

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records



**SECOND COMMITTEE, 1406th
MEETING**

Friday, 12 November 1971,
at 3.25 p.m.

NEW YORK

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

*In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Britó (Brazil),
Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.*

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.1177-1179);**
- (b) **United Nations Capital Development Fund;**
- (c) **Technical co-operation activities undertaken by the
Secretary-General;**
- (d) **United Nations Volunteers programme**

1. Mr. KARKOSZKA (Poland) said that while he understood why developing countries were submitting the draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1146/Rev.2), he was not convinced that it could have the desired effect, for an increase in the membership of the Governing Council of UNDP might reduce its efficiency and create financial difficulties. He had serious doubts concerning the sixth preambular paragraph, since the Governing Council had so far efficiently managed the funds of UNDP and there was no reason to suppose that it could not do so in the future. If, nevertheless, the majority was in favour of a larger Governing Council, such a decision should, in view of its importance, be arrived at by consensus. In addition, there would have to be an equitable geographical distribution of seats. Again with reference to the sixth preambular paragraph, he expressed the view that allocating more seats to countries benefiting from UNDP programmes was not a matter exclusively related to the question of resources. The tasks of UNDP were broader and more important than that, since it helped to promote co-operation at the world level. The question should be studied jointly with other United Nations bodies such as UNIDO, UNCTAD and the Economic and Social Council. The best solution would be the UNIDO formula, and the Polish delegation hoped that the draft resolution would be amended accordingly.

2. His delegation would support the amendment proposed in document A/C.2/L.1178, which it considered very important in that it tended to strengthen the universality of United Nations bodies and, after the entry of the People's Republic of China into the United Nations, only confirmed the trend towards a stricter application of that principle. The economic potential of the German Democratic Republic in particular should be utilized in the interests of the least developed among the developing countries. Contrary to what had been said by the Philippines representative at

the previous meeting, the amendment tended not to weaken UNDP but to strengthen it.

3. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) recalled that his delegation had already had occasion to advocate enlargement of a number of United Nations bodies. That view was shared by the Economic and Social Council, which had recently adopted a resolution on increasing the number of its members. The Governing Council of UNDP should also have a larger membership, if only to meet the needs of States which had more recently been admitted to the Organization. He agreed that it was a more delicate matter in respect of the Governing Council of UNDP, since there it was complicated by factors not present in the case of other bodies. The distribution of seats as between recipient and donor countries was not governed by the same principles and, with respect to the Governing Council, there was no fixed precedent. Three kinds of difficulties stood in the way of a consensus. First, in the application of the principle of equitable geographical representation as between the developing countries and the developed countries, the latter should be represented in greater proportion in view of the special nature of the Governing Council and the role which they played in it. Secondly, the question of expanding the membership of the Governing Council differed from such a measure in other bodies in that the Council was not a strictly legislative organ but dealt primarily with the implementation of programmes. In that connexion, he understood the concern shown by the Canadian delegation in its amendment (A/C.2/L.1179), but he felt that what it proposed had serious implications for the way in which the various countries would participate in the work of the Council. If the proposal was adopted, there would be the danger that the developed countries might create within the Governing Council of UNDP a smaller governing council without any members from the developing countries. The expansion of the Governing Council would then have produced a result quite opposite to what had been intended. Moreover, it was for the Governing Council itself to examine at a later stage whether it was necessary to establish new mechanisms. Thirdly, the biggest problem was that of the number of seats to be allocated to the various groups. In view of the difficulties referred to by the developed countries in connexion with the 51 seats proposed by the Argentine delegation (A/C.2/L.1177), where three additional seats had been allocated to the developing countries, and in view of the need to arrive at an equitable distribution of seats between the developed and the developing countries, the Pakistan delegation was prepared to accept the figure of 48 seats although it would be in its immediate interest to support the figure of 51.

4. As to the draft resolution itself (A/C.2/L.1146/Rev.2), his delegation had two difficulties. First, he would welcome an explanation from the representative of the Philippines

concerning the seat for Yugoslavia mentioned in operative paragraph 1 (a). The second difficulty was more important and concerned operative paragraph 1 (c). That provision already existed for some of the regional groups but not for Asia, and he felt that it should be left to each regional group to decide whether or not to adopt it. He suggested that the subparagraph should be deleted or, if that was not acceptable, replaced by the following text: "Elections to the Governing Council of UNDP should ensure adequate rotation of seats among the members of the regional group".

