



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 22: The situation in the Middle East (<i>concluded</i>)	1
Agenda item 45: Review and appraisal of the objectives and policies of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade: report of the Secretary-General Report of the Second Committee	6
Agenda item 12: Report of the Economic and Social Council Chapters III to VII, VIII (sections A to E), IX to XIV, XXI and XXII: report of the Second Committee (part I)	6
Agenda item 44: Operational activities for development: reports of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme: (a) United Nations Development Programme; (b) United Nations Capital Development Fund; (c) Technical co-operation activities undertaken by the Secretary-General; (d) United Nations Volunteers Programme; Report of the Second Committee	14
(e) Confirmation of the appointment of the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme	14

President: Mr. Adam MALIK (Indonesia).

AGENDA ITEM 22

The situation in the Middle East (concluded)

1. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now continue its consideration of agenda item 22 by hearing explanations of vote after the voting, which took place late yesterday.
2. Mr. RAHAL (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): The position of the Government of Algeria was explained at length in the statement we made in the course of the debate on the situation in the Middle East [2008th meeting]. However, the vote we cast yesterday on draft resolution A/L.650/Rev.1 calls for some clarification.
3. Obviously, the text of the resolution adopted [resolution 2799 (XXVI)] does not correspond to the views of the Government of Algeria as regards a satisfactory settlement in the Middle East. The text is based essentially on Security Council resolution 242 (1967), which was never supported by Algeria. I shall not dwell at this time on the reasons for this opposition which I developed at length in the course of the debate. I shall therefore limit myself to a brief repetition of our criticism of the resolution just adopted by the General Assembly.

4. First of all, this resolution purports to state the principles for an over-all settlement of the Middle East crisis, yet it takes into account only those factors of the situation which were created by the Israeli aggression of 1967 and by the occupation of Arab territories by Israel.

5. Secondly, it fails to take into account the essential fact that in the events of June 1967 Israel was the aggressor and the Arab countries were the victims of aggression. Not only does the resolution place the aggressor and the victims on the same footing but, what is more, it would accord substantial compensation to Israel for withdrawing from the Arab territories it occupies. The text of the resolution thus runs counter to the principles of the Charter and is essentially at variance with the most important provisions of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, which was adopted at our twenty-fifth session [resolution 2734 (XXV)].

6. Thirdly, the resolution does not take any account of the position which has been adopted by Israel towards international institutions, nor of its constant refusal to comply with General Assembly and Security Council resolutions. Because of its conduct Israel should be condemned; this resolution, however, strengthens Israel in its negative attitude and encourages it to continue to defy the United Nations and to renew its acts of aggression from which it has benefited with impunity so far.

7. Fourthly, this resolution does not take into account one of the essential factors of the situation in the Middle East, namely the fundamental rights of the Palestinian people. Those inalienable rights have been recognized and reaffirmed in several resolutions of our Organization, and even in the course of the present session. It is now recognized that no solution to the crisis can be found unless one takes into account the claims, wishes and aspirations of the Palestinian people. It is therefore unacceptable that a resolution on the situation in the Middle East should not make any reference at all to this decisive factor and continue to approach the problem exclusively as a refugee problem.

8. Nevertheless, we abstained in the vote on this resolution, first of all, in deference to the mission of the African Heads of State, who endeavoured to find a solution to the problem and also in order to emphasize our conviction that the sponsors of the resolution were prompted by a sincere desire to put an end to the difficult and even tragic plight of the people of the area. Lastly, we do not wish to hamper any attempt to focus the attention of world public opinion on the threat of the Middle East situation to world peace.

9. Our abstention notwithstanding, we remain convinced that a settlement of the situation in the Middle East

requires thorough study and a return to the sources of the crisis and must of necessity include the participation of the Palestinian people themselves.

10. Mr. RYDBECK (Sweden): In accordance with the line that Sweden has followed ever since 1967, our delegation abstained yesterday in the vote on the draft resolutions before us advocating different approaches to the solution of the political problems of the Middle East. We note with deep regret that no solution is as yet in view. The Swedish Government firmly believes that a political solution must be sought on the basis of the Security Council resolution 242 (1967), in its entirety.

11. For us it has always been a matter of course to support the Secretary-General and his Special Representative in their efforts to achieve a realization of the decision of the Security Council. I avail myself of this opportunity to state here again that Sweden firmly supports Ambassador Jarring's mission and has the fullest confidence in the way he is discharging his mandate. We should therefore like to express our firm hope that his initiatives will be met with a full and positive response by all concerned in such a manner as to enable the search for a peaceful settlement under his auspices to continue.

12. Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Argentina did not participate in the debate on the situation in the Middle East, and we did not do so because we thought that the present status of the question did not make it necessary to repeat our point of view with regard to the principles which are at stake in this problem. We have made these public on repeated occasions and, during the course of the year which has elapsed since the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly, there have been no events which would require a further elaboration of our policy. It is precisely this absence of practical developments which makes it necessary to make greater use of the procedural means leading to a just and lasting solution of the question, which we all hope for.

13. It is worthwhile in this context to emphasize the positive reply given by Egypt [*A/8541/annex II*] to the aide-mémoire sent by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, dated 8 February 1971 [*Ibid.*, *annex I*]. We consider that this reply by Egypt is a valuable element which can to a large extent facilitate the progress of the Jarring mission.

14. At the same time we sincerely believe that a re-examination and further clarification of the terms of the reply of the Government of Israel [*ibid.*, *annex III*] to that aide-mémoire could provide a sufficient basis for the talks which have been held under the auspices of Ambassador Jarring to be reinitiated with some chance of success. Nevertheless, the position which the Government of Israel intends to take is within its exclusive competence and we can only express our hope that its reply will contain certain elements which we deem necessary.

15. Having expressed these hopes, we doubt the propriety for the General Assembly to request by way of a draft resolution that a Member State reply to a certain question in the course of negotiations which must be judged on the basis of the results and not on the basis of the various procedural steps.

16. For this reason we deem it necessary to express a reservation with regard to operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/L.650/Rev.1. We voted in favour of this draft resolution, however, because we consider that it represents a reasonable effort to reactivate the Jarring mission on an appropriate basis, which is ultimately the primary objective in the present circumstances.

17. Some parts of that draft are, of course, not entirely satisfactory to my delegation, but in so delicate a problem as that of the Middle East it is obviously impossible to agree on a text which would accurately reflect the thinking of each delegation. For example, operative paragraph 9 in the Spanish text presents certain difficulties for my delegation. The English text, which is the original text, seems to us to be more appropriate, and we voted in favour of the draft resolution taking the original English text into account and not the Spanish text, which, in our opinion, should be revised.

18. The position taken by the delegation of Argentina with regard to draft resolution A/L.650/Rev.1 logically determined our position with regard to the other draft resolutions and amendments which were submitted to the General Assembly for consideration. We believe that all of them were prompted by excellent motives and had positive elements, but in order to be consistent with our vote on the draft resolution, we decided to abstain on the other texts.

19. My delegation would not wish to end its statement without reaffirming that the attainment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East continues to be the goal to which all the efforts of the United Nations, as well as those of its Members individually, should be directed and also that Security Council resolution 242 (1967) as a whole continues to be the basis on which this just and lasting peace should be built.

