

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-FOURTH SESSION

Official Records



**SECOND COMMITTEE, 1305th  
MEETING**

Tuesday, 9 December 1969,  
at 3.15 p.m.

**NEW YORK**

**CONTENTS**

	Page
Agenda item 38:	
United Nations Industrial Development Organization: report of the Industrial Development Board ( <i>concluded</i> )	417

**Chairman:** Mr. Costa P. CARANICAS (Greece).

**AGENDA ITEM 38**

**United Nations Industrial Development Organization: report of the Industrial Development Board (*concluded*) (A/7603, chap. VII; A/7617 and Corr.1, A/7693 and Add.1, A/7705, A/C.2/L.1093/Rev.1, A/C.2/L.1099)**

1. Mr. CORREA (Chile) submitted the revised draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1093/Rev.1) on the special international conference of UNIDO, on behalf of the sponsors, which now included the Indian delegation. Recalling the reasons why the Industrial Development Board had wanted the member countries to be consulted on the advisability of holding a special international conference, he gave a brief analysis of the draft resolution. The sponsors had held lengthy consultations with some of the delegations and had amended their text to take the fullest account of the suggestions put forward. In so doing, they had been led to depart somewhat from the Board's proposals. Most of the amendments were occasioned by the desire to rationalize the calendar of meetings and to reduce expenditure. For that reason the conference was to be held in 1971, to synchronize with a session of the Industrial Development Board, but it was not to take place in the same year as the third session of UNCTAD. It was to be held at Vienna, and would enable UNIDO's staff and equipment to be utilized. The Board would act as a preparatory committee for the conference, to ensure better co-ordination of the work and a reduction in expenditure.

2. Chile, which was a member of the Industrial Development Board, believed that the time had come to assess the work done by UNIDO during its first few years of existence and to consider the guidance to be given for its future work. Admittedly, the financial implications (A/C.2/L.1099) of the draft resolution seemed very substantial, but it should be possible to cut expenditure since one of the Board's sessions might not be necessary. Moreover, the sponsors were willing to amend their text in order to obtain the most economic solution and for that reason they no longer urged that the conference should necessarily be held at Vienna. In operative paragraph 1, the words "special conference of all member countries of UNIDO" should be replaced by the words "special international conference of UNIDO". In paragraph 2 the end of the second line should

read "... to propose the venue, date and duration,". In the last line of the same paragraph, the word "scheme" should be replaced by the word "structure". Finally, he hoped that the revised draft resolution would be approved unanimously.

3. Mr. ROMUALDEZ (Philippines) said that by sponsoring the draft resolution his delegation had wished to stress the importance which his country attached to the work of UNIDO. His Government had complied with the recommendations of the International Symposium on Industrial Development<sup>1</sup> held at Athens in 1967 and welcomed the support given by UNIDO to its industrialization programme. However, it was always conscious of the fact that the Philippine economy was mainly agricultural. With that in mind, it had always endeavoured to harmonize development by taking account of the requirements of both agriculture and industry. Substantial results had been achieved in both fields and the manufacturing now accounted for some 20 per cent of the net national income. At a time when the terms of trade were steadily deteriorating, the Philippines had launched a campaign to promote exports, particularly handicraft products. Financial and tax measures encouraged foreign investment and all possible guarantees were given to investors. In the Industrial Development Board, the Philippines had sponsored resolution 22 (III) to organize a special meeting at the ministerial level (see A/7617 and Corr.1, p. 223). His delegation was therefore gratified to be a sponsor of the draft resolution submitted to the Second Committee. It accepted the amendments proposed by the Chilean delegation and hoped that the revised draft resolution would be approved unanimously.

4. Mr. PIACITELLI (Italy) said that his Government had accepted the Board's proposal to organize a special meeting of UNIDO (*idem*). However, the draft resolution submitted by the Chilean delegation appeared to put the matter in terms different from those visualized by the Board. Moreover, the financial implications (A/C.2/L.1099) seemed to be very considerable. Thus there appeared to be two matters before the Committee: firstly, it should give its opinion on the subject of the special meeting suggested by the Board; and secondly, it should also express its views on the conference proposed by the sponsors of the draft resolution. As their revised text differed substantially from the previous draft (A/C.2/L.1093), the Committee would require additional information in order to be able to come to a decision with full knowledge of the facts. Finally, his delegation was able to confirm that it agreed to the convening of the special meeting proposed by the Industrial

<sup>1</sup> See United Nations Industrial Development Organization, *Report of the International Symposium on Industrial Development* (United Nations publication, Sales No.: E.69.II.B.7).

