

council

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

conseil

ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ALIMENTATION ET L'AGRICULTURE

consejo

ORGANIZACION DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA LA AGRICULTURA Y LA ALIMENTACION

CL

CL 96/PV

Ninety-sixth Session
PLENARY

Quatre-vingt-seizième session
PLÉNIÈRE

96º periodo de sesiones
PLENARIA

Rome, 6-10 November 1989

VERBATIM RECORDS OF PLENARY MEETINGS OF THE COUNCIL
PROCÈS-VERBAUX DES SÉANCES PLÉNIÈRES DU CONSEIL
ACTAS TAQUIGRAFICAS DE LAS SESIONES PLENARIAS DEL CONSEJO

TABLE OF CONTENTS	TABLE DES MATIERES FIRST PLENARY MEETING PREMIERE SEANCE PLENIERE PRIMERA SESION PLENARIA (6 November 1989)	INDICE
		<u>Page/página</u>
I. <u>INTRODUCTION - PROCEDURE OF THE SESSION</u>		
I. <u>INTRODUCTION - QUESTIONS DE PROCEDURE</u>		2
I. <u>INTRODUCCION - CUESTIONES DE PROCEDIMIENTO</u>		
1. <u>Adoption of the Agenda and Timetable (CL 96/1; CL 96/INF/1)</u>		
1. <u>Adoption de l'ordre du jour et du calendrier (CL 96/1; CL 96/INF/1)</u>		2
1. <u>Aprobación del programa y el calendario (CL 96/1; CL 96/INF/1)</u>		
2. <u>Election of Three Vice-Chairmen, and Designation of the Chairman and Members of the Drafting Committee</u>		
2. <u>Election de trois Vice-Présidents et désignation du Président et des membres du Comité de rédaction</u>		5
2. <u>Elección de tres Vicepresidentes y nombramiento del Presidente y los miembros del Comité de Redacción</u>		
IV. <u>CONSTITUTIONAL AND LEGAL MATTERS</u>		
IV. <u>QUESTIONS CONSTITUTIONNELLES ET JURIDIQUES</u>		6
IV. <u>ASUNTOS CONSTITUCIONALES Y JURIDICOS</u>		
11. <u>Other Constitutional and Legal Matters</u>		
11. <u>Autres questions constitutionnelles et juridiques</u>		6
11. <u>Otros asuntos constitucionales y jurídicos</u>		
11.1 <u>Invitations to Non-Member Nations to attend FAO Sessions (CL 96/INF/8)</u>		
11.1 <u>Invitations d'Etats non membres à des réunions de la FAO (CL 96/INF/8)</u>		6
11.1 <u>Invitaciones a Estados no miembros para que asistan a reuniones de la FAO (CL 96/INF/8)</u>		
II. <u>ACTIVITIES OF FAO</u>		
II. <u>ACTIVITES DE LA FAO</u>		7
II. <u>ACTIVIDADES DE LA FAO</u>		
3. <u>Preparations for the Twenty-fifth Session of the FAO Conference, including:</u>		
3. <u>Preparation de la vingt-cinquième session de la Conférence de la FAO, notamment :</u>		7
3. <u>Preparativos para el 25- periodo de sesiones de la Conferencia de la FAO, en particular:</u>		
3.1 <u>Nomination of the Chairman of the Conference, and of the Chairmen of the Commissions of the Conference (Recommendations to the Conference) (C 89/12: C 89/12-Corr.1. English only)</u>		
3.1 <u>Proposition de candidatures aux fonctions de Président de la Conférence et de Présidents des Commissions de la Conférence (recommandations à la Conférence) (C 89/12)</u>		7
3.1 <u>Propuesta de candidaturas para la Presidencia de la Conferencia y de las Comisione de la Conferencia (recomendaciones para la Conferencia) (C 89/12)</u>		

	<u>Page/página</u>
3.2 <u>Election of the Nominations Committee</u> (C 89/12; C 89/12-Corr.1, English only)	
3.2 <u>Election des membres de la Commission des candidatures</u> (C 89/12)	8
3.2 <u>Elección del Comité de Candidaturas</u> (C 89/12)	
<u>TRIBUTE TO HIS EXCELLENCY MR McDONALD BENJAMIN, PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF DOMINICA TO FAO</u>	
<u>HOMMAGE A M. SON EXCELLENCE McDONALD BENJAMIN, REPRESENTANT PERMANENT DE DOMINIQUE AUPRES DE LA FAO</u>	9
<u>HOMENAJE AL EXCMO. SR. McDONALD BENJAMIN, REPRESENTANTE PERMANENTE DE DOMINICA ANTE LA FAO</u>	
III. <u>PROGRAMME, BUDGETARY, FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS</u>	
III. <u>QUESTIONS CONCERNANT LE PROGRAMME, LE BUDGET, LES FINANCES ET L'ADMINISTRATION</u>	9
III. <u>ASUNTOS DEL PROGRAMA Y ASUNTOS PRESUPUESTARIOS, FINANCIEROS Y ADMINISTRATIVOS</u>	
5. <u>Programme of Work and Budget 1990-91 and Medium-Term Objectives</u> (C 89/3; C 89/3-Sup.1; C 89/3-Sup.2; C 89/3-Sup.3; C 89/3-Sup.4; CL 96/4)	
5. <u>Programme de travail et budget 1990-91 et objectifs à moyen terme</u> (C 89/3; C 89/3-Sup.1; C 89/3-Sup.2; C 89/3-Sup.3; C 89/3-Sup.4; CL 96/4)	9
5. <u>Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para 1990-91 y objetivos a plazo medio</u> (C 89/3; C 89/3-Sup.1; C 89/3-Sup.2; C 89/3-Sup.3; C 89/3-Sup.4; CL 96/4)	
SECOND PLENARY MEETING DEUXIEME SEANCE PLENIERE SEGUNDA SESIÓN PLENARIA (6 November 1989)	
	<u>Page/página</u>
III. <u>PROGRAMME, BUDGETARY, FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS</u> (continued)	
III. <u>QUESTIONS CONCERNANT LE PROGRAMME, LE BUDGET, LES FINANCES ET L'ADMINISTRATION</u> (suite)	22
III. <u>ASUNTOS DEL PROGRAMA Y ASUNTOS PRESUPUESTARIOS, FINANCIEROS Y ADMINISTRATIVOS</u> (continuación)	
2. <u>Election of Three Vice-Chairmen and Designation of the Chairman and Members of the Drafting Committee</u>	
2. <u>Election de trois Vice-Presidents et nomination du President et des membres du Comité de rédaction</u>	22
2. <u>Elección de tres Vicepresidentes y nombramiento del Presidente y de los miembros del Comité de Redacción</u>	
5. <u>Programme of Work and Budget 1990-91 and Medium-Term Objectives</u> (C 89/3; C 89/3-Sup.1; C 89/3-Sup.2; C 89/3-Sup.3; C 89/3-Sup.4; CL 96/4) (continued)	
5. <u>Programme de travail et budget 1990-91 et objectifs à moyen terme</u> (C 89/3; C 89/3-Sup.1; C 89/3-Sup.2; C 89/3-Sup.3; C 89/3-Sup.4; CL 96/4) (suite)	22
5. <u>Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para 1990-91 y objetivos a plazo medio</u> (C 89/3; C 89/3-Sup.1; C 89/3-Sup.2; C 89/3-Sup.3; C 89/3-Sup.4; CL 96/4) (continuación)	

THIRD PLENARY MEETING
TROISIEME SEANCE PLENIERE
TERCERA SESION PLENARIA
(7 November 1989)

	<u>Page/página</u>
III. <u>PROGRAMME, BUDGETARY, FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS</u> (continued)	
III. <u>QUESTIONS CONCERNANT LE PROGRAMME, LE BUDGET, LES FINANCES ET L'ADMINISTRATION</u> (suite)	50
III. <u>ASUNTOS DEL PROGRAMA Y ASUNTOS PRESUPUESTARIOS, FINANCIEROS Y ADMINISTRATIVOS</u> (continuación)	
5. <u>Programme of Work and Budget 1990-91 and Medium-Term Objectives</u> (C 89/3; C 89/3-Sup.1; C 89/3-Sup.2; C 89/3-Sup.3; C 89/3-Sup.4; CL 96/4) (continued)	
5. <u>Programme de travail et budget 1990-91 et objectifs à moyen terme</u> (C 89/3; C 89/3-Sup.1; C 89/3-Sup.2; C 89/3-Sup.3; C 89/3-Sup.4; CL 96/4) (suite)	50
5. <u>Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para 1990-91 y objetivos a plazo medio</u> (C 89/3; C 89/3-Sup.1; C 89/3-Sup.2; C 89/3-Sup.3; C 89/3-Sup.4; CL 96/4) (continuación)	

FOURTH PLENARY MEETING
QUATRIEME SEANCE PLENIERE
CUARTA SESION PLENARIA
(7 November 1989)

I. <u>INTRODUCTION - PROCEDURE OF THE SESSION</u> (continued)	
I. <u>INTRODUCTION - QUESTIONS DE PROCEDURE</u> (suite)	78
I. <u>INTRODUCCION - CUESTIONES DE PROCEDIMIENTO</u> (continuación)	
2. <u>Election of Three Vice-Chairmen, and Designation of the Chairman and Members of the Drafting Committee</u> (continued)	
2. <u>Election de trois Vice-Présidents et désignation du Président et des membres du Comité de rédaction</u> (suite)	78
2. <u>Elección de tres Vicepresidentes y nombramiento del Presidente y los miembros del Comité de Redacción</u> (continuación)	
III. <u>PROGRAMME, BUDGETARY, FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS</u>	
III. <u>QUESTIONS CONCERNANT LE PROGRAMME, LE BUDGET, LES FINANCES ET L'ADMINISTRATION</u>	78
III. <u>ASUNTOS DEL PROGRAMA Y ASUNTOS PRESUPUESTARIOS, FINANCIEROS Y ADMINISTRATIVOS</u>	
6. <u>Reports of the Fifty-eighth Session of the Programme Committee; the Sixty-sixth Session of the Finance Committee, and their Joint Session</u> (Rome. 13-29 September 1989) (CL 96/4). include:	
6. <u>Rapports de la cinquante-huitième session du Comité du Programme, de la soixante-sixième session du Comité financier et de leur session conjointe</u> (Rome. 13-29 septembre 1989) (CL 96/4), notamment:	78
6. <u>Informes del 58º período de sesiones del Comité del Programa; del 66º período de sesiones del Comité de Finanzas y de su período de sesiones conjunto</u> (Roma, 13-29 de septiembre de 1989) (CL 96/4), en particular:	
6.1 <u>Financial Position of the Organization</u> (paras. 3.32 - 3.49)	
6.1 <u>Situation financière de l'Organisation</u> (par. 3.32 - 3.49)	78
6.1 <u>Situación financiera de la Organización</u> (párrs. 3.32 - 3.49)	

	<u>Page/página</u>
6.2 <u>Appointment of the External Auditor</u> (paras. 3.80 - 3.87)	
6.2 <u>Nomination du Commissaire aux comptes</u> (par. 3.80 - 3.87)	78
6.2 <u>Nombramiento del Auditor Externo</u> (párrs. 3.80 - 3.87)	
6.4 <u>Personnel Matters</u> (paras. 3.88 - 3.102)	
6.4 <u>Questions de personnel</u> (par. 3.88 - 3.102)	78
6.4 <u>Cuestiones de personal</u> (párrs. 3.88 - 3.102)	
6.5 <u>Matters Relating to UNDP</u> (paras 2.119 - 2.124 and 3.72 - 3.73)	
6.5 <u>Questions relatives au PNUD</u> (par. 2.119 - 2.124 et 3.72 - 3.73)	78
6.5 <u>Asuntos relativos al PNUD</u> (párrs. 2.119 - 2.124 y 3.72 - 3.73)	
6.6 <u>Other Matters Arising Out of the Reports</u>	
6.6 <u>Autres questions découlant des rapports</u>	78
6.6 <u>Otras cuestiones derivadas de los informes</u>	
FIFTH PLENARY MEETING CINQUIEME SEANCE PLENIERE QUINTA SESION PLENARIA (8 November 1989)	
III. <u>PROGRAMME, BUDGETARY, FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS</u> (continued)	
III. <u>QUESTIONS CONCERNANT LE PROGRAMME, LE BUDGET, LES FINANCES ET L'ADMINISTRATION</u> (suite)	108
III. <u>ASUNTOS DEL PROGRAMA Y ASUNTOS PRESUPUESTARIOS, FINANCIEROS Y ADMINISTRATIVOS</u> (continuación)	
7. <u>Conclusions of the Review of Certain Aspects of FAO's Goals and Operations</u> (C 89/21, C 89/21-SuD.I. CL 96/2)	
7. <u>Conclusions de l'examen de certains aspects des buts et opérations de la FAO</u> (C 89/21, C 89/21-Sup.1, CL 96/2)	108
7. <u>Conclusiones del examen de algunos aspectos de las metas y operaciones de la FAO</u> (C 89/21, C 89/21-Sup.1, CL 96/2)	
SIXTH PLENARY MEETING SIXIEME SEANCE PLENIERE SEXTA SESION PLENARIA (8 November 1989)	
III. <u>PROGRAMME, BUDGETARY, FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS</u> (continued)	
III. <u>QUESTIONS CONCERNANT LE PROGRAMME, LE BUDGET, LES FINANCES ET L'ADMINISTRATION</u> (suite)	134
III. <u>ASUNTOS DEL PROGRAMA Y ASUNTOS PRESUPUESTARIOS, FINANCIEROS Y ADMINISTRATIVOS</u> (continuación)	
7. <u>Conclusions of the Review of Certain Aspects of FAO's Goals and Operations</u> (C 89/21, C 89/21-SuD.I. CL 96/2) (continued)	
7. <u>Conclusions de l'examen de certains aspects des buts et opérations de la FAO</u> (C 89/21, C 89/21-Sup.1, CL 96/2) (suite)	134
7. <u>Conclusiones del examen de algunos aspectos de las metas y operaciones de la FAO</u> (C 89/21, C 89/21-Sup.1, CL 96/2) (continuación)	

SEVENTH PLENARY MEETING
SEPTIEME SEANCE PLENIERE
SEPTIMA SESION PLENARIA
(9 November 1989)

III.	<u>PROGRAMME, BUDGETARY, FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS</u> (continued)	
III.	<u>QUESTIONS CONCERNANT LE PROGRAMME, LE BUDGET, LES FINANCES ET L'ADMINISTRATION</u> (suite)	170
III.	<u>ASUNTOS DEL PROGRAMA Y ASUNTOS PRESUPUESTARIOS, FINANCIEROS Y ADMINISTRATIVOS</u> (continuación)	
7.	<u>Conclusions of the Review of Certain Aspects of FAO's Goals and Operations</u> (C 89/21, C 89/21-Sup.1, CL 96/2) (continued)	
7.	<u>Conclusions de l'examen de certains aspects des buts et opérations de la FAO</u> (C 89/21, C 89/21-Sup.1, CL 96/2) (suite)	170
7.	<u>Conclusiones del examen de algunos aspectos de las metas y operaciones de la FAO</u> (C 89/21, C 89/21-Sup.1, CL 96/2) (continuación)	
	<u>UNVEILING OF THE PORTRAIT OF THE INDEPENDENT CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL</u>	
	<u>INAUGURATION DU PORTRAIT DU PRESIDENT INDEPENDANT DU CONSEIL</u>	197
	<u>DESCUBRIMIENTO DEL RETRATO DEL PRESIDENTE INDEPENDIENTE DEL CONSEJO</u>	

EIGHTH PLENARY MEETING
HUITIEME SEANCE PLENIERE
OCTAVA SESION PLENARIA
(9 November 1989)

III.	<u>PROGRAMME, BUDGETARY, FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS</u> (continued)	
III.	<u>QUESTIONS CONCERNANT LE PROGRAMME, LE BUDGET, LES FINANCES ET L'ADMINISTRATION</u> (suite)	202
III.	<u>ASUNTOS DEL PROGRAMA Y ASUNTOS PRESUPUESTARIOS, FINANCIEROS Y ADMINISTRATIVOS</u> (continuación)	
7.	<u>Conclusions of the Review of Certain Aspects of FAO's Goals and Operations</u> (C 89/21, C 89/21-Sup.1, CL 96/2) (continued)	
7.	<u>Conclusion de l'examen de certains aspects des buts et opérations de la FAO</u> (C 89/21, C 89/21-Sup.1, CL 96/2) (suite)	202
7.	<u>Conclusiones del examen de algunos aspectos de las metas y operaciones de la FAO</u> (C 89/21, C 89/21-Sup.1, CL 96/2) (continuación)	

	<u>Page/página</u>
II. <u>ACTIVITIES OF FAO (continued)</u>	
II. <u>ACTIVITES DE LA FAO (suite)</u>	216
II. <u>ACTIVIDADES DE LA FAO (continuación)</u>	
4. <u>Report of the Fifty-seventh Session of the Committee on Commodity Problems (Rome, 12-16 June 1989) (CL 96/6)</u>	
4. <u>Rapport de la cinquante-septième session du Comité des produits (Rome, 12-16 juin 1989) (CL 96/6)</u>	216
4. <u>Informe del 57- período de sesiones del Comité de Problemas de Productos Básicos (Roma, 12-16 junio de 1989) (CL 96/6)</u>	
III. <u>PROGRAMME, BUDGETARY, FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS (continued)</u>	
III. <u>QUESTIONS CONCERNANT LE PROGRAMME, LE BUDGET, LES FINANCES ET L'ADMINISTRATION (suite)</u>	228
III. <u>ASUNTOS DEL PROGRAMA Y ASUNTOS PRESUPUESTARIOS, FINANCIEROS Y ADMINISTRATIVOS (continuación)</u>	
8. <u>Second Report on Unscheduled and Cancelled Sessions in the 1988-89 Biennium (CL 96/3)</u>	
8. <u>Deuxième rapport sur les réunions hors programme et les réunions annulées pendant l'exercice 1988-89 (CL 96/3)</u>	228
8. <u>Segundo informe sobre las reuniones no previstas y las reuniones canceladas en el bienio 1988-89 (CL 96/3)</u>	
V. <u>OTHER MATTERS</u>	
V. <u>AUTRES QUESTIONS</u>	229
V. <u>OTROS ASUNTOS</u>	
12. <u>Any Other Business</u>	
12. <u>Questions diverses</u>	229
12. <u>Otros asuntos</u>	
- <u>International Conference on Nutrition (C 89/2)</u>	
- <u>Conférence internationale sur la nutrition (C 89/27)</u>	229
- <u>Conferencia Internacional sobre Nutrición (C 89/27)</u>	
IV. <u>CONSTITUTIONAL AND LEGAL MATTERS</u>	
IV. <u>QUESTIONS CONSTITUTIONNELLES ET JURIDIQUES ASUNTOS</u>	234
IV. <u>CONSTITUCIONALES Y JURIDICOS</u>	
9. <u>Report on the Fifty-third Session of the Committee on Constitutional and Legal Matters (Rome, 16-18 October 1989) (CL 95/5), including:</u>	
9. <u>Rapport de la cinquante-troisième session du Comité des questions constitutionnelles et juridiques (Rome, 16-18 octobre 1989)(CL 96/5), notamment:</u>	234
9. <u>Informe del 53- período de sesiones del Comité de Asuntos Constitucionales y Jurídicos (Roma, 16-18 de octubre de 1989) (CL 96/5), en particular:</u>	
9.1 <u>Immunity of the Organization from Legal Process in Italy</u>	
9.1 <u>Immunité de juridiction de l'Organisation en Italie</u>	234
9.1 <u>Inmunidad de procedimiento judicial de la Organización en Italia</u>	

	<u>Page/página</u>
9.2 <u>Convention on Early Notification of a Nuclear Accident and Convention on Assistance in the Case of a Nuclear Accident or Radiological Emergency: Accession by FAO</u>	
9.2 <u>Adhésion de la FAO à la Convention sur la notification rapide d'un accident nucléaire et à la Convention sur l'assistance en cas d'accident nucléaire ou de situation d'urgence radiologique</u>	235
9.2 <u>Convención sobre la pronta notificación de accidentes nucleares y Convención sobre asistencia en caso de accidente nuclear o emergencia radiológica: adhesión de la FAO</u>	
10. <u>European Commission for the Control of Foot-and-Mouth Disease: Amendment to the Commission's Constitution (CL 96/5)</u>	
10. <u>Commission européenne de lutte contre la fièvre aphteuse: amendement à l'Acte constitutif (CL 96/5)</u>	237
10. <u>Comisión Europea para la Lucha contra la Fiebre Aftosa: enmienda de la Constitución (CL 96/5)</u>	
11. <u>Other Constitutional and Legal Matters, including:</u>	
11. <u>Autres questions constitutionnelles et juridiques, notamment:</u>	237
11. <u>Otros asuntos constitucionales y jurídicos, en particular:</u>	
11.2 <u>Invitations to International Non-Governmental Organizations which do not have Status with FAO (CL 96/INF/5)</u>	
11.2 <u>Invitation d'organisations internationales non gouvernementales n'ayant pas de statut officiel auprès de la FAO (CL 96/INF/5)</u>	238
11.2 <u>Invitaciones a organizaciones internacionales no gubernamentales que no mantienen relaciones oficiales con la FAO (CL 96/INF/5)</u>	
11.3 <u>Changes in Representation of Member Nations on the Programme Committee: (CL 96/INF/10)</u>	
11.3 <u>Modifications de la représentation des Etats Membres au Comité du programme: (CL 96/INF/10)</u>	238
11.3 <u>Cambios en la representación de los Estados Miembros en el Comité del Programa: (CL 96/INF/10)</u>	
V. <u>OTHER MATTERS (continued)</u>	
V. <u>AUTRES QUESTIONS (suite)</u>	239
V. <u>OTROS ASUNTOS (continuación)</u>	
13. <u>Date and Place of the Ninety-seventh Session of the Council (CL 89/12, C 89/12-Corr.1)</u>	
13. <u>Date et lieu de la quatre-vingt-dix-septième session du Conseil (C 89/12)</u>	239
13. <u>Fecha y lugar del 97- período de sesiones del Consejo (C 89/12)</u>	

NINTH PLENARY MEETING
NEUVIEME SEANCE PLENIERE
NOVENA SESION PLENARIA
(10 November 1989)

	<u>Page/página</u>
<u>ADOPTION OF REPORT</u>	
<u>ADOPTION DU RAPPORT</u>	242
<u>APROBACION DEL INFORME</u>	
<u>DRAFT REPORT - PART I (CL 96/REP/1)</u>	
<u>PROJET DE RAPPORT - PREMIERE PARTIE (CL 96/REP/1)</u>	242
<u>PROYECTO DE INFORME - PARTE I (CL 96/REP/1)</u>	
<u>Introducción (párr. 1)</u>	
<u>Introduction (para. 1)</u>	243
<u>Introduction (par. 1)</u>	
1. <u>Adoption of the Agenda and Timetable (paras 2-3)</u>	243
1. <u>Adoption de l'ordre du jour et du calendrier (par. 2-3)</u>	
1. <u>Aprobación del programa y del calendario (párrs.2-3)</u>	
2. <u>Election of Three Vice-Chairmen, and Designation of the Chairman and Members of the Drafting Committee (paras 4-5)</u>	
2. <u>Election de trois Vice-Présidents et nomination du Président et des membres du Comité de rédaction (par. 4-5)</u>	243
2. <u>Elección de tres Vicepresidentes y nombramiento del Presidente y de los miembros del Comité de Redacción (párrs. 4-5)</u>	
<u>Tribute to the Memory of His Excellency McDonald P. Benjamin, Ambassador of Dominica (para. 6)</u>	
<u>Hommage à la mémoire de S.E. M. McDonald P. Benjamin, Ambassadeur de Dominique (par. 6)</u>	243
<u>Homenaje en memoria del Excmo. Sr. McDonald P. Benjamin, Embajador de Dominica (párr. 6)</u>	
3. <u>Preparations for the Twenty-fifth Session of the FAOConference (paras 7-9)</u>	
3. <u>Préparation de la vingt-cinquième session de la Conférence de la FAO (par. 7-9)</u>	243
3. <u>Preparativos para el 25- período de sesiones de la Conferencia de la FAO (párrs. 7-9)</u>	
3.1 <u>Nomination of the Chairman of the Conference, and of the Chairmen of the Commissions of the Conference (para. 7)</u>	
3.1 <u>Soumission de candidatures aux fonctions de Président de la Conférence et de Présidents des commissions de la Conférence (par. 7)</u>	243
3.1 <u>Propuesta de candidaturas para la Presidencia de la Conferencia y de las Comisiones de la Conferencia (párr. 7)</u>	
3.2 <u>Election of the Nominations Committee (para. 8)</u>	
3.2 <u>Election des membres du Comité des candidatures (par. 8)</u>	243
3.2 <u>Elección del Comité de Candidaturas (párr. 8)</u>	

	<u>Page/página</u>
<u>Sixteenth McDougall Memorial Lecture</u> (para. 9)	
<u>Seizième Conférence McDougall</u> (par. 9)	243
<u>16^a- disertación en memoria de McDougall</u> (párr. 9)	
11. (part of) <u>Otros asuntos constitucionales y jurídicos</u> (párrs. 10-13)	
11. (partiel) <u>Other Constitutional and Legal Matters</u> (paras 10-13)	243
11. (parte) <u>Autres questions constitutionnelles et juridiques</u> (par. 10-13)	
11.1 <u>Invitation to Non-Member Nations to attend FAO Sessions</u> (paras 10-13)	
11.1 <u>Invitation d'Etats non membres à des réunions de la FAO</u> (par. 10-13)	243
11.1 <u>Invitaciones a estados no miembros para que asistan a reuniones de la FAO</u> (párrs. 10-13)	
TENTH PLENARY MEETING DIXIEME SEANCE PLENIERE DECIMA SESION PLEÑARIA (10 November 1989)	
<u>ADOPTION OF THE REPORT</u> (continued)	
<u>ADOPTION DU RAPPORT</u> (suite)	246
<u>APROBACION DEL INFORME</u> (continuación)	
<u>DRAFT REPORT - PART II</u> (CL 96/REP/2) (CL 96/REP/2-Corr.1)	
<u>PROJET DE RAPPORT - DEUXIEME PARTIE</u> (CL 96/REP/2) (CL 96/REP/2-Corr.1)	246
<u>PROYECTO DE INFORME - PARTE II</u> (CL 96/REP/2) (CL 96/REP/2-Corr.1)	
5. <u>Programme of Work and Budget 1990-91 and Medium-Term Objectives</u> (paras 1-15)	
5. <u>Programme de travail et budget 1990-91 et objectifs à moyen terme</u> (par. 1-15)	246
5. <u>Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para 1990-91 y objetivos a plazo medio</u> (párrs. 1-15)	
6. (part of) <u>Reports of the Fifty-eighth Session of the Programme Committee; the Sixty-sixth Session of the Finance Committee, and their Joint Session (Rome, 13-29 September 1989)</u> (paras 16-25)	
6. (partiel) <u>Rapports de la cinquante-huitième session du Comité du programme, de la soixante-sixième session du Comité financier et de leur session conjointe (Rome, 13-29 septembre 1989)</u> (par. 16-25)	243
6. (parte) <u>Informes del 58º- período de sesiones del Comité del Programa, del 66º- período de sesiones del Comité de Finanzas y de su reunión conjunta (Roma, 13-29 de septiembre de 1989)</u> (párrs. 16-25)	
6.4 <u>Personnel Matters</u> (paras 16-17)	
6.4 <u>Questions de personnel</u> (par. 16-17)	252
6.4 <u>Asuntos de personal</u> (párrs. 16-17)	

	<u>Page/página</u>
- <u>Statistics of Personnel Services</u> (para. 18)	
- <u>Statistiques du personnel</u> (par. 18)	252
- <u>Estadísticas de los servicios de personal</u> (párr. 18)	
- <u>Allowance for the Chairman of the Appeals Committee</u> (para. 19)	
- <u>Indemnité du Président du Comité de recours</u> (par. 19)	252
- <u>Subsidio para el Presidente del Comité de Apelaciones</u> (párr. 19)	
6.5 <u>Matters relating to UNDP</u> (paras 20-21)	
6.5 <u>Questions relatives au PNUD</u> (par. 20-21)	252
6.5 <u>Asuntos relativos al PNUD</u> (párrs. 20-21)	
6.6 <u>Other Matters Arising Out of the Reports</u>	
6.6 <u>Autres questions découlant des rapports</u>	252
6.6 <u>Otros asuntos derivados de los informes</u>	
- <u>Commissary account - staff support cost reimbursement (Draft Resolution for the Conference)</u> (paras 22-25)	
- <u>Compte du Groupement d'achats du personnel - Remboursement des dépenses d'appui (Projet de résolution de la Conférence)</u> (par. 22-25)	252
- <u>Cuenta del Economato - Reembolso de los gastos de apoyo de personal (Proyecto de resolución para la Conferencia)</u> (párrs. 22-25)	
<u>DRAFT REPORT - PART III (CL 96/REP/3) (CL 96/REP/3-Corr.1)</u>	
<u>PROJET DE RAPPORT - TROISIEME PARTIE (CL 96/REP/3) (CL 96/REP/3-Corr.1)</u>	253
<u>PROYECTO DE INFORME - PARTE III (CL 96/REP/3) (CL 96/REP/3-Corr.1)</u>	
7. <u>Conclusions of the Review of Certain Aspects of FAO's Goals and Operations</u> (paras 1-9)	
7. <u>Conclusions de l'Examen de certains aspects des buts et opérations de la FAO</u> (par. 1-9)	253
7. <u>Conclusiones del examen de algunos aspectos de los objetivos y operaciones de la FAO</u> (párrs. 1-9)	
<u>DRAFT REPORT - PART IV (CL 96/REP/4)</u>	
<u>PROJET DE RAPPORT - QUATRIEME PARTIE (CL 96/REP/4)</u>	271
<u>PROYECTO DE INFORME - PARTE IV (CL 96/REP/4)</u>	
6. (part of) <u>Reports of the Fifty-eighth Session of the Programme Committee; the Sixty-sixth Session of the Finance Committee, and their Joint Session (Rome, 13-29 September 1989) (Draft Resolution for the Conference)</u> (paras 1-11)	
6. (partiel) <u>Rapports de la cinquante-huitième session du Comité du programme, de la soixante-sixième session du Comité financier et de leur session conjointe (Rome, 13-29 septembre 1989) (Projet de résolution de la Conférence pour le règlement des contributions ordinaires)</u> (par. 1-11)	271
6. (parte) <u>Informes del 58- período de sesiones del Comité del Programa; del 66- período de sesiones del Comité de Finanzas y de su reunión conjunta (Roma, 13-29 de septiembre de 1989) (párrs. 1-11) (Proyecto de Resolución para la Conferencia)</u>	
6.1 <u>Financial Position of the Organization</u> (paras 12-24)	
6.1 <u>Situation financière de l'Organisation</u> (par. 12-24)	281
6.1 <u>Situación financiera de la Organización</u> (párrs. 12-24)	

	<u>Page/página</u>
- <u>Status of Contributions to the Budget</u> (paras 12-13)	
- <u>Situation des contributions au budget</u> (par. 12-13)	281
- <u>Estado de las contribuciones al Presupuesto</u> (párrs. 12-13)	
- <u>Current Assessments</u> (para. 14-17)	
- <u>Contributions courantes</u> (par. 14-17)	281
- <u>Cuotas corrientes</u> (párrs. 14-17)	
- <u>Contributions in Arrears</u> (para. 18)	
- <u>Arriérés de contributions</u> (par. 18)	281
- <u>Cuotas atrasadas</u> (párr. 18)	
- <u>Replenishments of the Special Reserve Account and Advances to the Working Capital Fund</u> (para. 19)	
- <u>Reconstitution du Compte de réserve spécial et avances au Fonds de roulement</u> (par. 19)	281
- <u>Reposición de la Cuenta Especial de Reserva y anticipos al Fondo de Operaciones</u> (párr. 19)	
- <u>Need for all Member Nations to Pay Contributions</u> (paras 20-22)	
- <u>Nécessité pour tous les Etats Membres de payer leur contribution</u> (par. 20-22)	285
- <u>Necesidad de que todos los Estados Miembros paguen sus cuotas</u> (párr. 20-22)	
- <u>Voting Rights</u> (paras 23-24)	
- <u>Droit de vote</u> (par. 23-24)	285
- <u>Derecho de voto</u> (párrs. 23-24)	
6.2 <u>Appointment of the External Auditor</u> (paras 25-30) (Resolution .../96)	
6.2 <u>Nomination du Commissaire aux comptes</u> (par. 25-30) (Résolution .../96)	285
6.2 <u>Nombramiento del Auditor Externo</u> (párrs. 25-30) (Resolución .../96)	
6.3 <u>Other Financial Matters</u> (paras 31-35)	
6.3 <u>Autres questions financières</u> (par. 31-35)	286
6.3 <u>Otros asuntos financieros</u> (párrs. 31-35)	
- <u>Treatment of Profit and Loss on Exchange (Draft Resolution for the Conference)</u>	
- <u>Traitement des gains et pertes de change (Projet de résolution soumis à la Conférence)</u>	286
- <u>Tratamiento de las ganancias y pérdidas en los cambios monetarios (Proyecto de Resolución para la Conferencia)</u>	
<u>DRAFT REPORT - PART V (CL 96/REP/5)</u>	
<u>PROJET DE RAPPORT - CINQUIEME PARTIE (CL 96/REP/5)</u>	286
<u>PROYECTO DE INFORME - PARTE V (CL 96/REP/5)</u>	
4. <u>Report of the Fifty-seventh Session of the Committee on Commodity Problems (Rome, 12-16 June 1989)</u> (paras 1-8)	
4. <u>Rapport de la cinquante-septième session du Comité des produits (Rome, 12-16 juin 1989)</u> (par. 1-8)	286
4. <u>Informe del 57- período de sesiones del Comité de Problemas de Productos Básicos (Roma, 12-16 de junio de 1989)</u> (párrs. 1-8)	

8.	<u>Second Report on Unscheduled and Cancelled Sessions in the 1988-89 Biennium</u> (paras 9-10)	
8.	<u>Deuxième rapport sur les réunions hors programme et les réunions annulées pendant l'exercice 1988-89</u> (par. 9-10)	286
8.	<u>Segundo informe sobre las reuniones no previstas y las reuniones canceladas en el bienio 1988-89</u> (párrs. 9-10)	
9.	<u>Report of the Fifty-third Session of the Committee on Constitutional and Legal Matters</u> (Rome, 16-18 October 1989)	
9.	<u>Rapport de la cinquante-troisième session du Comité des questions constitutionnelles et juridiques</u> (Rome, 16-18 octobre 1989)	286
9.	<u>Informe del 53- período de sesiones del Comité de Asuntos Constitucionales y Jurídicos</u> (Roma, 16-18 de octubre de 1989)	
9.1	<u>Immunity of the Organization from Legal Process in Italy</u> (paras 11-12)	
9.1	<u>Immunité de juridiction de l'Organisation en Italie</u> (par. 11-12)	286
9.1	<u>Immunidad de procedimiento judicial de la Organización en Italia</u> (párrs. 11-12)	
9.2	<u>Convention on Early Notification of a Nuclear Accident and Convention on Assistance in the Case of a Nuclear Accident or Radiological Emergency: Accession by FAO</u> (paras 13-18)	
9.2	<u>Adhésion de la FAO à la Convention sur la notification rapide d'un accident nucléaire et à la Convention sur l'assistance en cas d'accident nucléaire ou de situation d'urgence radiologique</u> (par. 13-18)	286
9.2	<u>Convención sobre la pronta notificación de accidentes nucleares y Convención sobre asistencia en caso de accidente nuclear o emergencia radiológica: Adhesión de la FAO</u> (párrs. 13-18)	
10.	<u>European Commission for the Control of Foot-and-Mouth Disease: Amendment to the Commission's Constitution (Resolution .../96)</u> (paras 19-20)	
10.	<u>Commission européenne de lutte contre la fièvre aphteuse: amendement à l'Acte constitutif (Résolution .../96)</u> (par. 19-20)	286
10.	<u>Comisión Europea para la lucha contra la Fiebre Aftosa: Enmienda del Estatuto Orgánico de la Comisión (Resolución .../96)</u> (párrs. 19-20)	
11.	(part of) <u>Other Constitutional and Legal Matters</u>	
11.	(partiel) <u>Autres questions constitutionnelles et juridiques</u>	286
11.	(parte) <u>Otros asuntos constitucionales y jurídicos</u>	
11.2	<u>Invitations to International Non-governmental Organizations which do not have Status with FAO</u> (para. 21)	
11.2	<u>Invitation d'organisations internationales non gouvernementales n'ayant pas de statut officiel auprès de la FAO</u> (par. 21)	286
11.2	<u>Invitaciones a organizaciones internacionales no gubernamentales que no mantienen relaciones oficiales con la FAO</u> (párr. 21)	
11.3	<u>Changes in Representation of Member Nations on the Programme and Finance Committees</u> (paras 22-24)	
11.3	<u>Modifications de la représentation d'Etats Membres au Comité du Programme et au Comité financier</u> (Dar. 22-24)	286
11.3	<u>Cambios en la representación de los Estados Miembros en los Comités del Programa y de Finanzas</u> (párrs. 22-24)	

	<u>Page/página</u>
12. <u>Any Other Business</u>	
12. <u>Questions diverses</u>	286
12. <u>Otros asuntos</u>	
- <u>International Conference on Nutrition</u> (paras 25-28)	
- <u>Conférence internationale sur la nutrition</u> (par. 25-28)	286
- <u>Conferencia Internacional sobre Nutrición</u> (párrs. 25-28)	
13. <u>Date and Place of the Ninety-seventh Session of the Council</u> (para. 29)	
13. <u>Date et lieu de la quatre-vingt-dix-septième session du Conseil</u> (par. 29)	286
13. <u>Fecha y lugar del 97- periodo de sesiones del Consejo</u> (párr. 29)	

council

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

conseil

ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ALIMENTATION ET L'AGRICULTURE

consejo

ORGANIZACION DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA LA AGRICULTURA Y LA ALIMENTACION

CL

CL 96/PV/1

Ninety-sixth Session

Quatre-vingt-seizième session

96º periodo de sesiones

FIRST PLENARY MEETING
PREMIERE SEANCE PLENIERE
PRIMERA SESION PLENARIA
(6 November 1989)

The First Plenary Meeting was opened at 10.15 hours Lassaad Ben Osman, Independent Chairman of the Council, presiding

La première séance plénière est ouverte à 10 h 15, sous la présidence de Lassaad Ben Osman, Président indépendant du Conseil

Se abre la primera sesión plenaria a las 10.15 horas, bajo la presidencia de Lassaad Ben Osman, Presidente Independiente del Consejo

I. INTRODUCTION - PROCEDURE OF THE SESSION

I. INTRODUCTION - QUESTIONS DE PROCEDURE

I. INTRODUCCION - CUESTIONES DE PROCEDIMIENTO

LE PRESIDENT: Monsieur le Directeur général, Honorables Délégués, Mesdames et Messieurs. C'est pour moi un grand plaisir et un grand honneur de vous souhaiter la bienvenue et de déclarer ouverte la quatre-vingt-seizième session du Conseil. Je suis convaincu que, comme à l'accoutumée, nos débats seront inspirés par le souci de l'intérêt général attaché à la mission qui incombe à notre Organisation et à ses responsabilités essentielles pour l'alimentation et l'agriculture dans le monde. Je vous souhaite donc la bienvenue et je me félicite d'avance à la perspective d'un Conseil fructueux et utile à la veille de la vingt-cinquième session de la Conférence générale.

Nous passons à l'examen du point 1 de notre ordre du jour:

1. Adoption of the Agenda and Timetable

1. Adoption de l'ordre du jour et du calendrier

1. Aprobación del programa y el calendario

LE PRESIDENT: En ce qui concerne l'ordre du jour, le document relatif à l'ordre du jour est le CL 96/1. Je vous signale qu'il faudrait tout d'abord ajouter un sous-point 16.3 intitulé: Modification de la représentation des Etats Membres au Comité du Programme. C'est un document qui est rai pour information. Il s'agit du CL 96/INF/10.

Par ailleurs, des corrections seront apportées en ce qui concerne la numérotation des documents sur certains points de l'ordre du jour. En ce qui concerne le point 7: Programme de travail et budget 1990-91 et objectifs à moyen terme, il faudrait ajouter les documents C 89/3-Sup.3 et C 89/3.Sup.A. Ces documents ont été distribués à Messieurs les Délégués.

Point 11: Conclusion de l'Examen de certains aspects des buts et opérations de la FAO, les documents en question sont les suivants: C 89/21, C 89/21-Sup.1 et CL 96/2.

Pour le point 15: Commission européenne de lutte contre la fièvre aphteuse - Amendement à l'Acte constitutif (il s'agit de l'Acte constitutif de la Commission), le document de référence est le CL 96/5, et non pas le document CL 96/2.

En tout état de cause, le document CL 96/INF/1 qui est le calendrier provisoire que nous proposons à l'adoption porte la numérotation ajournée des documents.

Honorables Délégués, la présente session, comme vous le savez, va durer quatre jours et demi jusqu'à vendredi midi. Comme vous avez pu le constater, son ordre du jour est très chargé. Il comporte 18 points, dont plusieurs sous-divisions; l'un d'eux ne comprend pas moins de 6 sous-points.

Un certain nombre de points sont des questions de fond que va analyser la Conférence à partir de la semaine prochaine. Notre problème est de comment faire contenir en moins de 5 jours un débat sur tant de questions importantes telles que le Programme de travail et budget, la préparation du Bureau de la Conférence et les réformes. Il faudrait trouver une idée pour avoir le temps nécessaire pour traiter ces questions fondamentales et laisser au Conseil l'opportunité de jouer son rôle en toute quiétude.

Je sou mets donc cette idée à la réflexion du Conseil. Monsieur le Directeur général pourrait peut-être nous donner quelques idées. J'ouvre le débat et je donne la parole à Monsieur le Directeur général.

LE DIRECTEUR GENERAL: Je vous remercie, Monsieur le Président. Il y a un certain nombre de points inscrits à l'ordre du jour du Conseil et qui sont également inscrits à l'ordre du jour de la Conférence. Ils vont donc être discutés deux fois. Ces points sont les suivants: le point 5, le point 6, le point 8, le point 9 et le point 12.

Si le Conseil le décidait, les points 5, 6, 8, 9 et 12 pourraient être renvoyés à la Conférence qui, d'ailleurs, est la seule habilitée pour prendre les décisions finales sur ces points.

Toutefois, je me permettrai d'insister pour que le point 6, et plus particulièrement le sujet de la Conférence internationale sur la nutrition, puisse être brièvement discuté par le Conseil, si le Conseil est d'accord. Je sais que la décision sera prise à la Conférence. Mais c'est une question importante. Elle ne prendra pas beaucoup de temps. Mais si vous préférez on peut très bien laisser aussi cela à la Conférence. Je n'insisterai pas. Vous aurez ainsi beaucoup plus de temps pour discuter les autres questions. C'est simplement une suggestion de ma part.

LE PRESIDENT: Je remercie le Directeur général pour son intervention et nous passons la parole au représentant de la Colombie.

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): Los representantes de Colombia opinamos que el Director General acaba de hacer una propuesta pragmática y de consecuencias eficaces. Apoyamos la supresión de los temas 5, 6, 8, 9 y 12, si bien, como lo ha dicho el Director General, dentro del tema 6 podría conservarse el aspecto relativo a la Conferencia Internacional sobre Nutrición, que por primera vez ocuparía la atención de este Consejo. Pensamos que la supresión de estos temas facilitará la discusión más amplia y completa de otros importantes puntos de la agenda, como lo ha dicho usted, señor Presidente, que aunque aparecen en este calendario con poca disponibilidad de tiempo, todos sabemos que el calendario no es una camisa de fuerza, sino un cuadro indicativo flexible. Por estas razones, apoyamos plenamente la propuesta del Director General.

Antti NIKKOLA (Finland): Concerning Item 5, progress report on the plan of action for integration of women in agricultural and rural development, our delegation would like to make a statement on this item in the Council. We think that may be this item is dealt with somewhat differently in the Council than in the Conference.

R. PASQUIER (Suisse): Nous nous réjouissons des propositions qui ont été faites par le Directeur général pour consacrer plus de temps aux sujets importants. En ce qui concerne l'examen de certains aspects de la FAO que vous avez appelé des réformes, nous constatons que le calendrier prévoit deux demi-journées, ce qui nous donnera certainement un peu plus de temps. Nous pensons qu'il est important de pouvoir discuter tranquillement et sereinement de ces questions pour obtenir des résultats fructueux. L'objectif devrait être d'élaborer un projet de résolution sur ce sujet dans la mesure où le Conseil pourra le faire. Lors du dernier Conseil, je crois que nous avons prévu de consacrer deux jours de discussion à ce sujet. Nous espérons qu'il sera possible de disposer de ce temps-là pour effectuer ce travail calmement et sereinement. C'était d'ailleurs la raison principale pour allonger la session présente du Conseil.

Voilà notre proposition. Ce serait de retenir en principe ces deux jours que nous avons prévus lors de la dernière session.

LE PRESIDENT: Y a-t-il d'autres interventions? Nous considérons par conséquent que nous pouvons laisser à la Conférence les points 5, 6, 8, 9 et 12 de l'ordre du jour. Pour suivre la proposition du délégué de la Finlande, nous pourrions peut-être écouter son intervention mais la Femme est un sujet très vaste et cela nous prendrait certainement une demi-journée. Peut-être pourrions-nous insérer sa déclaration au procès-verbal du Conseil. Qu'en pensez-vous, Monsieur le délégué de la Finlande?

Antti NIKOLA (Finland): Thank you, Chairman. That is very good also.

LE PRESIDENT: Nous considérons donc que les points 5, 6, 8, 9 et 12 de l'ordre du jour seront confiés à la Conférence et que la déclaration du délégué de la Finlande sera insérée dans le procès-verbal de cette séance du Conseil. Moyennant cette modification, nous retenons l'ordre du jour tel que présenté.

LE DIRECTEUR GENERAL: Le Conseil souhaiterait peut-être entendre quelques mots au sujet de la Conférence Internationale sur la nutrition.

LE PRESIDENT: Nous avons parlé au Conseil de l'organisation éventuelle, en 1992/93, d'une Conférence internationale sur la nutrition. Il existe un document spécifique sur cette question. Lors de la dernière session du Conseil, on avait demandé au Directeur général d'approfondir cette question, de voir le Directeur général de l'Organisation mondiale de la santé et de nous faire rapport sur ces contacts.

Si vous n'y voyez pas d'objection, nous pourrions demander au Directeur général de faire le point de la situation **avant la** Conférence sans que cela **fasse** l'objet d'un débat.

LE DIRECTEUR GENERAL: La proposition que je vais faire au Conseil, c'est que l'on retienne seulement la partie du point 6 de l'ordre du jour relative à la Conférence internationale sur la nutrition, ce qui nous permettrait d'informer le Conseil des discussions importantes qui ont eu lieu avec le Directeur général de l'Organisation mondiale de la santé. Le Comité du Programme en a aussi été informé et je voudrais donc faire rapport au Conseil, ce qui, d'ailleurs, ne prendra pas beaucoup de temps.

LE PRESIDENT: Si le Conseil n'y voit pas d'objection, nous demanderons au Directeur général de faire rapport sur cette question importante. Moyennant quoi, nous pouvons considérer que l'ordre du jour est adopté par le Conseil.

R.G. PETTITT (United Kingdom): I would suggest that Item 6 be instructed so that it should only concern the Nutrition Conference and, if necessary, a decision be taken, not simply by a report. This is a subject which is appropriate for Council involvement.

LE PRESIDENT: Nous prenons note de votre suggestion.

Comme vous le savez, l'horaire de travail est le suivant: de 9 h 30 à 12 h 30 et de 14 h 30 à 17 h 30. Nous avons quatre jours et demi à notre disposition; nous devons donc essayer d'effectuer notre travail dans le cadre de ces quatre jours et demi, si possible sans prolongation des séances. Un calendrier provisoire est suggéré pour nos travaux. Quelles sont les observations de messieurs les délégués? Peut-on considérer que le calendrier est adopté? Bien entendu, nous en retirerons les points qui ont été transférés à la Conférence. Comme le disait le délégué de la Colombie, il y a toujours de la souplesse dans le calendrier et cela nous laissera plus de temps que nous pourrions consacrer à la discussion des questions de base, à savoir l'objectif, le budget et la préparation de la Conférence.

Gerald J. MONROE (United States of America): With respect to adoption of the timetable, I would like to direct the Council's attention to the Swiss proposal. Since we are now, I think, very wisely shortening our agenda, moving items forward to Conference, we might now look seriously at extending the time we make available to discuss this very key and important issue for the FAO, namely the review process.

LE PRESIDENT: Je crois qu'il est clair que le fait d'avoir diminué le nombre des points de l'ordre du jour nous permettra de consacrer assez de temps aux points les plus importants. Pour le moment, il est effectivement prévu de consacrer deux demi-journées au rôle de la FAO. Nous pourrions avoir besoin de deux journées pour ces discussions mais il faut être pragmatique et plus nous avancerons rapidement dans l'examen des autres questions, plus nous aurons de temps pour les réformes. Je ne pense pas qu'il soit possible, d'ores et déjà, de dire quelles seront les dates exactes mais nous retenons cette option qui pourrait nous permettre de consacrer assez de temps au rôle de la femme. L'objectif est clair: il faut faire avancer rapidement les autres questions pour laisser de la place à cette question fondamentale.

Le calendrier est donc adopté et nous allons passer au point suivant.

2. Election of Three Vice-Chairmen, and Designation of the Chairman and Members of the Drafting Committee
2. Election de trois Vice-Présidents et désignation du Président et des membres du Comité de rédaction
2. Elección de tres Vicepresidentes y nombramiento del Presidente y los miembros del Comité de Redacción

LE PRESIDENT: Nous procédons maintenant à l'élection des trois Vice-Présidents. Y a-t-il des candidats?

Mohammad Saleem KHAN (Pakistan): First of all, let me express the pleasure of my delegation on seeing you back in the chair at the head of our deliberations during this session. Now, under the specific items of nomination of the Vice-Chairmen, the Pakistan delegation is pleased to propose the name of Mr. Halinen of Finland as the first Vice-Chairman for the current session of the Council. Mr. Halinen is known to all delegates who are Permanent Representatives over here and those who have seen him in meetings over here know his contribution to the proceedings of the Council and the other committees of the FAO, I hope that he will make a good Vice-chairman.

C.S. SASTRY (India): We have great pleasure in seconding the nomination of the delegate from Finland for the Vice-Chairmanship.

LE PRESIDENT: Je crois que nous ne pouvons que nous féliciter de la proposition d'élire M. Halinen Vice-Président du Conseil. Je vous propose de le féliciter et d'applaudir son élection.

Applause

Applaudissements

Aplausos

Sumiji NAKAZAWA (Japan): It is the great pleasure and honour of the Japanese delegation to nominate Mr. Saleem Khan of Pakistan, who has just spoken. Mr. Saleem Khan is well known. He is the Chairman of the Group of 77, and his confidence is well known. I think he will greatly contribute to the good management of this very important meeting of the Council.

E.P. ALLEYNE (Trinidad and Tobago): The delegation of Trinidad and Tobago takes great pleasure in seconding the nomination of the delegate of Pakistan.

Parviz KARBASSI (Iran, Islamic Republic of): My delegation supports the nomination of Mr. Saleem Khan for this position.

LE PRESIDENT: Nous pouvons nous féliciter du choix de M. Mohammad Saleem Khan en tant que deuxième Vice-Président du Conseil et nous applaudissons son élection.

Applause

Applaudissements

Aplausos

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): Los representantes de Colombia, Señor Presidente, felicitamos muy cordialmente a los dos Vicepresidentes recientemente elegidos, Señor Halinen, distinguido y competente representante de Finlandia ante la FAO, y el Señor Saleem Khan, dinámico y activísimo Presidente de nuestro Grupo de los 77.

Deseamos presentar la candidatura del Embajador Bukhari del Reino de Arabia Saudita para el cargo de Vicepresidente del Consejo. Ciertamente el Embajador Bukhari no necesita presentación entre nosotros. Todos conocemos su competencia e inteligencia, confirmadas en la presidencia del Comité de Finanzas. Además sabemos de la consagración y altura con que este distinguido colega y amigo cumple sus importantes funciones de Embajador del respetable país del Reino de Arabia Saudita.

Aparte de esta propuesta que hacemos como delegados de Colombia, esta ocasión representa una grata nota personal para mí, porque me honro de contar entre mis mejores amigos al Embajador Bukhari, quien seguramente será un excelente Vicepresidente.

Ilja HDLINSKY (Czechoslovakia): It is a great honour and pleasure for me to second the nomination of H.E. Atif Bukhari for the post of Vice-Chairman of this august body.

IA PRESIDENT: Je voudrais m'associer personnellement à ces hommages car je connais bien M. Bukhari pour avoir eu l'honneur de participer à des réunions qu'il présidait comme président du Comité financier. Je sais que son apport aux travaux du Conseil sera substantiel. Nous l'applaudissons donc.

Applause

Applaudissements

Aplausos

Il nous reste à nommer les membres du Comité de rédaction. Pour ce choix, nous devons veiller à ce que soient représentées les différentes régions. Jusqu'à présent, nous avons toujours obtenu que les sept régions de la FAO y soient représentées, en plus, bien entendu, du Président du Comité. Il y a des contacts à prendre, il faut laisser aux délégués le temps de se consulter et nous pourrions donc traiter cette question au cours de l'après-midi.

Nous avons achevé l'examen des points 1 et 2 de l'ordre du jour.

IV. CONSTITUTIONAL AND LEGAL MATTERS

IV. QUESTIONS CONSTITUTIONNELLES ET JURIDIQUES

IV. ASUNTOS CONSTITUCIONALES Y JURIDICOS

11. Other Constitutional and Legal Matters

11. Autres questions constitutionnelles et juridiques

11. Otros Asuntos constitucionales y jurídicos

11.1 Invitations to Non-Member Nations to attend FAO Sessions

11.1 Invitations d'Etats non membres a des reunions de la FAO

11.1 Invitaciones a Estados no miembros para que asistan a reuniones de la FAO

LE PRESIDENT: Nous allons passer au point 16.1 de l'ordre du jour relatif à l'invitation d'Etats non membres à des réunions de la FAO (CL 96/INF/8). Le Conseil est invité à se prononcer sur la demande qui a été présentée par l'Union des Républiques Socialistes Soviétiques de participer à la présente session du Conseil en qualité d'observateur, comme ce fut le cas pour les quatre-vingt-quatorzième et quatre-vingt-quinzième sessions du Conseil.

Y a-t-il des objections?

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia). Parece, Señor Presidente, que en cada ocasión cuando se trata este tema nos corresponde el honor de intervenir solamente para evitar dificultades posteriores en la redacción del Informe. Queremos que conste en el informe del Consejo recibe con gran satisfacción la presencia de la Unión de Repúblicas Socialistas Soviéticas como observador.

João Augusto DE MEDICIS (Brazil): I support what has been said by the delegate of Colombia that our delegation - and perhaps this should also be included in the report - would expect that a step from the Soviet Union would mean that they will be joining our Organization soon and that we believe that their participation in the Organization would be of the greatest importance.

LE PRESIDENT: Je remercie le délégué du Brésil. Y a-t-il d'autres demandes de parole?

Je passe la parole à Monsieur le Directeur général sur ce point précis; 11 pourra nous donner des informations supplémentaires.

LE DIRECTEUR GENERAL: J'ai eu l'honneur d'être reçu à Moscou par les autorités, au plus haut niveau, lors d'un voyage que j'ai effectué en Mongolie en août dernier; j'ai eu des discussions tant informelles qu'officielles qui m'ont amené à croire qu'en tant que membre fondateur l'Union soviétique souhaiterait venir prendre sa place à la FAO.

En octobre, j'ai reçu la visite d'un Vice-Ministre des affaires étrangères ici, à Rome, et qui a bien voulu souligner l'intérêt de l'Union Soviétique à participer comme membre à part entière.

Enfin, quelques semaines plus tard, et toujours en octobre, le Vice-Ministre des affaires étrangères, Monsieur Petrovski, a déclaré dans une conférence de presse à New York que l'Union soviétique deviendrait à l'avenir membre de la FAO; d'ailleurs le Ministre des affaires étrangères de l'Union soviétique a aussi déclaré à l'Assemblée générale que l'Union soviétique joindrait la FAO.

J'espère, comme le souhaitent beaucoup de délégations, que cela se passera dans un avenir très proche.

LE PRESIDENT: Je vous remercie, Monsieur le Directeur général, pour ces informations; nous ne pouvons que nous associer à votre vœu; cela permettra à la FAO de concrétiser son caractère d'universalité.

Le Conseil est tout à fait heureux et honoré d'accueillir l'Union soviétique en tant qu'observateur et formule le vœu que ce soit un premier pas vers la présence de l'Union soviétique à part entière.

Ce point étant adopté, nous passons au point 3 de notre ordre du jour.

II. ACTIVITIES OF FAO

II. ACTIVITES DE LA FAO

II. ACTIVIDADES DE LA FAO

3. Preparations for the Twenty-fifth Session of the FAO Conference, including:

3. Préparation de la vingt-cinquième session de la Conférence de la FAO, notamment:

3. Preparativos para el 25º- periodo de sesiones de la Conferencia de la FAO, en particular:

3.1 Nomination of the Chairman of the Conference, and of the Chairmen of the Commissions of the Conference (Recommendations to the Conference)

3.1 Proposition de candidatures aux fonctions de Président de la Conférence et de Présidents des Commissions de la Conférence (recommandations à la Conférence)

3.1 Propuesta de candidaturas para la Presidencia de la Conferencia y de las Comisiones de la

Conferencia (recomendaciones para la Conferencia)

LE PRESIDENT: Il s'agit de la préparation de la 25ème Session de la Conférence de la FAO qui commence samedi prochain. Ce point prévoit les propositions de candidatures aux fonctions de Président de la Conférence et de Présidents des trois commissions de la Conférence. Il s'agit de faire une recommandation à la Conférence générale.

Vous vous souvenez que lors de la 95ème Session du Conseil nous avons eu à examiner la désignation d'un candidat au poste de président de la conférence et à ceux de trois présidents de commission.

Au cours d'une réunion informelle des chefs de délégation il avait été convenu que Monsieur le Ministre de l'industrie primaire et de l'énergie de l'Australie, Son Excellence John Charles KERIN, serait proposé au poste de Président de la 25ème Session de la Conférence; il avait été convenu que Monsieur le Directeur général prendrait contact avec le ministre pour savoir s'il était disponible pour occuper cette fonction. La réponse est positive; il est maintenant demandé au Conseil d'entériner officiellement cette candidature et de la proposer à la Conférence.

Etes-vous d'accord sur cette proposition? Je pense que nous pouvons la retenir en formulant tous nos vœux à Monsieur le Ministre pour qu'il puisse mener cette Conférence au mieux des intérêts et des objectifs de la FAO.

Il nous reste maintenant les candidatures pour les postes de président de ces trois commissions. Au cours de la même réunion informelle de Messieurs les chefs de délégation, un accord de principe a été atteint sur une certaine distribution régionale de ces postes. Monsieur le Secrétaire général Alessi va nous donner le résultat de ces contacts informels avec les différents groupes.

LE SECRETAIRE GENERAL: Je tiens à informer qu'à la suite des discussions intervenues entre les différents groupes régionaux les propositions suivantes ont été soumises au Conseil: pour la Présidence de la première commission, Son Excellence l'Ambassadeur João Augusto de Medicis, représentant permanent du Brésil auprès de la FAO; pour la Présidence de la seconde commission, Son Excellence l'Ambassadeur Joseph Tchicaya, représentant permanent du Congo auprès de la FAO; pour la Présidence de la troisième commission, Monsieur Rudolf de Pourtalès, représentant permanent adjoint de la Suisse auprès de la FAO.

LE PRESIDENT: Je vous remercie. Avez-vous des observations? Dans ces conditions, nous pouvons considérer que nous avons l'agrément du Conseil. Je félicite Monsieur l'Ambassadeur de Medicis, Monsieur l'Ambassadeur Tchicaya et Monsieur l'Ambassadeur de Pourtalès pour cette confiance dont ils sont particulièrement dignes. Je suis persuadé qu'ils joueront un rôle cardinal dans la réussite de la Conférence et les vœux du Conseil les accompagnent dans leur mission.

Applause

Applaudissements

Aplausos

3.2 Election of the Nominations Committee

3.2 Election des membres de la Commission des candidatures

3.2 Elección del Comité de Candidaturas

LE PRESIDENT: Les nominations pour la Commission des candidatures vont vous être indiquées par le Secrétaire général; vous savez que la commission comporte onze membres et se réunit le vendredi 10 novembre après-midi à la fin des travaux du Conseil.

Je passe la parole à Monsieur le Secrétaire général.

LE SECRETAIRE GENERAL: Suite aux propositions que nous avons reçues, la composition de la Commission des candidatures serait la suivante: Belgique, Turquie, Canada, Australie, Ghana, Japon, Pakistan, Chili, Argentine, le Royaume d'Arabie Saoudite, Egypte.

LE PRESIDENT: Avez-vous des observations? Nous pouvons considérer que ces 11 pays constitueront la Commission des candidatures dont la réunion est prévue vendredi après-midi.

Je passe maintenant la parole à Monsieur le Directeur général qui va nous entretenir de la Conférence Mc Dougall; celle-ci a lieu le premier jour de la Conférence.

LE DIRECTEUR GENERAL: Le Comité Mc Dougall, composé de vous-même, du Président du Comité du Programme, de Son Excellence l'Ambassadeur d'Australie et de moi-même, propose au Conseil la nomination de Son Excellence Monsieur Giorgio Ruffolo, Ministre de l'environnement de l'Italie en tant que conférencier Mc Dougall.

C'est le Conseil qui décide en la matière et qui doit donc accepter cette proposition. La cérémonie aura lieu lundi 13 novembre.

LE PRESIDENT: Y a-t-il des interventions et des suggestions? Nous considérons que le Conseil est d'accord pour la contribution de Monsieur le Ministre de l'environnement du Gouvernement italien; ce problème de l'environnement est à l'ordre du jour un peu partout, tant des pays développés qu'en voie de développement, peut-être pour des raisons diamétralement opposées, mais c'est un choix judicieux que de traiter de ce problème au cours de la Conférence générale.

Tribute to Mr McDonald Benjamin, Permanent Representative of Dominica to FAO

Hommage à M. McDonald Benjamin, Représentant permanent de Dominique auprès de la FAO

Homenaje al Sr. McDonald Benjamin, Representante Permanente de Dominica ante la FAO

LE PRESIDENT: Avant d'ouvrir le débat, je dois m'acquitter d'un pénible devoir. Je voudrais informer le Conseil du décès de Monsieur l'Ambassadeur McDonald Benjamin, de Dominique, qui a été un membre éminent du Comité du programme. J'ai eu le privilège d'écouter ses interventions très fondées au sein du Comité du programme et du Comité conjoint, interventions basées sur une longue expérience de l'Organisation et des problèmes agricoles. Son décès est une grande perte pour la communauté agricole internationale. Je propose une minute de silence à sa mémoire.

One minute of silence

Une minute de silence

Un minuto de silencio

Avec votre permission, nous insérerons dans le rapport du Conseil un paragraphe en hommage à M. McDonald Benjamin.

III. PROGRAMME, BUDGETARY, FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

III. QUESTIONS CONCERNANT LE PROGRAMME, LE BUDGET, LES FINANCES ET L'ADMINISTRATION

III. ASUNTOS DEL PROGRAMA Y ASUNTOS PRESUPUESTARIOS, FINANCIEROS Y ADMINISTRATIVOS

5. Programme of Work and Budget 1990-91 and Medium-Term Objectives

5. Programme de travail et budget 1990-91 et objectifs à moyen terme

5. Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para 1990-91 y objetivos a plazo medio

LE PRESIDENT: Ce point concerne le Programme de travail et budget 1990-91 et objectifs à moyen terme; c'est un point de base pour notre travail et le Docteur Shah va nous le présenter. Ce point est particulièrement important puisque nous abordons pour la première fois la nouvelle procédure de schéma, de sommaire et de budget approfondi, telle qu'admise par notre Conseil.

V.J. SHAH (Assistant Director-General, Office of Programme, Budget and Evaluation): Mr Chairman, you have referred to the documents which are before the Council on this item. Therefore, first of all, I will briefly draw attention to the major features of these documents. The main document C89/3, while of a different colour this time, does not contain any change in the basic structure. The structure remains the same. However, once again we have made greater efforts to provide comprehensive information and to ensure further transparency.

The Director-General's introduction sets the policy framework of his proposals before you. I would draw Council's attention to the extended presentation of cross-sectorial priorities, which appear in the Programme framework from paragraphs 2.1 onwards. This was in direct response to the express wishes of Member Nations in order to be able to perceive cross-sectorial priorities and programme linkages in a more analytical way than is possible from individual programme analyses. The same section also gives an analysis of the programme Budget proposals including the financial aspects.

In addition to the three annexes, which are a part of the main document, there are four supplementary documents to which you have already alluded. Supplements 1 and 2 are on the same lines as those you have received in the past, and that the Conference has received in the preceding biennia. Supplement 4 deals with the subject which was considered by the Finance Committee at its last session, and which also appears in the report of the Finance Committee before you.

May I now turn to the substance of the Director-General's proposals. The proposals for the next biennium are the results, as the Council will be aware, of an extensive dialogue among member countries themselves and between them and the Secretariat. You will recall that the Programme Budget Process this year has been distinguished by an additional consultative step 1-16, the step which the Council adopted on an experimental basis in November of last year, of an outline of Programme of Work and Budget which was considered by a Joint meeting by the Programme and Finance Committees in January of this year. This was followed by the Summary Programme of Work and Budget as recommended by the Council at its Ninety-fifth Session in June and the full Programme of Work and Budget has been prepared on the basis of that.

The Director-General acknowledges and has given due consideration to all the views which have been expressed during this extensive dialogue, and particularly to the views of the Council itself when it considered the Summary Programme of Work and Budget. As a consequence of the comments made by the various bodies which examined the Summary, including the Committee on Agriculture, the Committee on Fisheries and the Programme and Finance Committees, a number of shifts of emphasis and changes in proposed resource levels for specific programme areas have been effected.

The impact of new development and requirements which have taken place or been identified since the summary was prepared have also been taken into account.

The main features of the proposals before you are as presented in the document. A real programme increase of US\$ 5.5 million, that is to say 1 percent over the recosted base of the present biennium budget. The real programme increase is entirely devoted to the technical and economic programmes of direct benefit to Member Nations. The administration and other support services have been contained to the present real level and the increases in the technical and economic programmes are concentrated on a selected number of well-justified priorities which have already been endorsed by the Council at this stage of the Summary.

There is also a further net reduction in established posts, especially at the secretarial and clerical levels. The total net reduction amounts to 25 posts.

Despite the limited programme increase for the technical cooperation programme of US\$ 1 750 000, I regret to say that the percentage of the TCP appropriation in the total budget falls further from 12.8 percent to 11.8 percent. I flag this because many delegations have deplored it in the light of their own expectation to see a level of TCP appropriation more commensurate with requirements.

I now turn briefly to the financial aspects of the proposals. There are two important financial aspects relating firstly to the provision for cost increases and secondly, to the impact of the lire/dollar exchange rate. The estimate for cost increases included in the proposals reflects the most conservative prediction of all factors involved. Cost increases are beyond the control of the Organization. As you all realize, the conditions of service of staff are determined, at the level of the whole UN system, as indeed, member Governments wish them to be. Inflation is an inescapable fact of life. The nominal increases of the cost of goods and services worldwide have to be met. Thus, the estimate for cost increases in the full programme of Work and Budget have been increased by an amount of US\$ 16 million over the preliminary estimate in the Summary on the basis of all of the latest information available to us.

I can add that very similar provisions are included in the proposed budgets of other organizations of the UN system. It would be surprising if it were otherwise, since they also share the same operational characteristics, although structural differences and cost differentials among the various headquarters and office locations have their impact. Nevertheless, the Director-General is deliberately proposing the absorption of cost increases amounting to US\$ 3 million. In very candid terms, this means that the real programme increase to which I referred as being of 1 percent, in fact, would be 0.5 percent. This gives added evidence of the dilemma faced by the Director-General in shaping his budgetary proposals. On the one hand he seeks to meet the requirements for FAO assistance and expectations that its action continues to be felt at a satisfactory level.

On the other, he is very conscious of the need to limit the request for assessments on Member Nations to a minimum. The Council may be reassured that the Finance Committee carried out its usual detailed review of the cost increase estimates and concluded that there was no basis to dispute them.

The second financial factor is the impact of the exchange rate on the budget level in dollar terms. The total figure of the budget proposed to you in the document is at the budgetary rate of Lire 1 235 to the dollar. The budgetary rate for this biennium amounts to US\$ 574 million. However, if the current rates prevail in two weeks time when the Conference will consider and adopt the budgetary appropriation for the next biennium, the budget level will be substantially less, - around US\$ 555 million, and not US\$ 574 million. In turn, the call on assessments will be even less, namely US\$ 12 million less as a reduction for estimated miscellaneous income will be made according to our established practice.

The Chairmen of the Programme and Finance Committees are with us today and if you so wish, will undoubtedly share their perceptions of the matter before you. On my side, I should like to conclude with the following thoughts:

It appears clearly that there is no basic disagreement among Member Nations on the substance of the proposals. Their programme content has been fully endorsed.

I trust there is also unanimous recognition of the efforts made by the Director-General to promote a consensus approval of the Programme of Work and Budget for the next biennium. There remains the issue of the Budget level. I trust that the Council will also see its way to agreeing on that.

It will be recognized that the financial crisis that we have faced over the last three years is not of our making. Over two biennia we have had programme cuts amounting to US\$ 45 million. It is not only the Member Nations who relied on FAO support who have been deprived of services; in a sense one can also truly say that all Member Nations who have paid their contributions to the assessed Budget of the last two biennia have been deprived. They have been deprived because their contributions were predicated on a full implementation of the Programme of Work and Budget that the Conference had approved.

In the circumstances I suggest that the programme increase of 0.4 percent could be viewed in this perspective: US\$ 2.5 million real programme increase against the programme cuts of US\$ 45 million. The Director-General could have asked for those programme cuts to be recompensed for the next Budget level, to have reinstated a real programme increase of US\$ 45 million as a minimum. In that perspective the proposed programme increase is indeed symbolic.

I would conclude that there is no more ardent hope than that of the Director-General and of all his colleagues in the Secretariat that the proposals which are submitted to you now and which will be presented to the Conference would eventually be approved by consensus and that the Council will see its way to so recommending it to the Conference.

LE PRESIDENT: Je remercie M. Shah pour son exposé introductif. Nous souhaitons la bienvenue à M. Mazoyer, Président du Comité du programme et M. Bukhari, Président du Comité financier, qui nous ont rejoints autour de cette table.

Puisqu'ils ont pu analyser en profondeur cette question, je vais leur donner successivement la parole. La parole est à M. Mazoyer, Président du Comité du programme.

M.J. MAZOYER (Président du Comité du programme): Monsieur le Président, Mesdames et Messieurs les Membres du Conseil, Monsieur le Directeur général, Mesdames et Messieurs, ma tâche est somme toute facile, car vous avez les rapports de la session du Comité du programme devant vous sous la cote CL 96/4. Je souhaite surtout vous faire part des conclusions et de l'esprit de nos discussions, et je laisserai le soin à Monsieur l'Ambassadeur Bukhari, Président du Comité financier, de vous présenter également les vues de son comité sur ces questions. Je commencerai par la première partie de son rapport, c'est-à-dire le compte-rendu de la session conjointe du Comité financier et du Comité du programme, le débat en session conjointe sur le Programme de travail et budget a été très bref. Nous avons simplement confronté une synthèse des résultats des discussions séparées qui avaient eu lieu dans chaque comité, chaque comité ayant examiné les propositions du Directeur général dans son optique propre au cours de sa propre session, et je dois dire que les conclusions des deux comités étaient suffisamment proches les unes des autres et compatibles pour que cette confrontation soit rapide et facile.

Je soulignerai quelques points saillants de nos discussions et de nos conclusions. Tout d'abord, il est clair que les deux comités ont tout à fait apprécié les améliorations apportées au format et à la présentation des documents. Nous pensons, d'une manière générale, que l'Organisation dispose vraiment d'un outil cohérent, clair et aussi suffisamment riche en détails - certains

pensent sans doute trop riche en détails - pour permettre un examen tout à fait circonstancié du Programme de travail et budget de l'Organisation par les organes directeurs.

Les comités ont également constaté que les propositions du Directeur général étaient conformes aux directives antérieures des organes de la FAO. Ils ont pu vérifier, lors de cet examen du Programme complet, que les commentaires et les avis qui avaient été émis dans plusieurs enceintes, - entre autres au Comité de l'agriculture, au Comité des pêches, dans nos propres comités et, bien entendu au Conseil lui-même, quand ils ont examiné le Sommaire du Programme et du budget, - que ces commentaires et ces avis avaient bien été pris en considération, qu'ils étaient suivis d'effet dans le document définitif. Cela se manifeste par des changements au niveau des ressources affectées à telle ou telle activité et aussi par des modifications de substance de ces activités dans certains cas.

Si on considère l'ensemble du Programme de travail et budget, les comités ont estimé qu'il convenait, pour apprécier ce Programme, de tenir compte des besoins croissants d'assistance des pays membres qui comptent sur la FAO pour réagir à des besoins urgents. Les comités ont tout à fait reconnu que le Directeur général a dû se livrer à un travail difficile pour concentrer des ressources limitées, pour toutes les raisons que vous savez, sur des priorités soigneusement choisies. Tout en approuvant les propositions relatives aux priorités et aux Programmes, la majorité des membres des deux comités ont convenu qu'il n'est pas possible de répondre à tous les besoins, à toutes les attentes de façon satisfaisante dans les limites d'un accroissement modeste des ressources tel qu'il est proposé. Le niveau du budget, quel qu'il soit, en effet ne peut satisfaire tout le monde, on le constate réunion après réunion. La grande majorité des membres des deux comités a exprimé son soutien au Programme de travail et budget proposé mais en faisant bien remarquer qu'elle regrettait le caractère modeste de l'augmentation nette du Programme. Ces membres ont souligné la nécessité de prévoir dans le budget une provision suffisante et réaliste pour couvrir les augmentations inévitables de coût. D'autres membres tout en soutenant le Programme d'activité et tout en rejetant le concept de croissance zéro, ont exprimé également leur inquiétude devant l'accroissement des quote-parts de contribution pour certains pays en voie de développement qui sont très affectés par le fardeau de la dette extérieure.

Un représentant a réitéré la position de son gouvernement concernant la poursuite de la croissance zéro dans l'ensemble des organisations du Système des Nations Unies, en y ajoutant la nécessité d'une absorption maximale des augmentations de coût.

Un autre membre enfin, tout en rappelant l'appui de son gouvernement à la même politique, a exprimé l'espoir que néanmoins un consensus soit obtenu à la Conférence en ce qui concerne le Programme de travail et budget qui est proposé.

Enfin un autre membre a réservé la position de son gouvernement à propos du niveau du budget.

En conclusion, - je vous ai donné toutes les opinions un peu regroupées, - la majorité des membres a convenu de recommander au Conseil de donner son appui aux propositions du Directeur général, et a exprimé le vœu qu'il soit approuvé par consensus à la Conférence. A la session du Comité du programme, plus particulièrement, nous avons bien entendu passé en revue les priorités d'ensemble et les programmes d'activités les uns après les autres, et ceci à la lumière des informations supplémentaires contenues dans la version intégrale.

Tous les compléments d'information que nous avons demandés au Secrétariat nous ont été fournis par les cadres du Secrétariat. Je ne souhaite pas prolonger cette présentation en répétant ce qu'il y a dans notre rapport. Je pense que ce serait inutile. Je dois vous dire que l'atmosphère des débats a été très ouverte, constructive et qu'un certain nombre d'avis et d'opinions en ce qui concerne les changements introduits par rapport aux propositions initiales ont été présentés. Nous avons trouvé particulièrement utile la présentation qui est faite en ce qui concerne les priorités, les domaines prioritaires intersectoriels. Nous pensons que ces petites études préalables sur les biotechnologies, l'information agricole, le développement durable, les avis en matière de politique, le rôle des femmes dans le développement qui se trouvent dans la section intitulée Cadre du Programme, ces études préalables des priorités ainsi que toutes leurs incidences à l'intérieur du Programme sont très utiles et qu'elles peuvent tout à fait aller dans le sens de l'amélioration de la compréhension des priorités et de leur utilisation dans la construction du programme.

Nous avons également constaté que les autres priorités habituelles, comme la formation, le soutien à l'investissement, le soutien à la coopération entre pays en développement continuaient à recevoir toute l'attention voulue.

En ce qui concerne le Programme de coopération technique, qui bénéficie d'un accroissement net de ce programme, de nombreux pays ont regretté de voir le pourcentage du budget total alloué au PCT tomber au-dessous de 12%. Ils ont donné des illustrations concrètes de l'importance du PCT et de son utilité pour les pays récipiendaires.

Pour conclure, je crois pouvoir dire qu'il y a un agrément total sur la substance du Programme, sur ses proportions, sur ses priorités, même si le niveau du budget n'a pas obtenu pour l'instant un consensus complet et inconditionnel.

Pour ma part, et je pense parler au nom du Comité dans son ensemble j'appelle de tous mes vœux ce consensus et je pense qu'il serait en ce moment d'une importance capitale et symbolique, car l'Organisation - l'examen extraordinaire de ses buts et de ses opérations l'a bien montré - l'Organisation a besoin vraiment d'un appui unanime pour relancer son action avec toute l'énergie nécessaire en cette fin de vingtième siècle.

LE PRESIDENT: Je remercie M. Mazoyer pour les explications très claires du climat dans lequel s'est déroulée l'analyse du budget dans le cadre des deux comités conjoints.

A. Y. BUKHARI(Chairman, Finance Committee) (original language Arable): Mr. Chairman, thank you for giving me this opportunity to address the Council and explain the views of the Finance Committee on the Programme of Work and Budget for the biennium 1990-91.

In this respect, I should like to begin by referring to paragraphs 4.5 to 4.19 of the Report on our last session. To begin with, I should like to reaffirm that the discussions which we held on the Programme of Work and Budget which is proposed for the coming biennium were very positive and constructive discussions, because we based ourselves on our discussions held together with the Programme Committee in respect to the proposed Programme of Work and Budget in January, and also when we studied in detail the summary of the Programme of Work and Budget in May. I am persuaded that the Council will agree with us in our positive evaluation of the format and presentation of this document, which we feel constitutes a treasure house of detailed and clear information. Of course, we in the Finance Committee have not seen in any inadequacy in the information given us here. We concentrated on the increase naturally. We saw the cost increases given, and we thought it wise for estimated increases in the Programme of Work and Budget should be of the order of 60 million dollars, to over a little more than 76 million dollars than the previous one.

As you know, cost increases cover all those points listed in this summary, and we were able to calculate the cost increases in the course of our session.

The Committee also noted that the method followed to calculate cost increases was the same as the method used before, and that it had been approved by the Finance Committee of the Council and the Conference all in turn.

May I also draw the Council's attention to the fact that the Director-General did not include in these allocations any amounts for cost increases for duty travel, experts and consultancy services. We then have the matter of professional staff. This leads to a full amount of 3 million dollars in addition.

Mr Chairman, Council Members, so far as Member Countries owing certain assessments is concerned, we feel that no one would be in agreement with an increase in a financial burden, so it was no surprise to me when some of my colleagues in the Finance Committee -two of them, in fact-expressed their concern at cost increases. However, I must make it clear that all the other members accepted the proposed cost increases, and each and every member to the Finance Committee also accepted that this would lead to a slight increase in assessments. As in previous meetings, we discussed the Budget level. One of the members stated yet again his country's position with respect to zero growth in the Programme of Work and Budget. He also expressed the need for maximum absorption of all cost increases.

Another member of ray Committee reserved his Government's position concerning the budget level. Nevertheless, the majority of Members supported the proposals contained in the Programme of Work and Budget, including cost increases and the actual budget level proposed by the Director-General. These Members pointed out that after the absorption of the cost increases proposed by the Director-General, it would not exceed an increase of 0.4 percent. They therefore expressed their satisfaction at the fact that the proposals made were obviously of fundamental importance and constructive.

Mr Chairman, with respect to the Programme of Work and Budget, we looked at the proposal made concerning the lapse factor. It was a proposal made by the Director-General to lower the present factor, which is at 5.5 percent, to 3 percent.

Paragraphs 4.13 to 4.19 of the Finance Committee's Report contain our Committee's point of view in the matter, but you will see, nevertheless, that the Finance Committee was unable to reach overall agreement in the matter. Members of the Committee expressed different views with respect to the acceptability and timeliness of the proposal; some were ready to accept the Director-General's proposal, others were prepared to consider application of a lapse factor rate of between 5.5 percent and 3 percent proposed by the Director-General. Others said they could not agree with that proposal, and, as a result, the Committee was unable to come to a final, single opinion in the matter. It was agreed that the matter be taken up again in the course of the Council and Conference. Therefore, Sir, the Council might care to give its opinion in the matter on this particular issue, which will undoubtedly be debated in the coming Conference.

Mr Chairman, Members, I do hope that the views of the Finance Committee will be of use to the Council in debating the Programme of Work and Budget for the coming biennium. I thank you for your attention.

LE PRESIDENT: Je remercie le Président du Comité financier de son intervention.

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): Vamos a intervenir ahora, Señor Presidente, porque nos parece por lo menos curioso que sobre este tema para el cual estaba previsto el resto de esta mañana y toda la tarde de hoy, ninguno de los miembros del Consejo quiera intervenir. Tal vez esto se deba a cinco factores: el primero el hecho de que este es un tema muy importante del cual se va a ocupar próximamente la Conferencia y todos deseamos referirnos a otros asuntos que atribuimos mayor significación en este período del Consejo. Segundo, las excelentes presentaciones que en su orden han hecho el Señor Shah, a nombre del Director General, y los competentes Presidentes de los Comités del Programa y de Finanzas. Tercero, a que se ha llegado al final de un proceso intenso a través de un diálogo permanente por primera vez llevado a cabo en esta forma en el seno de esta organización. Cuarto, porque el Director General ha tenido seriamente en cuenta todas las observaciones que han venido haciendo los órganos rectores y, quinto, porque como lo han dicho los Presidentes de los Comités del Programa y de Finanzas, esos dos importantes órganos asesores del Consejo trabajaron en un clima abierto, flexible y fructífero, si alcancé a tomar nota de todos los adjetivos usados por los distinguidos Presidentes.

Es así como ahora recibimos estos documentos debidamente decantados analizados profunda y seriamente, lo cual facilita nuestra participación.

Los representantes de Colombia queremos reconocer el gran esfuerzo que ha hecho el Director General al absorber tres millones de dólares de los costos. Pensamos que todo esto confirma que el Jefe de esta Organización ha manejado esta difícil situación con firmeza y prudencia a la vez, con un resultado de total y reconocida eficacia.

Estamos insatisfechos de que el PCT que cuenta con el pleno apoyo no sólo de los países en desarrollo, sino de la gran mayoría de todos los Estados Miembros de la Organización, deba disminuir en un uno por ciento.

Deseamos destacar también la escala de proporción que parece estamos olvidando en proporción entre los modestos dos y medio millones de dólares que se proponen para el bienio 1990/91, en relación con los 45 millones de dólares que causaron drásticas reducciones en los Programas de la Organización en los últimos dos bienios, y también, porque no decirlo desde ahora, proporción dolorosa en relación con ciento cuarenta y dos millones de cuotas atrasadas que debe un solo país, y con más de ciento setenta millones de atrasos totales que realmente dificultan el funcionamiento de la Organización.

De todo esto, y para estar dentro del orden, hablaremos con la claridad y franqueza habituales, en el tema 10.1.

Nosotros queremos, Señor Presidente, proponer formalmente que sobre este tema el Consejo recomiende que la Conferencia apruebe por unanimidad, por pleno consenso, todas las propuestas del Director General relativas a las nueve prioridades básicas y al modesto aumento propuesto a nivel del presupuesto. Pensamos que después de dos años ha llegado el momento de que sea el

Consejo, y no la gran mayoría, como hemos venido haciendo durante todo este tiempo, el que haga esta recomendación clara y enfática a la Conferencia.

Sra. Mercedes FERMIN GOMEZ (Venezuela): La delegación de Venezuela será muy breve, Señor Presidente, porque simplemente vamos a apoyar en todos sus puntos y conceptos la exposición que acaba de hacer nuestro amigo y colega el Embajador de Colombia.

Sería innecesario agregar argumentos a los que él ha presentado. Nosotros hemos discutido estos problemas, no solamente en el Grupo de los países latinoamericanos, también en el Grupo de los 77, y hemos estado perfectamente de acuerdo en que ya basta de seguir ocultando el sol con un dedo. No es posible pedirle a esta Organización que siga reduciendo su presupuesto; no es posible que nosotros, los países en desarrollo, y con mucho menos razón los países subdesarrollados, podamos permitir que mientras los países superindustrializados, poderosos económicamente, faltan a su deber negando su contribución como les corresponde en la oportunidad debida, en mengua de los programas que la Organización de las Naciones Unidas para la Agricultura y la Alimentación deben llevar adelante.

Los países en desarrollo y los países subdesarrollados tienen, por mandato de la Constitución de esta Organización, absolutamente iguales derechos como corresponde a su soberanía de naciones libres, quienes hemos podido estar al día sin ser países tan desarrollados, como los grandes contribuyentes o llamados así, que ya no merecen ese nombre, hemos procurado estar al día e incluso hacer un adelanto. Este es el caso de mi país. Otros han hecho todos los esfuerzos para cumplir y ponerse al día, a pesar de que pesa sobre nosotros una descomunal deuda que es una carga de la cual sufren nuestras poblaciones; pero, en vista del cumplimiento de los intereses de los países miembros de la FAO y de los programas de esta Organización, hacemos un esfuerzo por ponernos al día. Sin embargo, consideramos que ya esta actitud de los países que sistemáticamente vienen negando, o retardando su contribución a la FAO, debería ser motivo de una llamada de atención por lo menos, o de un señalamiento especial en una reunión como ésta.

Por eso, repetimos, vamos a apoyar la propuesta del delegado de Colombia de aprobar por unanimidad todas las propuestas del Director General en relación con los nueve puntos prioritarios. Yo agregaría que los países que constituimos el Tercer Mundo deberíamos proponer una resolución de este Consejo, o una solicitud de este Consejo a aprobar por la mayoría que nos corresponde, y solicitar a aquellos países cuyas economías son abundantes y son las más poderosas, y que son miembros de la Organización, que atiendan al deber de sufragar sus cuotas atrasadas, por lo menos antes de la Conferencia. Yo lo haría como una proposición concreta y lo someto a la consideración de los miembros del Consejo para su apoyo y aprobación.

Hannu H. HALINEN (Finland): Let me first express my great appreciation of seeing you at the Chair of the Council. We have always admired the particular skill and integrity with which you have conducted the sittings of the Council. At the same time, let me thank the Council for the confidence put on myself by electing me as the first Vice-Chairman of this Council. Let me assure you that I will serve you in this task to the best of my abilities.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me turn to the item at hand. I would like to say the effort, to "satisfy the conditions of transparency and accountability", in the presentation of the Programme of Work and Budget 1990-91 in front of us, is a commendable one. Steps have been taken by the Secretariat to discuss matters among programme elements and sub-programmes for different priorities and objectives.

The inter-programme coordination, as well as the contribution to various programmes to various areas of major task and our Regular Programme and extra-budgetary resources are related to the latter. But obviously more of it is to be done. Priorities and priority setting on the one hand and medium term planning on the other are logically intertwined, the latter being a consequence of the former. My delegation expresses its satisfaction of the importance given to the two issues by the experts and by the Secretariat as reflected in the Programme of Work and Budget. Relating to the ongoing review of the FAO, this has been the focal point in the Finnish and Nordic way of thinking. The non-priority areas determined by the Secretariat and properly endorsed by the previous Council provide an appropriate example of a kind of an outcome the Member Countries might achieve after thorough and open discussions on the matter. Yet, the methodology in which this priority areas are taken into account in the budgetary planning and reflected in the Programme of Work and Budget for the next biennium should be further clarified to the Council. It should be clear at the outset that the reason for priority setting is not and cannot be the attainment of new resources to the Organization, whether extra-budgetary or within the Regular

Programme. Quite the contrary, setting the priorities contributes to the utilization of presently available resources in a more efficient manner than hitherto. Based upon the priorities agreed upon, the Conference can discuss and decide on the programme for the medium term duration. We are encouraged to note that concerning few items, medium term perspectives are already mentioned in the PWB 1990-91.

In our intervention at the last session of the Council, we emphasized that some prioritized issues should be considered and reflected in all aspects of FAO work, and not merely in separate priorities. We take due note of the fact that the cross sector of the nature of the issues, namely sustainable development, policy advice, women in development, as well as biotechnology and agricultural data development have been pointed in the budget document.

We have welcomed the proposed new sub-programme on sustained resource potentials. While it is the task of the interdepartmental working group on environment and energy to approach this multi-sectorial and multi-disciplinary question in an integrated manner, perhaps it could further clarify the relationship of the new sub-programme to the existing sub-programme on the integration of environment in the development process. The issue of integrating environmental conservation is a basic concern in the activities of the FAO and is not only a question of establishing the programme and requesting more money, although they might appear justifiable after careful consideration by the governing body. The work within existing organizations and resources should remain, however, as a starting point in approaching this question.

The programme framework includes thoughtful considerations on the definition and category of the policies and role of the FAO. What is missing, however, are the suggested operating arrangements. In the light of quite a number of shifts within various programmes concerning policy analysis and advice, which are not sufficiently explained, we cannot but wonder what the strengthening of FAO's policy advice is in concrete terms.

My delegation, for example, finds the suggestion of an additional US\$ 500 000 (five hundred thousand) for policy analysis and the planning under sub-programme on agricultural planning and assistance quite attractive. I would prefer clearer description of its use.

Mr. Chairman, my delegation raised some serious concern about the modest scale of forestry in the budget as well as a number of considerable cuts in its sub-programmes. We regret to note that the situation has not improved itself. The programme change is in fact slightly decreased since the Summary of PWB. The bulk of new resources being allocated to the programme management.

At the same time, the cuts explained by "integrational activities with other elements" and shifts made within the whole forestry programme, have often become deeper than before. They do not appear justifiable to us and here we see the concern expressed in the Finance and Programme Committee on these matters. We welcome and support the Special Action Programmes like the Tropical Forest Action Plan and Forests Trees and People in this context, but we are somewhat worried about relying too much on extra-budgetary resources at the cost of regular budget financing under this major programme. Furthermore, the multi-sectorial character of forestry and forestry-related activities should be better reflected in FAO work in this priority area. When planning forestry-related activities, the land-use policy, which is extensive, social, agricultural and other implications, should be taken as a starting point as the FAO already strives to do.

This interdepartmental point of view should be incorporated in the budgeting process as well. That is an approach that would further enhance the transparency of FAO's work in its major inter-link areas. Mr Chairman, the budget will be scrutinized more thoroughly at the Conference.

In conclusion, we would like to make two observations. We find the new format and presentation of the budget useful and recommend to continue making improvement to it in the same direction. As for the decision of the level and content of the budget, we regard it appropriate to make the final decision only after the discussionary session of the FAO during the Conference.

Javier TANTALEAN (Perú): En primer lugar, para agradecer al Sr. Shah y a los señores Mazoyer y Bukharl, Presidentes del Comité del Programa y del Comité de Finanzas.

Mi intervención sólo va a ser en rasgos generales ya que más adelante hay tiempo para profundizar, en la Conferencia, sobre este aspecto tan importante del temario. Nosotros observamos, Sr. Presidente, que el incremento de presupuesto propuesto es relativamente pequeño para un mundo que crece en su población, y en la cual los más pobres y los más hambrientos se incrementan. Yo me pregunto cómo se congelan los instrumentos internacionales de lucha contra el

hambre, que es la posición de algunos de los países, cuando justamente estos instrumentos, como la FAO, han sido creados para luchar contra ese mundo que crece en pobres y hambrientos.

Siempre he pensado, Sr. Presidente, que la cooperación internacional hay que tomarla como uno de los mecanismos de la redistribución del ingreso mundial, en momentos en que un solo país accede al veinticinco por ciento del ingreso mundial. Redistribución del ingreso mundial en el sentido de que los aportes a la cooperación deben venir de los países más desarrollados hacia los proyectos de desarrollo financiados por estos aportes en favor del Tercer Mundo. Y ese es el rol fundamental, creo yo, de organismos como la FAO. Por eso, nos parece que las cifras frente a las grandes demandas que existen, tanto de apoyo a la cooperación, a la agricultura, a los programas de montes, de pesca y en general a los programas de lucha contra el hambre, significan un incremento muy pequeño frente a estas inmensas necesidades.

Reconocemos, como ha sido expresado por el Sr. Mazoyer, que existe acuerdo sobre lo esencial del programa, y reconocemos que el proceso de presupuestación y programación ha sido largo y de técnica óptima. Por eso, felicitamos el trabajo de ambas Comisiones, pero queremos dejar sentado como delegación de un país del Tercer Mundo, nuestra preocupación por el pequeño incremento que se presenta para el presupuesto del bienio.

Ms Teresa HOBGOOD (United States of America): The United States delegation expresses its appreciation to Mr. Shah for his straightforward remarks, which will facilitate consideration of the 1990-91 Programme of Work and Budget and its relationship to FAO's medium term objectives. My delegation would like to commend FAO for its competent and dedicated work in drawing together this voluminous document. We would like to thank Messrs. Mazoyer and Bukhari for their comments.

With regard to the budget level, we were greatly pleased that the Programme and Finance Committees met jointly in January and February of this year to discuss FAO's 1990-91 Programme of Work and Budget and programme priorities. This meeting gave Member States an opportunity to focus attention early on the budget. We would hope that this additional step can become a permanent feature in the budget process and that in the future a budget outline for the 1992-1993 biennium can be submitted for consensus approval of the committees.

We would first like to address the medium-term objectives in the budget document. We are pleased that FAO has integrated such important issues as the role of women in development and the need for sustainable agricultural development into its medium-term programme objectives. We wish to stress that FAO must be careful not to duplicate the work of other organizations. For example, we note that FAO has expressed an interest in enhancing its ability to offer policy advice to assist countries in monitoring the sectoral effects of economic adjustment programmes. If any enhancement of FAO's ability to offer policy advice is undertaken, it should be in areas where FAO already has acknowledged expertise. We note that in the programme framework section on biotechnology FAO states that it will assess and report the global implications of widespread uses of biotechnology, as these may distort established patterns of comparative advantage. "Distort" has extremely negative connotations. Improvements in biotechnology, which will enhance productivity and lower producers' costs, should not be feared. Such developments enhance world food security and general economic development.

In evaluating its programme on biotechnology, we hope that FAO will not overlook two factors. First, adequate patent protection must be provided to products derived from biotechnology. Only with the assurances of reasonable returns on investments that patent protection offers will those who have invested in and developed these new products be willing to market them. Without such protection, we fear that the benefits of the spread of biotechnology will lessen and that funding for further developments will dry up. Second, it is important that we review and approve the safety and efficacy of products derived from biotechnology, based on sound scientific criteria and not socio-economic concerns. Multilateral organizations such as FAO's Codex Alimentarius Commission can play an important role in any international evaluation process.

The United States views agricultural applications of molecular biology as a low priority. Mutation breeding has been largely abandoned by industrialized countries because of its lack of productivity. In our view, the additional funding proposed for the joint efforts of FAO and IAEA on isotopes and molecular biology is not justified.

The United States gives very high priority to FAO's work in support of the Uruguay Round in the area of sanitary and phytosanitary standards. We appreciate the personal attention which the Director-General has given to this matter. Establishing a secretariat and an official body for the IPC is an important step in developing a viable dispute-settlement mechanism within the GATT.

However, this must be accomplished not by programme growth but through the reduction or elimination of activities of obsolete, marginal or ineffective utility.

FAO's work and data collection, analysis and dissemination in agriculture, forestry and fisheries continue to be of high priority to the United States and continue to receive strong endorsement from our private sector. These activities are valuable to both developed and less developed countries, from both a trade and development perspective. We believe that world trade has benefited tremendously from the work of the Codex Alimentarius, and we remain an extremely strong advocate of its undertakings.

The United States is also an ardent supporter of FAO's Forestry and Fisheries Programme. In particular, we strongly endorse the Tropical Forestry Action Plan and we commend FAO for the fine work it has already done in this area.

We are also a strong supporter of FAO's global forest resources assessment. FAO is uniquely qualified to make this assessment. Updating this data would be of great value to all nations concerned about the environment and sustainable management of the world's forest resources.

We welcome the increased attention that FAO is devoting to women in development and join other members in commending FAO for devoting more of its resources to this vital area. Hunger is often the creation of economic bias, bias based on race, religion and sex. Helping to overcome the economic bias against women is an important step in fostering development that benefits all.

Turning to the budgetary aspects of the Programme of Work and Budget, we acknowledge that taking decisions, which will ultimately result in some programmes receiving less and some receiving more resources, is a difficult process. Nevertheless, it must be undertaken by members of FAO if they are to undertake their oversight responsibilities in a serious manner. We ask that, as we proceed to discuss the financial merits of the Programme of Work and Budget, other members will view our comments in the sincere and constructive spirit in which we offer them.

With regard to the proposed budget, the United States maintains its commitment to zero real growth and maximum absorption of non-discretionary cost increases. This is a budgetary principle that we have enunciated for several years, not only in FAO but in other UN-system organizations. We believe it is important to note that the governing bodies of WHO, ICAO, ILO and WMO have all approved budgets for 1990-91 at either negative real growth or zero real growth. Negative growth budgets have also been proposed for the UN and UNIDO. We note that a programme increase of either 1.1 percent or 0.45 percent has been proposed. We were under the impression that programme growth calculations do not take into account estimates for inflation, currency fluctuations and mandatory cost increases. Thus we fail to understand how the absorption of cost increases for duty travel, consultants and staff upgradings reduces real growth. We would appreciate clarification of this point. If the growth is not 1.1 percent, it will be helpful if an amendment to the budget was provided which reflects 0.45 percent real growth broken down in a similar fashion as the 1.1 percent figure.

At the June Council Session my delegation expressed puzzlement at the size of the proposed cost increases. We now have a somewhat clearer understanding of these figures and would like to express appreciation to FAO for its efforts in this regard. There are several comments we would like to make at this time regarding these cost increases.

Another 14 million in cost increases has been added to the Programme of Work and Budget to cover an assumed 5 percent increase in basic professional salaries and the eventual results of a general service salary survey. With regard to the 5 percent increase in particular, FAO should not assume that increases in professional salaries being proposed by the International Civil Service Commission will necessarily be approved by the UN General Assembly this year; nor should it assume that the effective date of implementation, if approved, would be as soon as January of 1990. To the extent such increases are approved, the already dramatic cost increases projected for the Programme of Work and Budget require that these anticipated increases be absorbed by the use of savings in the budget. We note that on the basis of information available to the United States, a post adjustment classification for Italy had not reached Class XI (effective 1 June 1989) contrary to the remarks on page 49 of the budget document. We believe that FAO's projections for cost increases in the post adjustment system amounting to US\$ 25 million are far too generous and we would appreciate a clear explanation for this estimate.

With regard to the increase in the assessments of Member States we note that they will be calculated after taking into account estimated miscellaneous income of US\$ 12 million. We fully support the inclusion of miscellaneous income in determining that assessment. We also note that the Special Reserve Account ultimately will be credited with an amount equivalent to 5 percent of FAO's effective working budget for 1990-91. The Special Reserve Account was intended primarily

to protect FAO's programme against unbudgeted cost arising from currency fluctuations. In the light of the Organization's success in dealing with the fluctuations, (by forward purchasing its lira requirements), we believe that a 5 percent level for the account is no longer justifiable. An amount of 1 percent for the Special Reserve Account should be adequate to cover its other two functions. The difference should not be available for programme growth but should be used to reduce the 1990-91 assessments on Member States.

On page 347 of the Budget Document we note that information on the proposed distribution of the budgets is provided by items of expenditure. With exception of meetings, all categories reflect increases. We consider the trend with respect to the reduced amount for meetings favorable. However, we would have hoped that similar reductions would have been made in other categories. In particular we note that an increase of over US\$ 6 million is proposed for publications. We believe it would be useful to have a detailed accounting of the actual costs incurred for publications. We would be interested in knowing whether or not FAO has conducted user surveys, has automated sufficiently in consolidated mailings in the distribution sector in order to enhance economies and efficiency.

Finally, with regard to the Technical Cooperation Programme, the United States has expressed support for limited funding of TCP through the Regular Programme. We maintain that the UN Development Programme should serve as a central coordinating funding source for multilateral development assistance and that FAO should limit its focus to activities in which it has a comparative advantage, as the expert's report suggests. Such an arrangement would ensure the best use of limited resources of Member States.

In the Programme of Work and Budget, the proposed 1990-91 Budget for Technical Cooperation Programme is US\$ 64.9 million, an increase of US\$ 1.8 million over the 1988/89 approved budget for TCP. These funds will be available to FAO in addition to the US\$ 31.1 million balance of the TCP appropriation for 1988-89 expected to be carried forward into 1990/91.

We note that at the end of 1987 nearly US\$ 7 million in TCP funds for the 1984-85 biennium lapsed, thus nearly 10 percent of the amount appropriated for Technical Cooperation for 1984-85 was not expended. It would be helpful to know how much of the nearly US\$ 28 million in TCP funds carried forward for use in 1988/89 will lapse, thereby resulting in savings to the Organization. It would also be useful to have a brief description of TCP projects in the budget document.

We believe that with the suggestions we have made the level of the Programme of Work and Budget can be reduced.

Juan NUIRY SANCHEZ (Cuba): Comenzaremos para, en nombre de mi Delegación, apoyar en todas sus partes los pronunciamientos de los distinguidos colegas de Colombia, Venezuela y Perú, en aras de evitar repeticiones. Nuevamente nos encontramos ante la situación de presentar a la Conferencia una propuesta referente al Programa de Labores y Presupuesto 1990-91.

Referente al Programa de Labores, consideramos que hay poco en que abundar, puesto que en esta sesión del Consejo contamos con las excelentes informaciones de los Comités de Programas y Finanzas y los comentarios de los expertos sobre las funciones y objetivos de la FAO. Un aspecto importante de todo lo concluido se refiere al Programa de Labores que se propone concretamente la FAO para el próximo bienio. Teniendo en cuenta las excelentes propuestas para el Programa de Labores, que la Delegación de Cuba apoya en todas sus partes, nos hace meditar en el presupuesto necesario para cumplir el mismo. Las prioridades que se nos presentan en el documento C 89/3 sigue, a nuestro entender, las pautas derivadas de las mayores necesidades para nuestros países.

Consideramos que la preparación del Programa de Labores y Presupuesto ha tenido en cuenta exhaustivamente las opiniones de los diferentes grupos, así como de los diferentes Comités Técnicos. El incremento de solamente cinco millones de dólares nos indica que no será posible cumplimentar el Programa de Labores de acuerdo a las indicaciones de los países.

Referente al PCT, Programa tan importante y valioso para los países en desarrollo, debemos expresar con pesar que ha sufrido rebaja, o sea, ni tan siquiera se mantiene dentro de los límites del bienio anterior.

En el estudio efectuado por los Comités de Programas y Finanzas se ve un incremento para dicho Programa, una vez que reconoció la eficacia del mismo. La Delegación de Cuba reconoce ampliamente los esfuerzos hechos por el Director General para conseguir una aprobación del Presupuesto por consenso. La Delegación de Cuba apoya la propuesta que se nos hace y, en aras de ese consenso necesario, apoya la propuesta de Programa de Labores y Presupuesto, aunque esto es consecuencia de que no garantiza el nivel de necesidades de los países en desarrollo.

Esperamos que la flexibilidad con que se ha elaborado el Presupuesto, tanto por el Comité de Programas y de Finanzas como por la Secretaría General, incluyendo el propio Director General, lleve a este Consejo a recomendar plenamente a la Conferencia la aprobación de este modesto Presupuesto, tratando de garantizar el programa propuesto.

Específicamente sobre el estado financiero de la Organización, queremos reservarnos para expresar la opinión de mi país en la intervención dentro del contexto del examen con más profundidad, análisis y señalamiento por entender este aspecto de crítico.

Somos de la opinión de que la FAO está capacitada para presentar su propuesta de Presupuesto en el futuro, tal y como lo ha hecho habitualmente, sin necesidad de recurrir a sesiones experimentales o consejos externos. Lo que la FAO necesita es un nivel de Presupuesto aceptable para ser eficaz.

Del mismo modo, también durante la Conferencia mi Delegación podrá ser más extensa y explícita para argumentar nuestro apoyo al Programa de Labores y Presupuesto, que en términos generales rechazamos. Estamos conscientes de que la FAO necesita de un apoyo unánime para continuar la excelente labor que por años ha venido desplegando y que ha sido ampliamente reconocida por los análisis efectuados.

Yousef Ali Mahmoud HAMDI (Egypt) (original language Arabic): It is a pleasure to see you again in the post of Chairman and we would like to congratulate the Vice-Chairmen on their election and we would also like to thank Mr Shah and the Chairmen of the Programme and Finance Committees for their presentations.

We are extremely satisfied with the priorities and programmes suggested by the Director-General in the Programme of Work and Budget for 1990-91. These priorities reflect a balanced focus on selected priorities in fields which FAO can have a great impact.

As to the budget level, no doubt the Director-General has made enormous and laborious efforts (for which we are grateful) in order to limit the increase in the budget level. These efforts have resulted in a small increase which is 0.45 percent. This increase was inevitable in my view. However, we feel that it is unfortunate that the TCP has been relatively decreased. In our view, TCP is a speedy technical service which may be provided to developing countries. Finally, on behalf of my delegation we would like to express our support for the Programme of Work and Budget for 1990-91 and we recommend that this Programme of Work be submitted to the Conference for its unanimous adoption.

Parviz KARBASSI (Iran, Islamic Republic of): On behalf of my delegation I should like to express my great appreciation to the Director-General and the body of FAO for the fine work done in preparing the Programme of Work and Budget.

In the traffic of Rome rich and poor suffer together. Explosion of population will affect all nations, just as traffic does. Mr Shah has stated that the real programme increase for the 1990-91 biennium is \$5.5 million, while I heard that the debt of the share of Member Nations is \$175 million. To support the Director-General's proposals I should like to suggest to the Council that we should all try to contribute our share in time, to give a better chance to the capable Director-General of moving at a faster pace before we are all stopped flat in the traffic of population.

We welcome and support strongly the TCP, and think it is important that FAO strengthen as much as possible the TCP project. On behalf of my delegation I support the Programme of Work and Budget which is before us in the Council.

The meeting rose at 12.30 hours

La seance est levée a 12 h 30

Se levanta la sesión a las 12.30 horas

council

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

conseil

ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ALIMENTATION ET L'AGRICULTURE

consejo

ORGANIZACION DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA LA AGRICULTURA Y LA ALIMENTACION

CL

CL 96/PV/2

Ninety-sixth Session

Quatre-vingt-seizième session

96º periodo de sesiones

SECOND PLENARY MEETING DEUXIEME SEANCE PLENIERE SEGUNDA SESION PLENARIA (6 November 1989)

The Second Plenary Meeting was opened at 14.45 hours Lassaad Ben Osman, Independent Chairman of the Council, presiding

La deuxième séance plénière est ouverte à 14 h 45, sous la présidence de Lassaad Ben Osman, Président indépendant du Conseil

Se abre la segunda sesión plenaria a las 14.45 horas, bajo la presidencia de Lassaad Ben Osman, Presidente Independiente del Consejo

III. PROGRAMME, BUDGETARY, FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS (continued)

III. QUESTIONS CONCERNANT LE PROGRAMME, LE BUDGET, LES FINANCES ET L'ADMINISTRATION (suite)

III. ASUNTOS DEL PROGRAMA Y ASUNTOS PRESUPUESTARIOS, FINANCIEROS Y ADMINISTRATIVOS (continuación)

2. Election of Three Vice-Chairmen and Designation of the Chairman and Members of the Drafting Committee

2. Election de trois Vice-Présidents et nomination du Président et des membres du Comité de rédaction

2. Elección de tres Vicepresidentes y nombramiento del Presidente y de los miembros del Comité de Redacción

LE PRESIDENT: Avant de donner la parole au prochain orateur, je voudrais vous dire qu'après consultation entre les différents groupes, un consensus s'est dégagé sur la composition suivante du Comité de rédaction. Je vous prie d'en prendre note: Algérie, Argentine, Australie, Egypte, Espagne, Etats-Unis d'Amérique, France, Inde, Japon, Lesotho, Liban, Malaisie et Mexique. Voilà donc les treize membres du Comité de rédaction.

Il reste à nommer le Président de ce Comité. Y a-t-il une suggestion à ce sujet? Nous pourrions laisser le Comité se réunir pour qu'il nous fasse ensuite une proposition.

LE DIRECTEUR GENERAL: Si vous voulez vous référer au passé, c'est toujours le Conseil qui nomme le Président, mais je crois que le temps n'est pas suffisant aujourd'hui. C'est toujours le Conseil mais cela peut changer.

LE PRESIDENT: Je pense que nous pouvons attendre jusqu'à demain matin pour entendre, en séance plénière, les suggestions concernant la nomination du président du Comité de rédaction.

5. Programme of Work and Budget 1990-91 and Medium-Term Objectives (continued)

5. Programme de travail et budget 1990-91 et objectifs à moyen terme (suite)

5. Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para 1990-91 y objetivos a plazo medio (continuación)

LE PRESIDENT: Nous reprenons le cours de nos travaux avec l'intervention du délégué du Liban.

Amin ABDEL MALER (Liban) (langue originale arabe): Monsieur le Président, je regrette d'avoir à reprendre encore la parole en raison de l'incident technique qui a empêché les honorables délégués d'entendre ma déclaration de ce matin.

Je voudrais tout d'abord prier le Secrétariat de tenir compte pour les PV de la déclaration que je vais livrer et non de celle de ce matin.

Monsieur le Président, c'est un plaisir pour notre délégation de vous voir présider la quatre-vingt-seizième session du Conseil.

Je voudrais également féliciter les trois Vice-Présidents qui ont été élus ce matin.

J'aurais quelques observations à présenter, à ce stade de notre débat, au sujet du point de l'ordre du jour que nous examinons. J'interviens donc en qualité de membre du Comité du programme et en ma qualité de Représentant du Liban.

Le niveau proposé du budget n'est pas celui que nous aurions souhaité. Nous aurions préféré un niveau de budget permettant de répondre aux aspirations et aux attentes des pays en développement. Ces pays font toujours appel à la FAO, afin que l'Organisation leur fournisse l'aide nécessaire pour améliorer leur niveau de vie; c'est en effet ce qu'ils escomptent.

Nous regrettons donc que le niveau de budget proposé soit tel que le taux de croissance n'est que de 0,45%. Nous avons été contraints d'accepter ce niveau du budget après avoir entendu les propositions faites par le Directeur général aux sessions du Comité financier et du Comité du programme et les justifications de celles-ci. Le Directeur général a donné, en effet, les justifications qui l'ont amené à maintenir le budget à ce niveau. Le Liban, malgré toutes les épreuves qu'il a endurées et dont tous les délégués sont conscients, était prêt à accepter toute augmentation du budget qui aurait été proposée. J'ai le plaisir d'informer le Conseil que le Liban a déjà pris les mesures financières pour le paiement de sa contribution à l'Organisation pour la période 1989. Le Représentant de la FAO au Liban recevra un chèque de ce montant à la fin de cette semaine ou, au plus tard, la semaine prochaine.

Nous demandons beaucoup à la FAO mais ne lui donnons que peu. Le Secrétariat a pris toutes les mesures nécessaires au cours des deux dernières années et conformément aux directives du Directeur général, visant à réduire les ouvertures du crédit à concurrence de 45 millions de dollars. Cela a été fait sans répercussions négatives sur le programme de travail. Malheureusement, nous avons remarqué (et ceci n'est pas connu de tous) que certains membres du personnel de l'Organisation - et non des moindres - quittent celle-ci en raison du faible niveau de rémunération par rapport au secteur privé. Cela est fort regrettable mais ces cadres de la FAO ne sont plus en mesure de rester dans l'Organisation car les réductions budgétaires de leur point de vue ne permettent plus à la FAO de mettre en œuvre les projets auxquels ils sont attachés. Pour répondre aux programmes prioritaires, la FAO a donc besoin de personnel hautement qualifié. Je pose donc une question: comment pouvons-nous recruter de tels experts à un moment où d'aucuns estiment qu'il est nécessaire non seulement de maintenir le budget à son niveau actuel mais de le réduire; d'autres préconisent que l'on diminue le recours aux fonds extrabudgétaires. Je me demande alors comment l'Organisation pourra mener à bien ses activités d'une façon satisfaisante sans avoir recours aux fonds extrabudgétaires. Cela me semble pratiquement impossible.

Alors, quel est le sort de l'Organisation? D'une part certains réclament d'autres projets prioritaires, de nouvelles demandes de la part des pays en développement pour que ceux-ci reçoivent l'assistance nécessaire pour promouvoir l'agriculture, plus de transparence qui caractériserait toutes les activités de l'Organisation, de nouvelles demandes de réforme à des coûts très élevés, et d'autre part, des demandes de réduction du budget de sorte que son taux de croissance devienne négatif.

Je crois que le moment est arrivé de trouver un accord pour aider l'Organisation à l'avenir et pour consolider les résultats obtenus au cours des quarante dernières années. Essayons donc de nous mettre d'accord sur un programme de travail et budget tel que proposé pour le transmettre à la Conférence en vue de son adoption à la prochaine session. Nous espérons que le budget pour la période 1992/93 enregistrera une croissance qui permettra à l'Organisation d'assurer toutes ses activités. Ceci facilitera à l'Organisation l'octroi d'une assistance au développement agricole dans les pays en développement contribuant par là même à la lutte contre la faim dans le monde.

Abdullah M.K. BOJANG (Gambia): Thank you very much, Chairman. My delegation would like to thank Dr Shah, and the Chairmen of the Programme and Finance Committees, for the clarity of their presentation. The two committees and the Secretariat have put in a lot of effort in this exercise and we accordingly appreciate their diligence. The Gambian delegation would like to endorse the suggestion made by certain delegations that we recommend to the Conference to approve by consensus the Director-General's proposal. However, we are readily disappointed that very limited funding is provided under the TCP. We attach great importance to this programme at a time when most of our countries are involved in structural adjustments, less and less resources are available, even for vital sectors like agriculture. It is therefore necessary now to make our greater demands on the resources of the TCP. We would therefore order this Council to do everything in its power to make sure that at least we have further funding in this regard. It is gratifying to note that the Director-General is disposed to contact donors regarding possible further contributions on a voluntary basis, either through TCP or Trust Fund. We thank him for this initiative and we give him our wholehearted support. Thank you, Mr President.

Assefa YTLALA (Ethiopia): Thank you, Mr Chairman. First of all I would like to congratulate the three Vice-Chairmen upon their election to this important responsibility. I would also like to thank Mr Shah and Chairmen of the Programme and Finance Committees for their lucid presentations on the Programme of Work and Budget for 1990-91 biennium. As we were members of the Finance Committee, I should express that we were party to the recommendations in the document and supporters of the view of the majority. We are convinced that the programme element and priorities said and used in determining the programme and budget are results of intensive

discussions in the various committees and the bodies and feel that those concerned are fully considered in the documents that we have before us. As the programme elements in the documents were results of discussions that we had throughout the biennium, we don't feel it is appropriate to raise detailed matters at this stage because this will affect the gradual development of the consensus that emerged as the technical discussions were being carried out on each of the areas that were incorporated in the present Programme of Work and Budget.

Chairman, the proposed Programme of Work and Budget for the 1990-91 biennium has a very small and nominal programme increase when seen in the light of the range of requirements and expectations of member countries. The cost increase which is incorporated in the Programme of Work and Budget is a technical matter whose considerations are based on certain guidelines and discussions on these guidelines fall outside the mandate of both this august body and the Organization in which case we can only advise and recommend that those reasons and guidelines are closely synchronized with the request.

In a period of establishing a consensus, we would like to express our voice of endorsement, even though we feel that the proposed Programme of Work and Budget falls short of the expectations of member countries: the objective of achieving increased food production and appropriate assistance to this end by FAO.

Raphael RABE (Madagascar): Ma délégation voudrait d'abord vous féliciter et manifester sa satisfaction de vous voir à la présidence de cette session importante de notre Conseil. Elle félicite aussi les Vice-Présidents qui viennent d'être élus.

Monsieur le Président, la délégation malgache vous remercie de lui donner la parole et de lui donner ainsi l'occasion de s'exprimer sur ce point crucial de notre ordre du jour. Elle félicite le Secrétariat pour la qualité des documents qui ont connu au fil des années des améliorations très sensibles. Elle manifeste sa gratitude à Monsieur Shah pour la présentation très claire qu'il a faite du sujet et remercie par la même occasion les honorables présidents du Comité financier et du Comité du programme pour les compléments d'informations très utiles qu'ils ont bien voulu prodiguer à ce Conseil.

Comme toujours le Gouvernement malgache, par le canal de sa représentation permanente et des délégations qu'il envoie aux Sessions des différents organes de la FAO, a suivi de très près, d'une part l'exécution du programme de travail 1988-1989 mais aussi et surtout l'élaboration du projet de programme 1990-91. Il a donc eu largement le temps de faire part aux moments appropriés, de ses avis et recommandations à l'endroit des documents qui ont servi à l'élaboration du projet.

A la Conférence régionale de la FAO pour l'Afrique qui s'est tenue l'an dernier à l'île Maurice, la délégation malgache a joint sa voix à toutes celles des délégations présentes à cette conférence, pour lancer un appel vibrant à la Communauté internationale afin que le soutien accordé aux gouvernements des Etats africains soit plus intense, car la réalisation du programme des Nations Unies pour le redressement et le développement de l'Afrique connaît un retard important; aussi requiert-il beaucoup plus d'efforts.

L'on sait que dans le cadre dudit programme la FAO a élaboré pour le secteur de l'alimentation et de l'agriculture en Afrique un programme d'agriculture pour les 25 prochaines années qui, ayant reçu un appui vigoureux et unanime des Etats Membres, devrait connaître une mise en oeuvre effective et soutenue. Malheureusement tel n'est pas le cas, car trois années de suite l'Organisation a connu des difficultés financières sans précédent l'empêchant de répondre au pressant appel adressé par nos populations les plus démunies.