20. Sir Laurence McINTYRE (Australia): The Australian delegation abstained on all the amendments in documents A/L.655 and Add.1 and A/L.656 and would have abstained on draft resolution A/L.651 and Add.1 if it had been put to the vote because it was clear to us that those texts were not acceptable to all the principal parties involved in the Middle East crisis. The Australian Government, in keeping with its declared policy of neutrality on this question, would have preferred an impartial resolution which would not have the effect of polarizing international opinion in favour of one side or the other. Perhaps by attempting to find a middle ground between these conflicting positions such a resolution would have made a constructive contribution to the establishment of a lasting peace in the area.

21. We recognize and we welcome the comparative moderation reflected in the resolution adopted last night by the Assembly which shows that the sponsors were motivated by a spirit of compromise. But we regret that the sponsors did not find it possible to formulate or to accept a text that might have produced, if not the full support, at least the acquiescence of all the parties directly concerned. Without this, in the view of my delegation, there is no scope at this time for realistic practical action by this Assembly towards the reactivation of Ambassador Jarring's mission and thereby towards the opening of negotiations and the advancement of the cause of peace in the Middle East.

22. Having said this, my delegation would wish to pay a special tribute to the well-intentioned and thoughtfully constructive initiative of the 10 members of the Committee of African Heads of State of the Organization of African Unity, which has demonstrated, we believe, a degree of responsibility that has, if I may say so, set an example to the United Nations.

23. Mr. ZENTAR (Morocco) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation abstained yesterday evening in the vote on draft resolution A/L.650/Rev.1.

24. I should like to explain the deep-seated reasons why we adopted that attitude inasmuch as Morocco has always done everything in its power, in so far as it was able, to find a peaceful solution to the Middle East conflict. Although the text before us does contain certain principles which my country has always recognized and defended, particularly that of the inadmissibility of any acquisition of territories by force, on the other hand, other provisions seem to us not only inadmissible but even dangerous for the future of peace and stability in the area.

25. First of all, we have to note, to our great regret, that the resolution which the Assembly has just adopted is clearly a step backward in comparison with last year's resolution [*resolution 2628 (XXV)*]. Indeed, during the past year, certain praiseworthy efforts have been undertaken to outline a solution. But we have to note that while, on the Arab side, many concessions have been made, on the Israeli side all these attempts have come up against the most total intransigence. This proves that Israel wants to maintain tension in the Middle East and perpetuate its occupation of Arab territories.

26. In this situation, our Assembly ought to have voted this year on a resolution which contained a clear and more definite injunction with regard to Israel, demanding that it restore all the territories conquered after the aggression of 1967.

27. That is why we believe that the text adopted yesterday is, in practice, a reward for intransigence.

28. The second very serious deficiency of the resolution is its total disregard for the Palestinian people and their inalienable rights as a people. This seems to us unacceptable, because the people of Palestine have always been at the centre of the tragedy and, because these rights have been hitherto deliberately ignored, war broke out three times in the area.

29. Our Assembly last year adopted a resolution which states quite clearly in its operative part:

"1. *Recognizes* that the people of Palestine are entitled to equal rights and self-determination, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

"2. *Declares* that full respect for the inalienable rights of the people of Palestine is an indispensable element in the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East." [*resolution 2672 C (XXV)*].

30. Now, in the resolution voted upon yesterday evening, we confined ourselves to a timid reference to a settlement

of a problem called the "refugee problem", without even appearing to recognize that the people of Palestine have the right to exist or to be mentioned by name, although it is quite clearly an essential element in the crisis which prevails in the region.

31. My delegation considered that this was a serious erosion of what we achieved last year; indeed, it amounted to an amputation. Far from opening the road to peace, we feel that such a retreat encourages Israel to think that the whole question will disappear entirely from the agenda for the long.

32. That is why, at this stage, we would have liked to see our Assembly define in a more thorough, clearer and especially firmer manner, the conditions which would be liable to lead to a true over-all and final settlement of the conflict. My delegation regrets to state here that in its view the resolution just adopted does not meet that objective.

33. Mr. BORCH (Denmark): Denmark abstained in the votes on the draft resolutions and amendments contained in documents A/L.650/Rev.1, A/L.652/Rev.1, A/L.655 and Add.1 and A/L.656. We did so mainly because we do not think that the adoption of any of these texts would promote the search for peace in the Middle East. For one thing, these texts seem to be controversial in the eyes of the parties and as such we doubt if they can offer a realistic basis for a continued diplomatic process in which the co-operation of the parties is indispensable.

34. Our votes, however, do not imply that we are equally inclined towards all the texts. For example, we have reservations concerning any text the relation of which to Security Council resolution 242 (1967) is ambiguous. And, on the other hand, we have acquainted ourselves with interest with the constructive approach taken by the Committee of African Heads of State in its recent endeavours in regard to the crisis in the Middle East.

35. Security Council resolution 242 (1967) remains the basis for the search for peace in the Middle East within the framework of the United Nations. Therefore, it is of crucial importance not to upset the delicate balance upon which that resolution is based. Denmark continues to support that resolution, which represents a fair, balanced and non-prejudicial basis for the efforts to achieve a just and lasting peace.

36. It follows therefrom that Denmark fully supports the mission of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, and we urge full co-operation in good faith, active and constructive co-operation, with Ambassador Jarring. The framework for such co-operation is still to be found in Security Council resolution 242 (1967).

37. Mr. CASTALDO (Italy): My delegation voted in favour of the resolution adopted yesterday on this item because it shares the basic purpose of the co-sponsors, namely, to appeal to the parties for an early resumption of the indirect negotiations under Ambassador Jarring. Those negotiations have remained suspended for too long a period of time, to no one's benefit.

38. I wish to avail myself of this opportunity to thank the sponsors of the draft resolution for the constructive spirit of co-operation they showed in accepting a number of important amendments which were introduced by the representative of Belgium on behalf also of France, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands and the United Kingdom [A/L.657], and which were designed to balance the resolution and bring it more into line with Security Council resolution 242 (1967). At the same time, I wish to reiterate the position of my country, which is firmly convinced that resolution 242 (1967) constitutes the sole basis for the indirect negotiations to be resumed under the auspices of Mr. Jarring for the purpose of the full implementation of the said resolution in all its parts. We think that the resolution adopted yesterday must be interpreted in that spirit.

39. Mr. VAN USSEL (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation has scrutinized particularly closely the draft resolution which 18 countries tabled on 9 December, reproduced in document A/L.650. We have also followed very closely the debate in the General Assembly and listened with attention to the important statements made by the Foreign Ministers of Egypt [1999th meeting] and of Israel [2000th meeting].

40. My delegation thought that the draft resolution was a useful basic document which could, however, be improved. It was for this reason that we took the initiative, along with other European countries, in proposing to the sponsor some amendments [A/L.657] in order to make the draft more balanced and bring it further into line with Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and hence more acceptable to the parties concerned.

