



Chairman: Mr. Bruce RANKIN (Canada).

AGENDA ITEM 12

Report of the Economic and Social Council [chapters III to XI, XII (sections A to G) and XVII to XIX] (continued) (A/8703)

**UNITED NATIONS CHILDREN'S FUND
(concluded) (A/C.2/L.1242)**

1. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would assume that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.2/L.1242 without a vote.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 46

Operational activities for development: reports of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme (continued) (A/8703, chap. VII, sect. A, B and C; E/5092, E/5185/Rev.1):

- (a) United Nations Development Programme (A/8648, A/C.2/L.1256, A/C.2/L.1261-1264, A/C.2/L.1266):
- (b) United Nations Capital Development Fund;
- (c) Technical Co-operation Activities undertaken by the Secretary-General;
- (d) United Nations Volunteers programme (E/5146, A/C.2/L.1257)

2. Mr. VERCELES (Philippines) said the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1262, concerning the review of criteria for calculating indicative planning figures, had done their best to meet the views of the sponsors of the amendments in document A/C.2/L.1266. In the third preambular paragraph they had agreed to delete the words "and the divergent points of view expressed on the subject". They also accepted the wording of the second amendment in document A/C.2/L.1266 but proposed that it should be included in the sixth instead of the fifth preambular paragraph, which constituted an integral provision of the draft resolution and should remain unchanged. The sixth preambular paragraph would now read: "*Bearing in mind* resolution 62 (III) adopted by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development at its third session and other relevant resolutions and decisions of organs of the United Nations system. . .". In operative paragraph 1 the sponsors agreed to delete the words "the above-mentioned considerations" and to add after the words "resolutions of the Governing Council" the words "the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development at its third session". Finally, in order to meet the wishes of Afghanistan

and Upper Volta, the sponsors were prepared to substitute the words "sixteenth session of the Governing Council" for the words "seventeenth session of the Governing Council" in operative paragraph 2 and at the end of the paragraph to substitute the words "twenty-eighth session" for "twenty-ninth session".

3. Mr. DIALLO (Upper Volta) said that the sixth amendment in document A/C.2/L.1266 should now read: "*Requests* the Administrator to submit his study as envisaged in paragraph 1 above to the fifteenth session of the Governing Council. . .". The amendments in document A/C.2/L.1266 which had been accepted by the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1262 certainly improved it but did not go far enough. If the fifth preambular paragraph was not amended as his delegation and that of Afghanistan had proposed, the Second Committee would be violating the terms of General Assembly resolution 2688 (XXV) which made it clear that special measures should be adopted in favour of the least developed countries. A provision to that effect had been included in the Consensus adopted by the Governing Council of UNDP in June 1970¹ and which had been endorsed both by the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 1530 (XLIX) and by the General Assembly in resolution 2688 (XXV). If the sponsors of the draft resolution wished to alter that Consensus then they should say so openly.

4. Nor could the sponsors of the amendments in document A/C.2/L.1266 accept the revised draft of operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution. The version of that paragraph which constituted the sixth amendment merely took up the provisions of the operative part of UNCTAD resolution 62 (III) and should be acceptable to all Member States. If the sponsors of the draft resolution could not accept the amendments to the fifth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 2, his delegation and that of Afghanistan would insist that those paragraphs be put to the vote separately.

5. Mr. ZAGORIN (United States of America) said that draft resolution A/C.2/L.1262 was a matter of concern to his delegation, which supported the amendments to it (A/C.2/L.1266) and felt that they did not even go far enough. Since the UNDP Governing Council, UNCTAD and other bodies had agreed on the need for special measures in favour of the least developed countries, his delegation regretted the retrogression evident in draft resolution A/C.2/L.1262 and agreed that the Administrator should be requested

¹ See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Forty-ninth Session, Supplement No. 6A*, para. 94.

to submit his study to the fifteenth rather than the sixteenth session of the Governing Council.

6. In addition, because of the 1970 Consensus, which was the product of a great deal of negotiation and which one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1262, the Philippines, had called almost inviolable, it was extremely difficult to accept the approach taken in the draft resolution. When the General Assembly had decided to expand the technical assistance activities of the United Nations by establishing the Special Fund in 1958 it had also established the Governing Council, which then had 18 members with wide regional distribution, and had made it responsible for allocating resources and taking decisions on the allocation of resources (see resolution 1240 (XIII) of 14 October 1958). All contributors to UNDP—and his country was the largest—made their contributions in the knowledge that the Governing Council—and not the Second Committee—was the governing body of UNDP. The outcome of the present debate would be decisive to his country in considering what resources it made available to UNDP in the future. The representative of the Upper Volta had rightly said that, under the Consensus, it was the responsibility of the Administrator to propose indicative planning figures for approval by the Governing Council. In that regard, he drew attention to paragraphs 16, 17 and 27 of the Consensus. At the twelfth session of the Governing Council the Administrator had not been ready to make proposals that were acceptable to the Council, at the thirteenth session the subject had not really been dealt with, and at the fourteenth session—long after the matter should have been considered—it was decided to take it up at the fifteenth session. The needs of the least developed countries were pressing and the Governing Council's decision should be followed.

