



ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Tuesday, 27 July 1971

FIFTY-FIRST SESSION

at 10.15 a.m.

OFFICIAL RECORDS

PALAIS DES NATIONS, GENEVA

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 8:	
Operational activities for development	
(a) United Nations Development Programme (<i>concluded</i>)	177
(d) United Nations Volunteers programme (<i>concluded</i>)	180
Agenda item 13:	
Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations	182

President: Mr. DRISS (Tunisia)

AGENDA ITEM 8

Operational activities for development

(a) United Nations Development Programme (*concluded*) (E/4954 and Corr.1, E/5043, E/L.1439/Rev.2, E/L.1444/Rev.1, E/L.1448, E/L.1449, E/L.1450)

1. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the revised text of the draft resolution on special advisory services on natural resources submitted by the Congo (Democratic Republic of), Indonesia, Jamaica, Kenya, Pakistan and Yugoslavia (E/L.1439/Rev.2). He asked if any delegations wished to explain their vote before the vote was taken.

2. Mr. ZVEZDINE (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, despite the amendments made to the text, his delegation's position on the draft resolution remained unchanged. If the draft resolution was put to the vote paragraph by paragraph, the Soviet delegation would vote against the second and fourth preambular paragraphs and paragraph 1, and would abstain on paragraph 2. As it was his delegation would have to abstain on the whole draft resolution.

3. Mr. PRAGUE (France) said that, in view of the amendments made to the text, he could withdraw his own amendment (E/L.1450).

4. Mr. MILTON (United Kingdom) said that even the new text did not pay sufficient attention to the decisions of the Governing Council of UNDP, since paragraph 1 provided for immediate implementation of Council resolution 1572 B(L) and did not give enough importance to the study commissioned by the Governing Council. His delegation would therefore be unable to vote for the draft resolution.

5. The PRESIDENT put the draft resolution to the vote.

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

Hungary, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Indonesia, Italy, Kenya, Lebanon, Madagascar, Malaysia, New Zealand, Niger, Pakistan, Sudan, Yugoslavia, Brazil, France, Ghana, Greece, Haiti.

Against: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Abstaining: Hungary, Norway, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America.

The draft resolution (E/L.1439/Rev.2) was adopted by 16 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

6. Mr. OSANYA-NYYNEQUE (Kenya), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, said that they realized that it was impossible to accommodate all points of view. Their understanding of paragraph 1 was that the words "implement forthwith" would enable the Secretary-General to start implementing the Council resolution immediately. The phrase "when appropriate" had been inserted to enable him not only to take into account the results of the study, when they had been summarized in one document, but also to keep abreast of the study so that important facts which emerged from it could be taken into account while it was still in progress. In that way it took into account the decision by the Governing Council.

7. Mr. PATHMARAJAH (Ceylon) and Mr. AYOUB (Tunisia) said that, had they been present during the vote, they would have voted in favour of the draft resolution.

8. Mr. HEDEMANN (Norway) repeated the view expressed by his delegation during the general debate that the comprehensive report requested by the Governing Council should be completed before the Economic and Social Council took a final decision to implement the proposal for the establishment of special natural resources advisory services. It was not convinced that the introduction of separate advisory services for natural resources was the best procedure and it had taken note of the assurance given by the Deputy Administrator of UNDP (1788th meeting) that the proposed postponement would not reduce the rapid and efficient provision of such services when requested by developing countries. The Norwegian delegation agreed with the idea of advisory services as such, but considered that the resolution just adopted by the Council raised questions that required further study. For those reasons, his delegation had abstained in the vote.

9. Mr. de AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil), introducing the revised draft resolution submitted by Brazil, Haiti, Kenya, Pakistan, the USSR and Yugoslavia (E/L.1444/Rev.1), said that the first preambular paragraph embodied the important concept that without industrial development there could be no economic independence. The second preambular paragraph stressed the importance of the roles played by UNDP and UNIDO and the need for assistance, to which each country had a right at every stage of development; it also emphasized the fact that priorities were defined by each country within its own development plans. The third preambular paragraph referred to the complicated delays so far encountered in processing requests for assistance in industrial development. More dynamism was needed in that sector, where requests for assistance encountered particular difficulties.

10. Some amendments had been made to the operative paragraphs in order to take into account comments made by various delegations. Paragraph 1(a), with its emphasis on the least developed among developing countries, had been amended to take into account the amendment proposed by the representative of Madagascar. Paragraphs 1(b) and 2 had been amended to make it clear that the comprehensive progress report would be considered at the summer session of the Governing Council. The word "preparation" had been included in operative paragraph 1(b) because the delays in the preparation of projects were particularly long.