Development Board, but was not yet able to express its views on the conference referred to in the draft resolution.

5. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that his Government had always supported UNIDO's activities since its inception. In addition, it had given very considerable assistance to developing countries to help them to eliminate once and for all the after-effects of colonialism. However, for reasons which had already been stated on various occasions, his delegation could not support draft resolution A/C.2/L.1093/Rev.1. The wording of operative paragraph 1 implied an unjustifiable discrimination against certain socialist countries, such as the German Democratic Republic. Participation in all conferences should be open to all countries, whether or not they were Members of the United Nations. Since the German Democratic Republic was one of the most highly industrialized countries and gave very considerable aid to the countries of the third world, it was inconceivable that it should be left out. He therefore failed to see why such a discriminatory formula had been used. Furthermore, the long-term policy of UNIDO could have been considered in the General Assembly, which was the most representative organ. The conference would require considerable effort and would entail very heavy expenditure. There had already been very lengthy discussion in respect of much smaller amounts than those appearing in the Secretary-General's note (A/C.2/L.1099) on the financial implications of the draft. His delegation was not of the opinion that the end always justified the means. The USSR therefore reserved the right to speak again on the matter, particularly in the Fifth Committee and in other appropriate organs.

6. Mr. BLAU (United States of America) said that his country's position had already been stated on several occasions. His delegation had had difficulties at the Industrial Development Board with regard to the question of having meetings of UNIDO at a high level within the time frame of the General Assembly. That proposal ignored the organizational structure of UNIDO under which the ordinary affairs were supervised by the Industrial Development Board reporting to the General Assembly for necessary overall policy direction. Nevertheless, the United States had advised the Executive Director of UNIDO (see A/7693) that if that proposal were generally supported, it would not oppose such a meeting if, firstly, it would occupy only a brief part of the time allotted to the Second Committee of the General Assembly, secondly, it would deal exclusively with the long-term programme of UNIDO and, thirdly, some arrangements could be made under which all members of UNIDO could participate.

7. From the point of view of the convenience of members, such a meeting was unexceptionable since all members of UNIDO were represented at Headquarters. At Vienna, on the other hand, many developing countries not members of the Industrial Development Board are either not represented at all or are represented only by diplomatic missions which would have difficulty in dealing with the technical questions under consideration. They would, therefore, be put to the additional expense of bringing representatives to Vienna. The same would be true of any alternative location that might be suggested by the Industrial Development Board.

8. Moreover, if a few days of the time allotted to the Second Committee were utilized and the question confined to the long-term programme, there should be no financial implications.

9. The deletion of the words "in Vienna" in operative paragraph 1 was of no assistance in regard to the financial implications since it would be only the additional amount of \$413,500 that would be the responsibility of such country as might agree to host the conference.

10. Finally, the financial implications (A/C.2/L.1099) bordered on Alice in Wonderland. They were apparently prepared without consultation with the co-sponsors and seemed to relate to an entirely different type of conference than that contemplated by the draft resolution. The Committee was thus thrown into a state of utter and complete confusion which would be difficult to straighten out on the last day of its existence.

11. His delegation could, of course, vote against the revised draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1093/Rev.1) but would prefer that the sponsors would agree not to press the resolution to a vote but refer it, together with the staggering financial implications, to the Industrial Development Board with the request that it report back to the General Assembly. That would not be equivalent to leaving to the Board a matter it had referred to the General Assembly since the proposal before the Board (see A/7617 and Corr.1, p. 223) was markedly different from that discussed in the General Assembly.

12. Mr. ABE (Japan) said that his delegation understood very well why the sponsors had proposed to convene the conference. However, as their proposal (A/C.2/L.1093/Rev.1) differed substantially from that of the Industrial Development Board and its adoption would involve a number of difficulties, and in view of the fact that it did not seem possible to reach unanimous agreement on the revised draft resolution, it would be preferable to refer that text to the Board and request it to examine the matter more thoroughly.

13. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) said that his Government had already replied to the Executive Director of UNIDO (see A/7693). His delegation was not convinced of the usefulness of another special international conference, since no other specialized agency had called for one. The financial implications appeared overwhelming. Views could also vary concerning the date and meeting place. For those reasons, he supported the proposal to refer the text submitted to the Board.

14. Mr. WOLTE (Austria) felt that it would be very timely to convene a special conference. It was necessary to study UNIDO's long-range policy, particularly in the context of the Second United Nations Development Decade. However, views could differ concerning the date and other aspects of the matter and a more detailed study could be made. His Government believed that, if the conference were held at Vienna, UNIDO's facilities would be available, thus avoiding certain expenditure. Were the conference to be held elsewhere, additional expenditure would be involved. Moreover, a great many countries were represented at Vienna by eminent specialists who could make a very

fruitful contribution to the discussions. In any event, the matter could be studied in greater detail; however, his delegation would support the efforts of the sponsors by voting for the revised draft resolution.

15. Mr. DUBEY (India) said that the statement of financial implications (A/C.2/L.1099) was alarming and appeared to be intended as a shock therapy. He requested two further clarifications.

16. Firstly, there were two distinct headings in document A/C.2/L.1099; one referred to the preparation of a report for the fourth session of the Industrial Development Board; the other referred to the preparation of the pre-conference documentation; each document would have 150 pages and would require the recruitment of consultants and/or temporary staff. There appeared to be some confusion as to the nature of the two documents. If a document was to be published before the conference enumerating its objectives and certain subjects which it might usefully consider, the report for the fourth session of the Board should be restricted to the matters mentioned in operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, namely, the venue, date and duration of the conference, its provisional agenda and a very general statement of its basic objectives; such a report need not be more than twenty-five to thirty pages long and should not cost more than \$3,000 to \$4,000.

17. Secondly, the financial implications should be much lower still; the reason for holding the conference in synchronization with a session of the Industrial Development Board was, precisely, to economize; thus, the costs relating to the duplication already mentioned, as well as those relating to the holding of the fourth session of the Board, must actually be subtracted from the total of \$413,500 given in the financial implications (see A/C.2/L.1099, para. 5), so that the total financial implications could be reduced to one fourth of the amount indicated, and perhaps even less.

18. While believing that expenditure should be reduced to the minimum, he could not agree with the view that arrangements for the conference could be made in such a perfect framework as to entail no expenditure at all. If the principle that a conference was to be held was accepted, then the implication of attendant expenditure must also be accepted.

19. Mr. PRAGUE (France) recalled his Government's particular interest in industrial development and in the work of UNIDO. However, as France had already stated in writing to the Secretariat (see A/7693), it could not see what contribution the conference could make. The amendments to the original text of the draft resolution added to his delegation's apprehensions. It would therefore be unable to vote for the revised draft.

20. Mr. KELSO (Australia) said that his delegation fully understood the intentions of the draft resolution's sponsors, whose concern was similar to its own. However, it could well be asked whether the problems could be solved at another conference and whether it would not add to the confusion. Words must not be substituted for action. The financial implications appeared very substantial and it should be determined whether all the expenditure would

really be worth while. Furthermore, as other delegations had already expressed views very similar to his own, it would seem advisable to study the proposal in greater depth.

21. Mr. BILLNER (Sweden) said that although Sweden for reasons stated in the report of the Executive Director (see A/7693) had been somewhat doubtful as to the convening of a special meeting of UNIDO as proposed in Industrial Development Board resolution 22 (III) (see A/7617 and Corr.1, p. 223), his delegation was now in a position to support draft resolution A/C.2/L.1093/Rev.1. It was important that all States members of UNIDO should be given the opportunity to consider the question of the long-term direction of UNIDO's activities, its organizational structure and the question of the financing of its operations. As appeared from the draft, the consideration of those questions would be the main objectives of the conference. A prerequisite for the success of the conference was of course that it was carefully prepared with a view to enabling it to produce constructive decisions in that respect and thereby to strengthen the role of UNIDO in the development process. The Board, as its fourth session, would have to make a thorough review of the longer range orientation of UNIDO, its organizational structure and the question of financing in order to present specific and concrete recommendations to the conference. His delegation welcomed the report requested of the Executive Director of UNIDO in operative paragraph 3 of the draft. His delegation understood that report to be intended to provide the Board with the necessary background information for its consideration of those subject matters.