7. His delegation not only supported the still pending amendments contained in document A/C.2/L.1266 but also wished to propose two amendments of its own. In the fourth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, the word "extreme" should be deleted. In addition, the words "further study" in the same paragraph should be replaced by the words "careful examination".

8. He assured countries which might be afraid of early consideration of the matter that his Government had no fixed attitude which would result in harm to any country receiving assistance from it at present. The fact that his delegation supported the amendments contained in document A/C.2/L.1266 did not mean that it did not desire a fair solution of the problem.

9. Mr. GRANQVIST (Sweden) considered the question under consideration to be very important for the future of UNDP. He regretted that draft resolution A/C.2/L.1262 did not reflect the views expressed in the Governing Council or the urgency of the problem. Although he was glad that the sponsors of the draft resolution had accepted some of the amendments in document A/C.2/L.1266, he would continue to support the remaining amendments.

10. He did not really understand the need for such a draft resolution since the Governing Council had already decided to give further consideration to the matter. The Committee should not intervene in a process which was going ahead satisfactorily. He could not see why the sponsors of the draft resolution wanted to delay consideration of such an important matter in view of the need for a realistic distribution of UNDP resources based on the total resources made available to the Programme. Moreover, it was hardly realistic to expect the Governing Council to take decisions on the allocation of resources for the period after 1976 so long as no decision was taken concerning the criteria for calculating indicative planning figures. He therefore urged the sponsors not to press for action on their draft resolution at the current session and asked them whether it would not be sufficient for the General Assembly to transmit the draft resolution as it stood to the Governing Council, adding that, in reviewing the criteria for calculating indicative planning figures, the Council should take account of the views expressed in the General Assembly.

11. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said he did not agree with the United States representative that there was retrogression in the draft resolution. The sponsors were not contesting United Nations resolutions and decisions concerning the need for special measures in favour of the least developed countries but only wanted to avoid decisions being taken in great haste.

12. He would agree to the two amendments proposed orally by the United States representative. Although he agreed that the Governing Council was the supreme body of UNDP, he felt that if the General Assembly accepted every decision taken by the Governing Council there would be no use in considering the latter's report. He therefore requested the sponsors of document A/C.2/L.1266 not to press the remaining amendments and urged the developing countries not to be divided over a resolution that was not earth-shaking and did not detract from previous decisions.

13. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) asked what kind of document the Administrator intended to submit to the fifteenth session of the Governing Council and whether it would differ substantially from the document requested in the draft resolution.

14. Mr. COHEN (Deputy Administrator, United Nations Development Programme) read out the instructions given to the Administrator by the Governing Council at its fourteenth session (E/5185/Rev.1, para. 99). The study would indicate the allocation of resources depending on the total resources available and would be based on three assumptions with respect to total resources available. He could not say whether the results would be different if draft resolution A/C.2/L.1262 were adopted.

15. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) said that, at the fourteenth session of the Governing Council, his delegation had considered very carefully the Administrator's suggestion with regard to the revised distribution of UNDP resources and was glad that the recommendations of

the Working Group had been adopted. He was not sure that the draft resolution would achieve the objective of a fairer distribution of resources than that envisaged at the fourteenth session and he was not impressed by operative paragraph 1, which was so vague that it did not refer to any specific decisions and was not likely to assist the Administrator in carrying out the proposed study. It seemed that the study would be substantially the same whether the draft resolution was adopted or not. The draft resolution did not dilute the measures to be taken in favour of the least developed countries because it changed nothing. The only effect of the resolution would therefore be to postpone further the establishment of criteria for calculating indicative planning figures and that was not in the general interest of the developing countries. The Committee should avoid further delay unless it was sure that the adoption of the draft resolution would lead to a better proposal than the one which had already been requested.

16. Mr. GEBRU (Ethiopia) said that the criteria that had been used so far in the calculation of indicative planning figures had been based on historical factors that heavily favoured only a few developing countries. The Administration had seen the need to review those criteria, particularly because of the introduction of country programming. The Administrator had therefore submitted new proposals to the Governing Council at its fourteenth session, but no agreement had been reached on the criteria to be used and the Council had requested the Administrator to submit a further study at its fifteenth session, taking account of the comments made by Council members. It was his understanding that the Administrator had therefore already completed a study of the type called for in draft resolution A/C.2/L.1262. The statement by the representative of the Philippines that the Governing Council was not the appropriate body to deal with such matters and that the Committee should take action was a major reorganizational proposal affecting the functions of the Governing Council.

17. The appropriate course of action would be for the Administrator to submit the already completed study to the fifteenth session of the Governing Council pursuant to its request at the fourteenth session, and the General Assembly, as the supreme body, might have to take action at a later session if the study was found unsatisfactory. His delegation considered the draft resolution redundant and would vote against it if it was pressed to the vote.

18. Mr. MUELLER (Austria) said that his Government's policy was to do everything possible in favour of the least developed countries. For the Committee to say that the Governing Council's decision was wrong would be premature and would also undermine the Council's authority. There were two possible courses: the sponsors of the two documents under consideration should try to work out the difficulties between themselves or the Committee should allow the Governing Council to go ahead with its own plans at the fifteenth session.