41. We are pleased—and we would like to express our gratitude for this to the sponsors for having incorporated the European amendments. For this reason, my delegation, by its favourable vote, approved the draft resolution.

42. However, we would like the record to show that, in so far as concerns operative paragraph 1, we would have preferred to omit the second line which in effect simply duplicates the text of paragraph 2 (a) which states clearly that Israel should withdraw from the territories occupied since 1967. If we did not propose an amendment, it was in order not to prolong the debate.

43. In so far as the withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from the occupied territories as demanded in paragraph 2 (a) of the resolution is concerned, we consider that the text does not exclude minor frontier adjustments mutually agreed upon by the parties concerned.

44. In paragraph 6 we interpret the adverb “favourably” to mean that we want Israel to give to the aide-mémoire of Ambassador Jarring of 8 February 1971 a constructive reply making possible the resumption of negotiations.

45. Finally, my delegation hopes that the resolution adopted yesterday will be an important contribution which will enable the Special Representative of the Secretary-General to continue his mission.

46. Once again we would like to appeal to Egypt and Israel, in spite of their differences, to do everything in their

power to attain the objective to which all Members of the United Nations aspire with understandable impatience, that is to say, the restoration of peace in the Middle East through a freely negotiated treaty honouring the just claims of all the parties concerned.

47. Mr. JAMIESON (United Kingdom): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/L.650/Rev.1, on the clear understanding that the resolution in no way altered the delicate balance of Security Council resolution 242 (1967), which remains, in our view, the only basis for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. As for the call upon Israel in paragraph 6 of the resolution to “respond favourably” to Mr. Jarring’s aide-mémoire of 8 February, my delegation interpreted this in accordance with paragraph 27 of the Secretary-General’s report on the activities of his Special Representative to the Middle East [A/8541] as meaning that Israel is called upon to “make a response that would enable the search for a peaceful settlement under Ambassador Jarring’s auspices to continue”.

48. As a sponsor of the amendments to draft resolution A/L.650 and Add.1 and 2 contained in document A/L.657, my delegation felt obliged to vote against the amendments proposed by the delegations of Barbados and Ghana [A/L.655 and Add.1]. If, however, draft resolution A/L.651 and Add.1 had been put to the vote, we would have abstained on it, as we did on draft resolution A/L.652/Rev.1.

49. As for the amendments sponsored by Senegal in document A/L.656, we felt that these, taken together, would have upset the balance of a resolution to which we had submitted amendments. Therefore, we could not support any of them, even in separate votes. However, our vote against these amendments does not mean that we do not welcome the initiative of the African Heads of State. We do welcome it, and we also welcome the fact that they consider the replies of Egypt and Israel to the memorandum they addressed to them to have been positive.

50. We support the additional suggestion made by the sponsors of the amendments at the beginning of this debate for a specific gesture by Israel. At the same time, we considered that there should be mention of, and support for, Mr. Jarring’s aide-mémoire of 8 February 1971 in any resolution on this subject adopted by the General Assembly.

51. Mr. GARCÍA ROBLES (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Mexico voted in favour of draft resolution A/L.650/Rev.1, the text of which corresponds to the text of document A/L.650 as amended and substantially improved by virtue of the proposals submitted in document A/L.657. We did so on the understanding that the favourable reply requested of Israel in paragraph 6 is to be interpreted in the manner in which the Secretary-General himself has defined it in the introduction to his report on the work of the Organization, as a reply which “will enable the search for a peaceful settlement under Ambassador Jarring’s auspices to continue” [A/8401/Add.1, para. 219].

52. That reply will not, therefore, mean that there will be any change whatsoever in the position of complete equality

of both parties that has been and should continue to be maintained in their negotiations through the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, within the unchanging framework of Security Council resolution 242 (1967).

53. Mr. ALVARADO (Venezuela) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation was able to vote in favour of draft resolution A/L.650/Rev.1 because, with the addition of the amendments submitted by the six European countries in document A/L.657, the draft resolution acquired the balance which we have always wished to see between all the factors which were taken into account in Security Council resolution 242 (1967), to which we have always given our complete support because we consider it to be the proper basis for a solution of the problem in the Middle East and we have always advocated that it be implemented in its entirety. Nevertheless, we have to express our reservations in regard to paragraph 6 and the qualification made there as to the manner in which Israel is to respond to the initiative taken by Mr. Jarring on 8 February of this year. Accordingly, we voted in favour of the motion of the delegation of Barbados that this qualification should be the subject of a separate vote, and had that motion been adopted we would have said that we were in favour of the deletion of that qualification.

54. With that reservation, my delegation reiterates its support for the resolution which was adopted.

55. Mr. DIGGS (Liberia): The delegation of Liberia was obliged to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/L.650/Rev.1.

56. Our position on this matter stemmed from the fact that it was entirely unrealistic for the General Assembly to conclude that Israel had not responded favourably to the peace initiative undertaken by Mr. Jarring under the United Nations resolution, when in fact the report of the mission that the Organization of African Unity entrusted to the Committee of African Heads of State, which appointed a sub-committee of four, had stated that:

“The respective positions of the two parties which did not present any wide divergence of opinion was summarized in a memorandum which was communicated to the Egyptian authorities on November 23, 1971 and to the Israeli authorities on November 24, 1971 by their Excellencies Mr. Léopold Sédar Senghor, President of the Republic of Senegal, General Yakubu Gowon, Head of the Federal Military Government, Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of Nigeria,

“Accompanied by:

“Minister Mario Cardoso, Representative of the President of the Republic of Zaire

“Minister Eteki, Representative of the President of the Federal Republic of Cameroon.”

57. If the report of the Organization of African Unity's 10-member committee on the Middle East could come to that conclusion—that the respective positions of the two parties did not present any wide divergence of opinion—how could the Assembly conclude that the Israeli response was not favourable?

58. In the interests of the reality of the situation, my delegation therefore found it necessary to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/L.650/Rev.1.

59. We supported the amendments of Senegal [*A/L.656*], the amendments of Barbados and Ghana [*A/L.655 and Add.1*] and the draft resolution of Costa Rica and other Latin America States [*A/L.652/Rev.1*], because we felt that those draft resolutions and amendments contained essential conditions which would have permitted a resumption of the peace initiative under Mr. Jarring, and assisted the parties in overcoming the obstacle that prevents the conclusion, at an early date, of a peace agreement.

60. Mr. BENITES (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Charter affirms that the essential basis for a just peace is respect for the territorial integrity, the sovereignty and the independence of States, which obliges all States to refrain from the threat or use of force in international relations, with the sole and exclusive exception of self-defence, limited under Article 51 of the Charter, and collective action, as covered by Chapter VII.

61. Since the Kellogg-Briand Pact of 1928, war has ceased to be a means of creating, extinguishing or altering rights, and that has been incorporated implicitly in Chapter I of the Charter. My Government, therefore, has unswervingly maintained the principle of the inadmissibility and illegitimacy of the occupation of territories by force. Speaking personally, I have had occasion to defend that principle, notably, during the fifth emergency session of the General Assembly in 1967, when the Special Committee on the Question of Defining Aggression was reactivated, during the United Nations Conference on the Law of Treaties in 1969, and a few days ago when we adopted the resolution on the Indo-Pakistani problem [*resolution 2793 (XXVI)*].