22. Mr. MUZIK (Czechoslovakia) said that Czechoslovakia had always been keenly interested in UNIDO's activities, but his delegation could not unreservedly support draft resolution A/C.2/L.1093/Rev.1. It understood the sponsors' intentions and thanked them for having accepted some of its suggestions. However, there were still some inconsistencies in the draft. Referring to the preamble, he noted that the proposed conference had nothing to do with the one mentioned in Industrial Development Board resolution 22 (III). Furthermore, the reference to the Second Development Decade was inappropriate, since it would be years before the conference could be convened and the Board itself was fully competent to contribute to the success of the Decade. In operative paragraph 2, the Board was requested to propose the date, duration and basic objectives of the conference. The intention was certainly not to have it formulate the same objectives, organization or financing. Changes were expected with regard to all those aspects. His delegation had already had the opportunity to state in the Committee that UNIDO's current activities appeared satisfactory, considering the circumstances and the fact that UNIDO had been in existence for only three years. The conference should study such problems as the fact that UNIDO was not active enough in UNDP projects and that full advantage was not taken of available opportunities. However, the conference should not be convened too soon. A minimum of seven to eight years following UNIDO's establishment should pass before any decision was taken. Since the conference referred to in the draft resolution was not the one contemplated by the Board, it would be desirable to know the latter's views and, rather than decide to hold the conference, it would be better to suggest to the



Board that the conference should be held. Therefore, in operative paragraph 2 it would be better to use a formula such as "requests . . . to consider". The wording should be less precise and should not request that an agenda should be formulated. It would also be preferable not to mention organization or financing. The Board should be allowed the greatest possible latitude. A period of two years would not be too long to ensure that the conference was well prepared. His delegation believed that the matter should be referred to the Board. While it did not wish to propose formal amendments at present, it hoped that operative paragraphs 1 and 2 would be amended. Operative paragraph 1 might read as follows: "Suggests that a United Nations conference on industrial development at the broadest and highest possible level of governmental representation could be held after the United Nations Industrial Development Organization has been in existence for six or seven years". In operative paragraph 2, the following phrase should be added after the words "Requests the Industrial Development Board to": "consider the suggestion and the possibility for the Board to"; finally, the last phrase of the paragraph, "its organizational scheme and the question of financing", might be deleted.

23. The CHAIRMAN noted that those were suggestions not formal amendments.

24. Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) said that, as the representatives of Sweden and Czechoslovakia had rightly pointed out, the proposed conference was not the one envisaged in the Industrial Development Board's resolution 22 (III) (see A/7617 and Corr.1, p. 223). Since it was that other conference which had recently been discussed in the Committee (see 1270th meeting), the delegations had not had time to give serious consideration to the objectives of the conference referred to in the draft currently under discussion. Since UNIDO was only three years old, it might be asked whether it was not inconsistent for the General Assembly to plan to hold a conference to examine UNIDO's basic objectives, structure and financing. To do so might give the public the unfortunate impression that three years after having created that agency out of enthusiasm, the General Assembly was admitting that it had not given serious consideration to the matter at the outset. Time should be taken to consider the consequences of the draft resolution so as to avoid taking hasty decisions which would later be regretted. The Preparatory Committee for the Second United Nations Development Decade had requested that a list of the obstacles to the progress of the developing countries should be drawn up. His delegation wondered whether the proliferation of conferences was not in itself such an obstacle. Development called for action, rather than words. If several years were taken to consider the work accomplished by UNIDO, it would be possible to give serious thought to the matter and to take decisions that would hold good for the future. The amendment proposed by Czechoslovakia seemed too detailed. It seemed rather arbitrary to hold that six or seven years following UNIDO's establishment should pass before the conference was held. If a serious study was to be carried out, Sir Robert Jackson's *A Study of the Capacity of the United Nations Development System* would first have to be given serious consideration and the replies of the agencies concerned should be in hand. While it approved the spirit of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1093/Rev.1, the Iranian dele-

gation believed that nothing more should be done to request the Industrial Development Board to draw up a report on its new conference.