5. The amendment proposed in document A/C.2/L.1178 to the effect that UNDP should be opened to all countries touched on a very ticklish problem which no United Nations body had been able to settle. At the current stage, when changes were being made in the working methods of the Governing Council, it was very difficult to give effect to that proposal, especially as its wording was very vague.

6. His delegation's final position on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1146/Rev.2 would depend on the reaction of its sponsors to the amendment he had just suggested and on the extent to which a consensus, or at least very broad agreement, was reached, for it was important not to adopt a decision that might do UNDP harm.

Mr. Reyes (Philippines) took the Chair.

7. Mr. CAVIGLIA STARICCO (Uruguay) said that his delegation had supported the original version of the draft resolution although it had not been one of its sponsors. Nor had it co-sponsored the subsequent versions of that draft resolution because it did not wish to tie its hands; and in view of the way the discussion had developed on the item, it was happy that it had adopted that attitude. Draft resolution A/C.2/L.1146/Rev.2 not only provided for the participation of a larger number of countries in the Governing Council but also—and that was very important—advocated a change in the distribution of seats among regions, a proposal which his delegation could not accept. The amendment proposed by the Argentine delegation (A/C.2/L.1177) was very close to the first revised version of the draft resolution, which had obtained wide support. The Uruguayan delegation was therefore in favour of that amendment. Since UNDP was responsible for promoting co-operation in assistance for development, it was a body with very special characteristics which had not yet taken account, in the composition of its Governing Council, of the principle of equitable geographical distribution. That was clearly shown by the fact that the developed member States, the principal donors, were strongly represented. The distribution of seats could therefore not be based on purely mathematical criteria. Moreover, while it was normal to allocate a large proportion of the seats to the developed countries, the number of seats allocated to the developing countries should be increased in proportion to the over-all increase in the number of seats.

8. As to the amendment proposed by the Canadian delegation (A/C.2/L.1179), the Uruguayan delegation considered it useful and was prepared to support it.

9. The question of increasing the size of the Governing Council of UNDP should be further examined very care-

fully with a view to arriving at a consensus, i.e. to respecting the interests of all the regions.

10. Mr. DO RIO-BRANCO (Brazil) said that he was disappointed that the amendment submitted by the representative of Argentina (A/C.2/L.1177) had not received a warmer welcome from the sponsors of the draft resolution, since that amendment not only embodied the general principles of enlargement of the Governing Body of UNDP—to which his delegation subscribed—but it also confined itself to repeating the criterion adopted by the 14 sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1146/Rev.1. He hoped those delegations would vote in favour of the amendment in question, not only for that reason but also with a view to maintaining the unity of the developing countries on an issue of major importance. What was more, the figure of 51 members, far from being one chosen at random, was designed precisely to reconcile conflicting interests. It had been argued that if 48 was bad, 51 was worse: the reasoning that the smaller the number of members, the less bad the effect would be could be reduced *ad absurdum* by proposing the elimination of the Governing Council altogether. None of the figures proposed was a magic formula: they were better or worse according to whether they permitted a more or less equitable distribution of seats in the Council. In that connexion, the Canadian amendment appeared to establish a rather strange relationship between the number of members of the body and its efficiency: not only was the validity of such an argument questionable in that it constituted a gross prejudgement, but the amendment itself, as the Philippine representative had observed, was out of context in a draft resolution dealing exclusively with the distribution of seats in the Governing Council and the enlargement necessary to ensure a better distribution. It was not for the Committee to tell the Governing Council what it had to do, and if it had to indicate one among the many attributes that the Council's action should possess, it should single out caution rather than speed. For those reasons, his delegation felt that the Canadian amendment should be rejected.

11. Mr. DIAW (Mali) was of the opinion that draft resolution A/C.2/L.1146/Rev.2 was of very great importance and that the question which it dealt with required special vigilance in order to avoid any discrimination. It was in fact unacceptable that some countries should be members of the Governing Council of UNDP because they were already members of specialized agencies and that others should be ruled out when they were just as ready to co-operate in international development activities. Mali was jealous of its independence, as was evidenced by the fact that it was one of the non-aligned countries. For that reason, he would vote in favour of amendment A/C.2/L.1178, which would safeguard the sacred principle of universality. He would also vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1146/Rev.2, but hoped that the sponsors would take account of the amendment proposed in document A/C.2/L.1178.