62. Consistent with that basic principle of the international policy of Ecuador, my delegation could not object to draft resolution A/L.650/Rev.1, which affirmed in its operative paragraph 1, the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territories by force. Nor could we have voted in favour of the initial draft resolution, because it lacked the balance that was later introduced by the amendments proposed by Belgium, France, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom [*A/L.657*]. Even though the sponsors accepted these amendments, my delegation had to abstain because we lacked instructions on the revised text.

63. In regard to the amendments submitted by Senegal [*A/L.656*], it was not possible for my delegation to support it because if one accepts the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territories by force it follows as a logical consequence that if there is unlawful occupation the occupied territories must be returned. The Senegal amendment which would have deleted this last obligation led to doubts in the minds of our delegation which compelled us to abstain.

64. As for the original draft resolution of Barbados [*A/L.651*], which was also supported by Ghana, doubts had been created by many African States as to whether the document on which it was based, namely, the conclusions of the Committee of the African Heads of State, was an

officially public document. For that reason and because we lacked specific instructions, my delegation abstained.

65. And now I should like to refer to the draft resolution of Uruguay and Costa Rica, later sponsored also by Haiti and El Salvador, which is contained in document A/L.652/Rev.1. My delegation wanted to vote in favour of it, and indeed we received instructions to become a sponsor of it, but they came too late. The delegation of Costa Rica knows that on instructions from my Government I have co-operated at length in the quest for acceptable solutions and, Ambassador Molina always had an open mind and a forthright attitude in our exchange of views to arrive at such a formula.

66. I did not have the opportunity to participate in the final stages which led to the presentation of the actual text but my Government, on the basis of instructions I received last night, asked me to be a co-sponsor and I must place that on record expressly and publicly.

67. In conclusion, I feel bound to say that President Velasco Ibarra, the Head of State of Ecuador, maintains the permanent principles of the Charter, which constitute his political philosophy, but he considers that the case of Israel has its own special features and that equitable means must be found for the solution of the conflict in accordance with the means established under the Charter.

68. Mr. NAKAGAWA (Japan): In its last statement on the subject under discussion [*2009th meeting*], my delegation made it clear that this Assembly should reaffirm Security Council resolution 242 (1967) in its entirety and should call for the reactivation of the Jarring mission and for other practical means of achieving the purposes of the resolution, and that my delegation would support any constructive draft resolution which contained those basic points for peace-keeping in the Middle East.

69. I said in my statement also that it would contribute a great deal to making a breakthrough in the present deadlock if Israel should declare, without equivocation, its acceptance of the principle of withdrawal from the territories occupied by it in the war of June 1967.

70. Last night my delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/L.650/Rev.1 because in our view it embodied the basic points which I have just mentioned.

71. As regards the amendments in document A/L.655 and Add.1 and the amendments in document A/L.656, they embody partially or wholly the content of the memorandum of the mission of enquiry of the Organization of African Unity [OAU]. Although we have a high regard for the laudable initiative taken by the OAU countries, my delegation feels that at this stage we are not in a position to pass judgement on the suggestions made by the OAU mission of inquiry inasmuch as the full text of the memorandum is not yet available. For that reason my delegation abstained on those two amendments. However, I wish to say that it is our sincere hope that the recommendations of the OAU mission of inquiry will prove to be an important impetus for the reactivation of Ambassador Jarring's mission.

AGENDA ITEM 45

Review and appraisal of the objectives and policies of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade: report of the Secretary-General

REPORT OF THE SECOND COMMITTEE (A/8559)

AGENDA ITEM 12

Report of the Economic and Social Council

CHAPTERS III TO VII, VIII (SECTIONS A TO E), IX TO XIV, XXI AND XXII: REPORT OF THE SECOND COMMITTEE (PART I) (A/8578)

AGENDA ITEM 44

Operational activities for development: reports of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme:

- (a) United Nations Development Programme;
- (b) United Nations Capital Development Fund;
- (c) Technical co-operation activities undertaken by the Secretary-General;
- (d) United Nations Volunteers Programme

REPORT OF THE SECOND COMMITTEE (A/8563)

72. Mr. Salih Mohamed OSMAN (Sudan), Rapporteur of the Second Committee: I have the honour to present to the General Assembly the reports of the Second Committee on agenda items 45, 12 (part I) and 44.

73. The report on agenda item 45 is contained in document A/8559. In paragraph 24 of that report the Second Committee recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of two draft resolutions. Draft resolution I concerns the dissemination of information and mobilization of public opinion relative to the review and appraisal of progress in the implementation of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade; and draft resolution II is entitled: "Review and appraisal of the objectives and policies of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade." The Committee adopted draft resolution I by 71 votes to none, with 17 abstentions; and draft resolution II without objection.

74. Part I of the report on agenda item 12 is contained in document A/8578. I deem it more than appropriate to inform the General Assembly in plenary meeting that the general debate on item 12 was quite substantive and covered all the important questions relating to the world economic situation, particularly the current international monetary crisis on which the Second Committee is recommending the adoption of two draft resolutions. In paragraph 44 the Second Committee recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of seven draft resolutions. The Committee adopted draft resolution I on "Co-operation between the United Nations and the World Tourism Organization", by 91 votes to none, with 5 abstentions, and draft resolution II, on "United Nations regular programme for technical co-operation: regional and subregional advisory services", by 88 votes to 13, with 5 abstentions.

75. Draft resolution III, on the "Application of computer technology for development" and draft resolution IV, on the "Pledging target for the World Food Programme 1973-1974", were adopted without objection; draft resolution V, on "The international monetary situation", was adopted by 69 votes to 12, with 17 abstentions; draft resolution VI, on "The increasing burden of debt services", was adopted by 81 votes to none, with 17 abstentions; and draft resolution VII, on "Immediate measures to eliminate the prevailing state of uncertainty due to the present international monetary crisis", was adopted by 52 votes to 2, with 31 abstentions.

76. The report on item 44 is contained in document A/8563. I wish to draw the attention of the General Assembly to paragraph 4 of that report in which the Second Committee "expressed its deep appreciation and gratitude to Mr. Paul Hoffman for his untiring dedication to the cause of economic and social development throughout the world." In paragraph 80 of the report, the Second Committee recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of seven draft resolutions. The Committee adopted draft resolution I, on the reports of the Governing Council, without objection; draft resolution II, on the "United Nations Volunteers Programme", by 93 votes to none, with 18 abstentions; draft resolution III, on "Financial contributions to the United Nations Development Programme", by 81 votes to 5, with 25 abstentions.

77. The single operative paragraph of draft resolution III endorses Economic and Social Council resolution 1615 (LI), in which the Council requested the Governing Council to review at the first possible opportunity the planning estimates on which the indicative planning figures as approved by it were based, in order to attain the goal of the doubling of the resources of the Programme during the next five years, thus imparting a real meaning to the concept of country programming on a long-term dynamic basis. In paragraph 2 of Economic and Social Council resolution 1615 (LI), the Council urged Governments to increase their financial contributions to the Programme so as to enable it to use as fully as possible its improved capacity to assist developing countries in reaching the objectives of the Second United Nations Development Decade.