25. In speaking about the financial implications (A/C.2/L.1099) of the draft resolution, the Indian representative had mentioned shock therapy. The Iranian delegation would welcome such therapy if it opened everyone's eyes to reality. In the light of past experience, the financial implications seemed optimistic and it was likely that they would be exceeded in actual practice. The conference should not be a substitute for the action that was needed. The expenditure involved could only invite approval if it was applied to on-the-spot activities. Finally, the Iranian delegation proposed that the Industrial Development Board should be requested to consider the possibility of holding such a conference and should draw up a report on the subject for consideration at the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly.

26. Mr. STELLINI (Malta) said that his delegation had some doubt about the revised draft resolution and would have to abstain from voting. If the Industrial Development Board had requested the General Assembly to give consideration to what was requested in operative paragraph 2, his delegation would have been able to come to a decision on operative paragraph 1. The financial implications seemed considerable, and it should be recalled that the International Symposium on Industrial Development had taken place two years previously, resulting in an expenditure of about \$1 million. It would seem more worth while to apply the large sums necessary for holding the proposed conference directly to the industrialization needs of the developing countries.

27. Mr. BRADLEY (Argentina) said that his Government had given its attention to the draft resolution under discussion but had not as yet issued instructions on the matter. His delegation very much regretted that it would therefore be compelled to abstain from voting.

28. Mr. RINGNALDA (Netherlands) said that his delegation had already had occasion to express its views to the Committee on the matter under discussion. Those views were negative. His delegation's attitude had changed slightly when Chile had introduced the draft resolution, but it still had as many doubts about the financial implications (A/C.2/L.1099). As the representative of India had observed, document A/C.2/L.1099 had been drawn up somewhat hastily. The expenditure involved in the first part of the document, namely, the preparation of the report for the fourth session of the Board, should not be as high as it was. Similarly, some reduction should be possible in the expenditure envisaged for the second part of the document. There would, however, still be some expenses to bear, which might be acceptable provided a clearer idea was given about what was to be discussed at the conference. In the absence of such clarification, his delegation supported those delegations which had asked that the matter should be referred back to the Industrial Development Board. As for the suggestions proposed by Czechoslovakia, his delegation could accept the changes in operative paragraph 1 but would prefer that the minimum lapse of time before the conference was held should not be specified. It could also accept the changes in operative paragraph 2. Before making

a decision, his delegation would like to hear what the UNIDO representative had to say about the financial implications; it would also like to have the Chilean delegation's opinion.

29. Mr. PATRIOTA (Brazil) said that his delegation was one of the sponsors of the draft resolution and thanked Chile for introducing it. The financial implications seemed extremely high. The conference had been proposed for 1970 or 1971, or at least five years after the establishment of UNIDO. Five of the sponsors of the draft resolution were Latin American States, which were endeavouring to speed up their industrialization. His delegation hoped that the debate would be suspended so that the sponsors could hold consultations and consider the possibilities of reaching a compromise on the amendments so as to make them acceptable to everybody.

30. Mr. CORREA (Chile), announcing that the sponsors had agreed upon a new text, said that the statement by the representative of UNIDO might dispel the doubts about the financial implications.

31. Mr. AIZENSTAT (United Nations Industrial Development Organization) said that the financial implications of the draft under discussion, which were contained in document A/C.2/L.1099, were only preliminary estimates, serving to indicate approximate costs. Those figures had been based on the estimates mentioned in paragraph 3 of document A/C.2/L.1099. With regard to the observations made by the representative of India concerning the documentation referred to in paragraph 3 (f), there was no duplication involved. The first document of 150 pages was to be prepared before the conference and submitted to the Industrial Development Board for consideration at its fourth session, while the other 150-page document was to be the final report of the conference. He estimated that the technical documentation necessary for the proposed conference would amount to 500 pages. Those were, however, merely estimates based on a draft resolution, which was not intended to give every detail about the work planned.

32. The Indian representative had estimated that if the pre-conference report was short, its cost might be reduced. The \$30,000 total for part I of the financial implications was based on the assumption that the General Assembly would ask for a detailed substantive report covering the various matters mentioned in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution. In any case, it was essential that the Committee should make it clear to the Executive Director of UNIDO whether the report should be limited to the subjects of immediate interest mentioned in the draft resolution.

33. The Indian representative had also pointed out that savings could be made if the proposed conference took the place of a regular session of the Industrial Development Board. That was true, but the amount shown in the statement of the financial implications was based on the assumption that the conference would be a separate event, lasting two weeks.

