



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/Rev.2, A/C.2/L.1153, A/C.2/L.1177 to L.1179);
- (b) United Nations Capital Development Fund;
- (c) Technical co-operation activities undertaken by the Secretary-General;
- (d) United Nations Volunteers programme

1. The CHAIRMAN announced that the delegation of Romania had joined the co-sponsors of the amendment contained in document A/C.2/L.1178.

2. Mr. TODOROV (Bulgaria) said that his delegation had no objection in principle to increasing the participation of Member States in the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). Since the establishment of UNDP, many new Member States which were closely concerned with its activities had been admitted to the United Nations.

3. However, the text of the draft resolution before the Committee (A/C.2/L.1146/Rev.2), and in particular operative paragraph 1, was not acceptable to his delegation. The introductory part of the paragraph retained the standard discriminatory formula which prevented some States interested in the activities of UNDP and able to make a substantial contribution to them, such as the German Democratic Republic, from participating in the Programme. His delegation had therefore co-sponsored the amendment contained in document A/C.2/L.1178, and wished to draw attention to a recent decision of the Third Committee, taken at its 1866th meeting, concerning the participation of all States in the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. That was a precedent which the Second Committee might well follow.

4. Subparagraphs (a) and (b) of operative paragraph 1 employed an approach to the distribution of seats which was neither useful nor equitable. The division of countries into developed and developing, based on arguable criteria, would not be in the long-term interests of the developing countries. It was arbitrary, and deviated from the criteria applied to the composition of other United Nations organs. In particular, the number of seats allocated to the socialist countries was manifestly unjust; he therefore urged the

sponsors of the draft resolution to reconsider their position. A distribution of seats based on the principle of equitable geographical distribution would be greatly preferable, and the fairest solution would be to follow the model, for both number and distribution of seats, of the Industrial Development Board. Accordingly, his delegation could not support the amendment contained in document A/C.2/L.1177.

5. Mr. VERCELES (Philippines) said that his delegation was not in a position to speak on behalf of the other co-sponsors of the draft resolution. For its part, it believed that the adoption of the amendment contained in document A/C.2/L.1178 would have far-reaching consequences, resulting from the introduction into the draft of a political question which remained unresolved after lengthy discussions in various forums. Since discussions relating to the principle of universality were still going on, his delegation found the amendment totally unacceptable. If accepted, it would destroy the very foundation of UNDP, with disastrous consequences for the developing countries.

6. His delegation did not agree that the provisions of the draft resolution were unfair to the countries of Eastern Europe. The main purpose of the draft was simply to enlarge the membership of the Governing Council, without disturbing the principles underlying the establishment of UNDP by General Assembly resolution 2029 (XX). The seats occupied by economically advanced countries were allocated on the basis of their financial contribution. Moreover, there were nine Eastern European countries, and according to the terms of the draft resolution, four of them would have seats on the Governing Council. That ratio should be compared with 11 seats for the 41 African Member States, and nine for the 33 Asian States and Yugoslavia.

7. The representative of Greece had suggested that the permanent members of the Security Council should have permanent seats on the Governing Council, and that members of the latter which were not permanent members of the Security Council should not be eligible for re-election. His delegation felt that it would be unfair to donor countries to attempt to reproduce in the Governing Council of UNDP the pattern of membership of the Security Council, since that pattern did not reflect the pattern of actual contributions.

8. His delegation could not accept the suggestion of the representative of India relating to operative paragraph 1 (c). The purpose of the passage in question was to take into account the fact that a number of the regions had subregions. The amendment contained in document A/C.2/L.1177, relating to a further increase in the membership of the Governing Council, was also unacceptable.

9. With regard to the amendments submitted by the United Kingdom (A/C.2/L.1153), his delegation could not agree to deferring action on the draft resolution until after the thirteenth session of the Governing Council. The United Kingdom suggestions in fact contained, in the guise of an amendment, a completely different proposal, which the Committee could act on separately from the draft resolution. If necessary, his delegation would request a prior vote on document A/C.2/L.1146/Rev.2.

10. The Canadian amendment (A/C.2/1179) would not fit logically into the draft resolution, since the question was one which the Governing Council should take up of its own volition. However, his delegation had an open mind on the subject, since, under the terms of the amendment, the final decision would be left to the Governing Council.

11. Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation was not over-enthusiastic at the prospect of enlarging the Governing Council. Experience with the economic organs of the United Nations had shown that enlargement did not automatically lead to increased effectiveness. Equitable geographical representation on the Governing Council was already ensured; attention should therefore be given to increasing the Council's effectiveness within the present framework. His delegation could support the idea of enlargement but a rational figure for membership should be found as existing economic bodies varied widely in size. The Board of UNIDO which consisted of 45 members appointed in accordance with the principle of equitable geographical representation might provide such a model. The countries of Eastern Europe had 5 of the 45 seats on the Board; that seemed fair since the Eastern European group sometimes included countries from other geographical groups.

12. His delegation would not submit any formal amendment on the number or the distribution of seats on the Governing Council but hoped that the co-sponsors would bear its views in mind and make appropriate amendments themselves. The amendment in document A/C.2/L.1177 was unacceptable. It was important that agreement be reached on the basis of the UNIDO formula and sponsors of the draft resolution and of the amendments should hold consultations with that in mind.

13. Delegations of various countries had found it necessary to submit a formal amendment (A/C.2/L.1178), based on the idea that the UNDP should become truly universal. That was a matter of principle that concerned all countries and even the future of the entire Programme. The representative of the Philippines had just said that it was a complex political question which had yet to be resolved and that the sponsors of the draft resolution should act accordingly. It was, indeed, a political matter since, for a long time, for political reasons unrelated to the tasks or objectives of the United Nations or the United Nations Development Programme, various individual States, despite their desire to participate in the Programme, had been prevented from doing so. Now that the principle of universality was gaining acceptance, the time had come for the Second Committee to take a stand and put an end to that anomaly by adopting the amendment. UNDP would not thereby be destroyed as the representative of the Philippines had said; on the contrary, it would be strengthened.

14. In the previous day's discussion on special measures for the least developed among developing countries his delegation's position had been based on financial considerations. There was no reason to renounce the possibility of attracting further resources or to give up the opportunity to use experience that might help the developing countries. He disagreed with what the representative of the Philippines had said concerning the representation of the Eastern European countries. Sponsors of the draft resolution should remember that, unlike the situation in IBRD or IMF, in UNDP voting power was not proportionate to the magnitude of one's contribution. Two days earlier the Third Committee had decided by a majority that all countries should participate in the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, thus giving further support to the principle of universality. He hoped that the Second Committee would follow that example by supporting the amendment in document A/C.2/L.1178.

15. Mr. OGISO (Japan) said that, although his delegation would prefer to submit the question to the Governing Council prior to taking a decision, it understood the desire of members to enlarge the Council and would give that desire favourable consideration. If the amendment in document A/C.2/L.1153 were put to the vote, he would be prepared to vote in its favour. However, if the majority wished to settle the matter now without waiting for the Governing Council's view, he could support the draft resolution in document A/C.2/L.1146/Rev.2 which was well-balanced and took a variety of interests into account. It was his understanding that the purpose of the draft resolution was to increase the membership of the Governing Council without, however, changing its basic character as stated in General Assembly resolution 2029 (XX). So far the Governing Council had worked effectively by using consensus procedures. Since some people had expressed doubt whether the Council would be able to work effectively once its composition had changed, he hoped that no adverse effects would result therefrom and that the traditional consensus procedures would not be impaired.

16. The representative of India had said that subparagraph 1 (c) of the draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1146/Rev.2) should be deleted since the allocation of seats should be left to the regional groups concerned. However, the representative of the Philippines had explained that, in view of the special situation in some regional groups, the subparagraph was necessary but that it would not apply automatically to all groups. On that understanding he accepted the subparagraph.

17. The representative of the Soviet Union had referred to the amendment in document A/C.2/L.1178 proposing that all States be allowed to participate in UNDP. Since the object of the draft resolution was to increase the membership of the Governing Council without changing its basic character, the amendment should not be adopted at the present stage.