C'est en considérant et en ayant constamment à l'esprit les priorités de l'Afrique en particulier et celles de tous les pays en développement à bas revenu et déficit vivrier en général, que la délégation malgache a contribué activement aux différentes étapes de programmes de travail et budget 1990-91.

N'étant membre ni du Comité financier ni du Comité du programme nous n'avons pas participé à la session spéciale de janvier 1989 des deux comités mais nous avons examiné très attentivement les résultats de leurs travaux. Par contre, nous avons pris part à tous les travaux des autres comités techniques qui ont examiné le Programme de travail et budget, et, bien entendu, nous avons participé aux travaux de la 95^{ème} session du Conseil.

Partie prenante dans les conclusions de ces organes, nous n'éprouvons aucune difficulté à accorder notre appui au projet bien que nous continuions à regretter que la part du Programme de coopération technique ne représente que 11,5% du budget alors qu'elle représentait plus de 14% en 1986-87.

A signaler que le rapport du Comité financier au paragraphe 3.5 indique que sur 63 millions de dollars du biennium 1988-89, au 31 août il ne restait que 5 900 000 dollars alors que les demandes insatisfaites sont très nombreuses. Une raison de plus pour démontrer que le montant fixé pour le PCT est loin d'être exorbitant. Il est insuffisant et nous souhaiterions que dans l'avenir cette part du PCT dans le budget augmente sensiblement et approche et - sinon atteigne - les 17 ou 18% du budget.

Nous regrettons également que, en raison de différentes considérations, on ne puisse pas, dans le biennium à venir, remédier aux effets négatifs des réductions draconiennes opérées aux programmes 1988-89.

Le retard dans l'exécution des programmes et le manque à gagner persisteront donc malheureusement.

Devant ce tableau peu brillant et loin d'être encourageant peut-on encore se permettre d'insister sur le principe sacro-saint ou la religion pour certains de la croissance zéro? Une croissance réelle du budget de 0,45% serait-elle encore jugée exorbitante? Voudrait-on continuer à ignorer le mal causé par la suppression des programmes prioritaires correspondant à 45 millions de dollars?

Le dialogue a toujours existé au sein de cette Organisation et la volonté de coopération toujours manifeste, surtout sur les grands thèmes qui nous ont occupés et nous occupent actuellement. Les délégations, fort heureusement, ne sont pas ici pour s'affronter mais pour trouver ensemble les voies et moyens pour vaincre la pauvreté, la sous-alimentation et la faim. Employons-nous donc à faire le bilan de nos actions communes et à rechercher les actions appropriées aux lacunes et aux imperfections qui n'ont pas manqué de ternir les résultats de nos efforts conjugués. Les Comités financier et du programme, le groupe d'experts auxquels nous avons confié l'examen de la FAO et de la gestion de ses ressources nous confirment sans ambiguïté aucune que la FAO est une excellente institution technique et de développement, efficace et bien gérée. Cependant, pour garder ses qualités et s'acquitter de son mandat il faut d'une part qu'elle soit assurée de disposer de ressources suffisantes, mais, d'autre part, que des ressources habituelles soient accrues.

Au regard de ces affirmations rassurantes, on pourrait se poser la question de savoir à quoi aurait servi l'examen de la FAO si on continue à douter de la pertinence des propositions qui nous sont présentées, propositions qui ne sont que le résultat des recommandations que nous avons nous-mêmes formulées précédemment.

Dans son intervention de ce matin le Président du Comité du programme nous a informés de ce qu'au sein de ce Comité il y avait un agrément total sur la substance du programme. Dans ces conditions, nous pensons que la logique et le bon sens nous interdisent d'adopter une attitude négative à l'endroit d'un projet qui a recueilli un agrément total. La logique et le bon sens nous imposent donc le consensus dans son adoption.

Tawfik A.H. AL MESHHEDEANI (Iraq) (original language Arabic): Mr Chairman, I wish you every success, and I should like to congratulate the three Vice-Chairmen, who have the confidence of the Council. I should like to congratulate Mr Shah and to hail the excellent way he has presented this item. I should also like to thank the two Chairmen of the Programme and Finance Committees for helping the committees to come out with these fruitful results and for their proposals.

On considering the Programme of Work and Budget, we have found that the document is quite clear, particularly as regards the priority programmes, which has facilitated our understanding of the different programmes. We believe that there is a solid basis for the proposed programmes. For that reason, we support the priorities.

As for the budget level, we believe that great efforts have been deployed to reach this level.

As for the proposals, they are in conformity with the efforts deployed by our countries in order to overcome the problems relating to food and agriculture. We fully agree that we must increase the technical and economic programmes, including the Programme of Technical Cooperation, although we believe that the increase has been quite modest and does not correspond to the requirements of our countries.

On the other hand, we regret the support to be given by the TCP, because we depend on this proportion to a large extent. We believe that the approach adopted by the Director-General as far as the Programme of Work and Budget is concerned is quite responsible and takes into account the consensus and that the priority identification is very practical and accords with what could be applied; and, of course, all priorities have been taken into consideration.

In conclusion, we approve the Programme of Work and Budget and suggest that it be submitted to the Conference.

Igor MARINCEK (Suisse): J'aimerais d'abord, Monsieur le Président remercier Monsieur Shah ainsi que le Professeur Mazoyer et l'Ambassadeur Bukhari respectivement Présidents du Comité du programme et du Comité financier, de leur introduction de ce point de l'ordre du jour.

Notre Conseil est appelé à donner un premier préavis à la Conférence sur le Programme de travail et budget proposé pour 1990-91. Ce faisant il devra examiner les propositions du secrétariat sous les aspects suivants:

Premièrement : est-ce que le Programme de travail est bien orienté sur des priorités claires qui correspondent à une stratégie convaincante?

Deuxièmement, est-ce qu'il y a une concentration suffisante des activités proposées pour assurer une utilisation efficace des ressources?

Troisièmement, est-ce que la hauteur du budget proposée est justifiée, notamment en ce qui concerne les augmentations des coûts assez sensibles? Un premier constat s'impose: la structuration et la présentation du Programme de travail et budget ne laissent toujours pas ressortir assez clairement les priorités du programme. Le seul effort de priorisation visible concerne l'augmentation dite réelle du budget, c'est-à-dire 1/100ème de celui-ci. Par ailleurs, le nombre d'activités proposées, ceci sous forme d'élément de programme dans le grand programme deux, ou de programmes et sous-programmes dans le reste du Programme de travail et budget proposé, ne cesse d'augmenter. Nous comptons 310 éléments de programme pour le chapitre deux, soit une augmentation de 8 par rapport au programme en cours. Le nombre de programmes et sous-programmes proposé est de 150; dans le biennium actuel nous en comptons 147. C'est un indicateur que l'éparpillement des activités continue, ce qui a pour résultat une situation où de nombreuses activités restent en dessous du seuil de la masse critique. Cependant, il est sans doute trop tard pour faire à ce Conseil ou à la prochaine Conférence des changements profonds au programme de travail proposé. Nous devrions cependant décider à la 25ème conférence de réduire sensiblement le nombre d'activités d'ici deux ans c'est-à-dire pour le programme du budget 1992/93, réduction qui n'affecterait pas le niveau du budget 1992/93 et qui permettrait ainsi de redéployer un montant significatif d'années de travail au profit d'activités prioritaires dans lesquelles la FAO dispose d'un avantage comparatif.

Une telle approche nous paraît être indiquée pour renverser la tendance qui va à l'éparpillement croissant des ressources et qui risque de paralyser notre Organisation.

Le budget proposé pour le prochain biennium nous paraît trop élevé, les augmentations de coût réclamées pas clairement justifiées. D'abord, le budget ne tient pas suffisamment compte du fait qu'une certaine limite a été atteinte pour beaucoup de pays en ce qui concerne leur contribution obligatoire au système multilatéral. Ensuite, nous devons signaler que nous avons des problèmes avec le calcul du budget, en particulier avec les augmentations des coûts mais aussi avec l'abattement proposé pour délai de recrutement.

Ce dernier devrait à notre avis être adapté au taux moyen pendant le biennium en cours des vacances de poste effectives. Ce taux semble se situer autour des 10%. Il faut donc augmenter, et non pas diminuer le taux d'abattement pour délai de recrutement. Il en résulterait une diminution du budget de près de 20 millions de dollars.

Pour ce qui est du calcul des augmentations des coûts, il nous manque les indicateurs-clef nous permettant de vérifier leur bien-fondé. Par exemple, le taux d'inflation utilisé, l'augmentation des coûts de personnel en chiffres et non seulement en classes d'ajustement de poste etc.

Finalement, il y a un aspect structurel qu'il faut considérer quand nous regardons le calcul proposé pour les augmentations des coûts, notamment son élément de biennialisation. Il n'est pas possible de réorienter les activités de l'organisation aux nouvelles exigences auxquelles elle doit faire face, si l'on n'est pas disposé à toucher aux programmes hérités du passé.

Ce sont nous les pays membres qui devons décider si nous voulons limiter la marge de manoeuvre de notre Organisation pour réorienter ses programmes à la croissance dite réelle, ou si nous pensons au contraire qu'il est nécessaire d'augmenter la flexibilité de l'Organisation à sa capacité d'ajustement et de ce fait étendre sa marge de manoeuvre à l'essence de son programme.

Recalculer le Programme de travail et budget 1988/89 au prix actuel est un exercice qui nous lie trop au passé et qui renforce les inerties du Programme, ce qui favorise une utilisation peu efficace et peu économique des ressources. La seule méthode correcte à ce sujet serait à notre avis de partir des dépenses effectives dans le biennium en cours, mais on ne nous donne pas ces chiffres.

Il me semble utile de rappeler dans ce contexte que la Conférence adopte uniquement l'ouverture des crédits pour le budget ainsi que le programme de travail. Elle ne donne cependant aucune garantie pour le maintien des structures du Secrétariat. Etablir le nouveau programme en biennalisant les coûts de l'ancien programme de travail pour ensuite ajouter la croissance réelle et l'inflation prévue constitue cependant indirectement une telle garantie structurelle. Ainsi les variations des prix relatifs des ressources dont dispose ou auxquelles peut faire appel la FAO pour la mise en oeuvre des programmes perdent leur fonction régulatrice dans l'allocation efficace et économique des ressources de notre Organisation.

J'aimerais maintenant aborder la question de l'inflation prévue pour 1990/91. Le niveau de cette inflation et de l'augmentation des coûts correspondante étant hypothétique, nous pouvons soutenir les augmentations des coûts seulement si elles sont strictement liées à l'augmentation effective des coûts, vérifiée par le Commissaire aux comptes.

Ma délégation aimerait faire une proposition allant dans ce sens et qui concerne le projet de résolution sur l'ouverture des crédits pour 1990/91. Nous proposons plus précisément les changements suivants à cette résolution que nous pouvons trouver à la page LXIV du document C 89/3 en version française. Si nous regardons ce texte, nous proposons de ne pas changer le point 1., de ne rien changer en ce qui concerne le point 2.a). Pour les chiffres budgétaires, nous proposons de déduire du montant prévu du budget le chiffre pour l'inflation 1990/91, c'est-à-dire le chiffre de 45,1 milliards de dollars au taux de 1 235 liras par dollar. Donc nous ferions une déduction de ce montant et nous pourrions intercaler un nouveau 2.b), avant le 2.b) actuel, qui pourrait se lire comme suit: "un crédit supplémentaire de 45,094 millions de dollars (à ajuster au taux de change en vigueur du dollar lors du vote budgétaire) est ouvert pour faire face aux augmentations des coûts liées à l'inflation éventuelle pour la période 1990/91. L'Organisation est autorisée à utiliser ce crédit dans les limites de l'évolution effective des coûts. Cette évolution sera vérifiée par le Commissaire externe aux comptes".

Ensuite, le paragraphe 2.b) deviendrait le paragraphe 2.c) avec l'adaptation correspondante des chiffres, le paragraphe 2.c) deviendrait 2.d), etc.

Je suis disposé à donner le texte de cette modification au Secrétariat. Finalement, j'aimerais observer que l'estimation des recettes accessoires est très conservatrice. Elle repose par exemple sur un taux d'intérêt de 5,5 %. Or, actuellement le taux d'intérêt du dollar dépasse 8 % et la tendance n'est pas à la baisse.

Egalement l'estimation des recettes dites diverses semble être trop basse. Dans l'ensemble nous pensons que les recettes accessoires pourraient être plutôt estimées à 20 millions de dollars plutôt qu'à 12 millions de dollars.

LE DIRECTEUR GENERAL: Je n'ai pas lu la proposition de la Suisse mais je crois qu'elle n'est pas conforme à l'Acte constitutif de l'Organisation. L'Article VII de cet Acte stipule que le Directeur général a pleins pouvoirs et autorité pour diriger les travaux de l'Organisation, c'est-à-dire, inter alia, pour mettre en oeuvre le Programme de travail, sous le contrôle du Conseil et de la Conférence. Le vérificateur externe ne peut pas s'immiscer dans les prérogatives de l'exécutif et le Directeur général ne peut pas dépendre de lui dans des aspects essentiels de la gestion qui vont bien au-delà de la vérification des comptes. Le vérificateur externe a des fonctions qui s'exercent a posteriori; la gestion est par essence une fonction a priori.

La proposition suisse va très loin.

Si j'ai bien compris le représentant de la Suisse, il propose un budget inférieur de 20 millions de dollars, si l'on estime à 10 pour cent la proportion des postes vacants. En plus, vous faites une contre-proposition de budget réduit d'au moins 20, se ce n'est pas 30 ou 40 millions de dollars.

Igor MARINCEK (Suisse). Effectivement, j'ai abordé différents éléments: il y a des éléments concernant l'abattement pour vacance de poste puisque le taux utilisé est de 5,5 % actuellement. Une simple extrapolation - évidemment c'est au Secrétariat de donner les chiffres - permettrait de donner un chiffre. Avec 5,5 % qui correspond à une diminution de budget de 20 millions de dollars, l'extrapolation pourrait être de 20 millions de dollars en plus.

Raymond ALLEN (United Kingdom): I would like to thank Dr Shah for his helpful introduction, and also Professor Mazoyer and Ambassador Bukhari for their introductions on the work of the committees.

Taking first the medium-term objectives, our main comments on the technical contents of the paper have already been conveyed in the various technical committees. However, we note from the document that the deliberations of the various committees, at which programmes have been discussed during the year, seem to have little influence on the budgetary proposals. On the other hand, the accompanying text does appear to have been expanded in places to take account of some of the major concerns.

Turning first to the agriculture programme, the introduction to the programme provided a useful overview of the long-term trends which may be expected in world agriculture and the goals and strategies to be adopted in facing anticipated future problems. In this analysis we are particularly pleased to see the increased emphasis being placed on the importance of improved agricultural policy planning in many countries to accommodate both complex internal and external changes in the economic and social environments in which they are likely to occur. We fully support the view that this will become an increasingly important area of real work for the future in which FAO will have an increasingly valuable role to play through the provision of advice and the options, policies and strategies needed to promote equitable growth.

We are also pleased to see the renewed emphasis which has been placed on the importance of establishing a strong institutional base in developing countries. Not only to provide support through the continued development of agriculture, but also to support increased development of a sounder management system for resource base. This is rapidly becoming a practical problem of major concern in many countries as populations continue to expand and fears for the environment continue to grow. Institutional strengthening at national level will be an essential component in any future plans if the inevitable conflict between the need for more food and the protection of the environment - particularly in marginal lands - is to be checked. Appropriate institutional strengthening at both policy and technical levels is again an area of work in which we feel FAO has particularly valuable expertise to offer as part of the overall international effort in this important field.

The priority which has been accorded to the alleviation of rural poverty and the promotion of equality and development is also very welcome. The widening inequality between rich and poor and the growing evidence that large sections of rural societies have tended not to benefit from technological improvements, is again an area of increasing concern in most countries and requires a concentrated effort for successful intervention. In this respect specific reference to the need to develop economic and social opportunities for women in agriculture in a number of individual work programmes is encouraging, and we believe essential, for the sustainability of the development process.

It appears from the Director-General's introduction, and from the table on page 31 of the document that in the Forestry sector there has been little attempt to address the real issue of relative priority and funding provision between sectors. The proportion of the regular programme budget to forestry has not improved in terms of actual increased allocation. Agriculture receives a much larger increase than has been afforded to forestry. This is despite the great expansion of activity called for in the forestry sector, much of it related to conserving the

environmental and natural resource base for agriculture. The relative balance of funding between different elements within the forestry programme is acceptable. However, this is not the real point of issue and to analyse it in detail would distract attention from the main issue. All aspects of the forestry programme need strengthening.

Paragraph 10 on page 180 also seems to miss the essential point. It is not only forestry policies which need review and reorientation, but governmental policies bearing on the forestry sector.

As I said earlier, we have already presented our technical comments on the individual work programmes at the various fora. However, we remain concerned with the overall magnitude and broad scope of the programmes, and while appreciating the efforts which have so far been made in rationalizing several components, we suggest that this should be seen as an ongoing process. A formidable task lies ahead if our efforts to develop agriculture growth on a sustainable basis is to succeed. For this to be achieved care will need to be taken to ensure that the available resources are not spread over too wide a field of endeavor to be effective, but are carefully focused on key priorities to achieve maximum effect.

Turning now to the budget itself, my delegation agrees that our aim should be a programme and budget approved by the Conference by consensus. Of course, the budget which the Conference will eventually pass will be based on the Director-General's proposals in document C 89/3 and include such variations and expenditure patterns in the biennium as arise from the implementation of the review. The British Government is able to support only budgets of specialized agencies which show zero real growth in those activities funded from assessed contributions. Zero real growth must mean no programme growth as measured by methods of calculations of cost increases traditionally used within that organization. Our view is to compare like with like. I notice from paragraph 4 (18) of the programme framework on page 41 that the methodology for calculation of cost increases in 1990/91 is the same as that for 1988/89 and approved by the Finance Committee, Council and Conference.

There are clearly some shifts of programme and budget activities, but it is actually hard to see how far they are marginal and how far they are radical. There are also some reorganizations such as the transfer of agrometeorology to research and technology development division, but it is not clear what other possible changes have been considered. Since the programme part describes all activities FAO hopes to undertake (field programmes as well as regular programmes), it is not clear from the budget part what activities are geared essentially to success in building or carrying out a larger field programme, or what are basically either invariant regular programme activities or tooling up to provide the technical backup for field programme activity. Implied funding from different sources for the programme, is set out by sub-programmes such as crops, livestock, etc. There is little indication of the distribution of regular programme paid staff and other resources to the various activities within each sub-programme. It is not clear in most cases how far the regular programme provision of staff and resources depends upon a corresponding volume of extra-budgetary resources provided by recipient governments, UNDP, or other donors.

Much is said about shared responsibility for shared activities, and about internal coordination. However, I have the impression that all of this is to be achieved by special working parties or coordinating groups.

The need for such groups is itself often an indication that something is organizationally wrong. A regrouping and redefinition of responsibilities may lead to much less time spent on these joint working parties, especially since certain skills cannot successfully be duplicated in every technical division.

Turning now to some specific elements in the budget, I have some queries concerning the increases in the proposed budget which relate to the consistency of approach. Upon the answer will depend the extent to which we can support this budget when it comes before the Conference. The budget calls for an extra US\$ 14 million to cover the eventual results of the International Civil Service Commission Survey on conditions of service of staff in professional and higher categories. As mentioned by my US colleague this morning the General Assembly have not commented on the report and there is no guarantee as to what the results of their comments will be.

Consequently, there is no financial provision for the Report in the regular budget of the United Nations.

On page XLI we are told that the cost increases take account of the measurable impact of approved changes in scales for professional staff and changes in allowances as and when approved by the authorization body concerned. I read from that that the practice of the past has been not to make provision for possible salary increases. May the Council please have details of the

practice in FAO in the past when we have been faced with expected increases? Have we always tackled these increases as ones which should be absorbed, as the United States delegate said this morning again; or have we found a way which combines propriety with prudence, by agreeing a provision which is only authorized by the Council following completion action by the General Assembly?

Document C 89/3-Sup.4 refers to the application of the lapse factor, with the proposal that this be reduced from 5.5 percent to 3 percent. The paper gives us a comparison of the rates used in other UN organizations. We do not consider that comparisons of this kind serve any useful purpose since situations vary from one to another. However, I should like to point out that the 5 percent lapse factor is quoted for UNIDO. This is indeed normal practice, but the Director-General increased the factor to 9 percent on the regular budget and left it at 5 percent on the operational budget. The budget was accordingly reduced by the relevant amount, and this was treated as a reduction in real terms.

A consistent approach has been called for in Member Nations' attitudes to the various organs of the United Nations, and if these were adopted in this case the reduction in the lapse factor would have the effect of increasing the budget in real terms.

If there is an actual reduction in the level of unfilled vacancies, then this growth represents expansion towards agreed budget levels. However, if there is no change in vacancy levels this growth represents a real increase in the budget. We are given little or no evidence in the document that the level of unfilled vacancies has fallen, and hopes of a lower level of turnover in the future are hardly a basis for any change. Only if it can be shown that the present lapse factor has resulted in budgeted posts remaining unfilled due to the lack of resources can there be a case for a reduction in the lapse factor. Even then, we consider that a gradual reduction only would be more prudent.

Regarding the absorption of cost increases of \$3 million for consultants, travel and staff upgrading, I seem to recall that it was agreed in 1988/89 that efficiency savings would be made in these areas. Therefore, no inflation adjustment is made on these items in the currently proposed budget. The inference from this is that the price increases of \$3 million would be off-set by efficiency savings of \$3 million, such that the same level of programme activities can be maintained with the same level of resources. However, if one subtracts the \$3 million from the real increases as has been proposed, this implies that the price increases are met not by efficiency savings but by a reduction in the level of programme activities. This gives the lower growth rate.

It therefore appears that the case for claiming the lower growth rate of the budget rests on the acceptance of a lower level of efficiency and the use of resources than has already been agreed.

We should also welcome some clarification of the methodology used for working out the post adjustment factor. As I understand it, it all depends on movements in relative costs of living and exchange rates. I should therefore welcome some clarification of why an inflation factor has been built in.

We welcome the outline budget process and support the Finnish and United States comments on this.

Gerhard LIEBER (Germany, Federal Republic of): Mr Chairman, first allow me to express my pleasure at having the opportunity of working again under your able guidance here in the Council.

My delegation thanks Mr Shah and the Chairmen of the Programme and Finance Committees for their introduction to this item, the Programme of Work and Budget for the coming biennium, which is one of the most important items on our agenda.

My Government would like to thank the Director-General and the Secretariat for the well prepared budget document, which compares well with budget documents of other United Nations specialized agencies. However, before giving our final opinion on the budget before us we should like to touch up a few items and ask a few questions.

First, let me state quite clearly that my Government agrees in principle to the priorities FAO intends to establish for the coming biennium. However, the parts of the document describing new priorities deal in great detail with what FAO has done so far, and in our opinion too little with what it intends to do in the future. In particular, the items Policy Advice and Sustainable Development, which have been given considerable attention in the report on the current biennium, give us the impression that here primarily verbal shifts in priorities took place. This impression is intensified by the fact that in some cases the same programme elements and/or sub-programmes are listed under the activities for different new priorities.

As far as Policy Advice is concerned, the Director-General in his statement to the Ninety-fourth Council Session expressed his concern - and rightly so - about FAO's reduced role in this important field. The role of FAO is also reflected in the fact that FAO carries out policy advice only in half a dozen countries while the World Bank claims to do so in more than seventy countries.

Expert Group No. 1 states in its very informative report, in paragraphs 2.23 and 2.24, that FAO is being too passive in this field in having often left alone developing countries in the process of structural adjustment. In the same direction goes the more general criticism of the Jansson report of the field programmes within the framework of the United Nations, which states the lack of analytical work and pathfinding studies in developing countries. This should have been the task of FAO in the very important field of agricultural policy. We expect FAO's positive response in this field in the future.

My Government has some similar concerns about the very important priority - Sustainable Development. We shall come back to that later.

As we read it, there is a marked increase in funds for the TCP. Here we are again in agreement with the report of Expert Group No. 1 which suggests that a smaller number of but better prepared projects should be carried out. In view of the fact that the TCP comprises 10 percent of the on the whole very positive and good field activities of the FAO, the view that additional funds for the TCP would probably be of greater benefit to developing countries in other programmes of the FAO is in our opinion at least worth discussing.

The same expert group also suggests that the regional offices should assume the last place as regards funding priorities. In view of this, and of the tight budget situation it is not very comprehensible why the same resources in real terms are made available to the regional offices as in the current biennium.

Some sub-programmes of FAO show cost increases which are still not quite clear to my Government. I give you two examples: the 20 percent growth in Establishment Entitlement, and the 30 percent plus growth in the resources for the Conference. We would be very grateful for some more detailed information.

We are also concerned about the proposed change of the lapse factor. This element for budget calculation - a very important one - should follow the real situation as closely as possible. If it is set too low, over-budgeting is the unavoidable result.

We should also be very grateful for some more indepth information on how the real budget increase will go down from 1 percent to 0.45 percent by the absorption of \$3 million from the resources calculated to compensate cost increases.

David COUTTS (Australia): It is a pleasure to be back at the Council. It is a couple of years since I have had the pleasure of attending a Council meeting. I congratulate you and am pleased to see you in the Chair again, and I congratulate the Vice-Chairmen on their election. Just before I comment on this item, Mr Chairman, with your indulgence I should just like to thank the Council on behalf of our Minister, Mr Kerin. I did not raise my flag before because I thought it would be quicker if I did it now. He did ask me to thank the Council on the assumption that they were going to agree to forward his nomination before the Conference. He is very much looking forward to coming to Chair the Conference. He is certainly going to endeavour to do his best to make the Conference a success. There will be many challenges and he is looking forward to that.

Turning to the item, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take too long, Australia has been on the Finance Committee and we have had the opportunity to make our views known a number of times during the preparation of this Programme of Work and Budget. Overall we are satisfied with the documentation that has been provided, and we are certainly satisfied with the assistance that we have received from the Secretariat as the process has developed. FAO is a complicated organization; 'complex' may perhaps be a better word. No matter how much information you provide, there is always something else which somebody wants to see. One has to balance that against the realities and the costs of providing that.

In relation to the priorities and the substance of the Programme, Australia is broadly supportive of what is in the document. We have no particular problem. We are pleased to see that there is continuing and increasing concentration of policy analysis and advice. That has been an area which we have been supporting for some considerable time, for much the same reasons as have been given already by one or two other delegates, that we think that it is absolutely vital that, where an organization such as FAO is providing both technical assistance and general advice, this has got to be done within the context of a policy framework, or with a consciousness of the policy framework that is going to assist the adjustments that are necessary in a number of countries receiving this assistance. This will come again in the Review, so I will not belabour it any more. However, we are certainly happy to see that emphasis.

We are also happy to see the emphasis on a number of other things. I will not mention them all, but certainly sustainable development in the environment is one to which I think it is absolutely self-evident FAO has to give considerable attention to. Again, we shall come back to that when we look at the Review, because it is something we suggest there.

We are also pleased to see the continuing work on women and rural community development generally in the WCARRD programme and, perhaps, what is going to be done in future on that. It does underline to us though that FAO does need to approach its work with some degree of flexibility because, while there are these priorities, they can change fairly sharply. On the whole, we think that the Programme has evolved fairly flexibly in the sort of direction, and we are pleased to see that. FAO has been taking up things like forestry and pesticides, and other matters as they come along. I think it is important that it has flexibility to continue to respond to that. These are some other issues on the horizon which would not be reflected in this Programme, but which we would like to think FAO will have the flexibility to respond to if it is necessary. One of these which will, I think, come up here and during the Conference is the issue of driftnet fishing in the Pacific. I am not suggesting that anything should be in the Programme on that now, but it is an issue which is around. It is related to the sustainable development issue. We should like to think that the Organization, if there is a need to get involved in that issue, can respond flexibly.

In relation to the Budget itself, Australia has made clear on a number of occasions that we support zero real growth, maximum cost absorption. This Budget does not strictly conform to that formula. However, I was just talking about flexibility, and I think there is a lot of discussion to go on the Budget and on the Review. I think my country's position still has to be finally decided when we have those discussions all the way through. However, our policy is zero real growth and maximum cost absorption. One of the problems though is that figures can be very difficult things on which to get agreement, or even agreement on what they mean. There has been a number of comments on the cost increase and what that reflects. I agree with the UK delegate, that although there are some concerns that I have about the way that FAO does its sums here - not that there is anything incorrect about them, but it is a complex calculation. That is the way it is traditionally done and the Finance Committee is satisfied that it has been done on a consistent basis. We think that is the correct way to do it.

There is one issue there, however, which I think is also worth flogging. I am pleased to hear that it has been mentioned a couple of times. It is this allowance for additional cost in the next biennium which will result if there is approval of the salary reviews that are going in the United Nations. They are reasonably significant amounts of money. I think 8 million dollars is the figure I recall from our discussions earlier. I will be interested to hear Mr Shah's answer

on that question by the UK, because, as I understand it, if we had not known, or made allowances for that at this time - say, there was a very big question mark over whether that would be approved by the UN, but then it turned out that in the middle of next year that increase was approved, then eventually that would work its way in the biennialization aspect. Maybe Mr Shah needs to clarify that for us.

Presumably, as far as my country is concerned, if we did approve that 8 million dollars and then the UN did not vote for that increase, then we would expect that money not to be spent on other things. I mean, the money has been voted, if we voted for that purpose, and I am not quite sure what the end result would be if, in fact, it was not voted for, or all of it was not voted for, by the UN, but we had included it in our Budget. Maybe Mr Shah would be able to clarify that for us.

TCP: I would just like to remind the group also that money for TCP on the basis that the budget is not going down, it is going up, both in terms of the cost increases and in real terms. It is going down as a percentage of the overall budget. That is the decision that the Conference will have to make, but if you want to put it up to 18 percent of figures that have been mentioned, then, of course, you have got to say what you are going to cut in order to do that. As far as we are concerned, we support the TCP as a programme. We have always indicated some concern though that its resources should not be increased too dramatically. That is not to deny the need that it exists in developing countries for those sorts of programme, but the question as to the experts, whether TCP is the best way to provide always this type of assistance. We shall talk more again about TCP in the Review, so I will not say more about it now.

The lapse factor has been mentioned too. I should just like to mention that quickly. The Finance Committee did discuss it, as Ambassador Bukhari mentioned. As he also mentioned, we completely failed to agree in any fashion whatsoever about that item, and we have passed that all to the Council. In a way, that is a pity because it is really our job to make a clear recommendation, but it was not something we could agree on. My own position on that, however, was that FAO has managed for twenty years or more on a lapse factor of 5.5 percent, and I have not seen any arguments that convince me in the smallest fashion that there is any special reason now why we need to change that figure.

It will lead to an increase in the Budget, I think, of 18, 19 million dollars. I am just completely at a loss to understand why we want to complicate, an already complicated task by bringing that matter into it at this time. Five point five percent means that about one position in 19 is vacant on average. I just do not think that is an excessively large number of vacancies. I think if the Organization can run with only one position in 19 vacant, then it has got a very stable staff structure; indeed, too stable, because hardly anyone would be leaving on that basis, and I do think you need a gradual turnover in an organization.

I think that is just about all I wanted to say. I would just finally reiterate our position on the Budget. I have said what it is basically. In our minds there is a linkage though to what we decide to do on the Review, and that is the reason why I think these two issues have to be seen together in the context of this particular Conference. I think that is an issue that Commission II will have to look at too, how it deals with those two issues side by side. So, Australia is still prepared to talk about the Budget at this stage, but it does depend on what happens on the Review.

Huang YONGNING (China) (original language Chinese): Mr Chairman, thank you for giving me the floor. Firstly, the Chinese delegation is delighted to see you again in the Chair presiding over our meeting, and wishes to express its appreciation to Mr Shah and the Chairmen of the Programme and Finance Committee for their presentation of the document on the PWB.

I should now like to express our views on the document: the Summary Programme of Work and Budget for 1990-91 was reviewed at the 95th Session of the Council last June. We are now reviewing the final Programme of Work and Budget for the next biennium. We have noticed that, first, the next programme remains at US\$ 5.5 million. Secondly, the cost increase of US\$ 16 million has resulted from the natural increase in Personnel cost. We believe that the budget level in the final PWB

is determined by the DG taking into consideration the comments made by the Council and other fora. The final PWB was examined by the Programme and the Finance Committees in September. We have taken note also of the views of the two Committees contained in their Report to the Council. Therefore, we endorse the submission of the PWB to the Conference for approval.

The Chinese delegation will further state its views in Commission II during the Conference and we shall work together with other delegates to have the PWB improved by the Conference. Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Atif Y. BUKHARI (Kingdom of Saudi Arabia) (original language Arabic): I thank you, Sir, for giving me the floor. We should like to tell you that we are particularly pleased to see, once again, you chairing this Council session. As a member of the Finance Committee, I do not feel I need to go into the details of the PWB for 1990-91, but I would like to explain my country's attitude and position. I am sure you realize the PWB is, for FAO, the very backbone and basis of the Organization's work for survival. Thanks to this, it is able to contribute to helping developing countries.

From our viewpoint and from the viewpoint of developing countries in general, the PWB is the most important issue for discussion by the general Conference. It rates far and above all others. Consequently, Mr Chairman, I think we must realize that this is of great significance before discussing the others and I very much hope that the adoption of this PWB is carried out on the basis of a consensus, bearing in mind the measures taken concerning the priorities. This has all been examined by the Programme and Finance Committees and the Director-General in drafting the PWB, clearly did give due consideration to the guidance and recommendation of the governing bodies. He took into account the view of the regional conferences, too, and he did not fail to give account to the wishes of developing countries as regards the increase in the budget, and the appeal of developing countries. The end product, Mr Chairman, is to be found here in this clearly limited budget which is what might be described as a psychological budget.

Thirdly, there is no denying that developing countries will be duty bound to give their approval to this budget level for 1990/91, in full awareness of the fact that this budget will not fully answer their wishes for a better agricultural and food organization. We must remember that the developing countries, we, the developing countries, Mr Chairman, realize that there is a constant increase in demand from the developed countries, the industrial countries, they have increased their demands of recent years, particularly as regards further meetings and documents and the Organization will have to play a key role here, there and everywhere, and these new requests, which we hear in developing countries from the developed countries, are accompanied by other insidencies, that is that the Organization should not increase its budget level.

I would go further to these countries, the developed countries, and ask the Organization to absorb increased costs and the effects of inflation. So, Mr Chairman, dear brethren, what remains to be done to help the developing countries. There is no denying that we all fully realize that the interest shown by industrialized countries in our Organization and interest which has increased over recent years, is clear evidence, I say, that this power organization is playing a vital role as regards giving assistance to developing countries.

Now, as regards increased agricultural production, they are trying to help countries become self-reliant. Nevertheless, we ask the developing countries, Mr Chairman, to restrict their interest to certain issues so that the Organization can carry its humanitarian message to all corners of the world. Mr Chairman, the inflation rate and increased costs are tangible realities which we are all bound to acknowledge. Everyone, including the Secretariat, knows that this is an issue that was debated at length and is being debated again and again. Indeed, these criteria governing increased costs were discussed in the Finance Committee, an important committee which depends upon Council. They have also been discussed by external governmental committees, representing many countries. We must say that the criteria involved are not all that clear to decipher because the subject is complex, the Organization after all does not just work out of Italy, it works in all the corners of the globe.

Now, Mr Chairman, I would like to highlight the fact, and we refer to the famous 14 million that some members have questioned. We heard a member of the Finance Committee, that is Mr Coutts of Australia, stress the fact that the United Nations is going to revise this question and that there is in fact a study underway, and we believe that the present trend is that proposals concerning increased salaries of professional staff be adopted with full financial implications. We ask Council members who raise this question of the 14 million dollars, I say we would like to say to them that if the Organization does not include this figure in its budget estimate for the coming biennium, what will be the situation if the decision is in fact taken. This means that we will ask the Director-General to introduce further lapse factors affecting the programme in order to cover this shortfall. That is something we cannot expect.

In concluding, Mr Chairman, the delegation of Saudi Arabia expresses its determined support for the Programme of Work and Budget for the coming biennium. This decision has been taken, because we are appreciative of the lofty objectives of the Organization and what it has done over recent years. This decision is also the result of our support for the Director-General. We appreciate the tireless efforts he has engaged in in preserving the Organization and its paving its way for the future, enabling it to carry its message to developing countries in order to guarantee food security which will be lasting. Thank you, Sir.

Bahar MDNIP (Malaysia): Thank you, Mr Chairman, for giving me the floor. First of all, allow me to join other delegates in expressing my delight in seeing you again in the Chair, Sir, and also to your newly elected Vice-Chairmen. We are confident that this Council will be concluded successfully under your very able leadership. Thanks are also due to Messrs Shah, Mazoyer and Bukhari for their clear explanations.

Mr Chairman, my delegation considers this agenda item, the Programme of Work and Budget for the next biennium, 1990-91, as the most important item in this session of the Council. As it has been emphasized by many delegations and without any further constraint, this Programme of Work and Budget should get the support and approval of all. My delegation has read the documents which reflect the fact that the Director-General and his staff have taken every measure to formulate a proposal which is acceptable to all under this very difficult economic situation and tight financial squeeze. They have put in the forefront their great wisdom and judgement to reflect their needs and priorities, and having in mind the urgency and magnitude of the problems of food and agricultural development of the developing countries, the constraints consequential to sufficiency and resources and the capacity of the Organization to fulfil its mandate.

Mr Chairman, my delegation wishes therefore to congratulate the Director-General and his staff for having realistically examined and prepared this programme proposal.

As he indicated in the proposal, this Programme of Work and Budget was formulated after critical and serious examination, taking into account the urgent demands of the developing countries, after extensive dialogue among members and after other consultative steps had been taken.

My delegation does not want to go into a deeper examination of the proposals because we feel that, in the present situation, the Director-General has put forward what appears to us an acceptable proposal, though with the barest minimum budget level. There has been minimum increase of the budget level to ensure minimum negative effect vis à vis the programmes. There has been a humble increase of 1 percent, which is equivalent to an increase of half, or less than half, a percent in real programme. There has been a reduction of TCP from 12.8 percent to 11.8 percent. We only hope that this will not be the case in the future. We feel that zero growth should not be applied to an agency like FAO which plays an important role in the alleviation of hunger and malnutrition in the world.

If we consider carefully the actions taken by the Director-General and his staff in preparing the proposals summarized here, in which he has trimmed the budget for greater efficiency and economy and to shift his programme activities to boost technical and economic programmes, we would agree that this proposal would result in the implementation of priority programmes with the aim of increasing efficiency and optimum utilization of resources. We agree with the nine priority areas as envisaged in this Programme of Work and Budget.

In view of the fact that this proposal has been closely examined by both the Programme and Finance Committees, and in view of the constructive way that this proposal was prepared to give thrust and balance to the Programme, my delegation gives its full support to the proposals of the Programme of Work and Budget, especially with regard to the level of budget, and the strategies and priorities in the Organization's Programme for the next biennium.

Sra. Laurie CORDUA CRUZ (Nicaragua): Considerando que es la primera vez que mi Delegación hace uso de la palabra, quisiera aprovechar la oportunidad para expresarle nuestra satisfacción por verle presidir nuevamente nuestras labores. Igualmente felicitamos a los Vicepresidentes por su elección. También quisiera agradecer al Sr. Shah y a los Presidentes del Comité del Programa y de Finanzas la presentación que hicieron esta mañana del tema que nos ocupa.

Señor Presidente, si bien consideramos que el aumento del presupuesto propuesto no compensa los efectos de los recortes de años anteriores, que como es de todos conocido, asciende a 45 millones de dólares, sí lamentamos la reducción del uno por ciento en la asignación al TCP, Programa que consideramos tiene importancia fundamental como instrumento eficaz para responder a las necesidades urgentes en nuestros países. No obstante esto, Sr. Presidente, mi Delegación,

apreciando la labor y esfuerzos realizados por el Director General para presentarnos una propuesta del Programa de Labores y Presupuesto realista y que pueda gozar del amplio consenso, espera, tal como lo han expresado la mayoría de las Delegaciones que me han precedido en el uso de la palabra, que el Consejo recomiende a la Conferencia la aprobación del Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para el bienio 1990-91 por consenso.

Por otra parte, Sr. Presidente, mi Delegación desea expresar que rechaza la solicitud de una mayor absorción de costos. Consideramos que esto, aunado a la crisis financiera sin precedentes que atraviesa la FAO por la falta de pago del mayor contribuyente, tendría graves efectos sobre nuestra Organización.

Para finalizar, Señor Presidente, la Delegación de Nicaragua reitera su apoyo al Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para el bienio 1990-91 y rechaza cualquier vinculación de la aprobación del mismo con la discusión de otros temas.

Jang Bae YOUNG (Korea, Republic of): Mr Chairman, like other delegates, I should like to express our pleasure at seeing you once again in the Chair of this important session of the Council. As we are all aware, the agenda before us is one of the most important and challenging items in this session. However, we believe that, under your able guidance, as you have shown in many previous sessions, our meeting will produce fruitful outcomes and thereby reach a final conclusion, as all Member Nations desire.

I should also like to congratulate the three Vice-Chairmen on their unanimous election and to express our appreciation to Mr Shah and the Chairmen of the Finance and Programme Committees for their clear and succinct presentations and valuable remarks.

May I now make some brief comments on this agenda item?

Firstly, my delegation would like to express its compliments on the efforts made by the Secretariat in the course of preparing the Programme of Work and Budget proposals, such as improvements in form and structure and enhancement of budgetary transparency and the reduction of unnecessary expenditures.

Secondly, on the issue of budget level, we feel that the 1.1 percent increase is not sufficient to meet the increasing demand for agricultural development in developing countries. However, taking into consideration the financial difficulties of the Member Nations, as well as FAO's efforts for management improvement, we are of the opinion that the proposed budget is an acceptable one. Therefore, we fully endorse the Director-General's proposals.

In this regard, we should like to add our voice to the appeal for the unanimous adoption of the proposal at the forthcoming Conference.

Finally, my delegation believes that the nine programme priorities in the Programme of Work and Budget will reflect current needs for world agricultural development. We therefore fully support the priorities proposed by FAO. However, we should like to place special emphasis on priorities such as sustainable development, biotechnology and women in development. We hope that particular consideration will be given to for future budget allocations in this regard.

Ilja HULINSKY (Czechoslovakia): My delegation's remarks on the Programme of Work and Budget 1990-91 may be brief ones. We have noticed that some of our comments made in the FAO Council on the Summary Programme of Work and Budget have been reflected in the final documentation for the Twenty-fifth Session of the Conference, namely in the Director-General's draft of the full Programme of Work and Budget for 1990-91 and in the Report of the Programme and Finance Committee. We would wish that there should be enough time left for exchange of opinions on conclusions of the review of certain aspects of FAO's goals and operations, the relevant documents on that item having been for the first time on the Council's agenda.

Therefore, I have just four remarks to make at this stage.

First, on the proposed budget level, the Czechoslovak delegation is aware of the fact that the budget level had been formulated, from the very beginning of preparations of the outline of the budget for 1990-91. In extensive dialogue between Member States and the Secretariat, with the manifested intent of securing a consensus. That was the reason why we agreed at the Ninety-fifth Session of the Council to request the Director-General to proceed with the preparation of the final draft on the full Programme of Work and Budget on the basis of the document CL 95/3, inclusive of the budget level proposed in it.

While reserving our definitive position for the Twenty-fifth Conference of FAO, the Czechoslovak delegation would like to express its general support for the Programme of Work and Budget contained in document C 89/3, both for its substance and priorities, as well as for the proposed budget level.

Secondly, on procedure, in preparation of the Programme of Work and Budget 1990-91 a new procedure has been applied on an experimental basis. It is now suggested that the same procedure, i.e. a three-stage Programme of Work and Budget - the outline, the summary and the full PWB - be continued for at least another biennium so that its value can be judged over a longer time period.

As for the Czechoslovak delegation, we reiterate our position that we will endorse the continuation of this process, especially should it be clear from the outcome of the Twenty-fifth Session of the Conference that the new procedure would pave the way for consensus.

Thirdly, on resources, I am sorry that I have to raise again the problem of potential additional resources, which can be of help in covering both the material supplies and the services to field programmes, apart from the possibilities of being used for FAO's training programmes in the present difficult financial situation of our Organization. I am speaking of the UNDP accounts in national currencies that have been accumulated from several governments' voluntary contributions to the UNDP over a long period of years.

The Czechoslovak delegation strongly believes that it is more than time to get rid of the anachronistic political approach in that respect dating from the cold war period. Along with UNDP, FAO could, and should, do more than it has done until now within the IPF for utilization of these resources, following the example of UNIDO and WHO. I am using this opportunity to draw the attention of my colleagues from the Group of 77 to this problem, seeking their support in this matter. At the same time, the Czechoslovak delegation would like to suggest to the Director-General that he considers initiating the discussion of solving this question with the UNDP Administrator.

Fourthly, with reference to priorities, the Czechoslovak delegation has already endorsed the nine priorities of our programme of work. I will comment on just one aspect of our selected priorities. While taking into account that the requirements of the small farm sector will remain FAO's primary concern, the Czechoslovak delegation would welcome the increased assistance of FAO to the large farming sector. At the last Council's session we made known in detail why we share the position explained in document CL 95/3, namely, that it is necessary for FAO to meet the growing demand of member countries for information related to management techniques of large farms and to strengthen FAO's assistance to the large-scale farming sub-sector in developing countries. This is in order that the large farm units can become economically viable. We are also of the opinion that FAO should provide for the exchange of experiences concerning management practices of large farms operating in different countries. Our position was supported and reflected in the last Council's report (document CL 95/Rep). We are happy to note that it has been recalled in the Fifty-eighth Session of the Programme Committee (document CL 96/4) and elaborated upon in the draft full Programme of Work and Budget for 1990-91 (document C 89/3).

The Czechoslovak delegation to the Twenty-fifth Session of the General Conference would like to put forward further initiative in that respect: namely, the organization of training courses in Czechoslovakia on large-scale farm management to be offered through FAO to interested managers of large farms and assistants in developing countries. These courses will not favour a certain structural model. They will be purely technical and practical, based on the presumption that the economically viable management of large farms in different countries possesses a great number of common features. The organization of these training courses, may become one of the components of the concrete response to growing requests for information related to techniques of large farm and estate management, as mentioned in the Sub-programme 2.1.1.2 paragraph 30 of proposed full Programme of Work and Budget for 1990-91.

With that I shall limit my remarks on the item under discussion. The Czechoslovak delegation to the Twenty-fifth Session of the Conference will have sufficient opportunity to elaborate our position concerning aspects of the Programme of Work and Budget for the next biennium.

LE PRESIDENT: Avant de donner la parole au Représentant du Canada, je voudrais signaler au Conseil que 14 autres orateurs sont actuellement inscrits pour participer au débat sur cette question. Je demande donc au Conseil s'il souhaite poursuivre ce soir, en séance supplémentaire, le débat sur le budget afin de permettre de consacrer plus de temps à la question du rôle de la FAO ou s'il veut que nous arrêtions le débat à 17 h 30 pour le reprendre demain matin.

Gonzalo BULA HOTOS (Coloabia): Primero que todo, sería conveniente conocer la lista para que cada delegado sepa en qué turno está, y luego pensamos que como hoy es el primer día de nuestros trabajos, podríamos atenernos al horario convenido, y a partir de mañana tomar cualquier decisión fuera de ese horario.

LE PRESIDENT: Y a-t-il un avis contraire?

Il y a donc 14 délégués inscrits mais nous aimerions avoir la liste complète des orateurs de manière à bien organiser notre travail. Pour le moment, les orateurs inscrits sont les suivants: Canada, Grèce, Kenya, Libye, Philippines, Trinité-et-Tobago, Congo, Italie, Japon, Brésil, Mexique, Pakistan, Argentine et France.

Y a-t-il d'autres délégués qui désirent prendre la parole? Algérie, Gabon, Indonésie, Hongrie, Guinée, Lesotho, Inde et Angola.

Du fait que le temps est limité, je propose que les délégués qui ont déjà parlé ne reprennent pas la parole afin d'éviter de prolonger le débat, à moins que ce ne soit indispensable à la suite des réponses du Secrétariat.

Je m'excuse auprès du délégué de l'Iran mais je crois qu'il a pris la parole ce matin. Désire-t-il la prendre à nouveau?

Taghi SHIRVANIAN (Iran, Islamic Republic of): Pardon me, I will do it tomorrow morning.

LE PRESIDENT: Nous avons encore actuellement 22 orateurs. Je propose que ceux qui ont pris la parole ne la reprennent plus. Autrement, nous risquons de ne pas avoir assez de temps pour consacrer deux jours, comme je l'ai promis aux délégués de la Suisse et des Etats-Unis d'Amérique, à l'analyse du rôle de la FAO.

Nous avons beaucoup de travail à effectuer et je compte sur la compréhension des délégués qui ont déjà parlé pour qu'ils ne reprennent pas la parole.

Je considère que la liste des orateurs est close. Cela fera au total 45 délégués qui auront pris la parole. Il me semble que c'est un nombre très important.

Earl W. WETBRECHT (Canada): We are pleased to see you in the chair directing our proceedings during this Council session. I wish to thank Mr Shah, along with the Chairmen of the Programme and Finance Committees, for their introduction to this agenda item.

Through our participation in the committees on Agriculture and Fisheries, as well as in the June Council session, we have had an opportunity to comment upon earlier proposals contained in the Summary of the Programme of Work and Budget. Also, as a member of the Programme Committee we participated in the examination of the outline, as well as the summary, and the final Programme of Work and Budget proposals.

Nevertheless, my delegation welcomes this further opportunity to share its views on a number of proposed elements during this Council session. The Canadian delegation would like to compliment the Secretariat for the improvements made in the content and format of the Director-General's Programme of Work and Budget for the 1990/91 biennium. The incorporation of tables with the programme elements facilitates the assessment of activities and the identification as to where adjustments have been made. We also welcome the section on cross-sectoral priorities and agree with the main priority elements. The documents stopped short of providing a comprehensive list of possible lower priority elements, or areas where savings can be achieved. As the delegates of Finland, we see advantages in the process of further prioritization and note that it is an element which will arise in the context of our discussion on FAO review.

As noted initially by the delegate of the United States, Canada would welcome the continuation of the process introduced this year on an experimental basis whereby an outline programme of work and budget is presented to the Programme and Finance Committees by the Director-General. In previous discussions of the budget level, Canada has consistently argued that the programme changes should be made by reprioritization rather than through an overall increase in the programme budget level. We acknowledge cost increases of a non-discretionary nature and appreciate the information provided in the Programme of Work and Budget on the cost increases. However, as other delegations we prefer to see maximum absorption of cost increases. For example, we had questioned whether or not some activities, which were not implemented in the current biennium, needed to be recosted in 1990/91. Also certain budget elements such as the lapse factor could, in our view, be adjusted to reflect more closely the actual level of vacancies.

Other major specialized agencies have adjusted their 1990/91 programmes without requesting a growth in their budget levels. As the largest specialized agency in the UN system we are not convinced that FAO should be seeking a larger share of the system's resources.

My delegation welcomes the establishment of the new Sub-programme sustaining resource potentials. We hope that activities planned under this programme will improve FAO's contribution to the integration of ecological principles in agriculture practice. Referring to a comment made in the Programme Committee's report, we support FAO's participation in the forthcoming UN Conference on Environment and Development, working in close cooperation with its relevant sister agencies.

Canada recognizes the leadership role of FAO in the application of remote sensing and we welcome the emphasis placed on a world agriculture information centre. We also welcome the sharper focus on proposed activities relating to women in development. As pointed out by the US representative this morning we acknowledge the important contribution of the Codex Alimentarius in providing a basis for international coordination to harmonize national food standards as well as FAO's role in the harmonization of plant quarantine and phytosanitary requirements under the provisions of the International Plant Protection Convention.

We feel that the focus of FAO's programme in the fisheries sector generally corresponds with the views that have been expressed earlier, including the views expressed by the Committee on Fisheries.

The Canadian delegation compliments the FAO on the role that it has played in the promotion of the Tropical Forest Action Plan. The establishment of a coordination unit for the TFAP represents an important step. With the increasing number of national plans and preparation, and the growing involvement of donors, FAO will need to maintain a data bank of TFAP activities and closely monitor the outputs.

We note the importance that many countries attach to the technical cooperation programme and welcome further information provided on this programme in this document. However, we are not convinced that the information is sufficient to justify an increase of the magnitude proposed.

In conclusion, we thank the Director-General for the comprehensive document that has been presented under this agenda item.

Jean A. YENNIMATAS (Grèce): Ayant entendu les orateurs qui m'ont précédé, je serai très bref. Je vais essayer, en quelques lignes très générales, de vous faire connaître notre appréciation.

Le Conseil du mois de juin avait appuyé dans l'ensemble les propositions présentées par le Directeur général concernant le Programme de travail et budget pour 1990-91 et notre délégation avait axé son intervention sur deux raisons primordiales: premièrement, parce que mon pays estime que la FAO doit continuer ses efforts ayant pour but d'éliminer la faim et la malnutrition et de promouvoir le développement et l'harmonisation de la production agricole mondiale au profit des populations défavorisées; deuxièmement, parce que le Programme de travail et budget proposé à l'époque par le Directeur général est réaliste et devrait permettre d'arriver à un consensus.

Les années à venir ne seront pas faciles. C'est d'ailleurs la constatation du Directeur général. Mon pays, qui en est conscient, fera de son mieux pour participer pleinement aux efforts qui seront entrepris par notre Organisation.

Par ailleurs, permettez-moi de souligner entre autres l'importance du nouveau sous-programme de sauvegarde du potentiel naturel. Grâce aux projets-pilote et aux études qui seront entrepris dans le cadre de ce sous-programme, il sera possible d'établir un grand plan d'action dans l'avenir ayant trait aux politiques d'appui d'une agriculture durable, à la conservation des sols et des eaux et à l'impact des changements climatiques sur l'agriculture.

Dans le même contexte, l'analyse plus élaborée du Programme de travail et budget par région nous amène à la conclusion que les augmentations accordées aux régions de l'Afrique et de l'Amérique latine et Caraïbes sont justifiables.

Le budget que le Directeur général propose essaie d'équilibrer les divergences d'opinions entre ceux qui favorisent une plus grande augmentation du budget et ceux qui estiment une croissance zéro plus appropriée. A notre avis, le budget proposé réussit cette tâche et répond aux besoins fonctionnels de l'Organisation. En conclusion, notre délégation appuie les propositions du Directeur général concernant le Programme de travail et budget pour la période 1990-91.

Daniel D.DON NAN JIRA (Kenya): Mr Chairman, I thought that you had succeeded in convincing this august body that there was no need to go into a long debate because when you opened the meeting I thought you had avoided a number of procedural matters that consume a lot of time, so I was going to congratulate you heartily. However, seeing what is happening in this group now I do not know whether to congratulate you or not. But it is not your fault; it is our fault because most of the things that we are discussing here have already been discussed. My delegation would have wished that we go straight into the issues and make specific recommendations to the Conference, because what we are doing now has already been done, and it appears that what we are going to do will be done in the Conference. May I therefore appeal to the Council delegates to be sparing in their statements. I do not promise that I myself will be short because, as they say, "When in Rome do as the Romans do", but I do appeal to the Council to be short so that we can adopt the excellent reports which are before us for consideration, which the Director-General, with his usual competence, and with the competence of those who work with him, has given us. Therefore, I hope that there will be no need tomorrow for us to go into sessions longer than have been scheduled.

Having said that, I should like to highlight a few points which seem to my delegation to be relevant and worthy of note during this session of the Conference.

First, I wish to associate the Kenya delegation with the recommendations and details of the various components of the budget and the proposed priority activities. We hope that they meet with the approval of the Council.

Secondly, the Kenya delegation strongly holds the view that the problems and needs of Africa require preferential treatment. Consequently, we hope that due attention will be paid to such needs and priorities in the course of the Council and of the Conference sessions.

Thirdly, there is the question of prioritization of programme activities in Africa. According to my delegation that is still a challenge to us and to the international community. We believe that the African countries themselves and the FAO can continue to give priority to the African priorities, in concert of course with the resources that will be made available for this purpose.

Fourthly, in the view of my delegation the following are among the major areas requiring priority treatment in the African context. Among those to which we would like to see priority treatment given is the strengthening of applied research and transfer of existing technologies to enhance the scientific and technological capacities of the developing countries. These capacities are incomplete unless and until they are backed by adequate financial resources. For example, (i) we in Africa should be helped to eradicate the ugly and terrible American screwworm fly before it is too late. Its own name "screwworm" is very ugly. I hope that we can address this question and make sure that we arrest it before it goes too far; (ii) supply and distribution of affordable inputs for increased agricultural productivity; (iii) conservation activities relating to soils, forestry and biological diversity; (iv) strengthening and increasing resources to livestock development and animal feeds production; (v) accelerating manpower development and training in the developing nations and enhancing the role of TCP in this regard. Last but not least, something must be done to arrest the reverse transfer of resources from developing to developed countries. Competent studies which we read show an alarming and frightening trend which warrants putting this question on a priority list of items for our discussion.

I believe that the needs of the poor and the hungry of the world are and should be the concern of all of us members of the world community. We should take concerted measures to alleviate the critical social and economic situation of the less fortunate strata of society, especially those who live in the rural areas. After all, the proposed budget increase is not, comparatively speaking, large enough, especially bearing in mind the needs of the poor and hungry who should be the beneficiaries of our efforts. All the programme activities in the given documentation are essential but if they are to be performed satisfactorily not even the requested budget increase will suffice. We therefore reiterate the Kenya delegation's view that the proposed Programme of Work and Budget be adopted by consensus.

LE PRESIDENT: J'espère être en droit de vous remercier pour votre concision. En effet, il s'agit de questions très importantes; ce sont deux questions sur lesquelles chaque délégué doit pouvoir s'exprimer quitte à faire des séances supplémentaires.

Il y a deux questions importantes: le Programme de travail et budget et les réformes; convenons tous que c'est là notre travail et si nous devons faire une troisième séance nous la ferons.

Bashir El Mabrouk SAID (Libya) (original language Arabic): I accept the recommendation made by the Ambassador of Kenya as far as brevity is concerned, but I should like to have his permission to congratulate the Director-General on his presentation of this document, as well as Dr Shah and the Chairmen of the Finance and Programme Committees for their introduction and explanations.

Being a member of the Programme Committee I participated in the preparation of the document, and I should like to confirm that the proposals of the Programme of Work and Budget honestly reflect all the viewpoints that were expressed. This document has taken into account the needs of the developing countries under severe economic conditions and I believe that we should thank the Secretariat for this attitude. The priorities mentioned in this document and proposed by the Director-General are priorities that should be supported. We should like to reiterate what has been mentioned by previous speakers, that is that such priorities have been expressed by the organs of the FAO, the governing bodies of the FAO.

We were hoping, in the light of the increasing needs of developing countries, that there would be a further understanding of such needs, and that they would be reflected in the Programme of Work. The increase does not exceed 0.5 percent. That is why we are a little concerned about the appropriations of the TCP which we, the developing countries, all support. We should like to acknowledge the fact that the Secretariat has made great efforts to reconcile the increasing needs and the limited resources. We should like to thank the Secretariat for this.

My delegation would like to reiterate the following points. To link the approval of the programme and the review process is completely unacceptable and we, the developing countries, are refusing this attitude.

The consensus is what we are trying to achieve and what has been solved by the Director-General. Actually the Director-General has never called for separation, but we always have to depend on the idea of consensus. Thirdly, the additional step referred to in this documentary regarding the elaboration of the Budget should not be judged as of now and should not be the basis for our future work, because the necessity of reaching a consensus at an earlier stage, and through this experience, this review process only entails further costs. In this context we should like to support those who have supported the budget level and the Programme of Work and Budget. Thank you Mr Chairman.

Bruce J. TOLKNTINO (Philippines): Mr Chairman, thank you for giving us this opportunity to present our views. We should like to congratulate you for running this meeting very smoothly, and we should like to thank the Chairmen of the Committees on the Programme and Finance, who, it seems, have worked so hard on the document, along with the support of the Director-General and his staff.

With regard to the Programme of Work we should like to note with satisfaction the priorities that have been set for the next biennium. In particular we are very interested in the function that FAO will provide in terms of policy advice. It is a much-needed and welcomed assistance to us, particularly in the process of rebuilding our economy. The policy framework is that framework which provides the essential elements for development, especially at the time when many of us -and in particular the Philippines- are undergoing structural adjustment. This structural adjustment is taking place as we realise the inter-dependence of the various parts of our economy, and our dependence also on the economies of other countries, both developing and developed, including questions that had to do with the debt problem and food security.

We are also satisfied with the attention being paid to sustainable development, and we are pleased to say that in the past few weeks we have been cooperating very powerfully with the work of FAO in the celebration of World Food Day. In that celebration we focused on the help that FAO has been giving the Philippines in terms of the programmes of integrated pest management and attention to the fate of the seas and the protection of the environment.

We should also like to thank FAO for facilitating the assistance being provided by the Italian Government, and we thank the Government of Italy for supporting our work for the comprehensive agrarian reform programme of the Philippines.

With regard to the Budget, we all realize of course that in the face of all of the demands for assistance being placed upon FAO, it is very difficult to sustain and meet that demand in terms of the limited resources we are all afforded. We regret that the level of TCP support, as a proportion of the Budget, has been reduced, because this is a very important part of the FAO programme, and we depend on it for the resolution of many of our policy questions and policy debates.

We hope that the level of TCP support is increased in future years, and that the level of about 14 percent at least, and even up to 17 percent, is restored in the future. However, the restoration of that level of support is dependent upon all of us meeting our commitments or contributions, and honouring these commitments that we have made in the past.

Finally, we should all remember that the Programme of Work and Budget is the combination of a process which started with the beginning of the previous two-year period, and of deliberations in various Committees, previous Councils, and also the sub-committees that have worked on these documents and on the programmes, on the technical committees on agriculture, forestry, fisheries and commodity problems, as well as also the regional conferences. Therefore, the Programme is a compromise between the demands of the various Member Nations of FAO, the demands of FAO and of the limits of the resources provided by FAO. It is a balance between the concerns and the demands and hopes of the Member Nations. It is not a perfect document, we realize, but it has been arrived at as a result of serious work and serious focus. Therefore, even though it is not a perfect document, it is the result of work in which we have all cooperated, and the delegation of the Philippines supports the Programme of Work and Budget.

E.P.ALLKTNE (Trinidad and Tobago): Mr Chairman, the delegation of Trinidad and Tobago is also happy to see you taking charge of the deliberations of this Session. We also extend our warmest congratulations to the three Vice-Chairmen. We must also convey our thanks to Mr Shah for his usual lucid presentation, drawing our attention to the important details, not even allowing us to go adrift in failing to recognize the new colour scheme of the documentation.

The Trinidad and Tobago delegation wishes only to make a relatively brief statement at this time. This Ninety-Sixth Session of the Council, together with the Twenty-fifth Conference Session, are poised for particularly historical significance in the life of this Organization.

Weighty and far-reaching decisions will flow from our deliberations, decisions of a kind which will undoubtedly affect FAO for decades. It is the debate, the points of view, the final decisions from the Conference, which will, in essence, determine what will happen in the years to follow.

Fortunately, there is a consensus on the relevance of FAO, the necessity of a continued strong and effective FAO and the need for expanding activity by the Organization. Our delegation supports the basic priorities indicated, and there is comfort in noting that a technical assistance thrust will be maintained.

No one can dispute that this Organization has been seriously affected by a precarious resource situation in recent years. We are informed that over the past two biennia, programme cuts have been effected to the extent of US\$ 45 million. Frankly, what we are doing is forcing the Director-General to become perhaps the best human resources engineer in the United Nations system. In a delicate balancing act he continues to reduce and to freeze posts each biennium, knowing full well that the requests of the countries in need will and must increase.

It takes considerable courage to come here against the background of what the majority of delegations have said most vociferously and continuously over the years about the importance of TCP, and to say decisively that the allocation had been reduced percentage-wise.

Also the experts have clearly endorsed the crucial importance of the Programme. The developing countries must, therefore, inevitably share the optimism of the Director-General that resourcefulness from elsewhere will tip the balance again in the desired direction.

Our delegation can understand requests for clarification of various matters in the presentation of the Programme of Work and Budget. We are certain that the Secretariat will respond accordingly, since we see no indications of fluster on the podium. However, in a real sense, to suggest no increase for the 1990 biennium budget against what has happened in recent years is really asking for perhaps what we may call "minus zero" budgeting. Such a position simply does not fit the reality of the situation.

Mr Chairman, we thank the Chairmen of the Programme and Finance Committees for their presentation of this item. As we see it in the final analysis, the case for support of the Director-General's proposals in the present circumstances is simply overwhelming. In a real sense, the present budgetary request of a 0.4 to 0.5 percent increase can only be regarded as a very temporary situation. The realities of the world situation in food production and availability, nutrition, rural development and the increasing crisis in environmental matters do not allow for any continued trend in this direction.

Therefore, this delegation unhesitatingly recommends that the Programme of Work and Budget goes forward to the Conference with all appropriate explanations duly provided. It is also our further hope that, as the days move on, delegations from all countries will move away from fixed positions, and progress in harmony to consensus, for the good of the millions of disadvantaged who need a strong FAO.

Joseph TCHICATA (Congo): Comme je prends la parole pour la première fois aujourd'hui, je tiens, Monsieur le Président, à vous exprimer toute la joie qu'éprouve ma délégation à vous revoir à la présidence de notre Conseil. L'élection des trois Vice-Présidents, dont la compétence est reconnue par tous, constitue un gage supplémentaire du succès de nos travaux.

Je profite de l'occasion qui m'est ici offerte pour remercier tous les membres du Conseil pour la confiance qui vient de m'être témoignée en me proposant comme Président de la Commission II de la Conférence, dont chacun mesure le poids qui pèsera sur elle pour la réussite de la vingt-cinquième session de la Conférence. J'espère sincèrement mériter cette confiance et je puis vous assurer que non seulement c'est avec un grand plaisir que j'accepte cette charge mais encore et surtout que j'y serai présent.

Pour venir au point de l'ordre du jour qui nous préoccupe, je tiens à rendre hommage à l'excellente présentation qui nous a été faite comme à l'accoutumée par M. Shah au nom du Directeur général. Les fidèles comptes rendus des travaux du Comité du Programme et du Comité des finances, que nous avons suivis ce matin, sont à la hauteur de la compétence de nos deux éminents présidents, le Professeur Mazoyer pour le Comité du Programme et l'Ambassadeur Bukhari pour le Comité financier.

Je suis fort heureux de prendre part aux travaux de cette importante session du Conseil. En effet, les résultats de nos travaux pèseront sur ceux de la Conférence puisque notre Conseil a pour mission de faire des recommandations sur lesquelles la Conférence devra se prononcer, notamment sur les deux principaux points inscrits à notre ordre du jour. Il s'agit, comme vous l'avez compris, du Programme de travail et budget 1990-91 actuellement débattu, et de l'Examen de certains aspects des buts et opérations de la FAO que nous aborderons plus tard. Voilà deux points que nous traiterons séparément et pour lesquels aucun amalgame ne saurait être accepté. Nous devons librement, et en toute responsabilité, nous prononcer sur chacune de ces deux questions.

Pour revenir sur le vif du sujet, je noterai que tout a été dit sur la validité du Programme de travail et budget qui nous est proposé et les modalités d'établissement des propositions du Directeur général. Nous nous félicitons notamment du fait que dans ces propositions le Directeur général ait largement tenu compte des observations aussi bien de notre Conseil que des autres organes appropriés.

Quant à l'étape supplémentaire dans le processus d'examen du Programme de travail et budget, ma délégation pense qu'il est trop tôt pour se prononcer sur cette question. Mais mes conclusions pourraient être tirées au vu du résultat sur le vote du budget 1990/91, étant donné qu'une telle étape supplémentaire ne se justifiait que dans la mesure où elle favoriserait le consensus au moment de l'approbation du budget. Cependant, nous pensons également qu'une autre période probatoire est nécessaire avant d'évaluer ce processus révisé.

Ma délégation ne souhaite pas reprendre ici tout ce qui a été dit sur les mérites du Directeur général d'être parvenu à une proposition qui constitue un compromis entre les nécessités de faire face aux demandes sans cesse croissantes des pays en développement et les capacités de contribution des Etats Membres. Cependant, nous reconnaissons que l'augmentation de 0,45% paraît faible et tend plutôt à satisfaire les tenants du principe de la croissance zéro. L'absorption des coûts proposés me semble réaliste.

Mais nous voudrions exprimer notre désappointement quant à la diminution du taux budgétaire qui affecte le Programme de coopération technique qui vient ainsi d'être pénalisé malgré le succès qu'il connaît auprès des pays bénéficiaires.

Bref, nous approuvons toutes les activités proposées étant donné leur pertinence et nous nous félicitons ainsi de la capacité de la FAO de s'adapter aux nouvelles priorités qui s'inscrivent dans le cadre de son mandat et de ses objectifs.

Enfin, la délégation congolaise voudrait apporter tout son appui aux neuf domaines prioritaires et se félicite que le Directeur général ait concentré les ressources, certes limitées, sur des priorités soigneusement sélectionnées.

Pour conclure, la délégation congolaise donne son appui aux propositions du Directeur général et souhaite que le niveau du budget proposé, dont la croissance est quasiment nulle, soit approuvé par consensus à la Conférence. A cet égard, je pense qu'il convient, dès à présent, de dégager ce consensus que nous devrions recommander à la Conférence et nous proposons que le Comité de rédaction prépare un rapport clair et positif et qui évite des termes aussi vagues que "quelques", "certains", "de nombreux", et parle davantage du Conseil tout en mentionnant le point de vue minoritaire chaque fois que cela est nécessaire.

Gian Luigi VALENZA (Italie): Monsieur le Président, je voudrais dire avant tout combien nous sommes tous heureux de vous revoir ici comme Président de ce Conseil et de revoir aussi les deux Présidents du Comité financier et du Comité du Programme.

Je voudrais m'associer aux autres orateurs qui m'ont précédé pour remercier M. Shah pour son exposé très clair et au fond très édifiant. Je voudrais aussi féliciter le Secrétariat pour la présentation du document relatif au Programme de travail et budget que nous sommes en train d'examiner en ce moment.

Comme nous l'avons annoncé, je peux confirmer ici que le Gouvernement italien considère qu'une augmentation réduite de 0,4 ou de 0,5 du budget peut être en définitive considérée comme une croissance zéro, et donc comme une croissance tout à fait acceptable, même par les membres qui considèrent cette même croissance zéro comme indispensable et comme but ultime de leur requête.

C'est dans ce but que mon gouvernement souhaite que le programme proposé soit approuvé par consensus au moment voulu pour que les pays en voie de développement n'aient pas à se sentir particulièrement pénalisés.

LE PRESIDENT: Nous avons encore 14 orateurs inscrits.

Avant de clore la séance, je donnerai la parole au Directeur général qui voudrait intervenir à cet endroit de la discussion pour aider les délégués à réfléchir. Nous reprendrons le débat demain à 9 h 30 avec le Japon.

LE DIRECTEUR GENERAL: J'essaierai d'être bref. Je crois que le sujet est suffisamment important pour que je fasse déjà un commentaire général aujourd'hui sur le débat très intéressant qui vient d'avoir lieu.

Je remercie tous les délégués qui ont pris la parole sur les propositions du Programme de travail et budget.

Je voudrais simplement rappeler que votre Organisation n'a pas cessé d'être en crise depuis 1987. Ce n'est pas seulement une crise financière bien que celle-ci soit à l'origine de nos difficultés.

En 1987, nous avons été obligés d'éliminer des activités approuvées par la Conférence pour un montant minimum de 25 millions de dollars, du fait du retard dans le paiement de contributions, en particulier de la part du pays qui est supposé être, et qui ne l'est plus, le plus grand pays contributeur. En 1988, nous sommes restés en crise. Nous avons dû aussi éliminer des activités pour 20 millions de dollars, toujours en raison du retard dans le paiement des contributions.

En 1989, nous sommes toujours et encore plus en crise. Nous avons dû éliminer des activités pour 23 millions de dollars. On nous a parlé de 45 millions, mais au total ce n'est pas 45 millions, mais 45 millions plus 23 millions de dollars. Je parle en tant que responsable. Vingt-trois millions de dollars, c'était le coût additionnel des émoluments de diverses natures que nous avons dû payer comme augmentation à nos fonctionnaires et que nous n'avions pas prévu. Nous avons fait l'erreur de ne pas prévoir ces augmentations quand nous avons préparé le budget 1988-89. Aujourd'hui la crise a atteint un point qui n'est peut-être pas culminant - nous en parlerons demain - mais qui représente 177 millions de dollars de sommes dues par nos Etats Membres.

Si on m'avait dit, il y a quatre ans, que la FAO aurait des arriérés de 177 millions de dollars, j'aurais répondu: la FAO ne tiendra pas le coup. A la fin de l'année, nous aurons zéro dans notre fonds de roulement, zéro dans notre fonds pour la réserve spéciale et plus de 100 millions de dollars de dettes, "outstanding bills".

Comment dans ces conditions, pouvons-nous nous permettre de ne pas inclure dans nos propositions budgétaires cette fois-ci des crédits pour faire face à d'éventuelles augmentations de salaire?

Pendant ces trois années, nous avons été obligés de garder vacants 220 postes. Je rappelle que le nombre de postes à caractère continu n'a pas augmenté depuis 1976. Ce n'est pas une anecdote, c'est la vérité. Je serais heureux que l'on parle de cette situation à d'autres organisations du Système des Nations Unies. Même pour ce Programme de travail et budget, je me suis permis

d'éliminer encore 25 postes. Nous avons vécu ces deux années avec 220 postes vacants, 100 publications n'ont pas pu être réalisées, 25% de réunions n'ont pas été tenues, 25% de notre capacité d'organiser de la formation a été supprimée. Nos revues qui nous font connaître dans tous les pays du monde, dans les bibliothèques des Ministères de l'agriculture, dans les stations de recherche, dans les universités, n'existent plus. Il n'y a plus de Cérès, plus d'Unasilva, plus de Revue mondiale de zootechnie. Quand on cesse de publier, on dépérit. Tout cela pour dire que nous sommes en crise financière très grave. La fin de la crise financière est incertaine. En tout cas, les détails demandés pour l'accroissement des coûts ont été fournis au Comité financier. A chaque Comité son rôle. Le Comité financier se réunit deux fois par an, trois fois cette année. Il a donc eu tout le temps, comme l'a bien dit le représentant de l'Australie, d'examiner le budget en détail.

Un grand pays a envoyé quelqu'un ici à Rome pour avoir plus de renseignements. Nous sommes prêts à les fournir. Le Comité financier reçoit des ordres du Conseil. Si le Conseil veut donner des ordres supplémentaires au Comité financier, il n'a qu'à les donner. Il y a une formule pour calculer les coûts, nous la suivons. Si on change la formule, nous sommes prêts à présenter à l'avenir les coûts d'accroissement suivant la nouvelle formule. Nous ne faisons que suivre les instructions du Comité financier pour présenter les accroissements de coûts.

On a dit aussi que d'autres organisations des Nations Unies avaient présenté des budgets avec des croissances zéro ou négatives.

Je peux répondre que même si c'était le cas, on ne peut comparer que des choses comparables. Quand on a parlé du lapse factor on a dit qu'on ne pouvait pas le comparer à la situation d'autres organisations, parce que ce n'est pas comparable. Je répondrai la même chose. La FAO a perdu 68 millions de dollars pendant ses trois dernières années d'activités et n'a ainsi pu mener toutes les activités voulues par les Etats Membres. Est-ce que d'autres organisations ont vu leurs programmes coupés d'une façon aussi importante? Est-ce que leurs caisses sont vides comme à la FAO? Nous n'avons rien dans nos caisses qui nous permette de tenir. Est-ce que les autres organisations s'occupent de problèmes aussi vitaux que les nôtres, c'est-à-dire des besoins de base de la nourriture, ou s'occupent-elles de météorologie ou de politique?

En tout cas, je voulais simplement dire ce soir - parce que c'est cela le problème le plus important - que c'est le coût des augmentations qui a retenu l'attention des délégués et non pas le programme lui-même. Oui, je me sens coupable à propos du PCT - nous en parlerons demain - car je ne l'ai augmenté que d'1,7 million de dollars E.-U. tout en étant critiqué par la majorité des Etats Membres parce que je ne l'ai pas suffisamment augmenté. Mais je n'ai reçu aucun signe de sympathie des autres Etats Membres qui ne veulent pas que le PCT augmente. Il a en fait diminué en pourcentage. M. Shah répondra autant qu'il est possible de le faire aux questions et nous sommes toujours prêts à donner les informations nécessaires.

Il faut tenir compte du fait que nous agissons dans le contexte d'une crise financière sans précédent. Si nous avons le fonds de roulement à un certain niveau, à 17 millions de dollars ou à 23-24 millions de dollars, nous n'aurions pas inclus des crédits pour des augmentations éventuelles de salaires. Nous ne l'avons pas fait, 11 y a deux ans, mais il était possible de puiser dans la caisse. Maintenant, nous sommes sur la corde raide. Il est vrai que nous n'avons pas encore eu recours à des emprunts. Nous aurions pu avoir recours à des emprunts bancaires mais, toujours pour tenir compte de l'avis de ceux qui ne le voulaient pas, nous ne l'avons pas fait. Normalement, je crois que le Directeur général reçoit les instructions d'une majorité démocratique, mais j'ai également tenu compte des pays qui étaient d'un avis différent bien que minoritaire. J'en ai tenu compte avec mon augmentation de 0,4 pour cent. Ces 0,4 pour cent pourraient d'ailleurs être un double zéro.

Si les paiements bénévoles de certains pays ne sont pas faits pour le prochain biennium, nous aurons des raisons de croire que la situation deviendra insoutenable. Ces paiements, qui s'élevaient à environ 2,5 millions de dollars nous permettaient de payer le loyer et surtout d'entretenir ces bâtiments. Si nous devons encore prendre ces 2,5 millions dans notre chair, nous arriverons au double zéro. Nous sommes en crise et c'est tout. Il ne faut pas nous juger comme si nous jouissions d'une santé normale et que tout allait pour le mieux, comme si nous pouvions encore absorber ceci et cela.

Enfin, il y a la croissance zéro. C'est un concept que, personnellement, je n'ai pas encore compris. Comment peut-on parler de croissance zéro? Ce n'est pas une croissance, c'est une stagnation. Peut-être faut-il changer le mot et dire "stagnation". Si cette stagnation a commencé en 1983, il faut bien quand même y mettre fin.

Voilà les quelques remarques que je voulais faire dans un esprit très ouvert et libéral. J'espère qu'elles seront prises dans le même esprit et qu'elles feront comprendre que nous sommes en crise, qu'il ne faut pas essayer de trouver là 50 000 ou 200 000 dollars. Les caisses sont vides et nous ne pouvons pas prendre le risque de ne pas inclure dans le nouveau budget ce qui, selon nous, doit y être inclus.

LE PRESIDENT: Je remercie le Directeur général de ses explications très utiles. Nous allons lever la séance et nous nous réunirons demain, à 9 h 30, pour poursuivre les interventions sur ce point.

The meeting rose at 17.30 hours.

La séance est levée à 17 h 30.

Se levanta la sesión a las 17.30 horas.

council

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

conseil

ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ALIMENTATION ET L'AGRICULTURE

consejo

ORGANIZACION DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA LA AGRICULTURA Y LA ALIMENTACION

CL

CL 96/PV/3

Ninety-sixth Session

Quatre-vingt-seizième session

96º periodo de sesiones

THIRD PLENARY MEETING
TROISIEME SEANCE PLENIERE
TERCERA SESION PLENARIA
(7 November 1989)

The Third Plenary Meeting was opened at 9.45 hours Lassaad Ben Osman, Independent Chairman of the Council, presiding

La troisième séance plénière est ouverte à 9 h 45 sous la présidence de Lassaad Ben Osman, Président indépendant du Conseil

Se abre la tercera sesión plenaria a las 9.45 horas, bajo la presidencia de Lassaad Ben Osman, Presidente Independiente del Consejo

- III. PROGRAMME, BUDGETARY, FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS (continued)
- III. QUESTIONS CONCERNANT LE PROGRAMME, LE BUDGET, LES FINANCES ET L'ADMINISTRATION (suite)
- III. ASUNTOS DEL PROGRAMA Y ASUNTOS PRESUPUESTARIOS, FINANCIEROS Y ADMINISTRATIVOS (continuación)
- 5. Programme of Work and Budget 1990-91 and Medium-Term Objectives (continued)
- 5. Programme de travail et budget 1990-91 et objectifs á moyen terme (suite)
- 5. Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para 1990-91 y objetivos a plazo medio (continuación)

LE PRESIDENT. Honorables delegates, nous reprenons la suite de nos travaux. Je donne la parole á l'honorable délégué du Japon.

Kota HIRAMURA (Japan): Good morning, Mr Chairman. The delegation would like to associate itself with previous speakers in appreciating the Secretariat's efforts to facilitate Member Countries to understanding the budget proposal by introducing new methods of explanation. Our thanks will also be paid to Mr Shah for his recent introduction to this very important agenda item. My delegation would like also to appreciate the Secretariat's work to introduce a new stage of considering the budget outline which has greatly contributed to facilitating to reach consensus on such very important issues, although the discussion at the early stage was confined only to the Programme and Finance Committees members.

Mr Chairman, before going into the discussion on the budget proposal for the next biennium, my delegation would like to briefly touch on the payment of our assessed contribution this year, which is mentioned in Secretariat document CL 96/4, page 33, paragraph 3.47, where it says that the cash flow situation of the Organization had improved temporarily with the recent receipt of the contribution from the second largest contributor. Indeed, the Japanese government paid its contribution on 20 September, a little bit later compared with in the past. Such late payment, however, was caused by the recent severe financial situation of my Government, which was brought about by the rapid weakening of Japanese yen to the US dollar. According to the same Secretariat document, at 25 September, only 51 Member Countries had paid their contribution in full. Two-thirds of the Member Countries were in difficulties to make full payment.

Mr Chairman, in preparing the budget proposal, the FAO Secretariat should have considered such very severe financial situations which are prevailing in most Member Countries and are expected to continue at least during the next biennium. Under such circumstances the budget level should be maintained as low as possible to respond to the urgent needs of Member Countries and to selected high priority areas. The proposed budget level of about a 17 percent increase to the present budget might impose a heavy burden on Member Countries. In this sense, we believe that the real zero growth remains to be a very realistic approach and absorption of cost increase to the maximum extent should be perceived. As to the cost increase, my delegation is extremely disappointed by the new proposal which indicated further increase to the previous proposal at the last Council of June, which was already at the highest level. In this regard, the enhancement of efficiency of implementing programmes should be further pursued, as the enhancement of productivity and agriculture is the main objective of the Organization.

The explanation of the amount of cost increase is that the Director-General's proposal has been improved in comparison with the past, which we highly appreciate. This has not succeeded in convincing us of the necessity of such a high increase in cost. My delegation would therefore like to ask the Secretariat about the cost increase. We should like to know how our high rate of contribution of 15.5 percent, or US \$ 76 million, will be absorbed or spent without any programme increase. We should also like to know to what extent the enhancement of efficiency has been taken into account. FAO should remain active and respond quickly to the needs of Member Countries. Such needs change rapidly, and resources to be allocated to FAO are limited. Under such circumstances, and in order to try to respond to such requirements of FAO, our Organization should remain always ready to change. That is the vitality of the Organization. For that purpose, we believe it is essential to reduce programmes which are not urgently needed and to avoid duplication with other international organizations, which means to establish the identity of the Organization, to transfer resources to higher priority areas from lower priority areas, to set up primary implementation periods for new programmes and to reconsider the necessity of continuing present programmes on the basis of their evaluation. This will contribute to keeping the Organization active in facing present and future challenges.

As regards the Technical Cooperation Programme, the programmes of which have already been sufficiently discussed at the various fora, my delegation would simply like to point out the necessity for better and more transparent management of this Programme and consideration of the possibility of its diversified financing, as is given by Italy for the present biennium, and is

suggested by the report of the expert groups of the FAO Review. In this respect my delegation would like to know what the change will be in the actual implementation of this Programme for the next biennium compared with the present budget under the circumstances that the allocation is increased but the share is decreased compared with the present budget.

As to the details of the proposed budget, and especially the priority setting, my delegation has already expressed its support in various fora, and particularly at the last council in June. The priority setting reflects the discussion at meetings called by FAO.

Finally, my delegation will carefully watch the discussion on this issue during this Council and the forthcoming Conference, and its position with regard to the budget proposal will be finalized taking into account the development of these discussions.

Joao Augusto DE MEDICIS (Brazil): As a member of the Finance Committee, Brazil has participated in the process of preparation of the Programme of Work and Budget and thus in the consensus arrived at in the Programme and Finance Committees. My delegation has therefore very little to say and would like only to support what has already been expressed by a number of representatives, in particular by my Latin American colleagues, the Ambassadors of Colombia, Venezuela, Cuba, Peru and Nicaragua.

I should like to thank the Chairmen of the Programme and Finance Committees and Mr Shah for their clear and comprehensive presentation of the issue.

My delegation understands that this issue should be dealt with independent of any constraints that its consideration together with other questions would entail. It goes without saying that, having shared the consensus, Brazil concurs with the priority areas established by the Committees in January and accepts the general thrust of the Programme. We also believe that the priority-setting system adopted this year and the new scheme involving an early adoption of this priority setting to adopt the level of the budget have proved to be helpful and could be continued, on a tentative basis for an extra biennium.

In his presentation, Mr Shah indicated that, due to an extra absorption of costs of around US \$ 3 million, the real increase in the budget will not exceed 0.5 percent. We also noticed that the budget proposed does not take into account US \$ 45 million of reductions in activities that FAO was forced to make in the last two biennia.

My delegation is particularly sorry that the allocation for TCP has been reduced from 12.8 percent in the previous budget to 11.8 percent in the current proposal. We all know the importance that developing countries attach to TCP. I should like to see this Programme enlarged, improved, and enhanced, and my delegation is ready to participate in initiatives to this end.

Cost increases are the inescapable consequence of world inflation, and world inflation is due to the financial policies of developed countries. Developing countries should therefore not be penalized by them.

As a member of the Finance Committee, I am perfectly satisfied with the information provided by the Secretariat on the percentage of these cost increases, especially in the context of the financial crisis which affects the Organization. On the other hand, zero growth and total absorption of cost increases would, in the long run, result in the paralysis and stagnation of the Organization and in its final destruction.

In conclusion, we support the proposed Programme of Work. However, we believe it will be necessary to draw the attention of the Council, as we have done on previous occasions, to the impact of the budget level on assessed contributions of developing countries facing economic and financial difficulties due, among other factors, to the burden of external debt and to the revised scale of contributions. For the same reasons, my delegation would prefer that no alterations be introduced in the lapse factor as it is currently applied.

Finally, let me refer to some very valid and pertinent questions addressed by some delegations, especially those from developed countries, and let me also address a question to the Secretariat. How can the Organization be expected to be able to implement its Programme with US \$ 175 million of contributions delayed and when a single contributor owes FAO an amount corresponding to more than half its annual budget? Does the Secretariat see any hope of change in this bleak picture in the near future?

The Director-General recalled yesterday that in one meeting of the Latin American/Caribbean group, the representative of Venezuela reminded us of the maracayá, an animal living in South America which feeds itself from its own liver when it cannot find food. Zero growth is our maracayá. If the Organization insists on feeding itself from its own reserves, it will finish up by destroying itself, as the maracayá ends up by killing itself. Shall we accept this maracayá syndrome?

Sra.Margarita LIZARRAGA SAUCEDO (México): Permítame, Señor Presidente, manifestar la complacencia de nuestra Delegación por tenerlo de nuevo presidiendo nuestros debates. Esto nos da confianza en lograr buenos resultados.

Asimismo queremos por su conducto agradecer al Doctor Shah, al Profesor Mazoyer y al Embajador Bukhari por la calidad de sus presentaciones, siempre precisas y claras que dan base para un entendimiento entre los miembros del Consejo en torno a la propuesta del Director General del Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para el bienio 1990/91, a la cual mi Gobierno expresa todo su apoyo reconociendo el esfuerzo que ha hecho por conciliar las necesidades crecientes de los países y la limitación de los recursos disponibles.

Nuestra Delegación, Señor Presidente, considera este tema como la esencia de nuestra labor ya que es plasmar los acuerdos sobre el Programa que nuestra Organización deberá cumplir en apoyo de sus países miembros en el ámbito vital de la alimentación y la agricultura.

Es por ello, Señor Presidente, que nos complace el reconocimiento general que hemos escuchado respecto a los serios esfuerzos de la Secretaría para satisfacer de manera equilibrada los requerimientos de los países miembros.

En la presentación y estructura de los documentos, cada vez más clara, didáctica y abundante se reconoce el aumento de la carga de trabajo a la Secretaría, quien no ha escatimado esfuerzos para no poner en duda la transparencia del proceso programático y presupuestal y sus vinculaciones hasta nivel de subprogramas.

Apreciamos, asimismo, la continuación y mejoramiento en las evaluaciones de algunos Programas y las presentaciones analíticas de las nueve prioridades.

Evidentemente, Señor Presidente, cada país, subregión o región en función de sus características y necesidades desea que la asignación presupuestal sea mayor para una u otra prioridad, ya sea a nivel de Programas o Subprogramas, lo cual pone en dificultad ciertamente tanto a la Secretaría como a los Comités del Programa y de Finanzas para lograrlo dentro de estrechos límites presupuestales. Evidentemente, en las metodologías empleadas podrá haber siempre puntos de vista diferentes según las cosas.

Mi Delegación reitera su reconocimiento a los Comités y a la Secretaría por el riguroso trabajo que desarrollan al elaborar y revisar la propuesta del Programa y Presupuesto, que a través de las instancias establecidas por los textos básicos se va constituyendo, orientando y ajustando hasta llegar hasta su fase final. En ese contexto mi Delegación reitera la necesidad de mantener el proceso conforme a esos principios.

La Delegación mexicana, Señor Presidente, ha considerado oportuno diferir su pronunciamiento detallado sobre los Programas durante la Conferencia, ya que entonces se dispondrá de mayor tiempo. Sin embargo, queremos expresar nuestra preocupación, de una parte, por la asignación regional que es desventajosa para América Latina y el Caribe y, en particular, a la disminución de la asignación al PCT, que es tan importante para nuestros países.

Lamentamos también la diferente percepción respecto al nivel presupuestario que tienen algunos, por fortuna muy pocos, miembros de este Comité, que querrían mayores ajustes tendientes al cero real y para el cual se piden a estas alturas cambios programáticos o fórmulas y mecanismos varios de absorción de costos, que nosotros no compartimos.

En este contexto, apreciamos que hayan matizado su postura con apertura a la flexibilidad, por lo que hacemos un atento llamamiento a un principio básico en el diálogo, que es la de no vincular la posición en este tema con el debate de otros.

Mi Delegación, Señor Presidente, reitera su convencimiento de que el funcionamiento de todo organismo depende de la calidad de su personal, pero también de contar con la plantilla adecuada a su programa. En todas las instancias hemos manifestado nuestra preocupación por los ajustes que han tenido que realizarse, por los problemas de liquidez. Sabíamos de 45 millones de recortes pasados, y ayer nos hemos enterado, por la intervención del Director General, de que se agregan a ellos veintitrés más. Realmente nos preocupa.

El número de publicaciones, reuniones y misiones se nos ha venido disminuyendo, afectando a la buena marcha de importantes programas por los que, en buena parte, se expresa prioridad consensual en el foro, pero que, en todo caso, responden a las necesidades y planes nacionales, los cuales se ven afectados en los insumos de asistencia técnica que esperan de la FAO.

Nosotros podemos decirlo con hechos, y por eso pedimos que se nos entienda, ya que con el mismo esfuerzo equivalente contribuimos al Presupuesto de esta Organización, y, ciertamente con mayor esfuerzo la honoramos. En este sentido, nos unimos a los comentarios hechos por los distinguidos Representante de Brasil, de Venezuela y otros.

Dicho esto, Señor Presidente, reiteramos la aprobación a la propuesta del Director General sobre el Programa de Labores y Presupuesto, y expresamos nuestra esperanza de que pueda usted, a nombre de este Consejo, transmitir a la Conferencia esta versión final del Programa con una posición consensual de este Consejo.

LE PRESIDENT: Je remercie Mme la Représentante du Mexique.

Je voudrais en votre nom souhaiter la bienvenue à M. Omar A.Jallow, Ministre de l'agriculture de Gambie, qui vient de nous rejoindre.

Je donne la parole au Délégué du Pakistan.

Muhammad Saleem KHAN (Pakistan): I would like to start by thanking Mr Shah, Ambassador Bukhari and Prof. Mazoyer for their very succinct introduction to this very important item. We have studied very carefully the documentation on the Programme of Work and Budget for 1990-91 and also the Report of the Programme and Finance Committees. The proposals contained therein are in conformity with the recommendations of the subsidiary bodies of the Council. They were favourably scrutinized at the summary stage in the Ninety-fifth Council Session and exhaustively examined and supported by consensus in the Programme and Finance Committees.

My delegation has complete confidence in the members of the Programme and Finance Committees, who, after all, are from amongst us and we have no hesitation in lending our full support to the Programme of Work and Budget as presented to us. On the approach outlined in the Programme of Work and Budget we agree with the channelling of additional resources to the technical and economic programmes. We feel that over the years TCP has proved to be an extremely important instrument to satisfy the emergent and other needs of Member States, particularly the poor sectors.

Though we are disappointed with the decrease in the allocation for TCP from 12.8 percent in 1988/89 to 11.8 percent in the current biennium, in the interests of consensus we support this proposed allocation and hope that the shortfall will be met through the allocation of extra budgetary resources during the coming biennium. In fact, the TCP has already declined from 14.7 percent in the 1987/88 biennium to only 12.8 percent at the moment. We note that no extra budgetary resources for the next biennium have been earmarked or indicated. Thus, in the framework of the total needs TCP has only a 5 percent share of resources, which we feel is totally inadequate. Therefore, we stress on FAO that it should try to find all possible extra budgetary resources for this valuable programme.

We feel that policy advice is equally important in the sphere of FAO activities, and we are satisfied with the proposed emphasis on this area - particularly in the context of an economic adjustment programme. Likewise, we feel satisfied with the emphasis laid on the available resources, on the environment and sustainable development. We are sure that any further requirements on this account will be met through special funding arrangements.

Biotechnology is another item of interest to our delegation. We attach considerable significance to strengthening national capacities of developing countries in this field. Therefore, we are extremely pleased to note the proposals in the context of biotechnology and hope that their implementation would not be hampered by restrictions and barriers on the flow of technological development to the developing countries.

We also note that despite financial pressures in the present and past biennia, a nominal increase of one percent has been proposed over the recosted budget base. Yesterday Mr Shah explained that if we take into account the absorption of cost increases of US \$ 3 million, the programme increase will amount to only 0.45 percent.

Increased contributions to the FAO budget affect the developing countries even more as they are faced with increasing economic difficulties, owing to falling production, debt burdens, balance of payment problems and other economic problems. For us, even a small increase in our payments is extremely painful. But we realize that the magnitude of demands made on FAO definitely requires more than is being requested and proposed now. We are fully prepared to share our part of the burden despite our problems. Likewise, asking FAO to absorb unavoidable costs at the expense of available programmes for the needy and poor in developing countries is a proposition we find difficult to support.

It seems paradoxical that on the one hand we should be asking for rational planning and projections, while on the other we should close our eyes to costs of over US\$ 14 million which are inevitable. Nor do we find the absorption of costs advisable in a programme which is already limping under severe cuts of US\$ 45 million and cost absorption of US\$ 23 million as mentioned by the Director-General yesterday.

We have heard some speakers renewing their calls for the application of the principle of real zero growth and drawing comparisons with other UN organizations on this account. While noting the need for adequate financial support on a general basis to all UN organizations - each of which we feel is highly important in its own respective sphere of work - nevertheless, we must say this sphere of FAO's work relating to the most basic of human needs cautions against any such comparisons and any such universal application of the principle of zero growth.

We have also heard some delegates suggesting the Programme of Work and Budget be discussed at the conclusion of deliberations on the Review of FAO. This is a totally separate item on the agenda. My delegation would certainly look forward to any discussions in this respect under the separate agenda item, but feel strongly that the Programme of Work and Budget has to be considered on its own merits.

Finally, we note that the Finance and Programme Committees have endorsed the use of the additional step in the budgetary process. My delegation would have no hesitation in supporting this endorsement once it has established its utility in the coming Conference.

LE PRESIDENT: Je note qu'il reste encore neuf délégués inscrits sur la liste des orateurs. Je souhaiterais que nous puissions terminer l'examen de ce point de l'ordre du jour avec les réponses du Secrétariat - M. Shah et M. Bonte-Friedheim - a la seance de ce matin. J'aimerais donc que l'on tienne compte de cette contrainte dans les interventions a venir.

Sra. Monica DEREGIBUS (Argentina): En primer lugar, permítame usted expresar la satisfacción de la delegación argentina por verlo presidir nuevamente nuestros trabajos con su habitual dinamismo y simpatía. Asimismo, damos por su intermedio una calurosa felicitación a los tres vicepresidentes electos para ayudarle durante este período de sesiones. A todos les auguramos una fructífera tarea y les ofrecemos toda la colaboración de nuestra delegación.

Quisiera también, Sr. Presidente, agradecer al Director General y a su "staff por la clara formulación del Programa de Labores y Presupuesto que nos ha sido presentado; al Sr. Shah por su explicación inicial; y a los presidentes de los Comités del Programa y de Finanzas por ilustrarnos sobre los puntos de vista de dichos órganos.

En cuanto al mismo, expresaremos unos pocos conceptos de índole general a fin de no prolongar demasiado el debate.

En virtud de la brevedad y también por coincidencia de puntos de vista, permítame endosar en su totalidad la declaración que acaba de efectuar el Sr. Embajador del Brasil. El nivel del Programa de Labores y Presupuesto propuesto es considerablemente más elevado que el del bienio anterior. Ello se debe, en su mayor parte, a la incidencia de aumentos de costos derivados en gran medida de factores que ni la Organización ni los Estados Miembros pueden controlar, como la inflación y el incremento de rubros salariales y afines. Durante años han estado congelados los salarios y el ajuste por lugar de destino del personal de la administración pública internacional, produciéndose un notable deterioro de las condiciones de empleo que se le ofrecía. El éxodo de funcionarios capacitados de las organizaciones internacionales ha ido en aumento. Las Naciones Unidas han considerado que ha llegado el momento de revisar esas condiciones de trabajo y las

diversas medidas que adopte deberán ser cumplimentadas por la FAO. Esperamos que ellas aseguren el mantenimiento del personal idóneo y con experiencia, y que permitan asimismo la contratación de nuevos profesionales que puedan llevar conjuntamente adelante los importantes programas de la Organización.

La delegación argentina, señor, participa de la posición que se encuentra reflejada en el párrafo 1.5 del Informe de la Reunión Conjunta de los Comités del Programa y de Finanzas, en la que algunos miembros manifestaron su preocupación por los efectos que podría tener el nivel presupuestario propuesto sobre las cuotas asignadas a los países en desarrollo que se enfrentan con dificultades económicas y financieras debidas, entre otros factores, a la carga de la deuda externa y a la escala revisada de cuotas. Las limitaciones aludidas nos obligan a redoblar esfuerzos en la formulación de prioridades y en la administración de los recursos disponibles.

Dentro de las prioridades elegidas para distribuir los recursos adicionales netos, mi delegación apoya especialmente la biotecnología, la protección de los cultivos, la mujer en el desarrollo agrícola y rural y la acuicultura. Respecto de la primera, lamentamos disentir con la distinguida delegación de los Estados Unidos, pues apoyamos plenamente lo expresado en el párrafo 2.22 y también en el 2.23 del Capítulo: "Líneas Generales del Programa", del Documento 3. En ello, coincidimos con la distinguida delegación de Pakistán.

Otorgamos asimismo, gran importancia a la función de asistencia de la FAO a los países en desarrollo en las actuales negociaciones de la Ronda Uruguay del GATT, como asimismo a su participación técnica en el área de protección sanitaria y fitosanitaria.

Asimismo, privilegiamos el fomento de la investigación y de la tecnología en los países en desarrollo en lugar de los sensibles aumentos previstos para AGRIS y CARIS y de la cooperación técnica entre países en desarrollo. En cuanto al Programa de Cooperación Técnica, coincidimos con los puntos de vista ya expresados por numerosos países en desarrollo. La delegación argentina hubiera querido ver en este Programa de Labores y Presupuesto un reforzamiento mayor de los programas principales de Pesca y de Montes. En relación al primero, estima que no resulta beneficioso para los países en desarrollo el aparente desvío de fondos desde la asistencia directa a los países para que logren explotar óptimamente sus recursos, hacia aspectos de información y teoría de evaluación, a realizarse centralmente.

En cuanto al segundo, debería privilegiarse la asistencia de la FAO en el reforzamiento de la capacidad nacional de investigación, como asimismo el fortalecimiento institucional y la capacitación. La primera tendrá importantes efectos en la protección del vasto capital de recursos genéticos vegetales y animales de los bosques, especialmente los tropicales. La segunda y la tercera función tenderán a que se eliminen los obstáculos que afronta en la actualidad la efectiva puesta en marcha de los planes nacionales forestales formulados en el marco del PAFT a fin de aumentar la capacidad de absorción de asistencia de los países en desarrollo para que puedan atraer las inversiones necesarias para el desarrollo de sus sectores forestales.

En el programa principal, Agricultura, mi país ve con especial interés los siguientes de los objetivos y estrategias a largo plazo delineados en el documento; 1.- Conservación de los Recursos Naturales y Protección del Medio Ambiente. 2.- Armonización de Políticas y Mejoramiento del Sistema Internacional de Comercio de Productos Básicos Agrícolas.

Vemos sin embargo, con sorpresa, la disminución de las consignaciones para las industrias alimentarias y agrícolas, y en sanidad animal, a la lucha contra las enfermedades infecciosas. Nos sorprende aún más con respecto a las primeras, si se tiene en cuenta que el Comité del Programa, en su sesión de septiembre pasado, al realizar el examen del Programa Ordinario 1988/89 declaró lo siguiente - y cito textualmente de los párrafos 2.16 y 2.17 del documento CL 96/4 -que dicen: "El Comité reconoció la función decisiva del subprograma para promover agroindustrias en los países en desarrollo con el fin de elevar los ingresos y el empleo en las zonas rurales especialmente en beneficio de los pequeños productores y las mujeres. El Comité convino en que era decisiva la existencia futura de la FAO en el sector de las agroindustrias. Dicha asistencia debería promover activamente la integración vertical y una mayor participación del sector privado y de los agricultores. El Comité alentó a que se estudiara la posibilidad de crear una división mixta FAO/ONUDI de agroindustrias."

Jacques WARIN (France): Monsieur le Président, permettez-moi, puisque c'est la première fois que je prends la parole au cours de cette session, de me féliciter d'avoir l'occasion de le faire une nouvelle fois sous votre présidence éclairée et d'adresser en même temps mes félicitations aux trois Vice-Présidents qui ont été élus hier.

J'ai déjà eu l'occasion de dire, en juin dernier, tout le bien que je pensais de la nouvelle procédure d'élaboration et d'examen du budget qui nous permet, en trois coups de projecteur successifs, d'approfondir petit à petit nos réflexions sur la description des dépenses de l'Organisation. Contrairement à ce que disait hier un de mes collègues ici présent, je ne crois pas qu'il y ait là d'effet de répétition. Il me semble, au contraire, que nous avons intérêt à procéder pas à pas afin d'approfondir nos réflexions et, si possible, de rapprocher nos points de vue puisque le but que nous poursuivons est l'adoption du budget par consensus.

Je me propose de revenir évidemment de manière plus approfondie au cours de la Conférence, sur l'examen du budget et, aujourd'hui même en attendant cet examen plus complet que fera la Conférence générale, je voudrais simplement vous faire partager deux séries de réflexions: la première, sur le niveau des ressources et sur leur progression; la seconde, sur le contenu du Programme de travail et sur sa conformité avec les grandes orientations que nous avons fixées au Conseil précédent.

En ce qui concerne tout d'abord le volume des dépenses, le Secrétariat nous propose un budget de l'ordre de 575 millions de dollars, soit une progression de 15% par rapport à l'exercice précédent, ce qui est conforme à la progression enregistrée par d'autres instances des Nations Unies, et de 1% seulement en termes réels, c'est-à-dire après correction due à l'inflation mondiale. Encore que - M. Shah l'a expliqué très clairement - cette progression de 1% se réduise compte tenu d'une proposition d'absorption de coûts sur différents postes (consultants, voyages, etc.) à seulement 0,44 ou 0,45%, ce qui n'est pas loin, on en conviendra, de la fameuse croissance zéro défendue par un certain nombre de mes partenaires du Groupe de Genève et à laquelle je me rallie en principe tout en admettant, comme c'est la règle pour tout principe, qu'il peut y avoir des exceptions.

J'ajoute que la croissance des coûts de l'ordre de 75 millions de dollars est due pour une très large part à des accroissements obligatoires de coûts de personnel et il ne me paraîtrait pas très sain, en une période où les fonctionnaires de la FAO ont du mal à maintenir leur niveau de vie, de les démoraliser en leur refusant les augmentations auxquelles ils ont droit. Sur ce point, je me rallie à ce que disait mon collègue du Liban, M. Abdel Malek, qui exprimait hier son inquiétude face à la dégradation des conditions de vie des fonctionnaires internationaux dans un certain nombre d'organisations internationales.

Je précise enfin que le Comité financier, au cours de sa session de septembre dernier, n'a pas contesté la validité des calculs de croissance des coûts effectués par le Secrétariat.

En ce qui concerne maintenant le contenu du Programme de travail, l'accroissement des dépenses prévues dans un certain nombre de domaines peut recueillir notre soutien. Il en est ainsi des ouvertures de crédits pour la biotechnologie, la formation agricole, le développement rural, l'aquaculture, etc. Deux tendances me paraissent tout particulièrement positives: d'une part, la progression de certains postes à contenu scientifique (télédétection, biotechnologie) qui sont particulièrement intéressants pour le développement du tiers-monde; d'autre part, l'accent qui a été mis sur l'importance du développement rural dont les différentes composantes ont d'ailleurs été très bien analysées dans l'introduction du Directeur général au document que nous étudions.

On peut, certes, regretter la stagnation relative du Programme de coopération technique, comme l'ont fait dans cette salle un certain nombre de délégués. On pourrait aussi s'interroger sur la justification de certaines réductions de crédits qui nous paraissent malencontreuses pour certains postes dont l'intérêt ne va pas s'affaiblissant. Il en va ainsi des politiques agricoles et alimentaires, de l'élevage et de la gestion des ressources forestières, mais il est évident qu'avec des moyens réduits on ne peut pas tout faire et qu'il fallait opérer des choix.

En conclusion, je dirai que le Programme de travail qui nous est proposé, s'il met l'accent sur la continuité des efforts entrepris, révèle en même temps la capacité de l'Organisation de dégager de nouvelles priorités dans le cadre d'un budget en faible progression: moins de 1% en termes réels. C'est pourquoi la délégation française maintient la position de principe favorable qu'elle avait indiquée précédemment à l'égard de ce Programme.

LE PRESIDENT: Je tiens à communiquer que M. Mohammed Ghofran, Ministre de l'agriculture et de la réforme agraire de l'Afghanistan, vient de nous rejoindre à titre d'observateur à la présente session du Conseil. Nous lui souhaitons la bienvenue au Conseil.

Mlle Faouzia BOUMAIZA (Algérie): Monsieur le Président, malgré les consignes contenues dans le document "Méthodes de travail" du Conseil, la délégation algérienne ne peut manquer à l'agréable devoir de vous adresser à nouveau la bienvenue parmi nous, de vous souhaiter plein succès dans votre tâche et de vous assurer également de son soutien fraternel pour la réussite de nos travaux.

Permettez-nous aussi de féliciter les Présidents du Comité financier et du Comité du Programme, M. Bukharl et M. Mazoyer, pour les efforts accomplis durant leur mandat, qui a été bien laborieux.

Enfin, nous adressons également nos félicitations aux trois Vice-Présidents élus, connus parmi nous pour leur qualité de dialogue constructif.

Monsieur Shah, à sa manière habituelle, claire et concise, a présenté hier matin le Programme de travail et budget proposé par le Directeur général pour l'exercice 1990-91 sur lequel notre délégation entend donner son avis de manière préliminaire avant de l'approfondir lors de la Conférence, lorsque nous débattrons sur ce même point. La première remarque, c'est que, dans le document C 89/3, la présentation du Programme de travail et budget est nettement améliorée. Un effort certain a été accompli par le Secrétariat en vue d'en faciliter l'examen et de comprendre plus aisément les éléments du Programme. Quant au fond, notre délégation appuie le programme de travail proposé pour le prochain biennium car les neuf priorités fixées sont conformes aux recommandations des organes de la FAO et, en particulier, des Conférences régionales.

A ce propos, nous avons relevé avec satisfaction que l'agrométéorologie liée à la surveillance des cultures figure parmi les priorités. Notre expérience nationale a démontré que la connaissance des conditions météorologiques contribue grandement à contenir et à prévenir des phénomènes tels que les invasions acridiennes.

La délégation algérienne a noté également la place accordée à l'intégration de la femme au développement et, à ce propos, nous avons pris bonne note des activités proposées dans le sous-programme 2.1.5.4. L'augmentation prévue est certes plus élevée par rapport au sommaire présenté lors de la session du Conseil de juin dernier mais elle demeure minime par rapport aux ambitions des recommandations du plan d'action pour l'intégration de la femme au développement ainsi que la résolution adoptée à la quatre-vingt-quatorzième session du Conseil. Dans ce cadre, nous félicitons le Secrétariat d'envisager la création d'une équipe spéciale pour aider la promotion et le suivi de l'exécution du plan d'action, et pour ce qui sera fait en vue de recruter et de promouvoir davantage le personnel féminin.

L'Algérie porte également un intérêt particulier aux actions proposées dans le cadre des avis et matière de politique, notamment pour l'aide qu'apporterait la FAO ou pour les réformes et ajustements de politiques et programmes nationaux dans le domaine agricole, ainsi que pour la protection des cultures et le développement des biotechnologies.

La délégation algérienne souhaite en particulier réitérer son plein appui au Programme de coopération technique qui a largement démontré son efficacité et son utilité. Sur ce point, l'argument avancé par une délégation selon laquelle des reliquats enregistrés au titre de ce chapitre justifieraient une révision à la baisse, cet argument est irrecevable, pour au moins deux raisons.

La première est que le caractère spécifique du PCT induit une gestion rigoureuse de ses fonds et nécessite une extrême prudence compte tenu des critères d'urgence et de caractère non programmé, ainsi que d'une durée limitée.

La deuxième est que les coupes drastiques effectuées par le Secrétariat dans le budget des trois exercices précédents, en raison du non-paiement des contributions, couplées aux exigences d'une croissance limitée pour satisfaire à la fois ceux qui préconisent la croissance zéro et ceux, comme notre pays, qui ne peuvent supporter une charge financière trop lourde, ces deux aspects ont entamé non seulement le moral des fonctionnaires de cette institution mais aussi, comme le soulignait à juste titre le Directeur général hier soir, ont sérieusement réduit l'aspect d'intervention de la FAO.

Aussi, selon notre délégation il est impératif plus que jamais que les programmes techniques, notamment les chapitres 2 et 4, soient préservés afin de garantir aux pays membres la possibilité de recours à la FAO lorsque se présentent des situations d'urgence.

Enfin, et toujours sur le PCT, il faut quand même reconnaître qu'en réalité son augmentation ne parvient même pas à rejoindre le niveau de l'exercice précédent puisqu'il est réduit, actuellement à 11,8 % du budget total, alors qu'en 1988/89 sa part était de 12,8 %, soit 1 % de plus, sans parler de 1986/87 où elle était de 14,1 % soit encore une perte de 2,3 % en deux exercices seulement.

Vous l'aurez compris vous-même, Monsieur le Président, s'il y a des programmes pour lesquels mon pays voterait automatiquement, compte tenu de l'intérêt particulier qu'il accorde à ces programmes, c'est bien le chapitre 2 et le chapitre 4 des programmes techniques et économiques. Il se trouve qu'à part la légère augmentation du chapitre 5 - les services de soutien - ce sont les deux seuls programmes qui ont été augmentés de manière raisonnable.

C'est pourquoi nous nous joignons aux très nombreuses délégations qui sont intervenues avant nous pour exprimer le souhait que le Programme de travail et budget soit transmis à la Conférence avec la recommandation de son approbation par consensus.

La délégation algérienne, enfin, souhaite rappeler quelques éléments qui influent directement sur les activités de la FAO.

La première est la situation financière difficile que connaît la FAO du fait du non-paiement de trop nombreuses contributions courantes et arriérées. Et Monsieur le Directeur Général a indiqué hier qu'en fait ce sont 68 millions de dollars qui ont été soustraits durant ces trois dernières années et non pas 45.

Notre délégation considère que le paiement des contributions à l'organisation est une obligation morale et contractuelle du fait de la qualité des pays membres de la FAO, quel que soit l'avis prononcé lors de l'adoption du budget.

Le second élément est que l'examen que la FAO a conduit durant l'exercice actuel a nécessité des dépenses importantes supportées par le budget ordinaire et donc par tous les pays membres, alors même qu'un grand nombre d'entre nous avaient considéré que l'examen de réformes éventuelles de la FAO n'était pas une action d'une urgence absolue, et il faut bien reconnaître que les résultats de cet examen confirment notre point de vue.

Le dernier élément est la dimension humaine. En effet, pendant que nous tergiversons sur les méthodes de calcul et d'approches mathématiques différentes, les paysans, dans nos pays respectifs, attendent de nous des solutions pour résoudre les différents problèmes agricoles et pour améliorer la situation alimentaire dans le monde, principale préoccupation qui devrait nous inciter à discuter de méthodes et d'approches possibles pour vaincre la faim dans le monde.

Mme Ivone DIAS DA GRAÇA (Gabon): La délégation gabonaise voudrait tout d'abord vous exprimer sa satisfaction de vous voir à nouveau présider notre Conseil et féliciter les autres Vice-Présidents élus.

Nous voulons également féliciter le Directeur général et le Secrétariat pour l'important travail accompli dans l'élaboration de ce document très complet, ainsi que Monsieur Shah pour sa présentation très claire. Enfin, nous remercions Monsieur l'ambassadeur Bukhari et Monsieur Mazoyer pour leurs contributions enrichissantes à la présentation du Programme de travail et budget.

La délégation gabonaise approuve le Programme de travail pour 1990-91 ainsi que les priorités énoncées clairement dans le document sur l'orientation des différents organes directeurs de la FAO.

Nous appuyons plus particulièrement les biotechnologies, notamment dans le secteur de la lutte contre les maladies végétales, le développement rural, le rôle de la femme dans le développement et le plan d'action forestier tropical.

Nous nous félicitons de ce qu'à côté des priorités, certains domaines intersectoriels traditionnels, comme la formation et l'assistance aux petits exploitants ainsi que la priorité accordée à l'Afrique, restent des éléments importants du Programme de travail et budget.

Comme d'autres pays en développement nous regrettons que malgré l'augmentation de 2,8 % pour le PCT, celui-ci ne représente que 11,8 % de la part du budget de 1990/91 au lieu des 12,8 % actuels.

En ce qui concerne le budget, nous approuvons le niveau proposé dont l'augmentation est très légère et donc acceptable.

En effet, le Gabon, en raison de la crise économique qu'il traverse, se trouve dans l'impossibilité de faire face à des augmentations de contributions conséquentes dans les organisations internationales.

En conséquence, la délégation gabonaise souhaite que le Conseil recommande à la Conférence pour adoption par consensus le Programme de travail et budget 1990-91.

Jafri JAMALUDDIN (Indonesia): Mr Chairman, first of all allow me to express my happiness at seeing you presiding again over the Council's Session. On behalf of my delegation, I wish to congratulate all the Vice-Chairmen on their being unanimously elected. Furthermore, I wish to express my appreciation to the Director-General and his able staff for having prepared in an excellent manner the Programme of Work and Budget for the coming biennium. I also wish to express my thanks to the Chairmen of the Programme and Finance Committees for their explanation and clarification of various points relating to the Programme of Work and Budget.

Since previous speakers have already expressed their views and considerations, I have no intention of repeating what they have put forward. I wish, instead, to comment on certain aspects which my delegation considers important to be put on record by the Council. FAO has, in the past, repeatedly implemented various programmes with the objective of assisting farmers directly in developing countries, in their efforts to become successful producers and traders of their own agricultural produce. It is the wish of my delegation that FAO be in a position to continue such programmes in the future, since these programmes proved to be important in the implementation of the agricultural development project. In the light of the foregoing, my delegation pays great attention to the consideration of the Programme of Work and Budget of the Organization.

My delegation is in full agreement with the policy message as stated in the Director-General's introduction of the Programme of Work and Budget, which clearly reveals the possibility of maintaining FAO's effectiveness in assisting the developing countries.

We have, however, noted that not all of the ordinarily needed assistance relating to problems in the field, which in most cases are unpredictable, are reflected in the Budget. My delegation would, therefore, welcome all efforts which could lead to the provision of adequate funds for the Technical Cooperation Programme. There is no doubt that we give our full support to the long-term goals and strategies, as well as to the wide range of activities planned under this major Programme.

As in the case of technical and economic programmes, we are of the view that field activities are of importance. We also associate ourselves with the suggestion of further strengthening FAO country offices with the aim of enhancing the effectiveness of their support of the field activities.

With regard to the Technical Cooperation Programme, my delegation is of the view that it is a vital programme for many developing countries, and thus deserves the attention of all. My delegation feels with concern that, as it stands now, there will be a limited increase in the budget for the Technical Cooperation Programme.

We wish to reiterate our support of the priority setting as stated in the Programme of Work and Budget. We welcome the priorities on biotechnology, as this is important for the transfer of technology to the developing countries needed for the success of their agricultural development programme.

My delegation also welcomes the inclusion of the programme of Women in Development in the mainstream of FAO's programmes. Likewise, I wish to reiterate here my delegation's support of the implementation of the Tropical Forestry Action Plan which is in line with the Indonesian Five-Year Development Plan in the field of forestry.