34. In short, it would be well to bear in mind that the figures shown in document A/C.2/L.1099 were only preliminary and would undoubtedly be revised in accordance

with the decisions taken by the General Assembly and the Industrial Development Board concerning the scope of the conference. Furthermore, the situation would, in all probability, change as the Board considered the matter.

35. Mr. DUBEY (India) thanked the representative of UNIDO for confirming his belief that it was, in fact, possible to make some savings.

36. As a result of the comments made on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1093/Rev.1, the sponsors had decided to revise the text further. They were making those revisions for the following reasons: controversy concerning the proposed site for the conference should be avoided and the Industrial Development Board allowed to decide the matter; the conference had to be organized in such a way as to keep expenditure to a minimum; the proposed conference should be held in 1971 or 1972; the General Assembly should suggest that the Board consider the possibility of holding a conference and should not itself make a final decision on the matter; and it had to be presumed that expenditure arising out of the Conference would be lower than the amount indicated in document A/C.2/L.1099.

37. Operative paragraph 1 should be revised to read:

"1. *Suggests* that a special international conference of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, at the highest possible level of governmental representation be held, either in 1971 or 1972, ensuring that this conference and the third session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development are not held in the same year, within a framework which will reduce the expenditures for holding the conference to the minimum".

38. The phrase "which should include the longer-range orientation" in operative paragraph 2 should be replaced by "including the longer-range orientation".

39. The CHAIRMAN said that the representative of Jamaica had requested separate votes on operative paragraphs 1 and 2.

40. Mr. MUZIK (Czechoslovakia) said that he was unable to support the further revisions announced by the representative of India, since they took no account of the suggestions made by his delegation. He proposed the following amendments: to replace the words "a special international conference of UNIDO" in operative paragraph 1 by "a United Nations conference on industrial development", and to amend the opening line of operative paragraph 2 to read "*Requests* the Industrial Development Board to consider the suggestion and the possibility for the Board to act ...".

41. His delegation was not happy about the dates proposed for the conference and still preferred a less specific form of wording, such as "in the near future".

42. Mr. CORREA (Chile), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the revised draft resolution, said that they had no objection to the second amendment proposed by the representative of Czechoslovakia regarding operative paragraph 2. The sponsors could not, however, accept his amendment to operative paragraph 1.

43. Mr. WARSAMA (Somalia) thanked the sponsors for their effort to make the revised draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1093/Rev.1) more flexible. Unfortunately, his delegation was unable to support the draft resolution, even in the version resulting from the oral revisions. Resolution 22 (III) of the Industrial Development Board had envisaged a special meeting which would be held in conjunction with the celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Organization; the draft resolution was concerned with a conference of a different kind. In 1966 UNIDO had been established and its purposes clearly enunciated in General Assembly resolution 2152 (XXI). One year afterwards, an International Symposium on Industrial Development at the highest level had taken place. There was nothing to justify the holding of a further international conference within so short a time. His delegation agreed, in principle, that the Industrial Development Board should consider the possibility of organizing a conference, but definitely not in 1971 or 1972.

44. Mr. RANKIN (Canada) said that his delegation to the third session of the Industrial Development Board had expressed great interest in the aims of resolution 22 (III) of the Board. It was not convinced, however, that a conference at the highest level was a suitable way of attaining the objectives of UNIDO. It was the Board which was responsible for deciding on an appropriate long-term programme for UNIDO.

45. His delegation commended the efforts of those delegations which had proposed amendments to draft resolution A/C.2/L.1093/Rev.1 and the sponsors' spirit of co-operation. Nevertheless, since the draft resolution still recommended a conference, his delegation would find it difficult to support it.

46. Mr. CHRISTIANSEN (Norway) said that his delegation had supported resolution 22 (III) of the Industrial Development Board; it believed, however, that it was for the Board to review the role of UNIDO. It was extremely doubtful whether an international conference of the type envisaged in the draft resolution could make any significant contribution to the achievement of the objectives mentioned in the document. UNIDO should direct its efforts towards creating a climate of mutual confidence and devote less attention to organizing costly conferences. The time had come for UNIDO to embark on practical action. His delegation regretted that it would be unable to support the draft resolution, even in its revised form.