18. The representative of Greece had submitted an oral amendment at a previous meeting, adding a clause prohibiting the direct re-eligibility of members except those with permanent seats on the Security Council. The practice in UNDP was to give all major donor countries—not just the

permanent members of the Security Council—an opportunity to participate continuously in the Governing Council. If the Greek suggestion was accepted it might have an adverse effect on the willingness of major contributors to increase their contributions to UNDP. His delegation did not agree with the representative of the Soviet Union that the number of seats on the Governing Council should be considered in the light of the number of seats on the Board of UNIDO since the composition of each body was based on different considerations. His delegation would oppose the amendment in document A/C.2/L.1177 since the further increase of members recommended therein might upset the delicate balance achieved in the draft resolution.

19. With regard to the Canadian amendment (A/C.2/L.1179), his delegation supported the idea and, if the proposal were put to the vote, would vote in its favour. However, it did not seem absolutely necessary to adopt the amendment since the question it referred to would be taken up in any case by the Governing Council when its membership was increased.

20. Mr. HUTAGALUNG (Indonesia) associated his delegation with the Philippine representative's remarks concerning the amendments in documents A/C.2/L.1153 and A/C.2/L.1177.

21. Mr. DIALLO (Upper Volta) said that his delegation was opposed to any attempt to perpetuate the existing inequality between developing and developed countries in the Governing Council. If they were to play a constructive role in UNDP—which, after all, was financed by voluntary contributions—the developing countries must be assured of adequate representation in the Governing Council, and representation should not depend on the size of a country's contributions. His delegation also rejected the Greek representative's suggestion at an earlier meeting that the permanent members of the Security Council should enjoy permanent representation on the Governing Council.

22. His delegation would vote against the United Kingdom amendment (A/C.2/L.1153) because it was appropriate for the General Assembly, which was a truly representative body, to provide directives to the Governing Council, and not vice versa. It would also vote against the Canadian amendment (A/C.2/L.1179) because it appeared to imply that any increase in the membership of the Governing Council would *ipso facto* jeopardize the continued efficiency and speedy conduct of its business. Moreover, the amendment allowed the Governing Council too much latitude with regard to the mechanisms called for. The amendment contained in document A/C.2/L.1177 was also unacceptable to his delegation; like the draft resolution itself, that amendment did not allocate a sufficient number of seats to Africa which, with 41 Member States, accounted for 42 per cent of the developing countries. Lastly, his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole in its present form.

23. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom), referring to the Philippine representative's remarks, said that his delegation's amendments (A/C.2/L.1153) definitely were amendments to document A/C.2/L.1146/Rev.2 and did not constitute a different proposal.

24. Those amendments were prompted by his delegation's concern regarding the practical problems which would result from an increase in the membership of the Governing Council; it had never stated that the Council should not be expanded at some point. Moreover, those problems would be compounded if the amendments in document A/C.2/L.1177 were adopted. The Canadian amendment (A/C.2/L.1179), however, supported the logic of the United Kingdom amendments.

25. He agreed with the representative of Upper Volta that the General Assembly could provide guidelines to the Governing Council; however, the relationship between those bodies was a partnership and, if changes were envisaged in the procedures of a working body such as the Council, it was only natural that it should be consulted first. The Bulgarian representative had attached greater significance to minor amendments to a resolution adopted by the Third Committee than was warranted. The amendment in document A/C.2/L.1178, which clearly had in view the participation, in particular, of the German Democratic Republic, was not timely. Until a solution had been reached to the German question, the matter of that country's participation and membership must remain a political issue to be decided by the General Assembly.

*Mr. Brito (Brazil), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.*

26. Mr. RUTTEN (Netherlands) said that he had an open mind towards the proposal to enlarge the membership of the Governing Council. He was aware, however, that its enlargement would raise two problems, that of the operational efficiency of the Council and that of the relationships between donor and recipient countries. He was therefore impressed by the wisdom of the United Kingdom proposal that further consultations should be held on the matter and that the advice should be sought of the Governing Council itself and of the Economic and Social Council.

