



TOGETHER
for a sustainable future

OCCASION

This publication has been made available to the public on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the United Nations Industrial Development Organisation.



TOGETHER
for a sustainable future

DISCLAIMER

This document has been produced without formal United Nations editing. The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this document do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries, or its economic system or degree of development. Designations such as “developed”, “industrialized” and “developing” are intended for statistical convenience and do not necessarily express a judgment about the stage reached by a particular country or area in the development process. Mention of firm names or commercial products does not constitute an endorsement by UNIDO.

FAIR USE POLICY

Any part of this publication may be quoted and referenced for educational and research purposes without additional permission from UNIDO. However, those who make use of quoting and referencing this publication are requested to follow the Fair Use Policy of giving due credit to UNIDO.

CONTACT

Please contact publications@unido.org for further information concerning UNIDO publications.

For more information about UNIDO, please visit us at www.unido.org

We regret that some of the pages in the microfiche copy of this report may not be up to the proper legibility standards, even though the best possible copy was used for preparing the master fiche.



204015

Distr.
GENERAL

ID/B/SR.36
1 November 1967
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

United Nations Industrial Development Organization

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BOARD

First Session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE THIRTY-SIXTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 4 May 1967, at 3.20 p.m.

CONTENTS

Consideration and adoption of draft resolutions (ID/B/L.15/Rev.2,
ID/B/L.17/Rev.1, ID/B/L.19) (continued)

PRESENT:

<u>President:</u>	Mr. TELL	(Jordan)
later,	Mr. LUBBERS	Netherlands
<u>Rapporteur:</u>	Mr. M ^e BAYE	Guinea
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. BRADLEY)	Argentina
	Mr. VIDAL ETCHEVERRY)	
	Mr. REISCH	Austria
	Mr. FORTHOMME)	Belgium
	Mr. WOULBROUN)	
	Mr. PATRIOTA	Brazil
	Mr. VLADOV	Bulgaria
	Mr. CHAMFOR)	Cameroon
	Mr. ZGA)	
	Mr. BRADY	Canada
	Mr. FIGUEROA	Chile
	Mr. HERRAN-MEDINA)	Colombia
	Mrs. LOPEZ de GARCIA)	
	Mr. SANCHEZ LAMERAN	Cuba
	Mr. M ^e ZIK)	Czechoslovakia
	Mr. SCHEJBAL)	
	Mr. KURTH	Federal Republic of Germany
	Mr. UGELDAHL	Finland
	Mr. VIAUD)	France
	Mr. CESAIRE)	
	Mrs. AGGREY-ORLEANS	Ghana
	Mr. CHADHA)	India
	Mr. GUPTA)	
	Mr. MARTONEGORO	Indonesia
	Mr. BAYANDOR	Iran
	Mr. PISANI MASSAMORMILE	Italy
	Mr. KOFFI	Ivory Coast
	Mr. ABE	Japan
	Mr. KHURMA	Jordan
	Mr. AL-RIFAE	Kuwait

PRESENT (continued):

Members (continued):

Mr. OLUMIDE	Nigeria
Mr. AHMED	Pakistan
Mr. BOZA	Peru
Mrs. KODIKARA	Philippines
Mr. DUMITRESCU	Romania
Mr. RYABONYENDE	Rwanda
Mr. WARSAMA	Somalia
Mr. ARANA	Spain
Mr. SAHLOUL	Sudan
Mr. BERGQUIST	Sweden
Mr. TURRETTINA	Switzerland
Mr. VISESSURAKARN	Thailand
Mrs. SOLOMON	Trinidad and Tobago
Mr. CUHRUK	Turkey
Mr. TARASOV) Mr. LOBANOV)	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Mr. BADAWI	United Arab Republic
Sir Edward WARNER	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT) Mr. STIBRAVY)	United States of America
Mr. MONTERO	Uruguay
Miss CAMPBELL	Zambia

Observers for Member States:

Mr. RAHMANI	Algeria
Mr. BENSON	Australia
U BA YIN	Burma
Mr. FU	China
Mr. MULONGO	Congo (Democratic Republic of)
Mr. AGATHOCLEUS	Cyprus
Mr. OLSEN	Denmark
Mr. SUBERO	Dominican Republic

PRESENT (continued):

Observers for Member States (continued):

Mr. JATIVA	Ecuador
Mr. MAKAYA-CASTANOUL	Gabon
Mr. COLLAS	Greece
Mr. THOMAS	Liberia
Mr. LAI	Malaysia
Mr. CARRANCO AVILA	Mexico
Mr. CHULJUNBAATAR	Mongolia
Mr. SVENNEVIG	Norway
Mr. NENEMAN	Poland
Mr. SKATARETIKO	Yugoslavia

Representatives of specialized agencies:

Mrs. de LOPEZ	International Labour Organisation
Mr. WOODWARD	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
Miss BARRETT	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
Mr. PERINBAM	International Bank for Reconstruction and Development

Representative of the International Atomic Energy Agency:

Mr. NAJAR

Representatives of other United Nations bodies:

Mr. HARLAND	United Nations Development Programme
Mr. NERFIN	World Food Programme

Representatives of inter-governmental organizations:

Mr. WOODLEY	United International Bureaux for the Protection of Intellectual Property
-------------	--

PRESENT (continued):

Secretariat:

Mr. QUIJANO CABALLERO	Director, Technical Co-operation Division
Mr. GRIGORIEV	Director, Industrial Technology Division
Mr. GOODKIND	Office of the Controller
Mr. KROMERY	Department of Economic and Social Affairs
Mr. STORDEL	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
Mr. SYLLA	Secretary of the Board

CONSIDERATION AND ADOPTION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (ID/B/L.15/Rev.2, ID/B/L.17/Rev.1, ID/B/L.19) (continued)

ID/B/L.19

Mr. VLADOV (Bulgaria) announced that the sponsors of draft resolution ID/B/L.19 would not ask for it to be put to a vote; they proposed that the text should be included in the Board's report.

It was so decided.

ID/B/L.17/Rev.1

Mr. OLUMIDE (Nigeria), supported by Mr. AHMED (Pakistan), Mr. SAHLOUL (Sudan) and Mr. PATRIOTA (Brazil), asked whether the Jordanian delegation's approval of an amendment to draft resolution ID/B/L.17/Rev.1 at the previous meeting meant that it wished to become a sponsor of the draft resolution again.

The PRESIDENT, speaking as the representative of Jordan, said that his delegation was glad to resume its sponsorship of the draft, which as amended, protected the interests of the developing countries to a great extent.

Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) protested against a procedure which was not authorized by any provision of the rules of procedure. A delegation could surely not resume its sponsorship of a draft resolution which no longer existed as such. If Jordan had wished to become a sponsor again, it should have said so before the draft resolution was adopted.

Mr. OLUMIDE (Nigeria) and Mr. AHMED (Pakistan) pointed out that they had not submitted any proposal that the Jordan delegation should resume its sponsorship. They had merely wished to state their interpretation of the situation and to ask whether that interpretation was correct.

Mr. Lubbers (Netherlands), Vice-President, took the Chair.

After a discussion in which Mr. TELL (Jordan), Mr. PISANI MASSAMORMILE (Italy) and Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) took part, Mr. AHMED (Pakistan) observed that the Jordanian delegation had given the confirmation requested of it, and that settled the matter; he therefore formally proposed that the discussion on the question should be closed.

The PRESIDENT proposed that the discussion should be closed, in accordance with the Pakistan representative's proposal, and that delegations wishing to do so should be invited to explain their positions on the draft resolution.

It was so decided.

Mr. FORTHOMME (Belgium) said he believed that a number of changes should be made in the French text and requested that the necessary action should be taken.

Mr. Tell (Jordan) resumed the Chair.