47. Mr. ALI (Iraq) expressed the opinion that the draft resolution had been drawn up in haste and brought to the Committee's attention too late. The same observation applied to the statement of the financial implications (A/C.2/L.1099). His delegation favoured the idea of holding a conference, but believed, like the representative of Czechoslovakia, that it should be a United Nations conference, either with the participation of all States Members of the United Nations or open to all countries. His delegation would vote in favour of the Czechoslovak amendment to operative paragraph 1 (see para. 40 above) and would abstain from voting on the revised draft resolution as a whole.

48. Mr. FRANZI (Italy) thanked the sponsors for their efforts; he still believed, however, that the conference they were proposing was not the same as the one envisaged in resolution 22 (III) of the Industrial Development Board. His delegation had not had time to consult his Government and therefore regretted that it would be unable to vote in favour of the revised draft resolution at the present stage.

49. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the revisions made orally by the sponsors had not removed his delegation's difficulties; it could not support the draft resolution, even in its revised form. His delegation's reservations still applied.

50. Mr. MUZIK (Czechoslovakia) pointed out that his delegation's insistence that the conference should be a United Nations conference did not imply any prejudgement regarding its membership.

51. He proposed that the words "either in 1971 or in 1972" proposed orally by India as a further revision of operative paragraph 1 (see para. 37 above) should be replaced by "at an appropriate time".

52. Mr. DUBEY (India) said that the sponsors could not accept that amendment.

53. Mr. BLAU (United States of America) said that the first Czechoslovak amendment to operative paragraph 1 (see para. 40 above) did, in effect, prejudge the membership of the conference, inasmuch as it allowed for the possibility of excluding from participation some members of UNIDO which were not Members of the United Nations.

54. Mr. RABEARIVELO (Madagascar) said that his Government had been in favour of holding a conference in conjunction with the celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations. The draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1093/Rev.1) was proposing a different conference, at a different date; moreover, the financial implications (A/C.2/L.1099) were very substantial. His delegation could not support the revised draft resolution, even if it was amended in the manner proposed by Czechoslovakia; on the whole, it agreed with what the Italian representative had said earlier.

55. Mr. BRADLEY (Argentina) said that his delegation would abstain in the vote on the revised draft resolution. He wished to observe, however, that the Committee was not in a position to approve such an important proposal. It was customary for a resolution of that kind to be adopted unanimously by the General Assembly; a conference like the one envisaged in the draft resolution would not be likely to succeed if it failed to receive unanimous support, and the present draft would not command that support. The sponsors would be well advised to consider the consequences of their action before calling for a vote on the resolution.

56. Mr. SAM (Ghana) said that he supported the Argentine representative's suggestion.

57. Mr. ROUAMBA (Upper Volta) said his delegation had taken an active part in the work of the third session of the Industrial Development Board. It was under the definite impression that the proposal and its financial implications



were radically different from what had been envisaged by the Board in its resolution 22 (III). It also had the impression that the Second Committee was seeking to assume the prerogatives of the Board. His delegation supported the Argentine representative's suggestion. If the sponsors put their draft to the vote, his delegation would vote against it.

58. Mr. BILLNER (Sweden) suggested that the sponsors should accept the last of the Czechoslovak amendments (see para. 51 above) on the understanding that the conference could be held in 1970, 1971 or 1972; the Industrial Development Board would make the final decision.

59. The CHAIRMAN observed that the sponsors had rejected that amendment.

60. Mr. CORREA (Chile) said that the sponsors had originally envisaged the holding of a conference in 1970 at the United Nations level. For certain reasons, they had submitted another proposal, which, after several revisions, merely suggested that the Industrial Development Board should consider the possibility of holding a conference in 1971 or 1972. However, after having exchanged views on the matter, the sponsors accepted the Czechoslovak amendment regarding the date (see para. 51 above). In any event, the date for the conference would be decided by the Industrial Development Board. The sponsors were sorry that they could not accept the other Czechoslovak amendments, and they suggested that the Committee should vote on the matter.

61. The CHAIRMAN noted that the sponsors thus did not accept the Argentine representative's suggestion that the draft resolution should not be put to the vote.

62. Mr. SAMUELS (Guyana) said his delegation would abstain on operative paragraph 1 for essentially the same reasons as those indicated by the United States representative. It would vote for operative paragraph 2 in view of the explanation offered by the representative of Chile.

63. Mr. RIOS (Panama) requested that the revised draft resolution should be put to the vote.

64. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation would vote against operative paragraph 1, which had the effect of discriminating against the socialist countries.