19. Mr. AL JABER (Jordan) said that he fully supported draft resolution A/C.2/L.1262 and was one of

its sponsors. Most delegations had recognized the need to review the criteria on which indicative planning figures were based. He hoped that some action would be taken on the draft resolution at the current session since he had understood the Deputy Administrator to say that the study to be submitted at the fifteenth session of the Governing Council would not deal with the introduction of new criteria but only illustrate the application of indicative planning figures on the basis of three assumptions of resource levels. The question was of great concern to the developing countries and should be given its due importance and thorough, unhurried consideration. The sixteenth session was not all that far away. The finalization of any new criteria should be dealt with by the General Assembly since many developing countries not represented in the Governing Council would want to have a say in the matter.

20. Mr. VAN GORKOM (Netherlands) said that he fully shared the concern expressed with regard to draft resolution A/C.2/L.1262 by the representatives of Ethiopia, Pakistan, Sweden and the United States. The draft resolution was not only redundant but also dangerous since it upset the process of decision-making already well under way in the Governing Council and threatened to undermine the authority of the Council and the recently adopted Consensus. By threatening to undermine the authority of the Governing Council, it would also indirectly affect the willingness of many donor countries to contribute. He therefore appealed to the sponsors not to press the draft resolution to the vote and felt that the best solution would perhaps be to transmit the draft as such to the Governing Council.

21. Mr. HAMID (Sudan) said that he could not support the draft resolution even as amended by the sponsors. The idea of reviewing indicative planning figures was quite in order and the indicative planning figures for one country would not be decreased to benefit another. He too felt that the draft resolution was redundant and agreed with the representative of Pakistan that the delay it would cause was not in the general interest of the developing countries. He did not see the need for draft resolution A/C.2/L.1262 in the first place and certainly could not support it unless all the amendments contained in document A/C.2/L.1266 were accepted. He supported the suggestion that a decision should be postponed until the sponsors of the two texts had consulted each other.

22. Mr. OKELO (Uganda) said that, for the reasons given by the representatives of Pakistan, Sweden, the United States, Ethiopia and the Sudan, he would vote against draft resolution A/C.2/L.1262 unless the amendments contained in document A/C.2/L.1266 were accepted *in toto*. The draft resolution was contrary to paragraph 15 of the Consensus and unduly encroached on the process already being carried out pursuant to the decision by the Governing Council.

23. Mr. KIRSHI (Yemen) said that he fully supported the amendments contained in document A/C.2/L.1266 and fully agreed with the views expressed by the rep-

representative of Upper Volta. He was afraid that the spirit of co-operation among the developing countries was being threatened and that there would be a confrontation between the developing countries and the least developed countries. In order to preserve a spirit of co-operation between the developing and least developed countries, he appealed to the sponsors of the draft resolution to give further consideration to the outstanding amendments in document A/C.2/L.1266.

24. Mr. ARUEDE (Nigeria) said that the Administrator could clearly not be expected to prepare both the study requested by the Governing Council and the study requested in the draft resolution under consideration. The Committee should remember that if it adopted the draft resolution it would in fact be asking the Administrator to suspend action on the Council's decision. The Committee's task would be simplified if the sponsors of the draft resolution could reword it to take account of the views expressed in the Committee and in the Governing Council. He also pointed out that the Council was not under any obligation to finalize the matter at its fifteenth session and could continue to give it active consideration.

25. Mr. ABHYANKAR (India) said that, in conformity with the views it had already expressed on indicative planning figures, his delegation had difficulty with the draft resolution and felt that the Committee would be best advised not to proceed further with it at the moment. It not only had reservations concerning the time-limit set but also wanted to avoid an unnecessary confrontation between the developing and least developed countries. Before deciding how to distribute the resources most equitably, it was necessary to have an idea of the total resources available. He urged that the Committee take account of the Governing Council's decision at its fourteenth session and not take any action itself before seeing the results of the Council's action at its fifteenth and sixteenth sessions. Although he agreed that the present distribution of resources was inequitable, he felt that there should be stability in the indicative planning figures, that no country's figure should be reduced for the time being and that the present indicative planning figures should be the pattern until 1976. Since it would be unwise and unrealistic to try to finalize new criteria at the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly, he urged that the Committee suspend its consideration of the draft resolution and devote its time to the more important question of the structure and level of resources.

26. Mr. VERCELES (Philippines) said that the Committee's reaction to draft resolution A/C.2/L.1262 was proof of its importance. Almost all the least developed countries had spoken in support of the Upper Volta proposal to delete the sixth preambular paragraph. However, that paragraph contained the only reference to the developing countries in the draft resolution.