27. The fact that separate suggestions had been made to increase the size of the Governing Council to 45, 48 and 51 members was proof enough that the time was not yet ripe to take a final decision. The first step should be to consult UNDP as to the implications of adopting one proposal rather than another. It would be unfair and unwise to reach a premature decision and leave it to UNDP to face the ensuing consequences unprepared. His delegation therefore urged members of the Committee to vote in favour of the United Kingdom amendments (A/C.2/L.1153). If, however, the Committee did not see fit to do so, then his delegation would support the draft resolution, whose advocacy of a membership of 48 was the most that it could accept. However, it would request a separate vote on subparagraphs 1 (a) and (b) together, on which it would abstain. Moreover, if the United Kingdom amendments were not adopted, the draft resolution should at least be amended to incorporate the paragraph proposed by the Canadian delegation (A/C.2/L.1179) which would help solve some of the difficulties that an enlarged membership would pose for the UNDP.

28. He was in entire agreement with the representative of the United Kingdom that the amendment contained in document A/C.2/L.1178 raised political issues which it was

not for the Second Committee to resolve. It was likely that, as a result of negotiations that were already in progress, the question to which the amendment made implicit reference would shortly be resolved and that a decision on the matter would more easily be reached at the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly.

29. His delegation found the suggestion of the Greek representative regarding the membership of the Governing Council totally unfair and unworkable and therefore unacceptable.

30. Mr. ZAGORIN (United States of America) agreed with the representative of the Netherlands that the wisest solution would be to adopt the amendments submitted by the United Kingdom (A/C.2/L.1153), especially in the light of certain important events that had occurred since the draft resolution was first submitted. The various different suggestions that had been heard regarding the size of the Governing Council of UNDP reflected, more than anything, the conflicting interests of different countries. They pointed, moreover, to the advisability of taking more time to resolve the fundamental question of representation and of allowing the Governing Council to examine what effect an enlarged membership would have on its activities. Although an increased participation of Member States in the Council would not necessarily lead to inefficiency, there was no denying that it did raise some serious problems. It should not be forgotten, moreover, that the Governing Council had so far worked extremely well with its current membership. His delegation could not therefore support the draft resolution, nor the amendment contained in document A/C.2/L.1177. The Canadian amendment (A/C.2/L.1179), which should in any case be part of any proposal to enlarge the Council, added weight to the proposal of the United Kingdom delegation that the matter should be reconsidered at the fifty-third session of the Economic and Social Council.

31. With respect to the amendment contained in document A/C.2/L.1178, he felt that it would be extremely unwise to upset the delicate negotiations affecting European harmony and security already in progress and that the matter referred to should wait until larger political issues had been resolved.

32. In answer to a point raised by the representative of Upper Volta, he emphasized that the fact that contribu-

tions were voluntary did not mean that members of the Governing Council should be any the less preoccupied that they were used in the most effective and productive manner. The needs of recipient countries were such that they could not allow resources intended for them to be wasted or used inefficiently. Moreover, if voluntary contributions were to be made, the Governments of donor countries should be able to satisfy themselves that their money was being properly used.

33. Mr. MUELLER (Austria) said he was in favour of an enlargement of the Governing Council if it meant a greater participation of countries in UNDP activities. The draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1146/Rev.2) appeared generally to satisfy the desires expressed by a great many delegations. His own delegation would therefore vote in favour of it and hoped that it would receive the support of the Committee.

34. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that he was not against the principle of a larger Governing Council but was anxious that any increase in membership should be kept as small as possible for the sake of greater efficiency. Like the representative of the Netherlands, he could not possibly entertain any proposal to enlarge the Council to more than 48 members, whose distribution, moreover, should be both geographical and a reflection of the relationship between donor and recipient countries.

35. Although his delegation would abstain on the United Kingdom amendments (A/C.2/L.1153) which, if adopted, would cause a considerable waste of time, it would support the Canadian amendment (A/C.2/L.1179), as it drew attention to the serious consequences which an enlarged membership would have for the Governing Council.

36. The amendment contained in document A/C.2/L.1177 advocated an excessively large membership and might encourage the submission of proposals for an even greater increase. It was therefore unacceptable to the French delegation. The amendment contained in document A/C.2/L.1178 was likewise unacceptable, because of the harm it might cause to negotiations that were being actively pursued outside the ambit of the United Nations. If it was adopted, it might in fact have the opposite effect to that sought by its sponsors.

*The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.*