65. Mr. DERESSA (Ethiopia) said his Government had supported the idea of organizing a conference along the lines envisaged in resolution 22 (III) of the Industrial Development Board. The draft resolution now before the Committee was of a different nature. Personally, he did not feel that it was necessary to organize such a large-scale conference so soon after the International Symposium. Since his delegation had not received instructions from its Government, it would have to abstain in the vote.

66. Mr. BRATHWAITE (Barbados) said his Government had supported the idea of holding a conference organized in the manner indicated in resolution 22 (III) of the Industrial Development Board (see A/7617 and Corr.1, p. 223). The draft now before the Committee had a different objective,

and, in the absence of instructions from his Government, his delegation would abstain in the vote.

67. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the Czechoslovak amendment replacing the words "a special international conference of UNIDO" in operative paragraph 1 by "a United Nations conference on industrial development".

*The amendment was rejected by 35 votes to 16, with 37 abstentions.*

68. The CHAIRMAN noted that the representative of Jamaica had requested a separate vote on operative paragraphs 1 and 2, as orally revised by the sponsors.

*Operative paragraph 1, as amended, was adopted by 28 votes to 20, with 43 abstentions.*

*Operative paragraph 2, as amended, was adopted by 34 votes to 7, with 46 abstentions.*

69. The CHAIRMAN invited the members of the Committee to vote on the revised draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1093/Rev.1), as a whole, as orally amended by the sponsors.

*The revised draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 32 votes to 9, with 47 abstentions.*

70. Mr. BRADLEY (Argentina) expressed regret that the sponsors had not heeded his delegation's appeal, now that the draft resolution had been adopted, his delegation wondered what the sponsors would be able to do with it.

71. Mr. AKSIN (Turkey) said that while his Government had always supported UNIDO, it had certain misgivings about convening a special conference at the highest level. Such a conference did not seem to be the best means of achieving UNIDO's objectives, and his delegation had therefore abstained on operative paragraph 1 and on the draft resolution as a whole. Nevertheless, his Government would participate if the conference was held.

72. Mr. PRAGUE (France) said that the debate had by no means clarified the idea underlying the proposed international conference. It had only added to the ambiguity of the proposal, the last version of which was so vague that it did not preclude the possibility of a formula which his delegation would find acceptable. His delegation had therefore abstained in the vote.

73. Mr. BILLNER (Sweden) said that operative paragraph 3 should be understood in the context of the statement which the Executive Director of UNIDO had made in the Second Committee the previous month (see 1269th meeting).

74. Mr. FERNANDEZ (Venezuela) said that his delegation had abstained even though it had agreed with the basic idea of the draft resolution. It felt that such an important resolution should have been adopted by a substantial majority. In view of the result of the vote, the effect of the resolution would be very limited and it was unfortunate that the sponsors had insisted on putting the draft to the

vote under such unfavourable circumstances. His delegation had therefore preferred to abstain.

75. Mr. KHALIL (United Arab Republic) said that his delegation had favoured the Czechoslovak amendment to operative paragraph 1 because it felt that it was unfair to disregard the capacity of such highly industrialized countries as the German Democratic Republic to provide assistance. His delegation had abstained on operative paragraph 1 and had voted for paragraph 2 and the draft resolution as a whole. It felt that the text was purely procedural in nature and merely invited the Industrial Development Board to study the advisability of holding a conference.

76. Mr. SAMUELS (Guyana) said that his delegation had abstained on operative paragraph 1 and on the draft resolution as a whole even though it had originally supported the idea of holding such a conference. The situation had subsequently changed to such an extent that

his delegation, in the absence of instructions from its Government, had been obliged to abstain.

77. Mr. EL-ATTRASH (Syria) said his delegation had not been convinced of the need to hold the conference and had therefore abstained on operative paragraph 1 and on the draft resolution as a whole.

78. Mr. FRANZI (Italy) said that in voting for the revised draft resolution the Committee had supported the idea of holding a thirty-two-nation conference. However, what would become of the special meeting that was to be held in New York in 1970 at the request of the Industrial Development Board?

79. Mr. BLAU (United States of America) said that his delegation had voted against the draft resolution as a whole and the two operative paragraphs for the reasons it had already indicated.

*The meeting rose at 7.30 p.m.*