In conclusion, my delegation is pleased to support the Programme of Work and Budget presented by the Director-General which has been considered favourably by the members of the Programme and Finance Committees. My delegation would, therefore, express its sincere hope that the Council will feel able to give its approval of the Programme of Work and Budget for the next biennium.

István DOBOCZKY (Hungary): Mr Chairman I am very glad to see you in the Chair again and I congratulate the three Vice-Chairmen on their election. I also thank Mr Shah and the Chairmen of the Finance and Programme Committees for their excellent presentations.

We know the serious external and internal challenges the Organization is facing. With regard to these challenges, we are satisfied with the Programme of Work and we agree with its priorities. The need would be more, but the Programme has to remain within the limit of reality. As a consequence, we can follow a consensus of a minimum real growth of the Programme and Budget, knowing that it means difficulties for those countries which are short of hard currency.

Ibrahina KABA (Guinée): La délégation guinéenne vous salue, Monsieur le Président, et vous félicite pour la compétence et la sagesse avec lesquelles vous conduisez nos débats.

La délégation guinéenne a examiné attentivement le projet de Programme de travail et budget dont la préparation a été entourée, cette fois, d'une démarche nouvelle et de précautions particulières, en tenant compte des différentes positions des pays membres, ce qui a amélioré sa présentation. Nous en félicitons le Secrétariat.

L'exposé introductif de M. Shah et les observations éclairantes de M. Mazoyer et de M. Bukhari sont suffisamment convaincants quant à l'objectivité et au souci d'efficacité qui ont présidé à l'élaboration de ce document. En effet, le choix des priorités répond aux préoccupations des pays membres, priorités recommandées par les différentes instances de notre Organisation. La faible augmentation du niveau de budget n'est que la conséquence des augmentations de coûts. De toute façon, notre délégation n'est nullement partisane de l'application du principe de la croissance zéro, antithèse d'un développement rationnel. A notre avis, le paiement ponctuel et régulier des contributions par les pays membres reste avant tout la condition essentielle du bon fonctionnement de notre Organisation.

Il a été affirmé ici, et nous le confirmons à notre tour, que le PCT est une opération dont l'intervention initie ou impulse selon le cas d'importants projets de développement. Abaisser son niveau comme nous le constatons c'est affaiblir les possibilités d'assistance de la FAO à nos pays, assistance dont chacun réclame sans cesse le renforcement.

Par ailleurs, pour certaines délégations la tentation est grande de vouloir faire dépendre l'approbation du niveau du budget de l'examen du Rapport du Comité conjoint sur la question des réformes. A notre avis, il s'agit là d'une profonde erreur; c'est une attitude délibérée pour créer la confusion la plus totale, car qu'il y ait réforme ou pas, il faut bien que notre Organisation fonctionne.

Ne passionnons pas un débat dont la solution est à notre portée. La délégation guinéenne appuie fermement le projet de Programme et budget et souhaite que notre Conseil recommande son approbation par consensus à la 25ème Session de notre Conférence.

M. A. LETKKA (Lesotho): I thank you, Mr Chairman. We take the floor at this late stage of deliberations of agenda items to not necessarily come up with any new fresh items but to endorse those ideas already expressed to us, the adoption of the Programme of Work and Budget for 1990-91.

First allow me to join those who spoke before us in expressing our appreciation of a smooth and effective way of presenting the deliberations of this august assembly. We also congratulate your three Vice-Chairmen on their unanimous election. The two Chairmen of the Programme and Finance Committees, together with Mr Shah, have demonstrated their capabilities and commitment in their responsibility, and the Lesothan delegation stands ready to offer its support to the success of the general Council deliberations. I intend to be very brief in my intimations.

It is our belief that ideally FAO priorities should be established by countries in need. We are satisfied that most food deficit countries, including Lesotho, had a significant input in the determination of the nine listed priority areas and the technical and economic programmes as proposed in the Programme of Work and Budget for 1991. We are therefore happy to support the Programme of Work and Budget as it is, as it is in overall conformity with the firm needs of Member Nations. Fortunately the same need to have a broad consensus in this respect. Our main concern is, however, on the negative effect on the applied cuts to the programme of 1986-88. We would have hoped that the level of Programme of Work and Budget for 1990/91 will compensate for the lost momentum of FAO, as a result of the unexpected cuts. We are also disappointed that the TCP provision has further been reduced at a time when the demand on this important programme is increasing. It is our hope that the next Programme of Work and Budget will aim at correcting this imbalance currently haunting our Organization in order to enable it to execute its mandate effectively.

Pedro Agostinho KANGA (Angola): Monsieur le Président, comme je prends la parole pour la première fois, je voudrais en premier lieu exprimer ma satisfaction de vous voir présider cette 96ème session du Conseil. Je profite de cette occasion pour féliciter aussi les trois Vice-Présidents. Mes félicitations s'adressent aussi à M. Shah et à M. Mazoyer, Présidents du Comité financier et du Comité du Programme, pour leur exposé très brillant et pour le complément d'informations qu'ils nous ont donné.

Ce document nous fournit des informations très détaillées sur les choix, les priorités, les propositions de programmes, les augmentations de coût et l'utilisation proposée des ressources. Ainsi, nous ne pouvons passer sous silence les efforts déployés par le Directeur général afin de concilier les opinions des uns et des autres pour aboutir à l'élaboration finale de ce Programme de travail et budget pour 1990-91.

Les priorités définies dans ce programme ont fait l'objet de notre approbation dans différents organes de notre Organisation où ce problème a été posé. Ici nous ne faisons que réitérer notre position. Vu le peu de temps qui nous est imparti, nous n'allons pas faire une analyse exhaustive de ce document car nous aurons l'opportunité de le faire à la 25ème session de la Conférence. Nous ferons simplement et brièvement quelques commentaires sur certaines de ces priorités.

Pour ce qui a trait à l'évolution d'une étape supplémentaire pour la présentation du Programme de travail et budget, notre délégation fait sienne la déclaration présentée hier par l'Ambassadeur du Congo. Mon gouvernement pourrait être favorable à cette formule, si effectivement elle permettait d'arriver facilement à un consensus pour l'adoption du Programme de travail et budget et permettait le règlement des contributions et arriérés dus par certains Etats Membres, et en particulier par le plus grand bailleur de fonds, car le maintien de cette formule ne fera que provoquer des dépenses supplémentaires pour l'Organisation.

S'agissant du PCT, nous ne pouvons qu'exprimer nos regrets de voir sa part réduite de un pour cent, car on ne peut plus douter de son efficacité. Pour terminer, ma délégation estime que l'augmentation minime du niveau du budget de 5,5 millions de dollars ne répond pas aux besoins ressentis par les pays en développement, et elle ne comblera même pas la lacune créée par les compressions de programme opérées au cours des deux derniers exercices.

Malgré cette faible croissance, nous demandons que le Conseil recommande à la Conférence d'approuver par consensus l'augmentation du budget proposée.

Ma délégation appuie le Programme de travail et budget pour 1990-91.

C.Srinuasa SASTRY (India): Thank you, Mr Chairman. The Indian delegation is happy to see you chair this Ninety-sixth Session of the FAO Council. Under your chairmanship, we are confident that the Council will be able to arrive at unanimous recommendations based on the consensus on the two important agenda items. First, the Programme of Work and Budget 1990-91 and the mid-term objectives, and second, conclusions to the review of certain aspects of the FAO's goals and operations. We would also congratulate the three Vice-Chairmen who will be assisting you in your onerous and difficult task. We thank Mr Shah for his presentation of the documents. We also thank Mr Mazoyer and Ambassador Bukhari who, in their introductory remarks, have presented to the Council the different stages of consideration of the proposal for the Programme of Work and Budget in the two governing bodies since January 1989, as also the reason and consideration that weighed with the two Committees in arriving at their near unanimous recommendations with a few members expressing some reservations about the Programme of Work and Budget, which is now before us for consideration.

Mr Chairman, India has been fully and closely associated with this exercise of formulating the Programme of Work and Budget since January 1989, as a member of the Programme Committee, the COAG and also the Council. India also had the privilege of being associated with the detailed examination of the FAO's goals and operations as a member of the Programme Committee. Thus, we have had adequate opportunities to express our views and opinions at different stages of this fairly long drawn-out process for the formulation of the Programme of Work and Budget which commenced ten months ago.

May I, at this stage, appeal through you, Mr Chairman, to all the distinguished delegates and the Member Nations who are on the governing body of the FAO, like the Programme and Finance Committees, to utilize fully the opportunities available to them in the Sessions of the governing bodies. In these bodies, all the issues should be raised; all the relevant questions should be asked; all clarifications required should be sought and all the required factual information should be obtained, so that the work in these committees becomes more meaningful, productive and effective. If all members adopt this approach, we, in the Council, may not have to cover the same ground all over once again. Such an approach, in our view, would, while avoiding duplication, be conducive to more effective use of the Council's time. In this background, the Indian delegation would not like to go into the different aspects of this detailed, bulky, but analytical document, C 89/3 and the Supplements. Instead, we would like to confine our comments to some of the broader issues as related to the Programme of Work and Budget.

With your permission, Mr Chairman, we would also like to express our views on, and the reactions to, some of the suggestions made during the discussions yesterday and today by some of the distinguished delegates while they were dealing with this agenda item or the other agenda items discussed yesterday.

Mr Chairman, it is clear that the ongoing process for the formulation of Work and Budget for 1990-91, spread over the last ten months, has provided the Member Nations of the FAO, full and ample opportunities to participate in the process and to express their views in an extensive, detailed and a functional dialogue. The widest possible discussions and consultations have been held with the members.

We are also clear that the document that has emerged in the shape of document C 89/3 is in terms of its content and format, is clearer, more analytical, and has visibly added to transparency in terms of its presentation, prioritization and inter-sectoral programme relationships.

Mr Shah referred to the new colour of cover of the document C 89/3. We for one would prefer green, a colour widely associated with agriculture, and more particularly, with the "green" revolution.

The objective of this process of dialogue and discussion has evidently been to bridge the gaps in perceptions, to narrow the differences in views and opinions of the Member Nations through goodwill and understanding, and to evolve as broad a consensus as possible, not only in terms of the size of the Programme of Work and Budget, and the priorities of programmes and activities, at least in the medium term, but also in terms of inter-sectoral allocations.

In this exercise, as has been brought out by the Chairmen of the Programme and Finance Committees in their introductory remarks, a large and substantial measure has been achieved to a wide ranging consensus. It is now also clear that the views expressed and the questions raised by the Member Nations in the process of discussions on the Programme of Work and Budget, have been taken into consideration by the Director-General while formulating the Programme of Work and Budget which is now before us in the shape of document C 89/3.

Thus, Mr Chairman in the Ninety-sixth Session of the FAO Council, the Indian delegation, while expressing the view that it would no doubt be desirable for the FAO to list out its priorities in the Programme of Work and Budget for the next biennium, we also urged that the FAO should be circumspect while implementing these priorities. We are also keen that these priorities should not be perceived by the Members of the FAO as rigid priorities to be applied rigidly across the board to all the activities of the FAO all over the world. We pointed out that even in a geographically small country like India, with its 15 agro-climatic zones and federal states, we have been finding it extremely difficult to set out priorities in our own programme and activities for India as a whole. Thus, we found that what is applicable to the Thar desert and the semi-arid areas of Rajasthan in northwest India, which are comparable to the Sahara and sub-Saharan regions of Africa, will not have much relevance when we deal with northeast India where the rainfall ranges from 1 500 to 2 000 millimetres per year.

In this context, the Indian delegation is happy to note that on page xii in paragraph 2.15 it has been made clear that for at least four of the nine priority areas the listing should not be construed as an order of preference. We would also endorse the statement in the same paragraph that the other five priority areas are cross-sectoral and therefore merit a general presentation transcending sectoral programme narratives.

Similarly, while participating in the Tenth Session of the COAG, the Indian delegation proposed that a Regional Study for Asia and the Pacific on the lines of the Africa Study and the Latin America Study may be included in the Programme of Work and Budget for 1990-91. We are happy to see that this suggestion has been accepted and that a Regional Study of Asia and the Pacific has been included in the Programme of Work and Budget under sub-programme 2.1.8.2 at paragraph 20 of page 147 of document C 89/3.

However, we also realize that the resources are not only somewhat inelastic but are indeed finite and limited, while the demands on FAO, particularly from the developing countries, are not only very elastic but are growing rapidly. Therefore, it would not be possible for FAO to accommodate in the Programme of Work and Budget all the requests received from Member Nations. Thus, the Indian delegation believes that, in the food information and early warning system, workshops for managers of the national and regional early warning systems have an important role to play. However, we note that the number of workshops has been reduced from three in the 1988-89 biennium to two in 1990-91. While we are disappointed at this reduction in the number of workshops, we realize that the situation has to be accepted. We rationalize that this reduction becomes inevitable when FAO wants to limit the growth in its budget to the lowest possible figure.

This brings me to the two concepts of, first, zero real growth in the budget and, second, maximum absorption of increased costs by effective matching savings and imposing cuts, which have been referred to by many delegates in the course of the discussions yesterday and today. As you are aware, Mr Chairman, these two concepts have been raised and articulated on a number of occasions earlier in the governing bodies of FAO. They have been fully and thoroughly debated. One could argue that a discussion on these aspects becomes somewhat academic when we take note of the fact mentioned by the Director-General in his intervention late yesterday evening that reductions had had to be effected to the tune of US\$ 25 million in 1987, US\$ 20 million in 1988 and US\$ 23 million in 1989, a total reduction of US\$ 68 million over three years, mainly because of the delays in the payment of assessed contributions by Member Nations.

That point apart, it is understandable that in a technical agency like FAO the Member Nations, particularly from the developing world, expect the International organizations to provide more and - what is more important - better services.

Against this background, the governing bodies of FAO cannot subscribe to these two concepts of zero real growth and maximum absorption of increasing costs. As you are aware, Mr Chairman, an overwhelmingly large number of members in FAO's governing bodies have not been able to accept these two proposals.

In this context, and in the spirit of democracy and equality that prevails in all discussions and work in the UN bodies, may I appeal through you, Mr Chairman, to all the members, that the widely accepted view which is contained in document C 89/3, and which is based on consensus, be accepted as a basis for further action by all the Member Nations. If this could be unanimously endorsed by this Council and later by the Conference, FAO could proceed ahead full throttle with all its activities in the next biennium, unlike what happened during the last three years, when, due to various reasons known to all of us, there has regrettably been an avoidable cutdown in activities, much to the disappointment of the developing countries.

A point has also been made that the UN itself has adopted a budget reflecting negative growth, and on this analogy it has been suggested that FAO might follow suit. Unlike the United Nations, which in the ultimate analysis deals with political matters and issues, the FAO is a technical agency dealing with programmes and activities which are of great significance to the poorer nations. The Director-General pointed out yesterday evening that an analogy should be drawn between institutions which are comparable. Further, unlike the governing bodies of the United Nations, where also the representatives of the same member countries have participated, the governing bodies of the FAO have, through an overwhelming majority, come to the view that the growth in the budget, as presented in the Programme of Work and Budget C 89/3, is the minimum growth acceptable.

Against this background, the Indian delegation would earnestly appeal to all the members that the Programme of Work and Budget, as explained and embodied in document C 89/3, which has emerged after a long drawn out and wide consultation process as the consensus, be unanimously adopted by the Council and Conference.

We, too, share the perceptions of many Member Nations about the size of the allocations for the TCP in 1990-91. We would very much have liked to see a higher allocation. However, we realize that under the circumstances, the allocation, even though at a relatively lower percentage, was the best possible. We do, however, hope to see that the allocation for TCP will gradually and steadily be expanded so that activities in the future biennia will increase.

May I also take this opportunity to react to some of the suggestions made by some delegates in the discussions yesterday and today?

If I heard him and understood him correctly, the delegate from Finland, during his intervention yesterday morning, made two points: first, that he would like to reserve his opinion about the level of the Programme of Work and Budget until the outcome of the review process emerged clearly; and, second, that the review should not be used as an opportunity to seek additional allocation of funds for different programmes. Mr Chairman, we would submit for your consideration our view that it would not be correct to link the outcome of the FAO's Review to the level of the Programme of Work and Budget for 1990-91. We feel that these are two separate and independent issues and exercises. The Programme of Work and Budget has been formulated taking into consideration all the available information from the ongoing FAO Review as well as all the inputs that became available during the process of dialogue, discussion and consultation spread over ten long months. We also have before us now the full documentation relating to the FAO Review, which will come up before us as item 11. While we note that the Council will be devoting adequate time to discuss this in detail over the next three days, it is clear that the review process has testified to and reaffirmed the solidity and dynamism of FAO and has given the Organization a clean bill of health.

In this context, we would urge that linking these two issues of the outcome of the FAO Review and the Programme of Work and Budget would neither be correct nor appropriate.

Similarly, the point made that the Review should not be looked upon as an opportunity to ask for extra funds requires, in our view, to be contested. We shall no doubt be dealing with this aspect also in greater detail when we discuss Agenda Item 11. At this stage we would only request delegates not to prejudge the outcome of the Review. We would urge that the proposals in the Programme of Work and Budget before us be considered and decided upon independent of the outcome of the FAO Review. We should, however, recognize that, depending on the final and ultimate outcome of the Review in the Conference, the proposals in the Programme of Work and Budget might require some modifications.

Similarly, one of the delegates suggested yesterday that the FAO should give up marginal and obsolete activities. It was also suggested that, among the organizations in the UN system, the new activities should be taken up by the UN organizations in the system which have the relative comparative advantage.

Mr Chairman, you are fully aware of all the documents that are now available to us relating to the FAO Review, be they the reports of the management consultants, or of the two groups of experts, and they have not brought out even a single instance in which FAO is persisting with marginal or obsolete activities. Indeed, all the Review documentation, including the reports of the Joint Programme and Finance Committees, have called for strengthening of the activities at FAO. Similarly, the reports of the two groups of experts refer to various instances of duplication among the organizations in the UN system and urge FAO to assert its role. These reports also pleaded that Member Nations should help FAO to do so.

Further, when we are dealing with a new activity like biotechnology, how does one decide about comparative advantages? The Indian delegation, however, is happy to see that priority is being given to biotechnology in the Programme of Work and Budget for 1990-91. We, for one, look up to FAO as a multilateral international agency which would ensure that the benefits of the latest advances in the frontier areas of technological development do not bypass the developing countries but would indeed be available to the developing countries for speeding up their growth rates in agriculture.

While on this subject, we would strongly endorse what is stated in paragraphs 2.19 to 2.23 on pages xii and xiii of document C 89/3. As a representative of a developing country, we would expect FAO to ensure that the biotechnology developments which are taking place more and more in the private sector, in contrast to the earlier scientific breakthroughs in agriculture which accrued either through government or public sector organizations or through international research organizations in the CGIAR system, do not get monopolized only by the developed countries.

While dealing with biotechnology, one of the distinguished delegates also referred to the need for putting in place a mechanism for validating the claims of these advances and testifying about the safety of their use. We would endorse this suggestion and envisage a role for FAO in this activity. However, we are unable to endorse the suggestion of the distinguished delegate that, in evaluating these claims, one should only look at the scientific aspects and not at the socio-economic considerations. We should submit that, in dealing with matters relating to biotechnology, socio-economic considerations are indeed important and have to be given due and appropriate weight by a UN specialized agency such as the FAO. These aspects, in our view, are important and cannot be ignored.

A suggestion was made yesterday morning by one of the distinguished delegates, during the general discussion about the agenda for the Council, that on Agenda Item 11 - Review of FAO - the Council could possibly formulate a draft resolution for consideration by the Conference. We would respectfully plead against such a course of action. The review process has already involved 18 experts in two groups, a number of firms of management consultants and 20 members of the Programme and Finance Committees. The outcome of this exercise is now before the forty-nine members of the Council. In another week all of the 158 Member Nations are due to meet at the FAO Conference. Many Member Nations are likely to be represented by their Agricultural Ministers as compared to a relatively lower level of representation of the forty-nine Member Nations of this Council. In this context, although we look forward to a detailed discussion on Agenda Item 11 in the Council over the next three days, we urge that it would not be appropriate to think in terms of any course of action such as a draft resolution which, in our view, would reduce or limit the options available to the Conference.

Before concluding, I will deal with two brief points. A point has been raised as to whether or not the new process introduced as an experimental measure in the budget making procedure should be made a permanent part of FAO procedures. In this connection, I invite your attention to our discussions in the Ninety-fifth Session of the Council, which is also contained in the Director-General's introduction. It has clearly been stated that the Council concluded that a final decision on the issue of continuing the experimental procedure should therefore be taken at the Conference depending on whether this procedure helps in the emergence of a consensus. We submit that this position should remain.

My second point concerns the lapse factor. Going through the documents (supplement A of C 89/3 Appendix B, paragraph 3.19) to which a reference has been made by some members concerning the conclusion of the Finance Committee namely that it could not reach a definite conclusion, and noted that the matter should be pursued in Council and Conference. Having gone through the record, India would support this proposal that the lapse factor be fixed at 3 percent instead of 5.5 percent as was being done earlier.

To sum up, the Indian delegation would submit to all members of FAO Council that the proposals relating to the Programme of Work and Budget (document C 89/3) be endorsed by Council. They are the outcome of a protracted process of discussion, consultation and dialogue and are based on a balanced, responsive approach to the views and requirements of all Member Nations as a whole. This is the best consensus that has emerged and meets the expectations of a predominant number of members of FAO. We urge that the Council recommend the Programme of Work and Budget to the Conference, for acceptance through consensus..

I conclude with an apology to you and the distinguished delegates for this somewhat lengthy intervention.

Angel BARBERO MARTIN (España): Nos unimos a las demás delegaciones que han expresado su satisfacción por verle a usted en la presidencia, y por el trabajo que ha desarrollado la Secretaría y los Comités de Finanzas y del Programa. No queremos restar tiempo a la marcha de estos debates y no vamos a entrar en el análisis detallado del Programa, por lo menos de momento.

Pero sí nos limitaremos a comentar la propuesta del Director General referente al aumento en el presupuesto, que se ha presentado ante este Consejo. Entendemos que este aumento es muy reducido; tan reducido que en términos reales diríamos que puede llegar a ser negativo con el desarrollo de este Programa a medida que transcurra el tiempo. Y puede ser negativo por diversas razones, pero la más importante es que no se cuenta, como es natural al hacer el presupuesto, con los retrasos en el pago de las cuotas de los grandes contribuyentes, algunos de ellos, a estos retrasos me refiero, ya endémicos. La persistencia de esta demora produce unas pérdidas generales porque se reciben grandes cantidades de dinero que al cabo de meses o también de años no valen lo mismo que cuando se debieron haber pagado.

Por eso, tampoco compartimos el razonamiento de algunas delegaciones por el cual se pide a la FAO que se adapte a las escaseces provocadas artificialmente por los retrasos de los principales donantes. Esto nos recuerda, Sr. Presidente, una imagen de una cámara llena de personas a la que se está extrayendo desde el exterior el oxígeno, y al mismo tiempo se les está diciendo: "No se muevan; ahorren el aire porque el aire no les va a venir. Se van a morir ustedes, pero por lo menos muéranse plácidamente, muéranse tranquilos".

Estamos seguros de que se necesitan muchas reformas en la FAO y que la mayoría de ellas encontrarían el consenso entre ambas partes, y me refiero a países donantes y países receptores.

Hemos oído a algún delegado, concretamente al ilustre colega de Lesotho, hablar de que las prioridades las deben fijar aquellas comunidades que en el ámbito de la agricultura y la alimentación expresen determinadas necesidades. Esto es algo que nosotros también lo hemos dicho alguna vez, y viene a cuenta, se ha dicho aquí también, por ejemplo, con el tema de la biotecnología. Recordemos lo que ocurrió con la Revolución Verde, que tantos beneficios ha traído a muchos países, aumentando espectacularmente la productividad en ciertos cultivos.

Pero recordemos también las limitaciones que ha sufrido por razones muchas veces económicas y sociales, por razones incluso ecológicas, cuando esta Revolución ha requerido un paquete de insumos agrarios, a veces no accesible a ciertos campesinos, y sobre todo, provocador de desequilibrios ambientales y ecológicos.

Sin embargo, a la FAO le toca el papel de ofrecer la suficiente eficiencia y transparencia para suscitar la confianza, tanto de los países donantes como de los países receptores, y así resultar el canal adecuado por donde circule la ayuda necesaria en el momento, en la cuantía y en el lugar óptimos.

Pero para llegar a un consenso que sea fructífero, que los que puedan pagar lo hagan, y lo hagan a tiempo, Sr. Presidente. Si no, me temo que a lo que vamos a asistir aquí en las jornadas que nos restan va a resultar un diálogo de sordos que no va a beneficiar a nadie.

LE PRESIDENT: Nous avons entendu 46 orateurs sur ce point très important de l'ordre du jour. Avec votre permission, je vais demander à M. Shah, d'abord, puis à M. Bonte-Friedheim et, enfin, à M. Dutia, de bien vouloir nous apporter les éclaircissements et les éléments d'appréciation nécessaires pour répondre aux différentes questions posées par messieurs les délégués.

V.J. SHAH (Assistant Director-General, Office of Programme, Budget and Evaluation): At the end of such a rich debate with such a large number of interventions, it is no mean task to try and reply to all the questions which have been raised. With your permission, I propose to deal with all the questions by categories of subjects. If I were to reply to each delegate individually it would really be abusing the time of Council.

However, I should like to state that while I reply by category of subject, the Secretariat, and I in particular, have taken a very careful note of each question and even the nuances of the questions.

First of all, let me deal with the comments made on the subject of the programme increase. Is the real programme increase proposed 1 percent, or is it 0.45 percent? Does the table of budgetary comparison in paragraph 4.4, need to be changed? The table given in the document before you does not need to be changed. We have given in that table, which appears at page 54, the budgetary proposal at the rate of lira 1235 to the US\$ which shows that the real programme increase would be 0.97 percent and we have given the table at the hypothetical rate of lira 1350 to the US\$, which is near to the current rate of exchange, and where you would see that the programme increase is 1 percent.

What we have said when we refer to 0.5 percent is that, when you consider the proposed programme increase of US\$ 5.5 million - but bear in mind that US\$ 3 million of cost increases are not included and are to be absorbed - and compare the US\$ 5.5 million with the US\$ 3 million, what is the difference? The difference is US\$ 2.5 million and yesterday the Director-General went even further to explain that this increase is an estimated increase. There are so many unforeseen elements, for example new developments, new demands and conditions which can and do arise at this stage when we look at the new biennium, that even this increase of US\$ 2.5 million could very likely amount to zero.

It distressed the Secretariat to hear those comments which were made about an inadequate programme increase in certain areas. It distressed us, if I may speak for the Director-General as well, because we would wish to respond even further and I am sure the Director-General would have preferred to submit a programme of work and budget which responded to every demand made, but then the increase would have been considerably higher. The two subjects which have been mentioned most often bear some further clarification and comment.

First of all the comments made about the programme increase in the forestry sector and the major programme - Forestry. If certain distinguished delegates are unhappy that the increase is not greater, then we ourselves are unhappy that the increase could not have been greater because of the overall constraints which have affected the formulation of this Programme of Work and Budget. However, bear in mind that if you look at the table of estimates by chapter, which starts with the approved 1988/89 budget, this shows the programme change without cost increases. The major programme Agriculture is proposed to get a programme increase of 1.26 percent, Fisheries 1.93 percent, Forestry 3.09 percent. So there has been some effort made to discriminate in favour of forestry.

As regards changes in the forestry sector between the Summary Programme of Work and Budget and the full Programme of Work and Budget, there again I should like to draw attention to three sub-programmes: 2.331 on Training and Institutions, 2.332 on Investment Planning and Statistics and 2.333 on Policies and Information. In each case there is a programme increase in the final Programme of Work and Budget which is somewhat greater than that which had been proposed in the Summary.

The other programme area which has aroused the most comment is that regarding the Technical Cooperation Programme. Here none of us can fail to hear very clearly the comments which have been expressed: the comments of support for the Technical Cooperation Programme and the regret that there is a relative decline in the resources of the TCP in the next biennium. I am sure the Director-General wishes that he could have proposed a higher increase since the demands on TCP are so clear, so loud and so persistent.

One representative enquired about whether the resources available for the TCP in the next biennium in fact would not be greater than the amount proposed because of the unobligated funds which would be carried over from this biennium into the next. I should like to be very clear on this score. The amount proposed for the TCP in the next biennium is \$67.7 million. That is the appropriation that the Conference is asked to approve for the TCP. That amount will not be augmented by any amount carried over from this biennium. The reason is very simply that the appropriation for the TCP in this biennium, the US\$63 million, will be fully utilized for projects approved during this biennium. I can report, as my colleague from the Development Department has informed me, that of the total TCP appropriation, that is \$63,148,000, you would expect an average monthly approval of some US\$2.5 million a month for the full amount to be approved for projects during the biennium.

At the moment, with 2 months still to go, since we are at the beginning of November, we have less than US\$2 million left, in fact US\$1,850,000, and at the moment there is a portfolio of \$23 million worth of projects, not just requests but projects which have been appraised and analyzed, and meet the TCP criteria. So the demand on the TCP, I would point out first, is clear. Secondly, there is no concealed additionality of funds which will be available in the next biennium.

Another question was raised as to whether there would be any TCP funds which would lapse, the argument supposedly being that if we are not able to utilize the funds that we do have and funds are allowed to lapse, how can we ask for the level of the TCP that the Director-General has proposed? Let me point out that one delegate referred to the lapse of \$7 million from the TCP appropriation of 1984/85. The amount was US\$6,824,000. There were two factors which we need to bear in mind as to why these funds from 1984/85 were allowed to lapse at the end of 1987.

First, it was because it was in 1987 that we were hit by the enormous financial crisis due not only to the well known reasons of delays in payment of assessed contributions, but also related to that was the totally staggering decline in miscellaneous income. The miscellaneous income for 1986/87 had been estimated at US\$41 million and because of the lack of receipt of payments, because of the collapse of interest rates on placements of the limited funds that we did have, the miscellaneous income would have been less than 30 percent of what had been projected. You will all remember that because we discussed the financial crisis when it first arose in 1986. In that situation it was a deliberate decision of the Director-General to be very tight on the TCP approved funds and to encourage that funds from approved projects could lapse to the extent possible, and that amount lapsed would be added to your miscellaneous income for that biennium.

The second factor is that the 1984/85 TCP appropriation, which you will recall was originally of US\$57 million, was augmented by a special additional transfer of US\$15 million in that biennium which came from savings, from essentially savings on staff costs. Because of the crisis of agriculture in Africa and the emergency programme of rehabilitation that US\$15 million had been added to the TCP appropriation at that time.

So those were the two factors: the TCP appropriation then amounting to US\$72 million in 1984/85, and the financial problems which led to a lapse of the funds of US\$6.8 million.

I would conclude on this point by saying that I do not expect any significant amounts to lapse from the TCP appropriation for 1986/87.

A number of comments have been made about the financial situation, and in fact the Director-General himself responded to some of the concerns yesterday. May I point out that you will be considering the financial situation in further detail under the next Agenda Item 10.1, so at this stage I would not go into any detail on that score. A specific question was also asked about how the Secretariat envisages the situation on payment of contributions. I think that this is a point which should be put particularly to the Member Nation which is most concerned, accounting for 78 percent of the total amounts presently due.

There has been a lot of discussion about cost increase. The Council has on the one hand been satisfied, I think, by the review made by the Finance Committee and the statements by the Chairman of the Finance Committee and by those members of the Finance Committee who are here in the Council who have attested to their satisfaction with the review of cost increases that they undertook. Nevertheless, some questions remain and it is certainly not the Secretariat's intention to say "Since the Finance Committee is satisfied we do not need to reply to any questions". Of course we are open as always, and we try to satisfy all Member Nations.

There may be some difficulty in the understanding of cost increases. I do not think this is due to any lack of information which is submitted, because I will base my reply on the information which is submitted not only to you but to the Finance Committee.

Questions have been asked about the size of the cost increase. First of all may I draw attention to the fact that the cost increases which are shown as US\$76.6 million are shown at the budget rate of Lire 1235 to the dollar. The same cost increases at a different budget rate - here again you have the comparison shown in the table - at a budget rate of Lire 1350 the cost increases amount to US\$59,030,000. What are we talking about? Is it US\$76 million or US\$59 million? I would say we are talking about two things. We are talking about cost increases at a budget rate and we are talking about the cost increases at the rate that the Conference will eventually approve. If the Conference approves this budget proposal at the rate of L 1375 to the dollar the cost increases will be even lower. They will not be \$59 million; they will be US\$55 million. This is one point about which we should be very clear.

Because of the number of questions which have been raised about the cost increases, let me try and give you one example of how these cost increases operate because of the methodology and the factors on which they are based.

There is really very little speculation. Let me take the example of the post adjustments, since this is one of the major items of the cost increase. In this connection one delegate referred very early on to a paragraph on page XLIX and asked whether it was correct that the post adjustment had reached a level of class 11 as stated in the document. I should clarify that everything in the cost increases before you is at the budget rate, and it should be clarified that the class 11 was at the budget rate and not at the exchange rate operating during the month of June. As the Finance Committee is also aware, since they follow the personnel developments on a monthly basis in the salaries and remuneration of the Organization, in June the exchange rate was Lire 1435, and the class was 8 plus 0.8.

What does this mean? It means that the currency saving, the beneficial effects of the currency exchange rate, led to a credit to the Special Reserve Account, but at the budget rate, since the whole programme budget is given to you at one rate, we have to show to you what the class was at the budget rate.

On the question of biennialization and inflation, let us take the question of post adjustment. I draw attention to Table D - Cost Increases on page XLVII. It is the full page table of cost increases. The programme base for 1990/91 shows the post adjustment amount of US\$28,511,000. Of course this refers only to professional staff. The biennialization amount is US\$16,403,000. How did we come to this amount of US\$16,403,000? It is not on the basis of estimates of inflation. The post adjustment in our standard professional costs was budgeted for this biennium at the rate of Lire 1235, at US\$1,095 per man month. Actually, the cost is US\$1,725. The biennialization cost is calculated by taking this difference in cost and applying it to the total number of professional man months for the biennium, lapsed by 5.5 percent, that is to say 26,037 man months. So there is no jiggery-pokery, there is no flight of imagination on the calculation of this biennialization cost.

For the inflation we have given an amount of US\$8,150,000. On what is that based? It is based on an assumption. But that is an assumption which we give you. We do not hide it from you and we tell you what it is. It is an assumption that taking the post adjustment as a base, and according to the current rate of inflation, provision is made to cover in 1990/91 the cost equivalent of class 12 applicable at June 1990 and class 13 at May 1991. There are similar calculations for each category, and I only referred to one item to explain how this matter is dealt with.

Questions were also raised about the absorption of costs, and argument was advanced by some that since there is a provision included for US\$14 million - which refers, may I point out, not only to the increase in professional salaries which would result from the General Assembly action on the recommendations of the International Civil Service Commission but also to the increase in general service salaries which would result also from the ICSC's review of the general service salaries in Rome.

An argument was advanced that, since these amounts- the one for Professional salaries amounting to 8.2 million dollars, and the one for the General Service salaries amounting to 6.1 million dollars - since these are estimates, what basis do we have for including them?

Mr Chairman, for the Professional salaries, the Council will recall that there has been no increase in the salaries since 1975. Now I do not think it is for me or the Secretariat to try to argue with the Council what the outcome of the General Assembly action would be, but the Director-General considers it a reasonable assumption to make, a reasonable assumption which he shares with you.

Let me point out, Sir, that if this provision has been included now, even on the assumption, there are some very clear facts on which it is based. The ICSC itself has calculated the results in terms of costs of the recommendations which it is making. These amount to a total of 90 million dollars, but they affect all organizations: they affect not only the basic salary, but the post adjustment system, mobility and hardship allowances, motivation and productivity allowances, annual leave allowances, and others. So the provision that we have calculated as applying to the Regular Programme of FAO, as I reported to the Director-General, is really the minimum. As I informed the Finance Committee when I discussed this matter, the Secretariat would not be at all surprised if the provision may be found sufficient, but it is a prudent estimate which we are including.

Have such costs been absorbed? I have found only one instance, and that was in the biennium 1980-81. I must confess that I have not gone back more than 12 or 13 years, but in 1980-81 there was a cost increase amounting to 8 million dollars - just over 8 million dollars - which was absorbed. At that time, this cost was met by a withdrawal for the Working Capital Fund to the tune of 5.6 million dollars, and the withdrawal from the Working Capital Fund to the tune of 2.6 million dollars. However, that was due to the result of a General Service salary increase which was not foreseen, which could not be foreseen, and which only came into effect late in the biennium. In this situation we know that there are proposals for Professional salary increases which are under consideration. We know the magnitude of these recommendations. We know the implications. We know that the General Service salary survey should have been undertaken even earlier. If it has not been, you may thank the Director-General for what it has saved the Organization, but it is going to come into effect.

In this situation there is only one course, Mr Chairman, that the Director-General can propose: the course of prudence, to include the provision that the best estimates would indicate should be included.

Finally, there are some questions on the Special Reserve Account. It has been suggested that, since we have such positive experiences with the forward currency exchange arrangements, the level of the Special Reserve Account should be reduced from its present 5 percent to 1 percent. This is a suggestion which I find very difficult to follow, and certainly with which I would not agree. The Council will recall that the Special Reserve Account has three main purposes, of which dealing with the results of currency exchanges is only one. It has also to deal with the inadequacy of the Working Capital Fund, and it has to deal with unbudgeted costs.

Now with the size of the amounts due to the Organization, I find it very difficult to understand how it can be argued or suggested that the level of the Special Reserve Account should be reduced. Certainly, such a suggestion would make more sense if those who advocated it had first given evidence to other Member Nations of the contributions that they had themselves paid. Mr Chairman, since my colleagues are going to deal with other programme matters, I will not abuse your patience and generosity in time.

LE PRESIDENT: Je remercie M. Shah pour les explications qu'il vient de nous donner et je donne la parole à M. Bonte-Friedheim.

C.H. BONTE-FRIEDHEIM (Assistant Director-General, Agriculture Department): Mr Chairman, a relatively large number of technical subjects were raised by many delegates in the discussion of this item. They will be raised again when the subject comes up in Conference, and we will reply to some of them in Conference. However, there seem to be four technical comments and questions which require an immediate response, two short responses and two more detailed responses.

The detailed responses will deal with two of our priority programmes, and I can confirm to the distinguished delegate of India that there is no order of priority areas. In the Secretariat we are pleased that there seems to be consensus on the priority areas in total. We do not think we would get a consensus on the order of priorities from this Council or from the Conference.

The first short response is to the Finnish delegate who enquired about land use policies in FAO. Land use policies and land use planning are multi-disciplinary activities in FAO. They have been assigned to the division dealing with soil and water, to the division dealing with natural resources. This Division services all technical units dealing with animals, with crops or with trees in the Forestry Department. Remote sensing and agricultural research are other subjects where one Division provides services to other units. It would be very expensive if the Animal Division, the Plant Division and the Forestry Department all had their own land use planning unit. In land use you need a minimum critical mass of expertise if you want to be successful.

FAO's governing bodies have agreed that land use planning is not related to any specific beneficiary of land use and, indeed, nor should it be. Sound land use planning integrates all forms of land use, and this is well reflected by the subject matter being dealt with by a special inter-departmental working group. In this inter-departmental working group, the Fisheries, Forestry and Agricultural Department Divisions are all represented at senior level and the chairmanship rotates every two years by the ADG's of the Departments concerned.

The second point to which I would like to reply is from the distinguished delegate from Argentina. She noticed that in the Agricultural Industries Sub-programme there is a reduction, in spite of the general support for this Programme. The reduction is basically in two programme elements: firstly, in agriculture where a lot has been done in the last four years and where we have reduced the work and can reduce the work, we believe. The second is in the field of hides and skins development, where UNIDO has become a major actor. In the line of coordination and cooperation, we have given some of the work, or have been forced to give some of the work, to UNIDO. UNIDO seems to be better in attracting funds for this work than we have been in FAO. UNIDO seems also to be better in attracting funds on biotechnology, since they support a center on biotechnology in agriculture. That brings me to the first of the major subjects, which is biotechnology. In view of the many possible misunderstandings and the dangers of generalization, I would like to reply to the US statement in some detail. As I said, biotechnology is, and will be, much more in future - and the distinguished delegate from India has said the same thing - a major concern of many developing countries. The first comment the US made in their statement on biotechnology quotes from our own Programme of Work and Budget, and I repeat the quote, that FAO will assess and report the global implications of widespread uses of biotechnology, as these may distort established patterns of comparative advantage. Normally for the defence of FAO's position, we do not quote other sources, but on behalf of FAO I had the honour to explain in various fora FAO's views on the possible advantages and disadvantages of biotechnological development, and what is meant by distortion.

Mr Chairman, if you will permit, I should like to quote from an external source this time. I should like to read a very short paragraph from a World Bank document issued on 15 August this year, entitled "Sustainable Growth with Equity: A Long-Term Perspective for Sub-Saharan Africa". It deals, as the title says, with Africa, but the general applications with regard to biotechnology are, we think, good for all countries. On page 30 of this document we find the following paragraph. I quote: "The commercial use of new bio-industrial products may result in dramatically different patterns of agricultural production and trade. This may pose a threat to Africa's export crops. Laboratory-produced vanilla may soon put the livelihood of 70,000 vanilla bean farmers in Madagascar in doubt. And it is not unthinkable that consumers will soon have a choice between Kenya AA... - coffee - "and biocoffee beans made in Massachusetts. A second concern involves the privatization of research results. The current practice of patenting first generation biotechnology products to cover any further use of bioengineered material will severely limit future competition. For developing countries this may also entail high licensing fees for seeds, making it harder to disseminate new crop varieties to smallholders. A potential decrease of genetic diversity as a consequence of the widespread distribution of new bioengineered plant material may make crops increasingly vulnerable to new diseases."

That is the end of the quote, and I have nothing to add. The second statement of the United States says, and I quote: "Improvements in biotechnology that will enhance productivity and lower producers' costs should not be feared. Such developments enhance world food security and general economic development." FAO fully agrees with it, but we have the following comments: Why should this be true only with biotechnology where there is a clear dependency of the developing countries on the developed countries? Should this be true only for industrial sweeteners produced through biotechnology that push sugar made from cane out of the market in the developing countries? Should this statement not also apply to industrial countries where sugarcane, sugar from sugarcane, could displace sugar from beets. And also cassava chips could be replacing feed grain and palm oil should be displacing soya and other oils. The United States hope that FAO will not overlook two factors. First, that adequate patent protection will be provided to products derived from biotechnology and the reasonable returns to investment. Patent protection has two aspects. One to ensure returns, and unfortunately this can also be used to grant the monopoly position of a certain company and can also be used to exclude certain countries or certain producers from using the invention. FAO favours a processive patent for products developed through international research work allowing all countries, all producers, to share in the progress made through biotechnology. Of course, the argument on the reasonable return of investment can also be used for those small farmers and their forefathers, who have invested in

vanilla production in Madagascar or in coffee production in Kenya. The second request of the United States deals with the safety of efficacy of products derived from biotechnology. The United States has stated that such products should be judged on sound scientific criteria and not on socio-economic concerns. In general, there will be two products, a consumer or end-product and the industrial sweetener may be one of them, and the second, a living organism, a plant or an animal. For the living organisms, the FAO hopes that all countries, and I repeat, all countries will closely cooperate and work together with FAO in implementing the instructions recently received from our Commission on Plant Genetic Resources to develop a Code of Conduct on Biotechnology. With respect to consumer products, the rich countries are subsidizing their agricultural producers who are suffering from competition or new developments. The developing countries cannot afford such public subsidies. How are these countries to protect their producers, and I can only underline what has been said by the distinguished delegate from India.

The United States made two final points. They stated that molecular biology is viewed as a low priority by the United States. Modern biotechnology, aiming at changing the living organisms, cannot work without molecular biology. Therefore, one cannot support biotechnology without supporting molecular biology. Last year, our sister agency, the IAA reviewed the programmes of our Joint Division through a small high-level group of external experts. The Chairman of this group was the Associate Deputy Administrator of the USDA-ARS. That group made one strong recommendation to IAA, and through IAA to FAO for the future programme of the Joint Division. They advised that we should strengthen the agricultural application of molecular biology. The last point is the United States stated that mutation breeding has been largely abandoned by industrial countries because of lack of productivity. This view to us and the Secretariat is surprising. Over 75 percent of the rice production in California is based on mutation-derived rice varieties. Japan has also similar experience and Italy with durum wheat. Mutation breeding is today used also for flowers: chrysanthemum, carnation and roses. In Vienna, our Joint Division provides a service for the breeders in developing countries. They can send their seed to Vienna for induced mutation. In our own work in Vienna we are concentrating on single cell mutations of crops difficult to breed - for example, bananas and plantains, and here we can already show some very significant internationally accepted progress.

My fourth point, Mr Chairman, deals with sustainability, one of our priority programmes. It seems to many that sustainability has become a new word. Let me be clear speaking in defence of farmers. Farmers are to me those people, who, with their labour, with their hands, and the land, work for the survival of their children, so that they may become farmers. No farmer would take any unsustainable action - if he does, he does it for two reasons. One is lack of knowledge and the second, he is forced to do so. The comparison that I can think of is that one would not think that any mother would feed poisonous food to her children and family - she would only do it because of lack of knowledge or because she was forced to do so. So farming has lived since the early days on the wish to be sustainable. Second, in defence of FAO, it sounds sometimes, in discussions, that our programmes in the past have not had sustainability as their number one priority. I cannot understand how FAO's programmes on genetic resources, on desertification, on Integrated Pest Management, on soil conservation, on pollution, on Codes of Conduct, on the international undertaking, cannot all be called programmes for the sustainability of agricultural production.

Certainly, in the future, FAO needs to be more visible in its work under the heading "Sustainability". Whether that greater visibility will mean it will also be of a greater acceptability by the critics has to be seen. We will certainly attempt in the forthcoming Conference in showing more what FAO has been doing and will be doing under the subject. To us, sustainability is larger than the environment. The delegate of Finland, in supporting the inclusion of our new sub-programme on sustaining resource potential, one of the ways that we would like to show sustainability, as a catchword in FAO but also to deal with something new, like climatic changes, he requested further clarification on the relationship of this sub-programme as a sub-programme dealing with the information of environmental matters. We accept the importance of such a relationship, inter-relationships and in-house coordination, and that they are reflected in the report to Council from the Fifty-eighth Session of the Programme

Committee. The Programme Committee had been informed that the private group on sustainability on the IDWG, the Inter-departmental Working Group on Environment and Energy was one of the mechanisms for ensuring such coordination. I would like to inform the Council of one other activity with which we have done such coordination.

In October this year, we held the first large staff training course for four half days involving 42 participants from 16 Divisions covering five Departments. There were three subjects. With regard to the few projects, we looked and checked on the FAO developed environmental impact assessment, the approach, the criteria and the possible improvements. For the Regular Programme, we looked at the further development of the approach and at the methodology we should be using in the next biennium, and with the cooperation of other international organizations we planned our activities, mainly together with UNEP, in three countries: Malaysia, Mali and Costa Rica.

Mr Chairman, on many, many occasions, the Secretariat, especially the Director-General, has appealed to our governing bodies for extra-budgetary resources to push environment, to do more under the subject of sustainability in Headquarters in our field programmes. I have to report, unfortunately, that there has been, so far, very limited response. Thank you very much.

B.P. DUTTA (Assistant Director-General, Economic and Social Policy Department): Thank you, Mr Chairman. I would like to take this opportunity to respond to some of the questions and some comments that have been made on one of the priority areas, namely policy advice. Firstly, Mr Chairman, the delegate of Finland asked how FAO's policy advisory function would be strengthened in concrete terms, and he also sought more information on the use of the proposed increase of \$ 500 000 in the policy analysis and planning and sub.-programme 2.1.8.5. He also expressed some concern about the oral reduction under programme 2.1.8., Food and Agriculture Policy.

Mr Chairman, as regards the policy advisory function of FAO, it should be noted, in the first instance that it cuts across many disciplines and activities of FAO. However, specifically concerning the programme 2.1.8., the main policy aspects addressed under this programme include the improvement of world food security, the government of international committee and trade policy, support to TCDC, agriculture policy advice to countries, as well as related planning, assistance and training. The general objective of this programme is to assist Member Governments in improving their food and agricultural policies and planning processes through multi-disciplinary missions, through provisional training, and indirectly to the preparation of regional and global policy studies. The proposed increase of \$ 500 000 for policy analysis and planning is intended to strengthen several of these activities, including assistance to Member Governments to improve capacity to monitor and formulate agricultural policies and to translate them into plans, programmes and projects.

Mr Chairman, in recent years, requests received from Member Governments for assistance in this area increasingly relate to their needs for preparing for policy review meetings with donors, and for negotiating stabilization and structural adjustment programmes with members.

As regards the resources provided for the Programme 2.1.8 as a whole, no doubt there is a reduction. On the one hand, this reflects the overall resource limitation to which Mr Shah referred earlier. In addition, several specific factors have contributed to this. One is the reduction due to the fact that a major consultation on ECDC which was held in the current biennium will not be repeated in the 1991/92 biennium. Also there is a reduction due to the shift in resource-use pattern by the Regional Offices. However, despite an overall reduction under this Programme, there is a substantial US\$ 604 000 or 7.4 percent increase in the resources available under this Programme for activities that directly help interested member countries in policy and planning areas. This is in addition to the resources allocated for policy advice to member governments under Programmes 2.1.5, Rural Development, and 2.1.6, Nutrition.

The delegate of the United States commented that FAO's policy advice should focus on areas where it has comparative advantage. In particular, she queried FAO's intention to undertake policy advice in the field of structural adjustment. We agree with the United States that FAO's policy advisory role should concentrate on those areas where it has comparative advantage. Obviously, such comparative advantage lies in advising member governments on policies related to the food and agriculture sector, including forestry and fisheries, and that is exactly what we do and what we intend to do.

As regards the analysis of the impact of structural adjustment policies, it is not our intention to undertake policy advisory work in the field of macro-economic policies. However, the food and agriculture sector is generally the most important sector in developing countries that undergo structural adjustment. Hence the impact of structural adjustment policies is often most directly felt on the food and agriculture sector.

Equally, the success of the structural adjustment programmes depends on the extent to which the food and agriculture sector is in a position to respond adequately and positively to the envisaged changes in the macro-economic policies.

I may add that in view of this vital role of the food and agriculture sector in relation to the structural adjustment process, Mr Camdessus, the Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund, recently met with the Director-General here in Rome and requested that FAO should be increasingly involved in the structural adjustment process, of course at the request of the government of the country concerned. The Director-General has responded positively to this and further discussions at the working level will be held between FAO and IMF to consider the modalities of FAO's involvement in the structural adjustment process in relation to the food and agriculture sector. Discussions on this question are also planned with the World Bank at the working level.

The delegate of the Federal Republic of Germany commented that FAO's work on policy advice is limited to only a few countries. Although much would depend on what is included in the definition of policy advice, FAO's policy advisory functions and related projects cover a very broad range of activities and the number of countries where FAO provides such assistance is much larger. In order not to take too much time of the Council, I would not go into any details but just invite the attention of the delegate of the Federal Republic of Germany to Chapter 11 and in particular Table 11.2 on page 202 of the English text of the document C 89/8, Review of the Regular Programme.

Several members have stated that FAO's policy advisory role should be strengthened. This is also one of the recommendations made by the Programme and Finance Committees in their report on the Review of Certain Aspects of FAO's Goals and Operations. The Council will therefore have the opportunity to consider this matter in greater detail under agenda item 11. At this stage, however, I would like to make only two observations. First, FAO's policy advisory work has to be in response to the requests from Member Governments. As such, its scale is, and would be, largely determined by the extent of such requests. Second, if the number of such requests were to increase significantly above the present level, there will be the need for additional resources as indicated by the Director-General in his comments on this question.

Igor MARINCEK (Suisse): J'aimerais remercier le Secrétariat pour les explications qu'il nous a données mais il y a encore deux questions ouvertes pour ma délégation. Je vais vite les poser. Il y a d'abord une question technique adressée à M. Shah: peut-il nous expliquer comment il est possible, avec la présente méthodologie des calculs d'augmentation des coûts, que l'absorption de 3 millions de dollars pour les consultants, voyages, etc., qu'il fait valoir, affecte l'augmentation réelle du budget?

Une deuxième question va dans le sens similaire: comment est-il possible que des taux de change différents puissent affecter la croissance réelle, comme cela est suggéré à la page xi de la version française du document C 89/3?

Une autre question s'adresse au Conseiller juridique. Hier, le Directeur général a suggéré, après mon intervention, que la proposition faite par notre délégation de modifier le projet de résolution budgétaire pour l'ouverture de crédits pour l'exercice 1990/91 serait en contradiction avec l'Acte constitutif de la FAO. Entre-temps, je pense que le Conseiller juridique aura eu le temps d'examiner cette question et j'aimerais l'inviter à nous présenter ses conclusions et à nous indiquer, en particulier, quel paragraphe nous interdit une telle modification de la résolution budgétaire.

Je rappellerai seulement brièvement que nous avons proposé l'adjonction d'un paragraphe supplémentaire à cette résolution pour traiter de la question de l'augmentation des coûts liée à l'inflation pour les deux années à venir.

LE DIRECTEUR GENERAL: Monsieur Moore va répondre à la question relative aux aspects juridiques et M. Shah répondra aux autres questions. Vous êtes bienvenus, bien entendu, si vous souhaitez poser les mêmes questions à la Commission II.

V.J. SHAH (Assistant Director-General, Office of Programme, Budget and Evaluation): As I understood it, the question was how the absorption of US\$ 3 million of cost increases changes the real Programme increase, and, in particular, how the different change rate comparison affects the real Programme increase. I had hoped that I had replied, at least to the first of those questions, in my earlier reply, but let me repeat it. The comparison table which is referred to on page 54 of the document, the comparison table, shows in the middle column the proposed budget at the rate of Lire 1235 to the dollar, and it shows the cost increases of US\$ 76 350 000. This amount does not include the US\$ 3 million of the cost increases, which are absorbed, so the answer is there. The Programme increase of US\$ 5.5 million is then calculated against the base plus the cost increases, and it shows a Programme increase of 0.97 percent. Why does this rate of 0.97 percent change? The answer is in the final column of that table where the cost increases, at 1350 Lire to the dollar, are no longer \$76 million but US\$ 59 030 000. The base and the cost increases are US\$ 551 million. The Programme increase of US\$ 5.5 million is then taken as a percentage of that amount, and the result is 1 percent.

LEGAL COUNSEL: I have been asked to comment on the legal aspects and implications of the proposal put forward by the delegate of Switzerland yesterday. The proposal, as I understand it, was that, since the rate of inflation for the course of the next biennium is to some extent an uncertain factor, no allowance at all should be made in the budget for the effects of inflation but that a supplementary credit separate from the actual budget should be made available up to the estimated amount of inflation, but this supplementary credit could be drawn on only up to the extent of actual inflation rates as verified by the External Auditor.

I have looked into this proposal subsequent to the meeting, and I should point out that it would, in my opinion, be inconsistent with the present provisions regarding the Programme budget system set out in the Basic Texts of the Organization and that to adopt such a new system would thus require an amendment of those texts.

The system as set out in the Basic Texts provides for the adoption by the Conference of a single fixed and certain budget. This is provided for in Article XVIII of the Constitution. The present system also authorizes the Director-General to plan for the expenditure of funds and to commit funds up to the fixed limits of the budget approved by the Conference. That is set out in Financial Regulation 4.1.

Within the limits set out by the approved Programme of Work and Budget, and subject to the supervision of the Conference and the Council, the Director-General is given full power and authority to direct the work of the Organization under Article VII.4 of the Constitution.

The Swiss proposal, on the other hand, would in effect provide for a double budget, with expenditure under the second part being conditional upon a finding by an outside party, in this case the External Auditor. It would also make it difficult, if not impossible, for the Director-General to exercise his authority to direct the work of the Organization and to plan for

the expenditure of the funds voted as the exact limits of the budget that he is authorized to spend would not be known until later on in the biennium, or until the biennium is finished, as I presume it would take some time for the External Auditor to accumulate evidence as to the exact rate of worldwide inflation as it has affected FAO operations over the course of the biennium. Such a function of the External Auditor would also appear to go beyond his present auditing functions under the Basic Texts of the Organization.

LE PRESIDENT: Je voudrais, à la fin de l'examen de ce point très important me féliciter du nombre élevé de délégués qui ont pris la parole à ce sujet. Il y en a eu 46, et pratiquement tout le Conseil a pris part à cette discussion, et leurs remarques ont été très fouillées et très utiles.

Puis-je me faire l'interprète du Conseil pour dire qu'il félicite le Comité financier du travail excellent et minutieux accompli pour l'analyse du Programme de travail et budget selon la même procédure mise en vigueur à titre expérimental pour le biennium 1990-91.

J'ajouterai que le Conseil se félicite des améliorations sensibles apportées à la présentation du Programme de travail et budget; il a noté que des propositions ont pris en considération les directives et recommandations formulées antérieurement par les organes directeurs de l'Organisation. On peut constater que la grande majorité du Conseil a souligné que compte tenu des contraintes budgétaires évidentes, le niveau de budget ne permettra pas de satisfaire les demandes croissantes et de plus en plus nombreuses des pays en voie de développement.

Le Conseil a manifesté sa préoccupation quant à la baisse du pourcentage du PCT dans l'ensemble du budget: c'est un point que nous avons tous enregistré. Et, comme l'ont fait les Comités de programme et financier dans le rapport de la session, le Conseil a, lui aussi, apprécié l'effort fait par le Secrétariat pour tenter d'aboutir à un consensus sur le budget, et qui a conduit à une augmentation réelle de l'ordre de 0,45%.

Je crois pouvoir dire que dans ces conditions la grande majorité des membres du Conseil ont approuvé le projet de Programme de travail et budget et recommandé de le transmettre à la Conférence en proposant à cette dernière son approbation par consensus.

C'est à peu près ce que je retiens des discussions de notre Conseil.

LE DIRECTEUR GENERAL: Vous dites "La grande majorité" est-ce que c'est le Conseil...

LE PRESIDENT: C'est le Conseil. Trente-neuf délégués ont approuvé; sept n'ont pas approuvé. Par conséquent, dans sa très grande majorité, le Conseil a approuvé le PTB et a recommandé de transmettre le projet de PTB à la Conférence. Il a donné son approbation par 39 voix sur 46.

Nous pouvons lever la séance et nous retrouver à 14 h 30.

The meeting rose at 12:30 hours

La séance est levée à 12 h 30

Se levanta la sesión a las 12.30 horas

council

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

conseil

ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ALIMENTATION ET L'AGRICULTURE

consejo

ORGANIZACION DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA LA AGRICULTURA Y LA ALIMENTACION

CL

CL 96/PV/4

Ninety-sixth Session

Quatre-vingt-seizième session

96º periodo de sesiones

FOURTH PLENARY MEETING
QUATRIEME SEANCE PLENIERE
CUARTA SESION PLENARIA
7 November 1989

The Fourth Plenary Meeting was opened at 15.15 hours Lassaad Ben Osman, Independent Chairman of the Council, presiding

La quatrième séance plénière est ouverte à 15 h 15 sous la présidence de Lassaad Ben Osman, Président indépendant du Conseil

Se abre la cuarta sesión plenaria a las 15.15 horas, bajo la presidencia de Lassaad Ben Osman, Presidente Independiente del Consejo

- I. INTRODUCTION - PROCEDURE OF THE SESSION (continued)
- I. INTRODUCTION - QUESTIONS DE PROCEDURE (suite)
- I. INTRODUCCION - CUESTIONES DE PROCEDIMIENTO (continuación)
- 2. Election of Three Vice-Chairmen, and Designation of the Chairman and Members of the Drafting Committee (continued)
- 2. Election de trois Vice-Présidents et désignation du Président (suite)
- 2. Elección de tres Vicepresidentes y nombramiento del Presidente y los miembros del Comité de Redacción (continuación)

LE PRESIDENT: Je voudrais annoncer au Conseil qu'après consultation entre les différents groupes, il est proposé de nommer Madame Monica Deregibus, de l'Argentine, à la présidence du Comité de rédaction. Elle aurait donc la charge de présider le Comité de rédaction qui devra se réunir cet après-midi pour commencer ses travaux. Je vous propose de retenir cette candidature et je félicite Madame Deregibus. C'est une forme d'application d'intégration de la femme dans le développement car, à ma connaissance, c'est la première fois qu'une femme préside le Comité de rédaction.

Applause

Applaudissements

Aplausos

III. PROGRAMME, BUDGETARY, FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

III. QUESTIONS CONCERNANT LE PROGRAMME, LE BUDGET, LES FINANCES ET L'ADMINISTRATION

III. ASUNTOS DEL PROGRAMA Y ASUNTOS PRESUPUESTARIOS, FINANCIEROS Y ADMINISTRATIVOS

- 6. Reports of the Fifty-eighth Session of the Programme Committee; the Sixty-sixth Session of the Finance Committee, and their Joint Session (Rome 13-29 September 1989) (CL 96-4), including:
- 6. Rapports de la cinquante-huitième session du Comité du Programme, de la soixante-sixième session du Comité financier et de leur session conjointe (Rome, 13-29 septembre 1989) (CL 96/4), notamment:
- 6. Informes del 58- periodo de sesiones del Comité del Programa; del 66- período de sesiones del Comité de Finanzas y de su periodo de sesiones conjunto (Roma, 13-29 de septiembre de 1989) (CL 96/4), en particular:
 - 6.1 Financial Position of the Organization (paras. 3.32-3.49)
 - 6.1 Situation financière de l'Organisation (par. 3.32-3.49)
 - 6.1 Situación financiera de la Organización (párrs. 3.32-3.49)
 - 6.2 Appointment of the External Auditor (paras. 3.80-3.87)
 - 6.2 Nomination du Commissaire aux comptes (par. 3.80-3.87)
 - 6.2 Nombramiento del Auditor Externo (párrs. 3.80-3.87)
 - 6.4 Personnel Matters (paras. 3.88-3.102)
 - 6.4 Questions de personnel (par. 3.88-3.102)
 - 6.4 Cuestiones de personal (3.88-3.102)
 - 6.5 Matters Relating to UNDP (paras 2.119-2.124 and 3.72-3.73)
 - 6.5 Questions relatives au PNUD (par. 2.119-2.124 et 3.72-3.73)
 - 6.5 Asuntos relativos al PNUD (párrs. 2.119-2.124 y 3.72-3.73)
 - 6.6 Other Matters Arising Out of the Reports
 - 6.6 Autres questions découlant des rapports
 - 6.6 Otras cuestiones derivadas de los informes

LE PRESIDENT: Je vais donner la parole à M. Bukhari, Président du Comité financier, qui va nous faire un exposé sur l'ensemble du point 10.

Atif Y. BUKHARI (Chairman, Finance Committee) (original language Arabic): Thank you, Mr President. I have the honour of introducing the various items that fall within the competence of the Finance Committee which fall within document CL 96/4. My introduction will be slightly long, therefore I indulge your patience. These are firstly the report of the 66th Session of the Finance Committee held from 25 to 29 September 1989, and secondly the report of the Joint Meeting of the Programme and Finance Committees also held in September 1989, on which my colleague, Professor Mazoyer, is also commenting.

The 66th Session was the third session of the Committee held in 1989; I already reported to the Council, at its 95th Session, on the first two meetings. The 66th Session had a very long agenda as you will have noted from our report and a number of important subjects were dealt with.

Under Budgetary Matters, I had in fact introduced part of that item yesterday. The Committee reviewed the Programme of Work and Budget for 1990-91. I said, and I talked yesterday, about the great increase in cost which amounted to \$ 76 600 000. I said that the cost increases in fact included those questions which had not been included when we had discussed this point due to the lack of information. In fact, there are three items which led to this total cost increase of \$ 76 600 000 to main items, the review of the conditions of service of Professional and higher categories; secondly, the forthcoming salary review of the General Service staff in Rome, and the anticipated lifting of the transitional measures of the post adjustment classification. I said that the \$ 3 million had been absorbed and no allocation had been made for the cost for consultants, travel, and staff upgradings.

All these figures and facts, as is the case in the Summary Programme of Work and Budget, are based on the exchange rate of US \$ 1 = Italian Lire 1235, and Mr Shah had referred to this issue this morning. Since the FAO Conference would accept the budget rate for the next biennium, should the rate of the US dollar to the Italian lira be 1400, there would be a potential reduction of the budget level of some \$ 22 million. This was frankly and clearly stated by Mr Shah this morning as well.

At this juncture I should give you my comments on the Report of the Joint Session of the Programme and Finance Committees which was also devoted to the Programme of Work and Budget 1990-91. Generally, the Committees were satisfied that the proposals were in conformity with the views and recommendations they had expressed when examining the summary proposals in February 1989. They recognized that the high level of expectations for FAO assistance from Member Nations, could not realistically be met within the level of resources as proposed, and the Committees expressed satisfaction at the quality of the dialogue and two members, in fact, had endorsed zero growth to members still attached to the principle of zero growth. Two members are still attached to the principle of zero growth, and hope was expressed that consensus should be reached in the Conference on the Programme of Work and Budget. We hope that such reservations will be withdrawn in the future.

With regard to the application of the lapse factor, which I referred to yesterday as well, the Committee discussed the rationale for its application, recognizing that, despite all efforts to ensure timely action, some delay in filling posts had occurred. As is extremely natural over many years, a practice of reducing the corresponding budgetary provisions for personnel services of Regular Programmes has been developed, expressed as a lapse factor, currently standing at 5.5 percent. This high lapse factor has a negative effect on the implementation of the Programme of Work and Budget. Different modalities under which this lapse factor could be applied were considered, but note was taken that no statistically proven practice had as yet been found.

The Director-General had proposed a change from 5.5 percent to 3 percent in order to restore the staff capacities of the Organization, but the Committee noted that an increase in the budget will amount to about \$ 9.3 million. This is why the Committee did not come to a final and definite decision. Therefore, this matter is put before Council and Conference. I am quite sure that the Secretariat will further clarify and explain the contents of the Director-General's proposal for the benefit of the Council.

The Committee also had to consider the budgets of the European Commission for the Control of Foot and Mouth Disease and of the Regional Animal Production and Health Commission for Asia and the Pacific for 1990-91, which it endorsed.

Finally, with regard to budgetary matters, the Committee approved a budgetary transfer of up to US \$ 6 million from Chapter 2 to Chapter 5 in order to cover both the deficit from currency losses and the excess charges from the negative staff cost variance - that is, the increase of actual staff costs incurred in 1988-89 over standard costs for staff used in establishing the relevant budget. The Committee will, of course, receive a specific report on the exact amount of the transfer at its 67th Session in May 1990, when the 1988-89 accounts will be closed.

Under financial matters, the Committee noted the status of contributions at 25 September 1989. You will now be provided with the latest update of the situation.

At that time only 61.8 percent of the total 1989 assessment had been received, equivalent to US \$ 148.9 million, and the total of contributions outstanding and in arrears amounted to US \$ 194.9 million, of which US \$ 143.5 million were owed by the major contributor. These amounts of contributions outstanding and in arrears were the highest in FAO history at this time of the year.

The Committee noted with regret that the Organization was not successful in getting from Member Nations advance information on the expected dates and amounts of payments of their contributions so as to facilitate the Director-General's financial management. Another serious preoccupation expressed by the Committee was the risk for Member Nations concerned about losing their voting rights at this forthcoming Conference.

The Committee considered the report on the accounts for the period January 1988 through August 1989. It noted that, though the cash flow situation had slightly improved, the situation could become critical before the end of the year if no significant additional contributions were received. The Director-General has also referred to this point previously. The Committee also noted that the Working Capital Fund and the Special Reserve Account had been partially replenished to levels of US \$ 17.2 and US \$ 16.5 respectively.

The Committee reviewed the proposal by the Director-General to change the practice of charging profit and losses on exchange and considered the related draft Conference Resolution which is to be found in paragraph 3.56 on page 35 of our report. The practice so far had been to charge losses and credit profits on exchange arising from the purchase and holding of non-US \$ currencies to Chapter 5 of the Budget. As I mentioned earlier, we had been requested to approve a budgetary transfer from Chapter 2 to Chapter 5 partially for that reason. This practice therefore affects negatively the implementation of the Programme of Work and Budget whenever currency fluctuations result in excessive losses, as was the case over the period 1985-88. On the other hand, the Committee recognized that through Conference Resolution 13/81 the Director-General had been authorized to use funds from the Special reserve Fund to finance unbudgeted costs due to movements of currency exchange rates. It therefore found logical, and approved, the proposal put forward by the Director-General to rationalize the practice in this regard and have the referred profits and losses on exchange directly credited or debited to the Special Reserve Account as from the 1988-89 accounts, thus improving the protection of the Programme of Work and Budget from currency uncertainties. The draft Conference Resolution is therefore submitted for the consideration of the Council under paragraph 3.56 of our Report.

The Committee also examined the actuarial review of the Compensation Plan Reserve Fund at 31 December 1988 and noted that there was a surplus which allowed for a slight reduction in the rates of contribution applied to staff costs.

The Committee reviewed the 1988 results of the cost measurement system and in this regard noted that FAO received from UNDP a one-time adjustment of US \$ 2 058 000 in respect of 1987 support costs reimbursements to compensate for extraordinary exchange losses arising from the US dollar depreciation. It also noted the information on the new UNDP so-called successor support cost arrangements, which you will discuss under item 10.5 of your Agenda.

With regard to another form of support cost reimbursement, the Committee reviewed and approved a draft Conference Resolution, included under paragraph 3.79, concerning reimbursement for the cost of indirect services and facilities made available to the FAO Commissary. This Resolution is also submitted for the Council approval and is to be forwarded to the Conference for adoption.

The Committee had the opportunity to consider the presentations of candidatures for the position of FAO External Auditor for the period 1990-91. It was very impressed by the high standards of the two candidates, the French Cour des Comptes and the United Kingdom National Audit Office, which is the current incumbent of the position and which, as such, the Organization has come to know well over the years. The Committee noted the difference in approach in the performance of the tasks, which partly accounted for the difference in fees, and recognized that both Organizations were able to perform audits of high professional quality. It finally considered that in order to avoid the impact of the transition from the current audit system to a new one at this time when FAO was suffering from a reduction in staff resources, and also to retain the advantages of "value for money" audit performed by the UK office, it would advise retention of the services of the current External Auditor for a new period of two years, and accordingly submitted a draft Conference Resolution for the consideration of the Council, which you will find under paragraph 3.87 of our Report.

Under Personnel Matters, the Committee was informed of the changes in salary scales and allowances for Professional and higher categories and for General Service staff at Headquarters. Moreover, the Committee reviewed the customary statistics of personnel services presented to it. The Committee was also apprised of recent developments in the activities of the Consultative Committee on Administrative Questions and the International Civil Service Commission and Pension Boards which you will find described in paragraph 3.92 to paragraph 3.99 of our report.

The Committee endorsed the Director-General's proposal to adjust the allowance for the Chairman of the Appeals Committee.

Under Organizational Matters, the Committee was up-dated on the current developments regarding the Headquarters' accommodation and while expressing appreciation for the support from the Italian Government expressed the hope that the Host Government would find an early solution to the specific problem concerning Phase I of the Constructions, detailed in paragraph 3.105 of our Report.

The Committee reviewed the ultimate developments regarding the implementation of FINSYS/PERSYS and found that the project was proceeding on schedule.

Under Other Matters the Committee reviewed the Regular Programme and the Field programme 1988-89 which you will discuss under item 8 and 9 respectively.

With regard to the items dealing with the World Food Programme, the Committee as usual reported separately on this matter to the CFA through the Executive Director, to whom I have personally addressed a copy of that section of the Report produced as a Finance Committee document. The Council will be apprised of appropriate actions and comments on this section of the Report through the Committee on Food Aid Policies and Programmes as has been normal procedure.

Finally, the Committee concluded its deliberations in agreeing upon the dates of its next session which will be 8 to 17 May 1990 in Rome.

LE PRESIDENT: Je remercie le Président du Comité financier pour l'excellente introduction qu'il vient de nous faire.

Je voudrais demander à M. Crowther de bien vouloir nous donner quelques éléments supplémentaires d'information.

LE DIRECTEUR GENERAL: Nous sommes bien en train de discuter la situation financière, et non du budget.

LE PRESIDENT: C'est exact. Il s'agit bien de la situation financière.

D.K. CROWTHER (Assistant Director-General, Administration and Finance Department): Council Members have before them an update of the financial situation under document CL 96/LIM/1. This shows the financial position of the Organization as at 23 October, and I have some additional information which I will provide orally to give a complete up-to-date account of contributions received thus far in order that Council Members will have the latest information available to the Organization.

First, to give Council members some idea of the difficulty that the Finance Committee has had in dealing with the financial situation of the Organization, let me first go back to the beginning of this biennium at which time you will recall that owing to the lack of receipt of contributions the Organization ended up for the first time in history with a deficit in the sense of having expenditure exceed income. In either case the Director-General had taken the decision that it was necessary to reduce programme expenditures well below the authorized budget level.

Nevertheless, with the lack of receipt of contributions he found it necessary to spend an amount in excess of the receipts received during the biennium. This caused the biennium to end with a deficit of US\$ 46.7 million.

The Organization, at that time, had used up its safety net - its Working Capital Fund, its Special Reserve Account - and literally had a large list of bills approximating well over US\$ 100 million at that point in time. That was a large deficit. The situation was barely enough to get by on. Thanks to those member countries who very promptly paid their contributions beginning in January 1988, the Organization found the wherewithal to continue its operations and programmes without borrowing money. It was a critical time because the Director-General was faced with very severe shortage of funds, and continuing programme expenditures - it is not possible to turn off programme expenditures over night. He took a number of actions which, over the year, reduced expenditure, but caused serious problems in cash flow, due to the lack of receipt of those contributions.

A number of decisions had to be taken by the Director-General, most of which have been reported to you but in understanding the financial situation of the Organization today, it is well to review them briefly.

First, in order to survive the 1986-87 biennium it was necessary for the Director-General to reduce expenditures by US\$ 25 million. In 1988 it was necessary to again reduce expenditure in an amount just over US\$ 20 million. In 1989 finding himself in a position where he had increased costs, that were not anticipated on the personnel side, to the amount of US\$ 23 million, he could not make similar amounts of programme expenditure because of the unexpected costs. That really means that during 1987-1989 a total of US\$ 68 million in programme expenditures had to be reduced. Where does this leave us at the end of this biennium? Carrying over the deficit of US\$ 46.7 million from the prior biennium we will literally increase that deficit by a small amount, about US\$ 9 million, at the end of this biennium. Again, this is because of the lack of receipt of contributions and more specifically, arrears.

On top of the deficit with which we are faced, the amount of outstanding bills continues to accumulate and while the Director-General has done a tightrope act by balancing between one and the other, and keeping the vendors happy we find ourselves in a position where, at the end of the biennium, the Organization literally would have calls upon it for an excess US\$ 100 million. Now, there are a wide range of matters included in there but they are all legal obligations that the Organization will ultimately have to meet.

If we completely reduce the Working Capital Fund and Special Reserve Account which has had some build up during the biennium, in order to offset some part of the deficit - the Working Capital Fund at the moment is expected to have US\$ 18 million at the end of the year and the Special Reserve Account approximately US\$ 17 million at the end of the year - that US\$ 35 million would offset some part of the accumulated deficit. We could end the biennium with a reduced deficit of US\$ 20 million. Projecting from today, which is hard to do because we still do not know a number of figures which are absolutely imperative, particularly with respect to contributions, we would expect that at the end of the year we could have outstanding obligations, including the remaining deficit of US\$ 117.5 million and have practically no money in the bank whatsoever.

Now by doing that it means all of our safety nets will be depleted. There would be no Working Capital Fund, there would be no money in the Special Reserve Account and our cash would be very close to zero. After two years of some very heavy belt tightening and with a cash flow comparatively low we find ourselves in a position where, beginning in January, we will again have to call on Member Nations to pay their contributions as early as they possibly can to avoid borrowing.

The information reported to the Council in the document concerning the financial position of the Organization has been updated in the LIM document and have some additional information today. I will summarize that information so that it is not necessary for everyone to write it down. However, if anyone wants the information I can certainly provide it.

On current assessments at the beginning of the year of US\$ 240.9 million and contributions in arrears at the beginning of the year of US\$ 109.8 million the Organization was owed US\$ 350.8 million. Up until late yesterday we had received on current assessments US\$ 160.9 million, that is barely over two-thirds of this year's assessed contributions. We have received in arrears through yesterday US\$ 15 million. Therefore, in total we have received US\$ 176 million. Now, what is left outstanding? Approximately US\$ 80 million in current assessments remains outstanding today, US\$ 94.7 almost US\$ 95 million remain outstanding in arrears, which totals very close to US\$ 175 million. On a US\$ 240 million budget, US\$ 175 million outstanding makes it extremely difficult to manage. Of course, the major contributor has a rate of payment on a scale

of contributions of 25 percent. We have received for current assessments 66.8 percent. Now, if you remove the 25 percent you will see that there is roughly 8 percent that is still remaining. Now, that is a better rate of collection this year than last year, for all those other than the United States, but it is still 8 percent.

If we look at the amount of arrears we find again that we will end the year with the largest amount of arrears owed in the history of the Organization. Ordinarily it is US\$ 18 to 20 million at the end of a year and this year it is going to be US\$ 95 million.

The amount of arrears in current contributions at the end of the year is the largest outstanding. It is probably the most pessimistic picture that we have seen on the receipt side in history. Nonetheless, a number of Member Governments have been extremely prudent and paid very early. I think it is important for the Organization to report to the Council that this year particularly, and to a lesser degree last year, there has been a change in the pattern of the receipt of contributions by a number of member countries, for various reasons.

Without even attempting to understand all the reasons, needless to say we received less money in the third quarter of the year than we have done in the normal pattern of receipt of contributions in the past. All the contributions are due and payable on 1st January of each year, or thirty days following receipt of notice of those, and the Director-General very prudently puts out the notice on 1st December so that contributions fall due on 1st January.

All those contributions are due, and a number of countries - specifically the Nordic countries - pay regularly in January or early February. But the pattern of a number of other countries who have paid in the first quarter in the past has changed. We were receiving payments in September and October, and some we will not receive until November, that had been received in the first quarter in prior years.

You can imagine how difficult it is to project a cash flow. A number of member countries have asked for detailed information on cash flow projections. Nothing would make us all happier than to be able to provide those projections, but without information on when the Member Governments are going to pay, and in what amount, it is almost impossible to project them, and extremely difficult for the Director-General to manage under those conditions.

The financial situation, as I have explained it, is grave. Unless we can find some technique for receiving the contributions, and receiving them on a reasonably timely basis, we have reached the point now where you cannot continue just to cut programmes further without severe damage to those programmes.

The cash flow situation has been able to rely heavily on the Working Capital Fund and on the Special Reserve Account. This year we shall have to draw down on the Special Reserve Account to back-up the Working Capital Fund. It has been mentioned that perhaps 5 percent is too much in the Special Reserve Account. We shall be significantly short after having drawn down the entire Special Reserve Account this year. Every measure has been taken to avoid either currency fluctuation or other expenditure, but having taken all those matters into account the situation is extremely grave, as you can see.

The Finance Committee considered a number of possible alternatives to encourage Member Nations to pay. As Council members will recall, at the last Conference Resolution 18/87 was passed, which was Measures to Deal with Problems of Delayed Payment of Assessed Contributions. As part of that Resolution the Conference requested the Director-General to report to this Council session on those measures that were adopted in order to return to Member Nations interest arising on contributions to the Organization during the previous biennium from surplus. I would be very pleased to be able to report that there was going to be a surplus and we had interest to distribute. Obviously there will not be. Our deficit will continue to grow at the end of this biennium, so there will be no cash distribution in the 1990/91 biennium. I am sure the Director-General would much prefer to report that he had received contributions, that there were very few arrears and therefore there could be a surplus, but that is not the case.

As the Chairman of the Finance Committee has reported, there are three matters that come before the attention of the Council in the form of Resolutions. It would be appropriate if the various members commenting would particularly comment on those, the first of which follows the Finance Committee Report paragraph 3.56, which has to do with the treatment of profit and loss on exchange accounts. This is an important accounting adjustment. The Finance Committee has already explained it. Secondly, there is a resolution that would be on-forwarded to the Conference, if the Council agrees, following paragraph 3.79. It has to do with staff commissary support cost reimbursements. Since our commissary was set up by Conference resolution in order

to amend it, it must also go to the Conference, and there is a resolution there for your consideration. Finally, for decision is the appointment of the External Auditor. The resolution for the appointment follows paragraph 3.87, but that does not go to the Conference. That is for decision by the Council.

LE PRESIDENT: Je remercie M. Crowther de son exposé sur la situation financière de l'Organisation, qui ne laisse pas de nous préoccuper, et je donne la parole au Directeur général.

LE DIRECTEUR GENERAL: Je présente mes excuses au Conseil de prendre la parole après M. Crowther mais il s'agit d'une situation exceptionnelle, d'un triste record historique: 177 millions de dollars de contributions impayées, et je crois malheureusement que ce record sera battu l'année prochaine s'il n'y a pas une manifestation de bonne volonté de la part de tous.

Monsieur Crowther a dû utiliser quelques mots techniques. Je veux dire que, pour l'année 1989, il y a 80 millions de dollars qui n'ont pas été perçus et, pour les années antérieures à 1989, environ 95 millions. Le total est donc de 175 ou 176 millions de dollars impayés. M. Crowther a également dit qu'au début de l'année, notre fonds de roulement et notre fonds de réserve spéciale seront vides. Il a dit qu'il y aurait aussi des factures à payer pour un montant de plus de 100 millions de dollars, au début de l'année.

Je serais très déçu si, comme d'habitude, le Conseil restait silencieux et nous laissait seuls dans cette affaire, alors que nous n'y pouvons vraiment rien. Ce que nous avons fait, c'est plaisir à ceux qui ne veulent pas que nous utilisions les facilités bancaires accordées par la Conférence. Des mesures ont été prises pour encourager les Etats Membres à payer leurs contributions à temps. Les pays membres ont un mois pour verser la somme qu'ils doivent après en avoir été notifiés. Nous les notifions au mois de décembre; les sommes sont donc dues au mois de janvier suivant. Les mesures d'encouragement n'ont pas donné de résultats; elles consistaient à faire bénéficier les pays des intérêts tirés des surplus. Or, comme on le sait, il n'y a pas de surplus. Il faut donc envisager d'autres mesures pour décourager les Etats Membres à ne pas payer leurs contributions ou à en retarder le paiement. Je ne m'étends pas davantage, mais je pense que les mesures d'encouragement n'ont pas donné et ne peuvent pas donner de résultat et j'espère que le Conseil voudra bien se prononcer sur cette crise financière de 177 millions afin de nous permettre d'avancer. Sinon, nous nous enliserons et, lorsque nous nous retrouverons ici l'année prochaine, nous serons confrontés au même blocage; écouter et ne pas se prononcer.

LE PRESIDENT: Je remercie le Directeur général sur ce qu'il vient de dire sur la situation financière de l'Organisation qui est véritablement préoccupante.

Gonzalo **BULA HOYOS** (Colombia): Señor Presidente, después de la dolorosa y cronológica relación que sobre este tema viene haciendo el Director General con objetividad y realismo, dominando el impulso emotivo que naturalmente dimana de una situación como ésta, esperamos que en esta ocasión no sólo los representantes de países en desarrollo, sino todo los miembros del Consejo, expresaremos nuestra inconformidad con estos hechos graves, preocupantes, prolongados, y sin solución a la vista. Porque se trata de la vida misma de nuestra Organización que pertenece a todos nosotros y que hasta 1987 tuvo una acción dinámica y vigorosa gracias al apoyo de todos los Estados Miembros, gracias, particularmente - y lo reconocemos con honestidad - a las sustanciales contribuciones de los estados industrializados, que son vitales e indispensables. Estamos reconocidos a los demás países desarrollados que al pagar oportunamente sus contribuciones han evitado que la crisis adquiriera más dramáticas proporciones.

Los Representantes de Colombia pensamos que ese mismo espíritu generoso y solidario, bien entendido, debe prevalecer en la discusión y conclusión de este tema. Si procediéramos con debilidad nos haremos cómplices de esta deplorable situación y alentaremos a quienes sean responsables de la crisis a persistir en su actitud condenable con consecuencias incalculables.

En cambio si, como esperamos, todos nos manifestamos en contra de la actitud determinante de la crisis, y en nuestro informe consignaremos con claridad y franqueza, la insatisfacción que esa conducta lamentable nos produce, podremos contribuir a que esa actitud se modifique.

Lo ha dicho el Presidente del Comité de Finanzas y consta también en el párrafo 3.AO "la cantidad de cuotas sin pagar es la más alta de la historia de la Organización", y en el párrafo 3.36 se reitera esa afirmación al decir que "sigue siendo la más alta jamás registrada".

Cómo es posible entonces, que los miembros de este Consejo, representantes de gobiernos soberanos, podamos permanecer en silencio sin que en nuestro informe, como lo proponemos expresemos la profunda preocupación que esa situación causa al Consejo, y pidamos a la Conferencia que destaque la gravedad de esos hechos intolerables y exija a todos los Estados Miembros el pago de sus contribuciones, sobre todos a aquellos Estados Miembros cuyo incumplimiento ha sido determinante que paguen sus contribuciones, que cumplan el compromiso legal y moral adquirido, que digan cuándo y cómo van a pagar como lo pide el Comité de Finanzas en el párrafo 3.47 de su Informe.

Estamos seguros de que el Consejo será unánime en este juicio. No podemos imaginar que ni siquiera el silencio podrá dar la sensación de una absurda solidaridad con los responsables.

Colombia ha pagado todas sus contribuciones a pesar de nuestra difícil situación que el mundo conoce. Aportes limitados, pero hechos con sacrificio y buena voluntad.

En los párrafos 3.47 a 3.49, el Comité de Finanzas analiza muy bien la situación. Todos los llamados anteriores han sido inútiles, no han producido ningún resultado. ¿Qué debemos hacer entonces?

Se pide al Consejo, párrafo 3.49, que se pronuncie sobre qué otras medidas debían tomarse para conseguir el pago más puntual de las cuotas, y el Director General también ha insistido al respecto. Carecemos de poder coercitivo. Por ello preguntamos al Consejero Jurídico. Queremos que el Consejero nos diga si en el caso de que un país, o algunos países, en cualquier momento se atrasen considerablemente en el pago de sus cuotas, ese caso, o esos casos ¿podrán ser llevados ante la Corte Internacional de La Haya?, o ¿sólo nos quedará el recurso a la estigmatización, a la señalación moral? ¿El piadoso ruego a Dios, o a la Divinidad de cada quien? ¿La plegaria compungida? ¿Reiterar nuestra fe en el color verde de la esperanza?

Los representantes de Colombia estamos dispuestos a hacer todo ello, y mucho más. Hemos pensado que será necesario atender concretamente el llamado del Director General y del Comité de Finanzas sobre nuevas ideas que vamos a exponer.

El párrafo 3.38 del Informe del Comité de Finanzas contiene un aspecto paradójico, aberrante, injusto, que es necesario rectificar. Se dice en el párrafo 3.38 que 15 países, naturalmente todos en desarrollo, que esos 15 países: 7 de Africa, 5 de América Latina y el Caribe, uno de Asia, uno de Europa y uno del Medio Oriente, van a incurrir en la posible pérdida, no han perdido el derecho al voto, posible pérdida del derecho al voto en el próximo 25% período de sesiones de la Conferencia. Esos quince países son citados por sus nombres, por sus nombres propios, en ese párrafo 3.38. A esos países porque son del Tercer Mundo, porque carecen de recursos para pagar, se les ha lapidado, se les ha estigmatizado y se les ha conminado como morosos ante la Comunidad Internacional. Este es otro capítulo de la jerarquía de comparaciones a que hemos venido haciendo referencia. Ojalá, Señor Presidente del Comité de Finanzas, que en ningún otro próximo informe de ese importante Comité figuren los nombres de los países porque deban sumas insignificantes o que se aplique la misma medida para todos los deudores morosos.

El Apéndice A del Informe del Comité de Finanzas nos indica cuáles son las cuotas que deben esos países del Tercer Mundo. Veámoslas: Antigua y Barbuda, 54 000 dólares; Comoras, 88 000 dólares; Burundi, 98 000 dólares; Suriname, 99 000 dólares; Santo Tomé y Príncipe, 99 000 dólares. Es fácil notar que ninguno de estos países llega ni siquiera a la suma de 100 000 dólares; 100 000 dólares, repetimos, que, según nuestros cálculos serían apenas 0,0000000142 por ciento de 142 millones de dólares, cifra que citamos al azar.

Esa injusticia flagrante que hace parte de la jerarquía de comparaciones a que venimos haciendo referencia se refleja igualmente en el párrafo 5 del artículo 22 del Reglamento General, según el cual, citamos "ningún Estado Miembro podrá ser elegido para formar parte del Consejo si adeuda a la Organización en concepto de cuotas atrasadas una cantidad igual o mayor a la que corresponda pagar por los dos años civiles anteriores".

La situación dramática que estamos padeciendo, ante la cual parece que nos encontramos completamente inermes, indica claramente que esa disposición injusta hay que modificarla.

Los representantes del Gobierno de Colombia opinamos firme e irrevocablemente que ésta es una Organización democrática, en cuyo seno todos los Estados Miembros, grandes o pequeños, ricos o pobres, poderosos o menos, tienen los mismos derechos y las mismas obligaciones, sin ningún privilegio.

Es injusto o intolerable que se penalize a países del Tercer Mundo porque ellos, esos si, no pueden pagar por carencia de recursos y factores ajenos a su voluntad, cifras mínimas y que todos frente a esta situación sigamos felices y campantes como si nada estuviera sucediendo.

Estamos agradecidos al Director General y al Presidente del Comité de Finanzas porque nos han hecho pensar, nos han instado a sugerir soluciones y a devanar nuestras mentes.

Sera necesario modificar los Textos Fundamentales en cuanto al derecho al voto y a la elección al Consejo para evitar que en el futuro sólo los países del Tercer Mundo sean víctimas de esas disposiciones anticuadas.

Podríamos pensar, por ejemplo, en que el total de las cuotas atrasadas para poder votar en la Conferencia y ser elegidos al Consejo y a sus Comités, tenga un tope - digamos 50 millones de dólares - o establecer un porcentaje sobre el nivel presupuestario de, acaso, el 10 por ciento.

El párrafo 5.10 del artículo 5 del Reglamento Financiero dice que: "el Consejo podrá en cualquiera de sus períodos de sesiones, aconsejar al Director General sobre las medidas que sea conveniente adoptar para activar el pago de las cuotas. El Consejo podrá someter a la consideración de la Conferencia las recomendaciones que a este respecto estime conveniente".

Preguntamos al Consejero Jurídico: en virtud de esta disposición del Reglamento Financiero, ¿sería viable una propuesta a la Conferencia de este Consejo para modificar los Textos Fundamentales a la luz de nuestros razonamientos?

Naturalmente sabemos que será necesario respetar los términos de antelación para modificar los Textos Fundamentales, de manera que eso no sería posible para la Conferencia que se iniciará el próximo sábado; pero de todos modos estas inquietudes, elucubraciones, que nos han surgido para corresponder a las demandas del Director General y del Comité de Finanzas podrían ser tenidas en cuenta para el bienio entrante, de acuerdo con la evolución que pueda irse presentando en estas desafortunadas situaciones.

Los representantes de Colombia rendimos homenaje a la manera pragmática, ponderada y competente, como el Director General ha podido hacer frente a una situación semejante. Ya el Señor Crowther ha explicado muy bien los impactos que esta situación ha producido sobre el funcionamiento de la Organización, el aplazo de los pagos y también por qué el Director General no ha hecho uso hasta hora de la facultad de hacer préstamos. Sin embargo, queremos preguntar hasta cuándo será posible prolongar esa situación desdolorosa que no corresponde a una Organización como la FAO que aun así, menomada, con cicatrices sangrantes sobresale con orgullo en el Sistema de las Naciones Unidas como una de las más eficientes y dinámicas.

El Director General ha dicho, y el Señor Crowther ha confirmado, que existen 100 millones de dólares en facturas atrasadas por pagar. ¿Podrá esa cifra hacer reaccionar a quienes puedan tener responsabilidad en este proceso que causa desprestigio al buen nombre de la FAO y que afecta gravemente su seriedad y solvencia?

Hace tres semanas, el Gerente de una sociedad que suministra papelería y útiles de escritorio a nuestra modesta misión, aquí en Roma, me expresó su extrañeza porque la FAO excepcionalmente, como nunca antes en los 39 años que lleva en Roma, estuviera considerablemente retardada en relación con algunos pagos pendientes. Me conmovió la conclusión de ese Gerente de una mediana empresa. "Esto es sólo un comentario marginal", me dijo. "Non è un lamento - expresó en italiano - porque yo sé que la FAO pagará como siempre, honrará sus compromisos como lo ha hecho durante 39 años. La FAO es una grande, seria y respetable organización", terminó diciendo.

Señor Presidente, señores Miembros del Consejo, hagamos nuestras esas palabras de una persona humilde. Tengamos fe en el porvenir de nuestra Organización. La FAO tiene que sobrevivir porque así lo demandan las aspiraciones, las necesidades y los derechos de todos los Estados Miembros, particularmente aquéllos del Tercer Mundo.

Raphael RABE (Madagascar): La délégation malgache félicite Son Excellence Monsieur Bukhari, Président du Comité financier, pour la présentation magistrale du point 10 de notre ordre du jour. Elle remercie aussi Monsieur le Directeur général et Monsieur Crowther pour le complément d'information très utile qu'ils nous ont fourni sur la situation financière de l'Organisation.

Par la même occasion nous tenons à manifester notre vive reconnaissance envers tous les membres du Comité financier pour leur abnégation et les efforts inlassables et soutenus dont ils ont fait preuve en traitant toutes ces questions durant leur mandat.

La 24ème session de la Conférence avait déjà été saisie des problèmes de trésorerie de la FAO, et tous les Etats sans exception avaient à ce moment-là pris la résolution de porter - sinon de chercher à porter - remède à la situation qui prévalait.

Or, voici que la 25ème session sera à nouveau saisie d'une situation nettement plus critique, nettement plus grave et plus préoccupante: plus de 117 millions de dollars de contributions non payées sur un budget de 492 millions de dollars, soit plus de 35% de ses ressources, de ses moyens indispensables de travail. Et plus de 138 millions de ce montant, nous a indiqué le Directeur général et Monsieur Crowther l'a confirmé, constituent les obligations non réglées du plus gros contributeur.

Dans son examen de la situation financière de l'Organisation le Comité financier s'est déclaré extrêmement préoccupé et ses membres ont conclu à l'unanimité que l'Organisation ne pouvait continuer à différer le règlement de ses dépenses dont le total en suspens dépasse actuellement 100 millions de dollars.

Il faut éviter que la crédibilité de l'Organisation ne soit entamée du fait de la carence de quelques-uns de ses Etats Membres. Pour faire plaisir à ces mêmes Etats, le Directeur général n'a pas emprunté... A-t-il reçu pour autant un témoignage de satisfaction? Tel ne semble malheureusement pas le cas.

Les conséquences les plus redoutables de cette situation d'austérité provoquée sont la suppression de programmes vitaux pour nos pays, pour nos populations. Des actions de haute priorité correspondant à 68 millions de dollars ont déjà été sacrifiées, nous a précisé hier le Directeur général: l'assistance technique, la formation, l'appui aux ressources humaines, la documentation, dont certains comme le Cérès ou Unasilva ont été supprimés. On a fait des coupes très inquiétantes sinon fatales qui causent à la FAO des plaies difficiles à guérir car l'Organisation a déjà perdu quantité de ses meilleurs experts; et les experts de qualité, nous dit-on, commencent déjà à se désintéresser d'une Organisation rendue peu sûre par ceux-là mêmes qui l'ont créée.

Malgré ces graves difficultés économiques et financières, le Gouvernement malgache a fait face à ses obligations statutaires et a réglé la totalité de ses contributions démontrant ainsi son attachement à la FAO, la confiance qu'il veut lui manifester et le soutien permanent et indéfectible qu'il lui assure.

De nombreux autres Etats en proie à des difficultés semblables sont aussi en règle ou mettent tout en oeuvre pour le devenir.

Il nous semble à nous aussi peu équitable que les pays en voie de développement qui ont des retards en raison des problèmes qui les dépassent soient sanctionnés par la perte de leurs droits de vote. Nous aussi pensons qu'il faudrait revoir la question, l'examiner très sérieusement et, en cas de besoin, modifier les textes de base.

Serait-il utopique, Monsieur le Président, de souhaiter que ces immenses sacrifices consentis par nos pays contribuent à convaincre le grand contributeur de mettre fin à la période de sévère austérité financière, volontairement imposée par lui, et que des jours meilleurs s'annoncent pour le développement au cours de la prochaine décennie? Ce n'est pas une utopie car nous avons à plusieurs occasions enregistré les déclarations de satisfaction et de soutien que ce pays a adressées à la FAO. Il n'y a donc pas de raison qu'il ne concrétise ses déclarations par les faits. En tout cas le Conseil a le devoir de lancer un appel de détresse à la Conférence et invite cette dernière à prendre une résolution unanime de tous les Etats sans exception afin d'assainir sans délai la situation.

Juan NUIRY SANCHEZ (Cuba): Hemos escuchado con mucha atención el completo informe presentado por el Embajador Bukhari, Presidente del Comité de Finanzas, en la tarde de hoy, que no hace más que reafirmar la situación por la que atraviesa la Organización, así como lo posteriormente expresado por el Sr. Crowther demostrado en cifras, y en clara alusión a momentos sin precedentes en los anales de la historia de nuestra Organización, se ha calificado de crítica la situación financiera de la FAO. Y ante esa realidad seremos muy breves y concretos en esta intervención, pues sobre este tema, como expresamos anteriormente, trataremos con más detalle en el análisis del examen.

Ante esta difícil situación que atraviesa la Organización, que está relacionada fundamentalmente con el pago de las contribuciones de los Estados Miembros, sobre esta situación, nuestra delegación cree necesario hacer esta muy breve reflexión. En mi país, Sr. Presidente, existe una expresión que dice que no se debe andar por las ramas sino ir al tronco del árbol, y eso lo haremos. De esos 177 millones que faltan en las arcas de la FAO de las que nos habló ayer y hoy en su lenguaje valiente y directo el Director General, de esos 177 millones, un sólo país debe el 80 por ciento de ese total.

Sr. Director, Sr. Presidente: Hemos oído repetidamente en esta sala referirse a ese país como principal contribuidor. Yo creo que ante esta realidad su verdadera calificación sería el principal deudor. Pensamos sería necesario rectificar este "lapsus linguae" en el presente.

Ms Teresa HOBGOOD (United States of America): Mr Chairman, we have listened with interest to Mr Bukhari's introduction and the status report on the financial situation of the Organization provided by the Director-General and Mr Crowther. At this point, in the debate, my delegation would like to provide members of this body with a brief report on the outlook for United States' payments in the near term. Although we do not have final congressional action passed by both the House and the Senate of the United States Congress and signed by President Bush, we would like to offer the following preliminary comments: for fiscal year 1990, which reflects our calendar year 1989 payment to FAO, the President sought from the US Congress essentially full payment of our assessed contribution and an initial payment amounting to ten percent toward arrearages to international organizations. Based on congressional action to date, it is unlikely that our full funding request will be appropriated and we do not expect appropriate funds toward payment to arrearages. Until the legislative process is completed, we cannot provide more definitive information.

Mr Chairman, others have said that the needs FAO addresses are unique and that zero real growth should not apply to FAO's budget. For this reason: the United States believe there are many compelling needs that must be met. I doubt there is a Member Nation present which does not rejoice at the recent successes of the UN's peace-keeping efforts, or which does not share the common concern for the growing numbers of refugees and displaced persons. The United States, within the constraints on our budget, is trying to assure appropriate resources are available for all these needs. The complex process of budget formulation is continuing and involves trade-offs and priority setting, not only for our multi-lateral contributions, but also for domestic programmes. Also, document number CL 96/4, and other members of this body, have similar difficulty in paying their assessments to multi-lateral organizations. In this environment, a policy of zero real growth with maximum absorption of cost increases is the only prudent course for the Organization. Indeed, it is no more than is expected from many of us in our domestic budgets.

Mr Chairman, the Director-General referred to zero real growth as stagnation and several members have indicated a similar misunderstanding of the concept. Zero real growth does not mean an end to programme innovation; does not mean a reduction in services offered; does not mean a denial of benefits to FAO staff, rather, it is a management challenge facing this Organization, like the other organizations of the UN system. To strictly examine its programme priorities and structure, eliminating obsolete, inefficient and low priority items exactly so that there are sufficient resources to fund innovative new programmes, to provide more services to members through increased efficiencies and to promote the morale of staff by making their efforts more effective and valuable.

Taking into account our explanation of zero real growth, we do not accept the earlier explanation of the Secretariat that the 1990/91 proposed budget contains 0.45 percent real growth, not 1 percent real growth, due to the absorption of cost increases for consultants, duty travel and staff upgradings. While this comment was made under the agenda item on the Programme of Work and Budget, we believe that it is equally relevant when discussing the financial situation of FAO.

Turning to the Report of the 66th Session of the Finance Committee, as a member of this Committee which adopted the Report, my delegation does not wish to comment at this time on the various proposals contained in the Report, inasmuch as we should prefer to leave ample time for the discussion on the Review of Certain Aspects of FAO's Goals and Operations. However, we should like to be able to intervene again under this agenda item should the need arise.

Mauricio CUADRA (Nicaragua): Gracias al embajador Bukhari por la excelente presentación que nos ha hecho de este tema, ya de todos conocido y que resulta verdaderamente dramático. Asimismo deseamos dejar constancia de nuestro reconocimiento al Sr. Director General, por el manejo tan certero de una situación tan difícil, que sólo con una verdadera calidad, como la que él posee, ha podido llevar a cabo. Nos ha pedido el Sr. Director General que no lo dejemos solo, que el Consejo no lo deje solo. No sabemos cómo podríamos dejarlo solo, señor; sería como dejarnos solos a nosotros mismos. De manera que vamos a tratar de aportar algo con esperanza, como dijera nuestro colega el embajador Bula Hoyos, a la solución de esta problemática que nos atañe tan directamente a los que consideramos a la FAO como nuestra Organización.

Ya nuestra Delegación ha expresado su preocupación por el estado financiero de la Organización y el rechazo a que se pretenda recortar aun más, vía absorción de costos, señalando las graves consecuencias que la crisis financiera ya está teniendo para nuestra Organización. De modo de que, además de reiterar nuestra posición, quisiéramos hacer una reflexión adicional sobre este asunto tan lamentable. En el presente siglo hemos vivido acontecimientos verdaderamente impresionantes: desde grandes descubrimientos a destructivas guerras mundiales, a períodos posteriores de gran tensión, caracterizados sobre todo por un exagerado nivel de armamentismo nuclear y convencional, con el consiguiente gasto que esto representa.

El financiamiento de guerras destructivas y, en nuestro caso particular, aprobando una gran potencia sumas enormes de dinero para hacernos la guerra y destruir nuestra vida y nuestra economía, ha sido característica de los últimos tiempos. Enormes cifras de dinero se han aprobado con mucha facilidad sin atrasos de ningún tipo. Gastos exagerados en armas ha aprobado esta potencia en contra de nuestro país. Mientras el mundo se muere de hambre, aquí se regatean unos cuantos centavos para defender la vida. Absurdo, triste, decepcionante; no sabemos, en realidad, cómo llamarlo. Aquí nos da la sensación, de repente, de estar un grupo de países pobres y pequeños peleando por quitarles el pan de la boca a algunos de los países más grandes y poderosos de la tierra; o bien nos da la sensación de estar pidiendo una limosna. Y esto no es así, queremos dejarlo sentado.

Y, para dejarlo bien claro, tal vez sea necesario recordar que el estado de atraso y de miseria en que se encuentran la mayoría de los países del Tercer Mundo o en desarrollo se debe precisamente al grado de explotación que han sufrido y aún continúan sufriendo de parte de los países que hoy se niegan a cumplir con sus cuotas y, menos todavía, a hacer mayores aportes de nuevos fondos para el desarrollo. Es decir, abundando un poco en este detalle, desean continuar lucrándose de sus inversiones en nuestros países, inversiones que les proporcionan grandes ganancias, y no están dispuestos a hacer ni siquiera un mínimo aporte, al menos para reponer los recursos que extraen de nuestras economías. No es una limosna, pues: es una obligación lo que aquí estamos reclamando.

Pero si ni siquiera podemos lograr que se conciba como una obligación el aporte a instituciones como la FAO, estamos, pues, lejos de lograr un nuevo orden económico internacional que acabe con la injusta distribución de la riqueza a nivel mundial y promueva el desarrollo, sacando de la miseria al Tercer Mundo para el beneficio de todos; no sólo del Tercer Mundo, ya que un nuevo orden económico internacional que eleve el nivel de nuestros países propiciará un clima más adecuado en general para el desarrollo global de la humanidad.

Señalábamos que hemos vivido en este siglo y en los últimos años una gran carrera armamentista y de gastos enormes en armamentos, financiamiento de guerras cubiertas, descubiertas, de baja o alta intensidad, de todas las intensidades y colores. Nosotros en particular las hemos sufrido y las seguimos sufriendo. Pero, en fin, hablemos del futuro. Se vive hoy un clima de distensión mundial; se supone que se van a reducir los gastos en armamento y, en consecuencia, se iniciará un período de mejoramiento general de la economía mundial, sobre todo de las grandes potencias. Por tanto, habrá recursos para el desarrollo. ¿No sería lógico, entonces, proponer o pedir que se asignen más recursos para terminar con el hambre y promover el desarrollo? ¿No está acaso íntimamente vinculado el desarrollo y la satisfacción de las necesidades básicas de los pueblos con la estabilidad y la paz? Y, viceversa, ¿no es necesario acaso un clima de paz y respeto para promover el desarrollo y la estabilidad de los pueblos? Nuestra Delegación, al analizar estos aspectos de la situación financiera grave que atraviesa nuestra institución, a los países que se niegan sin motivo económico justificado a aportar sus obligaciones a esta institución, quiere ofrecerles elementos adicionales que los ayuden a reconsiderar su posición o que los alienten a reconsiderar su posición. No se puede seguir recortando financiamiento a la FAO, pues la labor que nuestra Organización desempeña llega a lo más sentido de nuestras necesidades, con la

estabilidad, la promoción del desarrollo, la lucha contra el hambre. No se puede ignorar la miseria, el atraso y el hambre de los pueblos, y luego lamentarse por las explosiones sociales de los mismos. No hay paz sin desarrollo, no hay paz sin igualdad, y aquí quisiéramos sumarnos al señalamiento que han hecho la Delegación de Colombia y otras, en el sentido de que todavía se continúa, no sólo en este Organismo utilizando el eufemismo de "el mayor contribuyente" u "otro país", mientras a los países pequeños se los menciona por su nombre. Vamos a continuar usándolos nosotros, mientras no se cambie, pero esta situación debe cambiar.

De manera que, aun cuando nosotros hemos dicho aquí que creemos que es una cuestión de obligación el hacer los aportes a la FAO y no una cuestión de caridad, si es necesario apelar a los buenos sentimientos de nuestros hermanos países desarrollados que no quieren pagar, hay que pedirles que de manera caritativa se saquen la mano del bolsillo y se la pongan en la conciencia o como les de la gana -mejor, tal vez, en el corazón- y aporten a la FAO.

Javier TANTALEAN (Perú): Antes de nada, quisiera agradecer al Presidente del Comité de Finanzas de la FAO por la excelente exposición que ha hecho sobre los problemas financieros de la Organización. Asimismo, al Asistente del Director General en materia financiera.

Señor Presidente, por su intermedio quisiéramos expresar una duda que tiene mi Delegación con respecto a este término famoso del "crecimiento cero".

Para mi Delegación, ha llegado un momento realmente, y lo digo con toda sinceridad, de confusión. ¿Qué es "crecimiento cero"? ¿Significa que es crecimiento cero con absorción de costos? ¿Significa que se le está pidiendo a la FAO que no crezca y que, cuando existan procesos inflacionarios igual a absorción de costos, deban ser asumidos por la propia FAO? ¿Quiere decir que estamos hablando de un decrecimiento en el largo plazo, que llevaría a la extinción de la Organización? Ya se ha mencionado que ejemplos de éstos existen, como es el caso de la OEA, que, poco a poco, se ha ido extinguiendo en su Programa de Cooperación Técnica y hoy no tiene casi ningún tipo de programa de cooperación técnica. ¿Estamos hablando, entonces, de un crecimiento en términos nominales cero -eso es lo que nosotros no logramos entender- o un crecimiento en términos reales?

De todas maneras, sea cual sea la explicación y la respuesta de la Delegación de los Estados Unidos, que es la que ha llevado el liderazgo de esta tesis -minoritaria, por cierto- en esta magna y democrática asamblea, queremos expresar que nosotros sí pensamos que este instrumento fundamental de lucha contra el hambre y la malnutrición tiene que tener un apoyo sostenido, y es un problema moral de los países grandes, pequeños y subdesarrollados.

Por otro lado, quisiera discrepar también con la Delegación de Estados Unidos cuando el día de ayer -ya que este asunto también se menciona en el informe del 58º período de sesiones del Comité del Programa y forma parte de la discusión de lo que tenemos que ver hoy en la tarde- se menciona que la FAO incurriría en duplicidad, si es que a solicitud de los gobiernos apoyaría a éstos en los programas de ajuste estructural.

Nosotros discrepamos de esta posición, porque justamente son los programas de ajuste estructural los que han perjudicado mayormente al sector campesino y al sector productor de alimentos, y en general han significado una merma en lo que son de las capacidades de producción del sector agricultura. No vaya a pasar, como en muchos de nuestros países, que el Ministro de Agricultura, o el Ministerio de Agricultura se entera de las medidas de ajuste estructural por los periódicos, al día siguiente que han sido dadas. Nosotros pensamos que la FAO tiene una labor importantísima que cumplir, desde los comienzos, que serán los programas de ajuste estructural, para que justamente estén con un balance compensatorio, de lo que nos hablaba algún organismo internacional: "el ajuste con rostro humano".

En tal sentido discrepamos, pues, porque además somos conocedores los que por experiencia propia nos ha tocado negociar este tipo de programas, que tienen su base en la crisis de la deuda externa fundamentalmente y, por qué no reconocerlo, en otros casos, al mal manejo, por nuestros propios gobiernos, de las políticas económicas.

Por otro lado, quisiéramos aunarnos a lo que plantea el Comité del Programa, cuando se refiere a la posibilidad de mayores apoyos a los países de América Latina y el Caribe. Esto es importante, en vista de que hay una crisis manifiesta en América Latina y el Caribe, por el menor crecimiento de la región -varios países han tenido tasas negativas de crecimiento económico en los últimos años; la misma FAO ha declarado en estado de emergencia agroalimentaria a algunos países de la América Latina y el Caribe- y, por otro lado, la crisis generada por el asunto de la deuda externa.

En relación al informe del Comité de Finanzas, pienso que estamos de acuerdo con la propuesta del Director General sobre la aplicación del coeficiente de descuento por vacantes para aplicar un descuento intermedio entre el actual punto 5.5 y el propuesto 3 por ciento.

Por otro lado, mi Delegación apoya todos los proyectos de resolución propuestos por el Comité de Finanzas y se auna a la exhortación y a la autoexhortación -porque es también para mi propio país- para pagar, porque no hay otra solución, los retrasos que se tienen con la Organización de la FAO. Esto es muy importante, como ha sido mencionado por otros oradores.

David COUTTS (Australia): This is an item on which I could speak at great length, having been involved in the deliberations of the Finance Committee which I found very interesting. I thought Ambassador Bukhari's introduction was very good and I certainly do not have any problems with it. I will restrain myself, however, as I was on the Finance Committee and our views are reflected in the report. I will restrain myself to one or two particular points that need to be made.

The major point is one that basically everybody had focused on, namely the financial situation of the Organization. Certainly, Australia has no difficulty in joining in the appeal for member countries to pay their assessed contributions and we have done that constantly. We pay our contributions and we do not expect any special credit for that. However, we consider that there is an obligation on all member countries to pay. Having said that we recognize that a number of member countries have all sorts of difficulties in meeting their obligations. We have to be as understanding as we can about that matter. However, we cannot ignore the matter because the situation has reached a point where there are almost insuperable problems for the Organization caused by these deficiencies in payment. I would like to underline the point that we certainly cannot agree to any attempt to discriminate between member countries in terms of the way we deal with this problem. As the United States delegate pointed out, there are reasons why they have been unable to pay their contributions. I think that this group needs to listen, in some cases a little more closely, to what the United States have been trying to tell us. As I understand it the United States administration has made very great efforts to obtain those funds but unfortunately, so far at least, there have been difficulties in extracting the funds from the system. Of course, they can speak for themselves as to what the difficulties are.

There have been the other countries which did not pay because of their economic problems and we are very sympathetic. There are many other countries who did not pay for all sorts of reasons, and I think some of them would be embarrassed if we started to look into those reasons. I do not think it would be profitable, sensible or acceptable to do so. When we start looking at what we ought to do about the situation we must look as far as we can on an equitable basis. As has been suggested by a couple of delegates losing voting rights, and sanctions, as I understand the Colombian proposal, seems to be a very strange way to continue to put pressure on countries to pay their contributions. I do not think it is a very profitable route to follow. It is a rather hollow stick with which to beat people. We have rules and they are flouted already. I think it would be very unfortunate if we were to get into the position where we tighten too much the sanctions we put on other countries. One could suggest all sorts of sanctions, for example a much tighter restriction on countries holding seats on the Council, and even committees, if they did not pay. However, I wonder if that is going to achieve very much.

Having said that I do not know where we will get to because we have made appeals constantly during the years. The Finance Committee discusses this matter at every meeting. We all agree on the need and we make the strongest statements and reports and they are all eloquently repeated by Ambassador Bukhari. It does not do any good - matters just get worse. I do not know the answer, but I think that all that can be done is for Council to repeat its appeal. I strongly urge the Council to make such an appeal a unanimous and all embracing one, and not one that focused in a discriminatory way on certain member countries. That does not mean that we cannot accept underlining the problem that is caused by the non-payment of the United States contribution. It is quite correct, that because of the role the United States plays in this Organization the non-payment is a particularly significant factor.

However, we have to be very careful how we word that in terms of how this relates to the budget, and what we are considering for 1990/91. As I am on the Finance Committee I have been fairly close to the problems that the Secretariat have. I hear what Mr Crowther says. We have discussed the matter a number of times. I have the greatest admiration for the Director-General and the Secretariat for the juggling tricks and the initiative that they have shown so far in carrying the Organization through these problems without having to resort to borrowing, with which we would have had difficulty, and with reasonably limited cuts to the programmes. However, it seems to me that in a sense the show is almost over. The juggling act has just about reached the limit of its ability to keep the show going on the basis of that sort of action. As Mr Crowther said, we have a huge problem with unpaid bills which I am sure makes the Secretariat extremely uncomfortable. As has been said, it does like to be known to be a reliable and proper payer. This is a real problem, and we have to face this real problem in commitments that will have to be carried out in the next biennium.

Having said all that, I do not have the answer although I feel very strongly that we have to keep the situation in mind when we look at the Programme of Work and Budget and the Review for 1990/91. It seems to me to be futile for the Council and the Conference to agree to budgets which show significant increases - if that is what happens - and look at matters such as lapse factors, which again dramatically affect the amount countries have to pay when we have this problem to grapple with.

In listening to the United States it seems to me that the chances of getting more than half of what the United States is due to pay in 1990 are not particularly good. The chances of getting any payment of arrears do not sound very good at all. This means that the situation is not going to improve in the next biennium, and we may also face a contribution situation over the biennium which falls US\$ 50 million short, or even more, of what should be paid, on the basis of the United States situation alone. If the Council and Conference puts their heads in the sand and do not recognize the situation certainly not condone or support it, unless you criticize it as strongly as possible, but it certainly cannot be ignored - we cannot keep passing budgets which do not take account of the situation.

There have been suggestions of establishing priorities and such matters. I am not particularly in favour of that method, but I think it is up to the Council and Conference in such a situation to give some guidance to the Director-General as to what they expect him to do about the situation. Our guidance so far is to tell him not to borrow, but unfortunately I cannot do more than that. I would certainly hate to be in his position and have to make the decisions that he has had to make over the last two or three years. For him the thought of having to make such decisions again over the next biennium possibly at even higher levels must be very uncomfortable. This is an important matter, and I do not have the answers, but maybe something will occur to me in the next couple of weeks as we are discussing the matter.

Finally, I should like to emphasize that when we are looking at the cost increases and the size of the budget we have to be very careful about the figures. As I said in my previous intervention there is a time-honoured way in which cost increases and programme increases are calculated. It is a way that is open to, I cannot say criticism, but could be done in other ways. What goes into the cost increases, while it is done in a very careful and meticulous fashion, (and I agree with Professor Shah on that matter) there is always room when dealing with estimates as to what should and should not go in - whether US\$ 76 million is correct or whether it should be US\$ 73 million or 79. I do not think it is correct to move to a point where we start calling a programme increase 0.45 percent rather than 1 percent. It is a small point and it would be silly to distract ourselves in an argument about it. However, if we are going to do it the traditional way, it seems to me that it is a 1 percent increase. We can acknowledge the absorption of costs as well, but it is a 1 percent increase.

I hope I have made all the points I wanted to make. I will continue with the other details of the Finance Committee. However, as with the United States, if debate opens up on some of those points I reserve my right to come back.