Mr. KOFFI (Ivory Coast) recalled that it had been decided that two passages relating to the draft resolution would be included in the report. In that connexion, his delegation would have some objections and reservations unless the words "the Board felt" were replaced by the words "the majority of the Board felt".

Mr. TURRETTINI (Switzerland) said, with respect to paragraph II (E), that his delegation hesitated to endorse a formula which would arouse hopes that could not be met with the limited resources available. His delegation was not convinced of the need at the current stage, to include among the activities listed in paragraph 2 (F) (vii) such activities as selection of processes, technologies and machinery and equipment, preparation of invitations for tenders, or evaluation of tenders. His delegation would have abstained on those two passages if separate votes had been taken on them. Nevertheless, Switzerland was ready to help in achieving the objectives of the resolution, and in that spirit it had supported it.

ID/B/L.15/Rev.2

Mr. AHMED (Pakistan), introducing draft resolution ID/B/L.15/Rev.2, said that it contained two basic proposals. The first was that a pledging conference should be convened in accordance with General Assembly resolution 2152 (XXI), paragraph 23 (a), while the second related to the utilization of the appropriate resources of the regular programme of technical assistance, provided for in paragraph 22 (c) of that resolution. The first proposal had already been discussed

/...

(Mr. Ahmed, Pakistan)

at length in the Ad Hoc Committee on the United Nations Organization for Industrial Development; the developing countries represented in the Committee had all pressed for the inclusion in the resolution establishing UNIDO of a provision concerning a pledging conference. During the debates in the Ad Hoc Committee and the Second Committee, the developed countries had agreed to that unanimous request. The developing countries had believed that UNIDO would have to have resources of its own if it was to enjoy the autonomy prescribed in resolution 2152 (XXI), part I. Paragraphs 22 and 23 of that resolution clearly stated the ways in which operational activities should be financed, and paragraph 1 of the draft resolution was the logical follow-up to paragraph 23 (a).

With regard to the resources of the regular programme of technical assistance, it should be borne in mind that all the specialized agencies had, like the United Nations, their own technical assistance programmes. As an organ of the General Assembly, UNIDO would participate in the United Nations programme of technical assistance. The sponsors felt that it would be better to include a separate appropriation in the budget of the United Nations to provide for the programme of technical assistance in industrial development. If UNIDO was to be able to fulfil its mandate, it was important that its autonomy should be protected and that it should be given adequate resources. It was in response to the unanimous wish of the developing countries that the sponsors were recommending the convening of a pledging conference, and in order to take account of the position of the developed countries which felt that such action would be premature, they were proposing that the conference should be convened during the twenty-third session of the General Assembly. They were certainly not trying to force Governments to take part in a pledging conference, especially since resolution 2152 (XXI) provided for other ways of making voluntary contributions, but they earnestly hoped that Governments would contribute to UNIDO's work in conformity with the provisions of their draft resolution. There was a drafting amendment in the fifth preambular paragraph, where the words in sub-section (a) should be replaced by the following:
"establishing in the budget of the United Nations a separate appropriation for the programme of technical assistance in industrial development".

/...

Mr. MUZIK (Czechoslovakia) said that his country had already indicated its readiness to make a voluntary contribution at the appropriate time; his delegation continued to think that a special pledging conference was not necessary and that technical assistance programmes should be financed by voluntary contributions, and not under the regular budget of the United Nations. It would therefore be unable to vote for the fifth preambular paragraph or for operative paragraph 2 (a).

Mr. M'BAYE (Guinea) said that the draft resolution was the culmination of long years of efforts to create a body capable of meeting industrial development needs. No organization could be dynamic and effective unless it enjoyed financial autonomy. The sponsors were aware that many delegations were unable to vote for a pledging conference, but they hoped that after the closure of the session those delegations would try to win their Governments over to the idea of such a conference.

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT (United States of America) said that his delegation had already stated its position on the principle of a pledging conference. He appealed to the sponsors to reconsider their attitude and to leave the question over to a later session of the Board.