78. Draft resolution IV, on the "United Nations Capital Development Fund", was adopted by 75 votes to 7, with 24 abstentions. Draft resolution V, on "Enlargement of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme", was adopted by 74 votes to 7, with 29 abstentions.

79. It is worth pointing out here that, in draft resolution V, the Second Committee recommends that the General Assembly should decide to enlarge the membership of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme from 37 to 48 members to make the Council more representative of both developed and developing countries. Developed countries will have 21 seats and developing countries will have 27 seats.

80. Draft resolution VI, on the "Capacity of the United Nations development system", was adopted by 88 votes to 2, with 10 abstentions; and draft resolution VII, on the

"United Nations Fund for Population Activities", was adopted by 59 votes to none with 17 abstentions.

Pursuant to rule 68 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the reports of the Second Committee.

81. The PRESIDENT: We shall first take up the report of the Second Committee on agenda item 45 [A/8559]. I wish to place it on record that the adoption by the General Assembly of the draft resolution recommended by the Second Committee would in no way prejudice the positions of those delegations that expressed observations, reservations or interpretations in the Committee.

82. The Assembly will now take a decision on the two draft resolutions recommended by the Second Committee in paragraph 24 of its report.

83. Draft resolution I relates to "Dissemination of information and mobilization of public opinion relative to the review and appraisal of progress in the implementation of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade". I shall put that draft resolution to the vote. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Draft resolution I was adopted by 100 votes to none, with 8 abstentions (resolution 2800 (XXVI)).

84. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution II is entitled "Review and appraisal of the objectives and policies of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade". If there is no objection I shall take it that the General Assembly adopts that draft resolution.

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 2801 (XXVI)).

85. The PRESIDENT: I now invite members to turn their attention to part I of the report of the Second Committee on agenda item 12, [A/8578].

86. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the vote on draft resolution II recommended by the Second Committee in paragraph 44 of its report.

87. Mr. VIAUD (France) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation is compelled to reaffirm the negative vote which it cast in the Second Committee with regard to the adoption of draft resolution II in regard to the United Nations regular programme for technical co-operation. It has been the constant position of the Government of France to consider that what are called the "operational activities" of the Organization should be financed not by the regular budget but by voluntary contributions. We thus have an objection in principle to an increase in the funds for the regular programme of technical co-operation.

88. This objection is coupled with serious doubts about the manner in which this operation has been carried out. Credits were agreed to without even the competent organs of the United Nations, such as the Governing Council of the UNDP, having had any opportunity to discuss the effective use of the funds considered. So it would have been far preferable to have referred this question back to the Governing Council so that the General Assembly could have made use of its conclusions at its next session in a manner more in accord with the procedures and interests of the Organization.

89. This attitude does not mean that we are against the fundamental idea of the text, namely, to make available to the regional economic commissions the means they need to ensure the distribution of advisory services on a regional and sub-regional basis to countries which depend on them.

90. On the other hand, my delegation will abstain on the two draft resolutions concerning the international monetary situation, draft resolutions V and VII. Since this abstention might appear to some members of the Assembly to be not completely in harmony with the statements made by us at this Assembly, I think that our position deserves a word of explanation. Furthermore, the importance of the subject justifies taking up the attention of the General Assembly for a few minutes on this item.

91. The Government of France has always indicated, in UNCTAD or in the General Assembly or even in the Economic and Social Council, that so far as it is concerned the discussion on a world level of monetary problems, and in particular the possible revision of the international monetary system, could not be carried out without the participation of those who have interests to defend and, therefore, should have their say in any such reform.

92. We have in mind the developing countries which so far have not had an opportunity to express themselves on the subject. Since the beginning of the debate we were whole-heartedly with the countries of the third world, first

in September in the Trade and Development Board and then in November in the Economic and Social Council and then a few days ago in the Second Committee. Unfortunately, now when we ourselves have embarked on international negotiations which are extremely delicate and on which may, in part, depend the economic future of France, it seems to us to be impossible to agree to certain suggestions which were made by this Assembly and adopted in the Second Committee in regard to a very technical plan covering the terms of a possible monetary reform, and therefore in a way which the General Assembly was probably not prepared to deal with in a suitable manner.

93. We were therefore compelled to vote against certain provisions of the draft resolution and to abstain in the vote on it as a whole. We did so to our great regret, and I should like to avail myself of this opportunity to say to the developing countries that if they thought they were right in expressing before the entire world what their point of view was, at a time when important financial talks are under way, nevertheless by acting as they did they have compelled some of their friends among the developed countries with market economies to take refuge in abstention or opposition. Because of this we do not consider it to be a happy result. It would probably have been possible to reach agreement on texts to which world public opinion would have been more sympathetic and such texts would have had a greater impact on universal opinion than the simple demand that the General Assembly will vote on in a few minutes.

94. These are the reasons that prompted us. Nevertheless, we continue to believe that, later in the conversations and negotiations to be held in the competent United Nations organs in regard to international monetary problems, we shall for our part see to it that the discussion of these problems and the decisions which are to be taken will not be limited to a small number of countries but will cover the entire international community.

95. Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): In the Second Committee the Soviet delegation voted against draft resolution II on the financing of regional and subregional advisory services under the regular budget of the United Nations and intends to vote against it here in the plenary meeting.

96. I should like to confirm our reasons for doing this and the position which was explained during the consideration of this question and this draft resolution in the Second and Fifth Committees.

97. The Soviet delegation does not object to the adoption of draft resolution IV on the World Food Programme and does not request that it be put to the vote. However, if it were put to the vote, the Soviet delegation would abstain on that draft resolution since, as you know, the Soviet Union is not a member of either FAO or the World Food Programme.

98. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now vote one by one on the seven draft resolutions recommended by the Second Committee in paragraph 44 of its report on agenda item 12 [A/8578]. After all the votes have been taken I shall give the floor to those representatives who wish to explain their vote at that stage.

99. Draft resolution I is entitled "Co-operation between the United Nations and the World Tourism Organization".

Draft resolution I was adopted by 106 votes to none, with 5 abstentions (resolution 2802 (XXVI)).

100. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution II is entitled, "United Nations regular programme for technical co-operation: regional and subregional advisory services". The administrative and financial implications arising out of operative paragraph 3 of that draft resolution appear in the report of the Fifth Committee [A/8579]. I now put draft resolution II to the vote.

Draft resolution II was adopted by 92 votes to 10, with 7 abstentions (resolution 2803 (XXVI)).

101. The PRESIDENT: The next draft resolution recommended by the Second Committee, draft resolution III, concerns the "Application of computer technology for development". If there is no objection I shall take it that the General Assembly adopts draft resolution III.

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 2804 (XXVI)).

102. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to draft resolution IV entitled "Pledging target for the World Food Programme 1973-1974". If I hear no objection I shall take it that draft resolution IV is adopted.

Draft resolution IV was adopted (resolution 2805 (XXVI)).

103. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution V deals with "The international monetary situation". I now put draft resolution V to the vote.