Sra. Mercedes FERMIN GOMEZ (Venezuela): Yo voy a tratar de ser muy breve y escueta. Realmente solamente tengo preguntas en mi mente con relación a todas estas posibilidades que presentan aquí las Delegaciones de Australia y de Estados Unidos. Sencillamente, porque nosotros somos un país en desarrollo sometidos a una deuda tremenda con déficit graves en nuestra situación económico-social que vemos el panorama de la FAO y del mundo con una óptica diferente de la que pueden verlo las grandes potencias y los grandes países que están superdesarrollados. Por esa razón yo no puedo decir aquí que no debe ser el uno por ciento ni el 0,5 por ciento, que no es posible que el crecimiento cero se interprete de esta manera o de la otra, porque son hechos que no tienen otra interpretación y que solamente las interpretaciones pueden ser interesantes. Yo solamente quiero preguntar a los grandes países que se hacen estas reflexiones si es posible que la FAO siga viviendo sin aumentar su presupuesto, sin atender a los programas; si es posible que la FAO pueda seguir actuando haciendo caso omiso de un Programa de Cooperación Técnica que es la vida, la esperanza y la posibilidad de supervivencia de los países en desarrollo y de los países atrasados del Tercer Mundo, para quienes efectivamente nace la FAO y debe vivir la FAO. Cuando se creó la FAO no estaba pensando en los excedentes de las grandes cosechas de cereales que había de repartir para colocarlos en la FAO. No se estaba pensando en la gran bonanza de los países superindustrializados que tenían que ver con sus contribuciones y para distribuirlos de esta manera. Se estaba pensando en un mundo que salía de una catástrofe tremenda, que era la Segunda Guerra Mundial, en un mundo hambriento lleno de necesidades. Unas naciones que estaban saliendo, naciendo a la vida de naciones independientes, porque eran naciones que habían estado dominadas siglos por las potencias colonistas y era ésta la oportunidad de la FAO, la de la Organización de las Naciones Unidas para la Agricultura y la Alimentación, su esperanza en un

porvenir cierto que, afortunadamente, ha podido darle la FAO. Porque les ha podido ofrecer su apoyo, su ayuda a través del Programa de Cooperación Técnica, a través del Programa de Campo, para ir a estudiar su enfermedad económica en su propio terreno, para poder aprender lo que era su miseria, su atraso, su falta de educación, su total ignorancia para traerlos a una vida humana, ya que ellos no estaban viviendo en la vida humana, estaban viviendo una vida totalmente de espaldas a la realidad de la cultura, a la realidad del progreso. Para eso nació la FAO. Y había venido cumpliendo esa tarea; pero resulta que ahora la FAO se ha convertido en un instrumento de investigación para dotar de estadísticas y de protección del Codex Alimentario y de todas estas posibilidades de que los países ricos industrializados aprovechen para poder ellos contribuir a su mayor desarrollo.

Yo me pregunto, si eso hubiese sido la posibilidad de la FAO, si ella solamente hubiera tenido estadísticas y Codex Alimentario, ¿habría podido hacer frente a la situación de hambre que soportó Asia en la cual sólo la FAO pudo sacarla adelante? ¿Habría podido la FAO sólo a base de estadísticas y de investigaciones de laboratorio hacer frente a la tragedia de Africa? No, no fueron las estadísticas las que le salvaron, fue la realidad, fue la vida de los expertos de la FAO los que fueron, ayudados, naturalmente, por los que tenían el dinero, por los que tenían los cereales, las cosechas; pero la FAO fue quien tuvo la iniciativa de hacerlo. Eso es lo que estamos esperando ahora los países de América Latina y el Caribe, que solicitamos de la FAO, en la Conferencia de Barbados y a quienes prometió la FAO, porque lo aprobamos así en Recife, Brasil, el año pasado, un estudio que va ya convertido en un plan de acción que esperamos que la FAO ponga en práctica. ¿Cómo no va a dar FAO satisfacción a este programa que están esperando los países de América Latina, atrasados todavía, y endeudados, y los del Caribe, si vamos a tener crecimiento cero y reajustes de los programas, y eliminación del Programa de Cooperación Técnica? ¿Qué nos van a dar? Estas son las preguntas que yo me hago. Yo no soy experta estadística ni mucho menos puedo competir con el Embajador Bukhari ni con el experto Sr. Shah en materia de finanzas. Yo los admiro por los informes que han presentado y admiro mucho más al Director General por la habilidad, la voluntad y el talento que ha tenido para administrar lo poco que tiene y que pueda seguir adelante. Es como uno de esos dueños de casa que sin trabajo y sin sueldo pueden sostener a una familia.

Eso ha venido siendo la FAO en los últimos años; pero eso no puede seguir siendo. La FAO debe ser una Organización que tenga sinceramente unos recursos adecuados para poder satisfacer las necesidades de los países miserables y de los países necesitados del mundo. Yo creo que es eso lo que esperan aquí los países representados del Tercer Mundo, porque los países del primer mundo son pocos, son muy poderosos, pero son pocos y los países del Tercer Mundo tienen, porque así se lo ha otorgado la Constitución de la FAO, el mismo derecho que les da su soberanía para solicitar de esta Organización la ayuda, la asistencia técnica, que es lo que le piden, y ahora se les niega porque el Programa de Cooperación Técnica ha tenido que ser reducido, porque ya no hay publicaciones, porque ya no hay asistencia y porque cada vez son menos los expertos que hay en la FAO, ya que dijo el Director General que ya hay doscientos veinte puestos vacantes y serán todavía más. Es decir, disminuye cada vez más el equipo de gente que tenía la FAO estudiando los problemas del Tercer Mundo.

¿Qué es lo que va a hacer la FAO con el plan de acción de Recife? Es lo que me pregunto como miembro de un país latinoamericano que está pendiente de este Programa. No podemos nosotros estar olvidándonos de lo que ese Programa dice con relación a la pobreza rural, con relación a sistemas alimentarios, con relación a la situación económico-social de aquellos países. No podemos nosotros estar elucubrando y analizando estadísticas del crecimiento cero, del uno, del cinco, del 45, del 0,2, porque eso no lo entienden los pueblos de nuestros países, y esos pueblos de nuestros países están esperando a los delegados de este Consejo y a los delegados de la próxima Conferencia a que les digan qué es lo que les llevan para ellos para satisfacer sus necesidades. No entienden de crecimiento cero, ni entienden de nada de eso. Entienden de cosas concretas, entienden de resultados de un programa que se les puede dar, de una asistencia que ellos esperan de FAO. Hablar en abstracto está bien para los embajadores que aquí les representan, pero no sé que van a hacer los embajadores del Tercer Mundo cuando regresen a sus países después de esta Conferencia y les digan que como Estados Unidos no paga sus cuotas atrasadas, resulta que nos vamos a quedar así en el aire. Además ellos son países que no pueden tampoco pagar sus cuotas porque no tienen con qué. Es una situación realmente grave, y yo no soy poetisa, la poesía es bonita para leerla, pero yo no he nacido para escribir poesía, me gusta la realidad.

Por estas razones yo pienso que no podemos gastar tiempo en analizar situaciones abstractas, que debemos pensar nosotros, cada uno de nuestros países cómo lo vamos a hacer, de qué manera podemos reclamar a nuestros Gobiernos que hagan un esfuerso para pagar las contribuciones de FAO. El Director General no puede sacar más dinero donde no hay y cada uno de nuestros países debe hacer esfuerzos y pagar el uno por ciento, el dos o el tres por ciento de su contribución. Puede ser que tenga un Congreso un poco más comprensivo que el de los Estados Unidos y que les ayude a pagar las cuotas atrasadas, que no serán tan grandes como la de Estados Unidos.

Le ruego, Sr. Presidente, que me excuse por mi extravagancia de hablar en este tono, pero no hay otro tono para estas soluciones tremendas como la que estamos confrontando. Hablar suave, decir frases muy hermosas no nos va a ayudar a afrontar la realidad. La realidad es dura, la realidad es verdaderamente difícil y no podemos dejar esto ni al Embajador Bukhari, ni al Comité de Programas, ni al Dr. Shah, ni tampoco al Director General para que lo resuelvan solos. Nosotros tenemos que ayudarles a buscar un camino con nuestra cooperación en nuestros propios países. Poco, lo que sea, pero que este año próximo de 1990 cada uno de los miembros de la FAO, por más pequeño que sea, trate de que venga a la Organización alguna contribución agregada, sea del pasado o sea del presente, pero que no se pase este año sin que podamos hacerlo, porque estaremos contribuyendo a acabar realmente, como dijo alguien antes, como el destino de la OEA. Sería triste que la FAO corra el mismo destino. Nosotros tenemos que salvarla y éste debe ser nuestro compromiso.

LB PRESIDENT: Je vais vous lire la liste des orateurs qui sont encore inscrits pour prendre la parole sur le point 10 de l'ordre du jour: Brésil, République de Corée, Kenya, Japon, Suisse, Egypte, Liban, Mexique, Libye, Chine, Malaisie, Canada, Royaume-Uni, Congo et Inde.

Avec votre permission, je vais clore la liste des orateurs. Il est 17 h 10 mais, compte tenu de l'importance de cette question, je vais demander une prolongation de séance pour terminer l'examen de ce point ce soir. Nous resterons donc le temps qu'il faudra. Mais il faut terminer notre travail sur ce point.

João Augusto DE MEDICIS (Brazil): I should first like to ask the Secretariat to up-date Appendix A of document CL 96/LIM/1, because on 23rd October Brazil made payment. It was a small payment, a token payment of around US\$ 604 000, but it is a token of our support for this Organization. I know that it would be impossible for the Secretariat to have this in time for the Council and Conference but I should like to announce this to the Council.

Having said that, I believe that my delegation owes the Council and the members of this Organization an explanation. In spite of the great efforts of our Government we have only been able to pay to FAO this year an amount of US\$ 3 480 000, which means that we are still in arrears of around US\$ 4 million. We are not proud of our record and we are sad, but we are not ashamed of it as we know that this Council and our fellow Member Nations are aware of the difficulties faced by my country due, among other factors, to the burden of external debt and in this particular case to the revised scale of contributions. I should feel much more at ease if I did not have to make this explanation, but I believe that it is my duty and that of my country to do so.

Having said that, I repeat the question put during the discussion of the previous item. How can we expect the Organization to implement its Programme with arrears in the order of US \$175 million, three-quarters of which are owed by a single government? I do not have to repeat here, as we all know, that there is a great difference between the two cases. I do not need to indulge in the motivations behind them. My delegation was therefore very disappointed by the statement of the representative of the United States. We were expecting a more positive approach. Actually we expected a communication on the payment of the United States arrears. Regretfully, all we got was a lecture on the great advantages of zero growth. It is hard to believe in these great advantages, especially when the largest contributor is not intending to fulfil its obligations. Do we have any reason to expect it to change its approach? I hope so. It is getting more and more difficult to believe in that, and therefore the views expressed in this Council are perfectly understandable.

Jang Bae YOUN (Korea, Republic of): To begin with, my delegation would like to commend the Secretariat for the high quality of the document. We should also like to express our appreciation to Ambassador Bukhari, the Chairman of the Finance Committee, for his excellent introduction.

We should now like to give our brief views on Agenda Item 10.1.

In the first place, we regret to note that the outstanding contributions amount to the highest level ever in the history of FAO. We may recall that in almost every forum of FAO strong appeals

for early payment of assessed contributions have been made to Member Nations throughout the last two years. Nevertheless, the result has been completely opposite to our expectations. The total outstanding arrears have increased to US\$ 194 million. Furthermore, there are 54 member countries, which account for over one-third of the entire membership of FAO.

I repeat, one-third of the entire membership has failed to pay outstanding arrears, as indicated in paragraph 3.43 on page 32 of the document CL 96/4. At this juncture we do not want to illustrate the negative outcome and effects of this disastrous situation in detail. However, we stress that such an extremely difficult situation should not continue in the coming years. In this context, noting the urgent need for hunger and poverty alleviation in every corner of the developing world, we should like to express our grave concern about the future of our Organization, and this mandate to be fulfilled by FAO itself. Therefore, we strongly urge that, not only Member Countries as a whole, but the FAO Secretariat should make utmost efforts in order to end this crisis in a harmonized and concerted manner. In addition, we also recognize that it is the right time to consider the necessary actions in order to break through the deadlock situation of our Organization. We hope that further discussions on this matter will be held in Commission II of the forthcoming Conference.

Turning now to the implementation of the TCP project in paragraph 3.45, we should like to underline the fact that US\$ 40 969 000 - which takes almost 65 percent of the total appropriations - remained unimplemented at the end of August this year. If we consider the high demand for TCP from developing countries in recent years, it is regrettable that such a large part of the allocation is still left in the TCP account.

My delegation is also deeply concerned about the situation, and the situation also continues in the next biennium. However, we believe that a TCP project implementation cannot be made fully in the coming years. Therefore, to increase the level of budget allocations to the TCP may not be meaningful even though developing countries are supporting this increase in a single and united voice. We should be grateful if the Secretariat could kindly provide some explanation in this regard.

Stanley M. GUANTAI (Kenya): Mr Chairman, my delegation would like to thank the Director-General, the Chairman of the Finance Committee and Mr Crowther for their comprehensive brief on the financial situation in the Organization. The picture painted is very grim and very regrettable. The legal obligations of over US\$ one million, and the record outstanding contribution is very disturbing and one that each and every member should view with concern. We call upon Member States to put their best foot forward in the name and interest of the deserving poor and hungry, and in the interest of global interdependence in efforts to improve the economic environment. We see FAO as a very important motor and catalyst in the fight against hunger and poverty in the world, and we strongly feel that it should be given the means and the resources to carry out its noble duty. We wish to underline that the strength of FAO is in its personnel for a continually excelling performance. The Organization must be able to attract and retain highly qualified personnel. It cannot do so without resources. Indeed, Sir, we note that the Organization has had to resort to freezing of posts and publications which have contributed to stagnating the thrust of the Organization's assistance to the Member States.

Kenya has maintained that all Members are obliged to meet their obligations. We wish to underline the difficulties that many of the developing countries face, which include severe economic constraints, declining exports earnings, increased debt servicing, and net outflow of resources due to high import costs, including commitments to the international organizations, constrain these countries.

Mr Chairman, their contributions, small as they are, do give the necessary resources to the Organization, but we wish to maintain that the efforts - since we are informed that quite a number of the small countries have actually made every effort to clear their commitments and also to maintain a non-arrears balance - that these efforts we maintain should be merited by our well-to-do partners whose contributions are large and make the difference to the Organization's kitty.

Mr Chairman, I wish to report to the Council that my Government has raised funds in order to honour its present obligations, which we are hoping to receive at any time now, and these will be passed on as soon as they arrive in Rome.

Coming to the report, my delegation wishes to underline our agreement with the Finance Committee in requesting the Secretariat to continue with the analysis and up-dating of the personnel statistics. We hope that efforts towards a regional balance will be made. We welcome and agree with the proposal of the Finance Committee in continuing the services of the present External Auditor, whose method of approach has become quite familiar to many of our member countries. We also note his efforts to undertake several reviews in a number of the Organization's activities, including projects, which were very revealing and of assistance to FAO in its internal adjustment and improvement efforts.

In recognition of the UNDP Programmes, my delegation appreciates the need for closer collaboration between FAO and UNDP. We also underline the important role played by FAO in the execution of projects under the UNDP Project Cycle. I reiterate my country's call in this regard for the UNDP and FAO to enhance programmes in manpower development and training of national personnel, to facilitate the governments of recipient developing countries in the interests of national aspiration and the need for harmonized overall international development in order to be able to execute projects whenever such national competence exists.

Kota HIRANUMA (Japan): Mr Chairman, thank you for giving my delegation the floor. My delegation also noted with concern that the rate of contribution paid by Member Nations is worse so far, as this contribution and the contribution in arrears, payment of which is the obligation of member countries, should be paid in a timely fashion. As has been strongly urged by the Secretariat to member countries, all of us are fully aware that payment of the contribution should be made in the appropriate manner. However, we shared the observation that the Member Nations face the grave difficulty of fulfilling this duty. As a matter of fact, my country has had difficulty in paying our contribution because of the drastic change in the currency translation, and so on. Nevertheless, my Government wishes to state clearly that we regard FAO as a very important UN organization, the objectives of which are fundamental for human beings. Therefore, we continued to overcome this difficulty, and we overcame it with full payment in September. Hence, we would like to share the appeal of the FAO Secretariat, that the Member Nations should fulfill their financial obligations quickly.

Roger PASQUIER (Suisse): La délégation suisse partage la position des délégués qui lancent un appel aux gouvernements qui ont des arriérés de contribution à verser. La FAO a besoin d'un flux prévisible de ressources et il n'est pas normal que le Directeur général doive dépenser son énergie pour tenter de résoudre ce problème. C'est aux pays membres d'exercer une certaine pression morale sur tous les gouvernements en défaut, en commençant par ceux qui seraient le plus à même d'honorer leurs obligations.

Ceci dit, nous remercions les délégations présentes à ce Conseil pour les efforts qu'elles entreprennent et qu'elles entreprendront dans leurs capitales à cet effet.

Adel EL SARKY (Egypt) (original language Arabic): Thank you very much, Chairman, in the name of God, compassionate and merciful. We have listened with great interest and care to the statements by His Excellency Bukhari, Chairman of the Finance Committee, and we are very grateful to him for this detailed information. We are also grateful to Mr Crowther for the additional information he supplied and we would like to thank him generally for all the efforts he has made, successful efforts he has made in managing this Organization, and would like to thank the Director-General for managing to cope with the situation without having to have recourse to borrowing powers. We had been facing a cashflow crisis ever since the 24th Session of the Conference, and the situation is getting worse since we are now, we have been told, US\$ 175 million in arrears. So it is obvious that such delay in contribution is going to have a very negative impact on the credibility of the Organization, apart from the negative impact on the important technical programmes which are of such vital importance to the developing countries and which we had in the Programme of Work for this current biennium. We would like to appeal to all member countries to make an effort to pay all the outstanding contributions so that the Organization may be strengthened. After all, our Organization here is the leading organization in the field of food and nutrition and we must make it possible for it to carry out this work properly, and we do hope that a solution can be found promptly and speedily.

Amin ABDEL MALEK (Liban) (langue originale arabe): La délégation de mon pays partage les préoccupations de l'Organisation face à certains Etats Membres qui n'ont pas honoré leurs engagements financiers à temps. Il est vraiment regrettable de voir que les arriérés de contribution ont atteint un niveau aussi élevé avec quelque 177 millions de dollars.

Nous avons écouté avec intérêt les informations que nous a communiquées Madame la déléguée des USA et nous espérons que la Chambre des députés et le Congrès adopteront la proposition du Président des USA qui aboutira au paiement de la contribution pour l'année 89 et de ses arriérés à la FAO.

Dans le même esprit, nous lançons un appel aux Etats-Unis, qui n'ont pas encore versé leurs contributions, de le faire le plus rapidement possible. Par ailleurs, nous insistons sur la nécessité de ne pas lier l'introduction de changements considérés nécessaires par certains Etats Membres au paiement des contributions dues par ces mêmes Etats Membres.

Je voudrais encore une fois réitérer que le Liban a fait toutes les démarches nécessaires pour que soit effectué le versement de sa contribution pour l'année 1989. L'Organisation recevra cette contribution la semaine prochaine.

La Conférence générale a autorisé le Directeur général à recourir à l'emprunt auprès des banques mais il a évité de le faire. Il nous faut donc l'aider et aider l'Organisation pour lui permettre de faire face, début 1990, au paiement des factures dues et dont le montant a atteint selon nos informations la somme de 100 millions de dollars.

Sra. Margarita LIZARRAGA SAUCEDO (Mexique): Seremos muy breves, dadas las limitaciones del tiempo. La ventaja de intervenir tardíamente nos permite asociarnos en todos sus puntos a la declaración de la distinguida Delegación del Brasil, por lo cual no abundaremos en sus detalles. Queremos, sin embargo, en respuesta al llamamiento del Director General, reiterar el apoyo indiscutible de mi Gobierno a la Organización y a su gestión. Esto lo construimos cada día, y, no obstante las limitaciones que el peso de la enorme deuda externa nos impone, hemos realizado los mayores esfuerzos, y hace algunos días hemos efectuado el último de los pagos.

Nos asociamos también a las reflexiones que han hecho múltiples delegados en relación con que la importancia de la voluntad de los países más pobres y en estado de desarrollo en el entorno económico debe medirse en proporción a sus dificultades para cumplir con sus obligaciones, independientemente de su voluntad e interés. Es por ello que mi país se une en el llamamiento a los países que tienen cuotas pendientes a que cumplan con los pagos, particularmente al mayor contribuyente, ya que sin la participación de todos, la situación se puede volver inmanejable. No podemos dejar solo al Director General. Ya este Consejo le ha reiterado en varias ocasiones las facultades para pedir préstamos y, sin embargo, él, con una gran prudencia, ha evitado llegar a éste que es ya un hecho autorizado.

Finalmente, mi Delegación ratifica el nombramiento del Interventor de Cuentas y Auditor General del Reino Unido. Mi Gobierno apoya también la resolución relativa al tratamiento de ganancias y pérdidas en el cambio monetario, para que las mismas no tengan impacto en el Programa.

Bashir El Mabrouk SAID (Libya) (original language Arabic): Thank you, very much, Mr Chairman, I think that all I am going to do really is repeat what we have been saying for the last two years. In fact, this difficult situation of FAO is simply getting worse and worse. To be brief, I shall just make one or two points. First of all, we must make a distinction between poor countries, which do not have the money to pay their contributions for reasons which neither the Council nor other Member States find convincing. Secondly, the Council should refuse any cuts in the Programme of Work and Budget for the next biennium, 1990-91. Thirdly, we must insist that if the Director-General is compelled to go out and borrow money to fill the gap, then the interest due for such borrowing should be paid by those who have not paid their outstanding contributions for reasons that the rest of us do not accept. These are the few points I wanted to make very briefly, Sir. Thank you, very much.

Huang YONGNING (China) (original language Chinese): Mr Chairman, we are very worried about the present financial situation of FAO. The arrears in contributions situation is getting worse and worse and this is a matter of great concern and if this state of affairs is not rapidly improved

the work of FAO will suffer very seriously indeed. We think, Sir, that the Council must look into the situation very carefully and should make specific proposals to solve the situation. We would appeal to all Member States of FAO, Member Nations of FAO to pay their dues in good time in accordance with the Constitution and general rules of the Organization. As in the past the Government of the Republic of China will pay its contribution due on a timely basis so as to give proper support for the work of the Organization. We have paid, in the past, and we shall go on paying in the future.

Karl W. WEYBRECHT (Canada): Thank you, Mr Chairman. I would just like to make a few brief remarks on certain points relating to the report of the Finance Committee. On the proposal, the two changes, the lapse factor, a rate from the current level of 5.5 percent to 3 percent, my delegation associates itself with those members of the Finance Committee that could not accept this proposal. We note that the current vacancy rate is much higher than the lapse factor currently used. As we mentioned in our statement yesterday, and on previous occasions, we would like, if anything, to see the level adjusted upward to reflect the actual pattern of employment in the Organization. On the proposed level of the budget for the next biennium, our views were expressed again yesterday in the course of our intervention on the Programme of Work and Budget. We support the interpretation given by the delegate of the United States that the figure of 0.45 percent mentioned in the context of the Programme of Work and Budget level does not represent the full amount of the proposed real growth. The figure, in our view, includes an element of cost absorption and therefore is an underestimation of the proposed real growth. We support the recommendation of the Finance Committee on the appointment of the External Auditor. We note the considerable attention that has been focused on the topic of the financial situation of the Organization. We support the appeal of the Finance Committee to those Countries with outstanding contributions and arrears, but like the delegate of Australia believe that there is a need on the part of the Council, for understanding, and that it would not be profitable to consider measures that would effectively count on the problem. We hope that Members of the Council in attempting to single out any particular donor would not question the dedication and record of generosity of that country in assisting the developing world. In this spirit, we see a need for full understanding and an appreciation of the situation faced by all countries. Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Bahar MUNIP (Malaysia): I shall be very brief indeed at this late juncture. Mr Chairman, much has been said about the serious financial situation of FAO. Indeed, a very great financial situation that is being faced by this Organization. Much has been said about the arrears of US\$ 177 million. Mr Chairman, it is noted that some countries did not pay a certain contribution because they lack the economic capabilities to do so, while others had economic capabilities but had not paid for other reasons, best known to themselves. My country, Mr Chairman, in spite of our limited resources and in all humility, my delegation wish to inform you that we have managed to fulfil our commitment to this Organization at the earlier part of the year. My delegation, therefore, appeals to member countries, especially those who could afford it to pay, immediately if not all, but perhaps partially, for a start, in order to alleviate the existing financial crisis. Thank you, very much.

Raymond ALLEN (United Kingdom): I would just like to seek a point of clarification, if I may. Are we talking just to Paragraph 10.1 or the whole of Item 10? Just 10.1. I would like to thank Ambassador Bukhari and Mr Crowther for the very clear introductions to the documents before us. We have over time seen a gradual improvement in the documentation. The provision of information about the financial position and the cashflow are, as we have said in previous Council meetings, particularly useful. We do recognize the constraints faced by the Organization by the non-receipt of information they have requested from Member Nations as to the amount and timing of their contributions. We are therefore particularly disappointed that because of these constraints it has not been possible to see a continuation of the improvements. We are particularly concerned about the cashflow forecasts which proved so useful last time. We would therefore like to join the Secretariat in urging Member Nations to do all within their authority to provide this information to enable the Secretariat to produce a reliable cashflow forecast which will help all Member Nations to better assess the financial situation of the Organization.

I would like to reiterate, Mr Chairman, on the question of borrowing, that the position of the UK remains unchanged. We are opposed to external borrowing and believe that the Organization should live within its income. This, we think, highlights the need for the Organization further to rationalize its programmes and to establish clearly defined priorities to overcome the problems

of possible shortfalls and to ensure that some of the more valuable programmes are protected and not adversely affected by lack of funds. In this respect, I would like to comment on the remarks made in paragraph 13 of page 1. The line here seems to be that in order to accommodate changing priorities, additional budgetary provision is required. Further prioritization of existing programmes to release additional resources to meet the needs isn't seen as a possible option. We cannot help but see the level of arrears and the number of countries which are behind in their contributions. I remind the meeting that my Government's position is very straightforward: all Member States should meet their obligations and not fall into arrears.

I agree with the comments made by the Australian delegation earlier this afternoon with regard to the changing of the rules of the Organization. We do not think that this would be very constructive.

Joseph TCHICAYA (Congo): La Délégation de mon pays a suivi avec une extrême attention l'exposé de Monsieur l'ambassadeur Bukhari, Président du Comité financier. Le complément d'informations fourni par M. Crowther et le Directeur général lui-même nous ont définitivement convaincus des difficultés auxquelles se trouve actuellement confrontée notre Organisation. Nous serons néanmoins bref et pour cela nous aimerions associer notre voix à celle de tous ceux qui ont exprimé leur vive préoccupation quant à la situation financière de l'Organisation. Dans ce cadre, nous partageons l'avis de ceux qui pensent que si la situation l'exige, le Directeur général emprunte, comme il y avait été autorisé, et dans ce cas seuls les pays devant des arriérés devront payer les intérêts.

Mon pays reste redevable à notre Organisation et seule la situation économique et financière difficile qu'il traverse explique notre position. En effet, le Congo, pays endetté en raison de l'ordre économique international injuste en vigueur, est soumis à la mise en oeuvre d'un programme d'ajustement structurel avec toutes les conséquences que cela entraîne.

Néanmoins, mon gouvernement, conscient de sa situation de Membre de la FAO, est en train de prendre des mesures pour régulariser sa situation vis-à-vis de la situation en épongeant ses arriérés dans un avenir très proche.

Cela dit, je sais que les 65.000 dollars dont mon pays est redevable vis-à-vis de notre Organisation ne changeront pas la situation financière actuelle de l'Organisation.

Aussi voudrais-je m'associer à l'appel pathétique lancé par le Comité financier et le Directeur général pour que cette Organisation vitale, qui a su jusqu'à présent faire preuve d'un dynamisme réel, retrouve sa santé financière afin qu'elle continue à répondre aux demandes des pays membres, notamment ceux en développement.

Ce faisant, nous rejetons le principe de la croissance zéro, qui, malgré ce qui a été dit, est synonyme d'immobilisme.

Mne Josefa Guilhermlna COELHO DA CRUZ (Angola): Tout d'abord, ma délégation veut remercier le Comité financier pour la qualité du document qu'il nous a présenté.

Ma délégation est préoccupée de la situation du paiement des contributions. Comme l'ont déjà dit de nombreux orateurs, le paiement des contributions est le devoir de tous les pays membres. Mais comment l'exiger de pays sous-développés qui ont des difficultés dans leur majorité si les grands contributeurs eux-mêmes ne paient pas?

En ce qui concerne la contribution de mon pays, je dois annoncer que nous avons déjà procédé aux opérations bancaires relatives au versement de notre contribution. Enfin, nous voulons lancer un appel à tous les pays qui n'ont pas encore payé pour qu'ils s'efforcent de le faire.

DIRECTOR-GENERAL: I should like, first, to thank the many delegates who have expressed their great concern about the financial situation and have urged the member countries which have accumulated arrears - especially the largest - to pay their arrears.

The Council has the possibility under Financial Regulation 5.10 of giving advice to the Director-General on the measures to be taken to speed up the payment of arrears. The Council could also submit recommendations for necessary action by the Conference. I am quoting Financial Regulation 5.10, but I am not clear what advice the Council has given me so far.

Silence on the part of the Council might have given the impression that, in spite of total outstanding amounts of US\$ 175 million, "Tout va très bien, Madame la Marquise". However, I think silence on this occasion could be misinterpreted and could also encourage more countries also not to pay their contributions.

Before making further comments, I should say emphatically that the methodology decided by the Finance Committee to calculate the cost increases is to the full advantage of member countries. Experience has shown that we have always underbudgeted the cost increases and, if at any time the cost increases should prove to have been overbudgeted, then automatically the excess of money would have gone to the General Fund and constituted cash surpluses for eventual return to the member countries. As mentioned earlier, the Finance Committee is free to impose on the Secretariat any methodology for calculating the cost increases.

Mr Chairman, I have a very great concern. What is my concern? I had hoped that this discussion might help delegations to find a way within their administrations and their legislatures to appropriate and pay their contributions and arrears. But concern is that no regret has been expressed about the harm caused to the Organization and to the member countries by those responsible for large arrears. As regards the country which is responsible for perhaps 80 percent of the arrears, the only explanation given has been about the virtues of zero budget growth.

I do not see the relationship between the financial situation which we are discussing - the nonpayment for some time of the largest arrears - and the dogma of zero growth budgets.

Are those in arrears not paying because FAO is not applying zero budget growth? I do not think so.

I am convinced that zero growth condemns the expansion of FAO's activities, and shows no sensitivity to factors such as the annual increase in the world population. FAO is there to serve people. Every year we have 85 million more people.

Since 1983, for particular reasons, the budget has not been increasing, so while the population has increased we have not been applying zero growth, but even less. Shall we keep zero growth until the end of the century, while in ten years' time there will be one billion people more? Do we play with priorities, putting one here and another one there? Is this a challenge? Is this a virtue or a moral to be held up to the staff? I do not think so.

I have noted that the United States delegation is not in a position to indicate what amount could be paid in the future. The whole matter is in the hands of the United States Congress: we know that. I am much concerned that the future of the payment of the United States' arrears is bleak. No doubt we shall be discussing this matter in the ensuing years.

This is the situation. We shall face it. I am realistic, and I am simply speaking in a very factual and concrete manner. I am not attacking the United States administration nor its legislative body. We must understand the situation of the United States. The President of the United States of America has requested an appropriation for full funding, and even for payment of 10 percent of the arrears, but Congress has yet to conclude its deliberations on this question.

However, I was recently in the United States and met distinguished persons who very much regret the situation.

I should like to end with some very good news. I received yesterday US\$ 1 million given by 300 000 anonymous small and poor farmers from Indonesia. They have each donated 5 to 10 kilos of paddy rice. They have sold this against rupees and the Government of Indonesia has allowed them foreign exchange, which amount to US\$ 1 million. They sent it to FAO in my name yesterday to be used to fund small projects for small farmers in the poor countries. This million dollars is to be added to US\$ 6 million also collected by anonymous farmers. Those farmers have on average half a hectare each. This is a tribute to FAO and to FAO's work and objectives, and that is the way I will end my statement.

Perhaps Mr Moore could now answer a question raised by a delegation.

LEGAL COUNSEL: I should like to respond to the two questions that were put to me by the delegate of Colombia earlier on in this meeting regarding arrears. The first point concerned the possibility of recourse to the International Court of Justice. It is true that under Article XVII of the Constitution of FAO there is a possibility of referring questions or disputes concerning the interpretation of the Constitution, if they are not settled by the Conference, to the International Court of Justice. However, I should make two points in this connection. First, there is a question as to whether there exists any question of disputes concerning the interpretation of the Constitution. In the present case, I am not aware that any of the countries in arrears have actually denied a legal obligation to pay their assessed contributions under Article XVIII of the Constitution, or to meet their full arrears. Therefore, I am not sure there is a question or dispute which could be submitted to the International Court of Justice. Secondly, in any case the most one could expect from the Court is merely a recognition or confirmation of the fact that a legal obligation to pay an assessed contribution does, in fact, exist which, as I say I do not think is contested. The actual sanctions for non-payment of contributions or being in arrears over a certain amount, are set out in the Constitution and in the General Rules of the Organization. You have heard them before today. They are Article III.4 of the Constitution, which provide for the loss of voting rights in the Conference, Rule XXII.5 of the General Rules of the Organization which relates to eligibility for election to the Council, Rule XXII.7 (GRO) which deals with the deemed resignation of members of the Council who are in arrears over a certain amount.

The second question raised by the delegation of Colombia relates to a possible amendment of the General Rules of the Organization, or the Constitution itself and the action the Council should take. The delegate has referred specifically to Financial Regulation 5.10 which says that "the Council, at any of its sessions may advise the Director-General as to any steps that ought to be taken in order to expedite the payment of contributions. The Council may submit to the Conference such recommendations in this regard as it may consider appropriate."

The delegate of Colombia was also correct in pointing out that in so far as these recommendations might entail amendments to the Basic Texts, there are certain requirements that would need to be fulfilled. In the case of the Constitution, notice has to be given of any proposal to amend the Constitution at least 120 days before the opening of the Conference session. In the case of the General Rules of the Organization, notice must be given at least 24 hours before the meeting at which the amendment is to be discussed, provided that a report on the proposal has been given by an appropriate committee.

Gerald MONROE (United States of America): In the light of the Director-General's remarks, I should like to respond to him through you, in the same spirit that has prevailed in our relationship during the past nine months. We have discussed these issues frequently. He has been candid as I hope I have been and I want this to continue. I have listened very carefully to the interventions made during the last few hours. We take note of them. My delegation has been greatly impressed by the high regard in which this Council holds its Organization. The Director-General has asked why we have not paid. The answer is quite simple. We have not paid because Congress in its sovereign duties has not appropriated the money. We simply do not have it. Whether or not we as individuals regret that fact is immaterial. The Congress of the United States has not expressed regret at not having completed its budgetary process for this year. The number involved when we speak about the United Nations is a very large number for the United States. It is more than US\$ 700 million.

As we have said on more than one occasion the numbers are large, the process is complex. The budgetary problems facing the United States have been for a number of years very serious problems. We are not capable of doing any more than seeking from the Congress that which we think is prudent. The administration has done its very best. The Congress is now assessing what the administration has done.

I will note that a document came to my attention earlier in the afternoon. It may have some bearing on what we are talking about now and what has been discussed this afternoon. At the Conference in 1987, as I am sure those of you who were there will recall, the United States did not agree with the budget. At that time our delegate made a very detailed explanation as to why he did not agree with the budget for the present biennium. I have over one and a half pages of verbatim text, and at that time he described at great length the problems confronting the US administration and Congress with respect to the budgetary burden it has had to bear. He paid particular attention to the UN account and specifically touched on his concerns, and the concerns

of the American delegation at the Conference in 1987, as to the size of the budget. I fear that the budget was over-ambitious in terms of our ability to pay our assessments. The administration this year did its very best, and we are still hopeful that we will be able to improve on what has happened in the immediate past. However, in all candor, I must make clear that we have told the Organization over the past several years both at Conference, Council and in the other side committees on which we are privileged to serve, that we do have budget difficulties. This is why we have looked at the budget in the way that we have.

To us, zero growth has never been designed to deny the members of this Organization, or any other multilateral organization, the benefits that the system can provide. Rather in our judgment to maximize, or optimize, the possibilities for both the United States and the system to deliver from the available resources the best possible service.

LE PRESIDENT: L'action que nous venons de traiter est extrêmement importante; en effet le Conseil, après avoir pris connaissance de la situation financière de l'Organisation, a manifesté sa vive préoccupation sur l'aspect critique de la trésorerie se traduisant par un montant d'arriérés le plus élevé dans l'histoire de l'Organisation; et ceci risque de mettre en péril l'efficacité de l'Organisation dans les années à venir.

Le Conseil, unanime, lance un appel à tous les Etats Membres. Vu l'importance de la question, peut-être le Conseil serait-il d'accord pour que le Comité de rédaction prépare pour vendredi un projet de résolution traduisant cet appel pressant aux Etats Membres. Une telle résolution, présentée à la Conférence, aurait un poids plus solennel que les appels précédents.

Nous comptons sur tous les délégués ici présents pour qu'ils se fassent les avocats de leurs administrations. Nous sommes persuadés qu'ils feront de leur mieux et nous laissons au Comité financier le soin de réfléchir sur les mesures concrètes susceptibles de hâter les contributions et les versements.

Il me semble que l'on peut résumer la situation sous cette forme; cette question est extrêmement importante et je ne doute pas qu'elle retiendra également l'attention de Messieurs les délégués lors de la Conférence.

Nous avons reçu une déclaration du délégué de l'Inde avec demande d'insertion au procès-verbal sur ce point. Avec votre approbation, cette déclaration sera insérée dans le procès-verbal de cet après-midi.

Nous allons maintenant passer à un autre point de l'ordre du jour, qui est un point pour décision: nomination du Commissaire aux comptes. Tous les autres points concernant les trois projets de résolution dont a parlé Monsieur Crowther et qui concernent le traitement des pertes et gains, du change, le compte du groupement d'achat, tout cela ainsi que le point 10.2 a été présenté par le Président du Comité financier.

Avez-vous des observations sur le point 10.2?

Jacques WARIN (France): Je m'excuse, Monsieur le Président, de prendre la parole à cette heure tardive et je n'en aurai que pour quelques minutes.

Je voudrais apporter quelques précisions complémentaires sur la candidature française au poste de commissaire aux comptes dont le Président du Comité financier, Monsieur Bukhari, nous a expliqué tout à l'heure, qu'il avait préféré la candidature britannique.

Loin de moi la pensée de contester le bien-fondé de la résolution du Comité financier qui est proposée à notre approbation et qui recommande pour la 20ème fois consécutive la nomination du vérificateur britannique pour contrôler les comptes de la FAO et du PAM. Je dis bien pour la vingtième ou la vingt et unième fois... je ne sais pas au juste car le mandat de commissaire est de deux ans et le Royaume-Uni l'exerce depuis 40 ou 42 ans avec compétence et efficacité.

Il est effectivement des postes à la FAO pour lesquels ne joue pas l'alternance. Ce n'est donc pas sur ce terrain que je me placerai mais sur celui de l'expertise et de l'expérience pour défendre les mérites de la candidature française.

- L'expertise d'abord. La candidature française est - le Président du Comité financier l'a dit tout à l'heure - celle de la Cour des Comptes, plus exactement d'une petite équipe de 4 ou 5 magistrats, de ceux qui, en France, constituent la plus haute juridiction financière. Elle remonte à Philippe le Long, qui fut un roi du moyen-âge qui a régné vers 1310, c'est-à-dire il y a près de 700 ans. Cette instance est chargée de vérifier la régularité et la conformité de toutes les opérations comptables des administrations, des établissements publics, des sociétés nationales et des collectivités locales.

Ces rapports font autorité et s'imposent en dernier ressort à l'administration.

- L'expérience ensuite. Je ne parle pas de celle qui remonte à Philippe le Long mais de celle que la Cour des Comptes a des Nations Unies. La Cour des Comptes a déjà été choisie à plusieurs reprises par le système des Nations Unies pour contrôler, à New York, les comptes du PNUD dans le passé; elle ne le ferait plus aujourd'hui. Elle a également contrôlé à Genève les comptes d'une petite institution spécialisée: l'Organisation mondiale de la météorologie.

Elle exerce ces fonctions avec rigueur et efficacité et n'a recueilli que des compliments sur ses méthodes et ses résultats. Je note d'ailleurs que la Cour des Comptes est relevée dans le Rapport du Comité financier.

Voilà pourquoi c'est plutôt à vous, Monsieur le Président du Comité financier, que je m'adresse. Si vous êtes, ce que je souhaite, encore dans deux ans Président du même organisme je voudrais vous demander de bien vouloir, à cette époque, examiner de nouveau la candidature française au poste de commissaire aux comptes.

Ma petite allocution n'avait pour but que de prendre date et de vous signaler l'intérêt que mon gouvernement, soucieux de la bonne marche du système des Nations Unies, éprouve de voir renforcer les liens existant entre la haute administration française et votre Organisation.

Bashir El Mabrouk SAID (Libya) (original language Arabic): I have listened with attention to the delegate of France. He referred to the fact that there should be rotation in the appointment of the External Auditor. I also appreciate what has been said by the Chairman of the Finance Committee on this score. However, I am in full agreement with what has been said by the delegate of France that other financial institutions should be taken into consideration and we should not only take the expertise in the auditing of the FAO as the only criterion. I believe that the Finance Committee will consider this issue in the future, and it should look to other institutions, even from developing countries.

Atif Y. BUKHARI (Chairman, Finance Committee) (original language Arabic): I should like to express my appreciation of the kind words expressed by the representative of France. In fact, if there had been an External Auditor who was submitted as a candidate by Saudi Arabia I would have shown the same kind of interest. However, when we considered this issue in the Finance Committee we considered the issue from numerous aspects. We considered the two parties and did not say in our report that one country was better or more efficient to undertake the post of External Auditor of the Organization. We said this quite clearly, and I have referred to this in my report. We did not say that the British candidate was more efficient than the French one. We said that both received the respect and appreciation of the Committee. However, due to the very difficult financial position of the Organization, and to avoid any change in continuity so far as the internal auditing was concerned, this might lead to an extra financial burden on the Organization and use funds that might be reserved for other purposes.

These are the reasons. We did not choose the British candidate due to him being more efficient. Both were welcomed by the Committee, and the Committee appreciated the work of both. However, for the reasons I gave earlier, the Finance Committee deemed it appropriate to choose the candidate of the British Government for 1991 and then to reconsider the issue afterwards. We hoped that the financial situation of the Organization would be better at that time and we could reconsider the issue.

LE PRESIDENT: Si Messieurs les délégués en sont d'accord je pense que nous pourrions considérer que la résolution qui figure dans le rapport du Comité financier au paragraphe 3.52 relative au traitement des gains et pertes de change (page 38 du texte français), la résolution 3.19 "Compte du groupement d'achats du personnel - remboursement des dépenses d'appui" (page 43 du texte français), et la résolution 3.87 "Nomination du Commissaire aux comptes" (page 45 du texte français), que ces résolutions sont approuvées par le Conseil en même temps que le Rapport.

Nous pourrions ainsi transmettre à la Conférence ce rapport avec ses trois projets de résolutions, assorti du projet de résolution du Comité de rédaction sur la situation financière.

Raymond ALLEN (United Kingdom): Mr Chairman, again I seek clarification. Are you closing the whole of item 10? We have something to say on relations with the UNDP.

Regarding the level of support costs from UNDP and Trust Fund programmes, while we do not dispute the comments made in paragraphs 2.124 on page 21 and 3.73 on page 38 of the document, that any new UNDP support costs arrangements would need to be fully discussed by FAO governing bodies, we think it should be noted that discussions on these arrangements are now due to be made by the UNDP Governing Council in the summer, and it is important for the programming of the money for the fifth cycle that there should be no further slippage.

The lateness of the expert reports on successor arrangements, now due out in early December, will mean that the opportunity of a discussion of the subject in the FAO Council and Conference before the decision taking has been lost. Member States will need to take account of their interests in FAO and the other agencies when they take their decision in the UNDP Governing Council next June in Geneva. The Secretariat will need to ensure that Member States are made aware of special FAO factors by other means, for example by contact with Permanent Representatives. Of course, the review of FAO's goals and operations, particularly the consideration of the field programme and the need for FAO to be able to pick and choose, will be at the front of the minds of Member States when the successor arrangements are discussed in Geneva.

We should also like to comment on the remarks made in paragraph 2.121 on page 21. We do not believe that there should be any automatic linkage between support costs agreed for the UNDP and those for Trust Fund projects. To the extent to which there is any link in the provisions in section 2.50 of the manual as described in document CL 92/8 of July 1987, this needs to be reviewed in the light of future Council decisions.

Rudolf DE POURTALÉS (Suisse): Je vous prie de m'excuser de prendre la parole à une heure si tardive mais avant que nous ne terminions la discussion sur le point 10 ma délégation aimerait poser certaines questions concernant la perte de change. En effet ces pertes se montent, pour 1988, à 3,5 millions de dollars E.-U., somme véritablement très importante alors que le Secrétariat nous a souvent parlé des opérations d'achat de lires à terme qui devraient permettre des gains plutôt que des pertes de change.

Nous aimerions avoir un état de la situation actuelle.

V.J. SHAH (Assistant Director-General, Office of Programme, Budget and Evaluation): In reply to the question about the discussions on support cost arrangements, discussions are to be pursued not only in the UNDP Governing Council but also, as has been pointed out, to be drawn to the attention of the FAO governing bodies.

As the delegate of the United Kingdom has noted, the report of the expert group which is advising the Administrator of the UNDP is not yet available. They are still working on it. We have been assured that that report will be available for comment to the secretariats of the organizations concerned before being submitted to the Governing Council at the special meeting in February.

This matter was discussed by the Administrative Committee on Coordination at which the executive heads of all organizations were present, and the understandings reached were that in order to enable the governing bodies of the organizations concerned to consider the matter there would be a request by the Administrator that the UNDP Governing Council would not take a decision on the matter at its session either in February or in June 1990, and this is a matter which would then enable the governing bodies -in our case the FAO Council- to be informed of developments and to be consulted on at its session in November 1990.

Dean K. CROWTHER (Assistant Director-General, Administration and Finance Department): The question has to do with profit and loss on exchange, and on page 34 of the English text of the Finance Committee Report, document CL 96/4, there is a list of either the profit or loss on exchange that has occurred from 1982 through to 1988. The question was: what is the status now?

Ms Joan DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America): My delegation would like to support briefly the observations made by the United Kingdom a few moments ago regarding support costs, and we acknowledge the answer that we have had from the Secretariat. The Study that is underway is important to the future of UN System Field Activities. Decisions will be taken with the UNDP Governing Council. We hope that the new arrangements will build greater cooperation among the organs of the UN System. We also expect that these new arrangements will take account of issues such as the function of technical agencies and specialized agencies, including FAO, in providing increased policy analysis advice in developing countries, in providing increased advice to the UN Field Representatives, both the Resident Representatives of the UNDP and the Resident Coordinators representing the Secretary-General. We appreciate the cooperation that FAO and other agencies have lent in this process. We would just request that this cooperation continue. Obviously the decision could have impacts on the budgets of the organizations themselves, but at least, if not far more important, is the impact that we hope new arrangements will have on the effectiveness of UN System activities in the Field.

Gonzalo BULA HOTOS (Colombia): Los representantes de Colombia pensamos que, a estas alturas, no convendrá que en nuestro informe se refleje ninguna opinión de fondo acerca de los asuntos relacionados con el PNUD. Como lo dijo el señor Shah y aparece en el párrafo 21.24, los cuatro expertos del PNUD no han podido finalizar el documento amplio que están preparando; sólo se terminará en diciembre, la Conferencia no podrá estudiarlo.

El Comité de Finanzas, en el párrafo 3.73, ha puesto de relieve la necesidad de un debate a fondo de esas disposiciones por parte de los órganos rectores de la FAO. Creemos, entonces, que en este momento sólo corresponde al Consejo tomar nota de estas informaciones y pedir a los Comités del Programa y de Finanzas que se ocupen de este asunto en su reunión de primavera del año 1990, para que luego el Consejo de noviembre de 1990 trate sobre esta cuestión.

Srinivasa Chavaly SASTRY (India): It now becomes clear, Mr. Chairman, that the financial position of the FAO is, to put it somewhat mildly, causing greater concern than what we initially thought was the situation.

From doc. CL 96/LIM/1, It is seen that India has paid its assessed contribution in full.

We would suggest that those Member Nations who are still in arrears, but do not have any reservations in making the payments, keeping in view legislative procedures for voting these payments in their countries, may be requested to inform the FAO Secretariat of the likely schedule for the payments, including the probable dates of these payments. This would enable the FAO Secretariat to make more realistic cash flow projections and plan expenditure accordingly.

Keeping in view the principle of equality, it is clear that all Member Nations that are in arrears, would have to be treated equally. However, we must also accept that depending on the size of the Member Nation's assessed contribution, non-payment by different Member Nations would have relatively different types of impact on FAO's work and activities.

We would suggest that those Member Nations which make relatively larger assessed contributions, and particularly the largest contributor, to arrange to pay their dues more expeditiously than the Nations whose assessed contributions are relatively small, and also give their expected payment schedule.

We would also compliment the FAO Secretariat on their prudent financial management, despite the serious financial difficulty and for having managed the situation without borrowing.

However, Member Nations should realize that if this situation persists, there would be no escape from borrowing. We should make it clear to the Director-General that he should feel free, at his discretion, to use the authority vested in him by the Conference resolution to borrow moneys.

With due respect to the Finance Committee, we would request the Chairman and Members of the Finance Committee, as a committee of the Council, to go into the matter relating to overdues from Member Nations, in a somewhat greater depth and detail instead of throwing the ball back into the laps of the Council. We submit that the Finance Committee should, after getting the required factual data from the Secretariat, go into this matter thoroughly, list what all the possible options are, and come up with specific recommendations as to what course of action the Council should recommend to the Conference. This is particularly necessary when we realize that borrowing, which might become inevitable, would involve extra costs for the Organization.

We would compliment the Distinguished Delegate of the USA for her frank and unambiguous statement. She has made it clear that the US Administration envisages Congressional problems in getting the appropriations, particularly for the arrears to the UN system, voted.

In the interests of the FAO, we are sure that all the Member Nations would wish and pray to their respective Gods, that the efforts of the US Administration to get the funds voted by the US Congress would be more fruitful than what the Distinguished Delegate from the USA would herself seem to be inclined to believe.

However, could one expect that whatever amounts are ultimately voted by the US Congress would be distributed by the US Administration evenly among the various Agencies in the UN system, without modulating the payments on a selective basis?

Mr. Chairman, we do not want to take the Council's time once again by speaking on the concepts of zero real growth in the Budget and maximum absorption of increasing costs, we made our position clear in our earlier intervention this morning.

However, it does not seem to be quite clear, as yet, whether the acceptance of the concept of zero real growth of the Budget would automatically result in the unblocking of the overdue payments. Should the cause and effect relationship become clear, the proposition would at least become more intelligible.

Leaving that point apart, Mr. Chairman, we would express our perception, based on the inputs received so far from the ongoing FAO Review exercise, that among the programmes being implemented by the FAO, the non-obsolete, the non-ineffective and the non-inefficient programmes are so many that the real problem has been how to fit all these into the available financial resources, which are limited.

Among the activities being carried out by the FAO, should there be any really obsolete, inefficient and ineffective programmes, we are sure that no Member Nation would plead, even if the FAO had at its disposal limitless resources, that such activities should continue to be implemented.

To obviate the necessity for the Indian Delegation to take the floor again on this agenda item, may I also add, Mr. Chairman, that the Indian Delegation supports the resolutions:

- (i) under para. 3.56 on p. 35 of doc. CL 96/4 on the treatment of profit and loss on exchange;
- (ii) under para. 3.79 on p. 39 on staff commissary support cost reimbursement; and
- (iii) under para. 3.87 on p. 41 on the appointment of the External Auditor. 1/

The meeting rose at 18.30 hours.

La seance est levée a 18 h 30.

Se levanta la sesión a las 18.30 horas.

1/ Statement inserted in the verbatim records on request.

council

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

conseil

ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ALIMENTATION ET L'AGRICULTURE

consejo

ORGANIZACION DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA LA AGRICULTURA Y LA ALIMENTACION

CL

CL 96/PV/5

Ninety-sixth Session

Quatre-vingt-seizième session

96º periodo de sesiones

FIFTH PLENARY MEETING
CINQUIEME SEANCE PLENIERE
QUINTA SESION PLENARIA
8 November 1989

The Fifth Plenary Meeting was opened at 9.45 hours Lassaad Ben Osman, Independent Chairman of the Council, presiding

La cinquième séance plénière est ouverte à 9 h 45 sous la présidence de Lassaad Ben Osman, Président indépendant du Conseil

Se abre la quinta sesión plenaria a las 9.45 horas, bajo la presidencia de Lassaad Ben Osman, Presidente Independiente del Consejo

- III. PROGRAMME, BUDGETARY, FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS (continued)
- III. QUESTIONS CONCERNANT LE PROGRAMME, LE BUDGET, LES FINANCES ET L'ADMINISTRATION (suite)
- III. ASUNTOS DEL PROGRAMA Y ASUNTOS PRESUPUESTARIOS, FINANCIEROS Y ADMINISTRATIVOS (continuación)
- 7. Conclusions of the Review of Certain Aspects of FAO's Goals and Operations
- 7. Conclusions de l'examen de certains aspects des buts et opérations de la FAO
- 7. Conclusiones del examen de algunos aspectos de las metas y operaciones de la FAO

LE PRESIDENT: Nous entreprenons l'examen du point 11 de l'ordre du jour intitulé "Conclusions de l'examen de certains aspects des buts et opérations de la FAO".

Comme les délégués le savent, par sa Résolution 6/87, à sa vingt-quatrième session, la Conférence générale a confié au Comité du programme et au Comité financier, conjointement et assistés par un petit nombre d'experts, la responsabilité de procéder à cet examen. Le résultat de celui-ci devra être transmis, avec les observations du Directeur général, au Conseil qui en saisira la Conférence, à sa vingt-cinquième session, avec ses commentaires.

Nous allons donc procéder à l'analyse du rapport présenté par le Comité du programme et le Comité financier en session conjointe, ainsi que les observations du Directeur général sur ce rapport, et faire part à la Conférence générale des commentaires du Conseil sur ce rapport.

Au préalable, permettez-moi de signaler à l'assemblée que j'ai tenu personnellement en ma qualité de Président indépendant du Conseil, à assister aux quatre réunions du Comité conjoint qui a eu à procéder à cette étude. A ce titre - et c'est mon devoir - j'ai le privilège de noter le caractère approfondi et minutieux du travail des deux comités réalisés dans le cadre imparti par la Conférence ainsi que les efforts soutenus déployés par tous les membres des deux comités pour aboutir à un consensus sur presque toutes les questions examinées. Il s'agit là d'un effort remarquable fait par les membres de vingt pays et, pour ma part, je considère que la Conférence a été bien inspirée, à sa vingt-quatrième session, de confier ce travail à deux comités coopérant en séances closes, assistés par un petit nombre d'experts qualifiés coopérant en toute indépendance.

Il est permis de considérer que nous avons entre nos mains une bonne base de réflexion pour nos débats. Permettez-moi de formuler le vœu que nous puissions aboutir à un consensus sur une question fondamentale. Afin de remplir correctement notre mandat, nous devons analyser ce rapport et les observations du Directeur général pour chacun des quatre grands chapitres du rapport, à savoir "Objectifs, rôle, priorités et stratégies de la FAO", "Opérations de terrain de la FAO", "La FAO dans le système international" et "Ressources". Evidemment, nous ne pouvons pas voir cela paragraphe par paragraphe, mais chapitre par chapitre. A cet égard, nous entendrons le rapport du Président du Comité du programme au nom des deux comités, ainsi qu'une communication du Directeur général pour exposer ses observations.

Pour la deuxième partie de nos travaux, je vous propose d'analyser le rapport relatif à la gestion de la FAO qui nous sera présenté, au nom des deux Comités, par le Président du Comité financier et nous entendrons également les observations du Directeur général à ce sujet.

Nous avons donc un travail abondant et très minutieux sur la planche et, avec votre permission, je vais donner la parole au professeur Mazoyer, Président du Comité du programme.

Marcel L. MAZOYER (Président du Comité du programme): Merci, Monsieur le Président, de bien vouloir me donner la parole, et merci tout particulièrement de l'attention soutenue et de l'appui que vous avez apportés à nos travaux durant ces deux années. J'y ai été personnellement très sensible et je suis certain que mes collègues des deux Comités sont également très touchés par les appréciations très élogieuses que vous avez formulées quant à notre travail.

Monsieur le Président, Mesdames et Messieurs les représentants des Etats Membres du Conseil, Monsieur le Directeur général, Mesdames et Messieurs,

C'est le 27 novembre 1987 que la Conférence a adopté la Résolution 6/87, qui confiait au Comité du programme et au Comité financier, travaillant conjointement, une tâche exceptionnelle consistant à réaliser un examen approfondi de certains aspects des buts et opérations de la FAO.

J'aurai donc l'honneur aujourd'hui, avec mon collègue Monsieur l'ambassadeur Bukhari, Président du Comité financier, de présenter au Conseil les conclusions et recommandations de cet examen, qui vous sont soumises sous la cote CL 96/2, C 89/21 et C 89/21-Sup.1.

J'aborderai principalement deux aspects dans cette intervention préliminaire: tout d'abord les modalités de mise en oeuvre de la Résolution 6/87, c'est-à-dire la manière dont nous nous y sommes pris (ce dont le Conseil a été informé au cours de ses sessions précédentes) et ensuite, je ferai quelques commentaires sur nos conclusions et recommandations et sur la manière dont elles répondent aux prescriptions de la Résolution 6/87.

Mais auparavant, et pour faciliter un peu le travail et les débats, je vais rappeler rapidement la composition des documents qui sont devant nous, que nous avons aujourd'hui à examiner et dont nous allons discuter.

Comme le prescrit la Résolution 6/87 dans son paragraphe 4, les conclusions et recommandations du Comité vous sont présentées par le Directeur général, et elles sont accompagnées de ses vues et de ses observations que vous trouverez dans la première partie du document C 89/21.

Ces conclusions et recommandations sont précédées d'une courte présentation dans laquelle les Comités rendent compte de manière concise mais assez complète de la démarche qu'ils ont suivie durant ces deux dernières années pour mettre en oeuvre la Résolution: ce sont les paragraphes 1 à 16.

La première partie du rapport porte sur les objectifs, rôle, priorités et stratégies de la FAO ainsi que sur les opérations de terrain. Je voudrais souligner que dans cette 1^{ère} partie, le chapitre 1 constitue une très courte introduction générale; par conséquent, la substance de nos conclusions et recommandations commence véritablement au chapitre 2 qui traite des objectifs, des stratégies, du rôle et des priorités de l'Organisation: paragraphes 2.1 à 2.64. Le dernier paragraphe couvre en fait l'ensemble des dix recommandations relatives à ce chapitre.

Le chapitre 3 couvre les opérations de terrain de la FAO, paragraphes 3.1 à 3.54. Les quatre derniers paragraphes contiennent les 15 recommandations relatives à ce chapitre. Le chapitre 4 couvre la FAO dans le système international: paragraphes 4.1 à 4.14 qui contient sept recommandations. Enfin un 5^{ème} chapitre bref traite de la dimension des ressources: paragraphes 5.1 à 5.6.

Le rapport comprend également une Annexe 1 qui présente une analyse de la situation et des tendances de l'agriculture et de l'alimentation mondiale, annexe élaborée à partir des documents fournis à ce sujet par le Secrétariat, des études des experts et des débats qui ont eu lieu aux Comités. Cette étude ne fait pas partie des conclusions et recommandations; elle n'a pas été examinée en détail par les Comités, ni adoptée; elle est simplement présentée en tant que document de référence pour la lecture des conclusions et recommandations.

La seconde partie de notre rapport porte sur l'étude de gestion qui vous sera présentée par mon collègue, Son Excellence M. Bukhari, Président du Comité financier.

Enfin dans un second tome C 89/21-Sup.1 vous trouverez l'essentiel de la documentation dont les Comités ont disposé pour conduire l'examen.

Tel est donc le contenu général des documents qui vous sont soumis, à savoir les conclusions et les recommandations touchant aux objectifs, rôle, stratégies et priorités, et les opérations de terrain de la FAO. Ce sont les chapitres 2 à 5 de notre rapport.

En ce qui concerne les modalités de mise en oeuvre de la Résolution 6/87: pendant cette mise en oeuvre les deux Comités ont rendu compte au Conseil de l'état d'avancement de leurs travaux. Dans la présentation du rapport, nous avons donné une description assez complète de la manière dont nous avons travaillé aux différentes étapes du processus d'examen. Je n'alourdirai donc pas mon intervention en vous fournissant des informations que vous avez sous les yeux.

Je voudrais par contre souligner, au risque de répéter ce que j'ai déjà dit au Conseil précédemment, que l'approche des comités a été très ouverte et très constructive; toutes les opinions, tous les apports des membres ont été pris en considération pour élaborer notre rapport.

Dès le début de notre travail nous avons gardé très présentes à l'esprit les circonstances qui ont conduit à cet examen exceptionnel. Il y avait eu à la Conférence, lors de l'adoption de la résolution, un accord unanime sur la nécessité de renforcer la FAO de toutes les manières possibles afin qu'elle puisse continuer à jouer un rôle de chef de file dans l'agriculture mondiale durant les années à venir; selon nous cet accord préalable est tout à fait fondamental pour qu'un consensus puisse être atteint car il porte en définitif sur l'objectif de l'examen.

Cela dit, la Conférence n'avait pas abouti à un accord complet sur la manière d'atteindre cet objectif et la Résolution 6/87 elle-même est le résultat d'un compromis entre des points différents, d'abord en ce qui concerne l'opportunité de l'examen et son étendue, et ensuite en ce qui concerne les modalités de réalisation de cet examen. En adoptant cette résolution la Conférence a sans doute voulu confier aux deux comités la responsabilité de rechercher une voie qui conduirait à un consensus. Il incombait donc aux deux comités de respecter ce souci et, tout en essayant de répondre le plus possible aux demandes et aux attentes des uns et des autres, il était nécessaire de s'en tenir scrupuleusement aux termes de la résolution. C'est ce que nous avons essayé de faire tant dans la manière de procéder que dans la définition du champ à couvrir par l'étude.

Dans son premier paragraphe, la Résolution 6/87 stipule que les comités travaillant conjointement seront assistés d'un petit nombre d'experts. Nous avons choisi au total 13 experts de compétence reconnue dans divers domaines. Nous l'avons fait, comme le prescrivait la résolution, en consultation avec le Directeur général et en tenant compte d'une répartition géographique équilibrée. Comme vous le savez nous avons réuni ces experts en deux groupes et nous leur avons donné des mandats très larges; nous leur avons laissé tout le temps et toute la liberté nécessaires pour accomplir leurs tâches en toute indépendance.

La résolution nous demandait d'examiner les rôles, les priorités, objectifs et stratégies de la FAO. Accueillant une proposition du Directeur général, nous avons décidé de développer aussi deux autres études: d'une part sur les opérations de terrain de l'Organisation, et d'autre part sur les questions administratives et de gestion, jugeant que l'attention ainsi portée à ces deux sujets était conforme à l'esprit de la résolution et qu'elle ne pouvait que renforcer la valeur et l'utilité de l'exercice.

Nous avons abouti à un ensemble de conclusions et de recommandations, dont la plus grande partie a fait l'objet d'un consensus dans les comités - quand je dis "la plus grande partie", c'est de très loin la plus grande partie - et ceci sans sortir du cadre qui nous était imparti par la Conférence. Je crois que le respect de ce principe sera tout aussi fondamental dans la phase finale de l'examen, si l'on veut aboutir à des résultats concrets permettant à l'Organisation de reprendre sa vitesse de croisière au début de la nouvelle décennie.

Les comités espèrent que leur rapport pourra constituer la base d'un consensus dans les débats du Conseil et de la Conférence.

Maintenant, en ce qui concerne nos conclusions et nos recommandations: notre rapport est, comme il se doit, aussi bref que possible. Il ne représente que la synthèse des conclusions et recommandations auxquelles nous avons abouti à la suite de nos travaux, de nos réflexions, de nos lectures et de nos débats. Pour ce qui est des études sur les objectifs, rôles, stratégies et priorités, et sur les opérations de terrain, nous nous sommes beaucoup appuyés sur les rapports circonstanciés des experts, présentés personnellement par les rapporteurs des deux groupes d'experts. Nous avons également bénéficié des rapports et des commentaires du Directeur général et d'une large documentation fournie par le Secrétariat. Nous avons joint à notre rapport la partie la plus importante de ces documents sur lesquels nous nous sommes appuyés, et ceci afin de permettre à tous les Etats Membres de disposer des mêmes sources d'information, pour alimenter et enrichir leurs propres réflexions ainsi que la réflexion collective du Conseil et de la Conférence.

Je ne voudrais pas du tout ici résumer nos conclusions et recommandations. Vous les avez lues. De plus, je risquerais de simplifier ou de déformer les résultats d'un processus qui a été complexe et de raisonnements qui, comme vous pouvez vous en rendre compte à la lecture du rapport, sont riches en nuances. Je voudrais seulement rappeler brièvement le contenu de ces recommandations et conclusions, en partant des termes de référence constitués par le paragraphe 2 de la Résolution 6/87, montrant ainsi que nous avons essayé de répondre aux prescriptions qui nous étaient faites par cette même résolution.

Au paragraphe 2 (b) de la résolution, 11 est d'abord fait état du ferme attachement des Etats Membres au texte de l'Acte constitutif de l'Organisation. Et un point sur lequel tout le monde - tant les experts que les comités - s'est trouvé d'accord, c'est que l'expérience a démontré le bien-fondé et la validité du Préambule ainsi que de l'Article premier de l'Acte constitutif, et ceci au regard de la situation actuelle et des tendances à venir de l'agriculture et de l'alimentation. Quarante-cinq ans après la création de la FAO, ses finalités et ses objectifs majeurs restent pertinents, et on pourrait dire qu'ils restent plus importants que jamais.

La résolution parle ensuite du renforcement du rôle consultatif de l'Organisation dans le domaine des politiques alimentaires et agricoles, ainsi que de sa fonction de catalyseur et de son rôle de dispensatrice d'aide. Nous avons attaché une attention toute particulière à l'étude du rôle

de la FAO en matière de politiques, et nos conclusions - ainsi que nos vues sur toute une série d'autres renforcements souhaitables - sont contenues dans le chapitre 2. C'est là que l'on voit tous les besoins futurs à remplir et tous les renforcements nécessaires pour y arriver. Dans le chapitre 3 vous trouverez nos conclusions détaillées à propos des activités d'assistance et de coopération technique exécutées par le biais des opérations de terrain.

Les paragraphes 2 (c) et 2 (e) de la résolution prescrivent quant à eux aux comités de procéder à un examen "des façons d'adapter le processus d'établissement de priorités au sein de la FAO" et "des mesures propres à garantir que les processus de budgétisation, de comptabilité et de planification de la FAO fassent clairement apparaître le lien entre les stratégies, les priorités, les activités prévues" et les ressources qui leur sont attribuées: c'est le chapitre 2 de notre rapport qui couvre l'ensemble de ces questions et fait des recommandations précises dans ce domaine.

De plus, dans le rapport de la Conférence, il avait été noté que la question de l'amélioration de la procédure du budget-programme serait prise en considération lors de l'examen. Les comités avaient déjà fait une recommandation au Conseil l'année dernière à ce sujet concernant le principe d'un schéma de Programme de travail et budget pour 1990-91. Suite à l'expérience de cette année, les comités recommandent de la poursuivre au moins pendant une autre période biennale afin de pouvoir juger de son utilité sur une période plus longue. Plusieurs membres du Conseil y ont d'ailleurs déjà fait allusion lors de la session en cours. Le paragraphe 2 (d) demande un examen des relations de la FAO avec d'autres organismes, organisations et organes du système des Nations Unies ainsi que des institutions financières internationales, y compris les activités du Programme de terrain. Notre chapitre 4 examine ces questions de relations inter-agences en général, et certaines conclusions et recommandations du chapitre 3 couvrent également le rôle de la FAO vis-à-vis d'autres institutions fournissant une assistance technique ou financière.

J'en viens maintenant au premier sous-paragraphe du paragraphe 2 (a). Il nous était demandé d'examiner "la façon dont la FAO pourrait apporter sa contribution la plus efficace aux efforts des Etats Membres et des populations en vue d'éliminer la faim, la malnutrition et la pauvreté, compte tenu des ressources dont dispose l'Organisation".

Un constat sur lequel nous avons tous été d'accord, et que les experts ont relevé avec force - et le Directeur général l'a souligné également dans ses observations - est que la faim et la malnutrition continuent de s'accroître. Notre examen a été conduit en gardant toujours présentes à l'esprit les grandes finalités de la FAO telles qu'elles sont stipulées dans le Préambule et en particulier celles consistant à chercher l'élimination de la faim, de la malnutrition et de la pauvreté. Toutes nos recommandations visent à mettre l'Organisation mieux à même de poursuivre ses efforts dans cette direction, mais j'ajouterai que c'est dans les limites des ressources disponibles et que, sans doute, cela ne permettra pas de régler ce problème dans les prochaines années, pas plus que cela ne l'a permis dans les années qui viennent de s'écouler.

Les recommandations des comités constituent sans doute le minimum nécessaire pour que l'Organisation reste en mesure de faire face aux exigences à venir, et continue à répondre à l'attente des Etats Membres. Il n'en reste pas moins que pour que ces recommandations soient mises en oeuvre des renforcements seront nécessaires, et ces renforcements exigent des ressources.

D'où viendront ces ressources? Ici les membres des comités n'ont pu unifier leurs points de vue, qui sont donc présentés séparément dans notre rapport. Les membres des comités ont cependant suggéré différentes modalités qui pourraient être utilisées de manière indépendante ou combinée, pour mettre en oeuvre les recommandations que le Conseil et la Conférence retiendront.

C'est maintenant aux Etats Membres de décider des moyens qu'ils pourront et voudront donner à l'Organisation pour faire face aux exigences de la situation et de l'avenir prévisible. Les comités, pour leur part, à l'issue de cet examen, tiennent à souligner, malgré les difficultés des dernières années et les dégâts qui en résultent pour l'Organisation, qu'ils sont d'accord avec les experts en ceci - que la FAO continue d'être une organisation solide, dynamique et qui mérite la confiance de ses Etats Membres.

Je vous remercie de votre attention.

LE PRESIDENT: Je remercie le Président du Comité du programme pour son discours introductif au nom du Comité financier et du Comité du programme. Je donne la parole au Directeur général qui va nous faire part de ses observations, qui permettront au Conseil d'avoir une vue d'ensemble préliminaire.

LE DIRECTEUR GENERAL: Selon les termes mêmes du paragraphe 4 de la Résolution 6/87 de la Conférence, le Directeur général était invité, conformément à son mandat, à ses prérogatives et à ses possibilités statutaires, à fournir les services nécessaires à l'étude et à faire connaître ses opinions concernant toute question relevant de sa responsabilité, ainsi qu'à présenter les conclusions et recommandations de l'étude avec ses vues et observations au Conseil, qui en saisirait la 25ème session de la Conférence avec ses commentaires. C'est fait. Vous avez devant vous les deux rapports sur lesquels je voudrais dire quelques mots.

Comme l'a si bien dit le Président du Comité du programme dans son lumineux exposé, le but essentiel de l'examen de la FAO est de renforcer l'Organisation afin de lui permettre de continuer à jouer un rôle de premier plan dans l'agriculture mondiale au cours des prochaines années et au service de ses Etats Membres.

Il y avait donc dès le départ consensus sur l'objectif de l'examen: il s'agissait de renforcer la FAO pour lui permettre de faire face au défi de l'an 2000, aux besoins d'une population qui va augmenter de près d'un milliard de personnes d'ici là. Quatre-vingt-dix pour cent de cet accroissement démographique aura lieu dans les pays en développement. Or la FAO, comme on l'a dit hier, est en pleine crise financière depuis 1987. Au cours de ces trois dernières années, nous avons été obligés de réduire nos activités au service de tous nos pays membres de près de 68 millions de dollars E.-U.

Que proposent les deux comités, en accord avec les experts? Les deux comités proposent un renforcement de l'Organisation. Ils ne proposent l'abrogation d'aucune activité. Les experts ont étudié méticuleusement nos activités, ils se sont informés de ce que nous faisons, et ils proposent des activités additionnelles. Les comités ont entériné les recommandations des experts. Nous avons donc maintenant des activités additionnelles proposées par les deux comités pour lesquelles des moyens additionnels sont nécessaires. Ces moyens sont estimés à près de 26 millions de dollars E.-U. pour le biennium et ces moyens ne sont pas inclus dans le Programme de travail et budget que nous avons examiné hier en projet. Vingt-six millions de dollars E.-U., qui ne compensent pas la suppression des 68 millions de dollars E.-U. dont je parlais tout à l'heure. Peut-on estimer que si ces 26 millions de dollars E.-U. étaient ajoutés au budget de 1990/91, le but, l'objectif de l'étude serait atteint et la FAO serait renforcée dans ses moyens comme la Conférence le souhaite? A vous de répondre à cette question.

Il y avait au départ une certaine méfiance de la part d'une majorité des Etats Membres en ce qui concerne l'examen de la FAO, mais je peux témoigner que cet examen s'est très bien déroulé, et qu'il s'est conclu par un grand succès, puisqu'il a obtenu l'accord général tant des 13 experts que des 20 pays membres des deux comités. Ce consensus ne peut être suivi que par celui du Conseil, et j'espère de la Conférence, autour des propositions contenues dans le rapport des deux comités.

Pour ma part, j'appuie les propositions contenues dans le rapport des deux Comités, ainsi que vous le remarquerez en lisant mes observations, et j'ajoute quatre propositions que j'estime être complémentaires.

Tout d'abord à la page XVII de mon rapport, paragraphes 80 et 81 je propose de renforcer la coopération avec le GATT. La FAO doit jouer un rôle aussi actif que possible dans le domaine du commerce international et je propose la somme de 900 000 dollars à cet égard. Plus tard, nous pourrions parler des détails de cette affaire. A la Conférence aussi ce sujet sera évoqué.

Cette proposition consiste à créer une unité de liaison avec le GATT à la Division de la nutrition pour coopérer avec le GATT dans le domaine des normes alimentaires. Nous avons été sollicités par le GATT de servir de conseiller scientifique du GATT en cas de litiges d'Etats Membres du GATT à propos d'importation et d'exportation de produits alimentaires. Il nous faut donc renforcer nos moyens et avoir une unité composée d'un cadre, d'un fonctionnaire de la catégorie des services généraux et de quelques fonds de voyages et de consultations; également une autre unité de deux personnes à la Division de la production végétale pour renforcer notre coopération dans le cadre de la Convention internationale de la protection des plantes. Le GATT nous demande justement, au nom de ses pays membres, de jouer aussi un rôle comme conseiller scientifique et technique dans ce domaine. Cette unité permettra de donner une assistance technique accrue à nos Etats Membres pour la création et le renforcement de services et pour leur

permettre aussi d'améliorer leur législation en matière phytosanitaire, pour organiser des centres de formations dans ce domaine. Cela permettrait au GATT d'utiliser les services de la FAO dans ces deux domaines très importants. C'est une dépense de 900 000 dollars.

Le groupe d'experts et les deux Comités avaient proposé un renforcement de la coopération avec le GATT. Nous avions estimé à ce moment-là qu'une somme de 30 000 dollars serait nécessaire. Mais au reçu de la lettre du Directeur général du GATT parlant au nom des Etats Membres du GATT et demandant à la FAO de jouer à l'avenir un rôle de conseiller technique dans ce domaine où il y a beaucoup de litiges entre Etats Membres (par exemple si la viande exportée d'un pays vers un autre est bonne pour la consommation ou pas, cela peut avoir des conséquences énormes si on ne suit pas les normes alimentaires), cela nous a ouvert un autre horizon, et je pense qu'il est intéressant de trouver quelque chose de nouveau dans les propositions des deux Comités. Je crois que c'est une chose qui va encore plus loin que ce qui a été proposé par les deux Comités.

J'attache une très grande importance à cette nouvelle activité. Nous organisons durant la Conférence, le 14 novembre, la première réunion de la Commission internationale de la protection des plantes. Nous avons aussi préparé des réunions des organisations régionales pour la protection des plantes pour créer une sensibilisation à ce problème. Il y a donc intérêt pour tous les pays membres à donner les moyens à la FAO d'aller de l'avant dans ce domaine nouveau et de jouer un rôle plus actif avec le GATT. D'ailleurs, le Comité des produits l'a souvent recommandé. Nous avons reçu des recommandations pour jouer un rôle plus actif. Nous ne pouvons pas jouer un rôle dans les négociations mais nous pouvons donner l'appui nécessaire au GATT. C'est le GATT qui fait les négociations. S'il y a des disputes, c'est à lui de les régler. Mais si l'on donne une autorité scientifique à la FAO, elle ne peut pas se dérober et elle doit jouer ce rôle de conseiller scientifique du GATT.

Je fais aussi une autre proposition au paragraphe 67 de mon rapport, page XV. Je reprends la proposition des experts qui se trouve au paragraphe 74 i). Il s'agit d'offrir au personnel de la FAO des possibilités de recyclage. Cela est extrêmement important. Je propose qu'une somme de 4 millions de dollars soit prévue à cet effet. On sait très bien que dans les entreprises privées, il y a toujours un certain pourcentage du chiffre d'affaires, qui atteint parfois 35%, consacré à recycler le personnel. Ici nous n'avons pas de crédit pour recycler le personnel. Les experts l'ont proposé, cela n'a pas été retenu par les deux Comités et je ne sais pas pourquoi. Mais je pense, pour ma part, que c'était une proposition très utile de la part des experts et je vous propose 4 millions de dollars.

La troisième proposition additionnelle est aux paragraphes 70-71 de mon rapport, page XVI. Je propose que des réunions informelles d'échange d'informations soient organisées régulièrement entre les Organisations des Nations Unies qui ont leur siège à Rome. Une fois par an, peut-être plus, une réunion informelle aurait lieu, soit à la FAO, soit au PAM, soit au CMA, soit au FIDA, qui grouperait des fonctionnaires au niveau "working level", qui puissent échanger entre eux pendant une journée des informations sur les politiques, les programmes, les activités de leur organisation, pour une meilleure information, une meilleure coordination, une meilleure harmonisation. Depuis 10 ans que ces quatre Organisations existent à Rome, cela ne s'est jamais fait. Je propose que ces réunions ne soient pas faites à un niveau élevé, mais à un niveau où on peut connaître les détails, travailler et se téléphoner. Je propose que ce soit l'organisation qui organise la réunion, chacune à son tour, qui en ait la présidence: une fois le FIDA, une fois la FAO etc.

Je n'ai pas d'ambition pour que ce soit toujours la FAO qui en assume la présidence. Ces réunions peuvent être utiles.

Nous avons ce genre de réunions informelles avec la Banque mondiale. Le Directeur de l'agriculture, M. Roland Petit, a passé une journée à Rome et il a discuté avec nos collègues. M. Dutia ira dans six mois à Washington pour échanger des points de vue de façon informelle. Ces réunions peuvent durer un ou deux jours. De la même manière, nous nous sommes mis d'accord avec le Directeur du Fonds monétaire international pour avoir des réunions informelles. Il a nommé M. Guthia et j'ai nommé M. Dutia, qui sont des points de liaison. Il nous a demandé de travailler ensemble dans le cadre des ajustements structurels. Nous allons donc pousser plus loin et voir ce que nous pouvons faire. Il était étonné, il y avait beaucoup de renseignements qu'il ignorait. Il ne savait pas que nous avions un centre d'Investissements aussi important.

Nous ne pouvons pas engager les autres organisations, mais nous sommes complémentaires. Le FIDA finance des projets, le PAM aussi finance des projets avec des produits alimentaires, nous offrons l'assistance technique. Je crois qu'il y a nécessité de se parler sur le plan des projets. Peut-être plus tard ces réunions auront-elles une forme plus formelle. Mais je crois qu'il est nécessaire de se voir régulièrement et méthodiquement et ne pas attendre qu'il y ait des problèmes.

Nous avons également des réunions régulières avec le PNUD depuis des années, qui se sont intensifiées ces derniers temps, cela ne coûte pas très cher et c'est très utile.

Quatrième et dernière proposition, que j'appellerais complémentaire de celles qui se trouvent dans le rapport. D'ailleurs toutes ces propositions ne sont pas en contradiction avec l'esprit des propositions du rapport. La quatrième proposition se trouve au paragraphe 38, page X. Je suppose qu'au cas où la Conférence déciderait de maintenir le schéma d'examen du Programme de travail et budget qui a été établi pour la première fois cette année, le Sommaire du Programme de travail et budget devenu superflu serait supprimé. En d'autres termes, au mois de janvier de l'année 1991, où il faudra déjà présenter un avant-projet du Programme de travail, c'est-à-dire les priorités ainsi que le niveau du budget, on ne présente plus au printemps un résumé mais un document plus complet que le résumé. Il y a beaucoup de perte de temps et d'argent. C'est une suggestion. Nous pouvons continuer à faire la même chose. Mais je dois aussi proposer de faire des économies. Entre le Sommaire et le Programme complet, il y a beaucoup de différences, mais il y a du travail, il y a de l'imprimerie, etc. et cela fait 140 000 dollars. C'est une suggestion pour l'avenir.

J'en termine maintenant; je n'ai plus que deux mots à dire. Vous avez sans doute noté, à la page xvii de mon rapport, mes observations sur les ressources nécessaires pour mettre en oeuvre les propositions des deux comités. A la page xix, je suggère des priorités pour les diverses propositions ainsi que des méthodes différentes de financement.

Les deux comités n'ont pas jugé nécessaire ou peut-être utile d'établir une liste prioritaire de leurs recommandations étant donné la contrainte du financement. J'ai estimé utile de faire des suggestions à ce sujet. Je suis évidemment prêt à fournir les détails nécessaires sur tous les aspects financiers.

En conclusion, je n'ai pas cessé de dire et de répéter que le consensus est obligatoire à propos d'une question aussi importante que l'examen de la FAO et de son avenir. Il me semble qu'il est interdit de voter à ce sujet et que le consensus s'impose.

Je vous souhaite plein succès dans votre débat.

LE PRESIDENT: Je remercie le Directeur général pour son exposé introductif et les observations qu'il a bien voulu présenter en conformité avec les directives de la résolution sur le rapport du Comité du programme et du Comité financier.

Nous allons donc ouvrir le débat sur ce rapport. Il s'agit d'un débat approfondi en vue d'aboutir à des recommandations concrètes. Nous allons examiner successivement chacun des chapitres, à savoir "Objectifs, rôle, priorités et stratégies de la FAO", ce qui est un point très important, puis les "Opérations de terrain", ensuite "La FAO dans le système international" et, enfin, "Ressources". Je propose cette formulation pour que le Conseil aboutisse à des commentaires concrets qu'il transmettra à la Conférence. Il s'agit en pratique de l'analyse d'un rapport et, plutôt que de l'effectuer paragraphe par paragraphe, ce qui serait quasiment impossible, nous allons le faire chapitre par chapitre. Cela n'empêchera pas, bien entendu, que nous fassions ensuite une synthèse de l'ensemble de ces observations.

Je propose donc que les délégués qui désirent prendre la parole se fassent connaître pour que le Secrétariat les inscrive sur la liste des orateurs. Quels sont les délégués qui souhaitent prendre la parole au sujet des objectifs, du rôle, des priorités et des stratégies de la FAO?

Ces pays sont les suivants: Cuba, Libye, Royaume-Uni, Hongrie, France, Venezuela, Grèce, Ethiopie, Madagascar, Espagne, Chine, Pérou, Japon, Finlande.

Juan NUIRY SANCHEZ (Cuba): Queremos comenzar diciendo que no nos va a ser posible circunscribirnos a lo que ha planteado el señor Presidente, pues nosotros tenemos un informe con un enfoque general sobre el análisis y sobre el tema que vamos a tratar. Este informe que han puesto a nuestra disposición para su análisis en este 96% período de sesiones del Consejo reviste virtual importancia para la Delegación de Cuba, pues el mismo constituye un hito para el presente y el futuro de la FAO. Agradecemos la clara y excelente presentación del tema del profesor Mazoyer, tanto como los comentarios del Director General, que precisó y amplió aun más los aspectos fundamentales del tema. Para los que personalmente no participamos en la 24% Conferencia, resulta necesario hacer referencia no a sus originarios propósitos, sino a sus antecedentes, para poder introducirnos en el tema.

En el año 1987, la Conferencia aprueba que los Comités de Programa y de Finanzas efectúen este Examen. Un año más tarde, en 1988, el Consejo decide que los Comités realicen una reunión conjunta; punto de partida para que toda una maquinaria se ponga en función: los miembros de ambos Comités, los miembros de los dos grupos de expertos, todo el personal de las oficinas regionales, empleados de las empresas consultoras, en fin, un aparato en todo lo infinito y redondo del planeta. Y de este dilatado esfuerzo de dos años, deseamos expresar que la FAO sigue siendo una institución sólida y dinámica, que merece la confianza de sus Estados Miembros. De este modo, a través de sus resultados, podemos observar que la Organización cobra aun más relieve, es eficiente, se entienden necesarias sus funciones y más imprescindibles sus fines, constituyendo para nuestra Delegación factor de primordial importancia; pues, como país enclavado en el llamado Tercer Mundo, le resulta de virtual necesidad disponer de una FAO firme y estable, capaz de desarrollar sus incuestionables fines, según le corresponde dentro del sistema de Naciones Unidas, como su órgano especializado. Por ello, nuestra Delegación no duda en manifestar su reconocimiento, no sin antes señalar que uno de sus principales resultados lo puede constituir que este Examen sea con carácter definitivo, pues no es cómo se trabaja lo cuestionado, sino qué se necesita para trabajar, lo cual se define en una palabra: recursos.

Entendemos que para nadie es un secreto la crítica situación financiera por la que atraviesa la FAO. El frío idioma de los números así lo demuestra. No darse cuenta es no querer sentirse responsable de esta tragedia. Y esto sí preocupa realmente a nuestra Delegación: los que no quieren comprender esta realidad, bien poniéndose de espaldas o ejerciendo presiones que traten de colocar a la Organización en situaciones precarias o de debilitamiento. Consideramos que la FAO y sus mecanismos establecidos tienen una visible mayoría de edad. Pueden desenvolverse como habitualmente están acostumbrados a hacerlo. Nos referimos a que esos aparatos puedan garantizar la preparación de su Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para el entrante bienio, puedan fortalecer sus aparatos al interior de la Organización sin recurrir a gestiones experimentales o consejos externos, que de modo alguno influirán en la normalización de la situación financiera de la Organización.

Nuestra Delegación piensa que con relación a las principales funciones de la FAO, se le debe atribuir una conveniencia especial a la asistencia técnica. Probablemente todos estaremos de acuerdo al afirmar que la FAO debe hacer lo razonablemente posible para promover el desarrollo de los países más pobres y, sobre todo, reconocer la importancia de la calidad en la presentación de la asistencia técnica. Mi país rechazaría cualquier sugerencia que debilite esta importante función y aboga a que no se desvíen los recursos necesarios para su desarrollo.

En igual magnitud valoramos la primordial importancia del Programa de Cooperación Técnica, a fin de que alcance un nivel de un 17 por ciento, por lo menos, de los recursos del Presupuesto Ordinario. Apoyamos ampliamente las recomendaciones de los Comités de que continúe en su forma actual, como elemento vital de las operaciones de campo de la FAO, y saludamos además la disposición del Director General de entablar contactos con los donantes a propósito de garantizar nuevas contribuciones. Apoyamos los criterios expuestos por los Comités en lo concerniente a la realización de estudios sobre políticas expresados en el párrafo 2.20 y las apreciaciones del Director General sobre este particular expuestas en los párrafos 22, 23 y 24 de su comentario.

La Delegación de Cuba valora las sugerencias de participación activa de la FAO en las mesas redondas del PNUD y en los grupos consultivos del Banco Mundial, ya que estamos seguros de que la presencia de la FAO aportará enfoques humanos y realistas a los políticos que a ese nivel se manejan sobre los ajustes estructurales. La acción de la FAO en el marco del nuevo orden económico internacional ha sido protagonista, como organismo principal del sistema de las Naciones Unidas en lo que se refiere a la producción de alimentos. La necesidad de que la FAO no se desvincule de los indispensables objetivos de creación del nuevo orden económico internacional debe constituir un factor constante de vigilancia de nuestros países, incluso ahora, al momento de concluir este Examen, que le ha conferido apoyo e importancia, y recomienda acciones para que lo fortalezcan. Por esto, nuestra Delegación apoya plenamente lo expuesto en los párrafos 2.30, 2.33 y 2.34, así como el comentario del Director General en el párrafo 29.

Mucho se habla en estos tiempos de la importancia del medio ambiente y del desarrollo sostenible, y nuestra Delegación valora altamente los esfuerzos que en este sentido se hacen a nivel internacional para el logro de estos objetivos. Sin embargo, es necesario que la FAO articule más claramente sus actividades en relación al desarrollo sostenible y medio ambiente y se percate de que hay que compensar el incremento de los costos que supone integrar las cuestiones ambientales en los proyectos de desarrollo.

Cuba está de acuerdo en el párrafo 2.35, que expresa la importancia de fomentar el desarrollo sostenible en los sectores que competen a la FAO. Pero también le resulta interesante lo que en ese mismo párrafo se observa, y es que la FAO debe tener presente también que su objetivo principal es el incrementar su producción agrícola y alimentaria en los países en vías de

desarrollo. Sería lamentable que en la escala de prioridades por lograr un objetivo que por demás es de extrema importancia se descuiden detalles que propicien el desarrollo mismo de nuestros países, los que en muchos casos tienen economía de subsistencia, y el cumulo de sus necesidades primarias resulta incalculable. En este sentido, es interesante el comentario del Director General en el párrafo 31, que expresa que los Comités han recomendado que la FAO promueva activamente el desarrollo sostenible, no sólo para conservar los recursos naturales, sino también para mejorarlos, con miras a una explotación racional de los mismos, en beneficio del desarrollo agrícola y rural, en particular de los países en vías de desarrollo.

Nuestra Delegación apoya la acción de la FAO para que se aproveche mejor la biotecnología en las investigaciones, en beneficio de los países en desarrollo. Es por ello que apoyamos este marco político de la función de la FAO en relación a la biotecnología y su responsabilidad para que los frutos de las investigaciones biotecnológicas no estén divorciados del acceso que los países menos favorecidos necesitan para su diagnóstico y desarrollo.

Por otra parte, no dudamos que la FAO debe continuar, como así lo expresa su mandato, desempeñando una función de primer orden en la conservación de los recursos naturales, así como de la diversidad genética y biológica de interés socioeconómico real o potencial para la agricultura, la pesca, la ganadería y la silvicultura.

Nuestra Delegación, con referencia al párrafo 2.36 y al 33 del Informe del Director General, que tiene relación con el problema de la mujer en el desarrollo rural, desea apoyar firmemente esas recomendaciones, al tiempo que insta a redoblar los esfuerzos para implementar con éxito el plan de acción de la FAO para la integración de la mujer en el desarrollo. Saludamos el encomiable esfuerzo que la FAO, junto a todo el sistema de las Naciones Unidas, realiza por llevar a vías de hecho esta promoción, que representa hacer justicia con la mitad de la humanidad secularmente relegada y explotada.

La Delegación de Cuba piensa que para llevar a cabo este plan se debe proveer a la Organización de los recursos necesarios, por ser ésta tarea de primordial importancia para el desarrollo integral de nuestros pueblos, donde las mujeres y los hombres laboran codo con codo cotidianamente.

Sobre los programas especiales de acción, Cuba considera oportuno el planteamiento de que se establezca un pequeño número de programas especiales de acción, lo que debe estar elaborado sobre las bases de prioridades muy bien definidas en el programa de la FAO y, por supuesto, que constituyan un beneficio para los países en vías de desarrollo. Las operaciones de campo son el medio gracias al cual la FAO puede acumular en el mundo entero una experiencia única en el sector del desarrollo y el instrumento necesario por el cual la Organización pone esta experiencia al servicio de los Estados Miembros. Así lo expresa el párrafo 3.3 del Capítulo Tres y nos parece que el mismo refleja una verdad incuestionable. A nuestra Delegación le parece bien la manera en que se recoge esta actividad vital de la Organización en el documento y apoya las medidas que se recomiendan y que tienen por objetivo afianzar la evaluación y la propia gestión y organización de los proyectos. Consideramos, además, apremiante la necesidad de nombrar nuevos oficiales de proyectos y de ampliar el personal encargado de proyectos.

A juicio de nuestra Delegación son sumamente interesantes las propuestas que se han realizado con relación al servicio de identificación y formulación de proyectos. Se trata de una excelente recomendación, ya que la puesta en marcha de este Servicio y sus modalidades de financiación, según los expertos y los Comités, permitirían mejorar la calidad de los Programas de Campo, reforzar la capacidad de la asistencia técnica de la Organización y encauzar la financiación de sus objetivos y planes de acción.

De igual forma apoyamos otra propuesta que sugiere más capacitación al personal nacional en lo que respecta a la identificación, formulación, gestión, seguimiento y evaluación de proyectos, ya que esta acción es de vital importancia para los países en vías de desarrollo.

La Delegación de Cuba reconoce el valor de las recomendaciones formuladas por el Examen, aunque estima la necesidad de buscar recursos adicionales; o sea una consignación suplementaria que den respuesta a la implementación de las mismas.

No se podría permitir a su vez que se apliquen aún más reajustes en el presupuesto y en los programas de la Organización para responder a esta sugerencia. Ya es imposible reajustar aún más los programas que ha traído como consecuencia recortes en actividades vitales de la Organización. Somos de la opinión de que 20 millones adicionales no pueden afectar el ya insuficiente nivel de presupuesto presentado con ponderación por el Director General de la Organización. A tales

efectos, la Delegación de Cuba desea apoyar el comentario realizado en el párrafo 84 del Informe del Director General, e insta a los países que promovieron este examen en la 24ª Conferencia, a que valoren con flexibilidad esta necesidad que significa acordar y proveer a la FAO de niveles suficientes de presupuesto para que las mismas sigan trabajando con eficiencia, como lo ha demostrado este examen el cual estamos analizando.

Los Comités de Finanzas y Programas, al igual que los dos Grupos de Expertos de este Examen interiorizaron que la falta de recursos es un mal que afecta a la FAO en su eficiencia y en la prestación de los servicios que esta Organización debe dar a los países menos favorecidos.

Nuestros países, Sr. Presidente, a la luz de este ejercicio que ha dado el Examen de la FAO, rechaza el concepto de crecimiento cero de la Organización, acción manejada ampliamente durante los debates de los distinguidos Representantes de los Comités y Grupos de Expertos por su connotación limitativa y, de manera especial, rechaza igualmente cualquier sugerencia a la absorción de los costos por ser esta última un ejercicio que llevaría a la Organización a la inanición.

Teniendo en cuenta los resultados del Examen, que con las observaciones manifestadas nuestro Gobierno aprueba, deseamos se nos permita reiterar nuestra ininterrumpida confianza tanto en la FAO como en su actual dirección que ha demostrado una clara visión y comprensión de la compleja cobertura que vive el mundo, los pueblos en vías de desarrollo, en todo este proceso. En la búsqueda de una FAO estable y con proa hacia el futuro.

Nuestra Delegación, Sr. Presidente, desea expresar su postura de apertura a posibles negociaciones que se tengan que realizar durante estos días, pero siempre dentro de los cánones establecidos en el mandato del Examen. Sería inaceptable, por tanto, dar rienda o permitir la introducción de nuevas propuestas que se hallan en general al margen de los mandatos de los Comités.

Por ser de significativa importancia para este Consejo, tanto por su enfoque y relación directa a nuestras funciones y objetivos, solicitamos se nos permita, Sr. Presidente, hacer referencia a la Resolución aprobada por los Jefes de Estado y de Gobierno en la Novena Cumbre del Movimiento de los Países no Alineados celebrado recientemente del 4 al 7 de septiembre en Belgrado sobre la Alimentación y la Agricultura. En esta Resolución, además de reiterar la imperiosa necesidad de mantener la alimentación y la agricultura en el centro de la atención global, manifiesta en parte de su texto, y cito: "párrafo 1, llamaron a la Comunidad Internacional, particularmente a la Organización para la Alimentación y la Agricultura de las Naciones Unidas, a monitorear de cerca el ulterior desarrollo en la situación global de la alimentación, especialmente en el déficit alimentario de los países en desarrollo, y en caso de un ulterior deterioro de la situación, poner el problema alimentario en el foco de atención en la venidera 25ª Conferencia General de la FAO.

Párrafo 7, cito: "Acentuaron el irreparable error técnico y de coordinación de la FAO en el desarrollo de la Alimentación y la Agricultura, particularmente en los países en vías de desarrollo, y apoyaron la ulterior mejoría de la información global y el sistema anticipado de advertencia, como las actividades apuntadas en el chequeo de la desertificación, deforestación, erosión del suelo, la langosta y otras formas de desastres naturales como inundaciones y sequías, así como las actividades para promover la seguridad alimentaria.

Expresaron preocupación por la situación financiera de la Organización y llamaron a los Estados Miembros, particularmente al mayor contribuyente, a cumplir con sus obligaciones financieras con la FAO y promover de recursos adicionales para estas acciones específicas".

Documento que comienza expresando, que los Jefes de Estado y de Gobierno, cito textualmente: "reiteraron que el derecho a la alimentación era un derecho humano fundamental y rechazaron el uso de los alimentos como un instrumento de presión política o económica.

Como los párrafos referidos de esta Resolución sobre la Alimentación y la Agricultura, aprobado por el Movimiento de los Países no Alineados, y recuerdo que son 102 países, en Belgrado, no necesitan explicación y dejan constancia de tanta actualidad y referencia, Sr. Presidente, nuestra Delegación plantea que debe quedar recogida en los documentos de este Consejo. Es incuestionable que los pueblos unen sus voces más fuertes unidas y firmes ante un proceso de desigualdad en la riqueza que agudizan la confrontación. Los años ochenta han contribuido no sólo a un decenio perdido, sino que han involucionado en relación a los países en vías de desarrollo. El mundo, próximo a finalizar uno y comenzar otro nuevo siglo, vive un presente contravertido; sí, por una parte, se vislumbran momentos de distensión, por otra, es visible el flagelo del hambre, la miseria y la malnutrición. Esto no es retórica, pues las estadísticas en este campo son más desgarradoras que cualquier elaborada frase. Es por tanto necesario encontrar fórmulas de

colaboración y negociaciones bajo el principio de sus organismos multilaterales en todas sus esferas, que abran las puertas al diálogo, matizado de reflexión y análisis de todos con igual derecho. Es este orden especial de nuestras ramas buscar la estabilidad y con ella la proyección en la esfera de la alimentación y la agricultura a la FAO, como su incuestionable rectora. Estos fundamentales aspectos, Sr. Presidente, constituyen para nuestra Delegación los principales retos, no sólo a la Organización como tal, sino a todos los otros como Miembros de la Comunidad Internacional.

LE PRESIDENT: Avant de passer la parole au prochain délégué, je demande dans toute la mesure du possible à Messieurs les délégués qu'ils portent leurs appréciations sur les recommandations précises présentées par le Comité du programme et le Comité financier sur les divers chapitres liés entre eux, et ce, afin que dans notre Comité de rédaction, en plus des stratégies générales, nous puissions recueillir et concrétiser l'avis du Conseil sur les recommandations précises faites par le Comité.

Je remercie beaucoup le délégué de Cuba qui nous a fait un exposé très fouillé et je remercie à l'avance les différents délégués de bien vouloir faire porter leurs jugements sur les différentes recommandations tant des Comités que du Directeur général.

R.G. PETTITT (United Kingdom): Two years of thought have now gone into the changes needed to equip FAO for the 1990s. We have had the year of the experts; and now the year of the Committees; and for the first time the fruit of this work is fully available to the membership to examine.

It will be for the Conference to reach decisions on the changes needed now, and it will need to set in train their implementation. It will also need to ensure that the capacity to change is built into the Organization. The United Kingdom will work with others to seek a consensus resolution on these subjects.

However, before we reach the Conference, this Council should make the input into the review process which was envisaged in Resolution 6/87. In particular, it should assist the Conference in its work by providing the first reaction of the representatives of Governments to the proposals in the Review document and all the papers annexed to it.

In the opinion of my delegation the Council could identify first of all the changes commended by the SJS or by the experts which particularly require endorsement in any eventual resolution. These should include the need for FAO to take account of the current preoccupations of the international community; namely, issues of population growth, the environment, the role of women in development, the ways of helping develop the capacity of developing countries to manage their development.

The recommendations of the SJS and the experts on the need for FAO to develop its capacity to deliver policy advice should be given a substantial place in our recommendation to the Conference.

We should point to the SJS recommendations on the need for FAO to concentrate its work generally; there are worthwhile and conservative recommendations on the increased use of special action programmes with their associated financial and intellectual input by bilateral donors. Especially in the experts' reports, there are wise words on the need to concentrate the field programme on matters within the mandate of FAO, not on the peripheries, and on the priorities determined by the membership for the whole of FAO's activities (Chapter 4). As is so well put in the use of the reports, FAO must have the capacity to pick and choose to say "yes" or "no".

There are some points on which we would urge the Council to commend that the Conference consider going somewhat beyond the recommendations in the Review paper, and there I differ somewhat from the remarks made by the delegate of Cuba. These are both in the nature of the recommendations and their scope, as some matters within the agenda of review were not substantially addressed in the SJS report itself. Some will be developed more fully in the UK delegation's contribution to the discussion at the Conference. But they include the need for FAO to have capacity to deliver country specific advice and to allow it to participate in the way it reasonably aspires to in international policy dialogue, such as in Round Tables and Consultative Groups again mentioned by the delegate of Cuba. There is more need for back up for the field programmes than is suggested in the SJS report. There is the need for a stronger geographic focus. Attention needs to be

given to making sure that the Technical Cooperation Programme concentrates on those projects which the Central Funds of the UN system, such as UNDP, WFP and the Capital Development Fund, are incapable of financing by virtue of their method of working rather than because of their priorities. The TCP needs to be consistent with the other activities of the UN system in the benefiting countries.

More generally, the Council should endorse the altered spirit as regards field cooperation shown in recent years, and point to the need for FAO to adhere to the letter and spirit of the agreements likely to emerge from the Triennial Review of Operational Activities currently in progress in the fund Assembly. This particularly in regard to the ideas over country statements and country programming which have emerged from the work on the subject by the CCSQ (Ops) in which FAO is involved, over delegations, and over the sharing of field expertise with the UN resident coordinators.

Thirdly, my delegation suggests that the Council should emphasize the need in the Review process and beyond to enhance the capacity to change and to respond to new needs. It can commend the proposals for the return to medium term planning, preferably on a six-year rolling basis. It should emphasize the need for effective prioritization, including a means by which programmes are dropped as well as added to. It should commend attention being given to ways in which the governing bodies can become places where there are meetings of minds. It should direct the Conference's attention to the need for a degree supervision by the membership of the field programmes, as well as the development of sensitivity towards changing needs by the existence of an effective and competent field presence. It should commend the retention of openness to ideas from outside, including the appropriate use of outside experts.

This is some of the guidance which in my delegation's opinion the Council could give to the Conference.

However, even with the longer time which the extension and rearrangement of this meeting has permitted, it would not be realistic to expect this Council to be able to make full proposals for a Resolution. In any event, for reasons put so cogently yesterday by the delegate of India, member states will probably wish to await the views expressed by Ministers attending the Conference and the views of non-members of the Council. So in addition to whatever ideas we can provide in this first run over the ground, what can the Council do to move forward the Review? There seem to my delegation to be two useful things that could be done.

First, we could start a discussion of the substance of the Review in a less formal atmosphere than in the Council in plenary session. Those delegations which have ideas on how to proceed -perhaps already with ideas for inclusion in a Resolution - could share them with others in such a meeting. Perhaps we could plan a division of labour on the initial drafting of the numerous points which need to be included from the SJS report and our subsequent thinking, or the various chapters which a Resolution will need. This meeting could either, depending on preference, be a meeting facilitated by you, Sir, or one of your colleagues; or it could be less formal, and so have no institutional link with the Council, and need not necessarily die with the ending of this Session.

Secondly, the Council in its capacity as organizer of the Conference could give some thought to the way in which the matter could be pursued in the Conference. In particular, it could recommend to the Conference that, to avoid the danger of running out of time on the consideration of the Review, the Commission II should set up at the earliest appropriate stage, a contact group or group of friends of the Chairman to draft a Resolution. A group similar to that which existed at the 1987 Conference might be appropriate, and could with advantage be set up as soon as the Commission is in being and once the general debate in plenary has been completed. If we adopted these suggestions we would avoid the danger of wasting the work of those who have made such a worthwhile input into the Review through our running out of time; while at the same time ensuring that all concerned have their opportunity to contribute from their national experience and vantage point to the thought processes.

Zoltán KALMAN (Hungary): First of all I congratulate the Secretariat for the preparation which Professor Mazoyer has done, and for the clear and concise presentation of the documents. We express our thanks also to the Director-General for his introductory statement.

The two expert groups dealing respectively with FAO's objectives, role and priorities, and the FAO's field operations have done an excellent job. On behalf of the delegation of the Republic of Hungary I also wish to express our sincere appreciation to the Programme and Finance Committees for their work at this stage of the review process.

This document, containing also the comments and views of the Director-General, provides a good basis for discussion. We have studied this document with great attention and, while accepting and supporting the majority of its findings and recommendations, our delegation wishes to make the following remarks: We strongly support the recommendation in paragraph 7.9 that FAO, in close cooperation with GATT and UNCTAD, should continue to explore ways and means for the progressive expansion of the free trade in food and agricultural commodities and speak out against protectionism.

On the issue of sustainable development, we are of the opinion that in all field projects and in the whole project cycle, that is from project design to final evaluation, high priority should be given to environment and to the preservation of natural resources. We are convinced that this is the only way to make agricultural development really sustainable.

We fully endorse the idea of strengthening FAO as a global agricultural information centre. Organization of data collection and improving the computerization of data base will make it possible, we hope, to have direct on-line access to more of FAO's data.

By supporting the recommendations in paragraph 7.29, also on the comparative advantage approach, my delegation thinks that greater attention should be paid to better cooperation and coordination with other international organizations, especially those within the UN system.

As far as the decentralization policy of FAO is concerned, we may go along with the suggestion to strengthen country representations. At the same time, in our opinion this can be taken as an example of how to determine a low priority area - that is, the regional offices - and to reallocate funds in favour of higher priority areas, in this case the country offices.

Recommendations in paragraph 7.31 on page 75 call our attention to the importance of medium- and long-term planning. We are convinced of the need for these plans, and in this regard we share the view that separation between the functions of policy guidance by FAO's governing bodies and the management of the institution is essential in order to improve FAO's effectiveness.

Permit me to make a short comment on FAO's field operations. We agree with the conclusion of the expert group that in the present framework FAO's governing bodies cannot devote the required time and attention to FAO's field operations. We also agree that new arrangements are needed to make it possible for the governing bodies, thus for Member Nations, regularly to monitor FAO's field operations. Therefore, appropriate ways and means should be identified to implement these new arrangements.

Finally, I wish to make a brief remark on FAO's personnel management, more specifically on the situation of women in FAO's Professional staff. We think that greater attention should be paid to that question during the selection procedure.

To conclude, there is a general comment I wish to make. We support the idea that FAO should concentrate its efforts and do less, mainly due to financial constraints, but do it better and more efficiently.

Jacques WARIN (France): C'est la première fois que les delegations sont appelées à intervenir sur les résultats complets de l'examen qui a été entrepris sur la base de la Résolution 6/87 par une série de groupes d'experts, les deux grands Comités et le Directeur général lui-même de l'Organisation. C'est donc la première fois que nous avons, sous un format pratique et dans toutes les langues de l'Organisation, les résultats des travaux entrepris par tous ces groupes, Comités et personnalités. Je voudrais d'abord les féliciter tous pour la qualité des travaux effectués et remercier tout particulièrement le Professeur Mazoyer et le Directeur général qui viennent de nous apporter des commentaires complémentaires à la fois concis et qui m'ont paru particulièrement utiles.

Je voudrais également m'excuser auprès de vous de ne pas suivre le plan que vous nous avez proposé. Il me semble que nous aurions intérêt, dans un premier temps, à exposer notre point de vue général sur ces rapports. J'y vois au moins plusieurs raisons. La première, c'est qu'il y a sûrement intérêt à ce que chaque délégation annonce la couleur avant de passer aux débats particuliers, et ceci dans la perspective que nous souhaitons tous l'obtention d'un consensus.

La deuxième raison est peut-être que beaucoup de délégations seront appelées à intervenir. Le débat sera aussi nourri que celui d'hier sur le Programme de travail et budget, et je vois mal comment nous pourrions, si nous avons à prendre la parole quatre ou cinq fois de suite, épuiser le sujet avant la fin du Conseil.

La troisième raison qui me paraît importante, c'est que nous sommes nombreux à attendre les discours d'orientation générale qui auront lieu la semaine prochaine au cours de la Conférence et qui permettront à nos Ministres de l'agriculture de donner le ton, car chacun d'entre eux aura à coeur de se prononcer sur le bien-fondé et les résultats de cet examen.

Cela étant dit, je me bornerai donc à des généralités, en me concentrant sur ces rapports dont je puis vous assurer que je les ai lus intégralement chapitre par chapitre.

Ma première réaction sera dans l'ensemble très positive. Elle est d'abord positive en ce qui concerne la forme revêtue par cet exercice: deux cahiers, l'un d'une centaine de pages, l'autre de 250 et de 300 pages, faciles à lire et à transporter, d'une présentation claire et agréable, parfaitement conformes au mandat défini dans la Résolution 6/87, puisqu'ils contiennent à la fois les observations du Directeur général, le rapport des deux Comités et tous les rapports des groupes d'experts, certains résumés. Le matériel est là au complet, personne ne peut accuser le Secrétariat ni les Comités d'avoir dissimulé certaines pièces du dossier. Félicitations, donc, pour la parfaite transparence de cet exercice.

Mon appréciation sera également positive sur le fond. Je constate tout d'abord que l'analyse effectuée par les Comités sur la base des travaux des groupes d'experts ne remet pas en cause les grands rôles de la FAO: information, action, assistance technique, et qu'elle justifie pleinement le maintien du Programme de coopération technique.

En second lieu, un certain nombre de tâches nouvelles sont définies, auxquelles mon gouvernement a, dans le passé, manifesté son attachement: défense de l'environnement, conseil en matière de politique, activité renforcée dans les domaines de la recherche et de la technologie. Enfin, la simplification proposée des procédures de gestion va dans le sens de la transparence et de l'efficacité accrue. Je relève tout particulièrement la recommandation sur l'informatisation de la gestion. C'est en effet la résurrection du Projet PROSYS soutenu dès 1987 par la France et que nous souhaitons vivement voir mis en oeuvre le plus tôt possible. Mais je relève aussi des idées originales et nouvelles, comme la création d'une unité d'inspection pour les programmes de terrain et l'institution d'un plan à moyen terme.

Reste un point important sur lequel nous ne nous sommes pas encore fait une religion: cet examen a un coût alors que certains d'entre nous s'attendaient peut-être à ce que les réformes, au contraire, permettent de dégager des économies en renforçant l'efficacité de l'Organisation tout en resserrant l'éventail de ses activités. On peut se demander si, dans une période d'austérité financière et alors qu'un certain nombre d'Etats Membres réaffirment leur attachement à la croissance zéro, il se trouvera beaucoup de gouvernements pour financer ce coût supplémentaire. Fort heureusement - et c'est là une des initiatives les plus heureuses du Directeur général - les annexes financières de ses observations nous présentent une sorte de menu à la carte avec trois ordres de priorité: une première priorité à 12 millions de dollars; une seconde à 12 millions plus 6 millions, soit 18 millions de dollars; et une troisième à 18 millions plus 8 millions, soit 26 millions de dollars. Voilà les dépenses proposées pour le prochain biennium. Nous examinerons en temps utile le détail de ces propositions dont certaines nous paraissent plus pertinentes que d'autres et pas toujours selon l'ordre de priorité affiché. Je relève, notamment, que PROSYS se trouve au troisième rang alors que, personnellement, je le mettrais au premier. Ce n'est qu'une observation parmi d'autres, qui viendront ensuite.

Je vous ai dit tout à l'heure que j'attendais également le discours d'orientation que fera le chef de ma délégation présent à Rome la semaine prochaine, le Ministre de l'agriculture de la France, et je ne crois pas opportun d'aller beaucoup plus loin maintenant dans le détail de l'examen des propositions. Cela dit, je suis disposé à reprendre la parole, si nécessaire, au cours du débat.

Je terminerai donc par des félicitations adressées à la fois aux deux comités et à leur président ainsi qu'au Directeur général pour la qualité du travail effectué, et par le voeu que cette réforme ou cet examen fasse l'objet à la Conférence d'une approbation par consensus susceptible de resserrer les rangs des Etats Membres et d'accroître pour l'avenir l'efficacité de notre Organisation.

LE PRESIDENT: Pour ce qui est de la méthode de travail, je crois que, comme l'ont dit les représentants de Cuba, du Royaume-Uni et de la France, nous pourrions laisser aux délégués le soin d'exposer leur opinion sur le rapport et le Comité de rédaction pourra, comme l'a suggéré le représentant du Royaume-Uni, placer ces remarques par rubrique. Nous allons donc laisser aux délégués le soin de s'exprimer sur l'ensemble du rapport sans que ce soit chapitre par chapitre.

Sra. Mercedes FERMIN GOMEZ (Venezuela): Precisamente me preparaba a seguir sus instrucciones para referirme solamente a los Objetivos y Fines de la FAO cuando usted cambia de parecer. Pero yo voy a respetar lo que habíamos planteado y me concentrare fundamentalmente a los fines y objetivos de la FAO. porque creo que ahí está contenida la esencia del examen además de las recomendaciones.

Ciertamente no podemos menos que celebrar que este estudio haya sido hecho con tanta claridad, con tanta precisión y presentado de la mejor manera posible. Por eso vamos a limitarnos a declarar nuestro apoyo a los principios que ha establecido. Es decir, que realmente nos complace que el examen de los expertos haya comenzado por reconocer que la FAO, a pesar de que está en crisis y a pesar de todo lo que hemos comentado adversamente en estos días, está haciendo su trabajo, hasta donde puede esperarse de una Organización que se mantiene con la mayor eficiencia que se le puede pedir, y solamente se pide un reforzamiento de la FAO además de agregar actividades adicionales. ¿Qué significa esto? Que han salido un poco frustradas aquellas Casandras que esperaban que el examen de los expertos iba a declarar una FAO en bancarrota, o por lo menos que había que cambiarla totalmente de estructura y de organización.

Pues no. La FAO está realmente con vida, si es que los contribuyentes morosos quieren cumplir con su deber de ver una organización eficiente y adecuada. Por lo pronto, los expertos no han dado el juicio adverso que algunos esperaban. Esas actividades adicionales que, como bien ha declarado el delegado francés, nosotros también apoyamos siempre que haya con qué realizarlas; y por eso celebramos la estupenda idea del Director General de haber presentado su famosa Carta, o sus famosos Menus, porque así habrá donde escoger.

Entre los objetivos y fines de la FAO, que todos nos sabemos de memoria, porque hemos estudiado los Textos Básicos, desde que ingresamos aquí, la FAO ha estado cumpliendo con el más importante de ellos, que es el de la alimentación y la agricultura, así como la conservación de los recursos de este planeta tierra, porque es la menuda tarea que tiene la FAO: la conservación, el estudio, la clasificación de los recursos del planeta. No son los recursos de este continente ni los del otro, ni los de los países más desarrollados o menos desarrollados: es del mundo entero. Y, en esos recursos, los más delicados, a los que la FAO ha dedicado mucho tiempo en los últimos años, son los recursos genéticos, esos recursos genéticos que todavía esperan que muchos países se adhieran al compromiso, porque en ellos está realmente ligada la vida del planeta; recursos genéticos que, de no estar bajo la jurisdicción de la FAO, corren el riesgo de caer, como ya muchos están, en el dominio de las corporaciones transnacionales, que los convierten en negocios privados, con el consiguiente perjuicio de los países indefensos, que por ignorancia, por atraso, por falta de información, desconocen que son precisamente esos países del Tercer Mundo, que son los países en vías de desarrollo, los poseedores de la riqueza por excelencia en genes, ecosistemas, genotipos; en una palabra, del germoplasma que todavía puede dar vida al futuro de la humanidad mediante la recreación de las plantas que allí existen. Ahí está la lucha actual, por ese germoplasma, que es uno de los verdaderos esfuerzos que está haciendo FAO, al que está planteando su compromiso internacional para defensa de los recursos genéticos. Esta sola tarea implica un gasto al que la FAO no está actualmente, con los recursos disminuidos que tiene, en condiciones de hacer frente. Y, repito, siendo que estos recursos pertenecen, por obra y gracia de la naturaleza, que allí los puso, a estos territorios que hoy son países todavía subdesarrollados, sólo la FAO puede protegerlos, si es que esos países ponen su riqueza bajo la jurisdicción de la FAO, porque es la FAO quien tiene el equipo de investigación y la disponibilidad y la capacidad de poder cumplir con esa tarea de defensa de estos recursos.

Esa sola tarea de la FAO como objetivo ya es una tarea gigantesca; pero, además de eso, tiene la obligación de velar por la conservación de los otros recursos. A ella se le recomienda, por ejemplo, la conservación de los recursos peces, de los recursos animales, que también son recursos genéticos, y hacer frente a la amenaza que significa en estos momentos la famosa biotecnología, la ingeniería tecnológica, la ingeniería genética, que están tratando de enfrentar al multilateralismo de la FAO y de las organizaciones internacionales la otra cara de la lucha de los países que piensan que ellos todavía pueden detentar, mediante sus relaciones bilaterales, la posesión o el negocio de estos recursos. Para eso, necesita la FAO precisamente que todos los países, sobre todo los países del Tercer Mundo, pudieran en este momento hacer un esfuerzo como el de los campesinos indonesios para poder enviar a la FAO, aunque fuera una contribución de una colecta que se hiciera entre esos países y poder aportar algo a salir de esta crisis que tiene la FAO.

Menciono este objetivo porque lo considero el de mayor trascendencia para el momento que estamos viviendo, pero no porque sea el único. Ya sabemos que la FAO tiene bajo su responsabilidad el desarrollo de la agricultura, la elevación del nivel de vida y de la "capacidad de vivir", que así se llama salir de la desnutrición la mayoría de los países, la mayoría de los habitantes de la tierra. Y es para eso para lo que necesita la contribución de los Estados Miembros, porque ella no tiene otro medio; no se le han asignado otras posibilidades, sino las contribuciones de los Estados Miembros.