12. Mr. GATES (New Zealand) expressed the view that the proposal to enlarge the Governing Council had been submitted not because the Governing Council was too small to conduct its work effectively, but because the system of rotation of seats within each geographical group had not worked satisfactorily: that was equally true for the group

of which New Zealand was a member. Nevertheless, instead of solving the problem by establishing a more equitable system of rotation of the existing seats, it was proposed to resort to the easiest solution and to increase the number of members of the Council, a solution which would inevitably be adopted. His delegation believed that if that happened it would be more difficult for the Governing Council to discharge its functions efficiently. It was, however, prepared to accept the idea of a Council consisting of 48 members at the most: it would therefore vote in favour of the draft resolution, but against the amendment proposed in document A/C.2/L.1177. It was sympathetic to the objectives of the amendments proposed by the United Kingdom (A/C.2/L.1153) and agreed that the technical organs should have an opportunity to state their views on a question before a decision was taken by the political organ. The case in question, however, was essentially a political question, namely, the legitimate desire of some countries to be represented more frequently on the Governing Council, and not a technical question of efficiency. A repetition of the current debate in the Governing Council of UNDP and in the Economic and Social Council would therefore add nothing to the consideration of the question and the General Assembly should take a political decision on the matter during the current session. His delegation would therefore abstain in the vote on the United Kingdom amendments but it would whole-heartedly support the Canadian amendment (A/C.2/L.1179) because it thought that the Governing Council should be required to take any measures necessary to ensure that its increased membership would result in greater rather than less efficiency. Lastly, his delegation would vote against the amendment contained in document A/C.2/L.1178 since, although it understood the intention of the sponsors, it did not think that it was an opportune moment to change the current political framework governing the participation of States in UNDP.

13. Mr. FERNANDEZ-VILLAVARDE (Spain) supported the draft resolution which would increase the membership of the Governing Council in so far as it expressed a just aspiration and provided that it did not jeopardize the efficient working of the Council.

14. He would like the developing countries to make known their joint opinion regarding the amendment proposed in document A/C.2/L.1177.

15. The amendment contained in document A/C.2/L.1178 would, if it was adopted, have very profound repercussions; he thought that it did not relate to the question under consideration and he would vote against it for the same reasons as those indicated by the representatives of the United Kingdom, the Netherlands and Colombia, amongst others.

16. On the other hand, he shared the point of view expressed by the Canadian delegation in document A/C.2/L.1179. The Governing Council of UNDP should indeed adapt to new conditions. His delegation was also in favour of the amendment proposed orally by the delegation of Pakistan since it had always defended the principle of rotation of seats.

17. Mr. MORENO (Cuba) said that his delegation, which supported the principle of increasing the membership not only of the Governing Council of UNDP but also of various

other United Nations organs, welcomed the fact that many other delegations shared that view.

18. With regard to the membership of the Governing Council of UNDP, more particularly, he pointed out that the Committee had three different proposals before it—the draft resolution fixing the number of members at 48, the amendment of a group of Latin American countries establishing the number at 51, and the oral amendment of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics limiting the number to 45—and he thought that such a proliferation of proposals could only prolong the discussion. Accordingly, he appealed to the sponsors of the three proposals to meet together with a view to arriving at a solution which could satisfy the majority of interests. He wished to state, however, that whatever the outcome of any such consultations, his delegation would vote in favour of the figure which would eventually be fixed.

19. He indicated that he would certainly approve the United Kingdom amendment (A/C.2/L.1153), under which the supreme political organ of the United Nations would give the technical organ concerned an opportunity to consider the question first, if States which were members of that technical organ were not also members of the Second Committee. The States which were members of the Governing Council of UNDP were, however, almost all represented in the Second Committee and he did not therefore see why the Second Committee should not be competent to take a decision on the matter.

20. With regard to the Canadian amendment (A/C.2/L.1179), he thought that the proposal contained therein was outside the context of the draft resolution. The General Assembly at its twenty-sixth session could, of course, take note of the concern expressed by the representative of Canada in his amendment, but that should not form part of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1146/Rev.2, since that draft resolution did not deal with new mechanisms but only with the enlargement of the Governing Council. Observing that the Canadian amendment was not very clear he said that his delegation interpreted its purpose as being to establish within the Governing Council an organ which would control the Council. That being so, his delegation would vote against the amendment.