Draft resolution V was adopted by 82 votes to 11, with 15 abstentions (resolution 2806 (XXVI)).

104. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution VI is entitled "The increasing burden of debt services". I now put it to the vote.

Draft resolution VI was adopted by 99 votes to none, with 11 abstentions (resolution 2807 (XXVI)).

105. Mr. KHALIL (Egypt): In explanation of my vote on draft resolution VI I could say that my delegation abstained when the draft resolution was put to the vote in the Second Committee as well as here in the plenary. In the view of my delegation the draft did not correspond to the magnitude of the problem of the burden of debt services, which is threatening the whole process of economic development of the developing countries.

106. My delegation considered the draft resolution not only too weak to cope with that problem but also rather negative, especially because of the implied references made in the eighth preambular paragraph to the reservations made by some developed countries recorded in the reports on the first and second sessions of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development which, in fact, watered down to a great extent the meaningful effective

measures that are badly needed by the developing countries and that have to be undertaken by the developed ones.

107. Furthermore, we found in operative paragraph 2 a clear invitation for the international financial organizations to interfere in the internal affairs of developing countries.

108. My delegation, in spite of these misgivings concerning the draft resolution, refrained from submitting any amendments at this plenary meeting, as had been the wish of some of our colleagues from developing countries. Therefore, my delegation abstained in the voting on that draft resolution and I place on record the position of my delegation in this regard.

109. The PRESIDENT: Lastly we come to draft resolution VII, relating to "Immediate measures to eliminate the prevailing state of uncertainty due to the present international monetary crisis". I now put that draft resolution to the vote.

Draft resolution VII was adopted by 78 votes to 1, with 31 abstentions (resolution 2808 (XXVI)).

110. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now consider the report of the Second Committee on agenda item 44 [A/8563]. In this connexion, an amendment to draft resolution V recommended by the Second Committee has been circulated in document A/L.658.

111. I call on the representative of the Philippines, who has asked to speak in order to introduce the amendment.

112. Mr. VERCELES (Philippines): On behalf of the Philippine delegation I have the honour to introduce the amendment in document A/L.658, which seeks to replace the words "at the organizational meetings of its fifty-second session" by the phrase "at its resumed fifty-first session" in operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution V contained in paragraph 80 of document A/8563.

113. This amendment is procedural in character and was prompted by practical considerations. It was the intention of the co-sponsors of the draft resolution on the enlargement of the Governing Council that the additional members of the Governing Council should start their terms in January 1972 and thus be able to participate in the Governing Council's thirteenth session, scheduled to be held at Headquarters from 12 to 28 January 1972.

114. Our attention has been called to the desirability of having the new members elected as soon as possible to enable their representatives to familiarize themselves with the voluminous documentation issued in connexion with the various agenda items of the Council's thirteenth session and the need for the Secretariat of the United Nations Development Programme to make the necessary conference arrangements.

115. The organizational meetings of the Economic and Social Council's fifty-second session are scheduled for 5 to 7 January 1972, and if the elections of the additional members were to be held only during that period, then those new members would have very little time to study the documents. This practical problem would be solved some-

what if the new members were to be elected during the forthcoming resumed fifty-first session—in accordance with our amendment.

116. My delegation has been informed by the Secretariat of the Economic and Social Council that its resumed session has been postponed from tomorrow, 15 December, to Monday, 20 December. If the draft resolution, including the amendment, were approved, regional groups would have time, from today on, to agree on who the respective candidates would be.

117. As I said earlier, the amendment is purely of a procedural nature, and I trust that it will meet with the unanimous approval of the Assembly without further debate.

118. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the voting takes place on the seven draft resolutions recommended by the Second Committee and on the amendment contained in document A/L.658.

119. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom): My delegation is waiving any other opportunity to speak under this item in order to explain the reasons for its continued strong opposition to what is now draft resolution VI in the report before us. It is worth noting that the title is perhaps misleading since the operative section deals in effect only with the United Nations Development Programme. When this draft resolution came up in the Second Committee we took the line that some of the provisions were improper and some were absurd. What I want to do now is selectively to pick on a few examples to show why it is that my delegation has taken this view and why my Government takes the line that the draft resolution is misconceived.

120. In general the draft resolution consists of a partial restatement, out of context, of the General Assembly resolution adopting the Consensus approved by the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme and endorsed by the Economic and Social Council on the capacity of the United Nations development system [*resolution 2688 (XXV), annex*]. Last year's Assembly adopted that Consensus; it does not require restating or restructuring at this time; it has not been called in question. But the present draft resolution tends by restating, and thus re-emphasizing, only certain parts of the Consensus in order to seek to give those parts more priority than it was the intention of the Assembly last year to give to these matters, and thus to downgrade the importance of the aspects which are not restated. There are also provisions which are in direct conflict with the Consensus.

121. To take examples, we object to the sixth preambular paragraph. To say that "global projects have a special significance" is not borne out by the terms of paragraphs 60 to 64 of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade [*resolution 2626 (XXV)*].

122. To go on with further examples, the seventh preambular paragraph fails to mention that the United Nations Development Programme is the major source of technical assistance funds within the United Nations system. The

United Nations Development Programme has been restructured specifically with the aim of maximizing its capacity to contribute to the operations within the Second Development Decade. Its capacity is already estimated to be beyond its present level of resources. If this paragraph is intended as a criticism of other components of the United Nations development system, this might be arguable; but the paragraph is out of place in the context of a draft resolution which in its operative part deals solely, as I have said, with the United Nations Development Programme.

123. In the Committee we said that the draft resolution contains some provisions which were absurd. Taking the ninth, tenth and eleventh preambular paragraphs together, the resolution is seeking to define on the one hand those sectors which it is claimed are essential features of development planning; yet, on the other hand, at the same time it leaves it to the developing countries themselves to determine their sectoral priorities. This is inconsistent and in any case the list of sectors which could be regarded as essential, if we are to list all essential sectors, is far from complete.

124. Operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution reaffirms the authority of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme. Why does it find it necessary to do this? I suggest that this is an attempt, not so much to reaffirm the authority of the Council, which I trust is beyond question, but to reaffirm only certain parts of that authority in an attempt to fetter the new Administrator by redefining only that part of his position which relates to the limitations of his authority. The paragraph seems both unnecessary and, by virtue of that bias, it seems to my delegation improper.

125. Operative paragraph 5 calls for a greater number of global projects in the field of science and technology. We certainly do not oppose such projects, but paragraph 22 of the consensus provides for intercountry programmes to be "systematically related to the development priorities of the countries concerned". Operative paragraph 5 of this draft resolution does not accord with that and I have already spoken of the absurdity of seeking to place emphasis on the list of seven "priority" sectors.

126. Operative paragraph 7, containing a request to the United Nations Development Programme to establish special natural resources programmes, seems to my delegation to be in direct contradiction to the Consensus both as regards country and intercountry programmes. If the programmes in the sponsors' minds are to be within the terms of the Consensus then they are not, as this paragraph would describe them, "special"; if they are not to be within the terms of the Consensus, then they depart from the Strategy for the Decade.