11. He had two further amendments to make to the text, in order to take account of comments made just before the meeting. The first was the replacement of the words "a basic feature" in the first preambular paragraph by "one of the basic features". Industrial development was clearly not the only basic feature of integrated, comprehensive development. The second was the insertion after the word "Requests" in paragraph 1 of the words "the Governing Council to instruct" in order to reflect UNDP procedure.

12. He hoped that the revised draft resolution would receive unanimous support.

13. Mr. HAMID (Sudan) said that the amendments incorporated in the revised text of the draft resolution had dispelled the doubts that he had had about the original text, to such an extent that he now wished to be included among the sponsors.

14. Mr. RAZAFINDRABE (Madagascar) said that, as the revised text had taken his comments into account, he would withdraw his amendment (E/L.1448). He wished to emphasize, however, that priorities should be decided upon by the Governments concerned and that particular attention should be given to the least developed among the developed countries.

15. Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya) said that, as one of the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1444/Rev.1, he was pleased to accept the constructive amendments introduced orally by the Brazilian representative. His Government attached great importance to industrial development as part of the over-all development strategy.

16. Mr. EFFAH-APPENTENG (Ghana) welcomed the oral amendments and the sponsors' inclusion of the amendment submitted by the representative of Madagascar in the revised text. Although most developing countries were basically agricultural, they aspired to industrial development. He therefore hoped there would be unanimous support for the draft resolution.

17. Mr. MILTON (United Kingdom), introducing the amendments submitted by his own and the United States delegations (E/L.1449), said that the explanations given by the Brazilian representative had not altered his delegation's position. All requests for assistance were equally deserving of attention and it was not for an intergovernmental body to direct that certain requests should be given preferential treatment. It was understandable that the Special International Conference of UNIDO should recommend that priority should be given to industrial matters. Similar requests might equally well be made for other sectors, and special attention could not be given to all.

18. With regard to the second amendment, for the deletion of paragraph 2, it seemed inappropriate for the Economic and Social Council to tell the Governing Council of UNDP what items should be placed on its agenda. The Council could express general views, but the details should be left to UNDP.

19. Speaking on behalf of his own delegation, he said that it agreed with the call in the third preambular paragraph for more dynamism and speed in processing requests for assistance in the field of industrial development, but considered that all requests should be speedily dealt with. With regard to the introductory sentence in paragraph 1, he did not think that the Governing Council should instruct the Administrator. He would prefer a less mandatory term such as "ask".

20. Mr. GÁL (Hungary) requested that his delegation should be added to the list of sponsors of the draft resolution.

21. Mr. ZVEZDINE (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the draft resolution was of great importance, for during the general debate a number of delegations had drawn attention to the lack of projects on industrial development in UNDP. No substantial progress towards economic independence could be made without industrial development, although countries could choose different sectors of industry, according to their natural resources and requirements.

22. His delegation understood the concern aroused by the draft resolution among a number of countries, especially those dependent on raw materials from the developing countries. The United Kingdom representative had said that all requests for assistance should be given equal attention. That was true, but special attention should be given to industrial development.

23. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) said that, as one of the sponsors of the draft resolution, he endorsed the Brazilian representative's remarks. With regard to the amendment

submitted by the United Kingdom and the United States, the reason for the use of the word "special" had been adequately explained by the Brazilian representative, who had pointed out that requests for technical assistance for industrial development had encountered particular difficulties which had led to undue delay. The responsibility for the submission of requests obviously lay with individual governments, but the fact that previous requests for industrial development projects had met with difficulties discouraged them from submitting further requests in that important sector. The word "special" was therefore important, but his delegation would be willing to accept any word adequately expressing the sponsors' intention if it was more generally acceptable.

24. It was true that requests for special priority from different bodies might cancel each other out, but the Governing Council would itself admit that industrial development projects had not so far received due attention.

25. His delegation did not endorse the United Kingdom representative's contention that the Economic and Social Council could not give detailed instructions to the Governing Council of UNDP. Since the Council had the central responsibility in all fields, it could give detailed instructions to all bodies subsidiary to it and which reported to it.