27. If the amendment to paragraph 2, as contained in document A/C.2/L.1266, was accepted, the Governing Council would have the last word on approval of

the criteria for indicative planning figures. The developing countries which were not members of the Governing Council would thus have no further opportunity to comment on those criteria. The present criteria would be used until 1976 and therefore there was no need for the Administrator to submit his study to the fifteenth session of the Governing Council, as had been proposed by the representative of Upper Volta. Paragraph 99 (c) of the report of the Governing Council (E/5185/Rev.1) merely requested the Administrator to submit calculations of indicative planning figures, whereas the Upper Volta amendment called for approval of the new criteria for calculating such figures. As he understood it, the amendment to paragraph 2 contained in document A/C.2/L.1266 constituted an alternative proposal to that contained in the draft resolution.

28. His delegation would be willing to hold further consultations with the sponsors of the draft resolution and the sponsors of the amendments with a view to solving their problems.

29. Mr. MOBARAK (Lebanon) said that his delegation had contacted the sponsors of the draft resolution and those of the amendments. Both groups were prepared to meet in the hope of reaching a solution, while the Committee could go on to consider another draft resolution.

30. The CHAIRMAN suggested that discussion of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1262 and the amendments thereto (A/C.2/L.1266) should be suspended while the informal consultations were held.

It was so decided.

31. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should proceed to the discussion of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1257, concerning the United Nations Volunteers programme, which had been submitted by Pakistan at the previous meeting.

32. Mr. REDDY (India) said that his delegation supported draft resolution A/C.2/L.1257. The United Nations Volunteers programme was extremely important and many more Volunteers were needed. The energy and enthusiasm of youth should be tapped and they should be encouraged to participate in the programme. He therefore suggested that operative paragraph 6 should be amended to read: "Requests the Co-ordinator to make renewed efforts to increase the proportion of Volunteers from developing countries, and to this end, to review procedures relating to recruitment;". He appealed to the sponsors to accept his suggestion, which would give the Co-ordinator scope to change the rules for recruitment.

33. Mr. DIALLO (Upper Volta) said that his delegation had no serious difficulties with the draft resolution. However, he proposed that the word "approved" should be deleted in paragraph 2. The amendment proposed by the representative of India raised certain problems because it called for a revision of the recruitment procedures in force whose results had not yet

been seen. In his view, paragraph 4 contained an element of "salesmanship" which should be avoided.

34. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) said that the idea introduced by the representative of India in his amendment was valuable but that it might better be submitted to the Governing Council at its next session. He agreed with the representative of Upper Volta that the word "approved" should be deleted in paragraph 2.

35. Mr. REDDY (India) said that he would not press his amendment and accepted the suggestion of the representative of Pakistan that it be taken up at the next session of the Governing Council.

36. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) suggested that in order to avoid the idea of "salesmanship" with regard to the United Nations Volunteers programme, the words "with agreement of the countries concerned" might be inserted after the words "to promote" in paragraph 4. Thus there would be no pressure on the recipient countries to accept United Nations Volunteers.

37. Mr. HEMANS (United Kingdom) said that it might be better to replace the word "promote"—which was linked with sales campaigns—with the word "facilitate" or "accommodate". He wished to know to what extent the Special Voluntary Fund for the United Nations Volunteers had been drawn upon thus far and to what extent the programme expected to draw upon it during the coming year.

38. Mr. WHITE (Liaison Officer, United Nations Volunteers) said that approximately \$100,000 had been committed on behalf of Volunteers from the developing countries who represented half of the Volunteers in service.

39. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) said that the suggestion put forward by the representative of Brazil was sufficient to remove the idea of "salesmanship" and appealed to the representative of the United Kingdom not to press his amendment.

40. Mr. HEMANS (United Kingdom) said that he would not press his amendment.

41. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to adopt draft resolution A/C.2/L.1257, as amended, without a vote.

It was so decided.

42. Mr. HEMANS (United Kingdom) said that the unanimous adoption of the draft resolution did not imply that his country would contribute to the Special Voluntary Fund for the United Nations Volunteers.

43. Mr. BORISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation did not object to the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1257 but that, had there been a vote thereon, his delegation would have abstained for the same reasons as it had abstained on

other resolutions concerning the United Nations Volunteers programme.

44. Mr. GRANQVIST (Sweden) said that his delegation would have voted for the draft resolution, because it believed in the Volunteers programme and hoped that Volunteers would be requested increasingly in United Nations assisted projects. His delegation had reservations on the proliferation of voluntary funds and believed that the United Nations Volunteers programme should be financed through UNDP. He therefore wished to record his delegation's reservations on operative paragraph 5.

45. Mr. MORENO (Cuba), said that if there had been a vote on the draft resolution his delegation would have abstained, because it had reservations on the United Nations Volunteers programme.

46. Mr. MASSONET (Belgium) recalled his delegation's previous reservations on the financing of special Volunteer services.

47. Mr. HJELDE (Norway) said that his delegation shared the reservations of Sweden and Belgium with regard to the financing of special Volunteer services.

48. Mr. CZARKOWSKI (Poland) said that his delegation had reservations on the Volunteers programme and would have abstained if a vote had been taken on the draft resolution.

49. The CHAIRMAN announced that Bolivia, Chad, Paraguay and Rwanda had asked to be included among the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1261.