21. As for amendment A/C.2/L.1178, of which his delegation was a sponsor, he noted that very divergent opinions had been expressed regarding its content but he himself thought that the United Nations could not stand aside from reality but should admit to membership all countries which were in a position to make a contribution to the work of international technical co-operation. He expressed the hope that, in the interests of technical co-operation, amendment A/C.2/L.1178 would receive the support of all delegations.

22. Mr. VOLOSHIN (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) explained that in the view of his delegation, for which the matter was one of principle, the enlargement of an organ did not in itself guarantee the increased efficiency of that organ, which depended above all on a qualitative improvement.

23. His delegation nevertheless approved the proposal for the enlargement of the Governing Council of UNDP since it

believed that in that particular case it would ensure a better geographical distribution of seats.

24. Pointing out that at the preceding meeting the representative of Japan had said that the number of seats on the Governing Council should be determined in the light of certain differentiation factors, he said that although he understood that point of view he was afraid that if such a procedure was adopted it might result in a certain discrimination. On the other hand, he in no way shared the point of view of the representative of the Philippines that seats should be allocated according to contributions. In the view of his delegation, it was important above all to ensure equitable geographical distribution; that was not done by draft resolution A/C.2/L.1146/Rev.2.

25. As a sponsor of amendment A/C.2/L.1178, he recognized that that amendment was political in nature, as the representatives of the United Kingdom, the United States of America and the Netherlands, amongst others, had said. In that connexion, some representatives had held that the Second Committee was not the proper forum to decide the question of the universality of the United Nations. He believed, however, that the General Assembly, which was the parent today of the Second Committee, was precisely the organ competent to consider that question—a question which should and could be decided at the twenty-sixth session. In that connexion, he pointed out that at the 1866th meeting the Third Committee had adopted, as part of a draft resolution concerning action to combat racial discrimination, an amendment submitted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics which, like amendment A/C.2/L.1178, dealt with the question of universality. He therefore expressed the hope that the Second Committee would follow that example.

26. At the previous meeting the representative of the Netherlands had said that his delegation would have difficulty in voting in favour of amendment A/C.2/L.1178 but he pointed out to the representative of the Netherlands that a convention on the hijacking of aircraft—whose basic provisions dealt with universality—had recently been adopted at The Hague. He confessed that he did not understand the attitude of some Western countries, such as France or the United States of America, which did not accept the principle of universality in the Second Committee when they accepted it at The Hague. He inferred from that that when a question affected their own interests, the capitalist countries invoked the spirit of the United Nations Charter, but when a question affected the interests of the developing countries they did not hesitate to defy the provisions of the Charter in their decisions. He himself thought that the principle of universality should become a permanent element of the United Nations; he therefore expressed the hope that the amendment (A/C.2/L.1178) would receive a large number of votes.

27. Mr. O'RIORDAN (Ireland) thought the increase in the membership of the Governing Council of UNDP realistic, since it reflected a normal trend. Besides, the sponsors of the text had made praiseworthy efforts to reach a compromise. The Asian countries in particular had shown an admirable spirit of conciliation in accepting only nine seats.

28. He could not see how the amendments proposed by Canada and the United Kingdom would improve the draft resolution, because he did not share the fears of those delegations. On the other hand, he had no difficulty in accepting the oral amendment of the delegation of Pakistan.

29. Mr. SAIDI (Iran) said that as a co-sponsor of the draft resolution he could not support any of the proposed amendments, including that of the Latin American countries (A/C.2/L.1177), because he believed that the developing countries of the three continents were given more equitable representation on the Governing Council by the draft resolution. With respect to the Czechoslovak amendment (A/C.2/L.1178), he shared the views of the United Kingdom and Netherlands representatives. He could not support the Canadian amendment (A/C.2/L.1179) or the United Kingdom amendment (A/C.2/L.1153) because he did not share the fears of those two delegations concerning the efficiency of the Governing Council and because he found the Canadian amendment unwise and unnecessary. On the other hand, he endorsed the oral amendment proposed by the representative of Pakistan.

30. Mr. CONSTANTIN (Romania) felt that the principle of universality should be applied in UNDP so that all countries would, without discrimination, be able to participate in it. By recognizing present-day realities, the Organization would enhance the potential of UNDP and of international co-operation.