26. Mr. ZAGORIN (United States of America) said that, if the sponsors could not accept the replacement of the word "special" by the word "appropriate", they might be prepared to accept the word "adequate". He would have no hesitation in supporting the draft resolution if that word was used instead of "special", since it gave the sense that sufficient attention should be paid to the industrial development of the developing countries.

27. He agreed that due attention should be paid to industrial development and that if in fact UNDP had been remiss in that respect - which he doubted - it should change its attitude. There were, however, other means of promoting development, such as pre-investment and technical assistance projects, which could be more effective, particularly for the least developed among the developing countries. The word "special" meant that priority should be given to the industrial sector and not to other equally important sectors such as transport, communications, power and export processing and promotion. The priority to be accorded depended on the individual needs of the countries concerned.

28. His delegation had no hesitation in supporting paragraph 1(b) but felt that paragraph 2 extended the sphere of policy guidance and interfered with the domestic arrangements of UNDP. He therefore thought that paragraph 1(b) was enough and that paragraph 2 should be deleted.

29. Mr. de AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) thanked the delegations which had supported the draft resolution and those which had asked to be added to the list of sponsors.

30. The word "special" exactly expressed the intention of the sponsors, who wanted particular attention to be given to a neglected field of activity. They were therefore unable to accept either "appropriate" or "adequate". Only the

word "special" would express the need to avoid the present delays in processing requests for industrial development assistance.

31. He saw no objection to the use of the word "instruct" in the introductory sentence of paragraph 1.

32. If paragraph 1(b) was generally acceptable, he saw no reason why such an important item should not have a permanent place on the agenda of the summer session of the UNDP Governing Council. He was therefore unable to accept the amendment submitted by the United Kingdom and the United States.

33. The PRESIDENT said that there seemed to be a possibility of reaching a consensus. He appealed to delegations to find a formula acceptable to all.

34. Mr. CHAMMAS (Lebanon) agreed that, in the light of the discussion and the arguments advanced by the sponsors of the draft resolution and of the amendment, a consensus would be possible. The sponsors of the draft resolution had explained that, in view of the past history of UNDP, they wished to give policy guidance to the Administrator. He did not think that the right of the Council to give such guidance could be questioned.

35. The argument that words such as "appropriate", or "adequate" would give too much latitude to the Administrator because they would be open to subjective interpretation would apply equally to the word "special". A way of ensuring that special attention would be given to requests for industrial development would be to ask developing countries to state their priorities when submitting requests. If that was made clear in the draft resolution, the United Kingdom and United States might be willing to withdraw their amendment.

36. He thought that their difficulty with regard to paragraph 2 was also a question of wording. He would not make a formal proposal, but suggested that the paragraph might be re-worded to read, for example, "Further requests the Governing Council to give, during its summer session each year, due consideration to the report referred to above". The word "permanent" was too specific. There might be some particular reason why the Governing Council would not be able, or would not wish, to discuss it at one particular session. Moreover, the developing countries hoped that they would eventually become economically independent and the progress report would no longer be necessary.

37. Mr. SCOLAMIERO (Italy) said that his delegation was in favour of the draft resolution. It was important, however, not to give the impression that UNDP was being rebuked for not having processed enough industrial development projects. In fact, as the Governing Council's report on its twelfth session (E/5043) showed, industrial projects had ranked second of all the projects, totalling 368. The problem lay in the fact that the countries concerned found it difficult to formulate their requests; he hoped that they could be given more help in that respect.

38. Mr. BRUM (Uruguay) supported the draft resolution. There could be no development without industrial equip-

ment; industrial projects should therefore have priority attention.

39. The amendment to replace "special" by "appropriate" or "adequate" in paragraph 1 (a) would rob the draft resolution of its meaning. All Council resolutions were bound to receive appropriate attention from the Governing Council of UNDP.

40. He considered that the Lebanese suggestion concerning paragraph 2 was a sound one. The Council was a principal organ of the United Nations and was empowered to give instructions to subsidiary bodies. Indeed, it would be failing in its duties under the Charter if it failed to do so.

41. Mr. PRAGUE (France) said that his delegation could support the draft resolution. Although he was in sympathy with the first amendment submitted by the delegations of the United Kingdom and the United States, he could accept paragraph 1 (a) as it stood, since the word "*particulier*" in French was not very strong and implied no modification of priorities.

42. He could also accept the wording of paragraph 1, while agreeing with the United Kingdom representative that a less peremptory word than "instruct" might be preferable.