Operative paragraph 2 (a) ran counter to the trend of developments in the United Nations. To make separate budgetary provision for the operational activities of UNIDO would be contrary to the principle of supporting country priorities and would mean cutting the developing countries off from far greater resources. In the past two years, the funds allocated to industrialization projects had amounted to one sixth of the total resources of the regular programme of technical assistance. If requests for assistance were more numerous, there was no doubt that the proportion could increase.

Everyone agreed that it was for the recipients of assistance to determine their needs. The Board could, of course, establish guidelines in that regard, but to make it an intermediary between countries requesting aid and those providing it would hardly be desirable, and there was the question when the Board would meet to approve requests. For all those reasons, his delegation could not support the draft resolution.

Mr. VIAUD (France) agreed with the representative of Guinea that UNIDO would not be viable unless it had resources of its own. Nevertheless, since its resources came mainly from a few countries, decisions and recommendations must take the views of those countries into account, and that did not appear to be entirely the case in the present instance. France had always maintained that the operational activities of the United Nations should be financed by voluntary contributions, and not under the regular budget, which should be used for administrative expenses only. That position was unchanged, but it was worth repeating, since there were still some countries putting forward a draft resolution like the one before the Board. If the draft was put to a vote, his delegation would vote against the fifth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 2. As far as the pledging conference was concerned, the French Government knew what it was willing or able to do, but it was not its intention to prevent other Governments from following their own course. On that point, therefore, France would abstain.

In explanation of the differences in those positions, he pointed out that to make use of the regular budget did not seem in accordance with the principles and practices of the United Nations. In that regard - and such was still France's position - many members had seemed to agree in bodies other than the Board that appropriations under the regular budgets of the United Nations and the specialized agencies for technical assistance purposes should cease and should be merged in a single broad technical assistance programme, in order to avoid the danger of dispersion. It was essential to the United Nations and to UNIDO that all technical assistance activities should be brought under a single policy-making, administrative and supervisory authority. Lastly, France's assessed contribution to the regular budget was not entirely commensurate with its influence on decision-making, and the draft resolution called for the establishment of a new budget without its being known whether the main contributing countries would be able to exercise their rightful influence.

As far as the pledging conference was concerned, that was a matter of procedure and method. The real question was whether many countries were prepared to give direct aid to UNIDO. That was probably the case, but some Governments might prefer the choice of a procedure for announcing their contributions to be left to them. They might prefer to use the Special Fund or to announce their

(Mr. Viaud, France)

contribution to the Secretary-General direct. The draft resolution aimed at polarizing the Board, and consequently Governments, towards a single solution which might not be the one which Governments would choose. That was somewhat maladroit. However, while France would abstain, it did not take a negative and sterile attitude, for it was not opposed to the principle of voluntary contributions and had already expressed its intention of giving direct assistance to UNIDO. By abstaining, France wished to signify its feeling that it was not affected by the decision.

The intention of some delegations to recommend a resumed session of the Board did not seem either desirable or necessary. It would merely serve to reopen discussion of a work programme which had been drawn up with great difficulty. In any event, his delegation would not wish to join in such a recommendation.

Mr. TARASOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation greatly sympathized with the efforts of the developing countries to ensure the financial autonomy of UNIDO. In that regard, the Soviet Union had clearly indicated its intention of making direct contributions. However, it had some objections to the draft resolution, an important part of which dealt with the regular budget of the United Nations. UNIDO was merely an organ of the United Nations, and it was not for the Board, but for the Fifth Committee of the General Assembly, to take decisions in the matter. It was really surprising that the sponsors had not thought of that.

The regular programme of technical assistance had not hitherto played any part in industrialization. Its resources were only about \$1 million, and it could scarcely be expected to finance the projects of all countries wishing to industrialize. The fourth preambular paragraph was therefore unacceptable. As far as the financing of technical assistance under the regular budget was concerned, it should be terminated and replaced by voluntary contributions. The USSR had contributed more than 4 million roubles to finance technical assistance activities, but its contribution was lying untouched among the assets of the United Nations. It was therefore unable to agree to the fifth preambular paragraph, or to operative paragraph 2, since the technical assistance programme was too complex a matter to be modified without first being thoroughly studied.