31. Mr. RAMIREZ-OCAMPO (Colombia), speaking as a co-sponsor of amendment A/C.2/L.1177, recalled that his delegation was one of the sponsors of the original draft resolution. As that draft resolution had raised difficulties, a first revision had been hastily prepared, with the result that his delegation had been unable to participate. Consequently, his delegation had joined some other Latin American delegations in submitting amendment A/C.2/L.1177. He was surprised to hear from some representatives that the Governing Council could be efficient with 48 members, but not with 51. Since it was important to ensure a proper balance, he believed that it would be easier to satisfy all the regional groups if the membership of the Governing Council were increased to 51.

32. His delegation regretted that it could not support the United Kingdom amendment.

33. As to the draft resolution itself, his delegation would vote in favour if the sponsors were prepared to accept the substance of amendment A/C.2/L.1177.

34. With regard to amendment A/C.2/L.1178, he wished to clarify his delegation's position. He recalled that, in the 1952nd plenary meeting of the General Assembly, his country's Minister for Foreign Affairs had spoken in favour of the principle of universality and said that in his view that principle should be applied to all United Nations organs, not only to UNDP. It was intolerable that certain countries should have to use the back-door to enter the precincts of the international community and for that reason the Charter must be revised to ensure the automatic admission of every sovereign State. Nevertheless, he agreed with the representative of the United Kingdom that the Second

Committee was not the proper forum for dealing with that question; it might better be discussed by the Sixth Committee or the First Committee. In any case, as the representative of the Ukrainian SSR had very rightly pointed out, it was clearly for the General Assembly to take a decision on the matter.

35. Referring more particularly to amendment A/C.2/L.1178, he said that it did not deal very clearly with the question of universality. He was sure that, in saying that UNDP "should be opened to all countries", the sponsors of that amendment did not intend to include Taiwan, but if the amendment was accepted, Taiwan could claim the right to participate in UNDP. It was a very serious and complex problem, and the sponsors of the amendment should consider that special aspect of the question. In the light of what he had said his delegation would vote against amendment A/C.2/L.1178.

36. As to amendment A/C.2/L.1179, he agreed with the representatives of Brazil and Cuba that it would be not very wise to adopt it.

37. He supported the suggestion of the representative of Cuba that the sponsors of the draft resolution and of the various amendments should meet with a view to agreeing on a text.

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

38. Mrs. NIKOI (Ghana), speaking as a co-sponsor of the draft resolution, said that the Canadian amendment (A/C.2/L.1179) was pointless, since it exceeded the scope of the draft resolution, whose purpose was only to ensure adoption of the principle of an increase in the membership of the Governing Council and to prescribe the procedures which were to govern the distribution of seats in the future. The Canadian amendment gave the impression that increasing the membership of the Governing Council—mainly for the benefit of the developing countries—would lessen the efficiency of the Council. Her delegation could not accept that insinuation and would vote against the amendment. She did, however, approve the proposal of Pakistan.

39. Recalling the statement of the representative of New Zealand that the efficiency of the Governing Council would be better ensured by establishing an improved system of rotating the seats on the Council than by increasing its membership, she said that what the sponsors of the draft resolution wished to have borne in mind was, on the contrary, the fact that a large number of developing countries had joined the ranks of the United Nations since the creation of UNDP.

40. Mr. BERLET (Canada) said that with a view to meeting the wishes of the Ghana delegation, he had decided to replace the words "to ensure the continued efficiency and speedy conduct of its business" in his delegation's amendment by the words "to enhance the efficiency and ensure the speedy conduct of its business".

41. Mrs. OULD DADDAH (Mauritania) said she supported the draft resolution since it would help to ensure a balance, which should always be the rule in the United Nations Organization. The membership of the Governing Council

must be increased if UNDP was to become more efficient and more representative. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics had expressed the fear that an increase in the membership of the Council might be detrimental to its efficiency, but it was her view that only an excessive increase would justify such a feeling.

42. Her delegation could not accept the suggestion of the representative of Greece to establish a system of weighted voting in the Governing Council of UNDP and to allocate permanent seats to the big countries. It was true that injustice was now rampant in the world and that the gap between the developed and the developing countries was widening; however, it was the duty of the United Nations not to reflect that injustice but to correct it.