43. Paragraph 2, however, was unnecessary, since it duplicated paragraph 1 (b). The UNDP Administrator could hardly submit a report to the Governing Council if the item was not on its agenda. It would therefore be better to delete that paragraph or at least amend it as suggested by the representative of Lebanon.

44. Mr. de AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) agreed to the wording suggested by the representative of Lebanon for paragraph 2.

45. Although in different parts of the draft resolution the sponsors had made it clear that they were seeking special attention for the requests of each country in accordance with its own development plans, they were prepared to amend the first part of paragraph 1 (a) to read "give in accordance with the priorities assigned by the developing countries, to requests submitted by them . . .".

46. The aim was to ensure that the developing countries made full use of UNDP in the industrial sector. That was an important policy issue on which it was the duty of the Council to provide guidance. He therefore hoped that the amended text would receive unanimous support.

47. Mr. ZAGORIN (United States of America) accepted those amendments on behalf of his own delegation and that of the United Kingdom.

The draft resolution (E/L.1444/Rev.1), as amended, was adopted unanimously.

48. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Observer for Chile), President of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme, said that the Council had demonstrated the importance it attached to industrial development, particularly for the least developed countries, and its desire to avoid the previous imbalance in industrial programmes. It

was important to note that the reason why there were fewer industrial development programmes was that many countries had not put forward their requirements in that regard. In many cases the delays were due to the complexity of industrial projects.

49. Mr. DUMONTET (United Nations Development Programme) assured the Council that special attention would be given to its resolution. The necessary steps would be taken to place the matter on the Governing Council's agenda for its summer session in 1972.

AGENDA ITEM 8

Operational activities for development

(d) United Nations Volunteers programme (concluded) (E/5028, E/C.2/740, E/L.1446/Rev.1)

50. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) informed the Council that the delegations of Kenya and Lebanon had joined his delegation as sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1446/Rev.1.

51. Introducing the draft resolution, he said that the almost unanimous faith of delegations in the efficacy of the United Nations Volunteers programme was evidence of the wisdom of the Iranian Government's initiative in proposing its establishment. The Administrator of UNDP had taken prompt action to implement General Assembly resolution 2659 (XXV), under which the programme had been set up, and the appointment of a Co-ordinator was especially to be welcomed. The sponsors were well aware of the difficulties faced by the Administrator of UNDP and by the Co-ordinator of United Nations Volunteers in making the programme operational; their efforts were therefore commended in paragraph 1 of the draft resolution. The need for specialized agencies and other voluntary organizations concerned to co-ordinate their volunteer activities was referred to in paragraph 2. With regard to paragraph 3, the availability of adequate resources in the Special Fund established under General Assembly resolution 2659 (XXV) to finance the external costs of volunteers from developing countries would ensure that the programme would be able to provide a great many Volunteers from the developed countries and thus implement the principle that it should be truly universal in scope. Regrettably, contributions had not so far been very substantial; Governments, international organizations and voluntary agencies, especially those who were in a position to do so, were therefore urged to contribute.

52. Mr. ZVEZDINE (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that from the outset his Government had had doubts about the need to set up a United Nations Volunteers programme and was not convinced that a small group of volunteers could make any substantial contribution to the development of developing countries. His delegation would therefore abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

53. Mr. HEDEMANN (Norway) said that his delegation had expressed doubts about the establishment of the

Special Fund for United Nations Volunteers and was reluctant to increase the number of such special funds. His country had therefore not contributed to the Fund and did not intend to change its position. It maintained that its contribution through UNDP would be adequate for the purpose. In fact, Norway and the other Nordic countries had increased their contributions to UNDP substantially over the past few years. His delegation would therefore abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

54. Mr. ZAGORIN (United States of America) expressed his delegation's satisfaction with the report of the Secretary-General (E/5028) and urged that the Secretary-General should continue with the Volunteers programme, to which his own Government had recently pledged \$200,000. He understood that the money would be used to meet the external costs of qualified Volunteers from developing countries for whom sponsor financing was not otherwise available. All interested governments should be encouraged to contribute to the Fund to achieve the aims of the programme.

55. His delegation could support the draft resolution but would like the word "member" to be inserted before "governments" in paragraph 3 to bring the wording into conformity with General Assembly resolution 2659 (XXV).

56. Mr. PRAGUE (France) supported that amendment, but felt that the words "especially those who are in a position to do so" in paragraph 3 were unnecessary. Perhaps that paragraph could be amended to read "in particular those who could not otherwise participate in the United Nations Volunteers programme". That was not a formal amendment but merely a suggestion. If the text was not amended, however, his delegation would abstain in any separate vote on paragraph 3.