/...

(Mr. Tarasov, USSR)

Lastly, there seemed to be no unanimity on the pledging conference, even though it was more or less a procedural question. The sponsors might do well to abandon the idea, which would only deepen the differences among members of the Board. The matter could perhaps be left to the wisdom of the Secretary-General, particularly as resolution 2152 (XXI) provided for several different modes of financing.

Mr. KURTH (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation regarded a pledging conference as premature. If the draft resolution was put to a vote, it would abstain on operative paragraph 2 because the Federal Republic of Germany, not being a Member of the United Nations, did not consider itself competent in the matter.

Mr. SAHLOUL (Sudan) pointed out that the recommendation for a pledging conference was in conformity with resolution 2152 (XXI), which had been approved unanimously by the General Assembly. The resolution established three modes of financing for the activities of UNIDO. Two of them had already been applied, and it was only natural that an attempt should be made to use the third, the more so as the draft resolution did not involve the donor countries in any obligation to participate in the conference. Whatever the outcome, there was no reason to fear that it would deepen the differences, as some had claimed. Besides, several countries had already announced their intention of contributing to UNIDO direct. He hoped that their example would encourage others.

Some members had said that the SIS programme was sufficient to absorb the voluntary contributions. It was true that the programme had been of great assistance to UNIDO, but its procedures were tending to grow more complicated and it would soon be inadequate.

Mr. BADAWI (United Arab Republic) said that the two operative paragraphs had a single purpose, which was to ensure UNIDO's financial independence. No country was obliged to take part in the pledging conference and it might serve to stimulate the flow of contributions. Moreover, an increase in the level of allocations under the regular budget would enable UNIDO to cope with the increase in requests.

Mr. PISANI MASSAMORMILE (Italy) stated that he would abstain on operative paragraph 1 since he did not wish to prevent any member from participating in a pledging conference. Nevertheless, as no Government had yet pledged any contribution, to adopt the draft resolution would be to convene a conference to no purpose. It might therefore be better not to press for the adoption of a text which would not have the unanimous support necessary and to incorporate it in the Board's report. That would be an equally good method of swaying the Governments which were hesitating.

Sir Edward WARNER (United Kingdom) said he could not support the draft resolution since to establish a separate appropriation in the budget of the United Nations to provide for the programme of technical assistance in industrial development conflicted with the principle that the budget should be based on the requests of the countries in question. Further, he could not see what useful purpose would be served by deciding at the present time to recommend a separate Pledging Conference, since it had not been demonstrated that UNIDO either needed or could at present put to worthwhile use operational funds over and above those already available.

Mr. OLUMIDE (Nigeria) appealed to the developed countries not to use the holding of a pledging conference without their full approval as an occasion for freezing all types of financial assistance, particularly since their reluctance was caused by procedural considerations. Moreover, the conference would not take place before the twenty-third session of the General Assembly, by which time some countries might have been able to overcome their reluctance.

Mr. M'BAYE (Guinea) urged the Board not to prevent the convening of a pledging conference - unless it wished UNIDO to become a kind of unfinished symphony through lack of financial independence.

Mr. REISCH (Austria) considered that it would be inopportune at the current session to convene a pledging conference to be held during the twenty-third session of the General Assembly. The question should be reconsidered at the second session of the Board when the situation might be somewhat clearer. Furthermore, the draft resolution in document ID/B/L.18/Rev.1, of which his country was a sponsor, requested the Executive Director to formulate guidelines on the use of voluntary contributions and it would be well to await his report in order to take a fully

(Mr. Reisch, Austria)

informed decision. Moreover, the debate had shown that the principal donor countries were apparently unwilling to take part in the proposed conference.