43. While she appreciated the concern felt by the representative of Canada for the efficiency of UNDP, she pointed out that it was for the Governing Council alone to decide on its methods of work. Consequently, her delegation could not support the Canadian amendment.

44. The United Kingdom amendment was not really an amendment, but a new proposal to the effect that the Second Committee should not take a decision for the time being. She believed that the Governing Council of UNDP should reflect the situation as it was and that the figure proposed in the draft resolution was reasonable; she therefore hoped that the United Kingdom delegation would once more show its traditional goodwill by withdrawing its amendment.

45. Mr. VERCELES (Philippines), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution, regretted that they could not accept amendment A/C.2/L.1177, since they considered the figure of 48 members to be more reasonable.

46. In reply to the question of the representative of Pakistan whether it was fair to give Yugoslavia one of the seats allocated to Asia, he said it was, since that seat could not be left floating.

47. Although he understood the reasons which had prompted the representative of Pakistan to make a proposal concerning operative paragraph 1 (c), he preferred to keep the present wording.

48. As to the United Kingdom "amendment", it was not in his view an amendment at all but a new proposal. He pointed out that adoption of the United Kingdom amendment would automatically torpedo the draft resolution; and he formally requested the Chairman to conduct the vote strictly in accordance with the provisions of the final sentence of rule 131 and the whole of rule 132 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

49. He appealed to the members of the Committee to rise above all regional considerations when they were voting and to bear in mind only one thing: the need to ensure the integrity and the financial capacity of UNDP. The enlargement of the membership of the Governing Council was a question of only passing importance, but UNDP itself would continue to be the most important source of aid.

50. Mr. KUDRYAVTSEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), exercising his right of reply, took up the points

raised by certain representatives with regard to amendment A/C.2/L.1178, of which he was a co-sponsor. That amendment was not at all out of place, as some representatives had suggested, for in drafting it, the sponsors had taken as their guide the basic document governing the activities of the General Assembly—the Charter of the United Nations, which declared the determination of the States Members to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples. The United Nations Development Programme was part of that machinery, and it was only fitting to propose that participation in it should be opened to all countries.

51. As to the comment that his amendment was unacceptable because the question of UNDP membership had been decided at its establishment, he drew attention to Chapter IV of the Charter, which provided that the General Assembly could make recommendations on the powers and functions of any of the organs provided for in the Charter.

52. It had been said that the wording of the amendment was ambiguous; but he did not find it so. The participation of new countries which might make an important contribution to UNDP would open up new possibilities, just at a time when universality was of the utmost importance.

53. Mr. VOLOSHIN (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), exercising his right of reply, recalled that the delegations of the socialist and other countries had been striving for years to ensure universality in the activities of the United Nations and UNDP and that they always submitted an amendment reflecting that concern. The Colombian representative had misinterpreted the amendment in document A/C.2/L.1178 when he had linked it to other points that were being discussed in the United Nations. As to his remarks about Taiwan, he should bear in mind the fact that the General Assembly had restored the legitimate rights of the People's Republic of China and expelled the representatives of Chang Kai-shek from the Organization.

54. He had been sorry to note that in his summing up the Philippine representative had not mentioned either the proposal that the members of the Governing Council of UNDP should be elected in the same way as those of the Industrial Development Board of UNIDO (45 members elected on the basis of equitable geographical distribution with due representation of the different regional groups) or the proposal put forward by the socialist and other countries in document A/C.2/L.1178.

55. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom), also speaking in exercise of his right of reply, disagreed with the Philippine representative that the United Kingdom amendments (A/C.2/L.1153) constituted a proposal. Document A/C.2/L.1153 was an amendment, not a proposal, for draft resolution A/C.2/L.1146/Rev.1 contained a decision to enlarge the membership of the Governing Council of UNDP, whereas the amendment merely invited the Governing Council to consider the question, which would subsequently come up for further discussion.

56. As to the order in which the amendments should be put to the vote, rule 92 of the rules of procedure provided that the General Assembly should vote first on the amendment furthest removed in substance from the original

proposal. As the amendment in document A/C.2/L.1178 was political in content, as the Ukrainian representative had pointed out, it should be voted on first.

57. When it came to a vote on the amendment in document A/C.2/L.1153, he wondered whether the Committee would know whether the membership proposed for the UNDP Governing Council was 48 or 51.