50. Mr. DIALLO (Upper Volta) announced that Afghanistan, Lesotho and Nepal had also joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

51. On behalf of the sponsors he submitted the following modifications to the draft resolution: deletion of the word "too" in the fourth preambular paragraph; insertion of the words "and maintenance" after the word "improvement" in the fifth preambular paragraph; insertion of the words "and/or technical" after the word "financial" in the sixth preambular paragraph; insertion of the words "at their request" after the words "investment to assist them" in operative paragraph 1 and insertion of the same phrase after the words "to help these countries" in operative paragraph 2. He hoped that the draft resolution would thus be acceptable to the Committee.

52. Mr. ZAGORIN (United States of America) said his delegation felt that it would be more in keeping with the usual practice for paragraphs 1 and 2 to begin with the words "Invites" rather than "Requests". Furthermore, in principle, his delegation did not accept the idea of establishing a special fund for subsidizing the additional transport costs of land-locked developing countries, as proposed in paragraph 3. His delegation understood the difficulties arising from the geographical situation of those countries and believed that they should be borne in mind, but the best way to

solve their problems was not to establish yet another special fund. If his delegation was to support the draft resolution, paragraph 3 would have to be deleted.

53. Mr. DIALLO (Upper Volta) recalled that paragraph 3 of the draft resolution was taken word for word from paragraph 13 of UNCTAD resolution 63 (III), which had been adopted without objection in Santiago. He therefore expected all delegations to be consistent with the position they had taken in Santiago. If compared with the original text proposed by the Group of 77, paragraph 3 contained a very mild request. It merely invited the Economic and Social Council to study the desirability and feasibility of a special fund for the land-locked developing countries. He could therefore not agree with the deletion of paragraph 3. With regard to the word "Invites", he pointed out that the word "Invite" was used in the French text, which was in accordance with the language used in UNCTAD resolution 63 (III).

54. Mr. OKELO (Uganda) agreed with the representative of Upper Volta that operative paragraph 3, which was taken word for word from the UNCTAD resolution, was the essence of the draft resolution before the Committee. He was strongly opposed to its deletion.

55. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil), referring to operative paragraph 1, said that it was unusual to ask countries to report directly to the General Assembly. It would be preferable to request the Secretary-General to transmit the reports to that body.

56. Mr. DIALLO (Upper Volta) said that he would have no difficulty in accepting the Brazilian representative's suggestion.

57. Mr. HAMID (Sudan) felt that it was most inconsistent of delegations to call for the deletion of operative paragraph 3 in view of the overwhelming support given to the UNCTAD resolution which contained a similar provision.

58. Mr. BORISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his country in its bilateral relations took account of the special problems of the land-locked developing countries. It was also in favour of such countries receiving special treatment where international technical assistance was concerned. He therefore fully supported the spirit of the draft resolution. However, he would only be able to give it his unreserved support if the words "a special fund" in operative paragraph 3 were changed to the words "a special voluntary fund". In that connexion it would be recalled that the Soviet delegation, together with other delegations, had entered reservations with regard to UNCTAD resolution 63 (III).

59. With regard to the reference in the sixth preambular paragraph to the International Development Strategy, he said that his delegation supported that text only to the extent that its provisions corresponded with the Joint Statement by the Socialist Countries on the Second Development Decade and Social Pro-

gress.² The same reservation applied to draft resolution A/C.2/L.1264.

60. Mr. VAN GORKOM (Netherlands) said that his delegation also had difficulties with operative paragraph 3, despite its sympathy for draft resolution A/C.2/L.1261 as a whole. It was true that UNCTAD resolution 63 (III) had contained a similar provision and yet had been adopted by consensus, but that resolution had contained many elements, whereas in the draft resolution under consideration the establishment of a special fund was the principal element. His delegation maintained the position it had adopted at Santiago, namely, that a new fund would not be helpful and that the special needs of the land-locked developing countries should be met rather by drawing on existing bilateral and multilateral sources. Accordingly, he intended to request a separate vote on operative paragraph 3, on which his delegation would abstain, while it would vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

61. In operative paragraph 1 it would be more appropriate to provide that the periodic reports should be transmitted through the Economic and Social Council rather than directly to the General Assembly.

62. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that his delegation had every sympathy for the spirit of the draft resolution and would support it on condition that operative paragraph 3 was deleted. Even the Soviet amendment, namely, to study the desirability of establishing a special voluntary fund, was not a solution. In his delegation's view, a great deal of aid was already being given bilaterally and multilaterally and the establishment of further funds was not called for.

63. Turning to the preamble, he said that the meaning of the fourth paragraph was not clear. In the fifth preambular paragraph he suggested the deletion of the word "urgent", which had an over-emphatic ring.

64. Mr. DIALLO (Upper Volta) said that he could accept the Brazilian amendment to operative paragraph 1 to the effect that the Secretary-General should be asked to report periodically to the General Assembly. However, he could not agree with the representative of the Netherlands that there was a need to insert "through the Economic and Social Council" in the same paragraph. With regard to the Soviet Union amendment to operative paragraph 3, it would be premature to decide now whether the fund was to be voluntary or not; it was for the Economic and Social Council to decide whether the fund was necessary and, if it was, its modalities; when that had been done, the General Assembly would be free to make any changes it deemed necessary.