Entre las recomendaciones -porque no voy a poder ir punto por punto por estos objetivos; por eso me refiero a los más importantes; ya habrá otras personas que se dediquen minuciosamente a examinar el documento-, yo quiero referirme a las que ha propuesto la comisión de expertos con relación al Programa de Campo. Ellos aspiran a que se organice una dependencia de inspección de los trabajos de campo, y estoy perfectamente de acuerdo con el Delegado francés cuando manifiesta su asombro por esta tarea. Si nosotros pensamos -tal vez yo, por mi condición de profesional de la geografía sé lo que es hacer un trabajo de campo- si nosotros sabemos cuántos puntos de la tierra en este momento están bajo las misiones de trabajos de campo de la FAO en cualquiera de los territorios de los continentes que pertenecen al Tercer Mundo; si nosotros pudiéramos medir, aunque fuera en una fotografía aérea, la distancia en que trabaja una misión de otra, podríamos darnos mejor cuenta de cómo va a hacerse esa inspección. ¿Tendrá la FAO un equipo, de qué? ¿De aviones? ¿De permanentes viajeros, que irán de un sitio a otro para realizar esa inspección? Porque un trabajo de campo no se hace cayendo de un helicóptero y mirando desde arriba; un trabajo de campo es una labor directa en el terreno en donde se están haciendo encuestas, en donde se están recogiendo muestras, en donde se está estudiando el suelo, en donde se está examinando el agua, etc. etc. Es decir, lo que se hace en los trabajos de campo, sobre todo de este tipo de análisis de trabajos de campo que hace la FAO.

¿Y quién va a hacer el equipo de inspección? Tendremos que tener un equipo igual al de los trabajos de campo, para que cada uno examine; quiere decir que la FAO tendrá que proveerse de un presupuesto especial para ese equipo de inspección de los trabajos de campo, porque, de otra manera, no se concibe que se pueda examinar, a menos que se concentren en una estación del año los trabajos de campo, y ya sabemos que en la mayoría de los países que tienen cuatro estaciones, la estación del invierno es perdida para el trabajo de campo, que no se hace nada en agricultura durante el invierno.

Por esta razón, yo no estoy de acuerdo, sinceramente, con esta nueva dependencia de inspección de los trabajos de campo, porque creo que es un gasto excesivo. Sería preferible que nosotros le diéramos un aumento al presupuesto del Programa de Cooperación Técnica, que podría ya, por sí mismo, realizar esa inspección de los trabajos de campo, puesto que estas dos Comisiones de la FAO -Cooperación Técnica y Trabajos de Campo- tienen que estar íntegramente e inmediatamente vinculadas, puesto que la una es consecuencia de la otra. La Cooperación Técnica no puede rendir un informe sin que la Comisión de Trabajo de Campo haya hecho su trabajo y lo haya traído aquí para que luego las comisiones de técnicos que trabajan en la FAO puedan elaborar su programa.

Mirando yo estos objetivos de la FAO directamente en la realidad, pienso que es realmente digno de elogio el trabajo que la FAO realiza con el poco presupuesto a que se le ha forzado tener durante los últimos tres años. Esa maligna concepción del "crecimiento cero" yo no sé qué mente la crea, porque crecimiento cero es una antinomia. Cero no se puede crecer, porque el cero es el vacío. ¿Qué puede crecer en el vacío? Nada. Un crecimiento cero es ya un concepto completamente inconcebible para una mente normal. Podríamos decir "crecimiento mínimo". Estamos de acuerdo con el 0,45, o el 0,1 por ciento, pero "crecimiento cero" ya es algo así como para que los niños llamen a Mandrake, que es el que resuelve todos los problemas imposibles. En eso quieren convertir al Director General, en una especie de Mandrake, el personaje ése que es capaz de hacer las cosas imposibles.

De manera que yo -perdóneme, señor Presidente, que no me gusta hablar en primera persona- pienso que este informe es excelente, que la comisión de expertos ha trabajado y hecho su trabajo racionalmente, con justicia. Y quiero leer, con permiso de la Presidencia, la frase que dice, en su Capítulo, 2.2: "Los Comités no pueden sino constatar que el interés de los Estados Miembros de la FAO, cuarenta y cinco años después, tal como se expresa en el preámbulo de su Constitución, sigue respondiendo a las necesidades de la situación de la alimentación y la agricultura y a su futura evolución".

Por supuesto, la FAO tiene hecho un trabajo, que se llama "La Agricultura hacia el año 2000", que ya es una pieza de investigación extraordinaria. Y si los Estados Miembros y quienes están interesados en que la solución del hambre en el mundo sea una verdad, no tendrían más que seguir las líneas generales de ese estudio de la FAO, en donde está plasmada cuál va a ser la solución de esos países hambrientos. El Comité no hace, pues, sino decir lo que es una verdad, y sigue diciendo que los objetivos de la FAO están vigentes. Pero ¿porqué están vigentes? Porque una

Organización, con el presupuesto que tiene es incapaz de satisfacer las necesidades de nutrición, de alimentación, de desarrollo de agricultura de los países atrasados. Todo, de la noche a la mañana.

Si quienes, mas o menos, tenemos conciencia de lo que es un jardín y sabemos lo que cuesta plantar un jardín y sabemos que hay que cuidar el suelo y los nutrientes que necesita para que produzca, y se tiene que enfrentar la FAO a países en donde todavía no tienen noción de qué suelos tienen, hay que estudiar la calidad, el tipo de suelo, para poder saber qué deben sembrar, porque, de lo contrario, sería una frustración. Cuando estudiaba Geografía en Estados Unidos, nos contaba un profesor que la FAO, allá en sus comienzos, hará probablemente treinta y pico de años, mandaba unos expertos a determinados países atrasados, que llegaron a hacer construir presas, y después se dieron cuenta de que el río para el cual ellos creían que iban a hacer la presa no existía. Era un riachuelo y ellos estaban haciendo una presa para un río. Cosas así hacía la FAO antes, en sus primeros tiempos. Eso no ocurre hoy, porque hoy la FAO ha afinado sus equipos para que hagan y actúen de acuerdo con las realidades y no con la imaginación.

Y para terminar, porque no quiero abusar, el 2.3 termina diciendo: "Los Comités rinden homenaje a la clarividencia de que dieron muestra los fundadores de la FAO. Consideran que esa concepción de la Organización sigue estando justificada y que no existe ninguna necesidad de que se modifiquen los importantes fines que le asigna el preámbulo de su Constitución". Quiere decirse, pues, que no ocurrirá lo que algunos de nosotros pensamos que podría ocurrir: que estos expertos iban a declarar a la FAO verdaderamente obsoleta y que habría que reestructurarla, que habría que rehacer la Organización. No, no hay nada de eso. El Examen es eminentemente favorable a la situación de la FAO, dependiendo de que cuente con los recursos necesarios. Ahora bien, esa dependencia de contar con recursos no es potestativa de la FAO como Organización; es potestativa de los miembros contribuyentes. Afortunadamente, por este año Venezuela ha cumplido cabalmente con su obligación. Si todos hiciéramos lo mismo, si la gente hiciera el esfuerzo de adelantar lo que pudiera, la FAO tendría un presupuesto disponible, no con crecimiento cero, ni siguiera con un uno, sino con lo que le corresponde, y entonces los países que están pendientes, esperanzados de que la FAO es la solución de sus problemas, de acuerdo con sus objetivos y sus fines, podrían ya tener esperanza. Si pudiéramos confiar que en la próxima década el proteccionismo agrícola de los grandes productores agrícolas no va a funcionar, la agricultura del año 2000 que la FAO está estableciendo como ideal o como posibilidad en su documento, sería otra esperanza para los pueblos del Tercer Mundo.

Por esta razón, creo que no nos queda otra cosa que remitirnos a la Conferencia, en donde podremos hablar con más tiempo acerca de este documento. Por ahora, me limito a declarar mi satisfacción por la aprobación del Comité de Expertos.

John A. YENNIMATAS (Grèce): Monsieur le Président, permettez-moi, à ce stade du débat, de faire les réflexions suivantes pour marquer notre appréciation globale de l'examen de certains aspects des buts et opérations de la FAO. Notre point de départ est que le but de l'opération en question doit être le renforcement de la capacité de la FAO afin que l'Organisation puisse faire face aux défis à venir avec une efficacité et un rendement accrus. Ma deuxième réflexion, c'est que l'Acte constitutif de la FAO a bien servi l'Organisation et ses Etats Membres et qu'en pratique il a bien été respecté dans l'esprit et à la lettre. La FAO devrait donc continuer à jouer le même rôle à l'avenir.

En d'autres mots, l'évolution satisfaisante de l'Organisation jusqu'à ce jour, avec les moyens dont elle dispose, n'exclut toutefois pas la possibilité de progrès. Voilà, en quelques lignes, où se situe le problème d'après nous.

L'examen des buts et opérations de la FAO, après plus de quarante ans d'existence de l'Organisation, est un exercice qui s'impose mais y consacrer des jours de travail interminables ne nous mènerait à rien. Compte tenu de l'état des choses actuel, nous soutenons que le paquet de conclusions que nous sommes en train d'examiner justifie une base de consensus.

Par ailleurs, le fait qu'un certain nombre de tâches nouvelles proposées sont dans la même ligne que nos considérations en la matière ne signifie pas nécessairement qu'on ne pourrait pas en avancer d'autres. A titre d'exemple, je pourrais mentionner des tâches visant à une plus grande transparence et à une efficacité plus rigoureuse encore de la FAO. Toutefois, le réalisme politique qui doit éclairer notre attitude nous oblige à souscrire aux réformes proposées. Je suis conscient du fait que ces dernières n'aboutissent pas au dégagement des économies que certains d'entre nous préconisent. Cependant, je trouve particulièrement difficile, dans la conjoncture actuelle, de pouvoir espérer l'amélioration et les progrès qui s'imposent sans faire face à des coûts supplémentaires. Voilà notre appréciation, que l'on pourrait considérer comme positive.

Bashir El Mabrouk SAID (Libya) (original language Arabic): Allow me, first of all, to express my congratulations and my gratitude to Professor Mazoyer for his lucid, complete and faithful presentation of the review. It is my privilege to be a member of the Programme Committee, and I must say I have been very happy to work under his guidance. I would also like to thank the Director-General for his additional comments which were excellent on a number of important aspects of this very vital item on our agenda.

Mr Chairman, we have had a two year exercise which has been the Review of Certain Aspects of FAO's Goals and Operations, and the conclusions of this review show that FAO is a dynamic organization which meets effectively the needs and aspirations of member countries, and in particular of developing member countries.

This is what my delegation has been saying for two years, Sir, and I am happy to see that the conclusions of this review, in fact, confirm the view that we have been propounding all along. This review also shows that the Constitution of the FAO, the basic text of FAO and the goals set therein, are still valid today as they were then; that they fit in with the situation of prospects of food and agriculture in the world. But two years ago, we did think that this exercise, let's say this Review of Certain Aspects of FAO's Goals and Operations including priorities and strategies and FAO's food operations, was a useful idea for the purpose of really developing a true consensus, including developing countries. As a member of the Programme Committee, I have been involved in this Review from its inception, and I would like to say here that everyone who has been involved in that exercise has worked very hard and very well. I would like to mention, in particular, the role played by the Director-General himself and his staff in this tremendous task.

My delegation makes its own the conclusions reached by the two Committees, the Programme Committee and the Finance Committee, and I see no need to repeat them here now. I simply say that we support them. But I would like to add something. We, however, are ready to negotiate if anything needs to be negotiated, with the same positive spirit of understanding which we have displayed throughout these two years, Sir, because flexibility is always necessary, but we do want to state that we reject the idea of any new suggestion, new proposal or new idea being injected into the process now, because they are ideas that have already been rejected by the Council and the Committees previously. So whatever we discuss, whatever we negotiate, must be done within the framework and within the limits of Resolution 6/87. That is our term of reference.

Secondly, the role of FAO in the field of technical assistance is a leading role and we would reject any attempt to weaken that role of FAO in this field. However, FAO is also a world information centre in its special sector and we do want to stress this other aspect of FAO's activities as well.

Thirdly, to say that the interpretation of these recommendations from the Review will not involve additional resources is a very doubtful stage, indeed, Sir, and we think that these recommendations can only be implemented if additional funds are made available.

Fourthly, Sir, we are happy to note - we welcome in fact the proposal of the Director-General to the effect that the Programme of Work and Budget preparation process should be as outlined in his proposal, an outline without a summary, but will go into further detail when this matter is discussed in Commission II.

Fifthly, Sir, we find it very difficult to accept, indeed we would tend to reject the idea of a contact group to consider any question whatsoever. We feel that the Drafting Committee, which has been elected, can validly look at all the matters before the Council have been the subject of debate here, so we are entirely opposed to the idea of a contact group.

These are just a few general comments which I wanted to put before you as briefly as possible concerning this item of the agenda.

Assefa YILALA (Ethiopia): The delegation to the People's Democratic Republic of Ethiopia had the honour and privilege of offering its humble services in the Joint Committees sessions and is generally attuned to the recommendations contained in the document. Our delegation, therefore, would like to reaffirm its support for the recommendations contained and pay its tribute to the teams of experts, Secretariat of FAO, Staff, the Director-General, to Chairmen and Members of the Finance and Programme Committees for their invaluable contributions in this endeavour.

While indicating our support to the recommendations contained in the document, thus placed before the Council, however, I feel obliged to make some observations in relation to the three roles of FAO and the resource dimensions. During the process of the Review, it was satisfying to have noted the efforts of the Committee Members in achieving agreements and consensus. Those areas where there were differences in views, conciliatory formulations were revised without affecting the mandate of the Review. There were some areas, however, where such conciliatory efforts were not bearing fruitful results, and in such situations the views of the majority and minority had to be expressed. These matters were discussed in the Committees at length and not settled. We hope to see that these differences are adequately considered by the Council with the objective of developing further consensus. We do, therefore, limit our observations to some of these concerns and in line with the earlier guidance that you expressed, Mr Chairman. If our delegation, however, feels that the discussion will lead to further differences and need for further observations arise, we might be obliged to request you for the floor once again.

Sir, the three major roles spelled out in the Constitution of the organizations, we feel, are complementary to each other and inseparable, whose priority could require deeper analysis and understanding beyond those of normal processes.

All three roles being of a reinforcing nature to each other, the absence of any one of the three could endanger the effective implementation of the other two. Within this context, however, it could be possible to rationalize the relationship of one with the other. The assembling, analyzing and making available of information on agriculture and food being unique to FAO make it irreplaceable. This understanding being common to all, no difference of views could be expressed. We feel, however, that the proper use of information on agriculture and food will require a lot of preparation and training for the dominant majority of the member countries at this stage. This being the case, setting it in the top priority and subsequently allocating more resources to it might not be a timely decision. Even though we have no doubt of its relative importance, we do question the timeliness of such a decision when the dominant majority of the member countries is not in a position to make effective use of such services.

Promotion, encouragement and recommendation of actions in all its spheres of activity is an equally important role. Among these roles, research, shared with CGIAR, and commodity agreements, shared with GATT and UNCTAD, could be welcomed because of the additional impetus which they will exert for prompt implementation. FAO being responsible for food and agriculture, it could be difficult to think that, even though shared, these sectors will enjoy as much attention as would be possible within FAO. We feel that ranking this role second in the priority list because of shared responsibility and subsequently allocating fewer resources is likely to reduce the attention it deserves. We therefore feel that careful consideration will need to be given when considering the priority of this aspect of the role.

The third essential role, of providing technical assistance, is equally important and is inseparable and intertwined with the other two. In fact, this third role is crucial to the effective implementation of the other two roles. In some cases one might think that the other two would not function without the catalytic input of the third role.

It is therefore of the utmost importance to consider these three roles on equal terms in relation to each other and to place emphasis on their complementarity rather than the priority of any one over the others. In a spirit of establishing consensus, the priority setting as formulated by the Joint Committee could be acceptable to our delegation, even though the resource allocation aspect as set out in this priority setting is questionable because of the imbalance in background of member countries in the use of services deriving from the three roles in question.

With regard to resource dimensions, even though both the teams of experts and the two Committees agree that FAO has demonstrated innovations and has been responsive to changing world needs, they have concluded that there is scope for strengthening some areas. Hence recommendations for strengthening some areas were made.

There were no differences in the needs of financial resources for implementation of these recommendations but differences prevailed when sources of these financial implications were discussed, and hence four alternatives were proposed. Here again consensus is pulling all of us to accept the alternative proposed in the document. We are, however, seriously concerned about the second alternative, which requires the Director-General to make programme adjustments. We are talking about an organization whose programme implementation has been constrained to the extent of programme cuts amounting to \$45 million in the last four years. We have a fear that programme adjustments over and above these programme cuts might endanger some of the remaining valuable services, which will mean further reductions. Even though we are faced with budgetary resource

constraints, it could be essential to note that resources available for the development of food and agriculture through the multilateral channel form only a very small fraction of the overall requirements. It therefore becomes a futile exercise to think about global wellbeing and freedom from hunger when this minimal request for strengthening the Organization and its budget is being questioned.

Global population is estimated to increase to over 6 billion by the year 2000, of which the dominant majority in the developing world are to continue being subjected to the yoke of poverty, malnutrition and substandard survival. This is happening in the midst of the international community, where global resource and care and capacity is estimated to be more than adequate. This by no means calls into question the need for sustainable development. If we take the projected annual financial requests of all the three food-related UN bodies in Rome, we find that the total is less than \$1.7 billion, which comes to about 30 cents of investment pro capite of the global population which needs to be taken care of. This reference is made in relation to investment through the multilateral channels for the most essential and basic requirement: food and agriculture. Of this, less than one-third is requested for FAO, whose responsibility and mandate covers the broad area of increased food production for the wellbeing of mankind as a whole. We feel that this investment is far too little for the Organization, which is expected to tackle the challenges of the year 2000 and beyond.

All of us in this assembly are in one way or another tied to this important responsibility of increasing food production and agricultural development. We therefore have an individual and collective responsibility to see to it that adequate resources are mobilized for the sector without having to worry about overlapped and shared responsibility at this stage, because the support which the sector receives is still far too rudimentary and below expectations for a satisfactory outcome.

It is against this background and that of the present and realistic situation of mobilizing more resources that we accept the present level of resource requests by FAO. In saying this, we do realize the difficult economic conditions of the majority of member countries and also of those countries which do try to fulfil satisfactorily their share of responsibility in this noble endeavour. We also appeal to those member countries in a position to do so to see to it that their obligations are fulfilled and extended beyond the present level in whatever way possible.

Finally, our delegation has examined the study of the management consultants in relation to the rate for calculating the approved budget, and we should also like to express our views in this connection. From the experiences of the past, long-term solutions are to be found in real stability of the currency market, which is outside the control of this body. We therefore view the continuation of the present support rate, with the backup support of the Special Reserve Account, as the presently available and better alternative until long-term solutions are sought in the future.

Raphael RABE (Madagascar): La Délégation malgache vous remercie de lui donner la parole et de prime abord adresse ses félicitations à M. Mazoyer, Président du Comité du programme, pour la présentation très claire qu'il a faite de ce point très important de notre ordre du jour. Il a su attirer l'attention de cette auguste Assemblée sur les traits marquant des documents soumis à notre examen.

Nous félicitons également le Président du Comité financier et tous les membres des deux Comités ainsi que le Directeur général et le Secrétariat pour le travail très fructueux accompli.

Dans son intervention à l'ouverture de nos travaux le Directeur général a mis en exergue certaines de ses propositions permettant d'apporter des améliorations incontestables à l'Organisation. Elle mérite toute notre attention et nous nous emploierons à les étudier avec le sérieux requis.

Deux millions de dollars de dépenses... plus de deux années de travaux et d'investigations soutenus... de nombreux experts et fonctionnaires d'une Organisation mobilisés ont été nécessaires pour démontrer à quelques incrédules ce que la grande majorité des Etats Membres savait déjà et considérait comme un fait accompli, à savoir que la FAO est et demeure une Organisation solide et dynamique et qu'il n'y a pas d'érosion majeure de son mandat malgré, soi-disant en passant, la concurrence vive d'autres institutions.

Elle a, au cours des années, précisé l'étude, lancé des stratégies mondiales ambitieuses et d'une portée considérable, entre autres et pour n'en citer que quelques-unes, le Programme d'action de la Conférence mondiale sur la Réforme agraire et le développement rural, le Programme mondial sur les pêches, le Plan d'action forestier tropical; elle a élaboré avec patience et grande compétence des conventions internationales garantissant d'une coopération internationale juste et équitable, j'ai nommé le Pacte mondial de la sécurité alimentaire, le Code de conduite pour la distribution et l'utilisation des pesticides que nous allons examiner, avec un point sur l'information préalable, et l'engagement international sur les ressources phylogénétiques. Bien entendu, comme la délégation malgache l'avait souligné lors de la 24^{ème} Session de la Conférence, des améliorations peuvent et doivent être entreprises dans le sens des performances de l'Organisation en vue de la rendre capable de répondre aux demandes pressantes et croissantes émanant de ses Etats Membres.

Mais il n'était pas nécessaire de s'adresser à des groupes d'experts pour y parvenir, puisque l'Organisation dispose d'organismes, de comités qui peuvent aussi bien étudier et prévoir ces améliorations. Mais en tout cas, l'étude a été réalisée et nous l'apprécions. Un dilemme cependant. En effet, pour mettre en oeuvre toutes les recommandations, il faudrait 26 millions de dollars. Etaler dans le temps cette mise en oeuvre constituerait en vérité la seule alternative possible, en commençant par celles des recommandations qui permettraient des résultats significatifs en considération des sommes engagées. Il faudra sans doute compter sur la volonté politique des Etats en mesure de contribuer, dans le cadre de ces crédits complémentaires, car il est, à notre sens, absolument exclu que les dépenses occasionnées soient supportées par le budget. Aucun programme ni sous-programme voté par la Conférence ne pourra plus souffrir de retard ou encore moins de suppression.

Dans son examen approfondi des résultats de l'étude et des recommandations du Comité, la Délégation malgache voudrait faire part à cette auguste Assemblée de ses vues, suggestions et recommandations à l'endroit de certains domaines, programmes et sous-programmes qu'elle juge d'une importance capitale pour renforcer la capacité d'intervention de la FAO et par conséquent pour la rendre mieux à même de servir ses Etats Membres. En priorité absolue ma Délégation voudrait insister sur la nécessité de développer vigoureusement l'assistance technique de l'Organisation, à l'endroit des pays en voie de développement, car les besoins de ces derniers demeureront importants, surtout en Afrique aux prises avec d'énormes problèmes de pauvreté et de sous-alimentation.

Dans les pays en voie de développement où les disponibilités en terre font défaut, la seule voie identifiée, la seule voie d'issue est constituée par la diffusion, la vulgarisation de paquets technologiques performants adaptés bien entendu aux conditions locales, et surtout bien assimilés par les petits agriculteurs. Tous les moyens pour y parvenir devront être mobilisés, devront être promus, entre autres la création d'un environnement favorable pour les agriculteurs, la conception de conditions de travail encourageantes pour les experts - aussi bien internationaux que nationaux -, l'augmentation sensible des ressources du Programme de coopération technique - nous avons déjà donné notre avis à ce sujet lors de l'examen du Programme de travail et budget -, et bien entendu les fonds fiduciaires qui devraient toujours avoir un caractère multilatéral, le maintien sinon le renforcement de la dynamique du Centre d'investissement de la FAO dont l'efficacité mondialement reconnue est une aide inestimable pour nos Etats, la résolution des problèmes particuliers d'envergure mondiale ou régionale par des programmes spéciaux appropriés. La recherche, la biotechnologie devront être orientées vers le bien-être de nos populations, vers le profit des pays en voie de développement. Elles ne doivent pas servir à creuser davantage encore le fossé existant entre les économies du nord et du sud, ou à nuire à nos agriculteurs. M. Bonte-Friedheim, Assistant du Directeur général et Chef du Département de l'agriculture, a cité hier les menaces graves de la biotechnologie à l'endroit de nos producteurs. Il a cité les producteurs de vanille, de café, de sucre. Ce sont des problèmes réels et nous avons des rapports à ce sujet.

C'est la raison pour laquelle, tout en appréciant le progrès, le développement, la technique, nous souhaitons que ces techniques ne se retournent pas contre nous, que la FAO nous aide à trouver des solutions à ces menaces. Le Gouvernement malgache attache une importance considérable à la coopération technique et à la coopération économique entre pays en voie de développement. Il fait confiance au rôle de plus en plus croissant que la FAO joue et devra continuer à développer dans la promotion des dites coopératives.

La priorité amplement justifiée que la Délégation malgache attache à l'assistance technique ne signifierait rien si elle se désintéressait des deux autres rôles de la FAO, à savoir celui de réunir et de diffuser des renseignements, des informations agricoles, et de servir de tribune internationale pour trouver le consensus sur les grands problèmes de l'alimentation et de l'agriculture. Nous n'éprouvons donc aucune difficulté à convenir avec le Directeur général que ces trois rôles sont essentiels et interdépendants à de nombreux égards. C'est ainsi que nous

accueillons très favorablement toute action, tout programme qui permette de renforcer le système d'information de la FAO. afin qu'elle puisse servir de centre mondial d'information agricole.

Nous sommes également convaincus que la FAO est et devra bien entendu continuer à être une tribune Internationale de concertations et de rencontres fructueuses, non seulement entre les Etats Membres mais aussi avec tous ceux qui sont intéressés et concernés par son mandat, notamment les autres institutions du système des Nations Unies. A ce sujet, notre délégation accueille très favorablement les propositions formulées par le Directeur général.

C'est aussi un lieu de rencontres avec les organisations non gouvernementales, dont le rôle est très important dans nos économies et dans notre développement; un lieu de rencontre avec les représentants des professionnels et les principaux protagonistes du commerce international des produits agricoles et d'autres encore.

Ma délégation aurait souhaité pouvoir clore sa déclaration sur une note d'optimisme et formuler un vœu qui soit le reflet de ces sentiments, à savoir pouvoir réaliser dans des délais raisonnables les mesures de renforcement recommandées. Malheureusement, elle est obligée de se montrer réaliste et pragmatique. En effet, d'après elle, ce dont la FAO a besoin dans l'immédiat et à très court terme, c'est d'abord et avant tout la restauration de sa capacité d'assistance, d'aide aux pays en voie de développement érodée par la privation voulue, provoquée et organisée de ses moyens d'intervention, la privation des ressources financières qui lui reviennent de droit, car décidées, votées par la Conférence. Si un vœu devait être formulé, c'est que la 25ème session de la Conférence - d'habitude le 25ème anniversaire est toujours célébré avec joie et espérance - soit l'occasion de prendre une résolution ferme et irrévocable engageant tous les Etats à soutenir la FAO, non seulement en bonnes paroles et en exhortations encourageantes, mais surtout dans les actes, les faits et en respectant scrupuleusement les obligations statutaires.

Nous souhaitons sincèrement que cet assainissement de la situation financière se fasse sans délai pour permettre la mise en oeuvre de mesures de renforcement jugées prioritaires par le Conseil et la Conférence. Nous souhaitons que le consensus soit atteint sur les recommandations pertinentes formulées par les Comités.

Ayant entendu les déclarations des délégations qui nous ont précédés, la Libye, Cuba et d'autres, nous pensons qu'il n'est pas opportun et utile d'introduire des questions non prévues par la résolution. Il faudrait s'en tenir aux questions étudiées par les Comités et qui sont inscrites à notre ordre du jour.

Angel BARBERO MARTIN (España): Nuestra delegación se une a la satisfacción expresada por otras delegaciones por ver que tras el estudio realizado, los principios y las voluntades en los cuales se enmarcaba la Constitución de la FAO en su momento y que definieron los Fines en el Preámbulo de esta Organización, permanecen todavía inalterables y traen como consecuencia que la FAO sigue siendo un organismo necesario, que está no solamente bien como está sino que debe ser reforzado.

Coincidimos también en confirmar la importancia de los tres tipos de funciones que tiene encomendadas la FAO, y compartimos la opinión de que son complementarias entre sí, que es muy difícil establecer un peso mayor de una o de otra sin peligro de menoscabar otro tipo de actuaciones correspondientes a las otras funciones, y por tanto no debería discutirse aquí cuál de ellas debería tener más importancia.

Pero alguna delegación ha citado la importancia de establecer una cierta coordinación entre ellas, sobre todo por hacer el mejor uso, el uso que sea más útil de cada una de ellas. De hecho, y en la actualidad, en los Comités de la FAO se viene haciendo esto, sobre todo por el papel de información, de estadística, más el papel de coordinación y de fomento de acuerdos. Si en los Comités se estableciera también el contemplar la marcha de los proyectos de la FAO y sobre todo las labores de campo, creemos que sería una buena manera de contemplar esta coordinación necesaria entre las tres funciones, o los tres tipos de funciones más en particular.

Nos congratula especialmente que el examen señale el inciso c) del Artículo 2.1 sobre la Conservación de los Recursos Naturales en la Constitución de la FAO, porque pone un énfasis en uno de los principales problemas que está afectando actualmente a la producción agraria, y que seguramente en los próximos años va a adquirir una importancia insospechada.

Los estudios de las estadísticas y de las tendencias de la alimentación y de la población nos indican para el futuro que si bien es posible que desde un punto de vista global se cubran las necesidades alimentarias de las personas que van a poblar el mundo en el año **2000**, muy probablemente, casi seguro y geográficamente, existirán unas carencias gravísimas de muchas

personas en ciertas áreas de la tierra. Y esto por varios motivos. Principalmente por motivos de desequilibrios del mercado y por motivos ecológicos. En relación con estos motivos o factores negativos ecológicos que van a influir en esta carencia en la alimentación y en la producción agraria, queremos señalar que efectivamente la FAO tiene unos programas estrechísimamente relacionados con este aspecto medio ambiental. Hay otros organismos en las Naciones Unidas y en el amplio espectro de las organizaciones incluso no gubernamentales en el mundo, que se dedican a ese aspecto del medio ambiente. Se dedican a aspectos muy parciales o muy globales en otros casos, pero el organismo que realmente tiene que decir la palabra principal en cuanto al uso racional de los recursos, en cuanto al desarrollo sostenible, es sin duda la FAO.

Sin embargo, muchas veces este aspecto no ha sido comprendido. En la pesca, en el uso de los plaguicidas, en los recursos fitogenéticos, en los programas forestales y otros sistemas que utiliza la FAO, como la detección, etcétera, existen unos aspectos medioambientales fundamentales que habría que reforzar y cuya importancia habría que explicar claramente a la opinión internacional; sobre todo, la necesidad de reforzarlos.

Hay otros aspectos nuevos que se presentan, como la biotecnología, que pueden tener también estas repercusiones medioambientales. Ayer el Sr. Bonte Friedheim nos indicó atinadísimamente cómo estas repercusiones en este sector, que está surgiendo con una fuerza muy grande, pueden tener aspectos socioeconómicos. Yo digo que también pueden tener unos aspectos medioambientales muy importantes.

Dudamos, sin embargo, que el establecimiento de una nueva unidad que pueda ocuparse de estos aspectos pueda ser realmente útil. A veces, si estas unidades no tienen la suficiente altura jerárquica dentro de una organización y son horizontales, no tienen la fuerza suficiente para influir en las demás unidades y terminan por ser algo exclusivamente casi, casi, diría yo, ornamental. Si es una unidad independiente de las demás, corremos el riesgo también de que se solape con otra serie de unidades de este tipo que poseen otras organizaciones internacionales.

Nosotros creemos que lo que habría que hacer es reforzar este aspecto medioambiental en cada uno de los programas de la FAO y, sobre todo, dotarlos de un sistema de evaluación de impacto medioambiental, teniendo en cuenta que este impacto puede ser tanto positivo como, a veces, negativo.

En el aspecto de los desequilibrios de los mercados, vemos que el papel de la FAO se hace fundamental en el GATT, no solamente en su papel actual de asesor en ciertos campos, como son los plaguicidas o el campo fitosanitario, o en Codex Alimentarius, sino también promoviendo, como hace en otros campos, la actuación de países que puedan asesorar y aportar sus experiencias en este foro de conversaciones tan importante.

Dentro de la Estrategia internacional para el desarrollo de las Naciones Unidas, entendemos que la FAO, al ir adecuando su estrategia a la estrategia definida por este foro, tiene una ocasión insustituible para asentar las bases de la importancia de la cooperación multilateral, de una cooperación multilateral que está representada en FAO y que se pueda desarrollar en términos de, por lo menos, equidad entre los países que la practican; en términos en que realmente existan beneficios para los países receptores; no siempre beneficios seguros para los países donantes e inseguros para los países receptores.

Por ultimo, nos parece que los programas de campo deberían, efectivamente, ser controlados, y ya lo son ahora con bastante asiduidad y con bastante eficiencia. Pero, como dije al principio de mi declaración, si el aspecto de seguimiento se incorporara a los distintos comités de la FAO, podría reforzarse este tipo de control y seguimiento a satisfacción de todos los países. Para terminar, quisiera referirme a las organizaciones no gubernamentales, a las que entendemos se les ha dado poca importancia dentro del Examen de la FAO, pero que van a adquirirla mucho más en el futuro; no solamente aquellas organizaciones que representan a los campesinos, a los centros rurales, sino, yo diría también, las otras organizaciones no gubernamentales de tipo medioambiental, de las cuales algunas, desgraciadamente, podemos decir que no están bien orientadas. Pertenecen a sectores urbanos, que tienen poca relación con el mundo rural y, por tanto, no poseen una clara definición de ciertos problemas, pero pueden a veces aportar también puntos de vista independientes y críticos que no hay que despreciar "a priori".

Por último, y para terminar definitivamente, yo había pensado hablar sobre los temas económicos del Examen, pero prefiero reservarme para más adelante, porque, según el sistema que hemos adoptado, existirá ocasión de hacerlo más en particular.

Huang YONGNING (China) (original language Chinese): The Chinese delegation has studied document C 89/21 and listened with great interest to the previous statements on the review of the report. Now I should like to elaborate on the following points.

First, document C 89/21 covers the conclusions and recommendations made by the expert groups on FAO's objectives, role, strategies and field operations. It also contains the views of the Director-General and the Programme and Finance Committees on these conclusions and recommendations. We have noticed that, as paragraph 7 of the document says, it is the view of the expert groups and the Programme and Finance Committee that FAO remains a solid and dynamic institution. This shows that FAO, as a specialized agency in food and agriculture, has done effective work in handling the important issues faced by world agriculture, especially hunger and malnutrition, and this should be duly recognized and should be reconfirmed.

Secondly, we are pleased to note that the conclusions in the recommendations put forward by the expert groups were unanimously adopted. Consensus was reached on almost all the issues reviewed by the Programme and Finance Committees, thus laying an extensive and solid base for in-depth reviews and adoption of these conclusions and recommendations by the Council and the Conference. We sincerely hope that the in-depth debates on the conclusions and recommendations will proceed in the spirit of unity, cooperation and a mutual understanding, for unanimous adoption.

Thirdly, in adopting the resolution concerning the review of certain experts of FAO at the last Conference, it was pointed out that FAO should be strengthened in every possible manner so that it could continue to play a leading role in world agriculture during the years to come. We therefore hope that a consensus will be reached in the Council and the Conference on the conclusions and recommendations as well as on the mechanism to implement them. This is to make sure that the review could turn out positive results to the extent that FAO's role can be strengthened.

Fourth, the review lasted two years, and thirteen international experts representing different regions were recruited. About \$ 2 million were spent. As a result the review has put forward many important conclusions and constructive recommendations on FAO's future work.

The Director-General and the Programme and Finance Committees have also done a great deal of work. We would like to express our appreciation for this. At the same time I want to reiterate that the Chinese Government supports all reforms conducive to the maintaining of FAO's mandate, the strengthening of FAO's activities and its work efficiency. We also support all beneficial proposals aimed at overcoming obstacles facing FAO.

LE PRESIDENT: Avant de lever la séance, je rappelle que deux propositions sont faites au Conseil. La première concerne les points 8 et 9 de l'ordre du jour. Nous avons décidé, lors de l'adoption de l'ordre du jour, d'enlever les points 8 et 9 relatifs à l'examen du Programme ordinaire et des programmes de terrain et de renvoyer leur discussion à la Conférence. Plusieurs délégués ont suggéré, étant donné que la discussion sur ces points au sein du Comité du programme et du Comité financier a été très riche et très fournie, que des extraits des rapports de ces deux comités soient fournis à la Conférence. Cela a été fait dans le passé et, si vous n'y voyez pas d'objection, nous pourrions suivre à nouveau cette procédure.

Ms Joan DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America): We should like to have time to reconsider that proposal and consider what exactly it means. My Government is not a member of the Programme Committee and we attach a great deal of importance to the review of field programmes. Therefore, I would not agree to that proposal at the moment.

LE PRESIDENT: Nous pouvons attendre cet après-midi pour que les membres du Conseil aient le temps de réfléchir à cette proposition et, s'ils sont d'accord, nous pourrions y donner suite. La seconde suggestion qui a été faite hier, à la suite d'une information donnée par le Directeur général concernant les efforts appréciables de paysans indonésiens pour aider la FAO, comme cela a été fait il y a quatre ans, lorsque le Président Soeharto est venu ici, c'est que nous donnions cette information avec toute la sympathie qu'elle mérite car il semble que c'est la septième fois que nos amis indonésiens font cet effort. Peut-être cela encouragerait-il d'autres pays à faire la même chose, le cas échéant. Je propose donc, si le Conseil n'y voit pas d'objection, d'inclure cette information dans notre rapport.

The meeting rose at 12.45 hours

La séance est levée à 12 h 45

Se levanta la sesión a las 12.45 horas

council

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

conseil

ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ALIMENTATION ET L'AGRICULTURE

consejo

ORGANIZACION DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA LA AGRICULTURA Y LA ALIMENTACION

CL

CL 96/PV/6

Ninety-sixth Session

Quatre-vingt-seizième session

96º periodo de sesiones

SIXTH PLENARY MEETING
SIXIEME SEANCE PLENIERE
SEXTA SESION PLENARIA
8 November 1989

The Sixth Plenary Meeting was opened at 15.00 hours Lassaad Ben Osman, Independent Chairman of the Council, presiding

La sixième séance plénière est ouverte à 15 heures sous la présidence de Lassaad Ben Osman, Président indépendant du Conseil

Se abre la sexta sesión plenaria a las 15.00 horas, bajo la presidencia de Lassaad Ben Osman, Presidente Independiente del Consejo

- III. PROGRAMME, BUDGETARY, FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS
(continued)
- III. QUESTIONS CONCERNANT LE PROGRAMME, LE BUDGET, LES FINANCES ET L'ADMINISTRATION (suite)
- III. ASUNTOS DEL PROGRAMA Y ASUNTOS PRESUPUESTARIOS, FINANCIEROS Y ADMINISTRATIVOS (continuación)
- 7. Conclusions of the Review of Certain Aspects of FAO's Goals and Operations (continued)
- 7. Conclusions de l'examen de certains aspects des buts et opérations de la FAO (suite)
- 7. Conclusiones del examen de algunos aspectos de las metas y operaciones de la FAO
(continuación)

LE PRESIDENT: Honorables délégués, je vous propose de reprendre la suite de nos travaux. Nous avons pour le moment dix délégués inscrits.

Javier TANTALEAN (Peru): En primer lugar, quiero felicitar a la FAO como institución, lo mismo que a los Comités por el proceso de trabajo efectuado tanto en su forma como en el contenido en relación al Examen de la FAO. Entiendo que el valioso Examen de la FAO es un documento de referencia realizado por un grupo de expertos. Partiendo de esa premisa, resulta un hecho importantísimo el Examen en su conclusión al afirmar que la FAO sigue siendo una institución sólida y dinámica que viene cumpliendo con sus fines, objetivos, funciones y sus mandatos, según ese Examen.

En este Examen se proponen algunas medidas de fortalecimiento que nuestra delegación comparte primeramente, en materia de desarrollo sostenible y cuestiones ambientales, en lo que respecta a la conservación y control de suelos y aguas, evaluación planificación de tierras, el manejo integrado de plagas, los recursos genéticos, la telepercepción y la ordenación de los recursos pesqueros y de las cuencas hidrográficas. Y se sostiene algo que compartimos; en materia ambiental, la intervención de los gobiernos es fundamental no pudiendo quedar esto a merced de los mecanismos del mercado libre. También compartimos las sugerencias del Examen del Comité y del Director General en materia de apoyo a los programas de desarrollo rural integrado, sobre todo en la necesidad de valorizar el rol de la mujer en el sector agropecuario y valorizar lo que son los campesinos y agricultores jóvenes para que puedan quedarse en las tierras y no emigrar en busca de nuevas condiciones de vida.

Asimismo, compartimos la necesidad de que la Organización tenga un plan de mediano plazo que podría ser éste de seis años. Consideramos en lo que se refiere al ámbito de los recursos genéticos que la FAO debería ampliar sus actividades a nivel de los peces y de los animales, estableciendo una coordinación con el CIRF siempre y cuando se reconozca y mantenga el liderazgo de la FAO en materia de recursos fitogenéticos. En los asuntos de pesca, nosotros estimaríamos que sería muy importante una asistencia técnica de la FAO a los gobiernos para incrementar los recursos pesqueros pelágicos que hoy se orientan a la pesca de consumo humano indirecto, como es la harina de aceite de pescado, y orientarlas hacia el consumo humano directo. No es posible que millones de toneladas de los recursos pelágicos a nivel mundial se quemen y no se distribuyan como alimento directo en las poblaciones, y no se vendan como recurso directo a las poblaciones más necesitadas de los países, sobre todo subdesarrollados.

Respaldamos asimismo la sugerencia para una participación muy dinámica de la FAO en la próxima Conferencia de las Naciones Unidas sobre el Medio Ambiente y el Desarrollo. La solución de diferencias sobre obstáculos al comercio en el marco del GATT, en la Convención Internacional de Protección Fitosanitaria y la incorporación de principios de información y consentimientos previos en el Código Internacional de Conducta para la Distribución y utilización de Plaguicidas y las medidas para luchar contra las plagas y las enfermedades.

En materia de política los expertos sugieren, y esto lo compartimos, que la FAO, haciendo uso de su capacidad instalada, debiera participar en los asuntos relativos a los programas de ajuste estructural desde sus inicios a solicitud de los gobiernos y que no debería adoptar: "servilmente los diagnósticos del Banco Mundial y el Fondo Monetario Internacional". Aquí pienso que si bien no existe en la FAO toda una experiencia en el manejo macroeconómico, lo existe en el sector agrícola y subsectores correspondientes, y podría entablarse una perfecta coordinación para que los programas de ajuste estructural consideren, y en esto FAO pudiera tener una labor importante, el diseño de programas, proyectos y políticas de compensación social en favor de los más pobres, sobre todo de los campesinos y agricultores cuando se establecen estos programas de ajuste estructural.

Asimismo sería una oportunidad para, con la coordinación con el Banco Mundial, ejercer una presión y así deberíamos hacerla los gobiernos sobre el mismo Banco Mundial, para que no sigan disminuyendo los préstamos al sector de agricultura. Y quisiéramos eso sí, preguntar a los expertos de la FAO su opinión sobre las perspectivas y tendencias de la agricultura mundial, porque para los expertos de la FAO, el período futuro se caracterizaría por excedentes mundiales de alimentos y no por escaseces. El factor limitativo no sería la capacidad productiva sino la demanda efectiva. Mientras que el Grupo de Expertos que ha hecho el Examen sostiene que ese punto de vista se puede poner en duda, que en los próximos 10 ó 20 años las expectativas se inclinarían hacia una mayor estrechez en el mercado por problemas de oferta más que de demanda. En este aspecto nos gustaría conocer la opinión de los expertos de la FAO.

Por otro lado, si logramos superar la crisis financiera actual de la FAO creemos que todos los países deberían hacer un esfuerzo para cumplir con los gastos prioritarios presentados en el Informe por el Director General en las páginas 18 y 19, para atender las tres categorías de gastos propuestos.

Mi delegación sostiene que luego del examen realizado, se ha dado término a una etapa necesaria, pero que luego del informe resulta innecesario seguir haciendo más exámenes y lo deseable sería ver cómo implementar las recomendaciones del Director General y de los Comités. Por eso respaldamos al Director General en lo que ha solicitado sobre el fortalecimiento de las relaciones con el GATT en cuestiones fitosanitarias. Nos preocupa que la crisis financiera de la FAO debido a los atrasos en las cuotas afecte y deteriore los recursos humanos con que cuenta la FAO. Por eso es atinado lo que el Director General expresó relativo a la capacitación del personal y reciclaje. Lo mismo apoyamos la sugerencia de él sobre cómo debería de ser el nuevo proceso de presupuestación que conllevaría a un ahorro de recursos.

Hannu HALINEN (Finland): The review process of FAO covering the last two years and the discussions on strengthening the Organization, stemming from a much longer period of time before, are now reaching a crucial point. The member countries are expected to make a decision on what is the role and what are the functions of FAO at the moment. How is the Organization to respond to the challenges of the 1990s and beyond; and in what way should we strengthen FAO as a whole and in concrete terms? In other words, we need to formulate and sharpen our vision of the important work of FAO now and in the future. Helping us in our task is an abundance of information. We have the views and comments of the Director-General; the report of the Programme and Finance Committees; the reports of the two expert groups; and the reports of the management consultants. Above all, we have our own ideas and views based on our own work and consultations with other member countries.

We all agreed and have confirmed on many previous occasions how important it is to reach a consensus decision on this process so essential to FAO's future and to all our governments. Considering the variety and complexity of the issues contained in the documentation before us, it appears that we first need to come to a common understanding of the scope and nature of a decision that could be agreed on at the forthcoming Conference. In the light of that understanding, we are able to see in what way this Session of the Council could best contribute to making such a decision possible. At the last Session of the Council in June, my delegation stated, and I quote: "We are concerned that the SJS report on the review will probably not be distributed under the latter part of October. This leaves the Member Countries with very limited time to reach a substantive consensus on these important issues. In our view, it is therefore important that the informal contacts between member countries are continued with a view to preparing elements of a consensus decision at the Conference in November".

All this remains valid, even more so at the moment. Although we regard the Review and its results as a process, we find it important that the conclusions of this ongoing exercise begin to take shape for the benefit of the Organization. The forthcoming Conference should be able to exchange views and agree on the framework and guidelines for the work of the FAO in the future. In this regard, we expect from the Conference the discussions, decisions on, firstly, priorities and priority setting of FAO. Secondly, a mechanism for medium-term planning as a consequence of, and follow-up to, the priority setting. Thirdly, programme and resource implications as well as possible amendments to the decision making process of these priorities and medium-term plans as applicable.

These issues have been reiterated by the Nordic delegations throughout the debate on the Review and reform of our Organization. My delegation is prepared to discuss these points with any delegation as well as to listen to the concerns of the other delegations with a view to finding common ground and outlining an approach that could be acceptable to all at the Conference.

In my view, it is our task here at the Council, to accomplish this type of preparatory work to facilitate the proceedings at the Conference. Most of the recommendations contained in the report of the Programme and Finance Committees are acceptable to my delegation. Specifically, we would like to refer to para. 2.54 in the report which, as we read it, goes along these lines which we indicated earlier. The experts and the SJS have presented their proposal for the guidelines for the priority setting. The task left to us, the governing bodies, is to elaborate on the guidelines and to actually set the priorities for the Organization to the effect that its operations are based on them.

The Director-General in his comments is mostly limiting himself to a number of detailed calculations of the resource implications of the SJS recommendations. Doing so, we understand him being largely influenced by the financial constraints of the Organization. We find this most unfortunate, since at this stage we would have welcomed a somewhat different approach. The Conference would still have greatly benefited from hearing his vision of how the Organization best faces these challenges and fulfils its tasks in the future. My delegation is also looking forward to his comments on programme implication and adjustments at the Conference.

At this stage Finland finds it premature to focus attention exclusively on the issue of additional resources on the basis of the document prior to the recommendations contained therein. Priorities are being defined at present. Their eventual financial implications must duly be taken into account. If we were to start our deliberations by addressing ourselves to the possible financial implications of a number of detailed proposals, we could completely distort the point of view needed to fully comprehend the responsibility that is on our shoulders and on the agenda of the Conference. My delegation does not oppose expenditures if they are found justifiable and agreeable by the Member States.

We strongly believe that many, if not all, of the recommendations based on the SJS and experts, can be implemented without additional costs as a result of programme adjustments within existing resources.

Let me add that this is the only reason why my delegation in its statement on the PWB wanted to leave the possibility open to see if something can be done already at this Conference for the next biennium in this regard. They seem to us a more logical way of organizing our work. I recognize at the same time the assurance as expressed by India, among others, that the required modifications to the budget figures can also be made by the relevant governing bodies after the Conference.

The documentation before us is difficult to digest within the short time available, yet our aim is to achieve a comprehensive decision by consensus at the Conference. Therefore, it is the sincere hope of my delegation that we would not waste time by focusing solely on the financial implications of certain specific recommendations or any minor points of the Review. Instead, we must be able to concentrate on preparing a framework that could serve as a basis for a constructive debate and decision-making at the Conference and result in a unanimously adopted resolution on the Review.

LE DIRECTEUR GENERAL: En réponse à ce qu'a dit le délégué de la Finlande, par déférence pour lui et pour les membres du groupe nordique qui a toujours accordé une grande attention à l'examen de la FAO, je voudrais dire qu'il ne m'est pas possible et qu'il n'est pas dans mes intentions de présenter un autre budget avec un ajustement de 26 millions de dollars. Vous avez souhaité que je le fasse, mais je ne peux pas le faire. Je présente un seul budget. L'Acte constitutif me demande de faire une seule proposition et je n'ai pas les moyens de greffer 26 millions de dollars sur 570.

Ensuite vous avez dit que je me suis limité à présenter les coûts. Ce n'est pas exact. J'ai présenté ce matin quatre propositions nouvelles et je me trouve d'accord avec les experts et les 20 pays membres. Je ne veux pas inventer des choses sur lesquelles les pays membres ne sont pas d'accord. Si vous voulez avoir mon point de vue, je proposerais peut-être 100 millions de dollars. Je trouve ridicule qu'avec 26 millions de dollars on puisse renforcer la FAO pour les prochaines années. Je l'ai dit ce matin. Vous dites d'autre part que vous n'avez pas eu le temps de lire le rapport. Le rapport vous a été remis le 12 octobre. Nous sommes le 8 novembre, cela

fait 26 jours. Quelques pays membres d'un certain groupe se sont réunis à Londres avec une copie du rapport les 8 ou 9 octobre. Cela fait un mois. C'est à vous de juger s'il faut plusieurs mois pour lire ce rapport. Vous avez tous reçu également le rapport des experts. Donc en ce qui concerne le temps, je trouve que ceux qui se préparent depuis deux ans sur cette question-là pourraient trouver le temps nécessaire.

En ce qui me concerne, je ne peux pas présenter un autre budget ajusté pour les 26 millions de dollars. La Conférence décidera. Je ne sais pas ce qu'elle va décider. Ce sont deux questions différentes, mais elles ont un lien. Je suis responsable de ce rapport. J'en suis fier. C'est un rapport clair, limpide, bien écrit, bien analysé. J'y ai mis toute mon expérience. C'est à vous de juger.

Muhammed d Saleem KHAN (Pakistan): It is indeed a matter of immense satisfaction, and, if I may say so, also relief that the review process which has been overshadowing proceedings in this Organization over the past two years has reached a concluding stage. We should like to express our gratitude and congratulations to the members of the Finance Committee, the Expert Groups and the managing consultants who assist them, the FAO Secretariat and the Director-General and, not least, the two Chairmen, Ambassador Bukhari and Mr Mazoyer, for devoting their energies and time in presenting us with a concise but most complete report on this important subject.

My delegation had always shared the widely held view that FAO was an efficient organization which, over the years, has successfully adapted itself to providing a variety of growing technical assistance to member countries and that there was nothing seriously wrong with its mandate, role, goals, strategy or operations which warranted a special examination outside the normal process of scrutiny and examination. However, in the general interest of consensus within the membership, we had accepted the setting up of a separate process with an objective of further strengthening FAO so that the Organization could become even more responsive to the needs of the Member States. We are pleased to note that both the Committees and experts hold similar views. Nevertheless, the review has resulted in some very important conclusions for the future work of FAO, the implementation of which could further enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of the Organization.

The implementation of most of these recommendations, however, would cost substantial amounts of money, which we understand it is not possible to find at existing resource levels. It will now be up to the Council and Conference to find ways and means for implementing these conclusions in order not to allow more than two years of efforts and over two million dollars in costs to be wasted.

It is also a matter of satisfaction that, for the most part, the report is unanimous and that even on the remaining parts there is a broad consensus, which makes the job of reaching a decision much easier for the members of Council and Conference.

While each of us has a sovereign right to our own independent view on any aspect of the review, we hope that, in the true democratic spirit and the spirit of cordiality and mutual accommodation which has normally prevailed in the process of decision-making within the intergovernmental bodies in FAO, we shall be able to reach a mutually agreeable decision.

My delegation had come fully prepared to exchange views here with other delegates on specific aspects of the review process and debate the differing points of view in order to arrive at a satisfactory consensus. However, we now note that there seems to be a hesitancy on the part of some of us to venture upon this course and a desire to restrict ourselves in the Council to generalities, while wanting certain opinions to be reached in informal groupings outside.

We are disappointed. In the 94th and 95th Council sessions impatient demands were being made to bring the experts' report before the Council, even before the Finance and Programme Committees had finished their deliberations on this. Now that the complete report is before us, we want to refrain from examining it in the Council. The holding of informal discussions between members is a prerogative which they can always exercise without the need for sanction from the Council. However, such exchanges, and, for that matter, any contact group, can only be useful once the different views become known in the Council and later in the Conference. A contact group, as we see it, facilitates the bringing of divergent opinions onto a convergent plane, but needless to say, we have first to know whether there is any divergence in views. The current trend, I am afraid, does not give any encouragement for the setting up of a contact group. Ipsa facto, any

deliberations on the drafting of a resolution would be tantamount to putting the cart before the horse. We do not rule out the need for a resolution at the end, but such a resolution will have to take into contention the recommendations of this august body, the views of the heads of delegations expressed in the Conference and the deliberations in Commission II on the various aspects of the review and report.

The second general point we should like to refer to is the scope of our discussions today. We are ready and willing, on our part, for any negotiations or discussions within the terms of reference of the Review as set forth under Conference Resolution 6/87. We feel that the two Committees have done an excellent job within this scope, and the introduction of any new issues at this stage, or the revival of proposals which the two Committees had not considered necessary, would be unproductive and should be avoided.

Coming to specific aspects of the Report, as I mentioned earlier, we were keen to express our thoughts here for an exchange of views, but, like several other speakers before me, we are now constrained to reserve our views, if an opportunity is to be provided later in the Session.

Meanwhile, we should like to associate ourselves with the views expressed by the delegation of Madagascar and several other delegations from Member States of the Group of 77 which have spoken before me.

Having said that, I should like to make observations on a few points. We fully share the view already expressed by several delegates that all three roles of FAO are mutually complementary, interlinked and necessary, an opinion which is also held by the two Committees and the experts. We would not support any steps for a reduction of any one role at the expense of another. The technical assistance role of FAO, and more specifically the Technical Cooperation Programme, has beyond doubt proved its usefulness and needs not only to be maintained but to be further strengthened. This by no means implies that FAO's other two roles should be weakened but that all three be carried out within the present equation of complementarity.

The other point I should like to speak upon is the issue of resources. We discussed the Programme of Work and Budget yesterday, and we were made aware by the Director-General of the rather frightening financial situation. The position is clear: the additional resources required for the implementation of the review results cannot be located within the existing budgetary level. Therefore, without ruling out the possibility of utilizing any available savings, on which I am sure the Director-General will inform us in due course, we must explore avenues for meeting the bulk of the requirements for extra-budgetary and supplementary resources.

Before ending, I should like to seek from the Secretariat an explanation on a point which has been raised by some of the delegates regarding the prioritizations contained in the tables at page xviii as to what criteria has been adopted in this prioritization.

Finally, we would appeal to all nations to get together to take the review to its fruitful culmination and not turn it into a monster with ever-spreading tentacles.

Norboru SAITO (Japan): I should like to express our thanks to Professor Mazoyer and the Director-General for their informative introduction to this very important agenda item. I should also like to pay tribute to those people in the Secretariat and the members of the SJS and review experts who have been involved in this important and hard task during this biennium.

We are now facing the last stage of the FAO review. During this Council and the forthcoming Conference, we must finalize the FAO review and decide on the FAO reform based on it. The FAO reform should aim at strengthening FAO in order to be able to respond efficiently and effectively to the challenges of the future. In this respect, the final decision on FAO reform should be made by unanimous agreement of the Member States.

For this purpose, my delegation believes that the main job of this Council should be to facilitate the reaching of such consensus among members, to be finalized at the forthcoming Conference, and that such efforts should be continued from this moment on, through the Conference. In this regard, the suggestion made by the United Kingdom delegation earlier this morning, namely the setting up of a contact group at an early stage, is fully supported by our delegation.

I would like to make some comments on the SJS report and the Director-General's comment on it, in the hope that these comments will be taken into account to the maximum extent in formulating the final decision on FAO reform.

The review of certain aspects of FAO's goals and operations was initiated to examine the FAO's role, priorities, objectives and strategies in the food and agriculture field, taking into account the available resources for FAO. Our delegation understands that the FAO review aims to achieve maximum utilization of FAO's function and roles in food and agricultural production through consideration of the priority, objectives and strategies of FAO. From this standpoint, the FAO review is not for approving additional expenditure for the future priority fields summarized by SJS meetings.

My country is of the view that the resources needed should be obtained through allocation of current existing budgets from low priority areas to high priorities. For example, computerization of field programme management will surely contribute to cost reduction.

We share the same views, in that the report gives equal weight to the three major roles of FAO: information-providing functions, a forum for exchanging views on food and agriculture and production consumption, and technical assistance to developing countries. These major roles are interdependent and should be equally strengthened.

My country supports the idea that policy advice function should be strengthened since the establishment of food and agricultural policy is a pre-requisite for promoting development of food and agricultural production in developing countries using their own efforts.

In research and development of technical aspects, FAO's cooperation with international agricultural research institutes, especially the CGIAR institutes, is indispensable. Technology development and its application in the field must be carried out smoothly by cooperation between CGIAR and FAO. My delegation feels that technology development should be achieved with due precaution in order to ensure the harmonization of agricultural production and environmental protection, considering the sustainable development in agriculture, forestry and fisheries. My country strongly supports the importance of small farmers' participation in development of agricultural and rural areas.

Concerning mid- and long-term working plans, it could be beneficial for FAO to make such plans because it could be regarded as the Programme of Work and Budget process to clarify the future targets of the Organization. But, we are not in a position to agree to make financial commitments for the future years beyond the biennium. By this planning we hope that information with more specific details will be provided for members at an early stage.

We support the proposal that the role of FAO country representatives should be strengthened, including the transfer and/or commission of authority to the representatives. Although this report does not give much positive appreciation of the roles and function of the regional offices, RAPA, for example, performs good works as regional focal points for information exchange and a forum for exchange of views on agriculture. This brings us to the conclusion that necessary steps for strengthening regional offices by transfer of authority should be taken, considering the actual regional situation.

Finally, as far as strengthening the coordination with other international organizations is concerned, my country considers it necessary to take measures to avoid duplication and to improve efficiency, such as having periodical consultations with other international organizations.

My delegation again stresses the importance of unanimous agreement between the Member States on the finalization of FAO review.

K.P. ALLEYNE (Trinidad and Tobago): My delegation wishes to indicate its appreciation to the very able and distinguished Chairmen of the Programme and Finance Committee, Professor Mazoyer and Ambassador Bukhari for having guided this difficult review exercise to completion. The deliberations and management of negotiations in order to arrive at this report which is before us now must have taxed their diplomatic skills to the hilt. We are satisfied that their personal reputations, for which this Council has the highest regard, must have stood them in good stead.

A review of this kind - four and a half decades after the founding of this Organization - is an historical landmark. Therefore, I feel it necessary to emphasize that in all the circumstances when most of the delegations depart from Rome at the end of the Conference, the names of our illustrious independent Chairman who has served us well, together with our two Committee Chairmen, will be securely etched in the historical records of the important events in the life span of this Organization. Your efforts will be appreciated for many generations.

Debate on this item ought to be made somewhat easier if we continuously remind ourselves that there was a common goal on which there was consensus with respect to this review. In summary, all countries wanted a strengthened FAO, a lead agency in world agriculture and an Organization with increased efficiency which is able to face the challenges of the 1990s and beyond.

I have some reservations as to your level of success for the forecasting of this debate, as you have indicated, chapter by chapter. It has to be understood that final comments and ultimate positions of delegations will, to some extent, follow Ministers' statements and further exchanges of views amongst delegates. This delegation is in agreement with the views and recommendations on FAO's roles and functions. In particular we wish to underline the emphasis given to technical assistance. The problems of food and agriculture, the data we have on hunger and starvation in the context of expanding populations and environmental degradation, do not provide support for any suggestion that this Organization be allowed to entertain directions indicating a shift of technical assistance towards greater emphasis on information gathering and analysis.

However, we are not denying the importance of these activities. Yes, we support FAO's activity and role with respect to global information and policy advice, but not at the expense of technical assistance.

In a recent issue of Time magazine, there was an article concerning the problems of development of a particular developing country. There was a photograph accompanying this article. On one side there is an individual with all indications of wealth - jewelry, etc. - surrounded by three well-dressed servants - an indication that perhaps on the other side, maybe across the valley are large numbers of people under seriously disadvantaged circumstances. If, for example, FAO were sending a mission to such a country, it would not be difficult to determine who would be happy to proceed with lengthy discussions on policy and general information. But, we can surely understand what will happen when we approach the millions who are under disadvantaged conditions - perhaps even tell them "let's go back to the rural countryside and discuss policy matters".

Let me emphasize that this delegation does not negate the significance of policy advice in the medium and long term. We feel very strongly that paragraphs 2.16 to 2.20 of Chapter 2 are very important. A number of developing countries are now reeling under the heavy hand of structural adjustment, regardless of which agency, or agencies working in concert, demand a direct structural adjustment or the situation may originate on the basis of internal national analysis and prescription. It is perhaps inevitable in many instances, that is to say without an alternative, but the constant here is one of strategy. Even the international institutions accept deficiency in the packages they have imposed and further accept the need to modify or adjust their adjustment recommendations.

Given the significance of the food and agriculture sector on the lives of the majority of the people in many of our countries, and the negative impact experienced in many countries as a result of maladjusted strategies, or badly managed implementation, it is easy to understand why we are already late with FAO's contribution to design, management and monitoring of such strategies.

I will make a few brief comments on the research and transfer of technology, not only in developing countries because the developed countries also need assistance in this area. We all need the knowledge of FAO with both feet on the ground. For example, yesterday we witnessed Mr Bonte-Friedheim, the Assistant Director-General, provide some corrective and timely technical backstopping to one delegation on important technical matters such as biotechnology, mutation, breeding, etc.

FAO's activity also provides considerable information and guidance for the bilateral programmes of some countries. I would like to make a supplementary comment on agricultural research, namely, the developing countries need a neutral hand in the matter of research, coordination and guidance. The developed countries are contributing, and with a recognized degree of generosity, to the international agricultural research centres. However, the fact is that many of these countries have surpluses today.

On my way here (through London) I saw an entire page of a major newspaper taken up with comments on what was felt perhaps to be a dismantling (maybe "rationalization" would have been a better word) of various research stations and related programmes in agriculture. Some of these countries are at the point where they have to take land out of food production. As I said before, they are surplus producers. Also, and there is no need to raise eyebrows at what I am going to say, one of the world's most renowned agricultural economists of a highly respected institute in the United States, John Mellor, suggested two years ago that as a result of serious food surpluses, developed countries may well not be willing to continue allocating resources generously to agricultural research in developing countries. This underlines the importance of FAO to

developing countries in many areas of research, including bio-technology. Imagine, if we are not careful we will soon have to send our orders for large quantities of plant and material for use in developing countries to cultural laboratories in developed countries. This would include coffee, cocoa, oil palm and even our own indigenous ornamental plants. All we want to ensure is that research progress is not moving in one direction.

It cannot be overemphasized that research technology and related areas are crucial areas of activity for strengthening FAO's programme of work. In those circumstances one can understand that while we must accept the importance of priorities and the focusing of our activities, ultimately we must leave the Organization with considerable flexibility in order to deal with the diversity of requests.

Therefore, in summary, this delegation is supportive of the recommendations of the Programme and Finance Committees. The problem, of course, is the task of the Director-General in carrying the Organization forward in the absence of adequate financial support. Over the past few days the Director-General has been called all kinds of names, - "financial juggler" - and yesterday someone called him a "special kind of UN housewife". But, as the distinguished delegate from Australia pointed out yesterday, we have come to the end of the road of belt tightening. The show is almost over. Let us hope that ultimately our delegations can open up their minds to the reality of the situation. Let us not unduly quote diversionary procedures by any name such as groups, special resolutions, etc. Let us deal with the report.

At this time our delegation is very supportive of the recommendations of the Committees. It has been almost two years in the making. Let us give it a good try. We must compliment the two committees on the level of consensus reached in the conclusion, and the recommendations are indeed very revealing. The Council has also benefited considerably from the hard work and continuous advice and views of the Director-General. Hopefully, flexibility and a generosity of spirit will move us forward in the Conference to the desired consensus.

João Augusto DE MEDICIS (Brazil): I can be very brief as I would be ready and willing to propose that this Council adopts this report and endorses its recommendations by consensus. We are sure that the other delegations which participated in the preparation of the report will share my position as it was by consensus that the SJS agreed on this report after lengthy and detailed analysis of the issue, following an equally detailed analysis of the study by the experts. The result is a positive one, as expected, and the SJS concluded that rather than reducing we should enlarge the scope and activities of the FAO.

Nevertheless, let me say a few words on this chapter to note that the Review, which aims at the strengthening of FAO, supports the roles, strategies and priorities of the Organization as expressed by our founding fathers and implemented in the last 45 years.

A special reference could be made to the importance that developing countries attach to their essential role, as stated in the report, of providing technical assistance. This is a major role, if not the major role of our Organization. This is a role that directly affects the lives of hundreds of millions of destitute people in the Third World.

Special attention should also be given to the process and criteria for priority setting. We should take into account that, to use the experts' words, "decisions on priorities take several factors into account", and are therefore very difficult to reach.

The Committee was particularly careful in drafting this recommendation as most members considered that priority setting required a deep analysis and should not be interpreted as yet another excuse to reduce the scarce resources available to development activities of the Organization.

To conclude, we are prepared to support the recommendations contained in paragraph 2.64 of the chapter. We expect that this Council will find it possible to convey them to the Conference with its positive evaluation.

Finally, on the United Kingdom proposal, we believe that we should wait for the discussion by the Conference. The United Kingdom representative himself rightly pointed out that we should hear the views of those countries which are not members of the Council. In any case, I do not believe that we have much time as the Conference is starting in three days.

LE PRESIDENT: Avant de passer la parole au prochain orateur je demande instamment aux délégués qui vont prendre la parole maintenant de bien vouloir prendre position sur les recommandations inscrites dans le Rapport du Comité conjoint; je souhaiterai qu'ils nous disent s'il y a des recommandations sur lesquelles ils ne sont pas d'accord, car il faut que dans le Rapport final nous sachions quels sont les points sur lesquels il y a des réserves.

David COUTTS (Australia): Mr Chairman, I shall certainly try to confine my remarks as you have suggested. In speaking I think I will follow the example of other delegates and cover the whole spectrum of what I wish to say on this report, although I was prepared to go along with your earlier ruling and take it section by section. However, as I have heard almost nobody conform to that suggestion I think it is right that we do it the other way.

Australia gives high priority to the matters covered by this report. Indeed, we think it is of the utmost importance, along with the 1990-91 Programme of Work and Budget, and the decisions made by the Twenty-fifth Conference should set the scene for FAO for years to come.

In broad terms, we can accept the SJS report. We do not fully agree with every point made in it, but on the whole we accept it as a good compromise for the disparate viewpoints that had to be brought together. It would be remiss of me if I did not say at this point that I feel the reports of the two expert groups were of immense help to those of us on the SJS. I should like to thank those who participated in those groups for the excellent work that they did. In particular, I would pay tribute to the two rapporteurs, Dr Faaland of Norway and Mr Sastry of India. I would also thank most sincerely the Director-General and the Secretariat for the help and cooperation that was given throughout this process. I will not dwell on those points because others have mentioned them, but having been in the SJS I really felt that I had to say that.

I also have to say the job done by the two Chairmen and the approach and attitude of all other members of the group was exemplary in my view. That is why we managed to reach a report that I think gives the Council and the Conference the opportunity to agree on something worthwhile out of this exercise. I would add that one of the reasons why I think we reached near consensus was that we did confine our focus pretty carefully to the matters under review, and I was very pleased to hear the suggestions earlier that the Council, and hopefully later the Conference, might follow that example in how to orientate their remarks, because if we can confine ourselves fairly closely to the sorts of issues in the mandate of 1987 we may manage to find a way through.

While we can accept the SJS report on a whole there are some particular points in it which I should like to underline.

One, while the report endorses the major objectives in paragraph 2.6 and the sub-objectives as mentioned in paragraph 2.7, it is agreed in paragraph 2.8 that nonetheless the Organization must carefully choose its specific programmes and activities, because the justifiable needs and objectives of members will far exceed the possibilities of the programme. To us this underlines our view that for efficiency and effectiveness even more careful selectivity must be exercised by FAO in the formulation of its programmes.

Secondly, we fully endorse the three major roles of FAO set out in paragraph 2.9, that is, information, promotion of action and technical assistance. A number of delegates have commented on those roles. In a sense, I think it is understandable that somewhat more emphasis is generally given to the technical assistance role by the developing countries which have spoken. After all, while countries like my own openly acknowledge and endorse what is in the report on the importance of technical assistance in terms of direct impact on us, it is the information role and perhaps special action roles that are most important. In a sense, the fact that we were trying in this report to give a balanced view or a fairly even-handed view of these three roles does reflect the sort of consensus building that we had to do, because the positions countries are coming from are a little different. I think what we have to get out of that is that everybody agrees that technical assistance is very important. That point should not be lost in disagreements about the relative merits.

Thirdly, we fully endorse the support for FAO's policy analysis and advisory role set out in paragraphs 2.15 to 2.20. We would only underline the point in paragraph 2.20 that FAO must speak out when it sees scope for improvements in policies that bear on objectives to which assistance is being provided. This implies to us that FAO needs to do more than merely respond to requests from individual countries for advice, especially in conducting appropriate analysis on a global or perhaps regional basis so that it can help countries to put their own policy objectives in the appropriate global context.

Four, this implies to us that FAO must be prepared to comment on the policies of both developed and developing countries. For example, we consider it pointless to advise developing countries to develop agricultural export industries when world markets for those products are distorted by protectionist policies of other countries.

Five, in this connection we are pleased to see the endorsement of FAO's role in supporting development of free trade, as set out in paragraph 2.38.

Six, we agree strongly that FAO has a very important continuity role in helping countries realize the potential of the results of agricultural research and in facilitating basic research in areas where it is needed. This is set out in paragraphs 2.21 and 2.23. We also fully endorse the special emphasis that should be given to the emerging area of biotechnology, as mentioned in paragraph 2.24, to help ensure that the potential benefits are effectively shared by developing countries. That comment applies to other emerging areas of research and technology.

Seven, we strongly endorse the support for FAO's role in promoting sustainable development and environmental protection, and commend the views set out in paragraph 2.35.

Eight, we are a little less certain about the merits of a formal medium-term plan. I know that we are perhaps a little out of agreement with some other countries on that. This was an area that the SJS had some difficulty with, especially in relation to the effort involved in such an exercise and the way it might be linked to the resources necessary to carry out the priorities which would be identified. However, we are prepared to go along with a consensus to try this approach.

Nine, in relation to the setting of priorities, we support the use of the guidelines set out in paragraph 2.54.

Ten, we support continuation of the additional stage in the preparation of the Programme of Work and Budget. I would want to think a little more about the Director-General's suggestion, but I do thank him for offering that thought because we need to think about the most efficient way to run the whole process, and it may be possible in a sense to combine the May and January parts of this.

Eleven, in relation to Trust Fund activities, we endorse the view in paragraph 3.23 that FAO must be even more selective in its choice of projects to ensure that its support facilities are not stretched beyond the level at which they can cope effectively.

Twelve, as concerns TCP, we agree that it should be retained as a vital element in FAO's programme, but cannot agree that this necessarily implies significant increases in resources for TCP. The arguments on this point are set out in paragraph 3.32.

Lastly, we would have liked to see the establishment of a new committee to overview the field programmes. We feel that existing bodies will have some difficulty in finding the time and expertise to carry out this task, which we feel needs strengthening in an adequate fashion. However, again in the interests of consensus, we agreed in the report to join a consensus to try out the proposals set out in paragraph 3.42, which would give this extra responsibility to the existing committees.

In relation to the recommendations in the report for strengthening the Organization, we are prepared to join a consensus that supports pursuit of these ideas. However, we do not accept that this necessarily implies an increase in overall resources. In our view, most of these initiatives must be taken up by reallocation of existing priorities. We know that this approach is a painful one for many, but in present and foreseeable budgetary circumstances we feel that it would be quite unrealistic to expect any other approach.

I would just add that to me this is the critical and focal point of what the Council and the Conference has to do. It is where this whole process could come unstuck. There is a quite remarkable degree of agreement, consensus and flexibility being shown on what is in the SJS reports, but if that leads us to some sort of enforced supplementary assessment to pay for these things, then I really fear for the implications and ramifications of that. That is not a threat; it is just a fear. We have a situation at the moment where many members of this Organization are unable or unwilling to pay their contributions. Without mentioning names, I would say that some of the members who have spoken strongly about increasing the resources are members who have not been able to pay.

I do not quite see the sense in the Organization then voting itself an extra 26 million dollars, or whatever, to carry out these proposals. I think another way has got to be found. If agreement can be reached on additional funds then that is very good, but unfortunately I do not see the sign. I do not know what solutions there are. I have been looking closely at what the Director-General has been proposing, although his proposals are all couched in terms of additional resources - and I understand fully his position there. As I said before, the show is nearly over in terms of juggling. However, maybe there are some other ideas. I do not know. I do not know whether it may be possible to consider some sort of appeal; if member countries really feel that extra funds are needed to do these things, then perhaps some sort of voluntary contribution could be called for, and we could see how many countries are prepared to back up what they say. Anyway, that is something which has to be discussed a lot more.

In relation to the Management Review, we consider there are many good ideas put forward by the Consultants. Many of these ideas are technical in nature. The SJS looked at them quite thoroughly, but felt that at this stage it would be better to keep that consideration on a fairly broad basis and to seek further in-depth consideration as the next biennium progresses, and we fully support that approach. We do think there are some very good ideas in there, many of them involving more money as well. We would strongly support, nonetheless, that the Director-General, with the assistance of perhaps the Finance Committee in the main, would continue to look at those.

If the Conference endorses the proposals in the SJS Report, we feel that the other really critical point is the process that we follow from now on. I do not want to go over the same ground as one or two of the other delegates have gone over, except to say that I am very concerned that if we wait until Commission II convenes, is one or two days into its discussion on this item - we really are very short of time to find the sort of compromises and consensus that we are going to need to get a good result on this, a result that is going to be positive and build towards a more harmonious and more effective Organization in coming years.

Therefore, we would support some process between now and when Commission II actually meets, to try at least to draw out the ideas that people have on what sort of resolution the Conference might take up. This does not need to be a formal process. I personally think a contact group or a discussion group or something would be the right way to do it. However, perhaps, that could be worked out when something is decided, but I do feel very strongly that some process is needed. I am quite perplexed at the opposition to that suggestion. I really fail completely to understand the logic of the objections. We have got to come to that point eventually. I predict that the general tenor of what will happen in the Conference will be very similar to what has happened here. That is not to belittle what happens in the Conference, of course, and some additional ideas probably will emerge, but at least the core of it will be similar to what we have heard here today.

I have just one last comment, Mr Chairman. Some comments have been made about the fact that this Review has cost us 2 million dollars. All that has done is to show us what we - that is some particular delegations - know anyway. I must say that I object very strongly to that line of thinking. Of course, it is up to the delegations concerned to hold that view, but I really think that to push that line of thinking is most counter-productive. Of course, this process was not exactly as everybody wanted it. The Resolution that was adopted in 1987 was not the Resolution some countries wanted. It was a compromise. Therefore, presumably the result is somewhat deficient in certain ways to what they were looking for. I feel, however, that what has come out of it has, in many ways, been very, very useful. It has identified a large number of things which, while they do not demonstrate any fundamental problem with FAO, I think are very positive in increasing FAO's efficiency and helping it to play its role more effectively in the future. I think also, if we can find the right approach through the Council and the Conference, It will help very much in building the sort of harmony and consensus that we are going to need in coming years. That is the very sharp edge that we are walking on, Mr Chairman. I do hope that we can find the right answer to that.

That is all I want to say, thank you very much, Mr Chairman.

LE PRESIDENT: Je remercie le Délégué de l'Australie pour les réponses qu'il a apportées aux différents points du rapport.

Effectivement, je crois que la meilleure formule est que les Délégués parlent de l'ensemble du rapport puisqu'il y a des interactions. Cela leur permet de développer l'ensemble de leurs idées notamment sur le problème des ressources qui est très important pour éclairer la suite des événements.

Ilja HULINSKY (Czechoslovakia): Mr. Chairman, Czechoslovakia has approached the review process of Certain Aspects of FAO's Goals and Operations currently being undertaken in accordance with the general Conference decision from the three following propositions.

Firstly, we respect the spirit and letter of Resolution 6/87 of the Twenty-fourth Session of the FAO Conference. That is why we have been waiting for the joint official report of the Programme and Finance Committees, as well as for the views and comments of the Director-General, to take our position on the substantive questions of the Review on the basis of their recommendations to the Council and to the Conference.

Secondly, we consider it indispensable that all the emerging problems of the review process must be grasped within the framework of the whole Organization, and within its Constitution.

Thirdly, we take it for granted that the positive results of the review process could be reached only in seeking a collective solution of all the problems relating to the present exercise, in close cooperation with all FAO Member Nations. We sincerely share the notion that the central objective of the review process is to strengthen the FAO so as to increase its capacity and effectiveness.

We strongly hope that the wide-ranging consensus which has emerged within the Programme and Finance Committees, while drafting the final Joint Report, would be maintained through the deliberations of both the Council and the Twenty-fifth Session of the FAO Conference.

In saying that, I would like to add that, throughout all the review exercise, we have been opposing the unconstitutional approach that has been trying to influence the results of the review process by financial pressure. The Czechoslovak contribution to FAO's budget is much higher than that to other Specialized UN Agencies. We strictly fulfill our financial obligations, but we would not make an inter-connection between our constitutional duties and the outcome of the deliberations in FAO, although we do have our problems and difficulties within the present structure of FAO and its functioning, issues to which we would like to seek a satisfactory reaction.

Mr. Chairman, let me turn now to the document under discussion. The Czechoslovak delegation shares the basic conclusion of the Programme and Finance Committees that follows from the Joint Report, namely that the main orientation of the FAO's Goals and Operations, that the FAO's constitutional and programme documents remain relevant and valid, and that there is no need for their substantive, far-reaching changes. We do agree in general with that. That does not mean that we oppose in principle the possibilities of particular changes, if needed. Quite the contrary; as I have already mentioned, we too see issues to which we should like to seek the solution inter alia.

The Czechoslovak delegation subscribes to the point of view expressed by many delegations, that FAO, as one of the important agencies in environmental matters, should continue to give consideration to sustainable agriculture, and that there is a need for a more concrete definition of the very concept of sustainable development to be included in the Basic Texts.

The Czechoslovak delegation subscribes to the ever-increasing interest to the fundamental principle, that of just rotation and balanced geographic representation in all FAO organs and bodies. We support the Brazilian initiative, looking for a review and redefinition of the politico-geographic groupings prevailing in FAO to be in conformity with the usual groupings in all the UN system. We also see an urgent need for tackling the issue of drafting the most desirable means of achieving the objective of just representation of all various regional systems on all the main bodies of our Organization, that of more equitable representation among the countries constituting each region when electing the main FAO Committees. The Czechoslovak delegation is also of the opinion that more energetic steps should be taken by the Director-General to ensure the principle of the equitable geographic distribution of FAO's Professional staff, both at Headquarters and in the Field.

The Czechoslovak delegation strongly supports the position of the Group of 77 that FAO should strengthen its Field Programme and thus improve its efficiency and effectiveness. We do share the concern of the Group of 77 countries that, without an active and world-wide field programme, FAO would become merely an academic institution. As a matter of fact, Czechoslovakia has always supported the just interests of developing countries in safeguarding the importance and essentiality of FAO's technical assistance role, in FAO providing a variety of growing technical assistance to them, and we will continue to do so in the future. Czechoslovakia considers it desirable that FAO activities be further oriented towards the objectives of the New Economic Order in FAO's field of competence. As a result of the review exercise, FAO can and should play an enhanced role in this respect.

Having stated our position of principle, it does not mean that we do not see the necessity of making other FAO activities more sound and useful, in the European region for example. The Czechoslovak delegation supports all of those delegations who would like to see that the forthcoming FAO European Regional Conference in Venice should concentrate on the task of making the activities of the Regional Office for Europe more effective and, as a matter of fact, of making all FAO's regional activities in Europe more effective. At the same time, we have to stress, once again, the necessity of closer coordination of the FAO's European activities with those of the UN Economic Commission for Europe in the field of agriculture and nutrition. Allow me to mention here just en passant, that Czechoslovakia has proposed to host in Prague, the next 18th European Regional Conference to be held in 1992.

To the Czechoslovak delegation are acceptable to the conclusions of the Programme and Finance Committees that FAO's practice of priority-setting is adequate and that it normally allows for Member States to be consulted in good time, separately in each region and collectively in technical committees and in the governing body. We have endorsed the nine priority areas outlined in the Programme of Work and Budget for 1990-91, the selected priorities being obviously based on analysis of such extensive consultation. Having listened to the statement of the distinguished representative of India, we would like to subscribe to his well-taken remarks on the problem of priority setting. We share his point of view that the order in which the priorities are listed in the PWB does not apply necessarily to the order of their preference. We share also his doubt on usefulness of applying these priorities rigidly to all the FAO's activities worldwide.

The Czechoslovak delegation supports the notion of the Nordic countries that there should be greater involvement of the member countries in the FAO's decision-making process as well as increased cooperation of FAO's activities with other UN bodies. Let us face it, certain problems do exist in the present decision-making processes in FAO; within the FAO's main organs and governing bodies. We have to deal with the problems if we take seriously the task of making all the FAO more effective. We share also the opinion that new efforts should be undertaken to ensure better coordination of FAO activities with other UN specialized agencies to minimize the duplication of work and to secure the best use of resources. We subscribe to the view that FAO Regional Offices should work in close relations with the UN Regional Commissions. We understand the concern expressed by the group of Nordic countries, that FAO countries offices' resources are spent too broadly and we understand also their suggestion for a redefinition of the role of the FAO Representatives.

We are open to further discussions as for the mechanism, how all this can be achieved, especially, how to achieve the greater involvement of member countries in the FAO decision-making process. For example, we share the opinion that the new arrangement proposed by the Programme and Finance Committees for discussions on field operations by the governing bodies should be approached as an experiment to be refined on the basis of experience. We have taken note of the suggestion of setting up a field inspection unit to reinforce the evaluation service and focusing mainly on project management. The idea, recommended by the Programme and Finance Committees, that of reintroduction of medium term covering three biennia, deserves also to be approached seriously. But, as a matter of principle, we are of the opinion that any decision concerning an improved mechanism of FAO's decision-making process should be taken in full conformity with the present FAO Constitution; should not involve extensive financial implications; and last but not least, should ensure the implementation of the just geographical representation.

It is not the intention of the Czechoslovak delegation to comment on other ideas and many concrete suggestions contained both in the extensive detailed Joint Report of the Programme and Finance Committees and that of the Director-General at this stage. We need not to comment now on the recommendations of the so-called FAO Management Review, provided by various private consultants either. There is nothing in all of those documents we would principally oppose, though there are certain concrete ideas and recommendations we do not necessarily share or on which we could differ either on their interpretation or on suggested ways and means of their implementation. Just in the case of the so-called FAO Management Review, my delegation would like to put into the records that we do not see justification for the future, to waste FAO resources in engaging private agencies on tasks that can be easily fulfilled in a qualified manner by the relevant FAO organs and bodies.

Before concluding, let me repeat, that Czechoslovakia is very much interested in the positive result of the current review of certain aspects of FAO's goals and operations. FAO, as a living organism, is certainly in need of periodical "check-ups" and in need of regularly adjusting itself to the demands of changing times. It goes without saying that the basic questions of the constitutional goals of FAO, as well as those of orientation of its programmes and operations, of its structure and methods of functioning, do belong to the exclusive competence of the Member

As regards the very important item, namely sustainable development, the Federal Government is of the opinion that in the future FAO must become more active, and we fully endorse the activities suggested in the several reports. In this regard, the Federal Government does not hold the view that a state of competition exists between sustainable development and food production. In our opinion there is a long-term positive trade-off between the careful use of natural resources and a sustained improvement of the living standard of many people especially in the rural areas of this world.

In our view FAO's field work must be concentrated to a greater extent on the real core area of the activities of FAO. The individual trust fund offers and requests for aid of single countries which do not fall fully within the mandate of FAO, should be discussed with other potential implementing agencies in order to ensure that the relevant projects are implemented by the Organization with the greatest project-related expertise.

The expert group II also notes that Member States are inadequately informed about FAO's field work. Therefore, we suggest measures be taken in order to increase the information flow to interested member countries. It was also stated that project quality and implementation speed must be the most important criteria for field operations. We wholeheartedly agree with this point.

The development of FAO's activities, from our point of view, should be realized within the framework of proper medium-term planning, especially concerning priorities of the Organization. For this reason it is desirable to draw up a rolling six-year plan which reports on new priorities as well as on the deletion of completed programmes.

This review process started in November 1987 with Resolution 6/87. We expect that it will come to its conclusion through another resolution which, in our opinion, is one of the main tasks of the forthcoming Conference. However, such a resolution will only be of practical value if it is carried by the broadest possible consensus amongst the members. To achieve this consensus will certainly not be an easy task. Considering the circumstances and the workload before us, we would welcome our Council's recommendation to the Conference that from the beginning of the discussions in Commission II a group of interested countries be formed in order to discuss elements for a draft resolution for consideration by the Commission and finally the Conference.

Tawfik Ahmed Hassan AL MESHEDANI (Iraq) (original language Arabic): I would like to thank the Director-General for the concise manner in which he presented the reports of the Programme and Finance Committees. I would also like to thank the members of the Programme and Finance Committees as well as the Chairmen of those two Committees for their great efforts in arriving at the conclusions, recommendations and proposals which have been presented to us. We are especially satisfied because we have completed this Review in the allotted time. This Review has been prepared according to Resolution 6/87. All the conclusions therein point to the fact that the objectives of the Organization follow the guidelines of the Organization as far as concerns food.

The Organization's role is always to work in an efficient manner, and this is the opinion of the experts as far as concerns the well-being of this Organization. The Review has concluded with positive results in order to consolidate the Organization's role as well as its efficiency. Consolidation of this role is the reason why we have arrived at a consensus in order to adopt Resolution 6/87. We should also arrive at consensus on matters which might lead to the strengthening of the guidelines of this Organization. For that reason we have approved the conclusions, recommendations and proposals which the two Committees have made to us, as well as comments made by the Director-General.

The methods used to reach consensus should not be used to waste time and undermine the Conference objectives. We should follow the Organization's rules closely. I do not wish to go into the detail of the review as my country's delegation will make a statement on this subject at the Conference. However, I should like to point out the various roles of the Organization which interact with each other. We think that technical assistance is closely linked by two other aims of the Organization through field operations. The Organization can put its objectives and aims into practice and it is the practical laboratory for converting words into deeds. It enriches our objectives and, for this reason, we think that the Technical Cooperation Programme is so important and it should have more funds. We also think that the role of aid and technical assistance should be strengthened rather than weakened for any reason. The recommendations of the two Committees require a large amount of funds. This fact cannot be ignored. We can accept

the idea that this should be financed from the ordinary budget. This might have a negative impact on the programmes of the various countries. On the other hand we think we should try and obtain additional funds outside the budget which might allow developed countries to play a modern role in showing their support for these programmes.

The Director-General's proposals are very important because they deal with the Organization's role in providing aid to developing countries and the need to coordinate with activities carried out by other organizations. We also believe it is important to increase efficiency and therefore we would like to say that we approve the proposals made by the Director-General and we think that the general Conference will, hopefully, take the right decision on this subject.

LE PRESIDENT: Avant de passer la parole au prochain orateur, je me permets de vous signaler que nous avons encore 17 délégués inscrits: Lesotho, Malaisie, Suisse, Philippines, Italie, Mexique, Canada, Guinée, Etats-Unis d'Amérique, Liban, Gabon, Colombie, Congo, Algérie, Inde, Indonésie, Kenya.

Il me semble qu'il faudrait donner la parole à ceux qui ne l'ont pas encore prise. L'honorable délégué du Royaume-Uni a demandé la parole, ainsi que l'Argentine, le Nicaragua et l'Arabie Saoudite.

R.G. PETTITT (United Kingdom): I have one simple point which I did not have occasion to raise in my earlier intervention. It will not take a minute at the end.

LE PRESIDENT: J'insiste à nouveau sur l'intérêt à ce que les délégués nous fassent savoir s'ils sont d'accord ou pas sur tout ou partie des recommandations du rapport car, lorsque nous allons transmettre le rapport final à la Conférence, il faut qu'on y retrouve nos observations et commentaires. Il faut absolument que nous connaissions vos observations, et sur le contenu du rapport, et sur les observations du Directeur général.

M.A. LETEKA (Lesotho): First, will you allow my delegation to make an observation that when the idea of a review was first introduced in the last Conference it seemed to suggest that there were very serious loopholes in the FAO which, as we were made to understand, resulted from the inefficiencies and incompetence of those in a position of authority in the FAO. Even though many Member States opposed at that time the idea of a review for reform of FAO suggested by those who were Member States, they did so with all honesty and determination to preserve the dynamism of this Organization. Nothing, we hope, could suggest that those Member States acted in a desperate vein, since they were all developing countries, to oppose any authority thereof. Instead, they were a group of sovereign states who always jealously guarded the survival of this Organization which is engaged in the struggle to eradicate the vagaries of malnutrition and hunger.

As we gather here today to discuss this issue again, my delegation is more than convinced of the need for Member States to rededicate their commitment to uphold the ideals of FAO.

The exercise of the Review of FAO is over, and it is now this Council's duty to recommend to Conference that the proposals by the two Committees and the Group of Experts could be implemented without suggesting any further adjustments to the Programme of Work and Budget for 1990-91.

We are all agreed on the critical financial position now facing our Organization. We would hope that there will be constructive suggestions from the proponents of the review, and willingness to arrive at consensus on the basis of what is reported in the document before us.

We wish to congratulate the two Committees and the Group of Experts on a job well done. We also appreciate the constructive and solid comments of the Director-General which have above all suggested possible lines of action on the findings of the Group of Experts. My country supports the notion that FAO should always act as a lead agency and coordinate all activities in its field of competence, especially considering its long-standing experience in activities which have a bearing on agricultural development. It is a well known fact that the contribution of FAO to the welfare of the poor in developing countries goes beyond the principle of multilateralism. This is why the Indispensability and importance of FAO's technical assistance role cannot be over emphasized.

Many developing countries, including Lesotho, have from the beginning of the 1980s been forced to pursue the painful but necessary - according to the sponsors - process of structural adjustment against the background of general economies characterized by massive debts, unemployment, irrelevant agricultural and economic policies and other related negative factors. We are expected to rejuvenate and revive our economies at all costs without paying attention to or considering elements of environmental concerns which in essence could threaten our resource base. FAO has since advised us that this development can be sustained for it to have effective and long lasting results. Of course, this would mean extra-budgetary resources over and above those given by the IMF and the World Bank. We believe that it is the FAO which should get directly involved in the policy guidance and assessment of possible costs required in order to integrate environmental concerns into development projects of developing countries.

We believe that this and many others, including women in development, priority setting, development in biotechnology and TCDC operations fall within the sphere of competence of FAO, and it is right to participate in all the round-tables; formulation and implementation stages should be respected.

My delegation would like to conclude by putting on record that even as we agree with the findings and recommendations of the Group of Experts, and all those who are involved in this critical exercise, we would oppose any moves which would suggest that the implementation be based on the proposed Programme of Work and Budget for 1990-91. At the same time, we would like to assure you of our flexibility where reasonable proposals are made.

Bahar MUNIP (Malaysia): I should like to take this opportunity to thank Professor Mazoyer for his introduction and Doctor Saouma for his views and proposals relating to the review. I shall try my best to follow the format that you have suggested, Mr Chairman, in the following intervention, that is FAO's objectives and roles, field operations and so on.

My delegation is happy to note that the Committees recognized that the activities of the Organization and the objectives it pursued were in uniformity with its mandate and that it fulfilled, within the limitations of its means, the three major roles of information, coordination and technical assistance which were assigned to it. We are fully supportive of these three major roles. The activities carried out by FAO all along confirmed the validity of these objectives.

We are happy to note that the Committees underlined the importance of the request for strengthening FAO's role as expressed in the Review reports and that these requests are justified considering the present situation in developing countries and the foreseeable trend. We wish to underline the recommendation that means be sought to ensure the necessity of strengthening FAO to face future challenges and that FAO should play the leading role in agriculture, at present and in the future.

Permit me now to refer to some specific points.

My delegation agrees with the proposal that FAO promote actively sustainable development aimed not only at conserving national resources but at improving them. Malaysia has been very concerned with the impact of agricultural activities on the environment and sustainable development, on soil degradation, on water pollution, on the greenhouse effect, on acid rain and on the need to protect the flora and fauna of treasured tropical rain forests. In this respect, my delegation wishes to inform the Council that in the recent Commonwealth Governments' meeting in Kuala Lumpur at the beginning of this month we initiated the formulation of the "Langkawi Declaration on the Environment" which could form the basis of international dialogue globally, both north and south, on the question of environmental preservation and sustainable development.

Apart from the above we are fully supportive of the recommendation that attention should also be given to biotechnology, genetic resources, an appropriate funding system and to modernize agriculture through TCDC.

Regarding FAO's role in relationship with GATT, the Director-General dealt at length with the increasing scientific role that is to be played in GATT. Malaysia had the privilege of attending some of the GATT meetings and Codex Alimentarius in Geneva in July. It was proposed that FAO should be one of the reference points in terms of sanitary and phytosanitary and other similar

trade disputes. Apart from these scientific reference points which deserve our full support, FAO should in our opinion positively assist developing countries in their negotiations with GATT and speak out, loud and clear, against protectionism, against trade distortion, against market inaccessibility, and against other measures which prohibit trade from developing countries.

While still on the subject of objectives and roles at FAO, we agree with the Committees' comment that the format used in the preparation of the 1990-91 Programme of Work and Budget be used for some time yet, so that its value can be judged over a longer period of time.

The Committees also stress the importance of new project identification and that FAO provide more training for national personnel in this field. My delegation fully supports this recommendation. But what about the training of the trainers themselves? What about training of the FAO staff themselves? This does not mean in any way questioning the competence of FAO staff; indeed, far from it. Should FAO be dependent on external sources all the time in fulfilling this training obligation?

The best asset that any organization can have is human resources. It is very important therefore that these human resources be developed at all times in order to cope with the latest demand in technology and similar fields. Staff training is a priority activity involving considerable expenditure conducted by both the private and public sectors world wide. It comes as a surprise therefore to our delegation that we in the governing body have neglected this very important role for the benefit of the Organization. My delegation therefore finds it pertinent to lend support to the suggestion made this morning that allocation be made for staff training. We believe it is fully justifiable.

Could I turn my attention to field operations? The Committees have identified a number of measures to strengthen their effectiveness for the benefit of member countries. We are happy to note that the Organization has carried out its technical assistance functions, thus contributing directly to the efforts of member countries in their development programmes, budget constraints permitting. We therefore find no difficulty in accepting the recommendations made by the Committees to ensure the effectiveness of the field programmes: among others, that TCP should continue, that the field inspection unit in the Evaluation Service be strengthened, that government participation be encouraged through training and so on.

My delegation is also happy to note that the Committee stressed, on the basis of its comparative advantages and experience, that FAO must be recognized as the leading agency and coordinator for the sectoral and sub-sectoral reviews in the field of food and agriculture. FAO should be represented in all multilateral coordination meetings, and the working relationship between FAO and other international agencies, both within the UN system or otherwise should be strengthened.

Implementation of the review will involve financial considerations and this should not be extracted from within the existing resources which are already far over-stretched, as we already realize from yesterday's discussion. It is at this juncture that my delegation feels that the concept of medium-term planning be given due consideration. The Organization could choose among all the recommendations and implement them in stages depending on the availability of resources.

Finally, Malaysia wishes to stress that if members want FAO to continue to be a dynamic and solid institution, then they should be confident in the Organization, should provide the support needed and should strive to ensure that it is able to play its mandatory role.

Roger PASQUIER (Suisse): Permettez-moi une remarque préliminaire inspirée par ce qu'a dit le Représentant de l'Allemagne fédérale.

Le Parlement suisse a décidé récemment aussi de soumettre l'ensemble de notre administration à un examen, en vue de réformes, assuré par une firme internationale de consultants. Ceci à l'exemple d'un exercice effectué avec succès pour la ville de Zurich qui a conduit à de grandes améliorations.

Cela dit, je voudrais revenir au sujet de notre débat. Les propositions de réforme que notre Conseil examine en ce moment doivent être considérées dans la perspective de l'évolution des besoins des 20 années à venir. Cela n'empêche qu'elles comportent des mesures qui sont applicables les unes à bref délai, les autres graduellement, d'autres peut-être à titre expérimental. En tout cas, une organisation dynamique comme doit l'être la FAO doit faire preuve d'une certaine hardiesse. Les organes directeurs de notre Organisation auront toujours l'autorité d'ajuster ou de remplacer certaines mesures le moment venu, à la lumière de l'expérience.

Par ailleurs, les propositions qui nous sont soumises doivent être examinées en ayant toujours à l'esprit la relation input-output, c'est-à-dire le plus grand service à rendre aux pays membres par million de dollars dépensé.

En Suisse, les instances concernées ont examiné le rapport du Comité du Programme et du Comité des finances, les avis du Directeur général, ainsi que les rapports des experts. Ma délégation tient à remercier ici les auteurs de ces précieuses contributions.

Certaines mesures proposées par les deux Comités sont acceptables telles quelles à notre avis. D'autres vont dans la bonne direction, mais doivent être élaborées davantage pour être opérationnelles. Enfin, l'une ou l'autre de ces propositions divergent d'avec l'analyse suisse. Il y a également les propositions additionnelles du Directeur général sur lesquelles je reviendrai.

Dans le sens souhaité par l'Honorable Délégué du Pakistan, ma délégation voudrait exprimer de manière précise sa position sur les principaux points que nous avons à examiner.

Je voudrais m'arrêter d'abord à la recommandation qui émane du paragraphe 3.51 du rapport des deux Comités concernant le renforcement du rôle des Organes directeurs et des Comités concernés dans

l'orientation des programmes de terrain.

La Suisse avait proposé dans le même but, à la Conférence de 1987, la création d'un comité des programmes de terrain, solution que nous continuerions à préférer, mais nous trouvons acceptable la recommandation différente qui est faite par les deux Comités. Mais le contenu de cette recommandation doit être complété si l'on veut qu'il donne lieu à une décision qui soit vraiment opérationnelle. Je me permets du reste de présenter maintenant la position suisse au sujet de quelques recommandations des deux Comités sous la forme d'éléments de décision éventuelle de la Conférence, ce qui permet d'être plus concis. Il est clair que la Conférence décidera à la lumière de ses propres débats ce à quoi elle veut conclure.

Premièrement, le Conseil consacrera chaque année une semaine de sa session ordinaire exclusivement à l'examen, à l'ajustement, à l'approbation de politiques applicables aux programmes de terrain et aux relations avec les autres agences des Nations Unies et des donateurs en la matière.

Deuxièmement, les Comités de l'agriculture, des forêts, des pêches et de la sécurité alimentaire consacreront 30 pour cent de leur temps en moyenne à examiner dans leur sphère de compétence les programmes de terrain.

J'ouvre une parenthèse: vous voyez que j'introduis simplement ici une certaine quantification, au lieu de dire "ils porteront une attention particulière" car nous craignons que, si la décision est prise sous cette forme-là, elle risque de s'enliser en cours d'année tandis que, si elle est quantifiée, à notre avis, elle deviendra opérationnelle.

Troisièmement, les recommandations et conclusions synthétisées et commentées conjointement par le Comité du programme et le Comité financier, avec l'aide du Secrétariat sont soumises au Conseil.

Quatrièmement, le Comité du programme, assisté par le Secrétariat et si nécessaire par quelques experts, organisera le fonctionnement de ce système. L'éventuel recours à des experts ne dépassera pas trois mois au total. Là aussi, souci de quantifier.

Cinquièmement, des économies sur la durée totale des autres réunions de la FAO viendront compenser l'allongement des sessions du Conseil et l'éventuel allongement des sessions des autres organes susmentionnés.

Sixièmement, après deux bienniums, les organes directeurs examineront si les changements ainsi adoptés sont suffisants ou si d'autres mesures doivent être envisagées; par exemple, l'établissement d'un comité de programmes de terrain.

Septièmement, tous les deux ans, la Conférence procédera à un examen des programmes de terrain, comme cela a été fait jusqu'ici.

Ma délégation remettra volontiers ce texte à ceux qui désirent l'avoir.

Je vais maintenant aborder la question des priorités: en premier lieu, je voudrais dire que ma délégation se réjouit de constater que tout le monde souhaiterait un rôle renforcé de la FAO en matière de politiques agricoles et de développement rural. Ainsi, ma délégation approuve pleinement le paragraphe 2.20 du rapport des deux comités, qui résume leurs recommandations sur ce sujet.

Je voudrais, par ailleurs, appuyer la priorité recommandée par l'Espagne tout à l'heure concernant le rôle des organisations paysannes, et cela dans le cadre du suivi de la Conférence mondiale sur la réforme agraire et le développement rural. Mais les deux comités, en cinq passages de leur rapport, font référence à la nécessité de concentrer davantage l'ensemble des activités de la FAO sur des domaines prioritaires et ils proposent, à cet effet, des lignes directrices. Le Directeur général, dans ses commentaires, en juin dernier, nous a de son côté affirmé que lui aussi serait prêt à considérer un certain déplacement des efforts (*shifting*, en anglais) en faveur des domaines prioritaires mais qu'il fallait, pour cela, que les pays membres se mettent d'accord sur les priorités à réduire ou à supprimer.

Ayant à l'esprit ces avis que nous partageons, nous pensons que la Conférence devrait prendre une décision qui conduise à une concentration bien marquée et que le Conseil doit élaborer des propositions en ce sens, ou en tout cas enregistrer des propositions. C'est à cette fin que ma délégation désire présenter ici les éléments de décision que voici. Selon nous, il pourrait être décidé, premièrement, de réduire un certain pourcentage (ce n'est pas vraiment un projet de décision comme l'autre, c'est un peu plus conditionnel, comme vous le verrez, mais cela pourrait être transformé assez rapidement en un projet de décision), par exemple, 20 pour cent du nombre des activités au niveau des 310 éléments du chapitre 2 du Programme de travail et budget, voire de sous-programmes des autres chapitres, et cela pour le Programme de travail et budget 1992-93 et non pas celui qui vient immédiatement; il s'agirait donc d'une réduction de 20 pour cent de ces éléments du Programme de travail et budget 1992-93 par rapport à ceux du Programme de travail et budget pour 1990-91. Cette réduction n'affectera par le niveau du budget 1992-93 et permettra ainsi de redéployer un montant significatif d'années de travail au profit d'activités prioritaires dans lesquelles la FAO dispose d'un avantage comparatif incontesté. Les demandes touchant aux activités ainsi éliminées qui parviendraient au Secrétariat de la FAO par la suite seraient transmises par lui, dans un esprit de coordination et de division du travail, à d'autres institutions, y compris des institutions nationales, scientifiques, etc., pour y être traitées.

Deuxièmement, on déciderait de focaliser les activités de l'Organisation qui auraient été conservées en les incorporant très largement dans les programmes d'action spéciaux prioritaires. Le choix et l'orientation des programmes d'action spéciaux se fera en accord avec les lignes directrices recommandées par les deux comités pour l'établissement des priorités

paragraphe 2.64 (viii) du rapport. Ces programmes d'action spéciaux s'inspireront dans leur approche du modèle du Plan d'action forestier tropical.

Troisièmement, on limiterait le nombre total des programmes d'action spéciaux ainsi sélectionnés à six ou sept, c'est-à-dire qu'il y aurait un certain regroupement. Il y en a actuellement 14 mais certains sont de très petits programmes, parfois même un peu symboliques. Ce serait donc des programmes beaucoup plus importants. Le deuxième en préparation, comme chacun le sait, est celui de la sécurité alimentaire.

Quatrièmement, on allouerait 60 pour cent des ressources financières du Programme ordinaire sans le PCT et 90 pour cent des ressources financières des programmes de terrain avec le PCT à ces six ou sept programmes d'action spéciaux.

Cinquièmement, pour donner suite à cette décision, la Conférence chargerait une commission ad hoc puisque les pays membres ne peuvent s'entendre à 150 sur des sous-programmes à choisir parmi ces 310 - d'élaborer des propositions correspondantes. Cette commission ad hoc serait composée, par exemple, comme suit: un membre désigné par le Directeur général, un membre désigné par le Secrétaire général des Nations Unies, un membre désigné par l'Administrateur du PNUD, et deux membres désignés par le Comité financier et le Comité du programme. D'autres solutions peuvent être imaginées, en effet, pour procéder à ce choix, mais celle-ci nous paraît avoir un certain équilibre et assurer d'emblée la liaison avec l'ensemble du système des Nations Unies.

Sixièmement, cette commission ad hoc présenterait ses propositions et conclusions à la quatre-vingt-dix-huitième session du Conseil de la FAO en novembre 1990.

Septième et dernier point, la quatre-vingt-dix-huitième session du Conseil de la FAO en 1990 examinerait ces propositions et donnerait des instructions au Directeur général et au Secrétariat de la FAO pour la préparation du Programme de travail et budget pour 1990-93 en accord avec cette décision. Je rappelle en passant que les deux comités, en cinq passages de leur rapport, ont évoqué cette nécessité de renforcer les priorités d'une façon ou d'une autre. Je ne peux pas répéter ces cinq passages; ils sont faciles à repérer. Ma délégation tient également le texte que je viens de lire à la disposition des intéressés.

Je voudrais aborder maintenant un sujet dont l'un des aspects importants est laissé de côté dans le rapport des deux comités et les observations du Directeur général. Il s'agit du surcroît de travail des fonctionnaires chargés des projets et de ceux chargés de l'appui technique. Je me réfère au paragraphe 3.17 du rapport des deux comités. On nous y informe que les fonctionnaires chargés des projets traitent chacun en moyenne d'une quarantaine de projets - des projets de dimension de plus en plus réduite financièrement parlant et aussi de plus en plus complexe. Le Directeur général propose, à cet égard, l'engagement de 10 fonctionnaires chargés des projets et de six fonctionnaires techniques. Nous ne sommes pas opposés à l'engagement de quatre ou cinq fonctionnaires supplémentaires en vue d'une meilleure qualité du travail puisque cette situation de surcroît de travail ne pourra pas changer du jour au lendemain. Mais ce qui manque pour corriger cette situation, ce sont des mesures de rationalisation. Nous pensons qu'il faut adopter l'objectif qui consiste à remplacer graduellement la multitude de micro-projets dans une très large mesure par des contributions importantes de la FAO à des programmes sous-sectoriels, par pays, planifiés sur cinq ans. Un fonctionnaire chargé de projets s'occuperait alors de quatre ou cinq contributions de ce type en plus de deux ou trois petits projets pour un montant total de même importance ou plus élevé qu'actuellement. Ces programmes sous-sectoriels correspondent, du reste, aux programmes d'action spéciaux du nouveau type, c'est-à-dire du type Plan d'action forestier tropical dont je viens de parler.

Parmi les propositions additionnelles du Directeur général qu'il nous a rappelées ce matin, nous pouvons soutenir d'emblée celles qui concernent le renforcement de la collaboration avec le GATT. En ce qui concerne les autres, nous n'avons pas encore de position définitive.

Quelques mots maintenant au sujet de la Stratégie internationale du développement. Le Conseil a reçu un avant-projet de contribution de la FAO à cette stratégie. Nous sommes d'avis que cette contribution de la FAO devra être remaniée pour refléter pleinement les décisions de la Conférence sur les réformes avant d'être soumises à la session du Conseil de juin prochain. Ainsi remaniée, elle pourra être considérée effectivement comme la stratégie de la FAO ainsi que le proposent les deux comités et le Directeur général.

En ce qui concerne l'aspect financier des réformes, il faut distinguer deux niveaux: celui du Programme de travail et budget et celui du financement extrabudgétaire. Au niveau du Programme de travail et budget, il doit y avoir un redéploiement des ressources au profit de la mise en oeuvre des réformes et aux dépens d'activités moins prioritaires à réduire ou à éliminer selon notre proposition de tout à l'heure. Au niveau des ressources extrabudgétaires, nous prévoyons que des réformes convaincantes attireraient surtout pour leur application dans les programmes de terrain des ressources qui vont actuellement à d'autres secteurs moins prioritaires de la coopération internationale. Pour ce qui est des ressources extrabudgétaires que la Suisse fournit au Programme de terrain de la FAO, ressources qui sont de l'ordre de 6 millions de dollars par an actuellement, nous pouvons annoncer au Conseil que leur volume futur sera influencé par le résultat de l'examen de la FAO, selon que nous jugerons les réformes très satisfaisantes ou peu satisfaisantes. Et nous savons que d'autres pays donateurs ont une position similaire.

Pour terminer, nous voudrions faire savoir que notre délégation serait heureuse d'échanger ses vues avec d'autres membres du Conseil, en particulier sur les éléments de décision suggérés. Pour le reste, ma délégation appuie les propositions de la délégation du Royaume-Uni relatives au processus pouvant le mieux conduire à des décisions de la Conférence qui représenteraient un réel consensus.

Bruce J. TOLENTINO (Philippines): I should like to note first that some countries have raised questions about doing the review in the first place and I think they are strange, because the Conference in Resolution 6/87 did order the review. We should now congratulate ourselves for undertaking this review and thank the Director-General and the Programme and Finance Committees for undertaking the review. It takes courage to undertake reviews and I hope we all recognize the effort as well as the risks involved in the review. Now is the time to take responsibility for the recommendations that have been raised and have the will to implement those recommendations

One thing we would like to note is that it is clear that the demand for FAO's services for technical assistance greatly exceeds the supply of technical assistance. The major question then is how to maximize the cost effectiveness of FAO's work. We look at this question knowing that there is a background and that background is outlined in the first Annex of the report which looks at the situation in trends and agriculture. This annex points out the international organizations of agriculture in all countries and underlines the interdependence of all countries, the interdependence within all sectors, within all countries, within the economic and also that national economy in the context of the world, trade and agriculture, as well as other commodities. Also in the background, we ask questions and we say that we want the FAO's services to be of very high quality and that quality ought to be one where that service gets results the first time it is provided. Also, when FAO provides that service, we would like that we are able to sustain the effects of that service and transfer the capacity of policy analysis or whatever other service that is to the Member Nation so that that Member Nation can undertake the effort for itself without growing a continued dependence on an outside entity even though it is a sympathetic entity like the FAO. It is against this background that we would like to raise a question about the role of the country and regional office. In paragraph 3.33, the experts and the Committee have recommended the strengthening of the country offices and also they have pointed out the need to institute the programme of decentralization of decision-making and capacity to the country offices. The Director-General has already said yes to this programme and he said we will try to implement this over a number of biennia. The question is the cost of strengthening country offices as well as decentralizing and creating the capacity in each of these offices will cost a lot of money and for one biennium alone, the Director-General estimates that he needs at least 5 million dollars per biennium to implement the strengthening of the country offices.

We would like to forward the proposal then that we ought to review the recommendations to strengthen the country and the regional offices and in reviewing the resources allocated to such strengthening, we would like to say that perhaps those resources can be re-allocated to three other areas. First, perhaps at this time to take into consideration the item that has been mentioned that the quality of Headquarters staff has been going down and perhaps those resources should be allocated towards strengthening and upgrading of Headquarters staff to increase its capacity and quality to service the needs of the member countries. Second, sound resources meant for strengthening country regional offices could be allocated to country policy studies as noted in paragraph 24 of the Director's report.

The idea is that, if these studies are carried out, and if the technology is transferred to national staff, as already mentioned in paragraph 62 of the Director-General's report, then the cost effectiveness of FAO's services can indeed be upgraded. The resources allocated to the strengthening of country and regional offices can perhaps be moved over to, first, upgrading the quality of headquarters' staff; second, increasing resources for country policy studies; and, third, training of national staff in the countries themselves. We should say, however, that, while reviewing the role of the regional offices, the role of FAO in providing assistance to member countries with regard to trade and economic integration issues is critical. These are issues which have to do with the new international economic order, as mentioned in paragraph 29, trade issues, paragraph 25, and the GATT, paragraph 35, not to mention issues with regard to the European Economic Community, through the Cairns Group and the Uruguay Round.

Turning to another item, we support the recommendation that Intensification of the monitoring and streamlining of the management of field programmes should be paid attention to, as already mentioned in paragraph 3.42. However, if the intensification of such monitoring of operations is done through the creation of new bodies, new committees, new positions in the Organization, this again will increase the costs of operating FAO. Why not carry out the task of overseeing the work of field operations by extending the functions and responsibilities of the existing committees? We have committees for agricultural commodity problems, fisheries, forestry and food security and the important committees of Programme and Finance. If we ask these committees, which are all composed, anyway, of Member Nations with a concern for the efficiency of FAO itself, to absorb these overseeing functions, then we shall not need to increase the costs of that exercise.

It is on this item that we should like to emphasize the link between the regular and field programmes, as already noted in paragraphs 3.2 to 3.4. The Director-General himself says in paragraph 18 that FAO's field programme should draw upon, and feed into, the regular programme. That sentence summarizes the symbolic and systemic relationship between the regular programmes and the field programmes. The field programme in itself is an extension of the regular work of FAO that is carried out in the member countries. This is developed in the process of deciding within the Council and the Conference and the staff itself. Thus there should be a logical connection between the expertise developed in the regular programmes and the work carried out in the field programmes. For example, the TCP is used to build the linkages between the regular programmes and the activities in the countries themselves.

Finally, we should like to make a general comment about the global role that FAO plays. FAO's assistance is very critical in a world where, unfortunately, there is now a lot of suspicion about the assistance being provided by some other international agencies. For example, many accusations are made by developing nations undergoing structural adjustment about the quality, objectives and motives behind the work undertaken by agencies such as the World Bank and the IMF or even agencies like USAID. We are not in a position at this time to say whether or not these accusations are deserved, or whether they are right or wrong, but the fact is that such suspicion exists. However, in this regard FAO is seen as a neutral, sympathetic and more transparent source of assistance, and thus we should use and strengthen the capacity of FAO to provide that assistance.

In summary, in general we endorse the programme in the recommendations provided by the Review. However, we would ask for a second look at the areas where greater cost effectiveness may be attained in a review of the role of the country and regional offices and in asking why we should or should not strengthen these country offices and maximize the benefits from existing committees for oversight functions and, finally, maximize the benefit we can derive from linking clearly the regular and field programmes.

Gian Luigi VALENZA (Italie): En tant que membre du Comité financier je ne pense pas que mon intervention sur les travaux et les résultats de réunions conjointes des deux Comités, qui se sont tenues tout au long de ces deux dernières années, doive être trop longue ou détaillée. Il est en effet vraiment très difficile d'être à la fois rédacteur partiel et critique acéré.

Tout en confirmant néanmoins le fruit de nos travaux, je me limiterai ici à deux brèves observations.

Tout d'abord, mon gouvernement espère qu'un consensus pourra être trouvé le moment venu grâce à l'aide de toutes les délégations, faute de quoi un vote ne pourrait être que regrettable voire négatif.

Quelques orateurs qui ont pris la parole avant moi ont évoqué le programme de coopération technique et ont souhaité son maintien, voire son renforcement.

A ce propos, il m'est agréable aujourd'hui de vous donner ici une bonne nouvelle. Nous avons tenu hier une réunion spéciale du CIC à notre direction générale de la coopération, avec la participation personnelle du Ministre des affaires étrangères. En surmontant certaines difficultés il a été décidé à cette occasion et dans cette enceinte que les 15 millions de dollars que l'Italie avait prévu de donner à titre exceptionnel pour le programme de coopération technique de la FAO seront payés sans faute avant la fin de l'année en cours.

Nous espérons que cela sera de bon augure pour d'autres paiements et pour le futur financier de cette Organisation qui, je crois, doit préoccuper tous les pays membres.

Applause

Applaudissements

Aplausos

LE PRESIDENT: Les applaudissements du Conseil reflètent mieux que tout autre chose l'appréciation de notre Conseil et de notre Directeur général pour la bonne nouvelle que vient d'indiquer M. le Délégué d'Italie et l'offre généreuse du Gouvernement italien que nous remercions.

Sra. Margarita Lizarraga SAUCEDO (Mexico): Nos complace haber escuchado cuan responsablemente se ha ocupado usted de seguir el proceso de examen de ciertos aspectos de la FAO que la Conferencia encomendó conjuntamente a los Comités del Programa y de Finanzas apoyados en un Grupo de Expertos. Esto testimonia una vez más la seriedad con que usted ha ejercido su función.

Agradecemos por su conducto al Profesor Mazoyer, Presidente del Comité del Programa, su pragmática presentación de la forma escrupulosa como se dio cumplimiento al análisis, conforme a lo dispuesto por la Resolución 6/87, y nos complace saber que el consenso en torno a la gran mayoría de las recomendaciones emanantes del análisis fue logrado.

Asimismo agradecemos al Director General quien nos ha informado, de una parte, de su participación en apoyo de todo el proceso y la presentación de sus comentarios al estudio conforme a la citada Resolución. El nos ha proporcionado informaciones adicionales sobre algunas recomendaciones y nos ha llamado a que las decisiones sobre el tema, por su implicación, se tomen por verdadero consenso; aspecto sobre el cual mi delegación compromete su mayor esfuerzo.