58. The CHAIRMAN said that he had consulted the Legal Counsel about the Philippine representative's question as to whether the United Kingdom proposal (A/C.2/L.1153) should be considered an amendment to draft resolution A/C.2/L.1146/Rev.2 or a separate proposal. The Legal Counsel had felt that under rule 131 of the rules of procedure, the United Kingdom proposal, which contained an entirely new text for the operative part of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1146/Rev.2, could not be considered an amendment but must be taken as a separate proposal. The Legal Counsel had pointed out that, in view of the nature of the proposal, the sponsors might, if they wished, ask for it to be voted on first, under rule 132.

59. He ruled that the United Kingdom proposal (A/C.2/L.1153) should be taken as a separate proposal. He then read out rule 132 of the rules of procedure and said that a vote should first be taken on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1146/Rev.2 and the amendments to it.

60. Mr. RODRIGUEZ (Panama) said that he wished to explain his vote before the vote. He supported the enlargement of the membership of the Governing Council of UNDP in principle but he disagreed with a distribution of the seats on a regional basis, which would mean that Latin America would be under-represented. The original proposal (A/C.2/L.1146) had allocated 11 seats to African countries, 9 to Asian countries, 8 to Latin American countries and 20 to economically more advanced countries; in the amended proposal (A/C.2/L.1146/Rev.1), 12 seats were allocated to Africa, 10 to Asia, 8 to Latin American countries and 21 to economically more advanced countries. In its final form (A/C.2/L.1146/Rev.2), the draft was almost identical with the original proposal, with one very big difference—the Latin American countries were given one seat less, which was allocated to the economically more advanced countries, and that was something which the Latin American countries could not just disregard. The new distribution of the membership was neither fair nor objective, particularly as it made no provision for a suitable regional distribution.

61. Mr. KAMBA (United Republic of Tanzania) announced that he would vote for the amendment in document A/C.2/L.1178 because it endorsed the principle of universality enshrined in the Charter. He found it strange that certain delegations objected to that amendment on the grounds that it was political in character; a few years before, the Second Committee itself had unanimously adopted a draft resolution expelling South Africa from UNCTAD.

62. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) pointed out that his delegation's amendment (A/C.2/L.1153) had been submitted as long ago as 15 October and it would be most unfair if there was not to be a vote on it.

63. The CHAIRMAN said that his ruling was clear and the Committee had two proposals before it, that contained in document A/C.2/L.1146/Rev.2 and the amendments to it would be voted upon first, and a separate vote would be taken on the United Kingdom proposal (A/C.2/L.1153).

64. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) asked for his proposal to be voted upon first.

65. After some discussion, in which Mr. DIALLO (Upper Volta), Mr. KHANACHET (Kuwait), Mr. VERCELES (Philippines), Mr. ABDALLA (Sudan), Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) and Mr. KITCHEN (United States of America), took part, the CHAIRMAN called upon the Committee to vote on the procedural motion that the United Kingdom draft (A/C.2/L.1153) should be voted on first.

The motion was rejected by 62 votes to 23, with 27 abstentions.

66. Mr. HOEUR LAY INN (Khmer Republic) said that although he had sympathized with the Pakistan representative's reservations regarding the inclusion of Yugoslavia among the Asian countries in the allocation of seats, he would vote for draft resolution A/C.2/L.1146/Rev.2 in a spirit of conciliation.

67. The CHAIRMAN announced that draft resolution A/C.2/L.1146/Rev.2 and the amendments to it would be voted upon in the following order: A/C.2/L.1178, A/C.2/L.1177, A/C.2/L.1179 and A/C.2/L.1146/Rev.2.

68. Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that the amendment in document A/C.2/L.1178 should be voted on first, not under rule 131 of the rules of procedure, since it was closely linked to the question under discussion, but because it was an important amendment.

Amendment A/C.2/L.1178

At the request of the Czechoslovak representative, the vote was taken by roll-call.

Colombia, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Finland, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Iraq, Khmer Republic, Libyan Arab Republic, Mali, Mongolia, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, People's Republic of the Congo, Poland, Romania, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic and Chile.

Against: Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Malta, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and

Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire, Zambia, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada.

Abstaining: Cyprus, Ecuador, El Salvador, Indonesia, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Swaziland, Tunisia, Uganda, Upper Volta, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon.