127. In stressing our opposition to this draft resolution and inviting other delegations to join the United Kingdom delegation in voting against it, I wish to reaffirm that the problem which runs throughout this draft resolution is not the problem whether there shall be development or not, but whether it shall go forward in accordance with the Strategy worked out with such care and over so long a period for adoption by the last General Assembly. In my delegation's view, this draft resolution would distort operations under the Strategy and we therefore oppose it.

128. Mr. CABEZAS (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Ecuador would venture to submit for the consideration of the General Assembly the following amendment to draft resolution V recommended for adoption by the Second Committee. In operative paragraph 1 (c), the words "subregional representation" should be replaced by the words "regional representation", so that the subparagraph would read:

"The composition of seats in each group should at all times give due expression to adequate regional representation".

This amendment is prompted by the fact that, both in the Charter and in the rules of procedure, the reference is at all times to geographical regional representation.

129. Mr. JURASZ (Poland): The Polish delegation will vote in favour of the adoption of draft resolution VI contained in document A/8563, but we should like to explain our position in connexion with operative paragraph 2 of that draft resolution.

130. That paragraph was inserted in the draft resolution at the request of the Egyptian delegation. The Polish delegation fully understands the intention of the author of that paragraph. That part of his country which is under occupation suffers from such special political circumstances as are mentioned in the paragraph.

131. In interpreting operative paragraph 2, the Polish delegation wishes to state most explicitly that the content of this paragraph in no way undermines the unanimous decision of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme on the indicative planning figures adopted for the period 1972-1975. This explanation is in accordance with the view expressed by the author of operative paragraph 2, and I quote from the summary record:

"... if those figures had to be revised they would be revised upwards and not downwards... The amendment it had proposed was not in any way intended to change the indicative planning figures now serving as a basis for country programming".¹

132. That interpretation of operative paragraph 2 enables our delegation to vote in favour of this paragraph and of the entire draft resolution.

133. Mr. PEREIRA (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): In regard to draft resolution V in document A/8563, my delegation requests a separate vote on operative paragraph 1, which reads:

"Decides to enlarge the membership of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme to 48 members to be elected from among States Members of the United Nations or members of the specialized agencies or of the International Atomic Energy Agency...".

134. On repeated occasions my delegation has stated its reservations in regard to this type of formula, reservations which are based on the principle of universality.

135. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now vote, one by one, on the seven draft resolutions recommended by the Second Committee, in paragraph 80 of its report [A/8563] and on the amendment contained in document A/L.658. After all the votes have been taken, I shall call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes at that stage.

136. We turn first to draft resolution I. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the General Assembly adopts that draft resolution.

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 2809 (XXVI)).

137. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution II is entitled "United Nations Volunteers programme". I put that draft resolution to the vote.

Draft resolution II was adopted by 100 votes to none, with 13 abstentions (resolution 2810 (XXVI)).

138. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution III is entitled "Financial contributions to the United Nations Development Programme". I put that draft resolution to the vote.

Draft resolution III was adopted by 82 votes to 5, with 24 abstentions (resolution 2811 (XXVI)).

139. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to draft resolution IV, dealing with the "United Nations Capital Development Fund". I put that draft resolution to the vote.

Draft resolution IV was adopted by 82 votes to 8, with 22 abstentions (resolution 2812 (XXVI)).

140. Mr. PEREIRA (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I wish to clarify my request for a separate vote on operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution V. My delegation requests a separate vote only on the sentence in this paragraph which reads:

"... to be elected from among States Members of the United Nations or members of the specialized agencies or of the International Atomic Energy Agency...".

141. We are against that wording. As far as the rest of the paragraph is concerned, that is, the preceding and the following part, we are in total agreement.

142. The PRESIDENT: Is there any objection to a separate vote? I hear none.

143. The Assembly will now vote upon draft resolution V entitled "Increased participation of Member States in the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme" and on the amendment submitted thereto in document A/L.658. In addition, Ecuador has proposed an amendment to operative paragraph 1 (c). A separate vote has been requested by Cuba on a part of operative paragraph 1.

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-sixth Session, Second Committee, 1407th meeting, para. 55,*

144. Mr. STAVROPOULOS (Under-Secretary-General for General Assembly Affairs): A separate vote has been requested by Cuba on the following words contained in paragraph 1 of draft resolution V "to be elected from among States Members of the United Nations or members of the specialized agencies or of the International Atomic Energy Agency". A recorded vote has been requested.

145. Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): In connexion with the proposal of the representative of Cuba, we should like to have a clearer formulation before the vote of what we are voting on: on the Cuban proposal that these words should be deleted, or on the retention of these words. It is my understanding that we are voting on the Cuban proposal that the words should be deleted.

146. Mr. STAVROPOULOS (Under-Secretary-General for General Assembly Affairs): A separate vote is always either for the deletion or for the retention of words. The question will be, Who are in favour of retaining the wording as it is, who are against and who abstain?

147. Mr. RAMIREZ (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): In the opinion of my delegation, since two amendments have been proposed in regard to draft resolution V, those amendments should be voted on first, in accordance with rule 92 of the rules of procedure. Furthermore, as I understand it, the proposal of the representative of Cuba is only for a separate vote on a part of a paragraph; he has not proposed an amendment.

148. The PRESIDENT: Rule 91 states:

"A representative may move that parts of a proposal or of an amendment shall be voted on separately. If objection is made to the request for division, the motion for division shall be voted upon."

I ask again, Who is in favour of this paragraph 1?

149. Mr. STAVROPOULOS (Under-Secretary-General for General Assembly Affairs): A vote by division has been requested in accordance with rule 91 on the following words contained in operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution V: "to be elected from among States Members of the United Nations or members of the specialized agencies or of the International Atomic Energy Agency".

150. Mr. AYOUB (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): Without going into the substance of the amendments or the substance of the proposal made by the delegation of Cuba, my delegation finds it rather strange that we are putting to the vote first in a separate vote this proposal which has been submitted to the General Assembly when the draft resolution itself is the subject of amendments. In the view of the Tunisian delegation—and I am reading rule 92 of the rules of procedure—"When an amendment is moved to a proposal, the amendment shall be voted on first". In the view of the Tunisian delegation, we should vote first on the two amendments proposed by the delegations of the Philippines and El Salvador and we could then have the separate vote.

151. Mr. STAVROPOULOS (Under-Secretary-General for General Assembly Affairs): This particular sentence is not

the subject of an amendment. This sentence is in paragraph 1. The amendments come later; they refer to paragraph 1 (c) and paragraph 2. We shall vote on them one by one as they come up in the text.

152. Mr. VIAUD (France) (*interpretation from French*): In a case such as this the first thing to do is to observe the rules of procedure, and it does not seem to me that everybody here has done so. The representative of Tunisia has rightly told us that the United Nations practice is to vote first on amendments, even if they refer to the last paragraph of a draft resolution, and after that, only after that, is there voting on proposals for separate votes requested by delegations.