His delegation did not consider that the measures recommended in operative paragraph 2 were likely to make UNIDO more effective and would abstain on the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. FORTHOMME (Belgium) encountered the same difficulties as a number of other delegations in regard to operative paragraph 2. To convene the conference would imply that there was an atmosphere of unanimity which did not, in fact, exist. Although it agreed with the principle of voluntary contributions, his delegation would vote against the draft resolution.

Mr. BRADY (Canada) endorsed the United States representative's comments and for the same reasons could not support the draft resolution. He shared the views of the French and Belgian representatives on operative paragraph 1. His Government had clearly stated its intention of making contributions direct to UNIDO but he questioned the need to do so at a conference. In recent years, his Government had progressively increased its contribution to the resources of United Nations bodies and had now announced its intention of raising its multilateral and bilateral development assistance to 1 per cent of its gross national product.

Mr. LUBBERS (Netherlands) recalled that his delegation had already outlined its position on the issue during the discussion of agenda item 10. The pledging conference proposed in operative paragraph 1 was premature while the measures recommended in operative paragraph 2 were highly complex and needed further study. Moreover, they were contrary to current practice in regard to technical assistance and the sponsors did not appear to have considered their implications for the United Nations budgetary cycle. He was therefore unable to vote for the draft resolution.

Mrs. KODIKARA (Philippines) said that she would vote in favour of operative paragraph 1 and sub-paragraph (a) of operative paragraph 2. She would abstain on sub-paragraph (b) since she was unable to take a decision with full knowledge of the facts. She requested a roll-call vote.

Mr. TURRETTINI (Switzerland) said that he could not support the draft resolution. Obviously, the representatives of the industrialized countries considered that it would be premature to convene a pledging conference. He himself felt that it was for each donor country to decide how it intended to finance UNIDO's activities.

Mr. BERGQUIST (Sweden) observed that the normal sources of finance for UNIDO should be UNDP and the United Nations regular budget, although he conceded that other means could be required to support UNIDO's operational activities. The question raised in the draft resolution was, however, premature. Sweden would be prepared to discuss the question of financing when UNIDO's work programme for 1969 had been submitted and could be evaluated.

Mr. UGGELDAHL (Finland) felt that it would be premature to convene a pledging conference during the General Assembly's twenty-third session.

Mr. ABE (Japan) said that he could not vote in favour of operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution. It would be difficult, at the present stage, to review the guidelines for the regular programme of technical assistance, which were still controversial. The same applied to the question as to whether technical assistance activities should be financed by voluntary contributions or charged under the regular budget. With reference to operative paragraph 1, the psychological conditions necessary for the success of the conference did not appear to exist. He would be grateful if the sponsors of the draft resolution did not press for a vote on it.

Mr. KOFFI (Ivory Coast) said that the developed countries which considered the convening of a pledging conference inopportune should state how they proposed to implement the provisions of operative paragraph 23 of General Assembly resolution 2152 (XXI). The sponsors of the draft resolution and the representatives of the developed countries might work out a compromise in regard to the date of the conference. The powers which the draft resolution would confer on the Board should in any case be upheld.

Mr. WARSAMA (Somalia) said that, in recommending the convening of a pledging conference, the sponsors had in no way intended to restrict the possibilities open to donor countries in regard to voluntary contributions.

Mr. AHMED (Pakistan) recalled that, according to paragraph 22 of General Assembly resolution 2152 (XXI), Governments could choose among several ways of making voluntary contributions. The date of the conference had been chosen in the light of the objections of certain delegations which felt it would be premature to hold it in 1967. The sponsors were aware that only the General Assembly could increase the level of the allocations to industrial development projects within the total appropriations under part V of the regular budget. The Board was being asked to recommend that the Assembly should take that step and provide for separate approval of those allocations. The Assembly could give effect to that recommendation by adding a new section to part V or by creating a special part. It could also impute those allocations to another section of the budget. The establishment of a separate appropriation for the programme of technical assistance in industrial development would be the logical consequence of the Assembly's decision to establish UNIDO. Without excluding a priori the possibility of transferring funds from one section of the budget to another, he considered the establishment of a separate appropriation essential if UNIDO was to be truly independent. The Board should have the same powers as the UNDP Governing Council, especially since it was asking not for increased total appropriations under part V of the regular budget but only for increased allocations to industrial development projects.