65. Mr. HEMANS (United Kingdom) said that his delegation would prefer the deletion of operative paragraph 3 for the same reasons as the delegation of the Netherlands. It was one thing to go along with one controversial paragraph in a resolution which con-

² See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fifth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 42, document A/8074.

tained a large number of important provisions and quite another to support a controversial proposal which was the main element of a draft resolution.

66. Mr. CAVAGLIERI (Italy) said that his delegation supported the aims of the draft resolution. It would have liked to see a reference to country programming in operative paragraph 2. However, the main obstacle for his delegation was operative paragraph 3, which did not constitute the best approach to meeting the special needs of land-locked countries. Accordingly, he suggested that the Economic and Social Council should be invited to study possible ways and means of subsidizing the additional transport costs of land-locked developing countries and that reference to a special fund should be omitted.

67. Mr. HJELDE (Norway) said that his delegation could support the draft resolution on the understanding that the provisions of operative paragraph 3 would in no way prejudice the outcome of any study made by the Economic and Social Council. He recalled that at the third session of UNCTAD and at the fourteenth session of UNDP his delegation had suggested that the Capital Development Fund should become a fund to finance measures for the least developed among the developing countries. If that were done, it would be possible to use some of the Fund's resources to benefit the many countries in the least developed category which were also land-locked.

68. Mrs. STRÖJE-WILKENS (Sweden) said that her country wished to assist in every way possible the land-locked developing countries to overcome their transport problems. However, the solution lay in bilateral and multilateral aid and in regional and subregional co-operation and not in the establishment of a special fund. In that connexion, she recalled the statement made by the Nordic countries at the third session of UNCTAD on the question of special funds. Apart from its reservations with regard to operative paragraph 3, her delegation could support the draft resolution as a whole.

69. Mr. REDDY (India) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution. However, in the third preambular paragraph it would prefer to replace the word "rational" by the word "equitable".

70. Mr. DIALLO (Upper Volta) said that it would be difficult to take account of all the minor suggestions made at the last moment. The sponsors had consulted briefly and had decided to incorporate the words "requests the Secretary-General" before the words "to report periodically to the General Assembly" at the end of operative paragraph 1, as suggested by the delegation of Brazil. However, all the other suggestions made were unacceptable.

71. He noted that many of the 18 paragraphs in UNCTAD resolution 63 (III) referred to activities under the jurisdiction of UNCTAD and UNIDO rather than of the United Nations itself. It was to be hoped that draft resolutions would be drawn up to put into effect all of the provisions of the UNCTAD resolution.

However, the fact that that had not been done was not a sound argument for opposing operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution under consideration.

72. Mr. DIAW (Mali) requested that his delegation should be added to the list of sponsors.

73. Mr. VAN GORKOM (Netherlands) proposed formally that the words "through the Economic and Social Council" should be incorporated in operative paragraph 1. He also called for a separate vote on operative paragraph 3.

74. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to proceed to a vote.

The Netherlands amendment was adopted by 85 votes to 11 with 16 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 3 was adopted by 80 votes to none, with 34 abstentions.

At the request of the representative of Upper Volta, a recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution as a whole, as amended.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstentions: Belgium, Malta, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Draft resolution A/C.2/L.1261 as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 111 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

75. Mr. ISAKSEN (Denmark) explained that his country had voted in favour of UNCTAD resolution 63 (III) but had explained in Santiago that such approval

did not prejudice the attitude of the Economic and Social Council when it came to consider the desirability of a special fund for subsidizing the additional transport costs of land-locked developing countries. Denmark was still not convinced of the desirability of such a fund and for that reason had abstained on operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1261.

76. Mr. ZAGORIN (United States of America) said that his country supported the aims of the land-locked developing countries but in Santiago had expressed serious doubts about the desirability of subsidizing their additional transport costs. His delegation thought it was only fair to reiterate those doubts in the Second Committee and had therefore abstained on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1261.

77. Miss COURSON (France) said her delegation did not feel that a special fund would solve the problems of the land-locked developing countries. It had therefore abstained on operative paragraph 3 but had voted for the draft resolution as a whole.

78. Mr. MUELLER (Austria) said that his delegation had also abstained on operative paragraph 3 in view of the reservations it had already expressed in Santiago concerning the desirability of establishing a special fund for the land-locked developing countries.

79. Mr. KANKA (Czechoslovakia) said his delegation had supported the draft resolution as a whole to the extent that it conformed to the Joint Statement by the Socialist Countries on the Second Development Decade and Social Progress but wished to express a reservation concerning the sixth preambular paragraph.

80. Mr. YOKOTA (Japan) said his country was well aware of the problems of the land-locked developing countries and had voted for the draft resolution as a whole. However, in Santiago it had been unable to support the provisions of UNCTAD resolution 63 (III) advocating a special fund for the land-locked developing countries. Since then Japan's position had not changed and it had therefore abstained on operative paragraph 3.

81. Mr. HARDY (Canada) said his delegation also had expressed a reservation in Santiago concerning the proposed special fund. Although it had voted for the draft resolution as a whole, it had abstained on operative paragraph 3.