Amendment A/C.2/L.1178 was rejected by 53 votes to 30, with 29 abstentions.

Amendment A/C.2/L.1177

Amendment A/C.2/L.1177 was rejected by 58 votes to 23, with 24 abstentions.

Amendment A/C.2/L.1179

69. The CHAIRMAN noted that the Canadian representative had revised that amendment by replacing the words "to ensure the continued efficiency and speedy conduct of its business" by the words "to enhance the efficiency and to ensure the speedy conduct of its business".

At the request of the representative of Upper Volta, the vote was taken by roll-call.

Malaysia, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Malaysia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Philippines, Singapore, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Khmer Republic, Liberia, Luxembourg.

Against: Mali, Mongolia, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Poland, Romania, Sudan, Swaziland, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Republic.

Abstaining: Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Paraguay, People's Republic of the Congo, Peru, Portugal, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Uganda, Uruguay, Argentina, Austria, Barbados, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Chile, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Honduras, Indonesia, Israel, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Madagascar.

Amendment A/C.2/L.1179 was rejected by 50 votes to 25, with 37 abstentions.

Draft resolution A/C.2/L.1146/Rev.2

70. Mr. BRADLEY (Argentina) asked that a separate vote be taken on operative paragraphs 1 and 2, including subparagraphs (a), (b), (c) and (d) of operative paragraph 1.

71. Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked that a separate vote be taken on operative paragraph 1 as a whole.

72. Mr. BRADLEY (Argentina) explained that he had requested a separate vote on operative paragraphs 1 and 2 taken together, including all the subparagraphs of paragraph 1.

73. The CHAIRMAN recalled that at the preceding meeting the Netherlands representative had requested that a separate vote be taken on subparagraphs (a) and (b) of operative paragraph 1, and that the Indian representative had subsequently requested a separate vote on subparagraphs (c) and (d) of that paragraph. He therefore proposed that a vote be taken successively on each of the four subparagraphs of operative paragraph 1, followed by a vote on paragraph 1 as a whole and then on paragraph 2.

74. Mr. MORENO (Cuba) asked that a separate vote also be taken on the section of operative paragraph 1 preceding the four subparagraphs.

75. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) pointed out that the Netherlands representative had requested a separate vote on subparagraphs (a) and (b) of operative paragraph 1 taken together.

First part of operative paragraph 1

The first part of operative paragraph 1 was adopted by 70 votes to 30, with 7 abstentions.

Subparagraphs (a) and (b) of operative paragraph 1

Subparagraphs (a) and (b) of operative paragraph 1 were adopted by 72 votes to 30, with 5 abstentions.

Subparagraph (c) of operative paragraph 1

Subparagraph (c) of operative paragraph 1 was adopted by 81 votes to 16, with 10 abstentions.

Subparagraph (d) of operative paragraph 1

Subparagraph (d) of operative paragraph 1 was adopted by 73 votes to 13, with 21 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 1 as a whole

76. Following a discussion on procedure in which Mr. BRADLEY (Argentina), Mr. KHANACHET (Kuwait), Mr. NDUNGÚ (Kenya) and Mr. VIAUD (France) took part, the CHAIRMAN put to the vote operative paragraph 1 as a whole.

Operative paragraph 1 as a whole was adopted by 73 votes to 30, with 4 abstentions.

77. Mr. BRADLEY (Argentina) pointed out that it was the divergency of the results obtained in the vote on the various paragraphs of paragraph 1 that had made it necessary to vote on the paragraph as a whole. In view of the outcome of the vote, he would not press his request that operative paragraph 2 be voted on separately.

Draft resolution as a whole

At the request of the representative of Ghana, the vote was taken by roll-call.

Nigeria, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, People's Republic of the Congo, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Cuba, Denmark, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger.

Against: Panama, Paraguay, Peru, United States of America, Argentina, Canada, Malta.

Abstaining: Poland, Romania, South Africa, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Venezuela, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Israel, Jamaica, Mexico, Mongolia, Nicaragua.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 74 votes to 7, with 29 abstentions.

78. The CHAIRMAN proposed that in accordance with rule 132 of the rules of procedure no vote be taken on the United Kingdom proposal in document A/C.2/L.1153.

It was so agreed.

The meeting rose at 7.10 p.m.