Nos toca pues, ahora, como Consejo, analizar los resultados de este Examen, pronunciarnos sobre ellos para transmitirlos a la Conferencia donde tendremos un debate más amplio. Sin embargo, un buen trabajo como el que ya hicieron en su turno los Comités conjuntos del Programa y de Finanzas puede facilitar la discusión y llegar a los resultados que nos planteamos consensualmente como base del Ejercicio: reforzar la FAO para que pueda hacer frente a las necesidades crecientes en materia de alimentación y agricultura en los años venideros. En ese contexto debo decir que nos ha decepcionado un poco que se haya tenido que colocar como Anexo la información que sobre la protección del entorno mundial, la alimentación y la agricultura se deben dar a fin de enmarcar la actividad de la FAO.

Se reconoce sin embargo que el análisis de todos los elementos lo comprenden intrínsecamente. Mi delegación se complace de la constatación hecha por todos los que participaron en el Examen, de que la FAO es una Organización sana que ha sabido irse adaptando a los cambios de las necesidades de sus países miembros. Esto pone de manifiesto las razones por las cuales la mayoría nos oponíamos a la necesidad de hacer esta revisión. Sin embargo, la aceptamos como fórmula de diálogo y concertación; y por ello nos complacen las conclusiones a que se ha llegado por lo cual las aprobamos puntualizando aquí que damos por concluido el Ejercicio.

Ahora bien, en lo que toca a la aplicación de los recursos, mi delegación si bien considera que la recomendación puede ser en general positiva para la Organización y para nuestros países, nos plantea el dilema de que en su mayoría las recomendaciones requieren de financiación y el problema es que nuestros países ya están haciendo su mayor esfuerzo para financiar el Programa de Labores bianual que democráticamente y conforme a las instancias establecidas por los Textos Básicos van estableciéndose. Si bien no todo lo que pedimos en las Conferencias Regionales y los Comités técnicos podemos obtener, porque hay que limitarnos a un mínimo de recursos, por lo menos vemos de cierta manera reflejado, y esperamos cada vez que lo que quedó pendiente, la próxima vez pueda quedar incluido.

Es por ello que a menos que se encontrase una fórmula para que este proceso, en donde se pronuncien todos nuestros países, pudiese cumplirse en el año anterior a la Conferencia, no aceptamos que se interfiera con una instancia de aprobación temprana en donde la representación de los países es mínima y se vaya a condicionar a los órganos gubernamentales. Existen, evidentemente, muchos elementos valiosos expresados en el informe que hemos visto, como ya la Secretaría está plasmando en superación, y en otros que nosotros mismos iremos incluyendo en nuestra actuación en los foros, como forma de aceptar toda mejora posible.

Sin embargo, hay un gran numero de recomendaciones que inevitablemente tienen un costo; costo que nuestros países en vías de desarrollo no estaríamos en la posibilidad de financiar y que tampoco estaríamos dispuestos a canjear por rubros que ya tienen su expresión en el Programa de Labores y Presupuesto, en su nivel actual de recursos. En suma, no podemos aceptar más reajustes. Esto no debe interpretarse como falta de voluntad de diálogo. Es sólo que no podemos ir más allá de nuestras limitaciones económicas. Nuestra expresión de diálogo trataremos de plasmarla a continuación al pasar al análisis de los diversos capítulos del Examen.

En lo que toca a las funciones coincidimos en que todas son válidas e importantes, y si bien los países en desarrollo, por necesidades prácticas, consideramos prioritariamente a la asistencia técnica, reconocemos la importancia indudable de los foros de donde emanan las directrices de política para definir las estrategias y planes de acción sectorial, que contribuyen incluso a establecer el marco de programas a mediano y largo plazo, así como el papel de la información por lo que apoyamos la creación del Waicent. La función de la FAO en el establecimiento de políticas nos parece un elemento importante. Sin embargo, consideramos que esto es un aspecto vital y sensible que requiere profundizar en su aplicación. Hemos analizado en el Comité de Seguridad

Alimentarla los efectos negativos de muchos de los programas de reajuste estructural emanantes de la vinculación a los créditos del Banco Mundial y del Fondo Monetario Internacional, y por ello queremos que la FAO, recogiendo las posturas de los países y la experiencia de sus departamentos técnicos, produzca alternativas viables que se configuren en proyectos bancables cuidando que no se hagan proyectos o análisis sectoriales en nombre y con las políticas y condiciones de los Bancos. La gran experiencia y prestigio de los Departamentos de Pesca y de Montes, Agricultura, etc., deben ser los que generen los elementos en los que se apoye el Centro de Inversiones.

Con respecto al comercio internacional nos complace que tanto las conclusiones y recomendaciones de los Comités coincidan con el propio GATT respecto al papel de apoyo que puede y debe darle la FAO en beneficio de todos. Esto conlleva a la importancia y prestigio del CODEX Alimentarius y a la validez de los acuerdos y establecimiento de unidades y programas interagenciales. Mi delegación los apoya con gran interés.

De la misma manera, apoya las iniciativas relativas al reforzamiento de las actividades de investigación y la tecnología en donde la FAO, por la cualidad que le da su carácter intergubernamental, debe contribuir en la orientación de los centros que componen la red del GCIAI.

La FAO, con arreglo a su mandato debe continuar desempeñando una función de primer plano en la conservación y ordenación de los recursos naturales, así como también la diversidad biológica y genética. Dicha tarea debe ser emprendida en estrecha cooperación con otras organizaciones basándose en el espíritu y los principios que constituyen el fundamento del Compromiso Internacional sobre Recursos Fitogenéticos.

A este nivel del proceso, evitaré decir en detalle la lista de los aspectos contenidos en el Examen. Me limitaré a referir dos aspectos fundamentales. De una parte, las operaciones de campo que son la expresión misma de la presencia de FAO en nuestros países. Mi delegación considera que deben hacerse todos los esfuerzos posibles por instrumentar las recomendaciones para reforzarlas dentro de las necesidades prioritarias definidas por los Estados Miembros, los cuales deberán participar activamente en todas las instancias.

Aceptamos la recomendación de la reintroducción de un plano a plazo medio que abarque tres bienios en la medida que contenga una indicación de los recursos por programas que se adapte a las necesidades crecientes para que sea realista, y se tomen en consideración las estrategias y programas de acción ya adoptados por las conferencias sectoriales celebradas en el seno de la FAO, así como programas vigentes como PASA, Plan de Acción Forestal, Plan de Acción para la Integración de la Mujer en el Desarrollo, etc..

Apoyamos la celebración de la Conferencia Mundial de la Nutrición y la elaboración de algunos programas de acción como pueden ser el desarrollo sostenible y otros.

A esta altura de mi intervención, me permito expresar que, en diferente forma y estilo, al expresarnos estamos ejerciendo la voluntad de diálogo. No debemos tratar de quemar etapas que le resten transparencia al proceso.

Ahora que estamos llegando a la fase final, recordemos que el Consejo es un órgano subrogado de la Conferencia y que en un tema tan trascendente como éste, todos los países tienen derecho a ser escuchados antes de tomar la decisión final. Sólo en esa instancia se puede definir la fórmula de plasmar los acuerdos, entretanto, respondemos a la invitación del distinguido Embajador de Brasil. Nos unimos al consenso logrado en los Comités, felicitándolos por el buen trabajo realizado.

Agradecemos al Director General su gran voluntad para armonizar las Conclusiones y Recomendaciones, muchas de las cuales incluso han sido ya incorporadas también por haber presentado un cuadro de costos indicativos e incluso alternativas para su implementación. Mi delegación reitera su acuerdo de la Implementación de las medidas convenidas por los Comités, dentro de los límites establecidos y en los términos de la Resolución 6/87 y que no impliquen ni adición ni absorción de costos o cambios al Programa de Labores y Presupuesto.

Finalmente, mi delegación expresa atenta pero firmemente, que esperamos correspondencia a nuestra flexibilidad en la aceptación del Ejercicio en aras de reforzar a la FAO y mantener el espíritu de diálogo, con una posición congruente respecto a los recursos que se requieren para su financiación, y en pleno respeto a los procesos democráticos. Lamentamos que a esta altura del proceso se quieran introducir enmiendas de fondo en temas sustantivos, que no podemos aceptar. Finalmente, todo nuestro agradecimiento al anuncio que acaba de hacer el distinguido representante de nuestro país huésped, Italia. Posiciones como éstas pueden hacer de nuestra Organización una organización más sólida.

Karl W. WEYBRECHT (Canada): I wish to thank the Chairman of the Programme Committee and the Director-General for their introduction to this agenda item. We would like to pay a tribute to the Chairmen of the Programme and Finance Committees for their dedication, confidence and patience in conducting the proceedings of the Special Joint Sessions that led to the report we have before us.

The Council has before it the conclusions and recommendations of the Programme and Finance Committees along with the Director-General's comments on the study of FAO's Roles, Priorities, Objectives, and strategies as well as field operations and certain administrative issues. As I believe was pointed out in the introduction to this item, Council has been asked in Resolution 6/87 to submit its own views to the Conference along with the SJS report and the Director-General's comments.

The report points out that the Programme and Finance Committee held four Special Joint Sessions to implement the Resolution. The acronym "SJS" has become firmly entrenched in FAO's vocabulary as the result of the attention that has been focused on this exercise.

My Government attaches great importance to the successful conclusion of the review exercise and has, on several occasions, set out the objectives it wishes to see accomplished. We were pleased to have had the privilege of participating directly in the various stages of the process, as a member of the Programme Committee. The scope of the Review is very broad and the range of individual issues is often highly complex. While views differ on some issues, as the Director-General pointed out in his comments, the Committees were able to reach a broad degree of consensus. It is only natural to expect, however, that in the course of discussion in Council and Conference additional views and ideas may emerge. Of course, it will be for Conference to decide on how to respond to the recommendations of the SJS taking into account the views of the broader membership.

The Conference will need to develop a clear course of action of implementation of the results of the Review process, including identification of possible follow-up actions. We share the wish that full agreement be reached so that ultimately the conclusions of the Review can be adopted on a unanimous basis. The decision taken by the SJS to attach reports of two groups of experts to its own report is very much welcomed. The experts made a valuable contribution to the review. It is appropriate that member countries are given this opportunity to examine the conclusions and recommendations of the experts in making their own assessment of the SJS report.

My delegation would like to highlight a number of areas that we consider of particular importance in the reform process. We support the strengthening of certain of FAO's roles as set out in the report, including its role as a global information centre, its policy role as well as its involvement in promoting sustainable development and the stress that needs to be placed on the role of women in development. Canada attaches importance to improved priority setting, including greater Member State involvement and decision making, in particular in the area of field programmes. We are encouraged by the recognition given by the SJS report to the needs for greater involvement of governing bodies in field operations.

We have supported the view expressed in the report by some members that FAO should focus resources on areas where it has a clear comparative advantage. Strengthening inspection and evaluation of FAO's activities is also an area that we support. In this regard we are not clear about the Director-General's comment in paragraph 49 on page XI, where it is suggested that it would be premature to decide the location of the field inspection unit before its detailed terms of reference have been decided. The Committee's proposal to establish a field inspection unit as a part of the evaluation service stems from the expert recommendation that a monitoring inspection mechanism be established and attached to the office of the Director-General. Indeed we had initially expressed a preference for a fully independent inspection mechanism. Therefore, we are not clear on why the location of the inspection unit has been reopened. We note the Director-General's proposal that if the outline of the Programme of Work and Budget is maintained, the Summary of the Programme of Work and Budget will be unnecessary. The implications of this will need to be examined closely in the light of the Director-General's supplementary comments this morning. My delegation may have further comments to make on this matter in discussion in Commission II of the Conference.

Closer inter-agency cooperation is a key element of the Review process. We note the proposal of the Director-General to facilitate a dialogue between Rome-based food and agricultural agencies to share information and to coordinate activities. On the surface this would seem to be a constructive proposal that presumably would not require additional resources. However, it would have been useful to have had the preliminary reaction of the other agencies concerned with this proposal.

We support efforts, as part of the administrative review, to improve the financial management of the Organization in pursuit of increased transparency and accountability. Steps to facilitate the availability of the provision of financial information, including regular up-to-date information on programme and sub-programme expenditures would be an important step in this direction.

In reviewing the comments of the Director-General concerning the SJS report, extensive emphasis has been placed on the resource requirements to implement the various recommendations. The resource dimension is the subject of a separate chapter of the report, where differing views were expressed.

My delegation associates itself with the view that when considering the resources needed to strengthen the Organization the main focus should be on a reallocation of priorities. Frankly, we are concerned, that the emphasis placed on the need for additional resources to cover the reform issues will divert attention from the substantial issues that need to be addressed by Council and Conference. Some important reform proposals would not result in substantial additional costs. We would urge the Director-General to reconsider whether some shifting of resources and economies could not be achieved with a view to making room for SJS proposals within the current Programme of Work and Budget. This may make it easier for some large contributors to show flexibility on the budget itself.

To facilitate a unanimous agreement we see considerable merit in the proposal put forward by some others that a process of contact be established. We share the view expressed by the delegate of Australia over the short period of time available to reach an overall satisfactory conclusion to the review. Members of the Council have clearly stressed the importance which they attach to reaching a consensus in our decision-making process for the Review. Consensus will require close dialogue between Member States. Therefore, we believe the suggestion made by the UK this morning would promote an understanding of all points of view.

Ibrahima KABA (Guinee): La Délégation guinéenne se réjouit de voir les résultats auxquels sont parvenues les investigations minutieuses qu'a exigées la Résolution 6/87. Je vous épargnerai une longue énumération des conclusions déjà bien analysées dans les rapports soumis à notre examen et que nous approuvons dans l'ensemble. Je ferai état de quelques brèves observations générales qui reflètent la position de notre Délégation en attendant la Conférence. L'obtention d'un consensus a permis l'adoption de la Résolution 6/87. Deux années de recherche, de nombreux hauts fonctionnaires et des experts indépendants mobilisés, deux millions de dollars dépensés, pour conclure que notre Organisation fait bien son travail et qu'elle est bien gérée. Mais comme on peut toujours mieux faire, de nouvelles propositions nous sont soumises. Pour notre part, nous avons foi en la FAO et en ses objectifs. En tout cas, dans mon pays son action est hautement appréciée. Nous faisons confiance au comité conjoint qui a été mandaté par la Conférence pour mener à bien l'examen. Cela dit, il est clair que le renforcement des activités de notre Organisation nécessite logiquement le renforcement de ses moyens d'action dont le principal est constitué par le moyen financier. Aussi la mise en oeuvre des nouvelles activités exige 26 millions de dollars. Or, nous savons que pour la mise en oeuvre des anciennes activités il manque de l'argent, au point que ces activités ne sont exécutées qu'en partie.

Comme c'est à la Conférence qu'il appartiendra de se déterminer sur ce point, nous le ferons nous-mêmes devant cette instance.

En ce qui concerne cet autre point, le renforcement du rôle d'assistance de la FAO revêt à nos yeux une importance toute particulière. Quant à la nécessité d'instituer un corps d'inspecteurs pour les programmes de terrain, nous nous interrogeons sérieusement sur l'opportunité d'un tel organe si l'on pense à l'aspect onéreux des voyages pour une organisation qui a tant besoin de ressources. En tout cas, dans mon pays, l'exécution des projets FAO est contrôlée par les experts du Département de tutelle avec la participation des organismes de financement.

Nous saluons la suggestion du Directeur général quant à l'institution de rencontres périodiques et informelles entre les organisations s'occupant de l'alimentation et de l'agriculture ici à Rome.

Comme nous l'avons dit plus haut, ce ne sont là que des observations préliminaires.

Ms Joan DUDIK-GATOSO (United States of America): The US delegation wishes to thank the two expert groups, the SJS of the Programme and Finance Committees and their Chairmen, the Drafting Support Group, and all those who have laboured so intensively during the past two years to bring us to the point where we can recommend specific actions to improve the operations and the efficiency of FAO.

The documents are considerable and complex. One can support any point of view by selective quotation from them. They do indeed testify to the importance of FAO's work. They testify to the professionalism and dedication of the staff of the Organization. On the other hand, they also make recommendations for important improvements which themselves testify to the necessity and the value of the review process itself, and the need for specific improvements in FAO's operations and structure to strengthen it and enable it to move ahead to meet future challenges. Let me cite a few examples from the annex - Appendix 2, the larger volume of C 89/21 - and the one on which the SJS based its work.

The Experts' Report of the field programme noted in paragraphs 45, 65, 70 and 81 on pages 97, 105 and 106 that field operations do not get the required attention by governing bodies. More information is needed by donors and recipients, they said; there is need for revised arrangements for providing policy direction by governing bodies; more work is needed here by us, the members of FAO.

Paragraph 48 on page 98 refers to the need for improvement in FAO through organizational and management measures at headquarters and in the fields.

Paragraph 75 suggests the need for clearer focus of FAO's operational activities.

Paragraph 52 notes that technical support was considered a problem, a main factor affecting the quality of FAO's performance. This, in the view of the United States delegation, is not simply a matter of resources; it is a question of how resources are used.

Paragraph 80 recommends improvements in the structure to improve FAO's effectiveness.

Paragraph 81 lists a series of practical improvements to improve field operations. These are well worth noting.

In paragraphs 90, 91 and 94, regarding the role, quality and competence of FAO Representatives Offices, there is an indication, we would say in English, of "mixed reviews", i.e. of varying quality of field staff and the suggestion that the selection criteria for staff need review.

Paragraph 57 refers to FAO's limited capacity to maintain a substantive dialogue with governments, and notes that this is a matter for further consideration in headquarters and in the composition of the fields structure.

Paragraph 61 says that FAO representatives in most cases are not equipped to provide policy advice and analysis to governments.

Paragraphs 72 and 73 suggest that better planning of the TCP would release pressure on TCP resources. They also suggest - and my delegation supports - the increased delegation of authority to field officers and grouping projects into more coherent packages. We note that the size of FAO projects is declining, and we are concerned about the management burden on FAO and on the governments themselves of many small projects.

In the report on the Role, Objectives and Priorities of the Organization, also in the same annex, paragraph 7.5 notes signs of overlap with other agencies. Paragraph 7.6 points out the scope for strengthening FAO, reinforcing its data and the information collection role, strengthening its capacity of independent policy analysis, and upgrading its work on the environment and in support of sustainable development. It also suggests ensuring that field projects remain within a set of objectives and priorities.

Paragraph 7.24 recommends that FAO exercise selectivity in field projects and suggests guidelines and priorities.

Paragraph 7.36 suggests important improvements in the way the Programme of Work and Budget is presented, showing links among programme elements and sub-programmes, inter-programme coordination covering major areas of work and the contributions of various programmes and sub-programmes to various themes or areas of major thrust.

Concerning the work done for us by the SJS during last year, the Council has an important role. Resolution 6/87, as others have noticed, instructs us to transmit the SJS report together with the Council's views to the Conference. If the Council does not present its views along with the views of the SJS and those of the Director-General, we are rejecting the instructions of Resolution 6/87. We are duty bound to express our own views in a way that we assist the Conference in coming to a decision. We also would seek a consensus, but we cannot just endorse the SJS report since, as others have noticed, the SJS report also includes areas where no consensus could be reached in the SJS discussions. This might be a good place on which to focus our attention.

While this agenda item is entitled "Conclusion of the Review", we wish to state clearly at this time that while it is the conclusion of one phase it is also a beginning. First, our actions will begin the implementation phase of this process, for if we do not promptly implement the recommendations we make, as others have already said, we can properly be accused of wasting our time and FAO's resources for the past two years. Second, it is a beginning, according to the recommendations in the SJS report, of the increased responsibility for oversight, monitoring and follow through for the governing bodies, the members of FAO. This may require a re-examination of the procedures of those governing bodies, bringing improvements, for example, in the decision-making process, in order to make those bodies more efficient and capable of carrying out these increased responsibilities.

Finally, let this be the beginning of a new FAO, ready for, and capable of, regular self-improvement, and thus more capable of meeting the challenges of an uncertain future.

The Experts' reports represent an excellent foundation on which to build. These documents point out, for example, that of FAO's three major roles, two - collection and dissemination of agricultural information, and promoting agricultural policy - are virtually unique to FAO and are critical to the whole agricultural system. The reports note that the regular programme and field programme are inextricably entwined in the field and suggest that they should be programmed to reinforce each other. We think this is a useful guideline for improving the effectiveness of the TCP programme. The reports give detailed guidance on the process of priority setting in Chapter A. Moreover, the reports, while finding FAO on the whole healthy, effective and of immense value to the world agricultural system, also point to the danger in the future that "The spectrum of responsibilities and activities has grown so large as to endanger the quality of the Organization's work: a loss FAO must not accept and cannot afford".

Thus the reports reaffirm our awareness of FAO's value, instruct us in our duty to protect and preserve that value, and guide us in means to fulfil that duty.

The SJS has built well on that foundation, identifying improvements which a wide sample of FAO's membership can support. In addition, we have the Director-General's own reflections in this document. This review has sometimes been presented as divisive: the efforts or desires of some members at the expense of others.

The Experts' Groups and the SJS, representing all regions of FAO's membership, have demonstrated that many areas of agreement can be found, and have presented specific recommendations on those areas. Other areas they left for this Council and Conference to come to agreement on. Still other areas, they concluded, require further study and later action. While there was no universal agreement on all issues, they demonstrated that those who wish FAO well can unite, rather than divide, for the good of the Organization and those whom it benefits. We would like this process to continue. Although, as some have noted this afternoon, this review process was more limited than we had wished and was not adopted by consensus, the US participated seriously in these painstaking efforts. While the end product is itself the result of compromise, we can, and do, endorse the recommendations made. We note that work remains to be done at this Council and Conference to come to agreement in at least three areas - the clarification of the role of FAO, determining the process by which the Governing Bodies help determine the priority setting of FAO, and, most important, determining the steps and mechanisms for the implementation and follow-up to the recommendations approved by the Conference.

These documents do not pretend to be perfect, complete or all-encompassing. By accepting them, we are accepting a challenge to begin to assure both that FAO's programmes stay in line with the needs of its Members, and that the membership shares a clear view of FAO's role, capabilities and limitations. As we consider and move towards implementation of these recommendations, and other recommendations still to be made by Members of this body or of the Conference, we will learn how better to strengthen FAO. Throughout the various steps of this review, the US has placed a great deal of emphasis on the process itself. Let us address the specific tasks before us. The Conference has the final authority to approve recommendations, but this Council has a role in the process, as we said. We are all aware that the Conference has a full agenda. We do not want to

end as we did in the closing hours of the 1987 Conference, regretting that there was just not enough time. We need not end up in that position if we start now. We are duty bound to express our views here in this Council in such a way that we assist the Conference in coming to a decision on this review.

Specifically: first, the SJS Report is not in the form of a resolution or decision, and cannot yet be acted upon. We here, as well as at the Conference, must work together, listen to each other in open and thorough dialogue, to draft a decision on the results of the review process set in motion by Resolution 6/87 two years ago, that can find support among all members.

Second, we must ensure that the decision resolution contains follow-up resolutions to ensure that what we decide is fully implemented in conformity with the desires of the Conference, and that the membership is fully involved in the process.

Third, we must examine carefully those areas where the members of the SJS were unable to reach full agreement, so that we may present to the Conference, to our Ministers who will be with us next week, clearly drawn issues for decision. These are heavy and time-consuming responsibilities.

Mr. Chairman, we have ideas for a decision and are sure that others do also. We have just heard some specific proposals from Switzerland. We would like to have ample time to explore these ideas with other members. For example, the report recommends that the budget outline be continued for at least one more biennium. That phrase "at least" recommends no specific end point. We would propose that it would be made a part of FAO's normal procedure to continue until a future Conference determines a change is necessary. The Director-General has also endorsed the budget outline, but this morning suggested that, in exchange, the Summary Programme of Work and Budget be eliminated. We applaud the efforts to find savings to finance a proposed recommendation, but we have reservations about this proposal that we think it would be worthwhile to discuss. From our point of view, we see two problems with the suggestion. First, the Summary Programme of Work and Budget is the primary document used by members of the COAG, the Committee on Forestry and Fisheries for their deliberation. The budget outline, because it does not go into programme details, cannot be used for this purpose. Also, the Summary Programme of Work and Budget receives much wider distribution, while the budget outline is available only to members of the Programme and Finance Committees. We need to ensure that all members are aware of, and able to contribute to, the budget formulation process. We recommend that both the budget outline and the Summary Programme of Work and Budget be retained.

We also wish to draw the Council's attention to paragraphs 2.26 to 2.28, which lay out the issues regarding the concept of comparative advantage. The SJS was unable to reach agreement on a recommendation on this issue, but recognized its importance. We ask members to take note of the Director-General's call for realism in planning FAO's future, and draft a recommendation that FAO's activities be strictly focused on those areas where FAO has a clear comparative advantage, avoiding overlap with other agencies which have greater expertise in a particular area. Only through such a step can we be sure that FAO's resources are used most effectively to assist its Member Nations, and that other assistance is obtained from those best able to provide it.

Another area on which neither the SJS, nor the Experts, produced recommendation is that of the management structure of the Organization. As the Experts noted in paragraph 59 of the Report on FAO's Field Programme, FAO's management structure has not changed since 1974. They noted that this raises questions of FAO's operational effectiveness. They pointed out that organizational structures have not changed in step with changing need and conditions at the country level, and with new methods in development cooperation. How FAO is structured is a function of the role of FAO. An effective structure is that which supports the primary roles of an organization. If we are to re-examine the role, and if we are to re-examine the activities, we should also re-examine the management structure, to ensure that it is, and remains, appropriate to the role and activities of the Organization.

This is an area where outside expertise, picking up on the management issues the Experts highlighted but had no time to address in depth, would be a useful part of the follow-up and implementation of the review's recommendations. A few moments ago the Philippines mentioned the role of country and regional offices, an issue on which the Experts offered a number of thoughts but came to no definitive conclusion. On a broader theme, when we consider the priorities of FAO, we believe the recommendations of this Council should state clearly that the Regular Programme activities and Field Programme activities should be integrated as much as possible, mutually reinforcing, complementing each other, rather than operating independently.

We also feel that the Regular Programme activities should be governed by the principle of comparative advantage. For example, FAO should and must collect and disseminate the results of research, but other organizations are better structured to conduct the research.

In view of these open items, Mr. Chairman, the US requests that you find a way to facilitate informal dialogue among those with specific ideas to contribute during the remainder of this week. I hesitate to suggest what to call such an informal dialogue, but I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that you in your wisdom will find the right name for it. For example, you could schedule and provide a space, and, if possible, Conference services for discussions. This should help us use our time to greatest advantage, and to prepare the way for the work of our Ministers in the Conference.

Beyond that, the US would like to see the Report of the Council include the recommendation that intensive consultation on this issue during the Conference begins the first week of the Conference, in parallel with the work of Commission II, which has additional important issues to consider. Various mechanisms are possible, but the difficult drafting job is unlikely to be successfully completed unless additional time is devoted to it. Again, we need to make the time if we want to avoid regretting the lack of time later.

Mr. Chairman, a final word about the resource issue: the SJS did not reach a conclusion on this issue, but rather laid out a number of options on page 41 of the Report for finding the necessary resources for implementing the recommendations. The US is strongly of the view that strengthening FAO to meet successfully the demands of its members is of overriding importance, and notes that an important set of the recommendations deals with the area of priority setting. It is our conclusion that Option II, which involves requesting the Director-General to examine priorities so as to find resources as necessary for implementation, will in, and of, itself begin the implementation of this set of recommendations, and so we commend this choice. A number of Member States have indicated their difficulty with increased assessments. Our position on this point is well known. It is unreasonable to expect even greater resources in this era of budget stringency. We, therefore, face difficult choices. In our view, we must find the necessary resources through re-directing resources towards higher priority activities which reflect the Organization's comparative advantage vis-à-vis other institutions.

Mr. Chairman, these are our comments for the first round of this debate. We would expect to discuss detailed elements of the specific recommendations, preferable in the consultations we have asked you to arrange with other delegations without taking further time of the Plenary.

LE PRESIDENT: Il est 18 h 45. J'avais envisagé de continuer la séance jusqu'à 19 heures et de reprendre la réunion demain matin. Nous avons un programme chargé et il faut laisser le temps au Comité de rédaction de travailler. L'important est de respecter l'ensemble de l'ordre du jour. La parole est au délégué du Gabon.

Jules Marius OGONEBANDJA (Gabon): Ma délégation voudrait d'abord féliciter le Directeur général de la FAO pour les excellentes orientations qu'il a bien voulu nous livrer quant à l'examen de certains aspects des buts et opérations de la FAO. Nous voudrions également féliciter le Comité du Programme et le Comité financier pour l'excellent rapport qu'ils ont élaboré sur la base des conclusions des experts.

Nous voudrions enfin associer pleinement à ces félicitations le Professeur Mazoyer pour son introduction très claire du document déjà bien détaillé. En ce qui concerne l'examen, je ne voudrais pas entrer dans le détail car nous y reviendrons. Nous sommes cependant heureux de constater que les trois grands rôles assignés à la FAO dans son Acte constitutif ont été confirmés vitaux pour le développement de l'alimentation et de l'agriculture dans le monde, sans qu'il soit souhaitable d'établir entre eux un ordre de priorités.

Nous appuyons les recommandations des Comités et les choix des priorités proposées, et soutenons plus particulièrement l'assistance technique, la formation, la recherche et le transfert des technologies vers les pays en développement, les programmes d'action sociaux et les efforts en faveur du rôle de la femme dans le développement rural et durable. Nous appuyons également les recommandations visant à promouvoir le rôle de la FAO en tant que contribution dans la mise en place du nouvel ordre économique international, notamment au sein du GATT, et souhaitons une plus grande liaison entre les organisations ayant les mêmes objectifs installées à Rome. S'agissant des ressources nécessaires à la mise en œuvre de ces recommandations et des différentes solutions préconisées, mon pays, frappé par une crise soutenue, éprouvera de grandes difficultés

à affronter de nouvelles augmentations de contribution, comme nous l'avons déjà indiqué. A ce sujet, nous appuyons les propositions d'autres délégués visant la mise en oeuvre à moyen terme et par étape en fonction des disponibilités financières. Cependant, nous ne saurions pour l'heure arrêter une position définitive à ce sujet et sommes persuadés que nous pourrions intervenir plus amplement lors de la Conférence.

LE PRESIDENT: Je vais demander au Directeur général de bien vouloir nous donner un supplément d'information qui nous permettra peut-être de réfléchir et d'arriver à un consensus.

LE DIRECTEUR GENERAL: Je répondrai d'abord à la question très importante soulevée par le délégué du Pakistan qui m'a demandé sur quelle base j'avais décidé de ce que certaines recommandations étaient prioritaires. Il a demandé si j'avais fait une liste des différents types de recommandations.

En fait, j'ai utilisé mon jugement, mon expérience de 14 années à la FAO en tant que Directeur général.

Les critères étaient les suivants: nécessité d'appliquer certaines recommandations pour la préparation du Programme de travail et budget de 1992-93, ce qui est à moyen terme un équilibre entre les trois rôles de la FAO, etc.; il y avait dans les priorités certaines recommandations qui concernaient le rôle de la FAO comme centre d'information, d'autres comme tribune internationale, d'autres en tant qu'assistance technique.

J'ai aussi tenu compte du fait que les deux Comités ont appuyé plus particulièrement certaines recommandations; et de toute façon, je n'ai fait que des suggestions qui n'étaient là que pour relancer le débat.

En effet, toutes les recommandations ne sont pas du même niveau; certaines peuvent être réalisées en deux ans, d'autres en trois ans, ce qui en plus peut faciliter la gestion des ressources.

Beaucoup de pays développés ont parlé de la possibilité de moduler le Programme de travail et budget 1990-91 en fonction d'une partie ou de toutes les recommandations. Il est certain que tout Programme de travail et budget possède en lui-même une certaine flexibilité à condition que les contributions soient payées. Et en ce qui concerne la flexibilité du Programme de travail et budget, tout dépendra du principal contributeur. En effet, si ce dernier paie une partie importante de ses arriérés, il y aura de l'argent; mais s'il ne paie pas, il est inutile de parler de tout cela. Il y a 142 millions de dollars, je dis bien 142 millions de dollars. On parle de la possibilité de payer 10 ou 15 millions de dollars cette année. Nous avons besoin d'au moins 100 millions de dollars pour l'année prochaine pour fonctionner. Alors ne me parlez pas de flexibilité. Nous avons des dettes de 100 millions de dollars; il n'y aura aucune flexibilité s'il n'y a pas paiement du principal contributeur.

J'aurais aimé que la déléguée des Etats-Unis me dise clairement si elle est d'accord avec les propositions que j'ai faites ce matin en réponse à une demande du Ministre de l'agriculture des Etats-Unis de renforcer la coopération avec le GATT. Je propose 900 000 dollars. Si les Etats-Unis ne sont pas d'accord avec cette proposition, je suis tout prêt à économiser ces 900 000 dollars et à les utiliser ailleurs.

Il est facile de citer tous les paragraphes où l'on critique la FAO. Evidemment et heureusement, nous ne sommes pas parfaits, nous ne sommes pas des anges. D'ailleurs, tout ce que les experts ont dit à ce sujet, c'était à la suite de conversations avec nous. Le problème est celui du financement. Je sais très bien que l'on pouvait avoir des inspecteurs, mais on n'a pas d'argent. Je sais très bien qu'il faut davantage de personnes dans les divisions techniques, mais on n'a pas d'argent.

Je n'ai pas de réponses à donner en ce qui concerne le Programme de travail et budget. Je suis d'accord avec la délégation des Etats-Unis. C'est une affaire dont il faut parler au cours des réunions des deux Comités. Nous ne ferons rien sans vous le demander. Nous avons d'autres propositions qu'un sommaire, mais si vous pensez qu'un sommaire doit rester, nous continuerons à le faire. D'ailleurs, nous sommes obligés par le Règlement de présenter un sommaire. C'était simplement une idée à débattre.

Quant à la question des inspecteurs, là aussi je suis très ouvert. Il y a une inspection faite par le Vérificateur interne, il y en a une faite par le Département du développement, toujours pour les activités de terrain, et il y a une évaluation faite par le service dévaluation. Là aussi, je veux simplement clarifier les choses. Je ne vois pas d'inconvénient à ce que ce soit le service d'évaluation, mais je veux moi-même être convaincu que ces trois types d'inspection se complètent et peut-être en supprimer l'un et renforcer l'autre. Il s'agit d'ailleurs de types différents d'inspection.

Le délégué de la Suisse a lancé un avertissement aux dix pays qui reçoivent une aide de la Suisse à travers la FAO, comme quoi la Suisse n'augmentera pas sa contribution pour le financement de projets d'assistance technique au-delà de 6 millions de dollars si la Suisse n'est pas satisfaite des résultats d'enquêtes. Il a dit qu'il parlait aussi au nom de plusieurs pays donateurs. Je trouve que ce n'est pas gentil de sa part. Soyons un peu sérieux. Ces petites menaces ne sont pas très gentilles.

Roger PASQUIER (Suisse): Je pense que Monsieur le Directeur général interprète mes paroles dans un sens que je n'ai pas voulu leur donner. La Suisse peut augmenter ou diminuer sa contribution. Et je ne parle pas de pays, je parle du Programme de la FAO.

Pour ce qui est des autres pays, je ne parle pas en leur nom, mais je sais tout simplement que d'autres pays ont cette position.

João Augusto DE MEDICIS (Brésil): Peut-on savoir quels sont ces pays?

LE PRESIDENT: Non! Ce sera fait en dehors du Conseil, si vous le voulez.

Nous nous réunirons demain matin à 9 h 30. Il reste encore onze orateurs. Après leurs interventions, nous entendrons les réponses du Président du Comité et du Directeur général ou de ses adjoints.

The meeting rose at 19.00 hours.

La séance est levée à 19 heures.

Se levanta la sesión a las 19 horas.

council

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

conseil

ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ALIMENTATION ET L'AGRICULTURE

consejo

ORGANIZACION DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA LA AGRICULTURA Y LA ALIMENTACION

CL

CL 96/PV/7

Ninety-sixth Session

Quatre-vingt-seizième session

96º periodo de sesiones

**SEVENTH PLENARY MEETING
SEPTIEME SEANCE PLENIERE
SEPTIMA SESION PLENARIA
9 November 1989**

The Seventh Plenary Meeting was opened at 9.45 hours Lassaad Ben Osman, Independent Chairman of the Council, presiding

La septième séance plénière est ouverte à 9 h 45, sous la présidence de Lassaad Ben Osman, Président indépendant du Conseil

Se abre la séptima sesión plenaria a las 9.45 horas, bajo la presidencia de Lassaad Ben Osman, Presidente Independiente del Consejo

- III. PROGRAMME, BUDGETARY, FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS
(continued)
- III. QUESTIONS CONCERNANT LE PROGRAMME, LE BUDGET, LES FINANCES ET L'ADMINISTRATION (suite)
- III. ASUNTOS DEL PROGRAMA Y ASUNTOS PRESUPUESTARIOS, FINANCIEROS Y ADMINISTRATIVOS (continuación)
- 7. Conclusions of the Review of Certain Aspects of FAO's Goals and Operations (continued)
- 7. Conclusions de l'examen de certains aspects des buts et operations de la FAO (suite)
- 7. Conclusiones del examen de algunos aspectos de las metas y operaciones de la FAO
(continuación)

LE PRESIDENT: Nous reprenons le cours de nos travaux. Vous avez sous les yeux l'ordre du jour pour aujourd'hui. Comme vous le savez, c'est notre dernière journée car il faut laisser celle de demain au Comité de rédaction pour travailler; et nous adopterons ensuite ses propositions.

Notre ordre du jour est particulièrement chargé et je propose à Messieurs les délégués de toujours tenir en considération cette contrainte de temps. Il est impérieux que nous terminions notre travail aujourd'hui afin de permettre au Comité de rédaction de se réunir, peut-être même parallèlement, pendant l'intervalle du déjeuner, puis ce soir de manière à ce que, demain, nous puissions nous pencher sur son rapport. Je lance donc un appel aux délégués qui doivent prendre la parole pour qu'ils gardent à l'esprit cette contrainte de temps. Je compte beaucoup sur leur compréhension.

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): El competente profesor Mazoyer, Presidente del Comité del Programa, sabe que yo, en actitud de acatamiento, admiración y respeto a su alta investidura, sigo siempre con toda atención sus actuaciones, y por ello puedo afirmar que la de ayer por la mañana ha sido una de sus mejores presentaciones. Los representantes de Colombia estamos sincera y profundamente agradecidos a los trece miembros de los dos grupos de expertos, a los dos Presidentes y dieciocho miembros de los Comités del Programa y de Finanzas, al Director General y a sus colaboradores en Roma, a los funcionarios de la FAO en las oficinas regionales y en las oficinas en los países, a los empleados de las tres empresas consultoras, a todos los funcionarios de las veintinueve organizaciones, dentro y fuera del sistema de las Naciones Unidas, que fueron consultadas, según aparece en el párrafo 10 del Documento 89/21. Ha sido todo un equipo solido de mentes clarividentes y de cerebros lucidos lo que ha producido estos documentos en dos años de intenso y excitante ejercicio.

Los expertos merecen especial reconocimiento, porque para cumplir su importante tarea cruzaron el mundo, se movieron agitada y frenéticamente desde el Asia mística y legendaria hasta la América austral. Los Comités adoptaron definitivamente su informe el jueves 28 de septiembre, y ya el jueves 12 de octubre, día del descubrimiento de América, apenas dos semanas después, llegó a nuestra misión esta mole de documentos. Fue una primera declaración anticipada de la eficacia lograda en los sistemas de impresión, seguramente ya en cumplimiento de la recomendación que los consultores sobre gestión han hecho en el párrafo 3 del documento C 89/21. Esa frenética secuencia parece confirmar nuestra impresión de que el verdadero y acertado protagonista de todo ese proceso ha sido el Director General, quien rápidamente, en sus opiniones y comentarios, manifiesta en el párrafo 6 que apoya las conclusiones y recomendaciones de los Comités. Y luego, con sabia prudencia de estadista, sobre cada recomendación expresa apoyo o toma nota.

El Director General no se opone a ninguna de las recomendaciones; y tenía que ser así porque casi todas las sugerencias ya se aplican actualmente en la Organización, para citar sólo algunos ejemplos, en el párrafo 31 el Director General afirma: "no es necesario introducir reorientación alguna porque éste es el espíritu con el cual la FAO trabaja hace ya muchos años."

En el párrafo 33, el Director General, dice: "el Plan de Acción para la Integración de la Mujer", será mejor que la Conferencia decida sobre esta cuestión. Todos sabemos ya que la Resolución 1/94 está en marcha y conocemos los documentos C/89/14 Sup. 1.

En el párrafo 35 el Director General dice: "esta recomendación no supone el comienzo de un nuevo tipo de actividades, sino más bien el reforzamiento de actividades ya en curso.

Así podríamos seguir haciendo citas, todo lo cual confirma nuestra impresión de que no obstante el gigantesco y loable esfuerzo realizado el resultado de este examen no ha descubierto nada nuevo bajo el sol, que sigue esplendente sobre las Termas de Caracalla.

Respetamos la opinión de aquéllos distinguidos colegas que piensan lo contrario, pero quienes a lo mejor por timidez han mantenido de incógnito las posibles novedades.

Reconocimiento a los expertos que lograron el consenso, en cambio, en el Informe de los Comités, como es costumbre, subsisten las expresiones: "algunos miembros", "y la mayoría", para concluir en el párrafo 16: "que la mayor parte de las conclusiones de ambos Comités se adoptaron por unanimidad aunque en algunos casos no pudieron adoptar un punto de vista unificado.

Los Representantes de Colombia hacemos referencia a esas respetables aptitudes de los expertos y miembros de los Comités para resaltar, en cambio, el valor de una importante, básica y determinante expresión clave sobre la cual sí hubo unanimidad en todas las instancias. La FAO sigue siendo una institución sólida y dinámica que merece la confianza de sus Estados Miembros.

A juicio nuestro este engranaje de consideraciones podría significar que a pesar del ánimo recto, del espíritu generoso, de la inteligencia y competencia indiscutible de todos los que participaron en este ejercicio, las pocas recomendaciones específicas que se hacen apenas si representan simples cambios cosméticos.

Las cuatro propuestas complementarias del Director General son mucho más significativas e importantes que todas las otras recomendaciones y a lo mejor, si no hubiera mediado este proceso, el Director General habría hecho por sí mismo propuestas de mucho mayor alcance. Creemos que el resultado ha estado muy lejos del espíritu y del contenido de la Resolución 6/87 que señalaba la necesidad de reforzar a la FAO de todas las formas posible para que pudiera continuar desempeñando un papel destacado en la agricultura mundial en los años venideros.

Lejos de nuestra intención criticar a quienes participaron en este Examen, por el contrario juzgamos que sus conclusiones, casi sin recomendaciones trascendentes, no podían hacer nada distinto, han sido coherentes con el contenido de los principales documentos que estudiaremos dentro de pocos días en la Conferencia, documentos en los cuales se demuestra claramente que la FAO, a través de su propia autoevaluación, de evaluaciones externas y del sistema severo y constructivo de reexaminar las prioridades cada bienio, con el concurso decisivo de los Comités técnicos, las Conferencias regionales y los Comités del Programa y de Finanzas; a través e ese ejercicio pragmático, realista y objetivo, la FAO misma genera mucha acción renovada, suficiente dinamismo continuado, actualización adecuada y pertinente.

En efecto en el párrafo 5.1 los Comités aceptan y suscriben la opinión de los expertos de que la FAO ha demostrado innovaciones en su trabajo y ha respondido a los cambios en los acontecimientos mundiales y a las nuevas necesidades a nivel mundial.

A la FAO, una de las recomendaciones propuestas, párrafo 2.64, apartado iv.

Los Comités recomiendan que la FAO alce su voz en el GATT contra las medidas proteccionistas. Alce su voz, esto atrajo nuestro sentimiento siempre muy tercermundista. Bien, veamos en el Anexo 2 cómo se implementara esa trascendental recomendación de los Comités y cuáles serán sus efectos positivos. Posible costo, Anexo 2 de la primera recomendación enumerada, párrafo 2.64 iv: 30. 000 dólares por bienio, repito 30.000 dólares por bienio, y luego seguirán gastos periódicos de 30.000 dólares por cada bienio siguiente. 30.000 dólares en dos años, divididos en 24 meses resultarán 1.250 dólares mensuales, cifra que no alcanza ni siquiera para pagar a un modesto funcionario de servicios generales.

De manera que la FAO si se limitará a esa recomendación, en el GATT no podrá alzar mucho la voz, al menos que los 30.000 dólares se inviertan en la compra de un amplificador electrónico.

Afortunadamente el Director General que ha estado por encima de este Examen ha hecho propuestas complementarias, párrafo 80, que con 900. 000 dólares representará un verdadero reforzamiento de la cooperación FAO-GATT.

Señor Presidente, distinguidos colegas, hemos tratado objetivamente de seleccionar una serie de adjetivos contrapuestos entre si para calificar en general el alcance del resultado de este examen, pero tal vez preferimos no utilizar todos esos adjetivos juntos para no incurrir en injusticias, porque a primera vista salta a nuestra mente oportunidad desaprovechada, ejercicio costoso, inútil, ilusorio, esperanzador, decepcionante, brillante, retórico, histórico, positivo, final glorioso de una experiencia, espejismo, y veleidades.

Todos estos adjetivos se nos ocurren al observar sólo por curiosidad la última página, el Apéndice 7 del documento C 89/21 sobre el costo del examen de la FAO. No obstante la prudencia de la Secretaría y la forma relativamente difícil de calcular los costos. Esos costos representan dos millones en honorarios, viajes, servicios, documentación, reuniones, más de un millón estimado del apoyo de la Secretaría, a todo lo cual deberá sumarse otra serie de gastos difíciles de contabilizar, ¿acaso un mínimo de cinco millones?

Tal como lo dijeron ayer los colegas de Checoslovaquia y Guinea entre otros, ante esos hechos se nos ocurre una pregunta. ¿Ha valido la pena incurrir en esos gastos, crear tanta expectativa y concluir con un resultado como éste que demuestra como del examen el paciente ilustre ha salido más sano y vigoroso que cuanto lo imaginábamos?

Son inquietudes que surgen cuando observamos que, tanto los expertos como los Comités, parecen coincidir en que el mal verdadero que afecta a la FAO y que no le permite ofrecer cada vez más eficientes y valiosos servicios a los países, es la carencia de recursos suficientes.

Sobre los recursos que la FAO necesita se han esgrimido argumentos demagógicos y sofísticos que rechazamos; se ha dicho que no pagan las contribuciones atrasadas porque se han gastado sumas en favor de la paz y de los refugiados en diversos lugares del mundo; pero es un hecho evidente que el compromiso legal y moral se adquirió aquí en la FAO, dos pisos más arriba en este edificio, en la Sala de Plenarias. Cuando la Conferencia, órgano supremo de la Organización, adoptó el nivel del presupuesto, todos los Estados Miembros adquirieron el compromiso legal y moral de pagar sus contribuciones, cualquier cosa sucediera en otro lugar del planeta, en Marte o en la Luna.

Si la falta de recursos es la única falla detectada después de semejante examen, entonces no hay que aplicar recomendaciones ni introducir reformas, lo que hay que hacer es pagar oportunamente las contribuciones como lo ha hecho Colombia, y aprobar niveles de presupuesto suficientes.

Se han expresado preocupaciones sobre el futuro, inquietudes que nosotros compartimos, ya que dentro de pocos días una vez más la Conferencia adoptará un nivel de presupuesto del cual se sabe de antemano que no se pagará la más alta contribución, a la luz de las lapidarias y desafiantes afirmaciones que hemos oído sobre las restricciones financieras. Sería inaceptable la repetición de quebrantar la voluntad del órgano supremo de la FAO si después de la adopción del nivel del presupuesto se impondría de nuevo la forzosa reducción de los Programas.

Reiteramos aquí la posición de Colombia en las Naciones Unidas en el sentido de que preferimos que el país que no esté en condiciones o que no quiera pagar su actual nivel de contribución fijado en la escala, que adopte la honesta decisión de reducir su porcentaje, al menos así sabríamos sobre qué terreno pisamos. Lo demás es falta de respeto a la Comunidad Internacional.

Deseamos reconocer la buena fe, la recta intención, el propósito sano de aquellos distinguidos representantes de gobierno que hace dos años en la Conferencia pasada compitieron por sobresalir como paladines entusiastas de las reformas. Por eso ahora, dos años después, nos decepciona un poco el hecho de que esos mismos representantes parece que han perdido ese ímpetu reformador que ya no clavan en el infinito las grímpolas de júbilo con las cuales querían transformar la Organización. Ahora se contentan con la pírrica adquisición de las pretendidas modificaciones en el proceso de planificación, programación y preparación del presupuesto.

Muy tímida y respetuosamente queremos preguntar a los eminentes y competentes Presidentes de los Comités del Programa y de Finanzas, ¿a quién o a quiénes resultó útil el experimento de la sesión especial de enero del 1989, según la afirmación que hacen los Comités al final del párrafo 2.63? Esa experiencia resultó útil sólo a dos o tres miembros de los Comités que, como lo demuestran los informes, tuvieron así otra oportunidad en esta situación frente a la tradicional reunión de primavera para empezar desde comienzo del año impar de la Conferencia a insistir sobre el funesto e inaceptable crecimiento cero.

Los representantes de Colombia nos oponemos una vez más a cualquier otra sesión especial aunque sea experimental. En el párrafo 2.63 los Comités dicen que en medidas de ese tipo tendrán influencia la normalización de la situación financiera de la Organización, que debates sobre temas anteriores y ciertas aptitudes arrogantes confirman el infundado optimismo de los Comités.

No es justo ni coherente que se supriman reuniones verdaderamente importantes. En otro tema del Consejo, en el documento CL 96/3, vemos que se han suprimido 96 reuniones de verdadera importancia para los países en desarrollo; mientras eso suceda, vamos a seguir patrocinando esta reunión costosa e improductiva.

Nos oponemos también, con todo el respeto por el Director General, a que, en caso de que se siga la práctica del esbozo, se suprima la presentación del resumen y el Programa de Labores y Presupuesto sea presentado directamente en su forma definitiva. Porque bien sabemos que algunas de las Conferencias Regionales se reúnen al final del año para cuando no hay conferencia. El año pasado, la de América Latina y el Caribe fue en Recife, Brasil. Y sabemos también que hay Comités técnicos como el COAG que se reúnen en el primer semestre del año impar. ¿Es así como el esbozo que se presentaría en enero del año de la Conferencia no podría tener en cuenta las recomendaciones de esas reuniones y el Consejo de junio recibiría entonces el Programa de Labores y Presupuesto ya brillantemente editado, empastado, o sea, no modificable? ¿Sólo los Comités tendrán ocasión de analizar el esbozo y reducir el nivel del presupuesto? Las recomendaciones de los otros órganos rectores quedarían convertidas en música celestial. Pero en fin, si la mayoría insiste en que se continúe ese experimento de la sesión especial, podríamos reconsiderar nuestra posición a condición de que en la próxima Conferencia todos apoyen por consenso el mínimo aumento presupuestario propuesto, y si el pago de las contribuciones atrasadas y de todas las cuotas correspondientes al bienio 1990-91 impedirán que se apliquen de nuevo reducciones en los programas.

El plan a plazo medio que abarque un período de seis años sólo será eficaz si se indican los recursos, como ya se hizo alrededor de los años setenta, con un promedio aproximado de crecimiento del 2,5 por ciento en cada bienio. Apoyamos la opinión del Director General, final del párrafo 37, sobre la necesidad de que la adopción de un plan a plazo medio debe entrañar compromiso serio y modificable de todos los Estados Miembros respecto a la cuantía del presupuesto en los tres bienios que comprende el plan. Elaborar un plan sin determinar los recursos sería construir castillos en el aire. Si seguimos al ritmo actual de tres millones/bienio a golpe de crecimiento cero, terminaría por congelar las actividades de nuestra Organización, porque tres por cero es igual a tres bajo cero. Los representantes de Colombia reiteradamente hemos venido exponiendo en esta Organización, a todos los niveles, la conveniencia de que un gran país, la Unión de Repúblicas Socialistas Soviéticas, ejerza el derecho a ser miembro de la FAO. Seguimos pensando que si la URSS decidirá, como lo esperamos, ser miembro efectivo de la FAO, muchas cosas podrían cambiar en esta Organización.

Sr. Presidente y distinguidos colegas: nos excusamos por la forma desordenada de esta intervención, pero debemos confesar que toda esta documentación contiene elementos tan ricos, variados y atractivos, y tuvimos tanto tiempo para leer todos estos documentos que decidimos escribir un libro, cuyo título es: "Envejecer no es deteriorarse". Mi colega que está sentada detrás de mí tiene ejemplares a distribución de los Miembros del Consejo y de la Secretaría para ser distribuidos gratuitamente.

Sr. Presidente: Pero no debe usted preocuparse ni los Miembros del Consejo porque no voy a leer todo este libro. Las últimas 129 páginas las voy a dejar para la Comisión II, cuyo Presidente me ha concedido ya su benevolencia.

En cuanto a las principales funciones de la FAO, unos pocos minutos. Apoyamos la necesidad y conveniencia de que se fortalezca aquélla del ofrecimiento de asistencia técnica dentro del criterio flexible de que habla el Director General en el párrafo 19 de sus opiniones. Como lo dijo ayer la distinguida Embajadora de Venezuela, no podemos regresar a los años setenta para convertir de nuevo a la FAO en una fría e intrascendente institución dedicada a almacenar y difundir informaciones, encerrada en una torre de marfil, lejos de la realidad social y económica, política y humana de los países del Tercer Mundo que ya están hastiados de retórica y de literatura y exigen esa asistencia técnica eficaz y positiva.

Destacaremos la importancia fundamental de la cooperación del Banco Mundial a través del Centro de Inversiones; las consultas periódicas entre FAO y el Banco Mundial y la necesidad de que ese importante Banco no sólo mantenga la participación de la cual acabamos de celebrar los 25 años de existencia sino que la incremente, y el período de dos años a que parece haberse prolongado por ahora esa cooperación, se transforme en otros 25 ó 100 años más.

Apoyamos la propuesta del Director General sobre la creación de un mecanismo mixto de trabajo de alto nivel de los cuatro organismos dedicados a la agricultura y a la alimentación con sede en Roma. Esa es una propuesta innovadora y afortunada que confirma la buena y decidida voluntad de cooperación del Director General a quien felicitamos, porque antes a nadie se le había ocurrido una iniciativa de posible significación.

El Gobierno de Colombia piensa que todos los organismos del Sistema de las Naciones Unidas, en vez de enfrentarse en competencia y rivalidades deben sumar los ya escasos recursos de que disponen en salvar el objetivo común: los países en desarrollo.

Apoyamos el Examen de las operaciones de campo por los órganos rectores tal como los Comités lo proponen en el párrafo 3.42, pero en cuanto al apartado a) de ese párrafo 3.42, será necesario que la Secretaría actúe con criterio selectivo y prudente, porque si, por ejemplo, a las reuniones del Comité de Agricultura que se ocupa de los dos departamentos más importantes de la FAO se presentaran todas las cuestiones relativas a las operaciones de campo, entonces el COAG tendría en su programa una serie confusa y prolífera de documentos cuya consideración desviaría la atención del COAG de los temas principales para los cuales fue establecido. Esto vale también para los Comités de Pesca, Montes y Seguridad Alimentaria. Si no se procede con adecuada selectividad, la innecesaria abundancia de documentos afectará también el cumplimiento de otras recomendaciones.

Reconocemos la buena voluntad y el espíritu constructivo de las propuestas de ayer tarde de nuestro colega y amigo el Sr. Pasquiet, de Suiza. Pero en cuanto a la cuantificación, no pensamos que en la forma deshilvanada como trabajamos, a lo mejor no podría corresponder a porcentajes y semanas a ese perfecto mecanismo de funcionamiento de los relojes suizos.

De las consideraciones anteriores, esperamos que aparezca clara la posición de Colombia en el sentido de que no tenemos ninguna dificultad en apoyar todas las conclusiones de los Comités. Nos oponemos firme y decididamente a que se aplique ningún reajuste en los programas ya acordados para implementar ninguna recomendación. Aquellos representantes de gobiernos que impusieron este ejercicio en la Conferencia pasada, deben ahora estar dispuestos a costear los 26 millones que el resultado del Examen costará en el primer bienio. Los únicos padres de la criatura, aunque ésta haya resultado débil y endémica, no pueden desconocer el fruto de su engendro ni negarse a sostenerlo.

Ayer, el distinguido Embajador de Italia, en actitud generosa que corresponde a la posición tradicionalmente positiva de nuestro Gobierno hospedante, anunció la confirmación, el ofrecimiento de 15 millones de dólares que representan el 59 por ciento de 26 millones. Un solo miembro de los 23 Estados que integran la OCDE ha así contribuido con más del 50 por ciento de 26 millones. Pero naturalmente, si a la luz de cómo se viene actuando en relación con los modestos 2 millones de aumento en el presupuesto para el próximo bienio, si siguiera ese mismo criterio, entonces podríamos acordar que los 26 millones se dividan en trece bienios de 2 millones cada uno para que así se satisfaga la aspiración de aquellos que desean que este ejercicio del Examen y la revisión se prolongue más allá del año 2000.

Sr. Presidente, distinguidos colegas: el Movimiento de los No Alineados está integrado por más de 100 Estados respetables, entre ellos Colombia. Proponemos que, como lo dijo ayer la Embajadora Neury de Cuba, se haga un breve resumen en el examen de las principales conclusiones de la última reunión de los No Alineados sobre la función de la FAO, la situación del hambre en el mundo y la responsabilidad de los deudores morosos.

Nosotros somos amigos del diálogo. Estamos dispuestos a dialogar. Podemos dialogar con colegas que han hecho aquí declaraciones generalmente positivas. El colega Pettitt, del Reino Unido, el colega Coutts, de Australia y, sobre todo, el colega Lieber de la República Federal de Alemania, los representantes del Japón y de Italia y también los señores colegas y amigos Hallinen de Finlandia y Pasquiet de Suiza, entre otros. Con ellos podemos dialogar y tenemos la esperanza de que podamos adelantar contactos positivos en el curso de la Conferencia. Como lo ha dicho el colega Lieber de la República Federal de Alemania, toda posibilidad de crear grupos de contacto o como quiera llamárseles, sólo podrá realizarse en el seno de la Conferencia que está integrada por todos los Estados Miembros de esta Organización.

Pero así como estamos dispuestos y queremos adelantar el diálogo con esas y otras delegaciones, queremos declarar con toda honestidad y franqueza que no contribuye a ese diálogo, que no es aporte positivo al logro del consenso, la actitud obstinada de una sola delegación. Nos ha causado estupor, también por su proveniencia, la propuesta de que la Conferencia apruebe una Resolución que contenga un mecanismo de seguimiento destinado a seguir revisando al infinito las actividades y la estructura de nuestra Organización. Esto sería un golpe de Estado contra la autoridad constitucional del Director General, cuya amplia capacidad, gran inteligencia y excepcional dinamismo todos reconocemos.

Como se habla tanto de prioridades, en el caso de que la Conferencia decidiera adoptar un mecanismo de seguimiento, éste debería servir para evitar que en el futuro se repitan retrasos tan graves en el pago de las contribuciones que pongan en peligro la vida misma de nuestra Organización. Otro alternativo mecanismo de seguimiento que podríamos aceptar sería aquel que, frente a las graves crisis de recursos y situación de la alimentación en el mundo, ese mecanismo de seguimiento permitiera a la FAO permanecer en contacto con "Amnesty International" en defensa de los derechos humanos de los millones de personas que padecen hambre y malnutrición en el Tercer Mundo.

Serena y sinceramente pensamos que todos los Miembros del Consejo, sin excepción, deberíamos actuar con un mínimo de coherencia y de responsabilidad, y en algunos casos hasta con humildad, a la luz de la grave crisis financiera y de las claras dimanantes responsabilidades. Sentimos sinceramente admiración por quienes de manera tan tranquila parecen demostrar desconocimiento de esa situación.

Hemos utilizado la vecindad de nuestro colega de la derecha, el Embajador del Congo, Presidente de la Comisión II, para ofrecerle nuestros servicios en busca del diálogo y del consenso. Por ello, vamos ahora a concluir con una sola palabra; una palabra que es muy utilizada por los italianos, pero que es también castiza: "Basta"!

LE PRESIDENT. Je remercie M. l'ambassadeur de Colombie. Je voudrais vous lire la liste des délégués et des observateurs, qui se sont inscrits pour prendre la parole: Argentine, Liban, Arabie Saoudite, Congo, Algérie, Indonésie, Kenya, Nicaragua et Angola. Le Royaume-Uni redemande la parole pour une information supplémentaire. Comme observateur, nous avons le délégué des Pays-Bas. La Suisse redemande également la parole pour une minute afin d'ajouter une information à sa déclaration d'hier.

LE DIRECTEUR GENERAL. Je demanderai la parole après avoir entendu le délégué de la Suisse.

LE PRESIDENT. Nous arrêtons définitivement la liste des orateurs inscrits parce que nous avons des contraintes de temps impérieuses. Je lance un appel à MM. les délégués pour que, dans toute la mesure du possible, ils tiennent compte de cette contrainte de temps.

Sra. Monica DEREGBUS (Argentina): Espero poder expresarme en pocas palabras y que sean claras y concretas. En primer lugar, agradezco en nombre de la delegación argentina a todas las personas, ya sean expertos, miembros de Comités o funcionarios de la FAO, que han estado involucrados en esta tarea del Examen de las actividades de la Organización.

Creemos que se ha completado un trabajo de gran aliento, que nos han presentado recomendaciones muy valiosas con efectos sobre el largo plazo, y que ellas deben ser analizadas cuidadosamente por los Miembros del Consejo y de la Conferencia para ver cuál es la mejor manera de ponerlas en práctica a los efectos de fortalecer la eficiencia de la Organización.

Nuestro primer comentario se refiere a las conclusiones del Examen en lo que hace a lo que se llama el rol o a lo que se llaman las funciones de la FAO. En ocasión de la aprobación de la Resolución 6/87 en la Conferencia, la delegación argentina había hecho una observación con relación a la necesidad de proceder al Examen de las funciones de la FAO. En aquel momento, nosotros dijimos que creíamos que la función de la FAO estaba claramente definida en su Constitución y que no había que tocarla. El Examen que se ha llevado a cabo nos ha dado razón en aquella apreciación.

En lo que se refiere a las funciones específicas, esas tres funciones principales que están enumeradas en los Textos Básicos, la delegación argentina estima que es fundamental poner de relieve el carácter complementario de las mismas, y que ello implica que debe haber un equilibrio entre los recursos que se les destinan, porque ellas se alimentan mutuamente. La primera, o sea la que se refiere a la colección y difusión de información, implica necesariamente que se debe ayudar a los países para ser capaces de obtener y transmitir sus propios datos económicos. La segunda hace uso de la información para poder formular políticas y recomendaciones pertinentes, eficaces y conducentes a los altos objetivos de la Organización. Y la tercera, la de asistencia técnica, también es fundamental por cuanto sin ella los países en desarrollo no podrían superar sus actuales limitaciones y no podrían contribuir nunca útilmente a las funciones anteriores de la Organización.

En cuanto a las nuevas tareas, apoyamos especialmente la actividad en materia de política de la FAO en lo que se refiere a los programas de ajuste estructural, coincidiendo en un todo con el párrafo 2.20 del Capítulo 2 del informe de los Comités.

También damos especial énfasis a la actividad de la Organización en el fomento de la investigación y de la transferencia de tecnologías. En este sentido, manifestamos nuestro especial acuerdo con los párrafos 2.23 y 2.24 del mismo capítulo, sobre todo en lo que hace a la CTPD y al fomento de la investigación en los propios países en desarrollo. En asistencia técnica estamos de acuerdo con lo que reza el párrafo 2.27 y quisiéramos llamar la atención sobre la necesidad de que ella se adecue sobre todo a la capacidad de absorción del país receptor, circunstancia que no vemos mencionada en los informes. Con relación a la actividad que propone el Director General en materia de consejo científico y técnico en las cuestiones de regulaciones sanitarias y fito-sanitarias para el comercio internacional de alimentos y otros productos agrícolas, mi Delegación está muy contenta de poder apoyar esta iniciativa y esperamos que ella cuente con la aprobación del resto de las delegaciones asistentes a la Conferencia.

En lo que se refiere a las operaciones de campo, favorecemos el examen técnico de las mismas por parte de los Comités principales competentes. Estimamos que ello permitirá detectar los problemas que se presentan y buscarles soluciones adecuadas. Estimamos también que ello implicará la necesidad de participación técnica, de participación a nivel de expertos que provengan de las capitales, mucho más de lo que ha exigido hasta el presente. Recordamos aquí la referencia que hicimos en el Consejo pasado acerca de la necesidad de que se provea en el futuro de alguna forma de asistencia a los países en desarrollo que no pueden hacer llegar a sus expertos de las capitales a Roma, en ocasión de las reuniones de los Comités principales. En la última reunión del COAG una delegación expresó su sorpresa por ver que el nivel de las delegaciones que asistían a los Comités principales de la FAO había ido decayendo a lo largo del tiempo. Nosotros dijimos en aquel momento que creíamos que ello se debía a las graves restricciones financieras que afrontan los países en desarrollo y que el Consejo debía pensar en alguna solución para asegurar que la participación de los países se pudiera hacer en un pie de igualdad y en un nivel técnico adecuado. Estamos planteando esta cuestión aquí para ver cuál es la reacción de los miembros del Consejo, para ver si podemos formular un diálogo en este sentido.

En cuanto a las prioridades en la selección de los proyectos y programas, estamos de acuerdo en que ello es un ejercicio necesario y estamos convencidos también de que la FAO lo ha hecho siempre. Cuando en muchas partes de los informes se dice que la Organización recibe muchas más solicitudes de asistencia que las que efectivamente puede dar, se está implicando que la Organización está diciendo que no a muchas de esas solicitudes de asistencia. Esto se hace, evidentemente con base en un criterio que tiene en cuenta el mandato de la FAO y las prioridades fijadas por los países miembros. Si bien la actual situación financiera es especialmente crítica, nosotros no podemos suponer que a la FAO siempre le sobró dinero, y que tenía más plata que la que necesitaba para ayudar a los países. El dinero siempre fue limitado en esta Organización, como en cualquier otra y como en cualquiera de los países miembros. De manera que la selección de prioridades y la selección de proyectos se ha efectuado siempre. Si lo que se está pidiendo es que esta tarea se refine de alguna manera o que en ella puedan tener los países miembros una mayor participación o que éstos encuentren la manera de ponerse de acuerdo sobre algunas prioridades, digamos, más prioritarias que otras, nosotros no tenemos ningún inconveniente en entrar en diálogo con el resto de la membrecía del Consejo, de la Conferencia, de la Organización, para ver de refinar el proceso. Pero quisiéramos dejar en claro que creemos que una selección de actividades se ha hecho siempre y que estamos seguros de que lo que hay que hacer es, tal vez, perfeccionar el proceso, pero no se puede decir que esto no se ha hecho en el pasado. Por consiguiente, no vemos contradicción mayor en los puntos de vista expresados en los párrafos 2.27, 2.29 y 3.23 del informe. Pese a que en el informe de las reuniones conjuntas de los Comités se hace aparecer como que hay puntos de vista divergentes, nosotros, que partimos de esta base que le acabamos de comentar, no vemos que haya realmente puntos de vista divergentes, y nos asombra que éste sea uno de los temas de los cuales se dice que hay divergencia entre los miembros.

Estos son los pocos comentarlos específicos que mi Delegación quería hacer. Queremos aclarar que, habiendo participado el miembro argentino en las deliberaciones de los Comités, nosotros podemos endosar completamente el informe. Creemos, sin embargo, que la cuestión es bastante delicada y complicada y que, por consiguiente, en las pocas semanas con que contamos para tomar decisiones al respecto, tendríamos que actuar con una dosis muy alta de pragmatismo y tender los países miembros a buscar soluciones que puedan ser reales y factibles; no, por ejemplo, a formular resoluciones de muchos capítulos, como mencionó una delegación en día de ayer, que no nos llevaría nada más que a largas sesiones de redacción para refinar el lenguaje. Nosotros creemos que, en la medida de lo posible, hay que tratar de mantener el lenguaje utilizado por los Comités, de manera de ir eliminando posibles fuentes de discrepancias. También creemos que es importante que el diálogo entre los miembros se realice de un modo informal en el primer tiempo. No estamos viendo -y esto nos llama la atención- que haya contactos informales entre los miembros en esta sesión del Consejo. Todo el mundo está diciendo que hay que crear un grupo de contacto, que hay que establecer un canal para las negociaciones, pero yo no creo que ésa sea la

manera más inteligente de hacer las cosas: creo que las personas, las delegaciones, deben ir acercándose un poco entre sí para intercambiar puntos de vista, y cuando las consultas estén maduras, entonces, sí, establecer ya los grupos que correspondan con el acuerdo de todos los miembros.

Nosotros tenemos nuestras dudas que entre las funciones del Consejo se encuentre la de recomendarle a la Conferencia métodos de trabajo. Nos tomamos el trabajo, valga la redundancia, de buscar en los Textos Básicos de la Organización si el Consejo tenía alguna posibilidad de recomendar procedimientos a la Conferencia, y todo lo que hemos visto son recomendaciones en materia de políticas, nunca de procedimientos. Así que yo, personalmente, tengo, repito, mis dudas sobre la conveniencia o inclusive la posibilidad de que el Consejo recomiende a la Conferencia que forme un grupo de contacto, como sugirieron algunas delegaciones.

Yo quisiera también decir, por último, que hay suficientes temas y hay suficientes cuestiones que están subrayadas en el informe de los Comités, que están propuestas a la atención de las delegaciones y que han podido ser analizadas y consideradas, y respecto de las cuales las delegaciones vienen con una posición como para considerar en la Conferencia, inclusive en este Consejo. Estos temas y estas cuestiones son ya tantos, inclusive la de la financiación de estas recomendaciones -de las que se decida poner en práctica en el próximo bienio-, que no creemos nosotros que haya que plantear en este momento nuevas propuestas que concentren o que puedan concentrar la atención de las delegaciones, las cuales no contarán con instrucciones al respecto, y que tampoco han sido objeto de negociaciones o de consultas previas. Se ha estado hablando aquí de empezar a pensar en modificar los métodos de trabajo de algunos órganos de esta Organización. Nosotros creemos que ya tenemos bastantes temas para decidir, que están en los documentos que nos han sido presentados y que estaban incluidos en la Resolución 6/87, como para empezar en este momento a pensar en nuevas propuestas. Por consiguiente, quisiera solicitar a las delegaciones interesadas en plantear estos nuevos temas que consideraran la conveniencia de resolver primero los temas que tenemos a consideración y, más adelante, ocuparnos de los nuevos.

Amin ABDEL MALEK (Liban) (langue originale arabe): Lors de sa dernière session, la Conférence a adopté la Résolution 6/87 invitant le Directeur général à présenter les recommandations et conclusions que formuleraient les deux groupes d'experts constitués à l'initiative du Comité du programme et du Comité financier afin de passer en revue les objectifs, le rôle, les priorités, les stratégies et les opérations de terrain de l'Organisation.

Si mes souvenirs sont bons, cette résolution avait soulevé en son temps une polémique sur l'opportunité de procéder à un tel examen dans ces conditions et sur l'approche à suivre pour un tel examen. Le Comité du programme et le Comité financier, en application de ladite résolution, ont établi deux groupes d'experts internationaux reconnus pour leur compétence, leur vaste culture, leur expérience et leur intégrité.

Le premier groupe a été chargé d'examiner les objectifs de l'Organisation, son rôle, ses priorités et ses stratégies. Au deuxième groupe revenaient les opérations de terrain. Les deux groupes se sont acquittés dans les délais impartis de la tâche qui leur était confiée et ont rédigé leurs rapports en temps voulu. Le coût de cette opération s'est élevé à plus de deux millions de dollars, sans tenir compte du coût de soutien représenté par le temps que le personnel de la FAO a consacré à fournir les informations et les services nécessaires aux deux groupes.

Chacun des deux groupes a rédigé un rapport fouillé et exhaustif. Lors de leur session spéciale conjointe, les deux comités ont étudié les deux rapports ainsi que les observations du Directeur général à leur sujet.

Ce qui précède représente un bref exposé de ce qui s'est passé lors de la dernière Conférence générale et les activités de mise en oeuvre de la Résolution 6/87 durant les deux dernières années. Certains s'attendaient à ce que les rapports des experts reflètent des erreurs, des manquements, des déficits et des dépassements dans les activités de l'Organisation. Mais les vents ont soufflé dans un sens contraire à leur attente. Et je voudrais citer textuellement ce que les experts ont dit dans leur rapport: "La FAO reste une institution solide et dynamique, et elle jouit d'une bonne santé tout en laissant la porte ouverte à une amélioration de l'efficacité de l'Organisation et de ses activités."

La mise en oeuvre des recommandations des deux groupes d'experts pour renforcer l'efficacité de la FAO nécessite environ 26 millions de dollars sinon plus. Dans son rapport, le Directeur général a indiqué qu'il approuvait la majorité de ces recommandations, d'autant qu'elles n'étaient pas contraaires à ce qu'il avait toujours essayé de faire si les fonds nécessaires pour cela avaient été disponibles.

Certains avaient demandé de par le passé de procéder nécessairement à un examen visant à une réforme de l'Organisation. Ce sont ceux-là mêmes qui aujourd'hui insistent pour priver l'Organisation de toute augmentation de ressources et maintenir le principe de la croissance zéro. C'est la raison pour laquelle je me demande comment la FAO pourrait mettre en oeuvre ces recommandations alors qu'elle a un besoin pressant des maigres ressources qui lui restent et également des versements qu'elle attend des pays qui n'ont pas encore payé leur contribution pour ces activités ordinaires. Certains lui demandent de résorber tous les coûts résultant de l'inflation dans le Programme ordinaire, qui n'a enregistré aucune augmentation. Les sommes dépensées pour cet examen dont l'Organisation n'avait nul besoin auraient mieux profité aux pays en développement si elles avaient été consacrées à des projets de développement. Quant à la FAO, elle aurait ainsi fait l'objet de félicitations et de remerciements de la part de pays qui auraient pu bénéficier de ces projets.

Cela ne signifie pas que nous n'apprécions pas le travail des deux groupes d'experts. Bien au contraire, nous n'avons à leur égard que considération et respect, et nous les remercions de l'excellente tâche accomplie qui leur a permis de faire le jour sur les vérités concernant la FAO, sa bonne gestion et l'excellente façon dont elle s'est acquittée des tâches qui lui ont été confiées. Ce sont des vérités que certains voulaient ignorer et que d'autres ont effectivement ignorées. C'est en fait un satisfecit délivré à l'Organisation et nul ne peut plus l'ignorer ou faire semblant de l'ignorer.

Certains ont proposé de nouvelles recommandations; d'autres lient le paiement de leur contribution à l'exécution de la réforme de l'Organisation et bien d'autres nouvelles propositions ont également été avancées. La délégation libanaise ne peut accepter aucune nouvelle recommandation qui sorte du cadre de celles figurant dans le rapport des experts. La délégation libanaise n'accepte pas non plus d'examiner tout autre point n'ayant pas été inscrit à l'ordre du jour de cette session. Nous refusons également de lier l'exécution des recommandations au paiement des contributions des pays membres. La délégation libanaise abonde dans le sens de la grande majorité des membres du Conseil qui ne sont pas d'accord sur la création d'un groupe spécial chargé de se pencher sur l'examen des activités de la FAO après que cet examen aura été effectué par le Comité du programme et le Comité financier et aura fait l'objet de conclusions acceptées à l'unanimité.

Nous ne partageons pas non plus l'avis de ceux qui prétendent que l'on n'a pas eu assez de temps pour examiner ces recommandations. Nous avons pleinement le temps d'une étude approfondie et la délégation libanaise ne voit nullement la nécessité d'établir de nouveaux comités, quelles que soient les tâches qui leur seront confiées tout comme nous ne voyons pas la nécessité de tenir des réunions supplémentaires du Conseil ou des comités techniques; en effet les réunions déjà prévues ou qui sont maintenant en cours sont largement suffisantes.

En bref, Monsieur le Président, la délégation libanaise approuve les recommandations du Comité du programme et du Comité financier; elle approuve également les quatre propositions avancées par le Directeur général et qui complètent les recommandations de base de ces deux comités, à condition toutefois d'assurer les fonds supplémentaires nécessaires à l'exécution de ces recommandations car, dans le projet de Programme de travail et budget présenté par le Directeur général pour l'exercice financier 1990-91, aucune ligne de crédit n'a été ouverte à cet effet bien que le Secrétariat ait déjà présenté une estimation première des coûts d'une telle opération, ce dont nous le remercions.

(J'attire ici tout particulièrement l'attention des interprètes sur les changements apportés au texte que je leur ai transmis; je les prie de traduire ce que je vais dire maintenant).

La délégation libanaise aurait souhaité que l'on aboutisse à un consensus sur ces recommandations; mais je dois dire, avec beaucoup d'amertume, que certaines remarques faites hier et qui constituent une sorte de pression exercée sur nous, pour ne pas dire une menace voilée, ces remarques nous les refusons en bloc car nous sommes les représentants de pays pleinement souverains et indépendants et qui ont leur dignité, et ces remarques, qui ont gâché nos attentes, auraient pu être évitées. Plus de cent pays, membres de la FAO, n'ont pas participé aux travaux du Conseil et auront leur mot à dire sur ce sujet lors de la Conférence générale. Nous espérons alors que dans l'Intérêt de tous nous aboutirons à un résultat meilleur sur cet examen pour le bien de tous.

Atif Y. BUKHARI (Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of) (original language Arabic): Thank you very much. In the name of Allah the merciful and the compassionate, I thank you and feel obliged to recall that experts who carried out the Review come from the various recognized political and geographical regions of the world. They are people who have the full approval of the authorities of their countries. Some of them were chosen by their own governments. They are people of international repute who enjoy the full confidence of their own governments and who are certainly up to the tasks that were conferred upon them.

The same can be said of the members of the Programme and Finance Committees, because they represent their governments and they are outstanding experts in food and agricultural matters. The members of the Programme and Finance Committees were chosen to represent their countries at the very highest level. They were also chosen by us, by the Council. All this experience, all this skill, together with the support provided by the Director-General and his staff, who are only too aware of the activities of FAO - there was a meeting of minds, and after two years of work they have produced a Report which covers the future of FAO and the futures of member countries of FAO. The result of the Review which is before us now shows that improvements can be made in FAO's efficiency, that we can strengthen FAO's objectives, but these documents have also proved that the Organization is healthy, sound in mind and body and that it is doing its job in an animated and active way, despite the financial difficulties it has had to face in the past years.

However, I feel obliged to repeat that renewal cannot stop at a specific age. It has to be an ongoing process. When the idea of the Review was first mooted, my delegation was not very enthusiastic about it. We thought that it was not the right time for such a review, especially since the economic conditions in the world were chaotic, and FAO naturally was bending over backwards in its attempt to cope with non-payment of assessed contributions. We never thought in Saudi Arabia that the results of the Review would show up gaps or inadequacies in FAO's management; nor did we expect the Review to lead to enormous savings, because it was logical and rational for us to know about all of FAO's activities in detail and for us to participate in the activities of all of the bodies of the Organization. So the Review showed what we expected. In fact, our expectations were met and, since I took part in the work carried out by the Finance and Programme Committees, I want to give my country's full support to the recommendations, all the recommendations, produced by the two Committees.

We are also convinced that the Director-General's comments are recommendations which complete those produced by the Committees, so we fully approve those as well.

Mr Chairman, friends, it is clear that the essentials in the Report were unanimously approved by both Committees. As I said, the members of the two Committees represent independent sovereign countries. They also represent all regional groups, and in the course of the last two years they have had plenty of time in which to express the point of view of their governments in the matter.

Mr Chairman, therefore, when the general Conference begins, we shall have to emphasize the points that were the object of more than one opinion, and we must examine the comments of the Director-General as well. We are convinced that if we do that we shall reach a consensus.

Turning now to FAO's three major roles which appear in its Constitution, they have already been mentioned by previous speakers and we approve them. They are the cornerstones upon which FAO stands and its objectives complement each other and, therefore, the strengthening of FAO's objectives must be carried out in a balanced way. With respect to the definition of priorities, my delegation would not agree that it would be either wise or easy in the course of one or two meetings to define priorities, because such an operation calls for a whole series of debates at all levels; at the national level; at the regional level; and also at the level of the governing bodies in the FAO. Furthermore, to define priorities requires clearly defined criteria, because some priorities are difficult to compare to others. The guidelines given us in 264 of the Joint Report are sufficient and acceptable in our opinion. With respect to assistance in technical cooperation between developing countries, these are two elements for which we cannot and should not even attempt to restrict the resources allocated to them. I think that everybody would agree, even if the support varies in form.

Sir, if we do not truly intend to be truthful and fair and we do not have enough insight, then we won't find the right path to follow, so before the general Conference begins, we must decide what we want; what we are seeking.

The Contact Group, which was set up in 1987, did not have much success, and everybody knows that. On the contrary, the Contact Group actually held up the work of the Conference; it fed and increased tension, because the intentions of the people were not fair or praiseworthy. So we must avoid making the same mistake again. If we have good intentions, if we want the Review to follow the right path, then the Drafting Committee, which will be established for Commission II, will be perfectly capable of doing the job. Nevertheless, we are open to proposals and I think that it is premature to discuss the matter just yet. And that the Chairman of Commission II, as well as the officers of the Commission, should decide among themselves how best to proceed. We would like to say very clearly that we are firmly in favour of the spirit and letter of Resolution 6/87 and we do not want to be entrapped in a vicious circle again as was the case in 1987. We are ready to negotiate objectively, but only within the framework of the provisions of Resolution 6/87. We do not wish to include new questions and we do not want to bring back to life proposals that were rejected in the past.

It is difficult for us to accept that the cost of implementing these recommendations should be covered by the regular budget. How can we possibly accept such a suggestion? This would be to the detriment of FAO, of its goals, of its role, its priorities, and its strategies. But if FAO can be assured of a regular inflow of contributions, especially from the major contributors, including the United States of America, and if this inflow is normal as in the past, then we can have another look at our position.

We have noted that the Director-General in his report, in his views and comments, has suggested three scenarios which we fully accept, provided, as I say, provided that a normal flow of contributions is ensured. And, as regards extra-budgetary resources, we hope that developed countries, industrialized countries, will be able to take this need into account, in accordance with the proposals of the Director-General. I am saying this because everybody knows that developing countries are also paying, but what they are paying is the interest on the debts they have with the developed countries. These interest payments have long exceeded the capital value of the debts, the original capital value of the debts.

Chairman, distinguished delegates, we must be honest and consistent with ourselves and we must make sure that the next, the forthcoming general Conference is the final, is the end, is the final point of this exercise, that things really come to an end there in this review so that the FAO, the Secretariat, the FAO, the Organization as such can really do everything to meet the needs of developing countries, so it may put into practice the recommendations formulated in the best manner so that they may finally bear fruit. We hope, and we ask all member countries, we urge all member countries to approve the results that have been produced by this Review, the recommendations by consensus.

This will certainly require constructive dialogue carried out forward, calmly, equanimously, with no threats, with no emotional reactions or challenges. The experience of 1987 of the last general Conference was a painful one. There were threats there, there was challenging. We created problems at that Conference session which we have not been able to solve in the intervening years.

Finally, we have those four supplementary proposals formulated by the Director-General as part of his views and comments and we fully support and approve them in their entirety here, because we are convinced that they are such as to strengthen FAO and to consolidate a better cooperation between international organizations. We are of the opinion that to establish, keep up a good contact with GATT and its Director-General and the fact of the contacts that have been had already with the Organization, shows how highly valued the technical quality of our Organization is by other bodies. So we urge the Director-General to continue along these lines; to continue within his dialogue with GATT, because this is in the interest of all Member Nations whether developed or developing.

Joseph TCHICAYA (Congo): Tout d'abord, nous voudrions rendre hommage au Comité du Programme et au Comité financier, qui, conjointement, avaient reçu aux termes de la Résolution 6/87 de la 24ème session de la Conférence la redoutable mission de procéder à l'Examen de certains aspects des buts et opérations de la FAO, sujet vaste, mais circonscrit dans certaines limites, dont le rapport est actuellement soumis à la considération de notre Conseil. Nous félicitons le Directeur général pour avoir accompli les tâches qui lui revenaient, non seulement en présentant avec la concision et la clarté qui lui sont familières ses vues et observations, mais aussi en facilitant le travail des deux Comités, ce qui leur a permis de présenter dans les délais cet important travail sur lequel la Conférence aura à se prononcer.

Nous remercions également le Professeur Mazoyer pour la clarté de son exposé introductif.

La Délégation de la République populaire du Congo accueille sans surprise et avec la plus grande satisfaction les principales conclusions auxquelles sont parvenus les deux Comités, puisqu'elles rejoignent ce que nous disions déjà lors de la discussion qui a abouti à la Résolution 6/87, à savoir que près de 45 ans après sa création, le souci des Etats Membres de la FAO, tel qu'il est exprimé dans le Préambule de son Acte constitutif, répond encore aux nécessités de la situation et aux tendances de l'agriculture et de l'alimentation. C'était notre conviction et nous en sommes ravis.

Je m'associe donc à l'hommage que les Comités rendent ainsi à l'exceptionnelle clairvoyance dont ont fait preuve les fondateurs de la FAO il y a 44 ans, et grâce à laquelle notre Organisation a su s'ouvrir aux innovations rendues nécessaires par les mutations en cours.

Voilà qui justifie quelque peu nos hésitations, lors de la dernière Conférence, face à l'urgence exprimée par quelques pays d'engager un examen en profondeur d'une organisation dont la solidité ne faisait l'ombre d'aucun doute et qui était de surcroît plongée dans une crise financière sans précédent. Cependant, nous nous étions ralliés à la Résolution 6/87, dès lors que ses promoteurs avaient retenu comme objectif majeur le renforcement de l'Organisation, c'est-à-dire également la fin de sa crise financière, donc le paiement rapide des arriérés de contributions par les débiteurs, et ce d'autant plus qu'il nous était demandé simultanément de procéder à une modification du processus d'examen du Programme de travail et budget afin, disait-on, de faciliter le paiement des contributions du plus grand contributeur promoteur de cette innovation.

Nous sommes dans l'obligation de constater, à présent que l'examen a été entrepris, la réforme du processus d'examen du Programme de travail et budget engagée, que la crise financière de la FAO s'approfondit, alors que la mise en oeuvre des recommandations contenues dans le rapport des deux Comités ainsi que les vues et observations du Directeur général sont toutes des propositions, nous le savons, qui appellent des ressources supplémentaires pour plus de 26 millions de dollars. Nous espérons que les pays nantis manifesteront la même énergie que celle qu'ils ont déployée pour exiger l'Examen actuellement soumis à notre attention. On se souviendra que nous avons dû nous rallier à cet Examen dès lors qu'il était acquis qu'il visait l'amélioration de l'efficacité de l'Organisation. Notre espoir résidait dans le fait qu'un tel Examen pouvait en effet mobiliser des ressources supplémentaires qui contribueraient à renforcer les possibilités d'intervention de la FAO. Du coup, nous rejetons l'immobilisme dans lequel on veut plonger notre Organisation en nous faisant croire qu'il est possible de renforcer la FAO sans lui injecter des ressources supplémentaires et pour ce faire on nous demande d'abandonner les priorités que les Etats Membres eux-mêmes ont retenues, suite aux propositions émanant des divers organes directeurs de notre Organisation, et on veut créer des organes peu représentatifs qui le feraient en leur lieu et place.

Il nous semble en effet contradictoire de vouloir renforcer une organisation et de refuser d'en payer le prix. Les propositions qui nous sont faites visant à intégrer les dépenses supplémentaires issues de l'Examen dans le Programme de travail de la FAO ne nous paraissent pas être la solution la plus appropriée.

La délégation de mon pays, en continuant à appuyer les trois grands rôles de la FAO dont la complémentarité constitue un atout majeur dans le renforcement des liens entre le programme ordinaire et le programme de terrain, estime que toute proposition visant à renforcer un rôle au détriment de l'autre ne peut aller qu'à l'encontre du but fixé par cet Examen, et ce, même si nous pensons que le rôle d'assistance technique de la FAO devrait être accru pour éviter de fragiliser notre Organisation. A cet égard, le point de vue exprimé par le Japon hier et d'autres délégations rencontre notre agrément, à savoir que les trois grands rôles de la FAO sont interdépendants et doivent être simultanément renforcés pour donner plus d'impact à l'action de la FAO.

En d'autres termes, nous avons et aurons encore besoin d'une FAO qui sache mobiliser l'information, qui joue parfaitement son rôle de forum international et qui fournisse une assistance technique à la hauteur des demandes des pays en développement.

Nous appuyons les quatre propositions du Directeur général qui nous paraissent complémentaires des recommandations du Comité. Nous partageons en outre tout l'appui qu'apportent les Comités à la conservation des ressources naturelles et à la protection de l'environnement. Nous nous sentons à l'aise de lire au paragraphe 3.31 que les Comités trouvent que les ressources affectées aux PCT sont manifestement insuffisantes pour lui permettre de répondre aux demandes des gouvernements et souhaitent que davantage de fonds soient mis à la disposition de la FAO. Bref, nous nous rallions au rapport des Comités aux vues exprimées par le Directeur général.

Cela dit, je pense sincèrement qu'à ce stade du débat, 11 n'est pas opportun de constituer un groupe de contact, mais une telle proposition pourrait être envisagée par ma délégation lors de la Conférence au niveau de la Commission II, où il sera possible, à un certain stade des débats, de constituer un Groupe d'Amis du Président pour réfléchir sur la meilleure manière de présenter les conclusions des débats sur cette question afin qu'une résolution soit préparée et adoptée par consensus. Nous sommes par ailleurs convaincus que le large consensus qui a prévalu lors des travaux des Comités et qui se dessine au sein de ce Conseil influera positivement sur les résultats relatifs à cette importante question de l'ordre du jour de la Conférence.

A cet égard, nous voudrions lancer un appel aux pays qui le peuvent d'accepter d'apporter volontairement les ressources nécessaires au financement de certaines recommandations. Le Congo, soumis aux contraintes de mise en oeuvre d'un programme d'ajustement structurel et qui vient tout juste de s'acquitter de ses engagements vis-à-vis de l'Organisation, ne pourra être en mesure de participer pendant ce biennium au financement des actions issues des recommandations des Comités et des propositions du Directeur général.

En outre, nous pensons que le processus de prise de décision de la FAO n'appelle aucun commentaire de notre part, bien que le Congo reste ouvert à toute discussion qui renforcerait la solidité et le dynamisme de la FAO afin qu'elle continue à mériter la confiance de ses Etats Membres. Ma délégation voudrait exprimer toute sa désapprobation aux propos tenus hier dans cette salle par notre ami de Suisse qui annonce des mesures de rétorsion si les choses n'allaient pas dans la direction qu'il souhaite. De tels propos ne peuvent que durcir les attitudes de ceux qui sont mus par le désir de travailler au renforcement de notre Organisation, éloignant ainsi les chances d'obtenir le consensus que tous nous appelons de nos vœux. En effet, tout chantage dans un exercice de ce genre ne peut qu'être que contreproductif. Fort heureusement tout le monde n'est pas de cet avis, et la déclaration de l'Ambassadeur d'Italie qui a suscité les vives applaudissements des membres de notre Conseil, a éclipsé ces imprudences et réconforté les pays bénéficiaires du PCT. Voilà qui indique que le Gouvernement italien aborde cette Conférence dans un esprit de dialogue constructif. Ma délégation ainsi que d'autres membres du Conseil sauront le moment venu apprécier à sa juste valeur ce geste du Gouvernement italien.

J'ai suivi avec beaucoup d'attention les interventions de tous les délégués qui ont pris la parole avant moi et je dois reconnaître, comme je l'ai déjà dit, que tous militent en faveur d'un consensus sur les recommandations à mettre en oeuvre. Mais je voudrais dire combien les interventions que j'ai indiquées tout à l'heure ainsi que les interventions d'une autre délégation m'ont préoccupé, en raison de leur intransigeance et de leur rigidité. Je crains qu'une telle attitude n'aboutisse à un durcissement des positions de beaucoup d'entre nous. Les menaces, le chantage, nous le savons, sont des armes désuètes qui suscitent la confrontation et tournent le dos au consensus.

Pour sa part, la Délégation congolaise appuie les recommandations du Comité et les propositions du Directeur général et nous restons, comme nous l'avons dit, ouverts au niveau de la Commission II aux dialogues constructifs avec tous dans la direction proposée par le Royaume-Uni et appuyée par d'autres délégués pourvu que nous nous en tenions aux limites définies par la Résolution 6/87. Nous oeuvrerons pour que cet exercice prenne effectivement fin avec la 25ème session de la Conférence, l'après-conférence devant être mise à profit pour la mise en oeuvre des recommandations sur lesquelles les délégués à la Conférence se sont mis d'accord.

LE PRESIDENT: Je donne la parole au Délégué de la Suisse pour le droit de réponse.

Right of reply

Droit de réponse

Derecho de replica

Roger PASQUOTKR (Suisse): Je n'interviendrai pas à la fin du débat comme je l'avais demandé puisque ma réponse est une information supplémentaire. Monsieur le délégué du Congo a aussi interprété d'une façon que je juge incorrecte ce que je voulais dire dans ma remarque très brève sur le flux de ressources suisses pour le programme de terrain de la FAO. Manifestement, 11 y a eu une mauvaise interprétation. J'ajoute donc l'information suivante :

L'aide suisse acheminée par le canal du programme de terrain de la FAO est prélevée sur un budget qui est de toute façon destiné à l'aide aux pays en développement. Toute diminution éventuelle des ressources passant par le canal de la FAO sera donc compensée automatiquement par une augmentation des ressources allant aux pays en développement par d'autres canaux. La Suisse choisit les canaux qui lui paraissent les plus efficaces au profit des pays en développement. Là, vous voyez le lien avec les réformes.

Enfin, il est évidemment exclu que la Suisse interrompe le financement de projets en cours d'exécution dans le cadre du programme de terrain de la FAO.

Mlle Faouzia BODMAIZA (Algérie): Je suis un peu choquée par ce que je viens d'entendre. Permettez-moi de reprendre mes esprits. Je crois que l'Algérie, comme le délégué du Congo et le Directeur général, a interprété correctement le message livré hier : il s'agit d'un chantage et je pense qu'au stade de nos travaux, il est très indélicat de lier l'examen des réformes et les résultats qu'il donnera à l'aide bilatérale ou l'aide multilatérale. Cela étant, nous allons avoir beaucoup de mal à égaler l'éloquence de M. Tchicaya, ambassadeur du Congo.

Avant de s'exprimer sur les différentes idées émises par les délégations qui ont précédé concernant le rapport du Comité du programme et du Comité financier (C 89/21), la délégation algérienne tient à féliciter M. Bukhari et M. Mazoyer ainsi que les membres du Comité financier et du Comité du programme et les experts pour le travail accompli. Notre délégation tient également à féliciter le Directeur général pour l'excellente présentation de ses vues et observations sur le rapport des comités. Ses commentaires nous éclairent considérablement compte tenu du fait que ses fonctions lui permettent de donner un avis motivé.

La délégation algérienne se prononcera plus en détail lors de la Conférence mais je tiens dès à présent à faire part au Conseil de notre intérêt pour certains aspects. Le premier d'entre eux concerne le Programme de coopération technique abordé aux paragraphes 3.28 à 3.32 du rapport des comités. Notre délégation partage entièrement les vues exprimées dans ces paragraphes, notamment l'idée de fonds additionnels sous forme de fonds fiduciaires pour augmenter les ressources affectées au PCT afin de le renforcer. A ce propos, nous félicitons très chaleureusement le Gouvernement italien de sa décision de contribuer à nouveau au PCT par des fonds supplémentaires et nous prions l'Ambassadeur d'Italie de transmettre à son gouvernement notre satisfaction. Nous le remercions également de s'être fait notre ambassadeur auprès de son gouvernement.

Le deuxième aspect concerne le rôle de la FAO dans le nouvel ordre économique mondial. Notre délégation est d'accord avec l'opinion selon laquelle la FAO devrait jouer son rôle de chef de file pour l'établissement d'un équilibre entre le nord et le sud en matière de production agricole et de recherche. Nous appuyons, en particulier, le contenu du paragraphe 2.34 relatif au renforcement de la coopération économique et technique entre pays en développement.

Le troisième aspect concerne la place de la FAO sur le terrain. Nous appuyons la recommandation d'ordre général des comités contenue au paragraphe 3.54 sur la nécessité d'associer la FAO aux tables rondes du PNUD et aux groupes consultatifs de la Banque mondiale car nous pensons effectivement qu'en matière d'études agricoles, la FAO offre un avantage comparatif certain. En outre, sa participation à ces réunions améliorera de beaucoup la coordination multilatérale.

S'agissant des opérations de terrain, notre délégation est préoccupée de l'avis des experts chargés de l'examen de ces opérations de terrain et repris par les comités au paragraphe 3.49 de leur rapport dans lequel il est fait état de l'incidence négative des contraintes budgétaires sur la qualité du soutien des projets. C'est pourquoi nous sommes d'accord avec les recommandations inscrites au paragraphe 3.52 visant à renforcer les capacités de soutien.

En ce qui concerne l'Unité d'inspection des opérations de terrain, notre délégation considère que l'évaluation et le contrôle effectués par les services déjà existants sont suffisants et qu'il n'y a pas lieu de mettre en place une nouvelle unité qui engendrerait une charge financière supplémentaire pour les Etats Membres alors qu'elle ne répond pas à un besoin impérieux.

Nous nous associons également aux conclusions des comités relatives au rôle de la FAO dans la recherche et la technologie, et en particulier le renforcement des centres nationaux de recherche et le renforcement du rôle de la FAO dans le commerce international des produits agricoles.

Notre délégation souhaite à présent marquer son opposition à la reconduction de l'étape supplémentaire introduite au cours de cet exercice biennal pour examiner une esquisse du Programme de travail et budget par le Comité financier et le Comité du programme. Nous voulons que tout le monde nous comprenne bien: nous ne sommes pas contre l'idée elle-même mais nous

pensons que cette étape n'a pas produit pour l'instant tous ses effets, puisque les Etats Membres qui nous ont expliqué que ce nouveau jalon permettrait un assentiment général ne se sont pas encore prononcés sur le niveau du budget mais en plus lient maintenant l'adoption du budget au résultat du débat sur les réformes. Notre délégation tient à indiquer clairement qu'elle ne discutera de l'éventuelle reconduction de la présentation d'une esquisse au mois de janvier précédant la Conférence que si le Programme de travail et budget est adopté par consensus.

Enfin, notre délégation appuie également l'excellente proposition présentée hier matin par le Directeur général pour mieux coordonner les activités interagences des Nations Unies à Rome.

Sur les autres propositions tout aussi intéressantes, notre délégation souhaite s'accorder un délai de réflexion avant de donner son avis définitif. Toutefois, nous tenons à indiquer clairement que l'Algérie se joindra au consensus qu'elle appelle de tous ses vœux et qu'il n'est pas impossible d'atteindre à condition que l'on s'en tienne à la discussion des idées contenues dans le document C 89/21 et que l'on ne propose pas de mesures dont le sens même est inacceptable, telles que celles qui visent à établir un nouvel organigramme ou à désorganiser les comités, ou encore à mettre en oeuvre une série de mesures comme celles proposées par le délégué de la Suisse.

A ce stade de nos travaux, nous souhaitons en appeler aux pays membres du Conseil et de la FAO pour qu'ils fassent preuve d'un esprit de dialogue en vue d'adopter une résolution acceptable pour tous. Pour ce faire, certains avancent l'idée de constituer un groupe de contact. Cette proposition en soi présente certains avantages et sera certes utile si la nécessité s'en fait sentir lors de la Conférence, au sein de la Commission II. Mais il nous semble pour l'instant prématuré d'organiser des discussions restreintes alors même que, comme l'ont indiqué de nombreuses délégations avant nous - et notamment celles du Pakistan et du Congo - il est à présent nécessaire d'élargir le débat sur la base des propositions du Directeur général et des comités financier et du programme aidés par le travail des experts, conformément à l'esprit et à la lettre de la Résolution 6/87 adoptée à la vingt-quatrième session de la Conférence.

C. Srinivasa SASTRY (India): Before presenting our views on the subject now under discussion, namely the contents of chapter 2 entitled "FAO's Objectives, Role, Priorities and Strategies", in the report of the Programme and Finance Committees which are at pages 9 to 24 of document C 89/21, permit me to make four general observations on the on-going review process of FAO.

First, the Twenty-fourth Conference has asked the Programme and Finance Committees working jointly to study the working of FAO with reference to the five specific aspects listed in paragraph 2 of the Resolution. The Conference also decided that the Programme and Finance Committees "working jointly shall be assisted by a small number of experts".

The Conference also invited the Director-General to service the study. The Director-General was also called upon by the Conference to submit the recommendations of the study conducted by the Programme and Finance Committees jointly, together with his own views and comments, to the Council. The Council in turn was asked by the Conference to transmit - I repeat transmit - the conclusions and recommendations of the study conducted by the Programme and Finance Committees jointly and the views and comments of the Director-General thereon to the Twenty-fifth session of the FAO Conference together with the Council's own views. In our view, we are now at the last stage of this step-by-step process laid down by the Conference Resolution.

May I point out here that out of the 49 members of this Council 16, or nearly one third, are also represented on the Programme and Finance Committees. Of the other four members on the Programme and Finance Committees who are not in this Council two, namely Austria and Dominica, are represented on the Programme Committee, while the other two, namely Cameroon and Costa Rica, are in the Finance Committee.

It is our view that the reports furnished by the two groups of experts and the various teams of management consultants to the Programme and Finance Committees are to be regarded as some of the inputs into the study which the Conference had asked the Programme and Finance Committees jointly to carry out.

You will recall that in the last session of the Council there was some discussion as to whether the reports of the groups of experts to the Programme and Finance Committees should also be made available to the Council and the Conference. Finally the matter was left to be decided by the Special Joint Session.

We share the happiness of the distinguished delegate of Australia that the SJS has decided to circulate the detailed documentation to all the members of FAO.

All these documents were gone into carefully and in detail by the 20 members of Programme and Finance Committees in two separate Special Joint Sessions held over four long weeks. We now have before us the considered recommendations of the SJS after it took into account all the inputs, including the reports of the groups of experts and also the views and comments furnished to the SJS by the Director-General. The specific recommendations of the SJS are in paragraph 2.64 of document C 89/21 and paragraphs 3.49 to 3.54, paragraph 4.14 and paragraphs 5.3 to 5.7.

We mention these details so that in our discussions on this item, which is so important for the future of FAO and which is supported by detailed, bulky and somewhat complex documentation, we do not get bogged down by trying to scrutinize, as some distinguished delegates have attempted to do, the various inputs which the Programme and Finance Committees have received for consideration in their Special Joint Sessions.

Considering that the Programme and Finance Committees representing 20 countries deliberated on these inputs for four weeks and have come up with their own views and recommendations, we would submit that the Council focus its attention on the recommendations in the report of the Programme and Finance Committees and the views and comments of the Director-General thereon.

As delegates will have noticed, the views, recommendations and advice given to the Programme and Finance Committees through all the various inputs are diverse and not always uniform or identical. The Programme and Finance Committees have already examined all these inputs in the Special Joint Sessions and have harmonized them, keeping in view the task entrusted to them. They have placed before us their largely unanimous report with their specific recommendations. If these are now to be reopened, we could have a rerun of the discussions in the Special Joint Sessions without having as much time at our disposal as the Programme and Finance Committees had.

Therefore, we would submit that the Council appropriately focus on the recommendations of the Programme and Finance Committees and the views and comments of the Director-General so that, while transmitting these to the Conference, we would decide on the views that the Council should offer on this report for being considered by the Conference.

Second, with my apologies to the distinguished delegate of Australia and in the hope that I shall not be causing him any undue offence, may I say that India has been one of the Member Nations of FAO which was not convinced, even in 1987, about the need for this type of review of the FAO.

The delegates of the Federal Republic of Germany and of Switzerland have mentioned the practice being followed of late in the government organizations in their countries by getting reviews of ministries and departments conducted by external agencies. The practice followed in public administration in this respect, however, differs widely from country to country. Among the experts in public administration there is also a view that in government organizations such studies are appropriately and best conducted by some internal units, like the O and M branch of the Treasury or the Staff Inspection Unit, as we do in India.

It is also true that in the international agricultural research institutions under the CGIAR system external management reviews are conducted periodically to satisfy the donors who make ad-hoc contributions and commit funds over a longer time frame than two years. However, on the issue whether such external management reviews are needed in an Organization like FAO, opinions could differ widely, as they did in 1987.

Notwithstanding our own reservations, since some members of FAO were keen on the review, in an effort to arrive at a consensus we fell in line, albeit reluctantly, and supported the Resolution 6/87 at the last Conference.

It is well known that, to some extent, the Review was actuated by a perception among some Member Nations that over the four decades and odd, FAO had strayed from its mandate and the the Review would bring out some deficiencies and shortcomings in terms of priorities, programme planning and implementation. These Member Nations also seemed generally to believe that the removal of these deficiencies and shortcomings after they are identified, would result in the availability of substantial additional resources even at the existing levels of funding. Their logic seemed to be that these resources could then be used for strengthening the Organization.

The results of the Review have revealed that such perceptions were misconceived and did not have a foundation in fact. While the Review was started with the view to strengthen FAO so that it becomes more effective and more efficient, it is heartening to note that the groups of experts, as well as the Programme and Finance Committees, have unanimously testified to the solidity and dynamism of the Organization, and given the Organization a clean bill of health.

The third general point I should like to make is that the emergence through this Review process of a set of recommendations representing a consensus which are now before us, is in itself a very significant development which should not be ignored or played down. By any reckoning the fact that two groups of experts drawn from different corners of the earth, from widely varying disciplines, backgrounds, experiences and attitudes, should, after carefully and closely looking at FAO as professionals, have been able to arrive at unanimous findings and recommendations, is by itself very remarkable.

Similarly, the fact that the Programme and Finance Committees, which include representatives, some of whom are experts in their own right, of twenty Member Nations, drawn from all over the world, and who also have representatives of some countries which strongly believed in the need for a Review as also those who were initially against the Review, have, after due deliberation, finally arrived at a unanimous set of findings and recommendations, is also in our view remarkable and noteworthy.

In our view, these two developments were pointers to the conclusion that if only the Council could examine the matters before it objectively and professionally, we should also be able to arrive at unanimous recommendations, which could form the basis for the decisions by the Conference on the Review. Once this is done - and we believe that we should be able to do this - we should put all this behind us and see that FAO devotes its full time and energies to attending to its daunting tasks in world food and agriculture. We are aware that over the last three years, due to paucity of finances, there has been a cut-back in programmes and activities, and that this should be made up as early as possible, and that the Organization should try its best to make up for lost time. All along we were optimistic, until yesterday, about the possibility of arriving at a consensus in the course of the discussions here, but after hearing the interventions, particularly by two distinguished delegations, serious doubts arose about the prospects of a consensus being arrived at during our deliberations. I will refer to this once again a little later, Mr Chairman.

The fourth general point we would like to make is that, having spent two years of time and money, effort and energy, on the Review exercise, when the results and the outcome in the shape of the unanimous report of the Programme and Finance Committees, and the views and the comments of the Director-General are ready and presented to us, for obtaining the views of the Council we should not appear to be shying away from them, from looking at them squarely, just because the bottom line in terms of extra funding requirements disconcerts us. We should not lose sight of the fact that this is an outcome of the unbiased efforts marked by a professional approach. Considering the cutbacks of US\$ 68 million over the last three years, if we feel that the US\$ 26.75 million of additional funding as given on page xviii of document C 89/21 is rather large, we can consider phasing this expenditure over a longer time-frame, and also consider the possibility of moving some of the items on page xviii from Category II to Category III. However we are not able to contribute to the view that all this can be accommodated in the Programme of Work and Budget without any additional funding. We also concede that this is an issue on which discussion should be held among members and agreement arrived at, keeping in view the comments and views of the Director-General.

Coming now to Chapter 2 of the Report of the Joint Programme and Finance Committees, there are in all ten recommendations of the Committees to the Council and the Conference which are to be considered by us now, along with the two paragraphs which precede these ten recommendations in paragraph 2.64 of page 22 of the English text.

India, as a member of the Programme Committee, was associated with the Review exercise. Our views and opinions are fully reflected in the Report of the Joint Special Session of the Programme and Finance Committees. As such we really have no comments on Chapter 2 of the Report which is now open for discussion, except that we should like to make a few observations in the context of the views and comments of the Director-General.

Turning to the first portion under "Objectives and Roles" on page 22, where the Committee has said that the Organization fulfils within the limits of its means the three major roles of information, promotion and technical assistance, we would go with the recommendations and the views of the Director-General in paragraphs 15 to 17 where he has clearly mentioned that there can be disagreement about the emphasis to be placed on these respective roles since they tend to be of different value to different countries at different stages of development. I could speak on

this, Mr Chairman, with reference to our Indian experience where we have agriculture being practiced in some pockets where the practices have not changed over three to four centuries, whereas there are others which epitomize the state of the art and can compete with the best and most commercial agriculture in the world. The activities of the Government of India and the approaches to these two types of areas have to be different. If this is true of a single country like India, this should apply with greater force when we consider the world as a whole.

Coming to Recommendation i which talks about the means which must be sought to ensure the necessary strengthening in order to face the future challenges, we have already discussed that there is a requirement of US\$ 26.75 million, which has been estimated by the Director-General, which will be looked at and considered.

Coming to Recommendation ii, where a series of new activities designed to take greater account of sustainable development is concerned, we agree with the views of the Director-General that no reorientation is required, since this is the spirit in which FAO has been working for many years. We strongly support the strengthening of FAO's role in the area of environment and sustainable development within FAO's area of competence. In this context, we feel that FAO should assume and discharge its responsibility to articulate and build up awareness of the need to mobilize external assistance to offset the additional cost of integrating environmental concerns in development projects in developing countries.

FAO also needs to articulate and build up awareness of the responsibility for environmental degradation, particularly when it was, or is, fueled by commercial considerations and the nexus between the level of that responsibility and the weight of the obligation to share the cost of protecting the environment and promoting sustainable development.

We also agree with Recommendation iii about the TCDC and genetic resources, along with the comments of the Director-General.

On Recommendation iv, relating to GATT, which has to be read with paragraphs 35 and 80 of the Director-General of FAO's Comments, we would agree with the Director-General proposals.

On Recommendation v, is to be read with Recommendation vii where we are talking about priorities not only in the long-term and the medium-term. We agree with the Director-General's observation that a medium-term plan would be meaningful only if the resource levels are indicated and where the degree of approval of the medium-term plan which involves a commitment by the membership regarding the size of the budget for the three future biennia covered.

As regards the recommendations on the priorities and the guidelines, on Recommendation VIII, we have already expressed our views when speaking on Item 7, while the priorities are important they cannot be very rigid and across the board. We do not subscribe to the view that when a Member Nation approaches FAO with a request for help, assistance or technical advice, which is within the mandate of FAO, FAO as a responsible international organization should just tell that Member Nation, "Sorry, I cannot help you because your request does not figure in the priorities which the governing bodies have set for my Organization."

There is also a Recommendation, Item ix, about the experimental process for the formulation of PWB that has been introduced and its continuation, and we expressed our views on this earlier. The utility of this, considering the extra time, expenditure and documentation involved, will be tested depending on the consensus that will emerge in the forthcoming Conference about the formulation of the Programme and Budget. Once this exercise proves its utility, we would not have in principle any objection to its continuance subject to the proposal made by the Director-General that, if this becomes a permanent feature, certain consequential changes will have to be made in the procedures.

Then on the recommendation regarding Special Action programmes that indicates some of these things, and here we agree with the recommendations and the views expressed by the Director-General in his remarks.

May I now present our views about a proposal to set up a Contact Group, either formally or informally, either now or later, in the Conference as suggested by some delegations. The first question could be whether the Council as a body of 49 Member Nations of FAO, without knowing what the other 109 Members would consider as appropriate, should go ahead with a recommendation of this type for setting up a Contact Group.

At this stage, I would not refer to what I regard as the lack of internal consistency in the point of view that was expressed by some distinguished delegations when, on the one hand, they said that the documents were received so late that they had no time to study them, but in the same breath they also suggested that there should be a need for a Contact Group. We would feel that internal consistency would demand a study of the documents and also a knowledge of the trend of the discussions before we come to discuss the need for a Contact Group.

The second point which I would like to raise is a more substantive issue, and that is one of sequence. The question is, when should we consider the need for establishing a Contact Group? Should this be after most of the delegations express their views on the recommendations that emerge from the Review process, and, based on this discussion, it becomes clear which are the questions on which there is a difference of opinion, and the nature of the differences, or should the Contact Group be set up even before the delegations express their views? In that event, would we not be prejudging the entire matter, including the need for establishing a Contact Group? Before we can consider setting up a Group, should we not be clear what the issues are, what is the range of the variations in the views and responses, and what the Group is expected to do? We would appeal to all the Members of the Council to express their views on the recommendations of the Programme and Finance Committees and the Director-General's comments and views thereon which are now before us. Only when, and if, it becomes clear that there is a wide difference of opinion in the Council, despite the consensus that has emerged in the Programme and Finance Committees, would it be necessary to consider such a proposal seriously and at the appropriate stage.

One could also argue, Mr Chairman, at this stage whether the 20 members who met in the Special Joint Session themselves did not already perform the functions which one expects of a Contact Group. Further, would it be realistic to expect that a Contact Group as now being proposed by some distinguished delegations would be able to hammer out a consensus different from what has already been evolved by the Special Joint Sessions, which, according to our perception, was effectively a Contact Group facilitating lots of negotiations and give and take, as was alluded to by the distinguished delegate from Australia. Whilst we are not against the proposal per se, we would submit that all these aspects, including the scope, terms of reference and timing, will have to be considered carefully before a view is taken on the proposal to set up a Contact Group in any form or under any designation.

A word now, Mr Chairman, about our views and comments on the proposals made by the distinguished delegate from Switzerland, which he has generously offered to circulate to interested members. We have listened to the English translation of the Swiss proposal with attention.

To us it tended to sound, and I may be pardoned for saying so, somewhat peremptory as it comes across, though we are in no doubt that the proposal is very well intended. The proposal appears to be based on some categorical pre-judgements which seem to be contrary to the conclusions of the Review. The Swiss proposal also seems to spell out a rigid methodology to work out the modalities for carrying out these pre-judgements. We are not sure whether the proposals made are in consonance with the consensus-building exercise which we are all now engaged in, and which most Member Nations are committed to. The linkages suggested in the Swiss proposal between the SJS views about priorities on the one hand and the steps suggested by the Swiss delegation on the other hand are not borne out by the reading of the SJS report in the formulation of which we also participated. The pre-judgements in the Swiss proposal particularly relating to, first the rationing of time of the main technical committees of the FAO to be devoted to field programmes; and secondly the reductions in the activities of the FAO; and thirdly the ceilings on the Special Action programmes as also the establishment of a committee consisting of a representative of the Director-General of FAO, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, the UNDP, and two representatives of the Finance and Programme Committees, to my mind, do not seem to leave any scope for a genuine debate on whether these steps are really needed. It would also be interesting to know whether there are any parallels to these types of procedures and mechanisms in any of the other agencies in the UN system. In this context, it is perhaps necessary to recall that neither the experts nor the Special Joint Session have identified any marginal or discardable activities of the FAO. The Swiss proposal is virtually a new resolution on the Review of the FAO which seems to take us far away from the Resolution 6/87.

My country has always held that any attempts to either overtly or covertly link any proposal for changes with financial contributions prevent objective discussion, as these are construed as a kind of pressure not conducive to consensus. We note what the distinguished delegate has just now said in clarification of his remarks of yesterday. We feel the clarification does not in any way amount to any diminution in terms of the pressure attached to the proposal.

Maybe we should concentrate on saving, from going to waste, the exercise that we are looking at in its final stages and not be distracted from our task by drastic alternatives which may not have any wide acceptance and which we may leave to cooler reflection in due course.

Some of the distinguished delegates have referred, during the course of discussions, to some issues like the decision-making process in the FAO which are extraneous, in our view, to the subject under discussion. These items are not covered by the review process. Further, it has already been laid down in the Conference Resolution 6/87, that the review should be subjected to the commitment of the Member Nations to the Constitution of the Organization. As it is, we are dealing with a difficult task and our efforts should be to strengthen the consensus. May I therefore suggest that issues which are not within the purview of the Review be scrupulously kept out of our discussions?

Now, for some brief comments on a few issues. Firstly, paragraph 46 of the Director-General's report on (ii) about the review of field operations by the governing bodies. I would submit that all documents, including the proposal that was made by the distinguished delegate from Switzerland before the last Conference about the establishment of a separate field programme committee, were carefully considered by all the agencies which went into the review and it was after considering all the alternatives that these recommendations have emerged.

Coming to paragraph 52, we would strongly urge that the appointment of additional staff for strengthening the project management, and also as technical back-up, is an imperative need of the Organization and should be strongly supported.

Coming to paragraphs 67 and 68 of the Director-General's comments, we would especially thank the Director-General for resurrecting this recommendation which we lost sight of in the Joint Programme and Finance Committees as this is an essential human resource development programme which an organization like the FAO should take up so that over a period of time the technical competence of its staff will get upgraded and they will get up to date.

Some members have referred to the need for a special mechanism on meetings for overseeing the implementation of the outcome of the review. Our stand on this is clear. We feel that a well designed institutional set-up in terms of governing bodies already exists in the FAO. The procedures of work followed in the FAO are also conducive to effective follow-up. Therefore, while we are against any new mechanisms of procedure, we feel that what is needed is definite and firm decisions about what the outcome of the review is, what the actionable points are, and what actions should be taken. Once the Council and Conference give these clear directions in this behalf - in our view, the proposals in document C 89/21 offer a reasonable and widely acceptable basis for such decisions and directions - these could be implemented by the existing organizational mechanisms in the system.

I would like to add, before I conclude, that the interventions made by some of the distinguished delegates during the discussions in the Council have raised serious misgivings in our minds as to how long the review process has to go on. The Indian delegation was all along under the impression that we are nearing the end of the review process. However, from some of the interventions by the distinguished delegates it now looks as though they perceive the situation differently and not as really being at the end of the review process. On the other hand, they seem to feel that we are just nearing the end of the beginning of the review. This, to our mind, is very disturbing. We all know that during the last two years the review process took so much time and attention of the FAO management and staff that other vital functions and programmes did not possibly get as much attention and time as they deserve. We strongly urge that this review process should end with the Twenty-fifth Conference so that from 1990 the FAO devotes all its energies and efforts and capabilities to serve the Member Nations to the best of its capacities.