153. What we must now do is invite the Assembly to vote first on the two amendments which have been submitted. Then there is a request for a separate vote which, as I understand, has not been challenged by the Assembly. The Assembly is ready to vote on the part of the sentence on which the delegation of Cuba requested a separate vote. If, therefore, this is indeed the intention of the Assembly, you need only tell us, Mr. President: "We shall now vote on the words mentioned by the delegation of Cuba. Those who are in favour of maintaining those words will vote yes, and those who are in favour of deletion of those words will vote no, and the others will abstain." In that way we shall know what we are voting on. Since it is an extremely important question, although it does not seem to be so, it is absolutely essential that we comply with the rules of procedure from start to finish and particularly that no confusion be created in the minds of members because of some vagueness where there should be none.

154. Mr. STAVROPOULOS (Under-Secretary-General for General Assembly Affairs): There is no reason why the Assembly should not vote on the amendments first, if it so wishes. It is peculiar, but the rules of procedure speak of the division of proposals in rule 91 and of voting on amendments in rule 92. In any case, the argument advanced may or may not stand.

155. But there is no reason why the Assembly should not vote first on the amendment proposed by Ecuador.

156. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on the amendment proposed orally by Ecuador, under which the word "subregional" in operative paragraph 1 (c) of draft resolution V would be replaced by "regional". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Fiji, France, Hungary, Mongolia, New Zealand, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Romania, Senegal, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Against: Burundi, Congo, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Indonesia, Jamaica, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Morocco, Netherlands,

Nicaragua, Panama, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Upper Volta, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Cuba, Cyprus, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Mexico, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, South Africa, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Togo, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Yemen.

The amendment was rejected by 33 votes to 27, with 47 abstentions.

157. The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on the amendment in document A/L.658. The amendment is to replace the phrase "at the organizational meetings of its fifty-second session," by the phrase "at its resumed fifty-first session" in operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution V. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Malta, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Cameroon, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Senegal.

Abstaining: Argentina, Bolivia, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Gabon, Jordan, Kenya, Mali, Mexico, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Peru, Uruguay, Venezuela.

The amendment was adopted by 91 votes to 7, with 15 abstentions.

158. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a separate vote on the phrase in operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution V reading as follows: "to be elected from among States Members of the United Nations or members of the specialized agencies or of the International Atomic Energy Agency". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Fiji, France, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Malta, Mauritania, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Finland, Guinea, Hungary, Libyan Arab Republic, Mali, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Abstaining: Algeria, Egypt, El Salvador, Guyana, Jamaica, Mexico, Morocco, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Singapore.

The phrase was retained by 87 votes to 15, with 9 abstentions.

159. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote draft resolution V as a whole, as amended. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Brazil,² Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Dahomey, Denmark, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Canada, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, El

² The delegation of Brazil subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as an abstention.

Salvador, Guyana, Hungary, Jamaica, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Romania, South Africa, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Draft resolution V as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 86 votes to 2 with 25 abstentions (resolution 2813 (XXVI)).²

160. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution VI, relating to the "Capacity of the United Nations Development System".

Draft resolution VI was adopted by 101 votes to 2, with 12 abstentions (resolution 2814 (XXVI)).

161. The PRESIDENT: Lastly, I put to the vote draft resolution VII, on "The United Nations Fund for Population Activities".

Draft resolution VII was adopted by 94 votes to none, with 20 abstentions (resolution 2815 (XXVI)).

(e) Confirmation of the appointment of the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme

162. The PRESIDENT: Before the Assembly concluded its consideration of agenda item 44 I should like to invite its attention to the note by the Secretary-General in document A/8475.

163. In paragraph 4 of his note, the Secretary-General proposes, for the confirmation of the General Assembly, that Mr. Rudolph A. Peterson be appointed as Administrator Designate of the United Nations Development Programme, with effect from 1 January 1972, on the understanding that he would take over as Administrator of the Programme, with effect from 15 January 1972, for a term of office ending on 31 December 1975. The Secretary-General also proposes that the term of office of Mr. Paul G. Hoffman should be extended to 15 January 1972.

164. May I take it that the General Assembly decides to confirm the appointment of Mr. Peterson and to approve the extension of the term of appointment of Mr. Hoffman?

It was so decided.

165. Mr. BORCH (Denmark): As I take it we have completed agenda item 44 (e), I should like to say that the five Nordic countries, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Sweden and Denmark, want to avail themselves of the opportunity afforded by this present agenda item to pay a tribute to the outgoing Administrator, since this would seem to us to be the only opportunity to do so from this rostrum and in the presence of the full membership.

166. On this occasion, when the General Assembly has confirmed the appointment of a new Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme [UNDP], one can but think back over the past 13 years when Mr. Hoffman reigned first over the Special Fund and later over the UNDP

and added to his already distinguished career an outstanding contribution to the cause of peace and development.

167. The growth of United Nations technical and pre-investment assistance took place at the same time as the Nordic countries started developing systematic aid programmes in favour of the third world. These programmes have many common features, one of which is the allocation of a very high percentage of their total means to international organizations. Our substantial financial support for the UNDP has been accompanied by our active participation in the work of the Governing Council, through which we have acquired an even more intimate knowledge of Mr. Hoffman than we had had in the days of the Marshall Plan.

168. We have come to admire Mr. Hoffman not only as a man who masters all details of the complex and interdependent problems of development and who has conducted with consummate skill a steadily expanding programme designed to solve these problems, but also as a man of vision, a man with a dream of a world without need, a man to whom the exploitation of the earth's resources has been, above all, a means to create a better and more peaceful world for all mankind. The dedication of Mr. Hoffman has inspired further efforts far beyond the limits set for the activities of the UNDP influencing and strengthening the whole field of international co-operation for economic and social progress.

169. It is my privilege to express today the profound gratitude of the Governments of all the Nordic countries to this great personage, whose achievements place him foremost among those worthy of the designation "citizen of the world". We wish him health and happiness in the years to come and we are confident that, although he is retiring from this post as Administrator, he is not withdrawing from the world and its problems.

170. It will be no easy task to succeed Mr. Hoffman. However, in our opinion, the Secretary-General has made a most happy choice in appointing Mr. Peterson the new Administrator. The UNDP and the entire United Nations development system should be marked by business-like efficiency and should at the same time be directed by persons having a firm belief in the role of multilateral assistance. In both respects Mr. Peterson is highly qualified. The reports of his task force on international development contain no ranting words; on the contrary, all through their terse language run a deeply sympathetic attitude towards international co-operation for development and the wish for a stronger emphasis on multilateralism.

171. The Nordic countries would not like to miss this opportunity to express our satisfaction with and our support of the appointment of Mr. Peterson as the successor to Mr. Hoffman, and to give to the Secretary-General our assurance of being ready to work as closely with Mr. Peterson as we did with Mr. Hoffman for a steadily strengthened United Nations development system.

172. The PRESIDENT: In my capacity as President of the General Assembly and on behalf of the whole Assembly I should like to pay a tribute to Mr. Paul Hoffman on the eve of his retirement as Administrator of the United Nations

Development Programme for his wonderful contribution to the work of the United Nations in the economic and social field and in the operational activities of the UNDP. In thanking him for his many years of distinguished service I

extend to Mr. Hoffman our warm good wishes for many years of health and happiness.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