57. Mr. MILTON (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had voted in favour of General Assembly resolution 2659 (XXV) in the belief that an international corps of volunteers could constitute a useful form of additional development assistance to developing countries. It had accepted the establishment of a Special Fund for United Nations Volunteers on the understanding that such a fund would be used specifically for the purpose of financing the external travel costs of Volunteers from developing countries for whom no sponsoring agency was available. The implication in the draft resolution before the Council, however, was that the Fund should be expanded as a means of financing all aspects of the Volunteers programme. That was unacceptable to his delegation, which would be unable to support the draft resolution. It considered that the Governments referred to in paragraph 3 were those mentioned in paragraph 4 of General Assembly resolution 2659 (XXV) and it therefore supported the amendment suggested by the representative of the United States.

58. Mr. SCOLAMIERO (Italy) said that his delegation, too, had voted in favour of General Assembly resolution 2659 (XXV) because it considered that the establishment of a United Nations Volunteers programme was a useful

initiative from which the developing countries could benefit. His delegation could therefore support the draft resolution before the Committee, but it would have to abstain on the fifth preambular paragraph and on paragraph 3 if those paragraphs were voted on separately.

59. Mr. GATES (New Zealand) said that in its general statement on the item under discussion (1789th meeting) his delegation had explained why it had not been in a position to contribute to the Special Fund for United Nations Volunteers although it supported the activities of voluntary agencies and did not object to the existence of the Fund. For that reason, and in the light of the provisions of the fifth preambular paragraph and of paragraph 3, it would have to abstain on the draft resolution.

60. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) said that it would be difficult for Pakistan to accept the amendment suggested by the United States. He wondered whether the United States representative would accept the present wording of paragraph 3 on the understanding that the Governments referred to were those which normally participated in the programme. He recalled that on a previous occasion the representative of the United Kingdom had accepted similar wording in another draft resolution, on the same understanding.

61. In endorsing the establishment of the Special Fund for United Nations Volunteers, the Pakistan delegation had been of the opinion that the Fund would be used to finance not only the external costs of Volunteers from developing countries but other external and local costs. The position of delegations which were not able to contribute to the Fund had been taken into account in paragraph 3 by the insertion of the words "especially those who are in a position to do so". That seemed to him to be a more suitable wording than that suggested by the representative of France.

62. The sponsors of the draft resolution would be willing to insert the words "to meet the external costs of Volunteers from developing countries and" after the words "in order" in paragraph 3 to reflect the views expressed by the delegations which had reservations about that paragraph.

63. Mr. KITCHEN (United States of America) said that, in the light of the explanations given by the representative of Pakistan, his delegation withdrew the amendment it had proposed to paragraph 3. He recalled that at the twelfth session of the UNDP Governing Council his delegation had expressed concern that some of the least developed countries might be unable to finance the local costs of Volunteers (see E/5043, para. 233). At that time, his delegation had been assured that UNDP was aware of the problem and would take into account the suggestion that the list proposed by the Committee for Development Planning should be taken as the basis for the definition of the least developed countries and that the Administrator of UNDP was prepared to seek a solution to the problem, either by resorting to the global reserve account or by giving favourable consideration to requests from countries that the local costs for Volunteers should be included in their indicative planning figures.

64. Mr. PRAGUE (France) said that his delegation was in a position to support the draft resolution following the statement by the representative of Pakistan.

65. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on draft resolution E/L.1446/Rev.1, as orally revised by the representative of Pakistan.

66. Mr. HEDEMANN (Norway) requested a separate vote on paragraph 3.

Paragraph 3 was adopted by 17 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.

The draft resolution (E/L.1446/Rev.1) as a whole, as orally revised, was adopted by 23 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

AGENDA ITEM 13

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the

specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations

67. The PRESIDENT said that he was required to submit a report on the consultations held with the Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, in accordance with paragraph 13 of General Assembly resolution 2704 (XXV). Those consultations, however, had not yet been held, because neither the Special Committee nor the CPC, whose views would, it was felt, contribute to the success of those consultations, had yet considered the matter. He therefore suggested that the Council should postpone its consideration of agenda item 13 until its resumed fifty-first session, when it would have available the report of the CPC on its tenth session and he would have been able to hold consultations with the Chairman of the Special Committee.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 12.35 p.m.