82. Mr. O'RIORDAN (Ireland) said his delegation had voted for the draft resolution as a whole but wished to make it clear that the inclusion of operative paragraph 3 would not prejudice the question of a special fund but would help the Economic and Social Council to consider that question more effectively.

83. Mr. GATES (New Zealand) said his delegation had abstained on operative paragraph 3 but had voted for the text as a whole. No inferences should be drawn from those votes when the matter came up for consideration by the Economic and Social Council.

84. Mr. CZARKOWSKI (Poland) said his country sympathized with the aspirations of the land-locked developing countries and had voted for the draft resolution as a whole. However, his delegation had abstained on operative paragraph 3 because it had reservations about the proposal to establish a special fund.

85. Mr. BREITENSTEIN (Finland) said his country had voted for the draft resolution as a whole but had abstained on operative paragraph 3. Its position regarding the establishment of a special fund remained unchanged.

86. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Committee should take a decision on draft resolutions A/C.2/L.1263 and A/C.2/L.1264, which had been submitted at the previous meeting by Argentina and Sweden respectively.

87. Mr. CZARKOWSKI (Poland) said his delegation agreed with the general objectives of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1263 but had some difficulties with the seventh preambular paragraph. He proposed that that paragraph should be reworded as follows:

"Reaffirming that the effectiveness of the development process of developing countries depends primarily on the developing countries themselves and that the contribution of the international community to this development is essential."

88. Mr. WILDER (Canada) said his delegation wondered if operative paragraphs 1 and 3 were really necessary. The tasks assigned to the Working Group could probably be done by UNDP itself.

89. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) said he sympathized with the basic idea of increasing and improving development assistance to the developing countries. However, the proposal contained in operative paragraph 1 (a) involved a complex problem which must be viewed within the general context of improving regional and subregional assistance. He doubted the advisability of assigning such a problem only to UNDP. Furthermore, the proposal in operative paragraph 1 (b) had come a little too late. That point had already been made in operative paragraph 4 of General Assembly resolution 2814 (XXVI) which called upon the Governing Council to consider ways and means of improving the procedures for global, interregional, regional and subregional projects. He therefore suggested that paragraph 1 of the draft resolution should be recast in the light of paragraph 4 of the General Assembly resolution.

90. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) said he fully agreed with the aims of draft resolution A/C.1/L.1263 but thought it was too limited in its scope. The possibilities of co-operation between the developing countries themselves were not limited to the field of technical assistance as provided by UNDP. It was therefore improper to assign the task of making recommendations on that subject to the Governing Council. It was rather a task for the Secretary-General of the United Nations, in co-operation with UNDP, IBRD, IMF and

UNCTAD. He therefore suggested that the representative of Argentina might recast operative paragraph 1 along those lines. He also felt that the question of administrative costs should be omitted from draft resolution A/C.2/L.1263 since that question had already been covered in draft resolution A/C.2/L.1264.

91. Mr. GEBRU (Ethiopia) said his delegation also wondered whether UNDP would have the resources to carry out the study suggested in operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1263. He would like a clarification of that point from the Deputy Administrator of UNDP.

92. Mr. COHEN (Deputy Administrator, United Nations Development Programme), replying to the questions raised by Canada and Ethiopia, said that the Administrator of UNDP did feel that UNDP, in consultation with the interested Governments, could carry out the study mentioned in operative paragraph 1.

93. Mr. ARLÍA (Argentina) said that his delegation also was certain that UNDP could carry out the study recommended in operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1263. However, the sponsors of the draft resolution left open the question of how the study should be conducted. The Governing Council might reject the study altogether or it might decide that it could be done, with or without the help of a working group. The sponsors were quite content to allow UNDP to carry out the work as it thought fit.

94. His delegation agreed with the representatives of Brazil and Pakistan that the problem of increasing and improving assistance to the developing countries should be considered in its broadest sense. If they wanted a broader study, his delegation would be prepared to go along with such a proposal if it were raised in an appropriate forum. For the moment, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1263 were concerned with a more modest and more practical proposal that would confine the study to UNDP.

95. Mr. JOSEPH (Australia) said that it was essential to respect the prerogatives of the Governing Council, but operative paragraph 2 suggested that the General Assembly should take a decision which fell within the competence of the Governing Council. He therefore suggested that paragraph 2 be deleted and replaced by the following text:

"Invites the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme to consider at an early session measures that are needed to reduce the Programme's administrative costs."

96. Mr. ARLÍA (Argentina) said that, as a member of the Governing Council the representative of Australia was better informed than himself. He therefore accepted his amendment.

97. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) proposed the addition of the following new preambular paragraph:

"Recalling its resolution 2814 (XXVI) of 14 December 1971 on the capacity of the United Nations development system;"

98. He also proposed that operative paragraph 1 should be replaced by the following text:

"Calls upon the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme to give priority to the improvement of procedures for the elaboration and implementation of interregional, regional and subregional programmes of UNDP."

His amendment had the same purpose as the original paragraph 1, but specifically within the context of UNDP. It constituted the next step towards improving country programmes.

