

We in Canada had this position of principle in mind when our delegation to the first session of the IDB voted against resolution 2(1). I want to emphasize that this is a question of principle. We fully share the general concern to see the industrial advancement of the developing countries. We realize that the co-sponsors have in mind the understandable desire to see UNIDO assured of certain regular budget funds so as to be able to respond readily to requests for industrial development assistance. But significant amounts of the regular budget **technical** assistance programme already go to industrial projects. There is no question that large amounts of such funds will continue to be used in the future for industrial development projects. However, the number of requests in any one year will naturally fluctuate and we do not see what can be gained by attempting to make such an amount a specific sum. Indeed, it is possible that more funds might be assigned for industrial development in any one year than could in fact be spent. Under the proposed system, such money would not then be available for other projects. Finally, operative paragraphs two and three of the draft resolution would reduce the ability of the Governing Council of the UNDP to see technical assistance under the regular budget as a whole or to relate the regular programme to the wider activities of the UNDP. For all these reasons the Canadian delegation is unable to support the draft resolution now before us.

Perhaps I should conclude by supporting the comment of the ACABQ in document A/6707 that, "should the General Assembly decide to take the action recommended by the Industrial Development Board, the provision for the programme of technical assistance in industrial development will be included in the totality of the estimate under part V, and that the constituent sections of Part V will continue to be administered as a whole so that it might be easy to accommodate programme changes arising during the operational year."