

heid, there is a wide consensus of view that the UN must show its concern with the situation by all feasible and peaceful means.

As the United Nations moved into its third decade of existence, the pressure from developing countries for intensified international efforts to accelerate economic and social development throughout the world increased during 1966. The role of the world organization in development activity was strengthened during the year, which was marked by the growing effectiveness of the work of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the new agency which has incorporated two voluntary programmes—the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance (EPTA) and the Special Fund. During 1966, Canada recognized the effectiveness of this organization by increasing its contribution to \$10.75 million (Cdn), making it the fourth largest contributor to the UNDP. The strengthening of development activities was furthered as well by the establishment of a new semi-autonomous organization within the United Nations, to be known as the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO).¹ Like the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD),² UNIDO is to focus its efforts on one aspect of the development process—industrialization. Canada and several other key developed nations demonstrated their support for the work this new organization was to undertake by seeking and obtaining election to its executive body—the Industrial Development Board (IDB).

As mentioned previously, however, these advances did not succeed in bridging the gap between rich and poor countries. A large majority of UN members are now developing countries. For the United Nations to be effective as a development mechanism, however, it is necessary for the developed or donor countries, who provide most of the resources for the implementation of various programmes, to agree to the procedures recommended. When such agreement does not exist, misunderstandings easily ensue. A case in point in 1966 was the debate over the establishment of a United Nations Capital Development Fund.³ The major donor countries opposed the establishment of the Fund on the grounds that this new institution would be an uneconomic duplication of existing institutional channels for development and would drain funds from existing institutions, such as the World Bank and the regional development banks, without resulting in an increased flow of aid to developing countries. Nevertheless, the developing countries, believing that there was an institutional as well as a financial gap, used their numerical superiority in the United Nations to adopt a resolution bringing the Fund

¹ See Page 48.

² See Page 50.

³ See Page 24.