99. Mr. ARLÍA (Argentina) said he was prepared to include the paragraphs proposed by the representative of Brazil, but he could not accept the replacement of paragraph 1. The action proposed in paragraph 1, suggested by Brazil, could already be covered by existing resources.

100. Mr. ZAGORIN (United States of America) said that it would be helpful if the representative of Brazil could specify the particular paragraphs of General Assembly resolution 2814 (XXVI) to which he referred, since the United States delegation had certain problems with that resolution. He also suggested amending paragraph 1 to read:

"Invites the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme to request the Administrator of the Programme, in consultation with the interested States Members of the United Nations, to:"

Such a wording would enable the Administrator to decide on the best way to undertake the action referred to in subparagraphs (a) and (b). He wondered whether that was what the sponsors of the draft resolution had in mind. His delegation welcomed Argentina's acceptance of the Australian amendment to paragraph 2.

101. Mr. ABHYANKAR (India) agreed with the representative of Pakistan that the proposal for the reduction of administrative costs—which his delegation supported—was already contained in draft resolution A/C.2/L.1264.

102. Mr. DEBRAH (Ghana) said that the object of the draft resolution would be destroyed if the Brazilian amendment to paragraph 1 was accepted. There were many areas in which the developing countries could share their capacities and experience, and the idea in paragraph 1 was that a working group should identify those areas. He had understood that the UNDP authorities were in a position to carry out the activities referred to. His delegation could not accept the Brazilian amendment replacing paragraph 1 but could agree to the addition of the wording proposed as a separate paragraph.

103. Mr. ARLÍA (Argentina) pointed out that paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1264, to which the representative of India had referred, stressed that administrative overhead costs should be reduced, whereas paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1263, as amended by Australia, also invited the Governing Council to consider the measures needed to reduce those costs. If the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1264 would amend paragraph 2 of their draft resolution along the lines suggested by the representative of Australia, he would be prepared to delete paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1263.

104. Draft resolution A/C.2/L.1263 suggested two ways of increasing existing UNDP resources: paragraph 2 proposed the reduction of administrative costs and the Administrator had stated that the Governing Council intended to take such action; paragraph 1 proposed an examination of the possibilities for co-operation between the developing countries. The developed countries had made similar proposals in all the United Nations bodies and the draft resolution before the Committee was aimed at introducing such a study within the framework of UNDP. Thus far, he had heard no valid argument against that proposal.

105. In reply to the representative of the United States he said that, whether it was suggested in the resolution or not, the Governing Council would in all probability set up a working group of staff or experts to study the possibilities referred to in paragraph 1. If the Governing Council did not set up such a group, it was for the Council to make the decision in any case and he could not see why the reference to a working group should cause the United States delegation any problem.

106. Mr. JOSEPH (Australia) pointed out that his delegation's amendment referred to administrative costs and might not be applicable to draft resolution A/C.2/L.1264, whose operative paragraph 2 referred to administrative overhead costs. The changes suggested by the Brazilian delegation to operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1263 were sound because they focused attention on regional, interregional and subregional programmes. However, existing paragraph 1 (a) embodied a very valuable concept and one which was consistent with the notion of self-help contained in the reworded version of the seventh preambular paragraph suggested by Poland. In order to accommodate the United States, perhaps the sponsors could consider rewording the first part of operative paragraph 1 to read:

"Invites the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme to examine, possi-

bly with the help of a working group, the best way for developing countries to:

"(a) Share their capacities and experience. . ."

107. Mr. GRANQVIST (Sweden) said that, as a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1264, his delegation agreed with the representative of Australia that the reference to administrative costs would be more appropriate in draft resolution A/C.2/L.1263. However, it would not take an inflexible position on that point and was prepared to discuss it with the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1263. The discussion on the latter resolution had served to reveal more clearly the intentions of the sponsors. Nevertheless, the impact of operative paragraph 1 was diminished because the wording was too broad, while the terms of operative paragraph 2 were too precise and prejudged a decision of the Governing Council on the subject.

108. Mr. DIALLO (Upper Volta) said that, before the sponsors could decide whether a reference to General Assembly resolution 2814 (XXVI) should be included in the text, they would like the Administration of UNDP to interpret the terms of paragraph 4 of that resolution.

109. Mr. ARLÍA (Argentina) said that the sponsors would also like to know whether the Administration of UNDP considered that the proposal in operative paragraph 1 would serve a useful purpose.

110. Mr. PETERSON (Administrator, United Nations Development Programme), referring to the Brazilian proposal calling upon the Governing Council to give priority to the improvement of procedures for elaborating and implementing regional and interregional programmes, said that a paper containing the Administration's suggestions on that subject was to be discussed at the fifteenth session of the Governing Council. In reply to the representative of Argentina, he said that the Administration would be more than willing to undertake a broader study of interregional and intercountry programming if requested to do so by the Governing Council.

111. Mr. COHEN (Deputy Administrator, United Nations Development Programme) added that the Administration considered the study of co-operation between developing countries to be extremely worthwhile and was prepared to devote considerable time to that undertaking if asked to do so.

The meeting rose at 7.55 p.m.