The French representative had stressed the advantages of a common fund on which all United Nations bodies could draw. Nevertheless, the specialized agencies now enjoyed a financial independence which some delegations, for reasons which were not clear, hesitated to grant UNIDO. The Austrian representative's proposal was in no way incompatible with the draft resolution under consideration. Of course, the financial arrangements had given rise to long and painful discussions and it had been easy to foresee that some developed countries would oppose the draft resolution. However, its sponsors were convinced that it would help to overcome existing disagreements.

Mr. TARASOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) expressed regret that the sponsors had been unable to accept his delegation's suggestions. He would agree to change his position if the words "Conscious of" at the beginning of the fourth preambular paragraph were replaced by the word "Noting".

Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT (United States of America) said that it would be preferable to include the text of the draft resolution in the Board's report. Although his delegation could not change its position, it would be advisable to replace the words "separate appropriation" in operative paragraph 2 (a), by the words "separate section in part V".

Mr. AHMED (Pakistan) accepted the suggestions of the Soviet Union representative and of the United States representative on behalf of the sponsors.

Mr. VIAUD (France) requested a roll-call vote on the fourth and fifth preambular paragraphs and operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution ID/B/L.15/Rev.2.

A roll-call vote was taken on the fourth preambular paragraph of draft resolution ID/B/L.15/Rev.2, as amended.

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

In favour: Colombia, Cuba, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kuwait, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Rwanda, Somalia, Sudan, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Zambia, Argentina, Austria, Brazil, Cameroon, Canada, Chile.

Against: Czechoslovakia, France, Japan, Netherlands, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Bulgaria.

Abstaining: Federal Republic of Germany, Finland, Italy, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Belgium.

The fourth preambular paragraph of draft resolution ID/B/L.15/Rev.2, as amended, was adopted by 30 votes to 6, with 8 abstentions.

A roll-call vote was taken on the fifth preambular paragraph of draft resolution ID/B/L.15/Rev.2.

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

In favour: Brazil, Cameroon, Chile, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kuwait, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Rwanda, Somalia, Sudan, Thailand, Turkey, United Arab Republic, Zambia.

Against: Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Finland, France, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Belgium.

Abstaining: Colombia, Cuba, Federal Republic of Germany, Romania, Spain, Switzerland, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, Argentina, Austria.

The fifth preambular paragraph of draft resolution ID/B/L.15/Rev.2 was adopted by 21 votes to 13, with 10 abstentions.

A roll-call vote was taken on operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution ID/B/L.15/Rev.2, as amended.

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

In favour: Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kuwait, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Rwanda, Somalia, Sudan, Thailand, United Arab Republic, Zambia, Cameroon, Chile, Ghana.

Against: Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Finland, France.

Abstaining: Romania, Spain, Switzerland, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uruguay, Argentina, Austria, Brazil, Colombia, Cuba, Federal Republic of Germany.

Operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution ID/B/L.15/Rev.2, as amended, was adopted by 19 votes to 13, with 12 abstentions.

A roll-call vote was taken on draft resolution ID/B/L.15/Rev.2, as a whole, as amended.

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

In favour: Chile, Cuba, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kuwait, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Rwanda, Somalia, Sudan, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, United Arab Republic, Uruguay, Zambia, Argentina, Brazil, Cameroon.

Against: Canada, Federal Republic of Germany, France, Japan,
Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great
Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America,
Belgium.

Abstaining: Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Finland, Italy, Romania, Spain,
Turkey, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Austria,
Bulgaria.

Draft resolution ID/B/L.15/Rev.2, as amended, was adopted by 24 votes to 10,
with 10 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 6.30 P.M.





11. 3. 74