We feel that under no circumstances should this review process spill beyond 30th November and the document that emerges from the SJS should be taken as the basis for according approval to consensus. We propose that the Council transmit the SJS report and the Director-General's comments thereon to the Conference saying that these constitute the best available consensus for deciding on the outcome of the review.

May I conclude by reserving our right to make another intervention on the other recommendations of the SJS on which we had no opportunity to comment as we are not clear whether only Chapter 2 is under discussion or the entire report.

Natigor SIAGIAN (Indonesia): I wish to express our appreciation to the Chairmen of the Finance and Programme Committees for their lucid introduction of the report on Review of Certain Aspects of FAO's Goals and Operations.

My delegation also wishes to express its appreciation to the Director-General who has given us an important explanation on the findings of the report as well as additional proposals regarding the implementation of the recommendations stated in the report. We thank the Director-General for his full support and cooperation which led to the smooth implementation of the works of the Committees.

The report on the review of FAO's Goals and Operations as presented by the Finance and Programme Committees to the Council has an objective to consider ways and means to strengthen FAO so that it could continue to play a leading role in the future. My delegation wishes to consider the report based on the above objective and within the framework of Resolution 6/87.

My delegation wholeheartedly agrees with the view of the Committee that the concept of FAO as stated in the Preamble of its Constitution is still valid and therefore there is no need for any modification in the major purposes assigned to it in the Preamble of its Constitution.

As regards FAO's policy role, we wish to underline the Committees' views that FAO policy advice should play an active role in structural adjustments and rural development projects and programmes. Due to the global economic problems, many of the developing countries have to undertake a structural adjustment of their economy. Since this adjustment should also take into account the problems and prospects on the agricultural sector, there are countries that need FAO's advice on matters related to policies and strategies. We, therefore, wish to express our hope that FAO could continue to play its important role in this field. We also do hope that FAO's role in assisting member countries in research and transfer of technology be continued.

One of the vital instruments of FAO is the FAO's field operations through which FAO has made available its worldwide development experiences for the benefit of the member countries. We feel that FAO should continue its activities in these fields and whenever possible effort should be made to strengthen FAO's technical assistance role with the focus of its assistance being placed on those activities in which FAO has a clear competitive advantage.

We wish to underline the importance of FAO to actively promote sustainable development in all its sectors of competence aimed at conserving the national resources and taking into consideration the environmental criteria, and also improving them with a view to their rational exploitation for the benefit of agricultural and rural development.

In the field of international trade, we welcome the possible active role of FAO in providing assistance to developing countries in their negotiations in GATT. Indonesia welcomes FAO's technical assistance to countries requesting it in making preparations for the coming more substantive negotiations in the Uruguay Round. We suggest that the FAO assistance be aimed at enhancing the national capacity to conduct the necessary policy analysis in order to be able to participate effectively in the negotiations.

As regards TCP, once again, we wish to express our support that TCP be maintained in its present form as a vital element in FAO's field operation, and therefore any possible effort including those mentioned in paragraph 3.32 of the report of the Committees should be seriously explored.

We follow with great attention the Committees' consideration on the strategies and long-term plans of FAO. We welcome the active participation of FAO in the preparation of the UN International Development Strategy (IDS).

Likewise, my delegation could go along with the suggestion of the Committee on the possible re-introduction of a medium-term plan covering three biennia, and if possible including a provisional indication of resources by programme.

In conclusion, we wish to express our support to the General Recommendation of the Committees and welcome the additional four proposals of the Director-General to be implemented within the possible agreed time frame and within the available resources.

Ms Ruth Grace S. SOLITEI (Kenya): Permit me first to convey my delegation's sincere appreciation of the work of the Joint Committee in digesting the reports of the Expert Groups and management consultants who have been accorded the role of looking at a number of aspects of the goals and operations of FAO. The introductory remarks made by the Chairman of the Programme Committee and by the Director-General of FAO were also very pertinent.

The Kenyan delegation believes that it is normal management practice for an organization to carry out regular reviews of its activities in order to ensure objectivity, relevance and increasing efficiency and effectiveness. We are therefore happy that the Twenty-fourth Conference saw the necessity to go on with the review process.

The findings of the experts and the recommendations of the Joint Committee are quite reasonable and provide a very appropriate basis and guide for improvements and adjustments within the Organization for increased efficiency and effectiveness. We have a particular interest with regard to a number of the findings in relation to field operations and technical cooperation. We feel these should be given every support and implemented as soon as possible in order to ensure that increased benefits are derived by recipient target groups. The TCP, in particular, needs to be given priority treatment for the support of developing countries.

In the financial crisis faced by the Organization, we strongly feel that Member States should agree to seek the means of, and process for, implementing the recommendations, but they should put aside the further studies that have been suggested. I wish to express emphatically the view of my delegation that enough studies have been done. Studies alone will not solve the problems of our Organization. We should instead allow the Organization to take one step at a time.

We see merit in some of the suggestions put forward for seeking resources towards the US\$ 26 million required for the implementation of these recommendations.

Kenya has for some time now stressed the importance of research and technology transfer and for the acceleration of the transfer of new advances in this field to developing countries. We have also called for higher priority to be given to manpower development and training in developing countries. We have further occasionally underlined the importance of the role and contribution of national experts.

My delegation has consistently requested that priority attention be given to the African region. More specifically we have underlined the need for prioritization of conservation, desertification, forestation and environmental concerns, and for greater attention to be given to traditional food crops and accelerated agricultural productivity. We note with approval that these items have been highlighted in the findings and recommendations of the review process.

The review has noted the need for medium-term planning, which would give the opportunity for a longer establishment of broad priorities which could be revised with changing circumstances.

As far as the FAO management suggestions are concerned, we agree that a number of recommendations are relevant but feel that it should be left to the management of FAO to implement them without undue interference.

Our view on the regional and country offices is in accordance with the suggestions for the strengthening of the technical and professional capability and the need to increase their managerial and decision-making role. This, in our opinion, would give more relevance to the interpretation and implementation of regional priorities.

It is our wish to ensure that FAO will be further strengthened in order to assume its leading role in the field of food and agriculture and in the maintenance of its high level of technical capabilities.

Sra. Laurie CORDUA CRUZ (Nicaragua): Mi delegación quisiera expresarle a usted su aprecio por el interés en que ha seguido el trabajo de los Comités del Programa y de Finanzas, participando en las cuatro reuniones realizadas. Compartimos su reconocimiento al esfuerzo realizado por los 20 Miembros de los Comités en alcanzar un consenso y consideramos también que el informe constituye una buena base para alcanzar ese mismo consenso entre todos los países miembros en un clima positivo y constructivo.

Agradecemos el trabajo de los Comités que contaron con el valioso apoyo de los expertos, así como todos los esfuerzos y trabajos realizados por el Director General y la Secretaría de la FAO en apoyo al Examen. Queremos agradecer al Director General por sus valiosos y equilibrados comentarios y opiniones sobre las diferentes recomendaciones hechas por los Comités y el cuadro de estimación de costos para la implementación de las mismas.

Para mi delegación es una gran satisfacción que los Comités hayan llegado a la conclusión de que la FAO continua siendo una institución sólida, dinámica y merecedora de la confianza de los países miembros; única conclusión posible conocida de antemano por la gran mayoría de países que no considerábamos necesaria la realización de este examen, y que aceptamos en la Conferencia pasada dando muestras de una gran flexibilidad.

Como bien ha señalado el Director General en su introducción, y lo han señalado igualmente muchas delegaciones, el Informe de los Comités propone un reforzamiento de la Organización; no propone eliminar ninguna actividad; más bien, se proponen actividades adicionales. Es decir que el problema es de recursos, de cómo se financiará la aplicación de las recomendaciones y no las recomendaciones mismas sobre las cuales hay un nivel de consenso bastante elevado, consenso que se ha alcanzado a través de un prolongado y desgastante proceso que ha durado dos largos años.

Según se desprende del Informe del Comité del Programa y de Finanzas, de los comentarios del Director General, según la misma introducción del tema que se nos hiciera en el día de ayer, según las intervenciones de la gran mayoría de las delegaciones sobre el tema, entendíamos que se había alcanzado un consenso, como he dicho, sobre la mayor parte de las recomendaciones, sobre la mayor parte del informe. Nos sorprende, conociendo la forma como se ha realizado ese proceso de examen, conociendo los términos de referencia de la Resolución 6/87 en base a la cual se realizó este Examen, escuchar ahora a delegaciones como la de Suiza y la de Estados Unidos que según parece, pretenden desconocer todo este gran esfuerzo haciendo propuestas que han sido rechazadas por los Comités, o que no están dentro de los términos de referencia de la Resolución.

Nos sorprende que la delegación de los Estados Unidos, país que ha estado presente en todo el proceso de examen, en el Grupo de Expertos, en el Comité de Finanzas, en el grupo de redacción que se creó después de la reunión de mayo, que venga ahora después de todo este esfuerzo en la práctica, a desconocer el trabajo realizado. Nos surgen serias dudas sobre las verdaderas intenciones que persiguen ese tipo de posiciones y la falta de pago de las cuotas por parte del mayor contribuyente, que están destinadas más bien a debilitar e incluso terminar con nuestra Organización.

Se ha mencionado aquí que no tendremos suficiente tiempo para alcanzar un consenso en la Conferencia, y que hay que crear a la brevedad un grupo de contacto, algún mecanismo para lograrlo. No me sorprende esta afirmación si se pretende reabrir todo el proceso.

La delegación de Nicaragua no se opone a la creación de un grupo de contacto. Estamos abiertos al diálogo pero todo a su tiempo. Considero, al igual que otras delegaciones, que es demasiado prematuro. No limitemos la participación de todos los países miembros que tendrán oportunidad de expresarse durante la Conferencia. Mi delegación reitera que está abierta al diálogo, pero dentro de los términos de referencia de la Resolución 6/87, y sin la introducción de propuestas ya rechazadas por los Comités.

Por razones de tiempo, no haré referencias concretas al informe y recomendaciones. Mi delegación lo hará ampliamente durante la Conferencia. Sin embargo, puedo expresar ya que nos acogemos al consenso que ha prevalecido en los Comités y esperamos sea ratificado por este Consejo.

Mi delegación quisiera expresar también su apoyo a las propuestas hechas por el Director General en su informe por lo que se refiere a los recursos para la implementación de las recomendaciones. Mi delegación considera que deben ser suplementarios. Nos oponemos a cualquier ajuste en el Programa de Labores y Presupuesto, a propuestas de mayor absorción de costos. Reiteramos que la preparación del Programa de Labores y Presupuesto no se debe vincular en el resultado del Examen. Mi delegación se une a otras delegaciones que me han precedido en el uso de la palabra, en el llamado a dar por concluido este ejercicio de Examen. Concentremos nuestros esfuerzos en fortalecer a la FAO; proporcionemos los recursos necesarios para hacer frente a las cada vez más crecientes necesidades del mundo sin condicionamientos y sin amenazas. Lamentamos las expresiones que en ese sentido hemos escuchado en este Consejo. La delegación de Nicaragua quisiera unirse también a la felicitación al Gobierno de Italia por su decisión que fue anunciada ayer por el distinguido Embajador Valenza. Actitudes como la del Gobierno Italiano son verdaderamente esperanzadoras en momentos como éste.

Para finalizar, como país miembro del Movimiento de Países No Alineados, mi delegación quisiera apoyar la propuesta hecha por la delegación de Cuba y apoyada por la delegación de Colombia, en importante declaración de los Jefes de Estados No Alineados en la Cumbre de septiembre pasado sobre Agricultura y Alimentación.

More Josefa Guilhermina COELHO DA CRUZ (Angola): Nous ne pouvons pas ne pas rendre hommage au Comité des finances et au Comité du programme et à tous ceux qui ont donné leur contribution très précieuse dans l'élaboration de ces documents.

Comme tant d'autres délégations, nous n'étions pas favorables à cet Examen, car nous ne savions pas où nous allions aboutir. Sans aucun doute aujourd'hui tous les pays membres de notre Organisation sont unanimes et reconnaissent que la FAO demeure une institution solide et dynamique.

Puisque nous intervenons les derniers, nous n'allons pas nous étendre sur tous les points, mais nous voudrions faire quelques commentaires. En premier lieu, ma délégation fait siennes les conclusions et recommandations des deux Comités. En ce qui concerne les objectifs de la FAO, nous nous réjouissons que ces objectifs, bien qu'élaborés il y a plus de 40 ans, n'aient pas perdu leur actualité et conservent toujours toute leur valeur. C'est une raison de plus qui confirme l'efficacité de la FAO.

L'assistance technique de la FAO est pour nous un élément primordial et doit être renforcée, car c'est la seule manière d'atteindre l'autosuffisance alimentaire et nous réfutons toutes les tentatives visant à son affaiblissement. S'agissant de la proposition d'organiser conjointement avec l'OMS une conférence internationale sur la nutrition, ma délégation souscrit pleinement à cette idée.

L'accent doit être mis sur la recherche de transfert de technologies ainsi que sur l'identification de la coopération avec les institutions nationales de recherche agronomique pour les aider à renforcer leurs capacités.

En ce qui concerne le PCT, nous insistons pour que ce Programme soit renforcé au niveau le plus élevé en tant qu'élément essentiel des opérations de terrain de la FAO. Ceci pourra être accru par les billets du Fonds fiduciaire, qui doit toujours avoir un impact multilatéral. Pour terminer, comme d'autres délégations l'ont fait observer, ma délégation souscrit à l'idée selon laquelle les éléments qui n'ont pas fait l'objet de discussions par les deux Comités ne peuvent pas être pris en compte. Nous appuyons également l'idée de ne pas mettre en discussion certains points à la prochaine Conférence. Nous réitérons notre appui aux conclusions et recommandations du Comité qui requièrent des allocations supplémentaires.

R.G. PETTITT (United Kingdom): I simply asked for the floor again because when I spoke yesterday it was before you had asked us point blank which of the recommendations in the report were not acceptable. Of course, this is not the real issue. What we are seeking is the best result from all this work, and I should hate to have to apply, at the end of this phase of review and renewal, any of the impressive list of disparaging epithets to which we were treated by the delegate of Colombia this morning.

However, since you have asked what is a legitimate question, and referring quite literally to the recommendations in paragraphs 2.64, 3.52 to 3.54 and 4.14 rather than the narrative itself, I find that there are just four recommendations which would seem possibly to cause us substantial difficulties.

I will present this in writing in case anyone cannot keep up with the numbers: 2.64 (v). The use of the chapter prepared for the IDS as our long-term strategy. This depends on what the chapter eventually says. Secondly, the same paragraph 2.64 (vii) Medium-term Plan. The idea of including an indication of resources is unrealistically optimistic although it does say "if possible". Thirdly, paragraph 3.52 (vii), the TCP: yes, it should continue, but we could not agree to the words "in its present form" if this rules out any of the changes which I suggested yesterday.

Fourthly, paragraph 3.54 (xv), FAO's involvement in round-tables. This is only appropriate if FAO has a worthwhile contribution to make. This would depend on its having a stronger geographic structure.

As to the propositions put before us by the Director-General yesterday, I apologise for not having touched upon those at all because I had at the time expected this would have been one intervention amongst several. As to the proposal that we drop the summary of the programme and budget if we are to have the outline, our view is that we need a fuller budget document than the outline in good time to consider at the summer Council meeting, and for the other purposes mentioned by the delegates of the United States and of Colombia. If this proposal is that we have a much earlier version of the full programme and budget but perhaps without some of the introductory sections, which obviously could not be written so early in the year, then on the face of it this would seem to be acceptable, and it is similar to the practice in other organizations.

Finally, we are not yet ready to take a view on the proposal in paragraph 71 of the views and comments by the Director-General about an inter-secretariat mechanism in Rome, for the reasons given by the delegate of Canada.

C.B. HOUTMAN (Observer for the Netherlands): Being an observer here, my delegation realizes that it should only raise its voice when it has something to add to the discussion. Indeed, we followed the discussion closely and we think we have something to add.

Despite the fact the Netherlands is not a member of the Council nor a member of the Programme and Finance Committees, despite the fact that no Dutchman was a member of the group of experts that dealt with the role and priorities of FAO, or of the other group that dealt with the field programme, whereas we are the second largest contributor to the Trust Fund Programme at the level of some \$ 30 million a year - despite all these facts, or possibly because of these facts, the whole review process was followed carefully.

We do not intend to speak specifically on what is in the SJS report. Many delegations have already done so, and with many things they said we can associate ourselves, especially remarks on how to give the recommendations hands and feet through a set of decisions in the resolution, or in other words how to make the result of this Review operational.

Several times it has been said that FAO stands at the beginning of a new era, that this Organization should adapt to the new global situations and challenges, but can we really expect this? When we were observing and interpreting what happened during this Council we became more and more convinced that something was lacking, not only during the debate on the Review but also during the discussions on the Programme of Work and Budget and the financial situation of our Organization.

What is missing? I would qualify it as a lack of trust, a lack of confidence in the Organization. Do we have other examples of an organization or of a club, in which almost half the members do not pay their contributions? Is this situation proof of trust in the Organization in its present form, structure or functioning? I do not think so. In listening and watching, we got the feeling that this lack of sufficient trust is the real problem.

We would say the final objective of the Review is to re-establish trust in our Organization, trust in its management, trust in its membership and trust in ourselves. Time and again we have noted that when delegations came up with ideas and suggestions in order to try and achieve a good conclusion of the review process - for instance to form a group to try to timely exchange views to reach consensus on how to go along with the results of the review, or in other words how we are going to deal with our Organization in the future - we found that most delegations did not react, while some others rejected immediately such an initiative. Why did they react so? Once again we believe that it was because they feel there is not enough trust.

If we cannot get any more to trusting each other, to trusting the Secretariat and the management, what will then be the future of our Organization? To come as close as possible to a situation that we trust each other again, we have to make arrangements, for instance, for better decision-making procedures that would endeavour to have better transparency in situations where that is felt to be lacking. It could even mean other management styles. After all, we live in a time of glasnost and perestroika. Those are things we have to be after in this Review.

With a few other countries we prepared some elements in which we would like to join with the members of the FAO family, formally or informally. We do not have secrets. We like to pool our ideas with those of others who have made their preparations for this Council or for the Conference, and we would welcome a structure being established that would enable us to do so.

Finally, I spoke at the beginning of the Trust Fund Programme, an important part of the field programme to which we, as I said before, contribute substantially. These are funds in trust, but can we really have expectations that these funds in trust will increase in organization that is in a situation where trust is fading away?

Let us really try to come to decisions on the Review which are based on trust in the forthcoming Conference. After all, let there be no misunderstanding. The Netherlands want to have a strong and efficient FAO supported by all members. I hope for a growing respect for, and trust in, each other. We shall need it.

LE PRESIDENT: Que le délégué des Pays-Bas me permette de souligner que, pour ma part, je n'ai pas noté un manque de confiance des délégués les uns envers les autres ou à l'égard de l'Organisation. Le défaut de paiement ne signifie pas automatiquement un manque de confiance. Il peut être dû à des raisons économiques: certains pays n'ont pas les moyens de payer, d'autres ont des règles strictes d'attribution des crédits. Personnellement, je pense que le fait de ne pas avoir versé sa contribution n'est pas une preuve de manque de confiance. En tout cas, la discussion que nous avons eue au Conseil a été ouverte, les délégués ont parlé avec franchise, quelquefois de manière directe mais dans le respect mutuel. Je ne crois pas que les délégués aient manqué de respect les uns envers les autres ou envers l'Organisation.

Nous n'avons pas eu le temps matériel de discuter le rapport chapitre par chapitre. Les délégués ont traité de toutes les questions à la fois. Mais nous pourrions peut-être demander au Président du Comité financier d'insérer sa communication dans l'examen que nous ferons au début de la séance de cet après-midi. Je demanderai alors au Secrétariat de bien vouloir répondre ainsi qu'au Directeur général. S'il veut le faire immédiatement, nous pouvons reculer l'heure de la cérémonie.

LE DIRECTEUR GENERAL: Le Président de la Conférence m'attend dans mon bureau. Nous allons avoir notre premier entretien tout à l'heure. Auparavant, je tiens à dire que je suis choqué de ce qu'a dit le Représentant des Pays-Bas. Ce qu'il a dit n'est pas exact. Il n'a pas vérifié. Les Etats-Unis doivent des centaines de millions de dollars à toutes les organisations, ce n'est pas parce qu'ils n'ont pas confiance en la FAO - ils le disent eux-mêmes - c'est parce qu'ils ont des problèmes avec leur Assemblée législative. Vous êtes cinq ou six ici qui n'arrivez pas à imposer votre point de vue à une cinquantaine de pays. Vous êtes membres d'autres organisations avec des arriérés supérieurs à ceux de la FAO.

Il est très négatif de dire qu'il y a des suspicions entre les Etats Membres. Préparer une autre étude pour l'année prochaine, pourquoi? Pour changer les structures, la "decision making", pour modifier l'équilibre des forces qui existent dans une société démocratique? Je ne vois vraiment pas pour quoi le délégué des Pays-Bas prend la FAO. Le Premier Ministre des Pays-Bas, qui était là, n'a jamais parlé de cela; M. Braks, le Ministre de l'agriculture, non plus. Ces accusations sont absolument sans fondement. Il est dommage qu'elles soient faites maintenant, à une heure moins le quart, par un observateur, sans que l'on puisse en débattre. Est-ce le cas de dire qu'il y a désaccord total sur tout et que c'est pour cela qu'on ne paie pas? Mais ce n'est pas vrai. Le Brésil a tenu à payer alors qu'il avait lui-même des difficultés; le Mexique et l'Argentine aussi.

Je dois défendre l'Organisation. Je représente les Etats Membres lorsque le Conseil n'est pas en session. Je me devais de dire cela à tout le monde, après 14 ans à la FAO. Je suis certain que la plupart des délégués partagent mon avis.

Applause

Applaudissements

Aplausos

Sra. Mercedes FERMIN GOMEZ (Venezuela): Yo no solamente voy a compartir lo que acaba de decir el Director General, sino que voy a protestar enérgicamente contra la grosera intervención del señor de Holanda que acaba de hablar. Yo no sé como, después de recibir gentilmente la oportunidad de hablar en un organismo al cual no pertenece y donde se la ha dado graciosamente la palabra como observador, puede decir tantas inexactitudes y groserías a una Organización que yo no sé por qué a ellos no les gusta. Si ellos son simplemente depositarios de un fideicomiso, pueden quedarse con él, puesto que dice que no es otra cosa lo que le interesa.

Yo creo que ese señor está completamente fuera de la comprensión de lo que significa la Organización para la Alimentación y la Agricultura de las Naciones Unidas. Esta no es una Organización para hacer negocios, para colocar dinero y que produzca interés y rentas, como alguien dijo ayer también: que la FAO no era una Organización rentable. Esto no es un banco ni es una organización para producir rentas o para producir dividendos. Los países que creen que eso es la FAO, deben buscar otro sitio, deben crear otra organización que les produzca rentas. Esta es una Organización que Naciones Unidas, reconociendo la deuda - no deuda de dinero: deuda de humillaciones y de todo tipo- que se tenía con los países del Tercer Mundo, creó para siquiera reponer, para darles algo de lo que se le había pedido durante siglos de explotación. Por una graciosa decisión de las Naciones Unidas se creó la FAO. No la voy a llamar "FAO", porque no corresponde: la Organización de la agricultura y la alimentación para atender a los países del Tercer Mundo; no para que los países poderosos depositaran dinero para sacar sus intereses, sino para proteger, para defender, para contribuir a aumentar, a incrementar la vida, la salud y los derechos humanos, que están consagrados en la carta de Naciones Unidas. Es realmente indignante que un país que ha suscrito esa Carta venga aquí a ofender a un grupo de países que no tenemos otro pecado que el de sentirnos independientes y soberanos, porque felizmente se acabaron las colonias. Eso es todo lo que tenemos que decir, en nombre de esa independencia, de esa soberanía de los países que somos inmensamente deudores, incapaces de pagar una deuda con esos mismos países, que tenemos la libertad de pensar y no queremos seguir siendo sojuzgados mentalmente por dueños ni por dominantes.

De manera que rechazamos ese tipo de amenazas, de chantajes, de insultos - porque esto es insultante. ¿Cómo se puede decir que ésta es una Organización en donde se tienen desconfianza unos a otros? Para los que no tienen confianza, el camino está abierto para separarse de ella, y que dejen aquí a quienes tenemos todavía la esperanza de cooperar unos con otros: los que más tienen y los que menos tienen. Porque hay una idea equivocada - y permíteme, señor Presidente - al pensar que aquí los únicos beneficiarios de FAO son los países del Tercer Mundo y los que nada tienen. No, también son beneficiarios de FAO aquellos que se benefician de los recursos humanos y naturales de otra clase - de nuestros territorios, de nuestra naturaleza. Esos también son beneficiarios de FAO. Y por eso, señor Presidente, quiero sentar mi protesta contra la intervención del señor Delegado de Países Bajos, por su grosería.

João Augusto DE MEDECIS (Brazil): Mr Chairman, very briefly, as Brazil is a country which is in arrears in its contribution, I believe it is my duty to state that in no way should our delay in payment be interpreted, as has been said before, as a lack of confidence in our Organization.

In my declaration before this Council I clearly stated that we are not happy with that record, but we are doing our utmost to comply, to the extent of our obligation.

Amin ABDEL MALEK (Liban) (langue originale arabe): Bien que le temps nous manque, j'espère que nous pourrions intervenir cet après-midi pour répondre à l'intervention de l'observateur des Pays-Bas.

LE PRESIDENT: Nous allons écouter la réponse du Secrétariat et de Monsieur le Directeur sur toutes ces questions et, peut-être pourrions-nous, après la cérémonie de ce matin, reprendre notre séance à 14 h 45 avec les interventions du Liban et de l'Argentine, puis nous aurons la réponse et la synthèse.

Nous allons donc lever cette séance, reprendre nos travaux cet après-midi et je passe la présidence au Vice-Président du Conseil, l'honorable délégué de Finlande.

Hannu Halinen, Vice-Chairman of the Council, took the chair.

Hannu Halinen, Vice-Président du Conseil, assume la présidence.

Ocupa la presidencia Hannu Halinen, Vice-presidente del Consejo.

UNVEILING OF THE PORTRAIT OF THE INDEPENDENT CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL

INAUGURATION DU PORTRAIT DU PRESIDENT INDEPENDANT DU CONSEIL

DESCUBRIMIENTO DEL RETRATO DEL PRESIDENTE INDEPENDIENTE DEL CONSEJO

CHAIRMAN; Mr Director-General, distinguished delegates, I think we have come to the point in our programme which we have to treat with the calm and dignity it deserves. I am very happy to say that this is a point on which we all agree unanimously.

We will now have the ceremony to unveil a portrait of the independant Chairman. This is usually done during the last Session of the Council over which he presides. The portrait is on the wall of the Red Room, beside those of his predecessors who have carried out the work of the Council since its inception.

I would now like to invite all delegates to remain seated while the Director-General, Mr Ben Osman, and the Secretary-General accompany me for the portrait unveiling ceremony.

Applause

Applaudissements

Aplausos

CHAIRMAN: Mr Ben Osman, Director-General, distinguished delegates, it is a great honour and privilege to chair this historic moment. At each meeting of the Council, His Excellency, Mr Ben Osman, has been chairing, he has shown his admirable capacity and diligence in guiding the Council through many, at times stormy, issues. There is no doubt about the fact that he is more than worthy to have his picture on our wall of honour among the other previous Chairmen. I thank him most profoundly on my behalf and, with your permission, on behalf of the whole Council. I do this only in order to save time. I am confident that all Members of the Council would like to express their appreciation and thanks to Mr Ben Osman. But I am asking you to refrain from doing this and to make those statements, as is traditional at the Conference, after the election of the new independant Chairman.

LE DIRECTEUR GENERAL (langue originale arabe): Distingués délégués, chers frères. On ne dévoile pas un visage qui ne s'est jamais retranché derrière un voile, Lassaad Ben Osman, un frère, un ami, un partenaire de l'Organisation, dans ses tâches les plus nobles, et qui représente à la fois la franchise dans toute sa splendeur et la transparence sans masque.

Notre tradition a voulu que l'on célèbre cette occasion aujourd'hui; ainsi, le portrait du Président indépendant occupe la place qui lui revient dans cette galerie de personnalités illustres qui ont assumé cette même responsabilité, et auxquelles nous adressons nos meilleures pensées.

Tout comme vous je suis certain que l'impression que nous laisse Lassaad Ben Osman va bien au-delà de nos sentiments et, qu'au contraire, il laissera toute son empreinte sur l'Organisation maintenant, et dans l'avenir.

Lorsqu'on déclare que le temps ne peut effacer certaines marques on songe aux qualités, aux talents, aux principes et aux valeurs que nous retrouvons aujourd'hui en la personne de ce cher ami.

Nous ne pouvons manifester notre gratitude et notre appréciation en quelques mots et quelques minutes ne suffisent pas pour exprimer des mérites qui portent sur une période de quatre ans, et je suis certain que les éminents représentants des Pays Membres du Conseil partagent avec moi le témoignage rendu au talent et à la sagesse du Président.

Il a toujours été fidèle à sa mission, dévoué aux rôles et aux objectifs de l'Organisation; il personnifiait le patrimoine arabe et faisait de son sens de la chevalerie une nature, une idéologie et un style de vie.

Sa connaissance de l'Organisation est sans pareille, et ce grâce à son expérience, sa compétence et surtout sa qualité de Ministre de l'Agriculture, poste qu'il a occupé et qui a été un bienfait pour son pays.

Monsieur le Président, nous avons observé votre souplesse et votre fermeté lorsqu'elles se sont révélées nécessaires; lorsque vous avez fixé votre attention sur un objectif vous ne vous en êtes jamais écarté. Vous êtes membre d'une famille unie et lorsqu'un membre d'une famille nous quitte, il ne nous abandonne jamais. Au contraire, il trouve une place de choix dans nos coeurs et nous l'attendons comme s'il allait réapparaître demain.

Je vous remercie et j'espère vous revoir bientôt.

Standing ovation

Ovation

Ovación

Lassaad BEN OSMAN, Président indépendant du Conseil (langue originale arabe): Je ne sais pas comment exprimer par ces mots les sentiments que provoque en moi un frère sincère; mais j'espère quand même mériter ses paroles non seulement pour moi-même, mais dans l'esprit des distingués représentants des pays. Avec l'aide de Dieu, j'ai pu m'acquitter des missions et des devoirs dont on m'a chargé.

Excellences Représentants des pays membres, c'est pour moi un très grand honneur que de voir mon portrait s'ajouter à ceux des personnes éminentes, qui, en leur temps, ont assumé la présidence de notre Conseil de façon objective et responsable et qui ont tous participé au cheminement de l'Organisation vers ses nobles objectifs. Je suis pleinement convaincu que ma présence représente le symbole de la présence de la Tunisie à cette auguste tribune, véritable engagement moral auquel nous souscrivons pour que l'Organisation atteigne ses objectifs: la lutte contre la pauvreté et la faim, et pour la dignité de l'être humain.

Ce portrait n'est que le symbole de l'effort qui n'a jamais cessé; il suffit de voir ce qui a été réalisé pour voir l'avenir avec espoir pour le plus grand bienfait des pays membres et en particulier du tiers monde.

Je vois là également un symbole du lien entre les générations, d'un lien entre des cultures et des expériences différentes qui font qu'il n'y a jamais rupture ni arrêt. Je voudrais surtout avoir été un chaînon solide dans cette série, être en paix avec ma conscience, sachant que je me suis acquitté de mon devoir dignement.

Sans aucun doute le Conseil a un rôle fondamental à jouer dans le fonctionnement de l'Organisation et, si j'ai une raison de me sentir quelque peu fier, c'est du au fait que les représentants des pays membres ont fait preuve d'un esprit de consensus et de collaboration, et ont su tous comprendre nos objectifs et comment y parvenir. Ils ont toujours renforcé l'Organisation et l'ont appuyée dans un esprit de collaboration et de coopération.

Je n'oublie pas non plus ceux qui ont été les pionniers de nos succès, et je pense en particulier à mon grand ami, le Directeur général, M. Edouard Saouma, qui infatigablement mène l'Organisation en travaillant sans repos pour renforcer le rôle de l'Organisation et intensifier sa présence dans un climat de compréhension entre tous. Il a voulu que cette cérémonie soit une manifestation de la fraternité, de l'amitié qui préside à nos relations. Que Dieu veuille nous aider tous.

Applause

Applaudissements

Aplausos

Amor BEN ROMDHAME (Tunisie): Monsieur Le Président, je vous remercie d'avoir bien voulu m'accorder la parole bien que la Tunisie ne soit présente qu'en qualité d'observateur; c'est une occasion et un événement historique pour l'Organisation.

La délégation tunisienne est très heureuse en ce jour où nous organisons cette cérémonie de l'inauguration du portrait du Président qui est par là même un hommage rendu à la Tunisie en la personne d'un de ses plus éminents fils, le compétent ingénieur, le brillant animateur, Lassaad Ben Osman, qui a consacré les meilleures années de sa jeunesse au service de l'agriculture et du développement

Nous nous sentons d'autant plus fiers de cette cérémonie qui rend, hommage, au-delà de Ben Osman, au Gouvernement tunisien. Nous sommes reconnaissants à tous les Etats Membres qui l'ont élu à ce poste et qui ont participé au succès de sa tâche surtout dans les circonstances difficiles qu'a connues l'agriculture dans le monde au cours des dernières années. Nous n'oublions pas non plus, Monsieur le Président, le rôle important qu'a joué le Secrétariat et à sa tête le Directeur général, Dr. Edouard Saouma, et les efforts déployés par ce dernier pour sauvegarder les intérêts de l'Organisation et créer les conditions adéquates en vue de réaliser les objectifs recherchés.

La délégation tunisienne saisit cette occasion pour exprimer au Président sortant du Conseil tous ses souhaits de bonheur et de bonne santé et au prochain Président du Conseil pleine réussite dans ses nouvelles fonctions. Enfin, tous nos souhaits à l'Organisation de succès continu.

Applause

Applaudissements

Aplausos

CHAIRMAN: The meeting is closed.

The meeting rose at 13.00 hours.

La seance est levee à 13 heures.

Se levanta la sesión a las 13 horas.

council

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

conseil

ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ALIMENTATION ET L'AGRICULTURE

consejo

ORGANIZACION DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA LA AGRICULTURA Y LA ALIMENTACION

CL

CL 96/PV/8

Ninety-sixth Session

Quatre-vingt-seizième session

96º periodo de sesiones

**EIGHTH PLENARY MEETING
HUITIEME SEANCE PLENIERE
OCTAVA SESION PLENARIA
9 November 1989**

The Eighth Plenary Meeting was opened at 15.00 hours Lassaad Ben Osman, Independent Chairman of the Council, presiding

La huitième séance plénière est ouverte à 15 heures, sous la présidence de Lassaad Ben Osman, Président indépendant du Conseil

Se abre la octava sesión plenaria a las 15.00 horas, bajo la presidencia de Lassaad Ben Osman, Presidente Independiente del Consejo

- III. PROGRAMME, BUDGETARY, FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS
(continued)
- III. QUESTIONS CONCERNANT LE PROGRAMME, LE BUDGET, LES FINANCES ET L'ADMINISTRATION (suite)
- III. ASUNTOS DEL PROGRAMA Y ASUNTOS PRESUPUESTARIOS, FINANCIEROS Y ADMINISTRATIVOS (continuación)
- 7. Conclusions of the Review of Certain Aspects of FAO's Goals and Operations (continued)
- 7. Conclusions de l'examen de certains aspects des buts et opérations (suite)
- 7. Conclusiones del examen de algunos aspectos de las metas y operaciones de la FAO
(continuación)

LE PRESIDENT: Nous allons reprendre le cours de nos travaux interrompus ce matin. Il y a eu cette intervention de l'observateur des Pays-Bas qui a donné lieu à des réactions et certaines délégations ont demandé à prendre la parole au début de cet après-midi. J'espère que nous pourrons passer ensuite à la réponse du Directeur général et de ses collaborateurs sur l'ensemble de la question de l'Examen. Puis nous passerons aux autres questions de l'ordre du jour, qui sont nombreuses.

D'un autre côté, le Comité de rédaction doit se réunir afin de préparer le travail pour demain, Je suggère donc que l'on passe assez rapidement à l'analyse des autres questions et je demande à Messieurs les délégués de tenir compte de cette obligation. J'espère que mon appel sera entendu.

Amin ABDEL MALEK (Liban)(langue originale arabe): Je ne voudrais pas parler longuement en réponse à ce qu'a dit le délégué des Pays-Bas ce matin. J'espère qu'il se trouve parmi nous pour m'entendre. Mais je ne veux pas m'abaisser à son niveau car je pense qu'il ne mérite pas qu'on lui réponde. Ce qu'il a dit ce matin concerne l'Organisation et ses responsables ainsi que les pays membres. Les relations entre les organisations et les pays membres ne sont pas détériorées. Les relations entre pays peuvent subir des divergences à cause de la multiplicité des sujets discutés mais nous ne sommes pas parvenus à la tension mentionnée par le délégué des Pays-Bas ce matin.

Javier TANTALEAN (Perú): Para no dejar lugar a dudas, ya que Perú es un país que le debe dinero a la FAO, quisiera aclarar al delegado de Holanda que esto no se debe en absoluto a la falta de confianza en la Organización sino a problemas derivados por la crisis de la deuda externa. Y por el contrario, mi Gobierno y mi país tienen plena confianza en la FAO y en su Director General.

Sra. Margarita Lizarraga SAUCEDO (México): México ha apoyado y sigue apoyando a la Organización porque ve en ella una fuente irremplazable de asistencia para los países en desarrollo. No tenemos duda sobre la competencia y capacidad de la Organización y de su Director General que, aunque ha sido puesto a prueba por difíciles situaciones financieras en su mayor parte impuestas, ha sabido salir adelante. Estamos en momentos en que la Organización, que no debemos olvidar que somos todos, Estados y Secretaría, requiere de apoyo. Sr. Presidente: en nombre de México, y creo interpretar el sentimiento de la mayoría, le expreso públicamente a la Organización y a su Director General nuestra confianza y nuestro apoyo.

Atif Y. BUKHARI (Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of) (original language Arabic): The representative of the Netherlands took not only the Organization and its administration to task but also members of the Council. This did violence to the spirit of cooperation which has been present during our discussions this week. We should like to protest most vigorously about what was said. We would ask that direct contact be made with the Government of the Netherlands to inform that Government about what has happened so that we may learn whether this is indeed the position of the Dutch Government. If that is not the case, we cannot allow this person to remain at Council Sessions.

Bashir El Mabrouk SAID (Libya) (original language Arabic): My delegation very much regrets what has happened. We hope that everyone here will agree that any speech which is not within the spirit of constructive dialogue and which lacks respect for member countries and for the Organization not only damages the Organization but also damages the member countries - and we are the member countries.

I think everyone will agree with me when I say that. Rather than becoming involved in a discussion which is futile and irresponsible and not within the normal context of responsibility in which we discuss matters, we should place on record in the report of this session the trust which has been expressed by member countries and the mutual trust which exists between individual members, as well as the trust which has been mentioned by the members of FAO. This is a trust which has been referred to by many and which has shown great homage to this Organization and the Director-General. It has also very much shown the positive spirit which has governed our discussions, which have also been carried out in a spirit of openness and respect.

I would not want to repeat the words uttered by Venezuela, but I hope this will not happen again because it could create serious tensions within our discussions.

E.P. ALLEYNE (Trinidad and Tobago): Under normal circumstances, my delegation would apologize most sincerely for requesting the floor at this time, given that we have so much to do, but these are not normal circumstances. I wish to add the voice of a small but very proud country to the intervention preceding mine in abhorrent reaction to the comments made by the representative of Holland this morning. That representative is not empowered to speak, has no authority even to attempt to indicate the feelings of Member Governments en masse, and very definitely not of the Government of Trinidad and Tobago, with regard to our status, our relationship, our perceptions regarding the Food and Agriculture Organization.

For the record, any delays in payment on the part of my country have nothing to do with a lack of confidence or a lack of faith in this Organization or the quality of its administration. It is incorrect, unfair, alarming and indeed insulting that the representative of the Netherlands should speak of failing trust at a time when delegations in this Council are meeting in an earnest attempt to move this Organization forward into the future.

It was also most unfortunate that those uncalled for and unjustified remarks were made just before we took time off for a most impressive ceremony in your honour. You received a standing ovation from this gathering, Mr Chairman. Surely your success must have reflected a period of guidance in the spirit of faith and trust among Member Nations.

I honestly believe that this Council and the Governments here represented deserve an apology.

Shahid NAJAM (Pakistan): My delegation is immensely distressed about the unfortunate remarks made by the Observer from the Netherlands. Pakistan is also a relatively minor defaulter, but this in no way implies that we lack trust and confidence in FAO. We should like to, categorically and emphatically, reaffirm and reiterate our full and unflinching confidence and trust in FAO, its highly competent management and its unstinting, excellent functioning for the extermination of hunger, poverty and malnutrition from the world.

My delegation fully supports the proposals of the distinguished delegates from the Lebanon and the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

Mauricio CUADRA (Nicaragua): Mi Delegación se suma al clamor de la mayoría de las Delegaciones aquí presentes, que manifiestan su rechazo firme a las expresiones que se han vertido en contra de la Organización, del funcionamiento de la misma y del Director General. A nosotros nos sorprende, porque conocemos perfectamente la política del Gobierno de Países Bajos. Somos beneficiarios incluso de proyectos que se financian con fondos fiduciarios de este país y que ejecuta la FAO, y nunca hemos tenido ni sentido de gobierno de las autoridades oficiales de Países Bajos, ni el más mínimo condicionamiento ni la más mínima duda hacia la efectividad de estos programas y, mucho menos, la más mínima duda hacia la honorabilidad, hacia la efectividad y hacia el funcionamiento de la Organización y de su Dirección.

Hemos escuchado a un distinguido Delegado pedir aquí que no se considere como oficial esta declaración, o bien que se pida una aclaración al Gobierno de los Países Bajos, si esta declaración que aquí se ha hecho es oficial. Nosotros nos sumáramos a esta petición, puesto que, insisto, tenemos excelentes relaciones con el Gobierno de los Países Bajos, somos beneficiarios de fondos de ese país, y nunca hemos tenido ni presiones ni condicionamientos para su uso ni dudas hacia nosotros ni, mucho menos, hacia la Organización.

Nos sumamos a ese clamor, y obviamente, sobra decirlo, reiteramos nuestro apoyo, nuestra confianza y nuestro aprecio por la FAO y en particular por la persona del Director General.

Víctor MACHINEA (Argentina): Creo que está todo dicho. Parece que extendernos en este tema no vale la pena. Primero tenemos que interpretar el nivel del Delegado en cuanto a representatividad se refiere -estamos hablando de un observador-, y no debemos dar más valor que eso. La República Argentina es deudor, es cierto, pero está muy lejos de pensar como lo trató de interpretar el distinguido Delegado de los Países Bajos. Así que, desde ya está nuestro pleno apoyo a la Organización y al Director General.

R.G. PETTITT (United Kingdom): I think that our experience today would rather suggest that it is not helpful or leading to clarification, or conducive to efficient business, for the Director-General or the Secretariat to make interpretive statements following interventions by member countries, rather than stick in mid-debate to answering questions or intervening, at request, to correct errors and misunderstandings.

I would also have thought that perhaps we members ought to exercise some degree of restraint before intervening in situations where it would appear from the heat generated that there is some element of misunderstanding.

LE PRESIDENT: L'Observateur des Pays-Bas m'a demandé, à l'issue de ces interventions et avec votre permission, de prendre la parole. Nous sommes tous unanimes pour dire qu'il y a eu des paroles malencontreuses; nous allons écouter le représentant de l'Inde et ensuite l'Observateur des Pays-Bas pourra peut-être rattraper cette affaire.

C.Srinivasa SASTRI (India): We share the feeling that the delegate from the Netherlands, utilizing his status as an observer has made a statement which is not in keeping with the tone and tenor of interventions by Member Nations in the fora of an international organization like FAO.

While the representative of the Netherlands has a right to his views and opinions, and also the right to express them in an appropriate manner, what he said is not on any specific subject on the agenda but constitutes a sweeping observation of a general nature on the members and also about the attitude of the Member Nations towards the FAO.

Under your leadership, Mr Chairman, particularly in the Council, the FAO has been functioning in a democratic manner and all members have exercised the right of freely expressing their views and opinions. The long and frank discussions in the Council on the Programme of Work and Budget and the FAO review have clearly brought out the faith of Member Nations in FAO and their willingness to strengthen the Organization.

Although India is not a defaulter in terms of assessed contributions, we would place on record our faith and belief in the FAO as in an international organization which has been doing outstanding service for the development of, and in the cause of, food and agriculture, rural development and related areas in the globe.

Now that you, Mr Chairman, have mentioned that the representative of the Netherlands wishes to make another intervention, assuming that you are going to give him an opportunity, we hope in deference to the statements made by the Member Nations in such a large majority the representative of the Netherlands will make adequate amends in a manner that is appropriate.

F.C. PRILLEVITZ (Observer for the Netherlands): I was shocked especially by the reactions of several colleagues of countries who have just spoken and also by the reaction of the Director-General, so I think if we were misunderstood, we have to clarify our statement which was read out by my colleague, and is now made available to all the members of the Council. Listening to those Representatives that have spoken about the paragraph in our speech that was devoted to the payment of contribution, I do have to apologize for the wording of this part of our statement because I have understood that it has done harm to these countries.

It could be that we were too naïve, but our contribution to this debate was meant to be constructive. When I came to Rome almost two years ago, my first experience with FAO was a financial crisis. And two days ago I heard that the situation is even worse than two years ago. Everybody may interpret this situation in his or her own way.

Review of FAO meant for us a possibility to overcome the difficulties we are facing now. Listening to the debate as an observer we have got the impression that there is a possibility that the results will not be in such a way that a renewed FAO will take up its tasks in a new spirit. With this in mind we have spoken about a lack of trust, of confidence. We never wanted to insult or offend any delegation or the Director-General and his Secretariat. If anybody in this room has got that impression we regret that very much. For us, as I said before, Review of FAO must lead to a restrengthening of FAO. If the reaction on our statement is representative for the hope in this room that we can reach such a result then I am very happy with this.

Finally, Mr Chairman, my Government wishes to be considered as one of the most constructive and supportive members of FAO.

DIRECTOR-GENERAL: I should like to answer the delegate of the United Kingdom who seemed offended by my reaction. I have the right, Sir, to participate in the debate. One must read the Constitution. I do not take the floor, I am given the floor, and whenever the dignity of the Organization or the management is being harmed I have to defend it. We have dignity. We live with our dignity, and if there are accusations I have to answer the accusations. I also was defending the honour of this Council.

Gonzalo BULA HOTOS (Colombia): Los representantes de Colombia deseamos declarar que hemos oído con respeto y atención las palabras del colega y amigo señor Prillewitz, de los Países Bajos, cuyo contenido esperamos que contribuirá a tranquilizar los ánimos justamente exacerbados de los miembros del Consejo. En nombre del Gobierno colombiano, deseamos reiterar nuestra admiración y simpatía al Gobierno y al pueblo de los Países Bajos.

LE PRESIDENT: Est-ce que nous pouvons adopter la proposition de la Libye, en ce sens que dans le rapport nous pourrions faire clairement état de l'esprit de concorde et de confiance qui a régné dans le Conseil au moment de l'étude de toutes les questions fondamentales inscrites à l'ordre du jour, qui traduisent la confiance totale des délégués les uns dans les autres et dans le management de l'Organisation, que nous considérons que ce capital de confiance est un gage de succès pour l'Organisation et ses organes directeurs. Si vous acceptiez cela, nous pourrions le mettre dans le rapport.

Est-ce que l'on peut avancer dans cette direction?

Ms Joan DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America): As I understand it, what you are asking now, Mr Chairman, is that the members of the Drafting Group commit themselves in advance to what would be in the text of the report of this Council. That is not a way in which my delegation wishes to proceed. We understand what has happened here. We do not wish to create problems for the Organization but at this moment we are not prepared to accept the idea that the words that were read out just now by you should be the words that appear in the report. I think what needs to come in the report will require some reflection by all delegations.

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): Señor Presidente, usted ha hecho un gran esfuerzo por tratar de presentar un texto que pudiera ser satisfactorio para todos los miembros del Consejo. La experiencia y la tradición indican que las palabras del Presidente de Consejo al final de un debate, no son letra escrita, no son textos definitivos para la decisión del Comité de Redacción. Yo creo que el Consejo toma nota de lo que usted ha dicho y los miembros del Comité de Redacción procederán según sus criterios y así podremos concluir este asunto.

LE PRESIDENT: Je crois que nous pouvons aller de l'avant et revenir à l'ordre du jour. Je vais donner la parole au Président du Comité du programme qui va répondre aux diverses appréciations apportées par les honorables délégués.

M. MAZOYER (Président du Comité du Programme): Monsieur le Président, Messieurs les Représentants des Etats Membres, Mesdames et Messieurs, permettez-moi de remercier les membres du Conseil qui ont bien voulu porter une appréciation positive sur le rapport conjoint du Comité financier et du Comité du Programme relatif aux objectifs, rôle, stratégies et priorités, et les opérations de terrain de la FAO, et considérer que ce rapport constitue une bonne base pour les débats de la Conférence. C'est un motif de satisfaction pour mes collègues du Comité financier et du Comité du programme, pour l'Ambassadeur Bukhari, Président du Comité financier, et pour moi-même.

Certes, ce rapport n'est pas parfait. Il peut être complété. Le Directeur général a déjà fait des propositions utiles à ce sujet. Vos débats quant au fond et à la forme du rapport montrent à mon avis que l'Examen prescrit par la Conférence a été productif à plus d'un titre.

Faisant suite à une période où des doutes et des propositions diverses relatives à la situation et à l'avenir de l'Organisation se faisaient jour, on peut considérer que le fait que les experts, les Comités, le Directeur général et finalement vous-mêmes soyez d'accord avec les conclusions et les recommandations qui vous sont soumises, est un résultat positif en soi, et tout à fait remarquable, un pas en avant vers davantage de confiance et de consensus.

D'autre part, comme l'ont rappelé plusieurs de nos collègues des deux Comités, l'étendue, la qualité, le niveau de l'information sur l'état de l'Organisation et sur ses activités se sont améliorés grâce aux enquêtes des experts, grâce aux contributions des Etats Membres, grâce à la documentation fournie par le Secrétariat, grâce au temps passé par les uns et les autres à s'informer, grâce aux débats entre les membres des Comités, avec les experts et avec le Secrétariat. Ainsi les activités de l'Organisation sont sans doute mieux connues par beaucoup d'entre nous et beaucoup plus justement appréciées. Des zones d'ombre ont été éclairées. De nombreux malentendus ont été écartés. Certains procès d'intention injustifiés également. On peut dire que le niveau d'écoute, de compréhension et la qualité de relation entre les uns et les autres se sont considérablement améliorés. M. Coutts a souligné lui-même que le travail des Comités s'était déroulé dans des conditions exemplaires. Tout cela constitue un pas en avant considérable vers un consensus renouvelé.

Mais il est clair que ces progrès, qui sont particulièrement nets au sein des Comités, ne sont peut-être pas aussi bien perçus par les représentants qui ont moins directement participé au travail d'élaboration des conclusions et recommandations qui vous sont soumises. Le résultat de l'Examen reste en partie fragile. Il faut en consolider les acquis techniques, politiques et moraux au Conseil et à la Conférence. Il faut étudier ses conclusions et recommandations, proposer des amendements constructifs comme l'a déjà fait le Directeur général, se mettre d'accord sur ces améliorations et sur les modalités de mise en oeuvre des recommandations.

Je vous en prie, faites-le dans le même esprit d'écoute, de respect mutuel, de compréhension que vos élus des deux Comités ont si bien respecté, ce dont je ne saurais personnellement trop les féliciter et les remercier. Mettez l'accent sur ce qui vous rapproche plus que sur ce qui vous divise peut-être encore. Si ces conditions sont réunies, je pense que l'Examen n'aura pas été vain, qu'il n'aura pas coûté trop cher.

Enfin je voudrais souligner que la moisson de conclusions et de recommandations, même si elle reprend beaucoup d'idées qui étalent dans l'air, même si elle prolonge ou renforce ce que faisait déjà l'Organisation, comme cela a été souligné, cette moisson est peut-être plus importante qu'il n'y paraît aux yeux de certains, et que sa portée est sans doute beaucoup plus grande que ce que les restrictions budgétaires, qui n'ont cessé de planer au-dessus de nos têtes pendant tous nos travaux, nous autorisaient en fait. Sans vouloir être exhaustif, il me paraît important qu'un accord de principe sur l'imprescriptibilité et l'Inter-relation, la complémentarité des trois fonctions essentielles de l'Organisation soit acquis; que le rôle significatif de l'Organisation en matière de politiques soit reconnu; que le rôle de l'Organisation et les nouvelles orientations en matière de recherche et de technologie, en collaboration avec d'autres organismes le soient également; que le rôle de l'Organisation dans le développement durable, la prise en compte des problèmes écologiques de notre époque dans son domaine de compétence le soient aussi, et j'en passe: Conférence de la réforme agraire et du développement rural, commerce International.

Les propositions pour l'amélioration de la procédure de planification, de budgétisation de l'Organisation ne sont pas négligeables. Bien appliquées, elles peuvent porter des fruits très utiles. Enfin, je ne parle pas du service d'identification et de formulation des projets financés pour les fonds fiduciaires, de l'examen approfondi des programmes de terrain etc., et de l'amélioration de la coopération, de la coordination avec les autres organisations et agences des Nations Unies. Je ne veux pas être trop long.

La portée de l'Examen n'est pas limitée à mon avis. Elle l'est peut-être à cause des moyens dont dispose l'Organisation. Elle ne l'est pas dans sa portée à venir. Les propositions sont améliorables mais elles ne sont pas nulles et non avenues, comme j'ai cru comprendre qu'on pouvait aussi le penser. Il est pourtant un point sur lequel je regrette que nous n'ayons pu avancer davantage. Comme je l'ai dit dans ma présentation hier, il s'agit de la prescription du paragraphe 2 a) de la Résolution 6/87, qui demandait d'examiner la façon dont la FAO pourrait apporter sa contribution la plus efficace aux efforts des Etats Membres et des populations en vue d'éliminer la faim, la malnutrition et la pauvreté, compte tenu, ai-je dit, et c'est écrit dans la Résolution, des ressources dont dispose l'Organisation. J'ai regretté que ces ressources envisageables dans les prochaines années ne permettent pas malheureusement de régler ce problème, pas plus qu'elles ne l'ont permis dans les années antérieures.

Je voudrais préciser ma pensée. Il y a dans les pays en développement plus d'un milliard de personnes, soit environ 250 millions de familles - je parle des campagnes - qui restent année après année directement victimes de la faim, candidates aux camps de réfugiés du Haut Commissariat, condamnées à l'exode proche ou lointain. Pour venir à bout d'un fléau de ce genre et de ses conséquences néfastes, il faudrait au bas mot 50 milliards de dollars durant une dizaine d'années, renouvelables sans doute, pour équiper ces 250 millions d'exploitations paysannes en outils, en intrants, en bétail, en plantations, en moyens d'arrosage au minimum. Le coût d'exécution d'un tel plan, si l'on considère qu'il représente 20% du coût des équipements en question, serait donc de l'ordre de 10 milliards par an.

Un jour, les Nations Unies auront besoin d'une organisation puissante, plus puissante que ne l'est aujourd'hui la FAO, qui soit capable de formuler, de coordonner un tel plan. Personnellement je regrette que ce moment ne soit pas encore venu. J'espère que les résultats de l'Examen analysés à la lumière de ce problème constituent tout de même une possibilité de consolidation et un jalon encore modeste, mais un jalon tout de même, sur le chemin qui permettra un jour à la FAO de remplir ce rôle, car le jour viendra où on lui demandera de le remplir.

LE PRESIDENT: Je remercie le Président du Comité du Programme pour son intervention et je donne la parole au Directeur général.

LE DIRECTEUR GENERAL: Je voudrais me permettre tout d'abord de remercier et de rendre hommage à M.Valenza, Ambassadeur d'Italie, pour la contribution importante qu'il a eue dans la décision prise par le Gouvernement italien de transférer 15 autres millions de dollars à la FAO pour permettre à la FAO de faire face à la crise financière dans laquelle elle se trouve depuis quelques années. Je sais que ce n'était pas facile. Il y a en ce moment quelques problèmes en ce qui concerne l'aide publique au développement et les Italiens ont été très généreux. Ceci va permettre de payer les salaires de la fin de l'année parce que nous attendions d'autres contributions qui ne sont pas arrivées. Je dois donc rendre hommage à Monsieur l'ambassadeur Valenza et au Gouvernement italien.

(continues in English) You will recall Resolution 6/87 made the Secretariat an integral participant in the Review process, and requested me to make my own conclusions known directly to the Conference and Council.

The process of Review was intellectually and managerially challenging. It was also time-consuming and costly. I am, therefore, glad that on the whole the reactions of the Council have not threatened to reopen past wounds - - I wrote this, of course, before this morning's intervention - - and to create new painful controversies, but have generally been positive and constructive. It is now for the Conference to reach conclusions. It was the Conference which started the process. It is the Conference which must finish it. Frankly, I hope that it will be finished, since the Organization's resources, as affected by the critical situation regarding contributions, cannot support further exercises of this kind, while trying to meet even the minimum of services which Member Governments have a right to expect.

One could hardly expect the Council to go further than it has on the subject, given the short time available and the rights of non-members of the Council to be heard in Conference before conclusions are reached.

However, I had good hopes and, despite one or two interventions which seemed to me to risk provoking unnecessary counter-reactions of an extreme kind, I still have good hopes that the Conference will reach a consensus without too many difficulties and pain on this matter, and give me the managerial go-ahead and the necessary resources to implement these conclusions into the next or future biennium.

On the question of resources, I do not want to get too deeply involved at this stage in the problem of how realistic it is for Member Governments to decide to engage in what are, in fact, major initiatives without assuring that the resources will be there to sustain the minimum base, let alone the capacity to respond in a reasonable way to their new requirements. What are at stake here are not minor programmes which could be accommodated in the past by the normal process of programme and budgetary adjustment, or from the Working Capital Fund, or the special Reserve Account.

Mr Chairman, these are major changes which, if seriously implemented, would involve more than 60 new posts, many requiring expertise not at present available, as well as serious amounts of money, possibly not all at once, but still necessary eventually. Moreover, we in FAO are not living in normal times. It is surely rather pointless to talk about adjustments, savings or even recourse to the Working Capital Fund of the Special Reserve Account, when neither I, nor apparently anyone else, knows if and when the next dollar of arrears or currently due contributions is going to arrive, especially from the main contributor which owes FAO US\$ 142 million, and if we consider the family of the United Nations, a total of US\$ 893 million to the whole United Nations system.

Nevertheless, I have tried all along to promote a consensus in a spirit of realism. Despite a range of opinions, the Council has in fact shown the same spirit. I hope that this spirit of conciliation, rather than of challenge or threat, and of political and financial realism will prevail. I will certainly lend my efforts to this end during the Conference.

In this connection, perhaps Member Governments will find it useful at some point in the proceedings of Commission II, or before, to participate in some sort of Group to work out a consensus solution. It is for Member Governments to decide, but I would make the point that, under Resolution 6/87, directly and through my representatives, the Director-General remains an integral participant.

Moreover, since we will be at the point of concrete decisions involving questions of programme and budgetary implementation, any such Group must be kept continuously informed of the Director-General's views on substance, feasibility, financial and administrative implications. Therefore, if any such Group were to be set up, I would be ready to nominate a senior person to represent me in it, as was the case for the previous Contact Group.

Finally, Mr Chairman, my main concern is that we should now begin to extract the practical benefits of this exercise and get on with our important substantive tasks. There seems to be general agreement on what these are. Let us, therefore, try to conclude this exercise, as our Host would say, "in bellezza".

LE PRESIDENT:Nous arrivons à la fin d'un débat extrêmement important sur l'un des points les plus importants de notre ordre du jour: l'Examen des buts et opérations de la FAO auquel ont participé la plupart des membres du Conseil, puisque 44 représentants et un observateur ont pris la parole. Je crois que, comme l'a dit le délégué de la Colombie - et ce que je dis est simplement indicatif, ce n'est pas impératif pour la rédaction du rapport - le Conseil s'est accordé à reconnaître la qualité et la valeur des documents qui lui ont été soumis pour examen. Les experts puis, par la suite, le Comité du programme et le Comité financier se sont livrés à une étude approfondie de l'Organisation et ont bénéficié des commentaires substantiels du Directeur général. Leurs vues ont été présentées d'une manière que l'on peut considérer claire, précise et susceptible d'offrir une base adéquate aux discussions et aux conclusions futures de la Conférence.

D'une manière générale, le Conseil est d'avis qu'il n'y a pas lieu d'introduire de nouveaux points pour discussion. Il a noté que le Directeur général a marqué son accord avec les recommandations faites par le Comité et qu'il en a proposé, en outre, quatre additionnelles. Le Conseil s'est accordé à reconnaître que les comités ont bien accompli la tâche que la Résolution 6/87 leur avait confiée et qu'après deux ans, il convenait de conclure cet exercice et

de permettre à l'Organisation de reprendre le cours normal de ses activités. Le Conseil exprime de manière unanime le souhait et la volonté d'aboutir, comme vient de le rappeler le Directeur général, à des conclusions par consensus sur une question aussi importante car c'est seulement en cas de consensus que l'on peut espérer que les recommandations adoptées pourront progressivement être mises en oeuvre dans l'harmonie entre les Etats Membres - harmonie dont l'Organisation a tellement besoin.

D'une manière générale, le Conseil et les membres du Comité du programme et du Comité financier ont exprimé leur accord sur les recommandations des deux comités. On a reconnu en particulier, comme l'ont souligné les deux comités dans la conclusion de leur rapport, que la FAO est une Organisation saine et en bonne santé, qui doit pouvoir bénéficier de la confiance des Etats Membres. Le Conseil a souligné que l'objectif de l'Examen est de renforcer l'Organisation tout en lui apportant les améliorations nécessaires. Il a tout particulièrement marqué son accord sur les trois rôles principaux de la FAO - information, tribune internationale, assistance technique - en soulignant qu'ils sont complémentaires et indissociables.

Certaines délégations ont exprimé le souhait qu'un mécanisme informel de consultation soit mis en place pour lancer la discussion sur ce sujet et préparer un projet de résolution pour la Conférence. Comme nous l'avons noté, à cet égard, la grande majorité des Etats Membres a estimé que cela paraissait prématuré car il fallait d'abord bénéficier des vues des ministres et de tous les membres de la FAO à la Commission II de la Conférence sur cette question vitale qui intéresse tous les Etats Membres, commission qui doit se réunir la semaine prochaine.

Il est à noter que la question du choix des priorités dans les recommandations qui a été suggéré par le Directeur général dans son intervention n'a pas pu donner lieu à une discussion générale approfondie. Je pense que la Conférence voudra bien se pencher sur le choix de cette priorité dans les recommandations. La question des ressources a été abordée par de nombreux Etats Membres mais force est de constater qu'il n'y a pas eu accord sur les méthodes de financement des recommandations proposées. De nombreuses propositions ont été faites, depuis la réallocation interne des ressources et la suppression d'activités de moindre priorité jusqu'à l'adoption de crédits supplémentaires ou l'appel de ressources extrabudgétaires. En tout état de cause, cette question est importante, elle reste ouverte, et je formule le voeu que l'Assemblée générale puisse y trouver une solution. Bien sûr, il ne faut pas perdre de vue, comme vient de le déclarer le Directeur général, que la crise financière que subit l'Organisation ne lui permet pas d'avoir la souplesse que l'on est en droit d'attendre d'une Organisation telle que la FAO. Cela est évidemment dû au montant très important des contributions en retard qui s'élève à 175 millions de dollars, et également au fait qu'il y a 100 millions de dollars impayés ou de créances susceptibles de ne pas être payées.

De mon point de vue, le débat a été extrêmement riche et il serait certainement difficile au Comité de rédaction, étant donné le peu de temps qui lui reste, d'en faire un résumé détaillé. La Conférence reprendra tout cela la semaine prochaine. Il y a des divergences et elles devront être surmontées par la Conférence. Maintenant c'est au Conseil et au Comité de rédaction d'en décider mais peut-être pourrait-on se limiter dans le rapport aux intentions générales et aux points principaux, c'est-à-dire faire un rapport un peu plus sommaire. Encore une fois, il s'agit là d'une simple proposition de ma part. Ce que je veux dire, c'est que le débat d'hier et d'aujourd'hui a été très fructueux. Je crois qu'il aura permis à chacun des délégués ici présents de connaître la position des autres. Malheureusement, le temps a été effectivement trop court pour que nous puissions aboutir à des choses précises et concrètes. Mais encore une fois, je pense que le document élaboré par le Comité conjoint est une bonne base de travail et de réflexion pour le Conseil. Voilà mon appréciation, mais nous laissons le soin au Comité de rédaction, puis au Conseil en dernier ressort, de décider du contenu définitif du rapport.

Ms Joan DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America): We appreciate the summary and actually also the responses that we have just heard from the Chairman of the Programme Committee and from the Director-General. We think that this debate is ending too early. We agree with you that it has been a healthy debate. But it is not over yet. As we indicated yesterday, we would like a chance for much further dialogue. What we see thus far is a first round, and for my delegation it has been a very interesting first round. It is clear to us that there are differences in this room, and with 48 members on the Council of the FAO, we are surprised that the Council may be unable to advance the work of the Review beyond that of the work done by the more limited number of members on the SJS. Many delegations have indicated that they agree with the SJS report, but the SJS report, as we pointed out yesterday, does not agree with itself. There are, in the SJS, a number

of issues which remain to be resolved. One of the themes of the Review of FAO, in the view of my Government, is that we are running out of time. It seems to us that we are always running out of time. We ran out of time in 1987. We are running out of time in this Council. We are told we may be running out of time in the drafting group. We may run out of time in the Conference, that certainly is a concern of my delegation.

We would appeal to you that you find a way to bring together the different views that you have heard in this room to facilitate further dialogue over the next couple of days. Some members have said, and I believe you yourself just said that, or proposed, that we should not consider new ideas. The Director-General has said he does not want old wounds re-opened. My delegation agrees that we would not like to see old wounds re-opened. However, we do not agree that we do not want to hear new ideas. The Director-General himself put on the table a number of new ideas, and as we indicated in our statement yesterday, we have ideas about his new ideas. There are quite a number of people in the room who have ideas. I don't think we should be afraid to continue this discussion. I think we would be failing in our responsibility if we did not do so. We do not think that the Drafting Committee should be limited in its work, but as we said yesterday, we think it would be perhaps a wiser course if it were a different body in recognizing the sensitivity of many delegations. As a contact group, we really will not insist on that per se, but some means should be found to facilitate a dialogue. If that is not possible, the record will show that this Council has not really been able to make the most of its time. That we passed onto our Ministers and to a much larger body something that we could not do ourselves and we think that would be indeed unfortunate and would risk wasting or failing to get the most out of the opportunities that the Review has provided.

R.G. PETTITT (united Kingdom): I simply intervene to try to identify just three points in your summary with which I do not think the British, UK delegation, could subscribe to, though they are matters of degree, I think, rather than in absolute terms. The first, in fact has been covered by my colleague on my right. We were not happy with your summary to the effect that extra subjects should not be covered. It depends what one means by "extra", but good ideas which emerge in this review process, in our opinion, should still be considered in the current chapter of our discussions, and this should include ideas which were not substantively considered by the experts or by the Committees or indeed by any further suggestions by the Director-General for whatever reason.

Secondly, we do not, I think, totally agree with you on looking upon this as the completion or near completion of a chapter. It is a matter for the Conference to decide where we go from here.

Thirdly, I may not, totally as it were, understood well your reference to priority setting. But in our view, priority setting and deficiencies or possible deficiencies in our priority setting should be discussed by the Conference.

João Augusto DE MEDICIS (Brazil): I am speaking out of frustration, out of frustration to realize that all the time reviewed by the Programme and Finance Committees was useless, at least in the thought of some delegations here. I realize all the effort we devoted to prepare a report that could be accepted by consensus was lost, and I really am surprised to see that some delegations that participated in this consensus do not agree any longer with this consensus.

I realize there are some points in our report that do not reach consensus, but most of our report does reach consensus. Yesterday we heard the delegate from USA, the distinguished delegate from US at length referred to the review process and ignored completely, I mean it, ignored completely the report of the SJS. She made a few very kind and very polite remarks to our efforts, and I thank her very much for that. But as regards the substantive work of this report, nothing was mentioned. I recall when I was a young boy, people used to say that self-compliment was as bad as a lie. Anyway, I don't want to self-compliment. We try to work very hard. We have the Chairman of the Programme Committee who devoted all his summer to this report. We met here in the last week of August to support the drafting committee with the participation of those delegations who now deny the value of this report. We had participation of all Member Countries coming from all regional groups, from all economic - let's say, from all sides of economies. We had people from the Group of 77; people from the OECD; people from the so-called Camberley Group, participating in this exercise. To realize, Mr Chairman, that the effort that we had devoted to this is not recognized. My delegation would be the last to oppose any move that could go forward in this process. We would be the last to be against any proposal that would make it more difficult for us

to reach a consensus and reach an agreement and to compromise. Really, I am really frustrated to see that the work to which not only my delegation or the Canadian delegation, the US delegation, the Austrian delegation, the delegation of Argentina, and of Australia, and of China, and of India - and excuse me, those countries I forget - really they devote so much time that is really ignored by some delegations.

We heard that before. As far as my delegation is concerned, my case rests. I will not say any more on that because I believe we are not being respected by a few delegations here.

Gonzalo BULA HOTOS (Colombia): Cuando el Consejo establece un Comité de Redacción lo hace esencialmente para evitar lo que ahora están protagonizando aquí dos distinguidas delegaciones. O sea, señor Presidente, que el resumen suyo que no es, como ya lo dijimos, una camisa de fuerza sino una orientación general, no puede ser discutido en este Consejo palabra por palabra porque para eso hemos elegido un Comité de Redacción.

Admiramos muchísimo que en ese Comité de Redacción haya miembros muy activos, dinámicos e insistentes, lo cual nos tranquiliza mucho para la discusión mañana del Proyecto de Informe. Nosotros pensamos, y éste es un mensaje que transmitimos a la distinguida Relatora y a los Miembros del Comité de Redacción, que el informe sobre este tema, si en realidad deseamos contribuir a que el debate en la Conferencia se facilite, debe ser breve, concreto y específico, sin que ninguno de los 49 miembros del Consejo, por importante que sea o se considere, pretenda que se impongan unilateralmente sus puntos de vista.

Nosotros apoyamos plenamente lo que ha dicho el colega de Brasil, y usted también, señor Presidente, cuenta con nuestro pleno respaldo. Hemos concluido hoy el debate preliminar sobre este tema, hemos llegado a la fase final en el Consejo sobre este tema. Aconsejaríamos a las distinguidas delegaciones que han promovido esta controversia que tengan un poquito de paciencia, poco más de una semana, el lunes 20 en esta misma sala, en la Conferencia estará prevista la discusión del tema 15, pero será ya *la* Comisión II de la Conferencia. Usted desafortunadamente sólo nos acompañará desde su retrato sobre la pared, y su puesto será ocupado por mi vecino de la derecha.

Nosotros proponemos firmemente que se concluya este tema con las declaraciones que ahora estamos haciendo. Mañana discutiremos el Proyecto de Informe y luego durante el fin de semana estamos completamente disponibles, sobre todo si somos invitados o acompañados por damas, porque somos, los latinoamericanos, galantes y estamos totalmente disponibles para desayunar, almorzar, comer y hasta bailar un poco. Pero no para hacer parte de ningún grupo de contacto de trabajo de ninguna asociación oficial.

LE PRESIDENT: Je remercie le délégué de la Colombie de son intervention et de ses efforts pour détendre l'atmosphère.

Sra. Margarita Lizarraga SAUCEDO (México): Mi país fue de los que, con la gran mayoría, sostuvo como innecesario el proceso de revisión, pero siempre estuvo abierto al diálogo, y justamente por tratar de contribuir a la distensión de las presiones que se le estaban aplicando a la Organización nos sentamos a la mesa de discusiones en el primer grupo de contacto, para definir los términos en que se iba a realizar tal revisión. La resolución 6/87 aprobada por la Conferencia marcó el ámbito y el plazo de la realización de los estudios, así como el mecanismo. Todos hemos sido, de una u otra forma, actores de este proceso, porque a todos nos interesa, todos somos la Organización. Cuando nosotros hemos iniciado en el Consejo este debate, hemos dicho que deseamos contribuir a la fase final de este proceso, y no queremos tener la sensación de una frustración.

Aquí se ha discutido del examen de la revisión de acuerdo con el mecanismo que planteamos. En su mayoría, los países lo hemos endosado. Hemos tenido dudas, como usted ha dicho, respecto al mecanismo de financiación, porque los países que no podemos aportar mayores cantidades de recursos consideramos que debe encontrarse una fórmula de quiénes pidieron el ejercicio de cómo llegar a instrumentar estos resultados.

De todas maneras, como yo soy parte del Comité de Redacción, quiero llevar una directriz clara, porque este Consejo deberá entregar a la Conferencia un reparto serlo del trabajo que le toco cumplir, y no puede ser un reporte en donde no se transfiera lo que aquí ha ocurrido, porque el Consejo creo que somos la mayoría, y la mayoría nos hemos pronunciado por la aceptación, el agradecimiento a la manera en que se llevó el trabajo y que tiene un gran consenso sobre toda la serie de medidas que allí se piden.

Creo que esto puede quedar, aunque sea en un reporte corto, pero claro y bien transmitido, diciendo cuáles son los detalles que quedaron pendientes; pero que no se diga que nuestros Ministros no van a recibir un informe de la parte correspondiente. Estoy muy orgullosa de ser parte de este Consejo y tomo mi responsabilidad como tal.

LE PRESIDENT: Effectivement nous n'allons pas ouvrir un débat car il y a eu majorité pour approuver les recommandations du Comité, c'est ce que j'ai essayé de mettre dans ma synthèse; mais il faut tenir compte du fait que d'autres délégations ont présenté quelques suggestions qu'il est de mon devoir de faire figurer dans cette synthèse.

Je vous fais la suggestion suivante: puisque le Comité de rédaction va se réunir pour soumettre demain un rapport au Conseil, puisque son travail est de réfléchir à ce qui a été dit au Conseil, peut-être pourrait-il nous faire demain une proposition aussi complète qu'il le souhaite, et ensuite nous nous prononcerons dessus. Mais il me semble irréaliste de croire qu'en vingt-quatre heures nous pourrions vider une question aussi importante.

C'est un début de processus; n'oublions pas que le Comité de programme et le Comité financier ont travaillé pendant 2 ans sur cette question, qu'ils vont faire un rapport directement à la Conférence, que M. Mazoyer sera présent à la Commission II pour exposer le problème et répondre aux questions, donc le processus continue; nous sommes une chaîne dans ce processus et le dernier mot appartiendra à la Conférence.

Je demande que du rapport du Comité de rédaction puisse sortir quelque chose de clair, agréé par le Conseil; il ne s'agit en aucun cas de fuir nos responsabilités; le Conseil a bien discuté de cette question mais ne peut pas avoir la prétention de résoudre des questions alors que la Conférence va commencer dans quelques jours.

Je voudrais dire au délégué du Brésil qu'effectivement les rapports du Comité financier et du Comité du programme ont été analysés; j'ai insisté particulièrement pour que l'on prenne position sur chacune des propositions; le délégué du Royaume-Uni n'a pas manqué de faire état de ses observations; le document de travail des deux Comités a été la base des discussions et a servi.

Je vous lance un appel pour que nous n'ouvrons pas le débat; laissons travailler le Comité de rédaction; peut-être que sur la base de ses réflexions, en comité plus restreint on pourra aboutir à une rédaction qui, comme le dit le délégué de la Colombie pourra servir de base aux réflexions de la Conférence.

Six délégués ont demandé de prendre la parole: Congo, Etats-Unis d'Amérique, Lybie, Cuba, Philippines, Inde. Avec votre autorisation pouvons-nous arrêter le débat pour laisser la discussion se faire au Comité de rédaction, et passer aux autres questions de l'ordre du jour?

Nous avons demain du travail et nous voulons terminer à midi; la question dont nous débattons est complexe; il faut tenir compte de toutes les sensibilités et être très fidèle.

Je récapitule les demandes d'interventions: Congo, Etats-Unis, Lybie, Cuba, Philippines, Inde, Finlande.

Joseph TCHICAYA (Congo): Je m'excuse de prendre la parole sur cette question et en effet nous nous sommes déjà suffisamment exprimés sur ce point. Mais, puisque l'atmosphère l'exige nous allons essayer de donner notre point de vue.

Tout d'abord je tiens à dire que ma délégation est d'accord avec le résumé que vous avez fait de nos débats. Il s'agit là d'un résumé équilibré et qui donne des orientations permettant au Comité de rédaction de rédiger un texte acceptable et, s'il n'y avait pas eu d'autres interventions après votre résumé, ce point aurait trouvé toute sa solution.

Je voudrais dire d'autre part que j'ai participé pleinement au groupe decontact mis en place lors de la 24ème Session de la Conférence de notre Organisation, et nouspensons avoir travaillé longuement. Comme l'a rappelé le Mexique, nous n'étions pas demandeur decette réforme mais, dans un esprit de conciliation, nous avons accepté la mise en chantier de cetexamen.

Vous vous souviendrez certainement - et nombreux ici le savent - que dès l'adoption de cette Résolution 6/87 nous avons assisté à une certaine agitation entre nous; parce qu'il fallait d'abord commencer par envoyer des propositions complémentaires et, avant même que cet examen ne soit connu, que des discussions s'engagent pour que nous puissions travailler, alors que le Comité financier et le Comité de programme avaient été chargés de mener l'étude.

En tant que groupe des 77 nous avons refusé ce débat parce qu'il nous mettait en dehors de la résolution adoptée par la Conférence, et nous pensions qu'il fallait attendre le rapport des deux Comités pour nous prononcer.

Il y a déjà eu des réunions ici et là dans cette ville, et les discussions ont commencé avant même que le Conseil ne puisse délibérer. Je pense qu'il convient de laisser les choses en l'état; au cours de ce Conseil un certain nombre d'idées ont été avancées; c'est au Comité de rédaction à "mâcher" tout cela et à nous présenter un rapport acceptable. Comme vous l'avez fait remarquer, M. le Président, nous n'en sommes qu'au début de ce processus même si d'autres l'ont commencé depuis longtemps. De toute façon, la Commission II examinera cette question à la lumière de nos débats et proposera ce qui lui semblera acceptable par tous. Je pense que plus tôt nous engagerons ces discussions en réunion formelle plus les discussions vont se raidir et l'atmosphère se polluer. Telle est la raison pour laquelle je pense qu'il faut nous en tenir à vos propositions; je les appuie fermement et je pense que tous les pays ici présents au Conseil devraient pouvoir en faire autant, afin que nous puissions arriver à la Conférence et poursuivre ce débat.

Gerald J. MONROE (United States of America) I apologize for taking the floor again. I shall be very brief, I promise you.

I did, of course, participate in the Special Joint Session, and perhaps, when I hear certain of my friends and associates make an intervention, there is a conditioned response, my flag goes up, my light goes on. We spent after all, close on nine weeks together, working band, and I should like to take this opportunity to pay tribute, through you, Sir, to all of the cicipants and also to commend to the Director-General the work of the support staff, which was really superb, during the summer.

I wanted to point out to the Council my perception that the Special Joint Session indeed advanced the work of the review to a very great extent. It was not the intention of the American delegation to denigrate that work, and I want to make that perfectly clear.

The SJS, in ray view, accomplished two things. It demonstrated we could reach a consensus on a number of important issues across geographic lines, group lines, however you want to define them, and that it was possible for a very disparate group of delegations to sit together and work out agreement. We also identified very clearly for the Council and the Conference those key areas of disagreement or those areas where perspectives varied which would require the careful attention of the Council and ultimately of the Conference. This was something which had been in my mind as one of our major objectives.

I share my colleagues' concern that we may well run out of time. Those areas where we did not agree, as hard as we tried - and I cannot stress enough the effort we put into trying to agree -are seminal areas. They are very important areas. If I may say so, I think we did very good work in identifying them very clearly and in putting them into very sharp focus. Frankly, it was done at the time with the intent of enabling the Council to focus on those areas. It was for that reason that we were very anxious for the Council to identify some means of focusing itself on what I will call these three clusters of issues. I am afraid I am not optimistic that the Drafting Group will be able to accomplish that, together with all its other functions. Be that as it may, we have done our best.

I should like to end by again paying tribute to the staff who assisted us in the Special Joint Session, the membership and the Chairmen.

Bashir El Mabrouk SAID (Libya) (original language Arabic): Ambassador Tchicaya has very much taken the words out of my mouth, and I would reiterate what he said.

Juan NUIRY SANCHEZ (Cuba): Trataremos de ser breves, en aras del tiempo. En primer lugar señor Presidente, le pedimos disculpas, pues nuestra Delegación trató de escuchar pacientemente todo este desagradable incidente y aguardó con la esperanza de que esto se lograra y llegar a una aparente solución. Y cuando creíamos que todo había sido aceptado, con los arreglos de los ilustres colegas y de su sabia conducción, saltó otra vez la manzana de la discordia.

Realmente, no puede nuestra Delegación dejar de participar, no en repetición de lo expresado, sino a la luz de estos nuevos acontecimientos. Siempre hemos hablado muy claro en nuestras posiciones, siempre; y así nos hemos expresado sobre el criterio de un diálogo abierto y sincero, dentro de una política multilateral de comprensión entre los problemas acuciantes de un mundo en que existen, quién lo duda, enormes y grandes desigualdades. Y, dentro de esas desigualdades existe, en el sistema de las Naciones Unidas, la FAO, como foro de esperanza y foro de análisis. El mismo análisis que acabamos de concluir es su mejor prueba. Pero tal vez no sea ésta. Esta intervención se puede ocultar en una voz aislada de un observador leída entre comillas.

De otro aspecto, el esconder bajo presiones económicas, intenciones políticas. Todo está dicho ¿qué se quiere decir?. Será hablar de lo que se esconde en las intenciones y ¿qué no está dicho?. Esto, Señor Presidente, es la preocupación de nuestra Delegación. ¿Dónde está la intención?, si está escondida es porque se teme a la dignidad, al respeto y al prestigio de la FAO, y esto molesta. La FAO no se controla, está en función de los pueblos representados aquí por la mayoría.

Cuando el fantasma del colonialismo desaparece físicamente, puede perdurar mucho tiempo el pensamiento colonialista; y esto preocupa. Es necesario respetar la expresión de la mayoría. Respetémosla. El que el resultado del examen haya molestado tanto, es parte del respeto expresado.

Señor Presidente, ese gran mexicano y figura latinoamericana, Don Benito Juárez, planteó una incuestionable frase: "el respeto al derecho ajeno es la paz". Creo que esta frase hoy es un postulado de extraordinaria actualidad.

Horacio M. CARANDANG (Philippines): The new round of debate seems to have arisen because some delegations do not appear to be in complete agreement with your summing up, Mr Chairman. Indeed, these delegations have the right to agree or disagree with your summing up and they have the right to express what they feel, but as has been pointed out by some delegations before me, the summing up of the Chairman is only a guide for the Drafting Committee. The Drafting Committee can take into account the summing up but is not obliged to follow the summing up of the Chairman word for word.

I believe that the debate on the substance of this item has been concluded. There may be loose ends, but nevertheless, as has been decided by you, Mr Chairman, the debate on the substance of the matter is concluded. It is now left for the Drafting Committee to put into words what happened during the debate. I hope that you can now close the debate and leave the Drafting Committee to show whether they are in agreement or disagreement with the substance.

LE PRESIDENT: Nous avons encore deux orateurs inscrits. La Résolution 6/87 a confié aux deux Comités la responsabilité première de préparer ce travail. Nous devons travailler dans le cadre de cette résolution. On nous demande de donner des commentaires sur le rapport. J'ai essayé d'insister pour qu'on serre de près le rapport des deux Comités. Il appartient à la Conférence de voir si elle considère que de nouvelles options sont à envisager.

Après ces deux intervention, nous devons écourter le débat, laisser le Comité de rédaction préparer le travail, et demain nous aurons certainement l'occasion de nous pencher sur la question à la lumière du rapport de rédaction. Je demanderai aux délégués de l'Inde et de la Finlande d'être concis car nous avons un programme de travail chargé.

C.Srinivasa SASTRY (India): Having been on the Programme Committee and having been associated with the SJS, we share in full the frustration and the disappointments which the delegate from Brazil has so ably articulated. We completely support what he has said, although to some extent these feelings have been assuaged by the latest intervention which Mr Monroe has made on behalf of the United States, in which he paid some handsome compliments to the work done in the SJS.

The second point I wanted to make is that the review process we are engaged in is not a stop-go process to be entered into in fits and starts, but it is a process for which the Conference in its wisdom has prescribed a series of steps in a particular order. Having gone through certain steps and having an adequate second stage, what is left for us is to say that the joint report of the SJS, with whatever comments the Council makes, with the comments and views of the Director-General, shall be forwarded to the Conference, though ultimately the Conference is the arbiter which is supposed to make the decisions on this particular matter.

Therefore, my submission would be that, keeping in view the point that the delegate of the United States made, as a participant to the consultation process in the SJS, saying that he stands by the consensus reached, and keeping in view the reservations that were specifically expressed by the delegate of the United Kingdom, item-wise it should not be difficult for the Drafting Committee to say what are the points on which there is unanimity and what are the points on which there is some divergency.

Thirdly, the delegate of the United States, Mr Monroe, has indicated the three key areas of disagreement. A reading of the report of the SJS makes this clear. These could be itemized and highlighted in the report of the Drafting Committee.

My last point is that I am very happy to hear from the delegate of the United States who made the earlier intervention, and also from the delegate of the United Kingdom, that they have in their view certain new ideas, certain good ideas, which must be incorporated in the FAO. We are happy that those two delegations have these new and good ideas to contribute, though I must confess to a sense of disappointment that if only these ideas were voiced at the table before the SJS possibly some of the credit for incorporating these new and good ideas would have gone to the SJS itself.

Leaving that apart, I would submit that the review is not the end of all changes and the option of good things and new ideas in the FAO. Even after the review exercise is completed I presume that we as members and the Director-General and his management will always be on the look out for new and good ideas which will enhance the efficiency and improve the effectiveness and working of the FAO. therefore, we need not be in a hurry see that all the good and new ideas go only into this law. We could possibly leave some good and new ideas to be taken up even after the review process is completed, so that if anything comes up all the suggestions could be examined on merit, not on the basis of an elaborate review as we have done now, but individually and on merit, and it could always be incorporated. I am sure that the type of live responsive management system which has been testified to by the groups of experts and the SJS would ensure new ideas would be looked at objectively and would be incorporated and adopted.

Hannu HALINEN (Finland): Mr Chairman, being the last speaker this afternoon on this item, I will be very brief. My delegation finds the interventions by Council Members on this point very useful. Finland, not being a member of either Committee, puts special stress on the comment by Prof. Mazoyer this afternoon when he was touching on the question of new approaches. In our intervention we tried to elaborate on the new approach, which we do not see in any way being contradictory to the SJS Report as such.

The other reference I should like to make is on the comment of Mexico, calling for an open dialogue. We find this very important.

Generally we would have hoped to get further at this Council Session on this issue, but we have to be realistic. First of all, we have to preserve a good and businesslike atmosphere, so important for our work. Therefore, let us intensify our dialogue now on an informal level in order to be able to clarify further our substantive views, and clearly indicate at the beginning of next week, if not before, how we should conduct our work in the coming weeks.

LE PRESIDENT: Nous allons donc laisser le Comité de rédaction travailler sur ce point et passer à la suite de l'ordre du jour.

Avant de passer au point 4, il y a une question de détail. J'avais proposé hier que pour faciliter le travail de la Conférence nous puissions avoir l'autorisation du Conseil d'envoyer directement à la Conférence les sections du rapport du Comité du Programme et du Comité financier relatives à l'examen du programme de terrain et du programme ordinaire de la FAO. Il s'agit donc de donner les sections complètes des rapports sur les points 8 et 9 de l'Examen du travail de la FAO à la Conférence, pour permettre aux délégués d'avoir en main des documents qui facilitent la discussion. Si tout le monde en est d'accord, le Secrétariat pourrait préparer ces documents pour la Conférence.

Nous passons au point 4 de l'ordre du jour: rapport de la 50ème session du Comité des produits (CL 96/6).

Nous allons demander au Président du Comité des produits de bien vouloir nous faire une communication introductive au document CL 96/4.

II. ACTIVITIES OF FAO (continued)

II. ACTIVITES DE LA FAO (suite)

II. ACTIVIDADES DE LA FAO (continuación)

4. Report of the Fifty-seventh Session of the Committee on Commodity Problems (Rome, 12-16 June 1989)

4. Rapport de la cinquante-septième session du Comité des produits (Rome, 12-16 juin 1989)

4. Informe del 57- periodo de sesiones del Comité de Problemas de Productos Básicos (Roma, 12-16 de junio de 1989)

Horcio M. CARANDANG (Chairman, Committee on Commodity Problems): Mr Chairman, I have the honour to present to the Council the Report of the Fifty-seventh Session of the Committee on Commodity Problems which met from 12 to 16 June this year under my Chairmanship. As required by its Terms of Reference, the Committee undertook a review of the commodity situation and outlook. It expressed concern that the agricultural commodity trade situation had remained extremely difficult, particularly for developing countries. The value of world agricultural exports in real terms fell by 7 percent in 1989 for the developing countries, whereas for the developed countries the real value of agricultural exports rose by 5 percent.

The Committee also expressed concern that recent years have been particularly discouraging for exporters of beverage crops. Prices of these crops remain depressed, and significant increases were not expected over the short term. It noted that the sectors held large stocks and tended to maintain output above levels of consumption. As perennial crops, the supply adjustment process involved long lags. The Committee regretted the difficulties confronting the International Agreements on Coffee and Cocoa. In fact, since June when the CCP met, the world coffee prices have slumped further by another 40 percent. The Committee noted, however, that for several commodities a better balance had been achieved between export availabilities and imports, resulting in at least a partial recovery in prices. For some commodities, these developments primarily reflected weather conditions. For some others, production policy changes were important causes. The Committee felt that, while policy changes had begun to be introduced in a number of countries covering several commodities, it was essential to continue to intensify the reform process in the interests of improving conditions of world agricultural trade.

In this connection the Committee stressed that the Uruguay Round of Multilateral Trade Negotiations continue to be of critical importance to achieving this objective.

The Committee also reviewed the activities of seven of its subsidiary bodies, to wit: Jute and Kenaf and Allied Fibres; Oilseeds, Oils and Fats; Hard Fibres; Bananas; Grains; Meat; and Tea. The review of these commodities is set out in paragraphs 22 to 43 of the Report.

In its review of the activities of the Intergovernmental Commodity Groups, the Committee noted the unanimous decisions taken by a number of groups to encourage the Director-General to approach the Common Fund for Commodities when it became operational, and to request the Common Fund to designate the Intergovernmental Groups as international commodity bodies for sponsoring and following up projects which might be financed under the Second Account.

The Committee's endorsement of these decisions was brought to the attention of the Council at the Ninety-fifth Session which immediately followed the CCP Session. I will simply restate the support expressed by the Council on that occasion. I will not go into the details of the various reports, beyond noting that the CCP endorsed all of the reports of its subsidiary bodies.

One special topic before the CCP concerned trends in, and prospects of, trade in tropical horticultural products. The Committee welcomed the initiatives taken by FAO in these non-traditional products, and strongly endorsed continued FAO activity in the tropical horticultural sector and expressed the desirability of extending the coverage to other non-traditional items.

In particular, I wish to draw the attention of the Council to paragraph 52 of the Report concerning the Committee's suggestion regarding future areas of work on these products.

Another special topic concerned the economic significance of tobacco. The Committee agreed that, notwithstanding the health concerns of smoking, the cultivation and manufacture of tobacco was likely to continue to be of considerable economic importance in the longer term for several countries in developed and developing regions.

Among its conclusions, the Committee considered that there was an urgent need to strengthen the collection of relevant information, with a view to carrying out a comprehensive and objective cost-benefit analysis of the tobacco industry.

The CCP also undertook a review of protectionism in agriculture. The assessment of delegates differed as to the progress made in lowering the levels of agricultural protection, in expanding market access, in reducing or eliminating trade distorting policies. However, the Committee agreed that the efforts to achieve a fair and market-oriented agricultural trading system should be intensified.

In this connection, there was the Twelve Country Agreement reached by the Trade Negotiations Committee in April 1989, which enabled the Uruguay Round Negotiations to be resumed. It noted with satisfaction that the approach agreed upon agriculture included both long-term and short-term elements for the reform of agricultural policies, as well as arrangements on sanitary and phyto-sanitary regulations. The Committee stressed the need for early progress on the agreed agenda for the remaining period of the Uruguay Round in the key area of agriculture in order to provide for substantial and progressive reductions in support and protection to correct and prevent restrictions and distortions in world agricultural markets. In welcoming the agreements reached in the Mid-term Review of the Uruguay Round of multilateral negotiations, particularly on the future directions for the negotiations on agricultural and tropical products, the Committee noted the technical support of FAO to the GATT Secretariat in relation to the Uruguay Round and the assistance provided to interested developing countries, to facilitate their participation in the Round. It also considered that FAO's work concerning sanitary and phyto-sanitary regulations, particularly in relation to the Codex Alimentarius Commission and the International Plant Protection Convention was of paramount importance.

The Committee furthermore considered that FAO support to the GATT Negotiation Groups on Agriculture, Tropical Products and Natural Resources-Based Products should continue and, where necessary, be intensified. In order to enhance the understanding of the issues related to agricultural protection, the Committee considered that further analysis and research were needed in a number of areas that are referred to in paragraphs 82 to 86 of the CCP report. The Council will recall that at its 94th Session it unanimously approved and requested its main Committee to examine and make recommendations on the issues relating to women in development within their areas of competence. In response, the Committee on Commodity Problems considered these issues in relation to commodity and trade developments. The Committee stressed the importance of FAO continuing to concentrate on their enhancement of women's marketing skills and particularly on the facilitation of appropriate credit schemes for women and information for women's groups on appropriate extension and training systems in the area of commodities. The Committee noted that FAO's activities in the area of policy advice at the country level also took into account issues concerning women in commodity development and recommended that such coverage should continue in the future and should be intensified where necessary. It also stressed the need to continue to cooperate with other concerned international organizations in relation to gender issues in the field of commodities and trade development.

In conclusion, I wish to commend the report for the Council's consideration and endorsement.

LE PRESIDENT. Je remercie Le Président du Comité des produits de son introduction.

Gonzalo BULA HOTOS (Colombia): Este período de sesiones del Comité de Problemas de Productos Básicos fue presidido, con la inteligencia y los conocimientos que le distinguen por el colega y amigo Horacio Carandang, de Filipinas, quien al haber sido trasladado a otro país ha dejado muy gratos recuerdos entre nosotros. Hoy nos complace volverle a ver y haber oído su excelente presentación.

Gracias también a los Sres. Baron de la República Federal de Alemania y Bisika de Malawi, que actuaron como Vicepresidentes.

Los representantes de Colombia opinamos que este Consejo debe refrendar la preocupación expresada por el Comité en el párrafo 14 sobre el considerable descenso de la participación de los países en desarrollo en las exportaciones agrícolas. Esas exportaciones aumentaron en un 5 por ciento para los países desarrollados y disminuyeron en un 7 por ciento para el Tercer Mundo, Tercer Mundo que siempre es la víctima de la estructura injusta de un comercio internacional que sigue sometido a trabas y limitaciones que impiden el libre acceso de los productos de exportación de los países en desarrollo a los importantes mercados de los Estados industrializados.

A pesar de las promesas y declaraciones de buena voluntad, esa situación en vez de mejorar empeora, como lo dice el párrafo 21 desde la última reunión del Comité. Los mercados para productos agrícolas importantes de países en desarrollo siguen gravemente deprimidos. Eso será necesario que conste en el Informe. Queremos destacar la valiosa labor de la FAO en cuanto a la promoción y diversificación de la producción del comercio de productos hortícolas tropicales. En el párrafo 44 se hace referencia a un Seminario que tuvo lugar en Bogotá, Colombia, al igual que otro en Nairobi, Kenya. Pensamos que el Consejo debe apoyar esta acción positiva de la FAO en favor de los países en desarrollo en el campo de los productos hortícolas tropicales.

Vamos a limitar nuestras observaciones finales al caso del café, que es uno de los productos básicos en mayores dificultades actuales. Somos conscientes de que el café se trata esencialmente en la Organización Internacional del Café con sede en Londres. Pero al hablar de productos básicos, la dramática crisis cafetera actual no puede pasar en silencio. Este documento tiene fecha de julio de 1989. En el párrafo 133 se habla de alza repentina de los precios del café. Sin embargo, en el párrafo 19 ya el Comité lamentó las dificultades con que empezaban a tropezarse en relación con los Acuerdos Internacionales para el Café y el Cacao.

Esas dificultades culminaron, por razones que preferimos omitir, con la terminación del pacto cafetero y el inicio de un verdadero caos en el mercado internacional. Los precios han bajado en un 50 por ciento. Cincuenta países, todos de Asia, Africa y América Latina y el Caribe asisten impotentes al derrumbarse de sus economías después de que el Acuerdo del Café los había preservado durante 27 años. Y este Consejo debe lamentar en su Informe que uno de los pocos acuerdos internacionales sobre precios que funcionaba bien, el del café, haya tenido ese entierro deplorable. En doce meses, los países productores de café deberán más de 5 000 millones de dólares.

En Colombia, el café sigue siendo la base de nuestra economía. Por cada centavo de dólar que baja la libra del café en el mercado internacional, los colombianos perdemos 15 millones de dólares. A fines de 1990, Colombia habrá perdido más de 500 millones de dólares por la baja del café. Cordialmente les invitamos a comparar esa cifra con el monto de la asistencia que se ofrece a esos mismos países. Nosotros hablamos sólo a nombre de Colombia, pero nos sentimos orgullosos de hacer parte del Grupo de CAIRNS, en el cual nos hemos asociado 14 países desarrollados y en desarrollo en pro de la liberalización del comercio internacional. Pensamos que para todos los países en desarrollo y esto lo ha sostenido usted mismo, Sr Presidente, más que la asistencia paternalista es importante un comercio internacional libre y justo en el cual nuestros principales productos de exportación puedan entrar a los mercados de los países desarrollados y obtener así divisas indispensables para nuestro desarrollo.

Finalmente, el párrafo 33 habla del Grupo Intergubernamental sobre el Banano. Se refiere a un delicado equilibrio en el mercado mundial del banano, al equilibrio frágil, y eso nos preocupa. Hace apenas un mes, en octubre pasado, estuvo en varios países europeos, entre ellos Italia, una misión multinacional coordinada por el Ministro de Agricultura de Colombia, misión que entró en contacto con los más importantes países de la Comunidad Económica Europea con el propósito de hacerles presente la preocupación de los países de América Latina y el Caribe productores de

bananos en relación con el mercado unificado de 1992. Pedimos que en nuestro Informe se haga constar a nombre de los países de América Latina y el Caribe esa preocupación y nuestra esperanza de que en el año 1992 se mantengan, por lo menos al nivel actual, las exportaciones de nuestros bananos a los mercados de la Comunidad Económica Europea.

David COUTTS (Australia): I appreciate being given the floor early so that I can make a statement on what my country feels is a very important set of topics covered in this document before I have to go to the Drafting Committee of the Council. What I would like to do is, I hope fairly briefly, just go through a number of points that we wish to underline in relation to the issues raised in this document, and I will go through that in connecting them with the particular paragraphs of the document that they relate to.

In relation to paragraph 9, we support the statement in that paragraph that fluctuations in currency exchange rates should be given more importance in commodity trade analysis.

Paragraph 18. Australia believes that a balanced cereal market will only arise when countries return to unassisted production policies. We are concerned, to some extent, that the general tone of this paragraph does not adequately recognize the role of prices in balancing supply and demand.

Paragraph 20. We agree that the growth of developing countries is being restrained by the agricultural assistance policies of developed countries.

We believe that low commodity prices, have rather than decreased import costs, had a much greater impact on export earnings, significantly impacting on the levels of debt of developing countries.

Paragraph 21. We strongly support the last two sentences indicating the importance of continuing and intensifying the reform process and the critical importance in this regard of the Uruguay Round.

Paragraph 27. It is noted that the Intergovernmental Group on Rice, although expressing general support for the set of guidelines (international and international action, is reviewing these guidelines to determine if a revision is needed. The group has received proposals for revision from Australia and, I gather, Argentina. As noted in the Australian proposal it is clear that significant changes to international production and trade in rice are now evident and consequently we believe the guidelines need to be refined to reflect current international attitudes towards commodity trade issues.

We welcome the moves to review the guidelines and hope the process will continue. We would underline that we feel that the present international climate is conducive to reform of agricultural arrangements.

Paragraph 34. Changes in grain production should be in response to world price changes. When assisted grains are allocated as food aid, we consider it involves the donor country in a double cost. The budgetary cost of assistance plus the export income. We believe this doubling costs lessens, rather than adds to, the amount of available food aid. Continued assistance will not encourage the development of agricultural sector in developing countries, because developing countries may then not be able to increase production fast enough to take advantage of rising prices.

Paragraph 37. Tea. The Australian Tea Council is very satisfied with the quality of tea available in the market, and are strongly of the view that the maintenance of tea quality is the responsibility of producers. There is very little generic promotion of tea done in Australia by the Council. That which is done is low key. It produces in India and Sri Lanka, but not China or Papua New Guinea, and packers have funded this generic production. The last IGG on tea, a proposal providing for national implementation of quality control, supplemented by sample spot checks by international agents was considered. We saw this exercise as the responsibility of exporting countries. It is in the interest of exporters to ensure that a quality product enters the market. As such, we indicate we were not prepared to contribute to funding for any such scheme.

Paragraph 68. We make the point that the reduced levels of protection reflected in the OECD's recent producer subsidy equivalent estimates may well reflect rising prices and not significant reductions in assistance. This is of particular concern because if this is the case, then protection levels will again rise when world commodity prices fall, and we feel there is a very

great danger that the important messages on reform may be disguised by the present world situation. Not that we want prices to fall, but I think we would be fooling ourselves, Australia feels anyway, if we consider that the problems have gone away merely because prices are higher at the moment.

Paragraph 70: Although there are hopeful signs, we do not believe significant action has been taken by major producers or importing countries to reduce protection. We feel that, far from aiding the balance of payments of developing countries, agricultural assistance has lowered export income and therefore increased the indebtedness of a number of developing countries. We also feel that, while an increase in international prices could adversely affect food deficit countries in the short term, in the longer term higher prices should stimulate agricultural production and investment, thereby reducing dependence on food imports. If necessary, food aid could be used to ameliorate the short-term problems.

Paragraph 71: We are also concerned that protection may increase overall as well as for certain sectors following the introduction by the EC of rebalanced protection.

Paragraph 72: We also welcome the GATT agreement in April and the more recent developments in the Uruguay Round to roll back protection over the longer term.

Paragraph 77 and 78: Although we recognize the volatility of commodity prices, we believe that prices masked by government intervention are much more misleading than short-run market prices.

Paragraph 79: It should be noted that in some countries assistance policies have encouraged land management practices which have exacerbated environmental problems. For example, high support prices for crops have encouraged high input farming practices.

Paragraph 84: We feel that objectives such as protection of farm income and equalization of farm income with that of other sectors is not efficiently achieved through output price support. If income support is the objective, it is best achieved directly through welfare payments rather than indirectly through raising operation profits. Price and supply stability may best be achieved through allowing market signals to work in all sectors of agriculture. Farmers will adapt their management practices to reflect the environment in which they operate. For instance in Australia changes in relative prices between commodities bring about significant substitutions of the more profitable for the less profitable crop or grazing activity from season to season. Farmers also hedge against price volatility by growing a number of different crops in each season. Australia would argue that food supplies need not be secured through domestic production at high cost. Food supplies can be made more secure if agricultural industries are allowed to develop in the country of least cost. Importing countries can further secure food supplies by negotiating long-term contracts or developing strong processing linkages with food producers. Regional development may not necessarily depend on maintaining farming as the primary activity, especially in developed countries such as the EC. Regional development may be better supported by decentralized industry. We reiterate our contention that agricultural assistance policies have generally exacerbated environmental problems, especially in developed countries.

Victor MACHINEA (Argentina): El documento CL 96/6 es fruto de una ardua negociación y, como tal no es perfecto. Con relación a la situación mundial y perspectivas de los productos básicos, cabe mencionar que, dada la característica dinámica de la agricultura, deberíamos realizar correcciones en estimaciones que hoy ya son realidades y en perspectivas que varían por cuestiones climáticas y políticas. Después de haber participado en la negociación de este documento, el nuevo Gobierno de mi país, en el marco del plan económico, ha expresado su apoyo al sector agropecuario, forestal y pesquero, que están relegados a través de nuestra historia. Este apoyo explícito produjo una inyección de optimismo en el sector, que ha hecho variar todas las estimaciones de cosechas, incrementándolas en forma global en un 40 por ciento.

Dentro de esta política económica de apoyo al sector, surge claramente la voluntad de impulsar la diversificación, basada en el mejoramiento de la calidad y en el desarrollo de la agroindustria frutihortícola y de los productos y sus productos forestales y pesqueros.

Asimismo, el documento CL 96/6, dados los importantes cambios producidos en las negociaciones del GATT, aparece como información que pierde vigencia, por las importantes propuestas presentadas el mes pasado en Ginebra.

Un observador imparcial frente a estos documentos criticarla la falta de consenso en su ítem principal, cual es la evolución de las negociaciones multilaterales de agricultura en la Ronda Uruguay del GATT. En los subtítulos "El proteccionismo en la agricultura" y "Algunas cuestiones relativas a la reforma de la política agrícola", se observa la diferencia conceptual entre las voluntades políticas puestas de manifiesto por algunos países industrializados y las de la mayoría del mundo, que pretende un comercio libre de influencias económicas y políticas. Estos condicionan a nuestros países a un permanente incremento de la población. Surge muy a las claras que algunos países industrializados responden a las necesidades de la reforma en la medida en que se sienten perjudicados económicamente, mientras tanto, son testigos que la evolución del mundo, sin preocuparles en demasía el destino de los pueblos en desarrollo.

No quisiera mi Delegación extenderse mas de lo debido en esta temática, ya que estamos ansiosos de participar en la Conferencia y allí ampliaremos nuestra participación. Mi Delegación hubiese preferido suscribir un documento que sobre esta temática fuera más coherente desde el punto de vista político. Pero, evidentemente, esto no es responsabilidad de la Secretaría, sino de aquellos que aun no se deciden a asumir sus propias responsabilidades.

Sin embargo, con referencia al resto de los capítulos, y especialmente en lo que se refiere al comercio de productos hortícolas y a la importancia económica del tabaco, quisiéramos destacar nuestro total y absoluto apoyo.

En definitiva, y con el objetivo de no abrir un debate en el marco del Consejo, apoyamos el documento CL 96/6.

Sang-Kil LEE (Korea, Republic of): It is our pleasure to express our thanks to the Secretariat for the high quality of the document before us. It is also our privilege to pay tribute to Mr Carandang, Chairman of the Committee on Commodity Problems, for his comprehensive and lucid introduction. The Korean delegation will touch briefly upon several issues in the report.

First with regard to the common Fund for commodities, we would like to give our full support to the recommendations that FAO's Intergovernmental Commodity Groups should be designated by the Common for as eligible international commonbodies format funds from the second account can he projects by theGroups.

to agriculturaladjustment issues, we acknowledge he long-term necessity and agricultural adjustment policy. However, we are opinion that more given to minimizing and overcoming the short effects arising in the process adjustment policy implementation, such as the inccress of external debt and the aggravation of food-security of the poor in developing countries.

Thirdly, as regards commodity trade matters, the Korean delegation welcomes and supports the significant progress which has been made in the multilateral negotiation of GATT in the past months. However, the agricultural conditions such as the availability of arable land, relative importance of agriculture in terms of employment and foreign exchange earning, social and other non-economic background, etc., differ from region to region and nation to nation as well.

In this context, the specific conditions of each developing country should be carefully taken into account in the process of negotiation. In particular, for food-deficit countries, where the major policy goal is to enhance self-sufficiency of staple food, it is of the utmost importance for them to maintain optimum levels of domestic food production to meet the domestic demand and to safeguard incomes of small farmers in their countries.

Lastly, we should like to express our concern that, in terms of tonnages, food aid has declined in 1988 and is expected to decrease in the coming year. We therefore wish to urge the international community, including donor countries, to maintain their food aid deliveries at the same level as before.

With these comments, we fully endorse the recommendations and conclusions presented in the report.

Armando DE LILLE (Mexico): Mi Delegación se une a las felicitaciones al señor Carandang, que ha hecho una brillante presentación del tema, así como al esfuerzo realizado en el Comité y el excelente trabajo de los grupos intergubernamentales que aquí participaron.

Resulta de relevante importancia para los países cuyas economías descansan en el comercio de sus productos agrícolas contar con aliados como la FAO para obtener, en foros de comercio multilateral, como es la Ronda de Uruguay, al amparo del GATT, condiciones más equitativas de intercambio y eliminación de barreras proteccionistas. Mi Delegación, después de haber leído con interés el documento CL 96/6, hace suyas las recomendaciones de los grupos intergubernamentales, por lo que lo apoya con agrado.

Sra. Mercedes FERMIN GOMEZ (Venezuela): En general, nosotros vamos a apoyar el documento, porque consideramos que es un trabajo serio, bien documentado, y agradecemos al delegado Carandang la tarea que en él ha desarrollado. Pero queremos precisar nuestro apoyo al Capítulo V, que se refiere a los artículos de productos básicos, concretamente a los productos hortícolas tropicales. Y queremos hacer énfasis en este capítulo, porque es uno de los aspectos de la agricultura que inciden en el interés de los países en vías de desarrollo y en los países del Tercer Mundo, cuya agricultura está todavía en manos de pequeños agricultores.

Hace dos años, la FAO determinó que se le prestara atención especial a la actividad de los pequeños agricultores, para ser ayudados desde el punto de vista de la asistencia técnica y desde el punto de vista del estímulo que debería darse para desarrollar estas actividades en sus propios países. Pero lo cierto es que, a pesar de que la FAO hace muchos esfuerzos en este sentido, con cursos de asistencia técnica y con apoyo, desde este punto de vista, del trabajo de la Comisión Técnica, la verdadera ayuda a estos países, que no han logrado todavía enrumbar su agricultura por caminos de técnicas mejoradas, sigue sin prestar el beneficio que debería prestar; especialmente, porque la producción de esos productos, de estos rubros hortícolas, debería ser complementada con la posibilidad de asegurar la exportación de los productos a los centros de consumo que están fuera de las áreas intertropicales. En estas áreas existe, por un lado, la protección agrícola y, por otro lado, verdaderas barreras comerciales que no permiten que los países sean los que coloquen sus productos en los mercados, sino que esta transportación, esta colocación, se hace a través de las corporaciones transnacionales, están utilizando la biotecnología para trasladar los cultivos de estas frutas -especialmente de las frutas- a las áreas de las zonas templadas.

De manera que, si bien los mercados europeos, los mercados de las zonas templadas, se ven frecuentados por estos productos tropicales -como podemos presenciarlo aquí, en Roma-, no significa esto que tales importaciones de parte de estos centros sean beneficiosas para los verdaderos productos agrícolas, porque son los intermediarios, las corporaciones transnacionales los que hacen realmente este beneficio. Indudablemente que la FAO, procediendo con las características que le corresponden, ha desarrollado innumerables cursillos, seminarios, simposios, para la preparación y la asistencia técnica de estas comunidades campesinas; pero no basta que estas comunidades reciban la técnica como enseñanza, porque es precisamente la base económica lo que a ellas les mantiene fuera de la posibilidad de participar en el mercado internacional. De esta manera, se hacen realmente ineficientes los esfuerzos de FAO.

Sería de desear, entonces, que de alguna manera pudiera buscarse la forma de superar las barreras que algunas veces son ciertas pero otras veces son torcidamente desviadas, como el control de calidad, como la infestación por algunos ácaros o por algunos otros animales, como es el caso de la mosca mediterránea o de la mosca de Suriname, que infesta las frutas y no pueden llegar a los centros de consumo en el mercado europeo, del cual es muy celosa la Comunidad Económica Europea.

Por eso creo que nosotros podemos darle nuestro apoyo a este capítulo V, pero debemos insistir en que la vigilancia, el seguimiento de estos mercados de productos hortícolas tropicales, que son objeto de atención por la FAO, pudiera ser complementado con la posibilidad de una asistencia financiera que a estas determinadas comunidades que se están dedicando a ello y adquiriendo cierta experiencia técnica, les posibilitaría elevar el nivel de su producción, y con eso la posibilidad también de acceder a un mercado que hoy está interesado en estos frutos.

Con esto quiero decir que el reforzamiento de la acción de la FAO en estas comunidades sería muy deseable, porque de esa manera la FAO contribuiría, como ha contribuido hasta ahora en otros aspectos -como es la producción de cereales o la producción de maíz o la producción de oleaginosos-, con la producción de productos hortícolas tropicales y de productos frutícolas.

Hasta aquí quiero concentrar mi intervención, dándole, de todas maneras, nuestro apoyo al documento en general, porque los otros delegados se han referido con detalle a los otros capítulos.

Hoboru SAITO (Japan): Although my country has no difficulty in endorsing the report, I should like to make some comments on this agenda item.

Regarding protectionism in agriculture my country is of the opinion that the formation of the new agriculture trade order is a most important issue through the establishment of the new GATT rules and disciplines, and would like to contribute to the GATT Uruguay Round negotiation to facilitate world agricultural trade and harmonize the development of world agriculture.

With this in mind, my country has recently taken a big step forward along the line of liberalizing our agricultural market. It can also be called agriculture reform, including a considerable cut of subsidies for the agriculture sector and lowering of support prices for agricultural products. Behind these radical measures there are some basic policy directions which are, in the first place to promote structural policies in order to establish our agriculture which is characterized by its small farming system as a self-reliant sector in the whole Japanese economy; secondly to ensure a stable supply of food with reasonable prices acceptable to our consumers; thirdly, to contribute positively to the Uruguay Round negotiations and to improve market access for food imports.

Those measures which my Government has taken and is now taking are not without pain for our farmers and are necessarily accompanied by a lot of impact on rural society. Moreover, as I have mentioned, our agriculture is characterized by small farmers whose average holding is just over one hectare which is, however, the result of a long history. Under these circumstances my Government is making the best possible effort to rationalize its agriculture.

My country would also like to express its concern over the introduction of the immature concept of recoupling. We consider that it is more fruitful and realistic to discuss how we can improve the existing policies rather than simply classify each policy under new categories such as recoupling and decoupling.

E. Wayne DENNEY (United States of America): Like others, we are most pleased to see Mr. Carandang back with us.

The United States supports the report of the CCP and compliments delegations for focusing discussions on technical issues. We associate ourselves with the Australian statement, particularly the last portion of it relating to the importance of using market signals. However, we regret that this session was sparsely attended and that only about a fourth to a fifth of the delegates came from capitals.

The United States strongly supports the long-term objectives for agriculture outlined in the April Framework Agreement, namely the call for substantial progressive reductions in agricultural support and protection sustained over an agreed period of time. Our goal is to integrate agriculture more effectively into GATT by increasing import access, phasing out export subsidies and scaling back internal support which distorts international trade.

We commend the session for its endorsement of the objectives in the GATT mid-term agreement of the Uruguay Round. It is important that national agricultural policies allow market signals to reach farmers and cease distorting trade flows. The Uruguay Round offers our best hope to achieve these goals and put world agriculture on a firmer economic footing. My Secretary will address this in considerable detail during the Conference.

We noted the high degree of interest among developing countries on the economic significance of tobacco. The United States believes there is still need for more extensive and unbiased analysis of the cost and benefits of tobacco. We suggest that FAO may want to look at this issue of what crops can substitute for tobacco, especially in the light of a likely decline in tobacco consumption in the future.

Sra. Grafila SOTO CARRERO (Cuba): Seremos breves, Señor Presidente, La Delegación de Cuba apoya el Informe del 57^a período de sesiones del Comité de Problemas de Productos Básicos y agradece los esfuerzos realizados en ese sentido por el Señor Carandang y sus colaboradores.

Desde su anterior período de sesiones el Comité de Problemas de Productos Básicos se pronunció positivamente a través de una Resolución acerca de la necesidad del avance de las negociaciones en la Ronda de Uruguay, dándole todo su apoyo.

La FAO, Señor Presidente, es la única Organización que se ocupa de la problemática agrícola en su conjunto. Por ello en el marco de las negociaciones ha prestado un apoyo técnico tanto a la Secretaría de GATT como a algunos países en lo concerniente a la agricultura y productos tropicales.

El trabajo desarrollado por la FAO en materia de reglamentaciones sanitarias y fitosanitarias, vinculados al Codex Alimentarius y a la Comisión Internacional de Protección Fitosanitaria ha sido en extremo útil.

Evidentemente todo ese trabajo que ha realizado la FAO en relación con las negociaciones reorientarán su trabajo, al menos en lo relacionado con el Comité de Productos Básicos, hacia los problemas concretos del comercio de productos agropecuarios y las formas y reformas de política agrícola necesarias para poder implementar los resultados que emanen de las negociaciones del GATT. Siendo ésta la principal repercusión posible que tenga esta negociación en el ámbito de la FAO.

La Delegación cubana se pronuncia porque la FAO mantenga su posición de asistencia técnica a las negociaciones en la Ronda de Uruguay, sí como que se utilicen las reglamentaciones sanitarias y fitosanitarias existentes como base para las discusiones que tienen lugar sobre este aspecto en el GATT.

Asimismo abogamos porque el papel de la FAO no se limite a lo que ya ha hecho, sino que éste se refuerce y se reoriente en los trabajos del Comité de Problemas de Productos Básicos hacia mayores logros en nuestros países.

Shahid NAJAM (Pakistan): We would like to thank Mr Carandang for his most lucid presentation of the report of the CCP. It is indeed heartening to note that CCP in its 57th Session has exhaustively and meaningfully reviewed the world commodity situation, activities of the various intergovernmental groups and some selected commodity and trade issues, besides dwelling upon the vitally significant problems of protectionism in agriculture, agricultural adjustment and agricultural policy reforms. In the process, the Committee has highlighted some very pertinent issues and revealed imbalances which warrant paramount attention not only to evolve strategies and measures for providing impetus and boost to the economies of the developing countries enabling them to realize self-reliance in food but also to minimize the paradox of chronic shortages and chronic super-abundance.

