on the part of developing countries or to the absence of a realistic basis for its operations. It was clear from the history of the Fund that that was not the case. The developing countries had consistently attempted, in the light of the boycott of the Fund by developed countries, to achieve an acceptable system of mutual assistance. However, they were frustrated in that attempt by the fact that they were unable to contribute to the Fund in the convertible currencies which were essential for its successful operation. It was for that reason that they insisted on participation by developed countries, in order that the Fund might have hard cur-

rencies available for its operations. Operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution was necessary not because the original concept of the Fund had been unrealistic, but because it had become unrealistic through lack of those currencies. It was not the developing countries which were responsible for that situation.

68. Mr. RUTTEN (Netherlands) said that he had not meant to imply that the Fund's failure should be attributed to lack of support on the part of developing countries. He had indeed taken note of their moderate contributions, but had stated that the failure of the Fund resulted from lack of agreement between developed and developing countries as to what form the third type of development assistance should take. The Fund could not become effective until such agreement was reached.

69. The CHAIRMAN said that the co-sponsors of the draft resolution agreed that operative paragraph 2 should remain in its present form. The Committee had before it two proposals regarding operative paragraph 5, that of India to delete the words "so as to make the Fund operational and effective", and that of the representative of Zambia to amend them to read "so as to make the Fund fully operational and more effective".

70. Mr. AYOUB (Tunisia) said he could not agree to the deletion of the words "so as . . . effective" from operative paragraph 5 because that paragraph was identical to paragraph 5 of General Assembly resolution 2690 (XXV), which was reaffirmed in operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution. However, he could accept the Zambian representative's proposal. Lastly, he saw no contradiction between operative paragraphs 2 and 5.

71. The CHAIRMAN said that if there was no objection he would take it that the Committee approved the Zambian representative's amendment.

It was so agreed.

72. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1151.

At the request of the representative of the Netherlands, a separate vote was taken on operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1151. At the request of the representative of New Zealand, a recorded vote was taken on that paragraph.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cuba, Cyprus, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico,

Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

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

Abstaining: Austria, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Khmer Republic, Mongolia, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Operative paragraph 5 was adopted by 74 votes to 9, with 22 abstentions.

At the request of the representative of New Zealand, a recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution as a whole.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cuba, Cyprus, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

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

Abstaining: Austria, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Khmer Republic, Mongolia, Netherlands,² New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Draft resolution A/C.2/L.1151, as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 75 votes to 7, with 24 abstentions.²

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.

² The delegation of the Netherlands informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.