The Committee has pointed out that during 1986 to 1988, the economies of developing countries expanded more rapidly than those of the developed countries, although some regions of Asia, Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean lagged behind. Nevertheless, this trend is a palpable manifestation of the persistent efforts of the developing countries to attain the objectives of food security and agricultural development. We are sure that given a more favourable and balanced international economic environment, these economies could gain even more stimulus for establishing the desired level of viability.

The Pakistan delegation would, in particular, like to draw the attention of this august body to the following findings of the Committee pertaining to the years 1987 and 1988: (I) strong recovery occurred in the volume of trade in agriculture, food and forestry which is primarily attributable to the developed countries. Their exports grew by 11 percent whereas those of developing countries fell by 4 percent; (ii) export prices for agricultural products exported mainly by the developed countries had risen by 12 percent and those of developing countries declined by 3 percent; (iii) the rise in value of world trade for developed countries was 5 percent whereas it had fallen 7 percent for the developing countries.

The Committee also observed that the major share of increased earnings was expected to be realized by developed countries. It is thus abundantly axiomatic that whether it is strong recovery in the volume of trade or enhanced export earnings, the benefits are accruing to those who already have opulence, and those who have been, for decades, striving hard to eradicate hunger, poverty and misery from their societies continue to be plagued by the maladies of shortages, deficits and deprivations.

Agriculture constitutes the backbone of the economies of the developing countries and is the major source of employment to the ever increasing population and for generating resources, though meagre and inadequate, and for funding other social sectors.

It hardly needs emphasis that the requirements which the food and agriculture sector has to meet with are inevitably the foremost essential requirements. International community has to ensure availability of basic food supplies as a major moral and social obligation.

Mr Chairman, the international environment is overwhelmingly tilted towards the developed countries, throwing the producers and farmers of developing countries at the mercy of market risk, limited market accessibility, prices and income fluctuations, reduction of investment margins and concomitant consistent retardation of development.

We would therefore strongly support the Committee's proposals and urge that all-out and concerted efforts be made by FAO for ensuring a fair and equitable agricultural trading system and elimination of support and protectionist measures so that imperfections and distortions in the world agricultural markets hamper no more the much needed economic growth of the developing countries.

It is encouraging to read in the report that OECD Ministers have reaffirmed the necessity to pursue vigorously a process of reform for a market-oriented trading system through progressive and substantial reduction in support and protection and strengthened GATT rules and disciplines. Let us hope that this reaffirmation of aspiration is translated into action-oriented measures facilitating favourable agricultural trade environment for the developing countries.

The Committee has expressed concern over the serious market depression for many commodities of importance to developing countries. The Committee also highlighted the essentiality of intensification of the reform process in order to improve world agriculture trade. The Committee has made reference to the critical importance of the Uruguay Round of Multilateral Trade Negotiations under GATT. This is certainly an important forum for making an effort to rationalize the international trade structure. However, as against the magnitude of the problem and urgency and immediacy of concrete actions for salvaging the situation, the process seems to be painfully slow. We are sure FAO can play an effective role in this regard.

We note the Committee, in the context of global consumption of cereals, underlines the need for a sufficient increase in the production of cereals so as to evolve acceptable demand-supply equation and combined that expansion should be finely balanced to obviate both the risk of shortages and glut of surpluses. We fully agree with this.

We also acknowledge and support the observation of the Committee that currency fluctuations posed a continuing difficulty in trade analysis. There is a real need to undertake a study to be able to facilitate better trade analysis. We hope that study on tea will come up with viable proposals.

The importance of quality control, improvement of marketing technology, product presentation and packaging does call for assistance to developing countries and we go along with the suggestion of the Committee that FAO, in conjunction with ITC, UNCTAD/GATT should extend support for this purpose.

The concern expressed to the Committee regarding decline in food aid deliveries in 1988 and 1989 from the donor countries also deserves special mention. Food assistance and aid will continue to be necessary for achieving a better nutritional balance for the poorest and undernourished groups. Modes of assistance can perhaps be linked to food-for-work programmes.

We also appreciate the immense contribution being made by the Intergovernmental Groups, and we lend our wholehearted support to the analytical work and recommendations for improving the state of affairs. We also endorse the recommendations of the Committee to orientate agricultural policies to the market signals and for integration and enhancement of the role of women in commodity and trade development.

The importance of expanding economic cooperation amongst the developing countries in the area of trade, as advocated by the Committee, could perhaps be more vigorously pursued on bilateral, regional and even global bases. The comparative advantages in the field of agriculture could be suitably harnessed by the developing countries for complementing and consolidating the economic effort and maximizing the benefit from the meagre resources. The potential is enormous.

K. WEYBRECHT (Canada): Mr Chairman, Canada participated in the deliberations of the Committee on Commodity Problems which was held in June. Therefore, we had an opportunity at that time to make a range of specific comments. Accordingly, I will be very brief.

We are pleased that the Committee delivers a clear message on the need to intensify efforts to achieve a fair and market-oriented agricultural trading system, and stresses the importance of achieving progress in the Uruguay Round of Trade Negotiations. Canada attaches high importance to achieving improvements in the international trading environment in agricultural products through the current MTN Round. We see a need to achieve early reform through a substantial progressive reduction in support and protectionism and the establishment of stronger and more effective GATT rules.

Mauricio CUADRA (Nicaragua): Vamos a ser, señor Presidente, sumamente breves.

Deseamos agradecer y felicitar al Señor Carandang por el excelente trabajo realizado y a hacer algunos señalamientos sobre el documento que en general aprobamos y apoyamos. Nos sumamos a la preocupación señalada por el Embajador de Colombia, Señor Bula Hoyos, en cuanto al grave impacto que tiene en la economía de los países productores de café la ruptura del Convenio cafetero. Es necesario que se sepa que es un impacto no sólo económico, sino político. Los países productores de café, en su mayoría países en desarrollo, van a sufrir, y estamos sufriendo ya, una reducción tan tremenda en nuestras economías, que no puede dejar de tener un choque de tipo político en la estabilidad de estos países.

Hago un llamado a los países que han contribuido a la ruptura de este acuerdo a que reflexionen, y ojalá se pueda lograr en próximas reuniones restablecer un acuerdo que componga esta situación a los precios.

El proteccionismo, por otra parte, y otras prácticas discriminatorias es una práctica nefasta de todos conocida con un impacto enorme en las economías de los países en desarrollo. Por tanto, estamos de acuerdo en el párrafo 21 sobre la importancia de la Ronda Uruguay, y creemos que la FAO debe seguir jugando ese importante papel que hasta ahora ha jugado en apoyo a los países en desarrollo en esta Ronda.

Suscribimos nuevamente la posición planteada por nuestro colega de Colombia, el Embajador Bula Hoyos, sobre la problemática del banano en el mercado de la Comunidad Económica Europea.

En los párrafos 44 al 50 encontramos, señor Presidente, una problemática que refleja claramente la dureza del subdesarrollo y los problemas que sufren nuestras economías. Esto es típico, encontramos aquí las barreras que sufren nuestros productos tradicionales para poder acceder a los mercados de los países grandes. Aquí no hablamos ya de barreras arancelarias, sino que estamos hablando de barreras de control de calidad. Podemos ver esto desde dos puntos de vista: uno por causa de atraso en los empaques en este tipo de cosas, pero también hay un factor adicional que queremos señalar, y es que en muchos países se continúan introduciendo productos tóxicos que envenenan los productos de estos países y luego se les impide el acceso a los mercados por no tener la suficiente asistencia técnica para poder desintoxicarlos y hacerlos accesibles a esos mercados.

Señalamos que aquí la FAO debe jugar un papel importante dotando de asistencia técnica clave a nuestros países para subsanar este tipo de deficiencias y permitir el acceso a los mercados de nuestros productos tradicionales.

Apoyamos, pues, señor Presidente, el Informe del 57 a período de sesiones del Comité de Problemas de Productos Básicos.

Raymond ALLEN (United Kingdom): Mr Chairman I can be very brief. The delegation of the United Kingdom welcomes the Report. We note the extensive work that has gone into its preparation. We endorse the recognition of the Report of the potential benefits of policy reform. A number of significant steps have already been taken in the global process of agricultural reform and some modest gains are already apparent. The reform process should therefore continue so that clear signals are given to producers and more stable market conditions are ensured for the future.

Moreover, we must ensure that the momentum of reform is maintained in order to realize the full potential benefits.

One area recognized by the Report in which future progress can be achieved is that of international trade. We hope to see a successful conclusion of the GATT-Uruguay Round and look forward to the further stimulus to the reform process which such an outcome will bring. Past experience shows that the benefits will be both substantial and widespread. The IGG's have demonstrated their usefulness as a forum for discussion on individual commodities. We agree with the view expressed in paragraph 25, especially regarding the avoidance of duplication of initiatives.

More generally, the United Kingdom recognizes, and notes with satisfaction, the activities of IGGs in working to greater market transparency.

Assefa YILALA (Ethiopia): Mr Chairman, we would also like to thank Mr Carandang for this outstanding work, and the Secretariat of FAO for the excellent document before us. Like some of the people who spoke before me, we have participated in the various Intergovernmental Groups and also the Fifty-seventh Session of the Committee on Commodity Problems, as the contents of the documents were as per the discussions raised in this Session.

We had no plan to intervene because we fully support the contents of the document. But then after the discussions started, we were able to hear some area of concern from the distinguished delegate of Nicaragua in relation to the International Coffee Agreement. Now, this being a topic which is not covered in this report, but a very important area that has affected most of the developing countries, I would like to express that I fully share the concern that was expressed by the distinguished delegate of Nicaragua.

István DOBOCZKY (Hungary): Thanks for the presentation. We fully endorse the report of the Committee on commodity problems. The Committee reviewed the commodity situation and outlook. It is interesting that world merchandise trade in 1988 was about eight percent increased in volume. My country, as a net exporter of food, is interested in fair trade when its competitive advantages can give an opportunity for the country. That is the reason why we support the Uruguay Round and are taking part in the work of the Cairns Group to have the liberalization of agricultural trade. We do our best in the field and in our agricultural policy. Step by step we eliminated the subsidies in our country. As a result, today our agriculture is among the very few in Europe that are a net contributor to the state budget. It is not easy, but we do that because it is a part of fair trade in our opinion.

B.P. DUTIA (Assistant Director-General, Economic and Social Policy Department): No specific question has been asked to the Secretariat, therefore I do not have to respond to any questions, as such. However, on behalf of the Secretariat, I would like to express our appreciation for the praise that has been extended to the work of the Committee as well as that of the intergovernmental groups which work under the Committee of Commodity Problems.

A number of citations have been made regarding certain areas which need to be given more attention in the future work of the Secretariat. We have taken careful note of all those citations and we will do our best to respond to them within the available resources. Mr Carandang, I understand, regrets that he had to leave to catch a plane and therefore he is not here at the time of the conclusion of the discussions on this report. I am told that he will be back on Monday.

LE PRESIDENT: Nous pouvons considérer que, moyennant les observations formulées par les délégués, le Conseil adopte le rapport présenté par la Commission des produits.

- III. PROGRAMME, BUDGETARY, FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS (continued)
- III. QUESTIONS CONCERNANT LE PROGRAMME, LE BUDGET, LES FINANCES ET L'ADMINISTRATION (suite)
- III. ASUNTOS DEL PROGRAMA Y ASUNTOS PRESUPUESTARIOS, FINANCIEROS Y ADMINISTRATIVOS (continuación)
- 8. Second Report on Unscheduled and Cancelled Sessions in the 1988-89 Biennium
- 8. Deuxième rapport sur les réunions hors programme et les réunions annulées pendant l'exercice 1988-89
- 8. Segundo informe sobre las reuniones no previstas y las reuniones canceladas en el bienio 1988-89

V.J. SHAH (Assistant Director-General, Office of Programme, Budget and Evaluation): This document is on the lines of the ones submitted to the Council at its autumn session each year. It is an information document which lists, firstly, the unscheduled sessions which have been approved during the year between October 1988 and 1 October 1989, and the sessions, approved sessions, which formed part of the Programme of Work and Budget which has to be cancelled. For each of the categories, the reasons are given, either for the scheduling of the session or for its cancellation.

It might interest the Council, Mr Chairman, to know where we stand. In 1988 there were 12 unscheduled sessions approved and 45 sessions cancelled. In 1989 there were 20 unscheduled sessions approved and 51 cancelled, which brings a total for the biennium of 32 unscheduled sessions approved and 96 cancelled. Since the document was finalized, there have been five other sessions cancelled.

If it would be agreeable to you and the Council, may I suggest that these sessions be listed in the document which will be appended to your report, because the document which is before you, CL 96/3, is attached to the appendix of your report. If you so agree, these additional five sessions will also be mentioned in that list. But I may mention them, if you wish, the five additional sessions cancelled: a committee on the inland fisheries for Africa, a sub-committee for the protection of fisheries in the Sahelian zone. This had to be postponed to 1990 because of circumstances in the host country. Secondly, a COPESCAL working party on fishery resources again for organization reasons within the host country; thirdly, the COPESCAL working party on fishery technology the same reason; fourthly, the working group of agricultural statistics in Latin America again postponed to 1990, owing to presidential elections in the host country which led the host country to request that the session be postponed. Finally, an Expert Consultation on agroforestry in the Asia and the Pacific region which had been postponed to 1990 since the dates for the session in question would have followed too closely on the 14th Session of the Asia and the Pacific Forestry Commission.

I am, as always, available if there are any questions.

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): El dato que aparece en el párrafo 3 sobre 96 reuniones canceladas, ahora asciende a 101 con las otras cinco a que ha hecho referencia el Sr. Shah. En el Anexo 2, podrá observarse que los motivos por los cuales se han suprimido muchas de esas reuniones son por reajuste del programa. Como esta cifra de 101 reuniones es realmente excepcional, no la recordamos nunca antes en ningún bienio de la historia de la Organización, proponemos que el Consejo lamente la cancelación de tan alto número de reuniones debido a la crisis financiera que ha impuesto el reajuste en los programas.

LE PRESIDENT: Moyennant cette remarque, je crois que nous pouvons libérer M. Shah et passer au point 17 de l'ordre du jour, à savoir la Conférence internationale sur la nutrition (CL 89/27). Ce point sera présenté par M. Lunven.

V. OTHER MATTERS

V. AUTRES QUESTIONS

V. OTROS ASUNTOS

12. Any Other Business

12. Questions diverses

12. Otros asuntos

- International Conference on Nutrition

- Conference internationale sur la nutrition

- Conferencia Internacional sobre Nutrición

P. LUNVEN (Directeur, Division des politiques nutritionnelles et de la nutrition alimentaire): Au cours de sa quatre-vingt-quinzième session, le Conseil a été informé que l'initiative avait été prise par le Sous-Comité de nutrition du CAC à sa quinzième session, en février 1989, à New York pour suggérer le principe d'une conférence internationale sur la nutrition destinée à mobiliser énergies et ressources pour livrer un combat décisif à la malnutrition avant la fin du siècle. Le Conseil a noté cette suggestion et, conscient que la malnutrition est encore très répandue dans le monde et s'est même aggravée dans certaines régions pendant la dernière décennie, il a de façon générale accueilli favorablement la proposition de convoquer une conférence internationale sur la nutrition.

En outre, le Conseil a considéré que la FAO, compte tenu de son mandat et de ses compétences spécialisées dans ce domaine, se devait de jouer un rôle prépondérant en collaboration avec l'OMS dans son organisation au cours de l'exercice 1992-93.

Le Conseil a noté avec satisfaction qu'un document détaillé exposant tous les aspects de la proposition serait présenté à la vingt-cinquième session de la Conférence afin de permettre à celle-ci de prendre une décision en la matière. Peu après la quatre-vingt-quinzième session du Conseil.

Le Directeur général de la FAO a rencontré M. Hiroshi Nakajima, Directeur général de l'OMS, pour discuter des dispositions nécessaires à la tenue de la Conférence internationale sur la nutrition. A la suite de cet entretien, les deux organisations se sont mises d'accord pour coparrainer la Conférence et sur plusieurs autres questions relatives à son organisation. Ces dispositions sont incorporées dans le document C 89/27, qui a été préparé en étroite collaboration avec l'OMS et qui est soumis à la considération du Conseil. En octobre dernier, les directeurs généraux de la FAO et de l'OMS ont présenté au Comité administratif de coordination, réuni à New York, un document conjoint décrivant les objectifs généraux et les démarches nécessaires à la convocation de la Conférence internationale de la nutrition tels qu'ils sont décrits dans le document C 89/27. Le CAC a exprimé sa satisfaction devant l'initiative conjointe des deux organisations et devant leur volonté exprimée d'y associer étroitement les organisations concernées à travers le mécanisme du Sous-comité de nutrition du CAC. Il a adopté la déclaration suivante que je vais vous lire en anglais, car la version française n'en est pas encore disponible.

(continues in English): International Conference on Nutrition. The Administrative Committee on Coordination (ACC) welcomes the joint initiative of FAO and WHO, following a proposal of the ACC Sub-committee on Nutrition at its Fifteenth Session, to convene an International Conference on Nutrition in late 1992 or early 1993 to focus worldwide attention on this important aspect of development. ACC believes that malnutrition and undernutrition, which affect millions of women, men and children, are major impediments to social and economic progress and that the Conference would be an important step towards increasing public awareness and obtaining national and international commitments to strategies and actions to ensure approved nutrition worldwide.

ACC appreciates that FAO and WHO as the joint initiators, intend to fully involve members of the ACC Sub-Committee on Nutrition and other agencies and organizations of the United Nations system in the preparation, proceedings, support and follow-up of the Conference on a continuing basis. ACC therefore invites these members and other concerned organizations, as well as non-governmental organizations, to work in close co-operation with FAO and WHO in this important endeavour, using the mechanism of the Sub-Committee on Nutrition whenever appropriate."

Le document C 89/27 qui sera soumis à l'examen de la Conférence décrit en détail les préparatifs envisagés pour l'organisation et la tenue d'une Conférence internationale sur la nutrition parrainée conjointement par la FAO et l'OMS, et en collaboration avec l'ensemble des organisations intéressées au cours de l'exercice 1992-93. En particulier, le document, dans son paragraphe 10, présente les objectifs proposés de la Conférence internationale sur la nutrition.

D'autre part, au paragraphe 11 le document propose que la Conférence Internationale sur la nutrition se tienne sous forme de réunion intergouvernementale pendant une durée de 7 jours ouvrables. Le site de la Conférence devra être déterminé en tenant compte de la déclaration du Gouvernement italien indiquant qu'il était prêt à accueillir la Conférence, ainsi que des multiples avantages que Rome offre pour sa tenue dans cette ville.

Concernant la date, comme le document 87 le mentionne au paragraphe 12, 1993 paraît mieux convenir, car cela permettrait de préparer la Conférence de façon adéquate, et d'éviter la concurrence qui ne manquerait pas de s'exercer en 1992 avec la tenue de la Conférence des Nations Unies sur l'environnement prévue la même année.

Aux paragraphes 13 et 14, sont décrites les modalités de participation des gouvernements, et les procédures de travail de la Conférence.

Les paragraphes 16 à 18 décrivent en détail les propositions de mise en place d'un Comité consultatif d'experts qui aurait pour rôle de donner des avis sur les orientations générales de la Conférence, et sur les principaux problèmes techniques à discuter. Si, comme nous l'espérons, la décision de la tenue de la Conférence est positive, il faudra alors prendre des dispositions financières appropriées pour la tenue de la Conférence internationale sur la nutrition. Comme le document C 89/27 le mentionne au paragraphe 20, la FAO et l'OMS en supporteront la charge équitablement. On espère que les autres Organisations participant à la Conférence pourront apporter leur contribution financière et que des ressources extrabudgétaires seront fournies par les gouvernements donateurs et les Organisations coopérantes pour assurer le plein succès de la Conférence.

Toutefois, comme l'indique le document C 89/27 les ressources nécessaires devront être inscrites au projet de budget pour l'exercice 1992-93, afin de couvrir les frais de fonctionnement de Secrétariat de la Conférence, des services contractuels, des missions d'experts, etc.

Les membres du Conseil auront sans doute à coeur de faire connaître leurs vues sur la proposition décrite dans ce document et que la Conférence de la FAO examinera de façon approfondie la semaine prochaine.

Je me tiens à la disposition du Conseil pour fournir toutes informations supplémentaires et donner des éclaircissements sur les dispositions contenues dans le document.

LE PRESIDENT: Je remercie le Docteur Lunven de sa communication introductive et demande aux Honorables délégués de bien vouloir nous faire part de leurs observations.

David DRAKE (Canada): Le Canada reconnaît pleinement l'importance du secteur de la nutrition en matière de développement; nos propres politiques en ce domaine soulignent l'importance de la nutrition, puisqu'elle touche à la participation des femmes dans le développement. D'une manière générale, le Canada est favorable à des consultations internationales et multilatérales portant sur ce sujet. Cependant, ma délégation pense que tenir une Conférence internationale sur la nutrition en 1993, un an seulement après la Conférence sur l'environnement et le développement à laquelle mon gouvernement attache une grande importance, nécessitera, en parallèle, quelques années de préparation intensive de la part des Etats Membres.

Certes il y aura nécessité d'une préparation considérable, mais nous sommes aussi inquiets quant aux effets de cette préparation sur les ressources de la FAO.

Pour ces raisons le Canada n'est pas en mesure en ce moment d'appuyer une Conférence d'une envergure telle que ce qui est proposé dans le document soumis au Conseil.

MA GENG-OU (China)(original language Chinese): Mr Chairman, document C 89/27 describes the current world malnutrition and how it affects human health. It then elaborates the need for holding an international conference on nutrition, and explains the necessary arrangements to be made by FAO for the conference to be jointly sponsored by FAO and WHO. We welcome the convening of such an international conference and commend the efforts made by the Secretariat to this end.

Now there are serious nutrition problems in the world and that of developing countries is a source of concern. Due to the inadequate economic development and backward agricultural production in developing countries, the number of malnourished and hungry people continues to increase and tens of millions of people are constantly threatened by diseases and death, while in developed countries overnutrition and irrational diet has led to many diseases directly affecting the people's health there. However, at the present, people, even government officials and decision makers have not realized the seriousness of this problem, and therefore do not consider it a matter of urgency.

We believe that the solution to malnutrition is related to general social and economic development, and it calls for the political will of the government of various countries, and it should be incorporated into the national development strategy as an integral part. In view of the situation, we think that it is necessary to hold an intergovernmental international conference on nutrition so as to arouse the general awareness of the international community to this issue. We hope that this international conference will put its emphasis on practical results and will be action-oriented. We hope that on the basis of an in-depth study and discussion at that other conference, some practical cogent indicators will be established and the necessary resources will be arranged and effective measures taken, and that the evaluation of monetary magnetism will be discovered so as to ensure that the conference will conclude with concrete results and play a positive role in the direction we desire.

Armando DE LILLE (Mexico): Mi Delegación considera que la celebración de esta Conferencia resulta una forma valiosa de crear conciencia a nivel mundial sobre la gravedad del problema y, más aún, la tendencia que tiene a emperrar la situación de carencias de muchos grupos humanos. Por la importancia que reviste, se podría titular como una conferencia mundial de nutrición. Mi Delegación desea señalar el carácter intergubernamental, a fin de obtener de los delegados participantes una orientación de política que lleve a posiciones y decisiones concretas. Por otra parte, esperar hasta 1993 es ya adentrarse mucho en el decenio, y pensando que la Conferencia del Medio Ambiente no es un obstáculo, ésta podría celebrarse en 1992.

David McGAFFET (United States of America): The United States attaches great importance to the subject of nutrition and malnutrition, and ways to bring about lasting improvements in the world nutrition situation. We have demonstrated this concern in a variety of ways both bilaterally and multilaterally in words and deeds. Thus it is not with the subject but with the proposed conference that we have difficulties.

The convening of an international conference on nutrition appears to us to come on the heels of other international meetings which address many of the same issues, such as the International Conference on Nutrition organized by the International Union of Nutritional Sciences held in August 1989 in Seoul, Korea. There have also been conferences in Africa, in Latin America, and there are other conferences planned. Indeed the Asian Nutrition Society will hold its regional conference in August 1991. This proposed international conference would likely revisit matters already addressed elsewhere or in only a marginally different fashion.

In terms of actions which address the underlying problem, we believe the types of interventions which could improve the world nutrition situation are broadly known. As the document notes; "The ingredients for bringing about a major lasting improvement in the world nutrition situation are at hand: adequate scientific knowledge, inexpensive and effective technology, and accumulated practical experience." As it states in paragraph 8 of the document, what is most needed is "a nutrition focus to the development strategy", which is multisectoral but well targeted to the households at risk.

In our view, given this background, there should be more effective ways to use limited resources other than devoting the staff time, energy and resources required in organizing another international conference. In other words our preference is for an efficient approach that gets to the households characterized as at risk to malnutrition, targeting them for well-focused interventions, and linking them to a country-specific development strategy.

Jean-Pierre POLY (France): Ma délégation se félicite du choix opéré au sein de l'ordre du jour très chargé de notre Conseil en faveur de ce très important sujet; elle a particulièrement apprécié la présentation claire, circonscrite et convaincante que vient de nous faire le professeur Lunven.

Compte tenu du mandat et des compétences techniques de la FAO, la nutrition constitue pour cette Organisation un domaine essentiel dans lequel elle joue, en parfaite collaboration avec l'OMS, un rôle de premier plan au sein du système des Nations Unies.

Dans d'autres domaines, forêts tropicales, pêches, ressources génétiques, la FAO a pris des initiatives importantes qui ont conduit à renforcer ses activités et à mobiliser d'avantage la Communauté internationale.

La persistance de la malnutrition dans les 15 prochaines années, en dépit des progrès considérables de la production agricole mondiale au cours des années 80, est un élément constant des perspectives dégagées par les experts et les organisations compétentes. Le nombre des personnes mal nourries a continué à croître au même rythme que la population mondiale, en raison surtout d'une répartition inéquitable des revenus et des mauvais résultats du secteur agricole et vivrier qui ont eu des effets néfastes sur la sécurité alimentaire dans de nombreux pays, notamment en Afrique.

S'il est vrai que ces considérations lors des derniers exercices ont orienté les programmes d'activités de la FAO vers des priorités progressivement mieux cernées, notre Organisation n'a pris, jusqu'à présent, aucune initiative du type de celle de l'organisation d'une Conférence internationale sur la nutrition.

Face à une situation aussi critique, le stade des consultations techniques et scientifiques doit être désormais dépassé à l'occasion de cette Conférence. La délégation française qui a déjà appuyé ce projet au Conseil de juin dernier ne peut qu'encourager vivement la FAO à poursuivre dans cette voie. Mon pays relève comme autant d'indices favorables à la future réussite de cette importante manifestation, la pertinence des objectifs fixés pour la Conférence: identification des problèmes de malnutrition, définition d'une stratégie de développement intégrant l'aspect nutritionnel, élaboration de programmes nutritionnels, la bonne coordination avec l'organisation de la santé pour une meilleure complémentarité de chacune des agences, enfin, l'état d'avancement du dossier qui prévoit la création d'un Comité consultatif d'experts et la tenue de cette Conférence à Rome en 1993.

Ma délégation saisit cette occasion pour exprimer le souhait des autorités françaises d'être étroitement associées à la préparation de cette importante Conférence.

E.P. ALLEYNE (Trinidad and Tobago): The delegation of Trinidad and Tobago wishes to indicate its full endorsement of the proposal for an International Conference on Nutrition. Our only reservation is, perhaps, that 1993 may be somewhat late. The document, brief as it is, provides a clear justification for the Conference.

We all recognize that food is the core concern of FAO. Surely nutrition is the ultimate, concern, the real test of the success of FAO's activity in this regard? It is to be noted that the problem is common to both developed and developing countries. It is evident that the activities of FAO in this regard, the guidelines, etc., which will emerge, will also be relevant to the poor, peripheral or marginalized groups in the developed countries.

We are all aware that structural adjustment is the endorsed and enforced functional development path for many developing countries today. We know that in many instances declining living and health conditions have been the result of such adjustments, thus leading to an even higher level of urgency for intervention with respect to a worsening of nutritional standards. In this regard, we ask FAO and WHO to ensure that the deliberations during this Conference provide opportunity for a multipurpose examination of ways and means of integrating nutritional elements into structural strategies.

Our delegation anticipates that one result of intervention by FAO, together with WHO, on this matter will be the education of the large community of people of all classes in the developing countries as to how to feed the young, babies and infants in particular, from widely available indigenous food.

Mlle Faouzia BOUMAIZA (Algérie): Nous tenons à remercier le Professeur Lunven pour sa présentation du document C 89/27, qui sera examiné plus en détail par la Conférence.

La Délégation algérienne se félicite encore une fois de l'initiative prise par le Directeur général, en accord avec le Directeur général de l'OMS, pour l'organisation d'une conférence internationale pour la nutrition. Elle nous a été présentée lors de la réunion du Conseil précédent. Nous avons en général accepté cette initiative et nous savons que le projet de conférence a fait l'objet d'une présentation conjointe de la FAO et de l'OMS lors de la deuxième session du Comité administratif de coordination en octobre 1989 à New York. Nous avons pu lire le document en question. Il me semble qu'une telle conférence se justifie parfaitement. Elle ne doit pas être interprétée, comme certains le disent ici, comme une nouvelle réunion d'experts, une de plus, mais bien comme une occasion offerte aux gouvernements de manifester d'une part leur volonté politique de lutter contre la malnutrition, permettant à ces deux secteurs essentiels, la santé et l'alimentation, de s'associer, mais en corollaire de mobiliser les ressources financières et humaines nécessaires.

Il faudra certes mobiliser des ressources supplémentaires, mais nous pensons que les conditions sont réunies pour améliorer de manière durable la situation mondiale de la nutrition. Grâce aux différents groupes d'experts, nous disposons maintenant de connaissances suffisantes. Cela est inscrit notamment dans le document C 89/27, où l'on nous dit que des technologies peu coûteuses et efficaces ont été mises au point à partir de l'expérience pratique accumulée. Il s'agit donc essentiellement de mobiliser la volonté politique des gouvernements.

Notre délégation ne comprend pas en particulier pourquoi deux délégations qui se sont exprimées avant nous se sont opposées à la réunion de cette conférence. Nous pensons qu'au moment où la situation de la nutrition dans le monde s'est grandement détériorée, il est temps justement de convoquer une conférence, après celles qui se sont tenues concernant la femme, concernant les forêts, concernant les pêches où l'on a abordé de manière partielle le sujet de la nutrition. Il s'agit maintenant de se réunir à un niveau politique et de donner les moyens à la FAO et à l'OMS de conduire une politique, certes en association avec toutes les agences des Nations Unies concernées, pour mener à bien leur action dans ce domaine.

N'oublions pas qu'au moment où il y a des potentialités énormes de produits, où il y a des excédents de matières alimentaires dans certaines parties du monde en ce moment même et dans ces pays et dans d'autres pays, la malnutrition avance et la sous-nutrition s'aggrave. Nous pensons donc qu'est venu le moment de se réunir.

Quant au choix de l'année, nous n'avons pas de problèmes. Quelle que soit l'année qui sera proposée, nous pouvons déjà l'accepter.

Raymond ALLEN (United Kingdom): Since I am the last to speak on this item, I can be extremely brief. The United Kingdom does not support the proposal for an International Conference. We fully concur with what has already been said by the delegate of the United States, and I will not repeat what he said. We need action, not words.

Mauricio CUADRA (Nicaragua): Mi delegación concedió el apoyo a la idea de realizar esta Conferencia desde que la misma surgió. Así lo expresamos en el 95 Consejo y lo reiteramos hoy, no voy a repetir - ya se han mencionado - las enormes necesidades y los graves problemas que van aumentando en el mundo a causa de la malnutrición. Se ha mencionado también que existe este problema de la malnutrición en países desarrollados, no solamente existen en los países pobres y en desarrollo. Hay también grandes masas en los países desarrollados mal atendidas y desnutridas sobre las cuales también tendrá que hablarse en esta Conferencia y que se van a ver también beneficiadas por las deliberaciones de este foro mundial que habrá de realizarse.

Se ha mencionado también el problema de los recursos. Nosotros queremos, señor Presidente, que después de esta Conferencia y con el clima que ya hemos alcanzado sobre este tema y el gran consenso, el problema de los recursos ya no va a existir para entonces, puesto que vamos haber logrado subsanar toda esta problemática con nuestras deliberaciones. Es más, estamos de acuerdo con las Delegaciones de México y Trinidad y Tabago en que el año 1993 nos suena muy largo para lo apremiante de la problemática nutricional en el mundo.

Nuestra Delegación, señor Presidente, quiere enfatizar su apoyo a la realización de esta Reunión mundial sobre nutrición.

B.P. DUTIA (Assistant Director-General, Economic and Social Policy Department): We have listened with great attention to the discussion on this important item and have taken note of the different views that have been expressed. These will be reflected in the report on the subject.

However, I need to make one or two points of clarification. The delegate of the United States of America, who was later supported by the delegate of the United Kingdom, made the point that a number of conferences and meetings have been held on this subject. Yes, that is true, but all these meetings have been at the expert level. Despite the importance of the subject of nutrition, and despite the fact that a large number of people in the world are malnourished and that in fact in certain parts of the world the situation has been worsening, there has not yet been a single intergovernmental meeting held on this subject. This will be the first such intergovernmental meeting, and the objective here is not just to discuss the problem or to measure the incidence of malnutrition but to consider the ways in which this problem could be tackled.

As has been pointed out in the document, the emphasis is on action at the intergovernmental level. The emphasis is on increasing awareness at the intergovernmental level, the policy level, on attacking this problem, on agreeing on the strategy for such an attack, and on mobilizing the necessary political will and the resources to tackle this issue. This is the main objective.

This subject will come before the Conference for its consideration, and we hope that it will be possible to reach a consensus on this issue.

LE PRESIDENT: Nous devons maintenant souhaiter que La Conference de la FAO puisse également apporter son appui à cette Conférence qui, comme l'a dit M.Dutia, sera tournée vers l'action plus que vers les études.

Ceci étant, nous passons au point suivant de l'ordre du jour: Rapport de la 53ème session du Comité des questions constitutionnelles et juridiques (CL 96/5).

Je donne la parole au Président du Comité des questions constitutionnelles et juridiques, qui va nous parler du point 14.1: Immunité de juridiction de l'Organisation en Italie.

IV. CONSTITUTIONAL AND LEGAL MATTERS

IV. QUESTIONS CONSTITUTIONNELLES ET JURIDIQUES

IV. ASUNTOS CONSTITUCIONALES Y JURIDICOS.

9. Report on the Fifty-third Session of the Committee on Constitutional and Legal Matters (Rome, 16-18 October 1989) including:

9. Rapport de la cinquante-troisième session du Comité des questions constitutionnelles et juridiques (Rome, 16-18 octobre 1989) notamment:

9. Informe del 53- periodo de sesiones del Comité de Asuntos Constitucionales y Jurídicos (Roma, 16-18 de octubre de 1989) en particular:

9.1 Immunity of the Organization from Legal Process in Italy

9.1 Immunité de juridiction de l'Organisation en Italie

9.1 Inmunidad de procedimiento judicial de la Organización en Italia

F. POULIDES (Chairman, Committee on Constitutional and Legal Matters): I have the honour to present to the Council, the Report of the 53rd Session of the Committee on Constitutional and Legal Matters. The first item is item 14.1, Immunity of the Organization from Legal Process in Italy.

The CCLM was informed of events which had taken place in regard to two legal actions against FAO which were pending in the Italian Courts. One case involved a former Italian General Service staff member whose appointment had not been renewed and who was arguing that the Italian Courts had jurisdiction over her employment relationship with the Organization and that Italian labour law was applicable. The second case was one involving a firm that previously provided official removal services for FAO. The matter had been discussed by the CCLM at its 52nd Session in May 1989, at which time it had expressed deep concern over the possibility that the Italian courts might not fully recognize the immunity of the Organization.

Since that time, the matter had been discussed in the joint meeting of the Programme Committee and the Finance Committee in May 1989 and subsequently at the 95th Session of the Council in June 1989. At that Session, the Council had underlined the necessity that the immunity of the Organization from every form of legal process in Italy be fully respected and expressed support for the steps being taken by the Director-General.

The Director-General had written to the Italian Government in June 1989, in accordance with mandate given to him by the Conference in 1987, to request the services of the Avvocatura Generale dello Stato to defend the Organization's immunity in court. A presidential decree, promulgated in June 1989, authorized the Avvocatura Generale dello Stato to do so. Moreover, the Director-General had met the Secretary-General of the Italian Ministry for Foreign Affairs in June 1989 to discuss the question of the Organization's immunity; subsequently, a first informal meeting had been held with the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs in September 1989 to discuss the conclusion of an agreement on the interpretation of the Headquarters Agreement. The CCLM welcomed the actions being taken by the Director-General and hoped that these would lead to full recognition of the immunity of the Organization by the Italian courts. This item is submitted to the Council for information and, of course, for whatever comments the Council might wish to make.

LE PRESIDENT: Je remercie l'Ambassadeur Poulides et je lui donne maintenant la parole pour exposer le point 14.2: Adhésion de la FAO à la Convention sur la notification rapide d'un accident nucléaire et à la Convention sur l'assistance en cas d'accident nucléaire ou situation d'urgence radiologique.

9.2 Convention on Early Notification of a Nuclear Accident and Convention on Assistance in the Case of a Nuclear Accident or Radiological Emergency: Accession by FAO

9.2 Adhésion de la FAO à la Convention sur la notification rapide d'un accident nucléaire et à la Convention sur l'assistance en cas d'accident nucléaire ou de situation d'urgence radiologique

9.2 Convención sobre la pronta notificación de accidentes nucleares y Convención sobre asistencia en caso de accidente nuclear o emergencia radiológica: adhesión de la FAO

F. POULIDES (Chairman, Committee on Constitutional and Legal Matters): The two Conventions submitted to the CCLM had both been adopted by the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency in September 1986 in the wake of the Chernobyl nuclear accident which had dramatically underlined the global significance of the release of radioactive contaminants into the environment and the importance of international cooperation at the level of the United Nations. The Conventions entered into force respectively in 1986 and 1987. Both Conventions are open for accession by international organizations and, in fact, the World Health Organization acceded to these Conventions in August 1988. A brief description of the Conventions is contained in the Report of the CCLM.

The CCLM first considered FAO's constitutional mandate in matters covered by the Conventions and concluded that the subject matter of the Conventions would fall within the competence and constitutional mandate of FAO. The Committee also considered the legal implications of accession by FAO to the Conventions and concluded that FAO's accession to the Conventions would, above all, be a symbolic act, confirming its readiness to cooperate actively with States and other organizations in taking measures within its field of competence in the case of nuclear accidents.

It should be noted that one member of the Committee expressed reservations concerning the accession of international organizations to the two Conventions. These reservations were not shared by the other members of the Committee.

The CCLM was of the opinion that it would be proper from a legal point of view for the Council to approve FAO's accession to the two Conventions and for the Conference to authorize FAO's becoming a party thereto. Thus, the Council is being asked to grant its approval for FAO to accede to these Conventions.

LE PRESIDENT: Nous demandons donc l'accord du Conseil pour que la FAO puisse adhérer à ces deux conventions.

Jean-Luc GRAEVE (France): La question de l'adhésion de l'OAA aux deux conventions de Vienne sur la notification rapide et l'assistance en cas d'accident nucléaire a été examinée en octobre dernier par le Comité des questions constitutionnelles et juridiques (CQCJ).

Mon pays, représenté au CQCJ, ne s'est pas opposé à la conclusion faite par les autres membres qu'il n'existait pas d'obstacle juridique à l'adhésion de l'OAA aux deux conventions. Je ne souhaiterais pas revenir à ce stade sur les aspects juridiques du débat.

Ma délégation voudrait, en revanche, mentionner dans l'enceinte du Conseil les inconvénients d'ordre pratique d'une telle adhésion. Ces inconvénients, je le précise, visent l'ensemble du système des Nations Unies et pas seulement l'OAA. Mon pays estime certes souhaitable la participation de tous les organes des Nations Unies, chacun dans son domaine de compétence, à la réalisation des objectifs de ces deux conventions. Elle est d'ailleurs prévue aux Article 4(B) de la Convention sur la notification 2.1 et 5 (E) de la Convention sur l'assistance. Cette participation s'effectue, comme l'ont voulu les rédacteurs de ces deux conventions, sous l'égide de l'AIEA, afin d'en assurer la cohésion et l'efficacité.

L'adhésion des organisations internationales, et donc de l'OAA, aux deux conventions elles-mêmes ne nous apparaît ni nécessaire ni utile. L'AIEA n'est du reste pas partie à ces deux conventions. De simples arrangements entre l'AIEA et l'OAA pourraient être envisagés pour l'application des deux conventions de septembre 1986, comme cela a été le cas pour deux autres institutions, l'Organisation météorologique mondiale (OMM) et l'UNDRO. C'est le rôle de coordination de l'agence, essentiel pour la réalisation des objectifs des deux conventions, que nous entendons préserver.

Il existe en effet un risque que l'adhésion de nombreuses organisations internationales aux deux conventions puisse avoir des effets contraires à leurs objectifs, dans la mesure où elle entraînerait leurs secrétariats à créer des réseaux et des mécanismes d'information et d'assistance parallèles à ceux dont la coordination est assurée par l'AIEA.

En conclusion, la délégation française, si elle est seule à maintenir ses réserves, ne s'opposera pas à un consensus sur la question de l'adhésion. Je souhaite toutefois que mon intervention soit prise en compte dans le rapport final du Conseil. Notre seul objectif doit être, dans les conséquences de cette adhésion sur le programme de travail de l'Organisation, de veiller à ce qu'elle n'interfère pas avec les principes de répartition des compétences au sein du système des Nations Unies et ne compromette pas les objectifs de cohérence des conventions.

Steven HILL (United States of America): The United States delegation supports FAO's accession to these Conventions. We participated in CCLM's discussions on this issue, and I would only like to add here that we expect that any costs involved will be absorbed into the regular budget.

C. Srinivasa SASTRY (India): May I enquire what the costs involved will be?

LEGAL COUNSEL: I understand that the costs would be minimal, and I presume that the costs would be merely the costs of attending meetings, etc. I do not think any new posts are envisaged with respect to this particular function of FAO.

Might I at this point also respond to the related question from the delegate of France. On the point raised by France, I should like to point out that the purpose of the Organization becoming a party to the two Conventions was to signify the willingness of the Organization to become part of the system of information exchange and assistance, in the case of a nuclear emergency, set up by the Conventions. There is no need or intention on the part of FAO to set up a separate system that would duplicate the IAEA system. Arrangements are already in place that would allow the Organization to become an effective part of that system through, for example, discussions on the kind of action that can be taken in nuclear emergencies, designation of contact points and the establishment of appropriate procedures.

I hope that that will satisfy the queries raised by the delegate of France and also by the delegate of India.

LE PRESIDENT: S'il n'y a pas d'autres questions, nous pouvons retenir le principe de cette adhésion avec la réserve de la délégation française, pour qu'elle figure dans le rapport du Conseil.

10. European Commission for the Control of Foot-and-Mouth Disease: Amendment to the Commission's Constitution

10. Commission européenne de lutte contre la fièvre aphteuse: amendement à l'Acte constitutif

10. Comisión Europea para la Lucha contra la Fiebre Aftosa: enmienda de la Constitución

F. POULIDES (Chairman, Committee on Constitutional and Legal Matters): In its Twenty-eighth Session in April 1989, the European Commission for the Control of Foot-and-Mouth Disease adopted an amendment to paragraph 1 of Article I of its Constitution. The purpose of the amendment is to enlarge the criteria for membership in the Commission. In addition to States situated geographically in Europe which are already eligible for membership, the amendment would also grant eligibility for membership to States participating as members in the FAO European Regional Conference and serviced by the FAO European Regional Office. The Committee noted that in accordance with Article XIV of the Constitution of the Commission, amendments thereto shall become effective only with the concurrence of the Council. Accordingly, the Director-General has submitted the amendment to the CCLM review. The CCLM reviewed the amendment in order to verify that it was consistent with the Basic Texts of the Organization, and in particular with Section R thereof, which contains principles and procedures which should govern Conventions and Agreements concluded under Article XIV of the Constitution. The CCLM concluded that the proposed amendment was consistent with the Basic Texts and recommended to the Council that it adopt the Resolution which is to be found in paragraph 39 of the Report of the CCLM. Therefore, this matter is being submitted to the Council for decision.

LE PRESIDENT: Je remercie Monsieur l'ambassadeur Poulides de sa communication. Le Secrétaire général adjoint a une communication à faire au Conseil.

LE SECRETAIRE GENERAL ADJOINT: La délégation de l'Argentine nous prie d'insérer son intervention qu'elle n'a pas pu faire parce que retenue au Comité de rédaction. Si le conseil est d'accord, nous allons l'insérer au procès-verbal de cet après-midi.

Victor MACHINEA (Argentina): La fiebre aftosa diferencia muy netamente el mercado mundial de carnes rojas, por lo tanto sugerimos se difundan con la máxima celeridad las conclusiones y recomendaciones de cada organismo regional, entre sí, y a los Estados Miembros, a efectos de que corrijan o intensifiquen sus planes y políticas en consecuencia.

La FAO debería ser el órgano encargado de dicha difusión con la máxima urgencia posible, especialmente en aquellos casos que, previsiblemente las conclusiones técnicas puedan incidir en la comercialización de carnes o subproductos de origen ganadero, como por ejemplo Recomendaciones sobre vacunas, o sobre métodos de detección y control diagnóstico en aduanas, etc.

LE PRESIDENT: Y a-t-il d'autres interventions sur ce point? Nous pouvons considérer que le Conseil est d'accord et approuve la résolution proposée dans le rapport du CCLM.

1 Texto incluido en las actas a petición expresa.

- 11. Other Constitutional and Legal Matters, including:
- 11. Autres questions constitutionnelles et juridiques, notamment:
- 11. Otros asuntos constitucionales y jurídicos, en particular:
- 11.2 Invitations to International Non-Governmental Organizations which do not have Status with FAO.
- 11.2 Invitations d'organisations internationales non gouvernementales n'ayant pas de statut officiel auprès de la FAO.
- 11.2 Invitaciones a organizaciones internacionales no gubernamentales que no mantienen relaciones oficiales con la FAO.
- 11.3 Changes in Representation of Member Nations on the Programme Committee.
- 11.3 Modifications de la représentation des Etats Membres au Comité du Programme.
- 11.3 Cambios en la representación de los Estados Miembros en el Comité del Programa.

Eberhard E. LÜHE (Director, Office for Inter-Agency Affairs): Mr Chairman, I think I can be very brief. The document in front of you is CL 96/INF/5. As you know, in accordance with the rules of the Basic Texts, it is normal practice for the Director-General to invite Intergovernmental and International Non-Governmental Organizations which have official status with FAO to send observers to FAO Technical Meetings on subjects within their specific fields of competence. However, as indicated in the document in front of you, FAO consults and invites from time to time International Non-Governmental Organizations which do not have official status with FAO. This is done in order to obtain expert advice and information on specific questions, especially in technical fields. The document in front of you contains information on technical meetings which were held during the 1988-89 biennium, to which FAO has invited International Non-Governmental Organizations which have active working relationships, as we call it, with FAO.

This Report is submitted to the Council in accordance with the request which was made to the Director-General at the Forty-ninth Session of the Council which was in the Fall of 1967.

I think I should re-emphasize that this is an information document, and therefore it does not require any specific action by the Council. However, are there any questions?

LE PRESIDENT: Je remercie M. Lühe de sa communication. Y a-t-il des demandes d'éclaircissement ou des observations?

LE SECRETAIRE GENERAL ADJOINT: Il y a un changement dans la représentation des Etats Membres au Comité du Programme, en l'occurrence, la représentation de l'Argentine à partir du 11 septembre. Le Directeur général a reçu une lettre de son Excellence Roberto Dalton, Ministre plénipotentiaire et Représentant permanent de la République d'Argentine auprès de la FAO, qui l'informait qu'il remplaçait son Excellence Keller Sarmiento en qualité de Représentant à la cinquante-huitième session du Comité du programme. Le document contient aussi le curriculum vitae de M. Dalton et est transmis au Conseil pour information.

LE PRESIDENT: Je remercie M. Tedesco de cette information. Nous connaissons tous M. Dalton et sa compétence.

- V. OTHER MATTERS (continued)
- V. AUTRES QUESTIONS (suite)
- V. OTROS ASUNTOS (continuación)
- 13. Date and Place of the Ninety-seventh Session of the Council.
- 13. Date et lieu de la quatre-vingt-dix-septième session du Conseil.
- 13. Fecha y lugar del 97- periodo de sesiones del Consejo.

LE SECRETAIRE GENERAL ADJOINT: C'est là aussi une question assez simple. Il est propose de tenir la prochaine session du Conseil, la quatre-vingt-dix-septième, au Siège de la FAO, le 1er décembre 1989, ou plus tôt si la vingt-cinquième session de la Conférence s'achève avant la date prévue.

LE PRESIDENT: Je crois que nous pouvons être d'accord avec cette proposition. Avant de lever la séance, je voudrais remercier tous les délégués présents et tous ceux qui sont au Comité de rédaction pour leur patience et leur sens des responsabilités car la journée a été rude. J'espère que nous aurons demain une journée constructive nous permettant de conclure efficacement les travaux du Conseil,

The meeting rose at 19.00 hours.

La sance est levée a 19 heures.

Se levanta la sesión a las 19 horas.

council

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

conseil

ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ALIMENTATION ET L'AGRICULTURE

consejo

ORGANIZACION DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA LA AGRICULTURA Y LA ALIMENTACION

CL

CL 96/PV/9

Ninety-sixth Session

Quatre-vingt-seizième session

96º periodo de sesiones

NINTH PLENARY MEETING
NEUVIEME SEANCE PLENIERE
NOVENA SESION PLENARIA
10 November 1989

The Ninth Plenary Meeting was opened at 10.15 hours, Lassaad Ben Osman, Independent Chairman of the Council, presiding

La neuvième séance plénière est ouverte à 10 h 15, sous la présidence de Lassaad Ben Osman, Président indépendant du Conseil

Se abre la novena sesión plenaria a las 10.15 horas, bajo la presidencia de Lassaad Ben Osman, Presidente Independiente del Consejo

ADOPTION OF REPORT

ADOPTION DU RAPPORT

APROBACION DEL INFORME

LE PRESIDENT: Nous ouvrons la seance avec, à l'ordre du jour, l'analyse et l'adoption du rapport élaboré par le Comité de rédaction.

Avant de commencer nos travaux, je voudrais donner la parole à Madame le Président du Comité de rédaction qui va faire le point du travail réalisé par ce Comité. Je vous signale que celui-ci a travaillé jusqu'à 3 heures du matin.

Sra. Mónica DEREGIBUS (Argentina): Presidenta del Comité de Redacción. Señor Presidente, el Comité de Redacción se reunió el miércoles y el jueves por la noche y pudo examinar una buena parte de la documentación que le había sido sometida. Lamentablemente, y pese a todos los esfuerzos desplegados, el Comité no pudo terminar de considerar los borradores que le habían sido presentados.

El día de ayer, cuando terminamos nuestra sesión a las 2.45 de la mañana, o sea en el día de hoy diría yo, quedaban sin terminar de resolver, aunque en buena vía de solución, las cuestiones del Examen de la FAO; un párrafo referido al programa de Labores y Presupuesto para el bienio próximo, y dos o tres pequeños documentos referidos al Comité de Finanzas.

Han sido aprobados por el Comité los temas 1, 2 y 3 de la agenda, que son los que se refieren a los que usted acaba de mencionar.

Yo creo que tal vez podríamos pensar, Señor Presidente, en la posibilidad de coordinar la sesión del Comité de Redacción, si usted está de acuerdo, para terminar las cuestiones sustantivas pendientes.

DRAFT REPORT - PART I

PROJET DE RAPPORT - PREMIERE PARTIE

PROYECTO DEL INFORME - PARTE I

LE PRESIDENT: Nous allons prendre le document CL 96/REP/1 qui traite les points relatifs au Bureau de la Conférence. Nous pourrions donc analyser ces points, ce qui est nécessaire pour le travail du Comité des candidatures.

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): Estamos agradecidos, Señor Presidente, a la distinguida colega y amiga Mónica DEREGIBUS, quien no obstante haber dormido poco ha explicado muy bien la situación reinante en el Comité de Redacción.

No es éste el momento de abrir polémicas ni controversias, sino de ayudar a usted y al Consejo a que concluyamos nuestros trabajos satisfactoriamente. Propongo concretamente que la primera parte del Proyecto de Informe sea adoptado sin discusión en bloque, ya esa parte comprende el párrafo 8 que incluye el Comité de Candidaturas, que luego se haga necesaria y forzosamente un intervalo en la reunión del Consejo mientras llegan los documentos siguientes y que paralelamente el Comité de Redacción vuelva a reunirse, pero que si una vez que el Consejo haya agotado el material que tiene a su disposición y el Comité de Redacción no ha terminado su trabajo, que el material restante pase directamente al Consejo, como ya se ha hecho en otras ocasiones, ya que necesitamos terminar hoy para que el Comité de Candidaturas se reúna esta tarde y la Conferencia empiece mañana.

Espero que esté clara mi propuesta y que la Presidenta del Comité de Redacción haya tomado nota.

LE PRESIDENT: Si j'ai bien compris l'intervention du délégué de la Colombie, il souhaiterait que nous terminions le point qui est relatif aux membres du Comité des candidatures, que nous laissions travailler le Comité de rédaction et que nous nous réunissions à une heure précise pour achever notre travail. C'est bien cela?

Gonzalo BOLA HOTOS (Colombia): Mi propuesta, Señor Presidente es: primero adoptar en bloque esta parte ya que no ofrece dificultades, y como no hay ningún otro material a disposición del Consejo, tendremos que levantar la sesión, pero una vez que esté disponible la parte 2 reanudaremos la reunión y en la medida en que avancemos aquí si el Comité de Redacción no concluye sus trabajos el material restante lo podríamos discutir directamente en esta sala.

LE PRESIDENT: Il me semble que c'est une méthode très claire. Nous pourrions donc adopter les points relatifs au bureau de la Conférence dans le document CL 96/REP/1, les présidents des Commissions, le Comité des candidatures, la Conférence McDougall et les invitations.

Pouvons-nous adopter ce document en bloc? Je considère que le Conseil adopte tous les paragraphes, le paragraphe 13 inclus, du document CL 96/REP/1.

Paragraph 1 approved

Le paragraphe 1 est approuvé

El párrafo 1 es aprobado

Paragraphs 2 and 3 approved

Les paragraphes 2 et 3 sont approuvés

Los párrafos 2 y 3 son aprobados

Paragraphs 4 and 5 approved

Les paragraphes 4 et 5 sont approuvés

Los párrafos 4 y 5 son aprobados

Paragraph 6 approved

Le paragraphe 6 est approuvé

El párrafo 6 es aprobado

Paragraphs 7 to 9 approved

Les paragraphes 7 a 9 sont approuvés

Los párrafos 7 a 9 son aprobados

Paragraphs 10 to 13 approved

Les paragraphes 10 a 13 sont approuvés

Los párrafos 10 a 13 son aprobados

Draft Report of Plenary, Part I, was adopted

Projet de rapport de la plénière, première partie, est adoptée

El proyecto de informe de la plenaria, Parte I, es aprobado

The meeting rose at 10.30 hours

La sèance est levée a 10 h 30

Se levanta la sesión a las 10.30 horas

council

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

conseil

ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ALIMENTATION ET L'AGRICULTURE

consejo

ORGANIZACION DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA LA AGRICULTURA Y LA ALIMENTACION

CL

CL 96/PV/10

Ninety-sixth Session

Quatre-vingt-seizième session

96º periodo de sesiones

TENTH PLENARY MEETING
DIXIEME SEANCE PLENIERE
DECIMA SESION PLENARIA
10 November 1989

The Tenth Plenary Meeting was opened at 15.00 hours Lassaad Ben Osman, Independent Chairman of the Council, presiding

La dixième séance plénière est ouverte à 15 heures sous la présidence de Lassaad Ben Osman, Président indépendant du Conseil

Se abre la Décima Sesión Plenaria a las 15 horas bajo la presidencia de Lassaad Ben Osman, Presidente Independiente del Consejo

LE PRESIDENT: Honorables Délégués. Mesdames et Messieurs, nous nous excusons de ce petit retard mais vous comprendrez que le Comité de rédaction a travaillé très dur jusqu'à trois heures moins le quart et le problème matériel d'impression fait que le rapport vient seulement d'être distribué.

Je donne la parole à Mme la Présidente du Comité de rédaction qui nous fera un exposé sur les travaux de ce Comité.

ADOPTION OF THE REPORT (continued)

ADOPTION DU RAPPORT (suite)

APROBACION DEL INFORME (continuación)

Sra. Mónica DEREGIBŪS (Presidenta del Comité de Redacción): En nombre del Comité de Redacción, quiero dar las gracias al Consejo, que nos dio la oportunidad de volvernos a reunir esta mañana. En este rato que tuvimos, pudimos solucionar algunas cuestiones pendientes, que eran de mucha envergadura; hubiera sido una pena que no se consideraran por el Comité de Redacción, a fin de poder facilitar la tarea del Plenario. En nuestra reunión de esta mañana, pudimos terminar las cuestiones pendientes con relación al Programa de Labores y Presupuesto del bienio 1990-91 y al Examen de la FAO. Lamentablemente, no nos alcanzó el tiempo para analizar la cuestión de la situación financiera de la Organización.

Los documentos que se refieren a la situación financiera de la Organización, al informe del Comité de Productos Básicos, a la Conferencia Internacional de Nutrición, a las reuniones no realizadas, a las cuestiones legales y a la fecha y lugar del próximo Consejo, no han sido vistos, por no contarse con tiempo para ello, por el Comité de Redacción. Con relación a los documentos que han sido distribuidos, el CL 96/REP/2, que se refiere al Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para 1990-91 y a los objetivos de mediano plazo, se debería tomar nota de que los párrafos 14 y 15 del Programa de Labores y Presupuesto están modificados. Estos dos párrafos han sido acordados esta mañana por el Comité de Redacción y van a venir más adelante. Estos párrafos que figuran aquí no están aprobados, sino que los párrafos aprobados son otros que vendrán a posteriori. Con relación al documento sobre el Examen de la FAO, que será el REP/3, y que no sé si ustedes tienen, los párrafos 7 y 8 están modificados, así que no tienen que tomar en consideración los textos que figuran en los párrafos 7 y 8.

Los temas que el Comité de Redacción no ha podido considerar van a ser incluidos en los documentos REP/4 y REP/5.

LE PRESIDENT: En votre nom, je voudrais remercier tous les membres du Comité de rédaction pour le temps précieux qu'ils ont consacré à la préparation de ce projet. Hier, ils ont travaillé jusqu'à trois heures moins le quart du matin, et ce matin de 10 h 30 jusqu'à 14 h 30 sans interruption. En votre nom à tous, je les remercie du sérieux et de la conscience avec lesquels ils ont assumé leurs responsabilités.

DRAFT REPORT - PART II

PROJET DE RAPPORT - DEUXIEME PARTIE

PROYECTO DE INFORME - PARTE II

PARAGRAPHS 1 TO 15

PARAGRAPHE 1 A 15

PARRAFOS 1 A 15

Igor MARINCEK (Switzerland): On paragraph 5 I have two observations. The first is with regard to, "Some members questioned the rationale and received clarification..." In the opinion of our delegation, it should be "explanation". We are still not clear, so we would prefer to have "explanation" in the first sentence.

In the third sentence it says, "The Council in general stressed that cost developments were beyond the control of the Organization..." There I would suggest that we introduce the word "largely" so that it would read "... were largely beyond control of the Organization..." I think the idea behind this is that maybe price developments are beyond the control of the Organization, but cost is a different thing. Cost is largely beyond the control.

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): La primera enmienda de Suiza no nos ofrece dificultades. La segunda no la entendimos. Ojalá que se repita y se explique claramente qué es lo que se quiere decir y dónde.

Igor MARINCEK (Switzerland): I said that we should amend the sentence which at the moment reads, "The Council in general stressed that cost developments were beyond the control of the Organization..." We think one cannot say this in these absolute terms, and we would suggest that we should say, "... were largely beyond the control of the Organization..." I have already given the explanation.

Muhammad Saleen KHAN (Pakistan): I am afraid that my delegation cannot agree with this proposal because all of us over here are very clear that the financial crisis has perpetuated all these problems and that they were beyond the control of the Organization. We cannot accept this proposal. I think that the wording that has come from the Drafting Committee is very appropriate.

João Augusto DE MEDICIS (Brazil): As I understand it, "largely beyond the control" does not refer to the crisis caused by the lack of implementation of payments but to the cost increases, and I think that "largely" could be accepted in that sense. It does not at all affect our feelings towards the nonpayment by a number of countries, including my own.

LE PRESIDENT: On pourrait retenir le premier amendement de Monsieur le délégué de la Suisse, à savoir de remplacer "éclaircissements" par "explications".

Et si le délégué de la Suisse en convient on pourrait laisser le texte en l'état. Acceptez-vous qu'on se limite au premier amendement?

Igor MARINCEK (Switzerland): This paragraph speaks about the absorption of US\$ 3 million, and I refer to the last sentence of the paragraph. I think what was made clear was a little different. The sentence reads, "Some members, however, did not agree with this approach", meaning that the result is 0.45 percent. I think it should read, "Some members, however, did not agree with this conclusion." I would change "approach" to "conclusion". That is what was explained by many delegations, including mine.

Sra. Mercedes FERMIN GOMEZ (Venezuela): En realidad, no creo que se puede considerar que hay una equivalencia de la palabra "enfoque" por "conclusión". Cambia totalmente el sentido de esto. La conclusión se refiere a todo el número 6, pero el "enfoque" es un punto de vista, una manera de ver. De manera que nosotros consideramos que habría que buscar un sinónimo de enfoque, pero jamás considerar que conclusión es sinónimo de "enfoque". No estamos de acuerdo. Pienso que no sería correcto.

Raymond ALLEN (United Kingdom): I should like to go along with the comments made by Switzerland. If one does decide that the budget is only 0.45 percent, then that is a conclusion. A number of delegations here do not agree that that is the conclusion.

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): La observación de la distinguida embajadora de Venezuela es adecuada. Podríamos dar una interpretación equivocada al usar el término conclusión. Podríamos acaso proponer para atender la intervención de Suiza y apoyada por Reino Unido, decir: "de acuerdo con ese cálculo", "ese cálculo".

LE PRESIDENT: On peut adopter "le calcul" au lieu de...

Gerhard LIEBER (Germany, Federal Republic of): We fully agree with what the Ambassador of Colombia has said. That is exactly what was meant.

LE PRESIDENT: Certains membres n'ont pas partagé le mode de calcul. C'est bien cela? Ce mode de calcul ou cette opinion? On prend mode de calcul? C'est "mode de calcul". Sous réserve de cette modification êtes-vous d'accord d'adopter ce paragraphe?

Paragraphe 6, approuvé; Paragraphe 7, approuvé; Paragraphe 8, approuvé;

Paragraphe 9, approuvé; Paragraphe 10, approuvé; Paragraphe 11, ?

Muhammad Saleem KHAN (Pakistan): The last sentence of paragraph 11 reads, "Most members, however, who also addressed the issue objected to any attempt to link the two matters in any manner". I think it was a majority of the members who spoke. I thought there were 46 members who spoke who said we should not link the two issues. This is a very weak representation of what the members said.

Mauricio CUADRA (Nicaragua): Nosotros estamos de acuerdo con lo expuesto por la delegación de Pakistan. Además notamos que se viene en la redacción haciendo un cambio. Quisiéramos que se mantuviera el orden lógico de exponer primero en el párrafo lo que la mayoría de los Miembros o el Consejo pidió, y al final lo que la minoría o un pequeño número de delegaciones pidió, y aquí se invierte el texto. Creo que está también así en el 5 y en algunos otros párrafos, en el 14 también aparece. Que se mantenga un orden, por favor. Y señalamos que la mayor parte de los Miembros pedimos que no se hiciera ninguna vinculación entre ambos temas.

Gerhard LIEBER (Germany, Federal Republic of): I have no difficulty whatsoever with the proposal of the delegate of Nicaragua but I think that the order as put before us by the Drafting Committee is correct insofar as this problem was brought up by the minority. In my opinion, it will be logical to give the opinion of the minority first because a minority caused the problem and then the majority reacted. But it is of minor importance really.

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): En primer lugar, creemos que el colega de Pakistán tiene razón y también el colega de Nicaragua, pero nos convencer un poco los argumentos del colega y amigo Lieber, de la República Federal de Alemania. Por eso proponemos que el párrafo 11 quede en el orden en que está redactado actualmente, pero que la última frase se refuerce de la manera siguiente: la última frase del párrafo 11 sería: "La gran mayoría de los Miembros del Consejo pusieron objeciones a cualquier intento...". Esa gran mayoría sería coherente con el pequeño número de que se habla al principio del párrafo 11.

LE PRESIDENT: Peut-on retenir la proposition suivante qui paraît logique: remplacer "la plupart des autres" par "la grande majorité des Membres du Conseil se sont opposés..."?

Muhammad Saleem KHAN (Pakistan): I think we would have no objection to what the distinguished Ambassador in his experience has said here except that we would not like to see the words "who also addressed". I think "the majority of the members", like the Ambassador from Colombia proposed. We agree with that.

Atif Y. BUKHARI (Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of) (original language Arabic): Mr Chairman, as a matter of fact paragraph 11 should have reflected first the point of view of the majority of Member States, and this has been the custom in the Council. However, in order to avoid opening endless discussions we do concur with what has been said by His Excellency, the Ambassador of Colombia, by saying "the vast majority of members of the Council", and we delete the phrase saying "who also addressed the issue".

David McGAFFEY (United States of America): It has become a rule in the drafting committee that the majority allows the minority to express what their views are, and the minority allows the majority to express their views. I do not have any comments on the phrasing but you all know that we are late and that some documents have not been considered by the drafting committee. I would say that most of the hours futilely spent in the drafting committee were wasted in discussions on number words - most, many, some, few, me and my aunt or whatever. I do not know what a vast majority is. This is hardly a multitude; there are forty-five members. I would appeal, not only on this paragraph but throughout, to avoid trying to characterize the sizes of majorities and minorities, and try to present the views of the Council to the Conference so that we can assist them in reaching conclusions rather than scoring the points upon another group.

I would support the proposed language by Pakistan in preference saying "most members who spoke".

Sra. Mercedes FERMIN GOMEZ (Venezuela): Yo no quiero caer en lo mismo que mi vecino de los Estados Unidos, no voy a hablar mucho. Simplemente voy a decir que estoy de acuerdo con lo que ha agregado el Embajador de Colombia: "la gran mayoría". Pero voy a asociar mi aprobación a eliminar "que también se ocuparon del tema", porque parece que fuera una cosa accidental, que pasaron por ahí y se ocuparon del tema. No, "la gran mayoría" forma parte de la Comisión, y tiene derecho, como muy bien ha dicho nuestro Delegado de Estados Unidos, a decir su palabra con igual derecho que la minoría. Así que la frase "que también se ocuparon del tema" sobra, porque desde luego que estaban allí para ocuparse del tema.

Por consiguiente, sería: "la gran mayoría de los miembros, sin embargo, pusieron objeciones a cualquier intento", etcétera.

Muhammad Saleem KHAN (Pakistan): I apologize Mr Chairman. I think what I said was misunderstood by the distinguished delegate of the United States of America because I said exactly what the distinguished delegate of Venezuela has said now, and if that is acceptable I have no problems.

LE PRESIDENT: Pouvons-nous dire, comme nous le propose la Colombie, à la place de: "La plupart des membres", "La majorité des membres"?

Michel MOMBOULI (Congo): Pour notre part, nous ne voyons pas d'objection à la proposition de la Colombie. Mais si nous intervenons, c'est pour vous demander ainsi qu'aux autres membres du Conseil que la mention "intervenus" soit supprimée, parce que en effet c'est une nouvelle notion qui commence à apparaître dans le rapport. Il vaut mieux parler de l'ensemble des membres du Conseil sans spécifier ceux qui sont intervenus. On pourrait mettre par exemple: "Certains membres du Conseil ont estimé". Ensuite on pourrait ajouter l'amendement de la Colombie.

Atif Y. BUKHARI (Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of): I believe, Mr Chairman, that I do not have much to say except to agree to what has been said by Venezuela and as you have proposed finally, Mr Chairman and I believe that the members of the Council are 49. We do not know exactly the number of those who supported this matter. I thank you, Sir.

Barl W. WEYBRECHT (Canada): Mr Chairman, we support the concern raised by the delegate of the United States, particularly with respect to any attempt to qualify the extent of the majority or to qualify the references to few members. Mr. Chairman, if we attempt to do this I agree we will end up having quite an extensive discussion on this terminology throughout the course of our consideration of not only this report but also other reports that come up.

So I support the concern mentioned by the United States and would like to see the original wording retained as it was presented by the drafting group.

David COUTTS (Australia): As I am on the drafting group I do not want to take the time of the Council, but we had about a three hour discussion on this matter. The reason it was particularly important to my delegation is that the first part of the paragraph is a position that my delegation takes, and we were trying to take that position to be helpful and constructive and positive in terms of the consideration of the budget. In other words, we were not saying we would close off any thought on reaching consensus of the budget, but we just said that in our situation we wanted to know that is going to happen with the review.

We had a long discussion in the drafting committee about this last sentence. We came to the conclusion as is expressed here - and this has already been said - that while quite a few members of Council may hold this view, they did not say so, and therefore the most accurate way to express it is as it is expressed here.

Now in the spirit of moving on, I would accept "Most members objected to any attempt to link the two matters in any such manner". I certainly could not accept anything further than that - vast majorities or anything like that. It is not true anyway, quite apart from anything else. I would prefer the wording that is here, but if others can agree to "most members objected" then I am prepared to do that. I must say it saddens me a little because we are trying to be constructive in the early part of that paragraph. We are not trying to link them to be destructive but constructive.

Assefa YILALA (Ethiopia): With the intention of moving I will be very brief. The formulation that was proposed by the distinguished Ambassador of Colombia indicating the vast majority at the beginning, and also the proposal made by the representative of Pakistan on deletion of the phrase "who also addressed the issue" is acceptable to us if this can help in moving the discussion faster.

Sra. Graflia SOTO CARRERO (Cuba): En realidad, pensábamos que no tendríamos que intervenir en este párrafo, porque de inicio nos pareció bastante equilibrada la presentación que nos hizo el Comité de Redacción; pero, dada la pequeña controversia que se ha suscitado, la Delegación de Cuba estaría más conforme con la propuesta hecha por el distinguido Delegado de Colombia.

E.P. ALLEYNE (Trinidad and Tobago): Mr Chairman, the concern of this delegation is to facilitate the most accurate record of the deliberations and the conclusions moving on to the Conference. I think that if in fact it was the majority, and for that matter if it was the vast majority, I think that the sentence should so reflect. If Mr Chairman a suggestion is made that we say "the vast majority" and there are some doubts that that is correct, then the Council is here in session, so if you do not hear a large number saying that the proposal for a "vast majority" is incorrect, then it is correct.

It is important, as I said, that we put forward an accurate record. The Conference must get the best possible guidance from the Council, so that what we set forth must be clear. There must not be anything hidden: it must be transparent, and I think that is the point of view we would like to make.

Sra. Monica DEREGIBUS (Presidenta del Comité de Redacción): Yo quisiera tratar de cooperar para no ver reflejadas en el Plenario del Consejo las situaciones que estuvimos viviendo en los últimos días en el Comité de Redacción. Quisiera, a través de usted, señor Presidente, decirles a los miembros del Consejo que, prácticamente, cada palabra de las que ellos van a encontrar en

estos párrafos ha sido analizada por el Comité de Redacción ha sido pesada, evaluada y equilibrada con otras palabras. Quedan muchos REP para ver y quedan muchas cosas que el Comité de Redacción no vio. Tal vez queden sorpresas. Yo quisiera corroborar lo que aquí ha sido dicho, en el sentido que con esta oración, con este párrafo, debemos de haber estado como una hora. Como con muchos otros, porque, si no, no se explica que para aprobar tan pocos párrafos controvertidos hubiéramos utilizado dos noches enteras.

Por consiguiente, yo quisiera a través de usted, repito, señor Presidente, hacer presente al Consejo esta situación y pedir a los miembros del mismo que tengan en cuenta que todo lo que van a encontrar que les llame la atención es producto de un acuerdo. Teniendo eso en mente, tal vez podamos avanzar más rápidamente los trabajos.

LE PRESIDENT: Il y a une divergence entre le texte anglais et le texte français. Dans le texte français, il est dit: "La plupart des autres se sont opposés", il n'est pas dit qu'ils ont pris la parole comme dans le texte anglais. On pourrait peut-être mettre en accord le texte français et le texte anglais pour enlever cette différence. Qu'en pense le Conseil? Est-ce qu'on peut retirer cet ajout du texte anglais?

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): No tengo los textos inglés y francés, idiomas que no conozco, pero quiero insistir en el espíritu de compromiso con que hice mi primera propuesta. Había dicho que estaba de acuerdo con Nicaragua y también con Arabia Saudita, sobre el orden inaceptable de la redacción del párrafo 11. Sin embargo, para que logremos el consenso, propongo lo siguiente: conservar el orden de las frases tal como aparecen en el párrafo 11, y así damos satisfacción también al colega de la República Federal de Alemania. Al principio del párrafo 11, suprimir también - al menos en el texto francés está - las palabras "que se ocuparon del tema" en la primera frase del párrafo 11. Adoptaríamos así esta primera frase. La segunda frase la leo tal como quedaría: "La gran mayoría de los miembros del Consejo pusieron objeciones a cualquier intento de relacionar ambas cuestiones de forma semejante." Esta es una propuesta de compromiso que espero que nos permita avanzar.

David McGAFFEY (United States of America): When I first spoke I talked about what a sterile, difficult and time-consuming effort it is to deal with these matters. I do appeal to the Council to accept the language of the Drafting Committee.

I would have no objection particularly to deleting the phrase "who addressed the issue" from both the first and second sentences, because that is balanced and parallel. However, if they insist on putting in value words to change the weight of the second sentence, I would feel it necessary to contribute value words to increase the weight of the first, for example a phrase something like "a few members who contribute a majority of the resources to FAO". I do not think anybody wants that. If you wish to delete the issue from both the first and second sentences that is balanced and fine; otherwise leave it as it was drafted by the Drafting Committee.

LE PRESIDENT: Voulez-vous que l'on prenne la rédaction suivante: "Parmi les membres du Conseil, quelques-uns ont estimé... mais la plupart des autres membres du Conseil se sont opposés...".

Sra. Mercedes FERMIN GOMEZ (Venezuela): A riesgo de ser un poco incisiva en esto, yo creo que estamos de acuerdo con el contenido de lo que el Comité de Redacción quiere expresar, pero no significa esto que, en aras de ese equilibrio, nosotros podamos decir cosas que no tienen sentido. ¿Cómo que "la mayor parte"? ¿Es que acaso el Consejo tiene partes? Tiene una mayoría y una minoría, no tiene partes. Nosotros no estamos divididos en partes y el Comité de Redacción no puede estar dividido en partes. Entonces, "la mayor parte" - permíteme usted, Presidente - no es lo correcto. "La mayoría" es mayoría. De todas maneras, "la mayoría de los miembros" es la mayor parte de los individuos que estaban allí. Excúseme por la corrección gramatical.

LE PRESIDENT: La majorité et la plupart, c'est la même chose. Si on dit: parmi les membres du Conseil quelques-uns ont estimé, mais la plupart des membres du Conseil se sont opposés, cela revient au même. Si vous acceptez cette rédaction, elle exprime ce que nous voulons.

Atif Y. BUKHARI (Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of)(original language Arabic): Mr Chairman, you are using the French language. I was listening to the English. The English language strengthens the first part of the paragraph. What you said was translated as "some members", and the second part in English has retained "most". I do not know whether this is the same as in French, but in English we have maintained the word "most". I do not know whether we can accept this despite our great respect for you.

Michel MOMBOULI (Congo): Monsieur le Président, nous sommes tout à fait d'accord avec la première proposition que vous avez faite concernant la première phrase du paragraphe 11. En ce qui concerne la fin de ce paragraphe, pour notre part, nous pensons qu'effectivement, comme vous l'avez dit, "la plupart" est proche de "la majorité". Nous avons eu un débat dont il faut tenir compte. Dans un esprit de compromis, il serait peut-être bon de sacrifier le mot "grande" et de conserver "majorité". Puisque nous avons eu un débat sur ce sujet, il faut progresser en ce sens.

João Augusto DE MEDICIS (Brazil): I suggest that we accept the proposal just made by the delegate of Congo and go on to paragraph 12 with no further discussions.

LE PRESIDENT: Je propose au Conseil de retenir la formule suivante: "Parmi les membres du Conseil qui sont intervenus sur ce sujet, quelques-uns ont estimé que... mais la majorité des membres se sont opposés à toute tentative...".

David COUTTS (Australia): Could I ask if the people looking for those wanting to speak could look this way a little more often. I have had my flag up for minutes and no one has been looking at me. But I will agree to that compromise.

LE PRESIDENT : Le paragraphe 11, ainsi amendé, est approuvé. Paragraphe 12 approuvé, paragraphe 13 approuvé.

Gonzalo BULA HOTOS (Colombia): Quisiéramos una explicación, Señor Presidente, ¿estos párrafos 14 y 15 provienen oficialmente del Comité de Redacción o se nos presentan directamente al Consejo?

Sra. Mónica DEREGIBUS (Presidenta del Comité de Redacción): Los párrafos 14 y 15 del REP/2-Corr.1 y los párrafos 7, 8 y 9 del Corr.1 del REP/3 son los textos acordados esta mañana por el Comité de Redacción y han sido objeto de una laboriosa tarea y constituyen la mejor oferta que puede hacer el Comité de Redacción al Plenario del Consejo.

LE PRESIDENT: Nous avons donc les rectificatifs des paragraphes 14 et 15. Les paragraphes 14 et 15 sont approuvés.

Paragraphs 1 to 15, as amended, approved

Les paragraphes 1 à 15 ainsi amendés, sont approuvés

Los párrafos 1 a 15 así enmendados, son aprobados

Paragraphs 16 to 25, including draft resolution, approved

Les paragraphes 16 a 25, y compris le projet de résolution, sont approuvés

Los párrafos 16 a 25, incluido el proyecto de resolución, son aprobados

Draft Report of Plenary Part II, as amended, was adopted

Projet de rapport de la plénière, IIème partie, ainsi amendée, est adoptée

El proyecto de informe de la Plenaria, Parte II, así enmendado, es aprobado

DRAFT REPORT - PART III

PROJET DE RAPPORT - TROISIEME PARTIE

PROYECTO DE INFORME - PARTE III

7. Conclusions of the Review of Certain Aspects of FAO's Goals and Operations (paras 1-9)
7. Conclusions de l'Examen de certains aspects des buts et opérations de la FAO (par. 1-9)
7. Conclusiones del examen de algunos aspectos de los objetivos y operaciones de la FAO (párrs. 1-9)

LE PRESIDENT: Paragraphe 1 approuvé. Paragraphe 2 approuvé, Paragraphe 3 ?

Hannu HALINEN (Finland): I am well aware that this text must be the result of a long and balanced discussion and I admire what has been achieved in paragraph 3. However, I feel that one element which has been discussed during the Council should be in this Report here, because I feel that it is constructive and would be helping the Conference in its considerations. The place for this additional question could perhaps be in paragraph 3 as a new sentence before the last sentence. With your permission, I will read the sentence out. The new penultimate sentence would be as follows: "Some members emphasized priority-setting and medium-term planning in providing framework and guidelines for the Conference consideration".

C. Srinivasa SASTRY (India): Mr Chairman, I have three reactions to the proposed amendment: point 1, in paragraph 3, the first sentence of the Draft reads, "The Council generally endorsed the findings and recommendations of the Committees' report". Our submission is that the Committees' report did refer to medium-term planning and to the extent that the Council endorsed medium-term planning as contained in the Committee SJS Report is already covered.

Second point: we find that in paragraph 7, which the Chairperson of the Drafting Committee has said has been amended, and we are awaiting the amended draft, deals with the portions relating to prioritization and financing. I presume that this be dealt with appropriately in paragraph 7.

Third point: in case the sentence is to be included, it must be mentioned in the Draft that some others - and particularly the Indian delegation - expressed their reservations about the prioritization and about the medium-term planning, because we feel that medium-term planning will have no meaning if there is no commitment of funds over the medium-term.

LE PRESIDENT: Y a-t-il d'autres remarques sur cet amendement?

David McCaffey (United States of America): I think we have just had a repeat of some of the debate in Council. In the Drafting Committee my delegation was able to propose a way of capturing this, together with the delegation of India. We may be able to resolve the problem in the second sentence of paragraph 3. We noted that the discussion had shown divergencies, and it gave a few examples where there were divergencies. Indeed, on subjects that the Committee did discuss, often the Committee had divergencies. I am not sure if Finland would find this acceptable, but perhaps we could resolve this just by adding the words "and medium-term planning" after "priority setting" in the second sentence. We can go to the verbatim and our own notes to discuss the positions held by particular countries on these issues.

LE PRESIDENT: Après les mots "l'établissement des priorités, vous proposez" la planification à moyen terme" ?

Sra. Graflia SOTO CARRERO (Cuba): Muchas gracias, Señor Presidente. En realidad nosotros seguimos apreciando mucho el trabajo del Comité de Redacción y, sinceramente, preferiríamos que todos estos párrafos que sabemos que han sido objeto de largos debates, de largas deliberaciones por ese Comité, hubieran podido ser aprobados por todos nosotros sin mayores complicaciones; pero, en vista de que esto no puede ser así, Señor Presidente, la Delegación de Cuba apoya en todas sus partes la propuesta hecha por el distinguido delegado de la India.

Atif Y. BUKHARI (Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of) (original language Arabic): Mr Chairman, the third paragraph reflects clearly the discussions and conclusions which were reached. We would not wish to add anything to this paragraph, and we would not support the proposal made by Finland. If Finland insists on this addition, then we would like to say that we approve and support the Indian delegation. Instead of "some members" we should say "most of the members", "the majority of members expressed reservations" etc, in the sentence that he suggested. To avoid too many amendments and additions being made to this paragraph, I think the suggestion of the United States would be quite logical, and we could add "medium-terra planning" in that sentence, and that way finish up with our discussions on this matter.

Hannu HALINEN (Finland): Mr Chairman, as I said in my statement, the purpose of my intervention was to be constructive. I would not be happy to add "medium-term planning" to be considered as one of the divergencies. I would rather see it as part of a consensus amongst us. Therefore, I would be withdrawing my proposal rather than changing that, and elaborate those views considered at the Conference.

Igor MARINCEK (Switzerland): Mr Chairman, my point concerns the end of paragraph 3 where it reads, "the Council concluded that the Review exercise should not be prolonged and that the time had come to act on the recommendations in so far as they were endorsed by the Conference". My proposal is to amend after "and that the time had come", "for the Conference to make appropriate decisions and give clear instructions for action". The idea behind this is that, as you know, there were other ideas brought forward than just the recommendation in the Report. So these ideas are also being presented to the Conference and will be discussed there. If you insist on a sentence limited only on the recommendations, then we would have to say that "the majority of the Council", but then it is not the Council itself.

Muhammad Saleem KHAN (Pakistan): Mr Chairman, the delegate of the United States sometime back said that we should try to make an effort to move on and not to open up the paragraphs. Even though our suggestion at that time was more in a constructive spirit on that paragraph, we should really try to portray what had actually been said over here in the Council. If the delegate of Switzerland is saying that a lot of members would not agree to those additional proposals, then you have to reflect their views that they did not agree to those additional proposals which were being introduced. Here what is said is "that the time had come to act on the recommendations, in so far as they were endorsed by the Conference". It does not really take out anything from what other delegates have presented. If the Conference endorses those recommendations during the Conference, then they should also be implemented. I think we cannot agree to this amendment as proposed.

C. Srinivasa SASTRY (India): Mr Chairman, these recommendations are on the subject stated on page 2 "Conclusions of the Review of Certain Aspects of FAO's Goals and Operations" which are contained in the documents mentioned in the footnote. These are the ones which were discussed by the Council, and any recommendations of the Council should be related to the recommendations that are before the Council, which were discussed and a view was expressed. Therefore, we would submit that any reference to recommendations and suggestions not contained in the Review - it would not be appropriate to include them in the Draft. We submit that the Draft be left as it is, which has been cleared by the Drafting Committee.

David COU IIS (Australia): Mr Chairman, it was terrible to have to go through this once, which we did in the Drafting Committee for days and days, and in a sense the same issues are coming up again. Can I make a suggestion? This particular point was something that we debated at length in relation to a paragraph a little later on in this section. It is one of the paragraphs we have not yet got because we revised it before. I think it was paragraph 8. It did actually address this question of whether additional ideas to what is in the Review etc., mentioned the Resolution of the Conference and all that sort of thing. So could I suggest that we put this point aside until we have seen that paragraph, because I think it will accommodate the point that Switzerland and others are making. The problem is that we have not got that paragraph in front of us so that we can see whether it accommodates this point or not. It is addressed later in paragraph 8, I think.

Michel MOMBOULI (Congo): Je voudrais dire que dans la hiérarchie des organes: la Conférence est l'organe suprême et le Conseil ne peut lui dicter quoi que ce soit.

LE PRESIDENT: Je pense que le délégué de la Suisse va retirer sa proposition et que dans ces conditions nous pourrions continuer.

Nous verrons ensuite le paragraphe 8 dont a parlé Monsieur le délégué de l'Australie.

Earl V. WEYBRECHT (Canada): I would just like to get clarification. We do not have the wording of paragraph 8 before us. Are you suggesting that we may return to this sentence after we have had an opportunity to look at paragraph 8?

LE PRESIDENT: On parlera ultérieurement du paragraphe 8; pour le moment nous approuvons le paragraphe 3; le délégué d'Australie est membre du Comité de rédaction et parlera du paragraphe 8; et si par hasard personne ne parlait du paragraphe 8 nous ajouterons quelque chose.

Atif Y. BUKHARI (Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of): As far as Switzerland withdraws his proposal it means we adopt this paragraph. The fact that paragraph 3 has been adopted has no link as it has no relation with paragraph 8, then we will discuss paragraph 8 separately.

Sra, Grafila SOTO CARRERO (Cuba): Yo pido disculpas por su conducto a todos los Consejeros, pero creo que la aclaración hecha por el distinguido delegado de Congo es valedera para este párrafo y para todos los demás. La Conferencia es el órgano supremo. El Consejo no puede hacer algo que esté en contra de lo que apruebe la Conferencia. Por lo tanto, aprobamos el párrafo 3 tal y como está; y después veremos el párrafo 8, el 9, y todos los párrafos que tengamos que ver. Pero nunca podrá hacer el Consejo algo distinto a lo que apruebe la Conferencia.

LE PRESIDENT: Le paragraphe 3 est donc approuvé. Nous passons donc au paragraphe A.

Igor MARINCEK (Switzerland): Firstly it is in the first sentence of paragraph 4 and then in the corrections to adjust the French text to the English text in the last sentence. In the first sentence the text as proposed reads: "The Council was pleased to note that the reports of the Committees and the Experts had confirmed that FAO was a sound, healthy, solid and dynamic Organization". I would suggest to replace the word "confirmed" by "concluded". It is a conclusion which they made and I think we should use this word. "Had concluded that FAO was a sound, healthy, solid and dynamic Organization".

And then in the second sentence, there is a mention in the English text, "the Committees identified" there in the French text, this wording is not to be found. So this is just a correction on the French text.

Igor MARINCEK (Suisse): Dans le texte français la dernière phase diffère du texte anglais; le texte français ne fait pas mention des Comités mais en tout état de cause il faut que les deux textes correspondent.

Michel MOMBOULI (Congo): Je prends la parole pour intervenir à propos de la première proposition de la délégation Suisse. Il est certain que dans l'esprit d'une certaine minorité c'est une conclusion, mais, en ce qui nous concerne, c'est une confirmation de ce que nous savions, à savoir que la FAO est une institution saine, solide et dynamique. Pour nous ce n'est pas la première fois, c'est une confirmation et nous maintenons notre demande que le mot "confirme" soit retenu.

LE PRESIDENT: En fait, le rapport du Comité a confirmé ce qu'ont dit les experts; c'est bien ce qu'ont dit les experts; M. Mazoyer est parmi nous et peut confirmer que c'est véritablement ce qu'ont dit les experts. C'est la raison pour laquelle se trouve le terme "confirme" puisque les experts l'ont dit et que les Comités ont repris ce qu'ont dit les experts.

Si vous acceptez cela nous pouvons peut-être avancer.

Sra. Mercedes FERMIN GOMEZ (Venezuela): Me excusarán si les parece que es una cosa minúscula, pero como esto es un texto español y como yo no tengo aquí el inglés. Dice: "El Consejo tomó nota con beneplácito de que los informes de los Comités y los Expertos habían confirmado que la FAO era una Organización...". Yo creo que para los que leemos español eso es colocar en un pasado esa afirmación, y nosotros creemos que debe ser en el presente. Por consiguiente, habría que cambiar el tiempo del verbo y decir "es" y no "era".

LE PRESIDENT: Nous avons encore beaucoup à faire. Le Comité de candidatures se réunit à 10 h 30. Pouvons-nous accepter le paragraphe 4 étant entendu que les experts ont dit la même chose avant.

Earl W. WEYBRECHT (Canada): I believe it would be useful to use wording that is actually consistent with wording used in the report of the Committee itself. I believe that the wording in the Committees' report made reference to "concluded" or "it reached a conclusion", as opposed to "confirmed".

João Augusto DE MEDICIS (Brazil): It really doesn't make much difference. But I can use both words. It can say "the Experts in conclusion had confirmed".

LE PRESIDENT: Nous avons encore beaucoup de travail. Je vous propose d'avancer, et s'il n'y a pas d'objections, d'adopter la formulation préparée par le Comité de rédaction qui répond aux vœux de Madame Monica Deregibus. Paragraphe 4 est ainsi approuvé. Paragraphe 5: approuvé. Paragraphe 6: approuvé.

Joseph TCHICAYA (Congo): Le paragraphe 7 est long mais je crois que la longueur n'est pas forcément un défaut. Seulement, la dernière phrase du paragraphe me chagrine. Elle dit: "Ces membres ont souligné que si les contributions dues ne sont pas versées à l'Organisation avant la fin du mois prochain, il n'y a guère de chance que les recommandations puissent être mises en oeuvre".

La plupart des délégués qui se sont exprimés ici ont été clairs: il n'est pas question que ces sommes là servent à la mise en oeuvre des recommandations. Nous savons tous que les recommandations sont issues de l'Examen qui a été ordonné par un certain nombre d'Etats. Nous pensions qu'ils avaient, à l'origine, réservé des sommes d'argent pour pouvoir financer la mise en oeuvre de ces recommandations. On dit donc que, si les Etats paient leurs contributions, cet argent servira à mettre en oeuvre les recommandations. Mais ce n'est pas du tout ce que l'on avait dit. Si les arriérés sont payés, ils serviront à mettre en oeuvre le programme que nous allons adopter hormis les recommandations par les Comités et le Directeur général dans le cadre de l'Examen de certains aspects des buts et opérations de la FAO. Je crois que cela doit être précis mais, telle que la dernière phrase de ce paragraphe est rédigée, elle prête à confusion.

Sra. Margarita LIZARRAGA SAUCEDO (México): Es, Señor Presidente, para hacer una aclaración, porque aquí falta una frase que quedó convenida dentro del Comité de Redacción. Es donde dice: "no había margen para una flexibilidad en el Programa de Labores y Presupuesto, y recordaron la declaración del Director General al Consejo en respuesta a las preguntas que se le hicieron.

Sra. Mónica DEREGBUS (Presidenta del Comité de Redacción): Sí, Señor Presidente, efectivamente falta aquí esta frase y faltan otras más que se las voy a decir.

Empiezo por la que acaba de señalar México.

Efectivamente, en la cuarta oración del párrafo 7 donde dice: recordaron la declaración del Director General al Consejo, hay que agregar: "en respuesta a las preguntas que se le hicieron".

La segunda frase que falta, Señor Presidente, es en la misma oración, pero ésta la tengo que leer en inglés.

La oración empieza: "In their view there was no room for flexibility in the Programme of Work and Budget", Allí hay que agregar: "to accommodate the order of the costs involved". Yo creo que esto es todo Señor Presidente en este párrafo.

LE DIRECTEUR GENERAL: Un mot manque.

LE PRESIDENT: Si j'ai bien compris dans le texte français on lit à la ligne 11: "Ils ont estimé que le Programme de travail et budget ne laisse pas de marge de souplesse et ils ont rappelé..." La phrase serait: "Ils ont estimé que le Programme de travail et budget ne laisse pas de marge de souplesse pour couvrir des coûts de cette importance et ils ont rappelé que, comme le Directeur général l'a déclaré au Conseil, à la suite de la demande qui lui était adressée, les contributions à recouvrer..." Je pense que maintenant le texte est clair.

Igor MARINCEK (Switzerland): We would prefer to discuss on the basis of a complete text. My proposal concerns the first sentence. "The Council did not reach conclusions on the prioritization of the Committees' recommendations for implementation nor" - here I would insert the words "on other proposals advanced in the course of the debate, nor on the possibilities of financing". This brings everything together. I think the first sentence should cover all this.

LE PRESIDENT: Monsieur le délégué de la Suisse propose que l'on dise "Le Comité n'est parvenu, à aucune conclusion quant à l'ordre des priorités à suivre pour mettre en oeuvre les recommandations des Comités ou les autres propositions avancées au cours des débats ni quant aux méthodes de financement". C'est bien cela?

Sra. Mercedes FERMIN GOMEZ (Venezuela): Para una Moción de Orden. Es imposible que podamos opinar sobre un texto que tiene una enmienda del delegado de Suiza, otra de la Presidenta y otra de los Miembros de México, y nosotros no tenemos nada. ¿Sería posible que alguien pudiera leer el texto completo a ver si es posible que nos podamos entender?

LE PRESIDENT: Vous avez raison Madame. Je vais demander à Madame la Présidente du Comité de rédaction ou au Secrétaire de lire l'ensemble du paragraphe 7.

Sra. Mónica DEREGBUS (Presidenta del Comité de Redacción): Yo tengo todas las enmiendas en inglés; por lo tanto puedo leer solamente el texto en inglés con todas las enmiendas que se han formulado, inclusive la suiza. (Lee el texto en inglés) (continued in English): "The Council did not reach conclusions on the prioritization of the Committees' recommendations for implementation, nor on other proposals advanced in the course of the debate, nor on the possibilities of financing. Some members expressed the view that additional funding for the for the implementation was not acceptable and therefore that the costs of implementing the recommendations could be borne by the cancellation of some activities and readjustments in the budget. The majority of members did not accept this view. They stressed that the Organization was in great financial difficulties because of the significant amount of sums of the outstanding

contributions. In their view there was no room for flexibility in the Programme of Work and Budget to accommodate the order of the costs involved, and they recalled the Director-General's statement to the Council in response to questions that were put to him about the huge amount of outstanding contributions (US\$ 175 million) and US\$ 100 million in outstanding obligations".

El resto del párrafo, Sr. Presidente, no tiene modificación, y es lo que tienen los delegados en el Corrigendum 3.

LE DIRECTEUR GENERAL: Il s'agit d'un paragraphe qui parle du financement des recommandations du Comité; et dans ce paragraphe, 11 convient de dire que le Conseil ne s'est pas mis d'accord sur les priorités accordées à diverses recommandations.

Dans mon rapport, j'avais proposé une certaine méthode pour clarifier ces recommandations. Cette liste de priorités était voulue pour pouvoir étaler les coûts sur un ou deux bienniums.

Ensuite on continue dans le paragraphe en disant qu'on n'a pas pu se mettre d'accord sur les méthodes de financement.

Que vient faire le texte du délégué de la Suisse qui dit que le Conseil ne s'est pas mis d'accord sur la "prioritisation" des recommandations du Comité et des autres propositions? C'est mettre en exergue ces autres propositions et dire qu'elles n'étaient pas dans la Résolution 6/87.

Ici, on parle seulement des recommandations des Comités et de leur financement. Parler des autres propositions est un sujet tout à fait différent.

Sra. Margarita LIZARRAGA SAUCEDO (México): Dos aclaraciones. Por una parte, en la version española la palabra "conspicua" no corresponde. Nosotros dijimos "significativa", que es más claro y que es como está en inglés.

Segundo: que en virtud de que, cuando se le pidió a la Sra. Presidenta de Comité de Redacción, ella leyó incorporando también la proposición de la representación suiza, nosotros queremos aclarar que eso lo está proponiendo aquí; esto no lo convinimos allá, porque justamente como lo acaba de decir el Director General, yo lo iba a explicar, es cosa de otro asunto. Y por tanto no lo aceptamos.

LE PRESIDENT: Le délégué de la Suisse, et c'est son droit, a fait une proposition; mais les délégués du Conseil ont le devoir et le droit de prendre position sur cette proposition; il peuvent l'accepter ou le rejeter; nous sommes en train d'étudier l'ensemble des paragraphes et il nous appartient de prendre position sur cette proposition.

Si vous ne l'acceptez pas vous le direz, le Directeur général quant à lui a dit que ce n'était pas le sujet; les délégués ici présents ont un mot à dire mais ce n'est pas retenu pour autant et j'attends votre réaction.

Sra. Margarita LIZARRAGA SAUCEDO (Mexico): Sí señor, pero yo también me pronuncio en contra de esa proposición.

Joseph TCHICAYA (Congo): Je pense aussi que la proposition faite par notre ami Suisse n'est pas la bienvenue ici; peut-être ont-ils fait des propositions qui n'ont pas été acceptées; mais il n'est pas question de mettre cet ajout dans ce paragraphe.

Mlle Faouzia BOUMAIZA (Algérie): Comme nous avons été membres du Comité de rédaction, nous aurions été heureux que le texte proposé par ce Comité soit accepté. Bien sûr des amendements sont apportés et nous devons donner notre avis.

La proposition suisse me gêne dans le sens qu'on introduit une idée sur le débat qui a eu lieu sur les recommandations, mais ce sont des propositions nouvelles qui ne reflètent pas le débat tel qu'il est contenu dans le rapport.

Dans ce paragraphe on parle de la FAO, de la situation et du débat qui s'est déroulé; on rend compte des conclusions de ce débat sur les recommandations.

Concernant les priorités et le financement on ne dit pas qu'il y a eu des propositions quelconques et de toute façon ce serait des propositions par rapport à quoi? On ne parle pas de première proposition là dedans; on parle de l'avis du Conseil sur les priorités et sur les méthodes de financement, sur lesquelles nous ne nous sommes pas mis d'accord.

Raphael RABE (Madagascar): Je voudrais intervenir sur trois questions. Premièrement je partage l'avis tendant à dire que la proposition du délégué de la Suisse n'a pas sa place dans ce paragraphe, en tout cas pas dans la première phrase.

D'autre part, je partage l'avis du délégué du Congo concernant la dernière phrase de ce paragraphe qui est erronée et ne reflète pas la vérité. Il faudrait la supprimer. De plus, il faudrait inverser l'ordre de la seconde phrase du paragraphe concernant les crédits supplémentaires.

En fait, c'est la majorité qui recommande que la mise en oeuvre des recommandations soit assurée grâce à des crédits supplémentaires; et certains membres ne partagent pas cette opinion. Ce ne sont pas certains membres qui émettent un avis alors que la majorité ne partage pas cet avis; c'est le contraire; il faut inverser l'ordre des avis dans cette dernière phrase et la remodeler complètement.

Il faudrait d'abord supprimer la dernière phrase et, dans la seconde phrase, inverser. La majorité pense que la mise en oeuvre des recommandations doit être faite sur des crédits supplémentaires et certains membres ne partagent pas cet avis.

LE PRESIDENT: Commençons par le plus facile. Il faudrait enlever cette dernière phrase. Personnellement je n'ai pas entendu cette histoire de fin de mois, de paiement....etc. Si le Conseil est d'accord on peut retirer cette phrase, et on verra après ce que l'on met à la place.

Je ne voudrais pas interférer dans le débat en cours mais dans le paragraphe 8 on parle des "idées nouvelles".

C. Srinivasa SASTRY (India): Before I make my intervention, Mr Chairman, may I ask you whether the proposal now is that the last sentence, as it now stands in paragraph 7, is to be deleted?

LE PRESIDENT: Peut-on supprimer la dernière phrase du paragraphe 7? Vous en êtes d'accord? c'est ce que le délégué du Congo a demandé.

Joseph TCHICAYA (Congo): Non, M. le Président. En fait je voulais l'amender; et si on la supprime, il faudrait suivre ce qu'a dit le délégué de Madagascar pour que la seconde phrase prenne une autre tournure.

C. Srinivasa SASTRY (India): My submission is on two points: the first one is the addition suggested by the distinguished delegate from Switzerland about proposals advanced during the course of the discussions. Our submission is that the agenda item is on the review of Certain Aspects of FAO's Goals and Operations which has a clear scope based on the Resolution 6/87 of the Conference.

Secondly, it is not as though the Council would take cognizance of any resolution suddenly tabled in the course of discussion and deliberate on it without getting the required data, background information and implications from the Secretariat, and take a view that this is to be implemented straight away. Therefore, we would submit that any reference to this in this portion of the Resolution is not required. We would also submit that also possibly this would be taken care of by page 3, paragraph 3, of the original draft, the last sentence, where it is said, "While recognizing that the process for improving systems and approaches was a continuing one, the Council concluded that the Review exercise should not be prolonged and that the time had come to act on the recommendations in so far as they were endorsed by the Conference".

Therefore, I would submit that this addition suggested by the Swiss delegate would not be supported by us.

The second point, Mr. Chairman, is that once you are taking the last sentence for consideration, I would make my submission, because as it is here I think it will require some changes; in case it is being kept, I would like to be given another opportunity to suggest an addition to that when the time comes.

E.P. ALLEYNE (Trinidad and Tobago): I have just a very brief remark, Mr. Chairman. Firstly, the paragraph is quite clearly one which emphasizes financial aspects, so to speak. I find that the proposal from the delegation of Switzerland simply does not fit. It is like throwing the cat among the pigeons. It simply does not fit here. Further than that, the sentence almost sounds as if the Council sat for many days and could not agree on anything. It is much too sweeping. Very definitely that last sentence could not possibly stand as is.

Igor MARINCEK (Switzerland): Paragraph 7 starts with "The Council did not reach conclusions" and I think that our report which is addressed to the Conference should carry a message as to what kind of work we still have ahead. We should tell the Conference that there are agreements on one side, but there are not agreements on the other. So this paragraph starts with "Where the Council could not find conclusions". Now I agree with the Director-General that one can improve a little, and I would make the following modification: "The Council did not reach conclusions on the Committees' recommendations and their prioritization for implementation, nor on the other proposals advanced in the course of the debate, nor on the possibilities of financing".

The other element of this paragraph is to do with the whole of the resource question. I think it is obvious that the whole resource question has to be seen in connection with all the conclusions the Conference may wish to draw from the Review discussion.

DIRECTOR-GENERAL: I do not agree with the delegate of Switzerland. He misunderstood me. Paragraph 7 deals with the conclusions on the prioritization, not on the general conclusions. The new ideas etc. are on paragraph 8. If you read paragraph 8, it is there. Paragraph 7 is only dealing with prioritization, of known, of costed recommendations. The new ideas are in paragraph 8. That is all, I do not think we should waste any more time on it. It is clear.

LE PRESIDENT: On reprendra cette étude au paragraphe 8 et nous continuons sur le paragraphe 7 mais avec les idées suggérées pour sa dernière partie.

João Augusto DE MEDICIS (Brazil): I could not understand the Swiss amendment because the point is very, very clearly stated in paragraph 8: "The Council heard a variety of new ideas proposed by a number of members. A number of members recommended that these ideas be considered in the Review process." It is clear here that we have a number of other ideas not decided upon by the Council. I think it is absolutely covered by that, Mr Chairman. I am sorry to intervene.

Salim SARRAF (Liban): Puisque je fais partie du Comité de rédaction, j'aurais aimé garder le texte comme il est. Je crois que si la Suisse retirait sa proposition, cela nous éviterait beaucoup de discussions, sinon vous allez reprendre toute la discussion qui a eu lieu pendant le Comité.

LE PRESIDENT: Je crois que pour gagner du temps nous pouvons nous contenter de l'examen de la dernière phrase que Monsieur le Délégué du Congo a évoquée. Monsieur le Délégué de l'Inde souhaiterait le remplacer.

Quelle est la proposition du Congo?

Joseph TCHICAYA (Congo): Il y a une proposition de Madagascar qui voudrait que l'on reformule la phrase numéro 2, mais je pense que compte tenu de la structuration de ce paragraphe, 11 serait bon que nous maintenions la dernière phrase. Voici la rédaction que je propose de cette dernière phrase :

Ses membres ont souligné que si les contributions ne sont pas versées à l'Organisation, et si les pays membres à l'origine de cet examen en mesure de le faire n'apportent pas de ressources additionnelles, 11 n'y a guère de chance pour que les recommandations puissent être mises en oeuvre.

Le versement des contributions ne suffira pas. Nous pensons qu'il faut des ressources additionnelles. Je fais cette proposition pour contrebalancer également ce qui est dit à la deuxième phrase: certains délégués affirmaient que, de leur avis, un financement supplémentaire n'était pas nécessaire. Voilà la proposition que je sou mets à l'attention du Conseil.

LE DIRECTEUR GENERAL: Pour simplifier et pour ne pas poser de problème avec cette phrase qui est un peu longue, je vais dans le même sens vous lire le texte anglais.

-"... that if the unpaid contributions and extra budgetary resources were not received by the Organization" - we delete "within the next month" - "the prospects for implementing the recommendations were dim." We are not mentioning the countries. We are also mentioning "extra budgetary resources". So it is shorter and it does not hurt the feelings of anybody. And it was said by some countries, so I think this is a proposal which will facilitate acceptance.

Joseph TCHICAYA (Congo): Cette formulation est certainement transactionnelle. Il y a une idée qui ne figure pas dans cette proposition, ceux qui étaient à l'origine de cela doivent payer. Mais je suis prêt, si le Conseil est d'accord, à me rallier à cette proposition.

LE PRESIDENT: S'il n'y a pas d'argent on ne fait rien, c'est tout.

Igor MARINCEK (Suisse): Ma Délé gation est prête à retirer l'amendement proposé, mais aimerait ajouter que pour nous 11 ne serait pas acceptable que le Conseil invite la Conférence à regarder uniquement les recommandations. La Conférence reçoit des documents beaucoup plus volumineux, il y a beaucoup plus d'Idées. Il y a aussi beaucoup d'Idées que les délégations voudront soumettre à la considération de la Conférence. Je trouve dommage que le Conseil se limite ainsi, mais j'accepte cette formulation.

LE PRESIDENT: Le paragraphe 7 est clair et il est maintenant adopté.

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): Proponemos que la primera frase del párrafo 8 termine después de las palabras "recomendaciones del Examen". Y se suprime todo lo que sigue en la primera frase del párrafo 8. El Comité de Redacción, en su menú, nos ha ofrecido un plato demasiado fuerte, que no podemos digerir. Lo del mecanismo fue planteado por una sola delegación, nadie más lo apoyó y nosotros nos opusimos.

R.G. PETTITT (United Kingdom): I was about to make a suggestion rather similar to the distinguished delegate of Colombia, that is one should delete in the English text the second line, the third line, and up to "drafting of", so that it would read: "The Council is unanimous on the need for reaching a consensus on a Conference Resolution on the Review." My reason for saying this is that I understand the sentences at first are intended to emphasize the extent of unanimity. Now, I read that there was unanimity on the outcome of the review process which is, one expects, a Resolution. There seemed to be developing two schools of thought on another thing. One was that we were concerned only with the three pages of recommendations contained in the review document; another school of thought was that we were concerned with whatever emerged from the Conference decision. My amendment would identify the unanimity without exposing the difference of view on this matter.

Joseph TCHICAYA (Congo): Je serais un peu gêné que l'on ne parle pas des recommandations. Pour tenir compte des avis qui ont été exprimés à ce sujet je propose que l'on dise tout simplement: Le Conseil a reconnu la nécessité d'arriver à un consensus sur les recommandations de l'Examen.

Igor MARINCEK (Suisse): Nous ne pouvons pas soutenir cette interprétation mais il ne semble pas qu'il vaille la peine de faire un grand combat autour de cette question.

LE PRESIDENT: Nous pourrions garder la première phrase en supprimant "sur le mécanisme de mise en oeuvre", et on maintient le terme "unanimité".

Sra. Margarita LIZARRAGA SAUCEDO (México): Yo no veo realmente la necesidad de quitar lo del mecanismo para su aplicación subsiguiente, porque varias delegaciones nos pronunciamos en ese sentido. Hay unas recomendaciones pero hay que saber cómo se van a instaurar. En fin no estoy para prolongar el debate; si esto causa problema, yo me asumo a la mayoría.

LE PRESIDENT: Donc en principe on retire: "le mécanisme de mise en oeuvre". Il reste la question posée par le Congo. Le Royaume-Uni attache de l'importance à ce point.

Gerald J. MONROE (United States of America): Although I was a member of the group which is guilty of preparing this material, and would, of course, have preferred simply to accept it as it stands, I am now becoming somewhat confused as to the direction the discussion is taking. Frankly, it seemed to me, that we had reached after, I might underscore, hours of discussion, a very carefully balanced construction. My sense is that the question of reaching consensus involved, at least in the view of my delegation, both the recommendations of the Review and the entire question of how the Review would be implemented; how the Organization and the membership would approach the results of our deliberations. I think certainly it has been a consistent concern of my delegation throughout the process.

I feel constrained to put in a word for the original formulation, excuse me if I am speaking slowly, I have been at this a long time, I really sense that we would be saving ourselves a lot of time in this group if we simply accepted this language.

Joseph TCHICAYA (Congo): J'écoutais avec attention l'intervention du délégué des Etats-Unis. Je crois que ce sont les mots "le mécanisme de mise en oeuvre" qui le préoccupent. Cela devrait préoccuper tout le Conseil. C'est pour cette raison qu'en ce qui me concerne, on peut supprimer le "mécanisme" et mettre, après "les recommandations de l'Examen et leur mise en oeuvre", c'est en effet "mécanisme" qui chagrine certains d'entre nous.

LE PRESIDENT: Vous voulez enlever "mécanisme" et laisser "mise en oeuvre"?

R.G. PETTITT (United Kingdom): I would hate to see a disappearance to the reference to unanimity over whatever we can be unanimous about. I do wonder whether I am seeing a burglar under the bed. I am referring really to the recommendation. I have no strong views on the mechanism for their subsequent implementation. If this wording is confirming us to those recommendations on the three pages of the Review document, then I have difficulty. If it is concerned with the outcome of the Review, as emerged in the Conference, I have no difficulty. My difficulty would be totally removed if we inserted before the word "recommendations" the "eventual recommendations", or with appropriate grammatical changes, substitute "recommendations" by "outcome". But either of those would meet my point.

LE DIRECTEUR GENERAL: Il y a 32 recommandations et il s'agit d'un sommaire de ces recommandations. Il faut lire tout le rapport pour comprendre chacune d'elles; il ne faut pas les réduire à trois pages. Les recommandations, c'est tout le rapport. Le Président du Comité du programme a écrit le rapport qui a été approuvé par tout le monde; on a fait une synthèse de ces recommandations mais il faut toutes les lire; il y en a 32.

Igor MARINCEK (Suisse): Le Directeur général serait-il d'accord si on mettait "conclusions"?

LE DIRECTEUR GENERAL: Elles sont rédigées sous forme de recommandations.

LE PRESIDENT: Peut-on retenir "un consensus sur les recommandations et leur mise en oeuvre"? Je crois que le délégué des Etats-Unis tient, et il a raison, à ce que l'on garde cette idée. On enlèverait "mécanisme" et l'on mettrait "sur leur mise en oeuvre". C'est ce que le délégué du Congo a proposé. Mais je reconnais que le Conseil n'en a pas discuté. On en a parlé un peu mais on n'en a pas discuté.

LE DIRECTEUR GENERAL: Ce que le délégué a demandé n'est pas dans le rapport.

Salim SARRAF (Liban): Puis-je suggérer à nouveau de prendre en considération ce qu'a dit le représentant des Etats-Unis et ce que j'ai dit moi-même?

Au Comité de rédaction, nous avons passé de très longues heures sur ce paragraphe 8. Je crois que l'approuver tel qu'il est ne présente pas de problème majeur.

LE DIRECTEUR GENERAL: Il n'y a rien dans le rapport qui parle d'un mécanisme de mise en oeuvre. Il y a des recommandations. Mais on n'a pas discuté de mécanisme. Alors, je ne vois pas pourquoi l'on dit qu'on ne s'est pas mis d'accord. C'est seulement le délégué de la Suisse qui a parlé d'un comité avec je ne sais qui; mais cela n'a pas été discuté. Il a simplement exprimé un avis.

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): Como fui yo quien hice la propuesta original, estaría dispuesto a aceptar la propuesta transaccional de Congo. Además, no me ofrece dificultad la posición del Reino Unido sobre dejar el término "unánime".

LE PRESIDENT: La phrase serait donc la suivante: "le conseil a reconnu à l'unanimité la nécessité d'arriver à un consensus sur les recommandations de l'Examen". Le Conseil est-il d'accord?

Gerald J. MONROE (United States of America): I must admit the longer we talk, the more attached I become to my original language. However, it is getting late. With the statesmanlike proposal of my United Kingdom colleague, that is to say the insertion of the words "eventual recommendations of the Review", I could agree with the other proposal to excise term.

LE PRESIDENT: Done, le delegue des Etats-Unis accepte que l'on retire "le mécanisme de mise en oeuvre".

Raphael RABE (Madagascar): Nous avons suivi très attentivement le débat au sein du Conseil. A notre sens, le Conseil a parlé de recommandations mais pas du mécanisme de mise en oeuvre. Je ne vois pas pourquoi on insiste sur le mécanisme de mise en oeuvre. Nous avons discuté d'un document qui traite de l'examen des recommandations, et c'est tout.

LE PRESIDENT: Peut-on dire ceci: "Le Conseil a reconnu à l'unanimité la nécessité d'arriver à un consensus sur les propositions d'un examen. Il a affirmé qu'un tel consensus..."?

David COUTTS (Australia): If you are going to reach a consensus, that is all right, but I just wanted to say on that point that I rather thought that most of the delegates did emphasize that there was a need to implement the recommendations, and there have been estimates of costs given to us and all sorts of things, so I cannot see what the problem is. If the problem is the word "mechanism", then take it out, but implementation of the recommendations was the central theme of many interventions, I thought.

Igor MARINCEK (Suisse): Avec tout le respect voulu, je voudrais quand même demander que le Secrétariat n'intervienne pas toujours dans l'adoption du rapport, qui est une affaire entre pays membres. Il est normal que le Secrétariat ait le droit d'intervenir à la demande du Président, mais il faudrait quand même limiter cela au minimum, si possible.

LE DIRECTEUR GENERAL: J'ai le droit de participer au débat à part entière. Les Textes fondamentaux sont clairs. Je suis partie prenante dans cette affaire-là. La Conférence m'a également demandé d'exprimer mes vues et de faire mes commentaires. Je ne me laisserai intimider par personne quand il s'agira d'exercer les droits que me confèrent ces Textes et la Conférence dans l'intérêt des pays membres. J'offre seulement mes conseils, je ne les impose pas car je n'en ai pas le droit; c'est votre rapport.

Gerald J. MONROE (United States of America): This is simply a point of clarification. In accepting the compromise - that is to say, the excision of the term "mechanism" and the addition of the term "eventual" - I had agreed to the addition to the second sentence of the phrase "and their implementation", which I believe was suggested by the delegate of the Congo. That, of course, was part of my compromise package.

LE PRESIDENT: Le Conseil accepte-t-il la phrase suivante: "le Conseil a reconnu à l'unanimité la nécessité d'arriver à un consensus sur les recommandations de l'Examen et leur mise en oeuvre"? On enlèverait le mot "mécanisme".

Jacques WARIN (France): Je suis entièrement d'accord avec le texte que vous venez de lire, Monsieur le Président. Je voudrais simplement être sûr qu'il n'y a pas d'ambiguïté parce que j'ai entendu le délégué américain ajouter l'adjectif "éventuelle", ce qui était une proposition de la délégation britannique, que je trouve malencontreuse. J'aimerais qu'on en reste là: "un consensus sur les recommandations de l'Examen".

LE PRESIDENT: Sans "mise en oeuvre"?

Jacques WARIN (France): Sans "mise en oeuvre". La phrase telle qu'elle est pourrait être acceptée par le délégué américain.

Joseph TCHICAYA (Congo): Je crois qu'il faut que l'on se comprenne bien. Nous ne parlons pas, dans ce texte, de ce qui a été dit pendant le débat. Je crois que nous étions tous plus ou moins d'accord avec les recommandations de l'Examen et que nous étions également d'accord pour dire qu'il fallait arriver à un consensus sur les modalités du financement de leur mise en oeuvre. Cette mise en oeuvre nécessite des ressources et il faut les trouver. Je crois que c'est cela l'idée que nous avons voulu mettre en exergue en écrivant "les recommandations de l'Examen et leur mise en oeuvre".

R.G. PETTITT (United Kingdom): I repeat that my delegation would have substantial difficulty in agreeing a sentence which said, "The Council was unanimous on the need for reaching a consensus on the recommendations of the Review", if by that term one means those recommendations which are contained in the Review document. We have no difficulty whatsoever in agreeing a sentence to the effect that we were unanimous on the need for reaching consensus on the outcome of the Review process. If it is necessary not to adopt my proposal of adding the word "eventual", or alternatively substituting "recommendations" with the word "outcome", which was another suggestion I made, then we would have to agree that there would be some qualification to the unanimity. I would hope, however, that we would be able to say that the Council was unanimous that a Conference resolution should be adopted by consensus.

Joseph TCHICAYA (Congo): Je voudrais tout simplement dire que le mot "unanimité" n'est pas nécessaire ici. Je pense qu'il suffit que l'on dise que c'est le Conseil et que l'on peut supprimer les mots "à l'unanimité".

LE PRESIDENT: Nous allons nous en tenir à cette formule: "le Conseil a reconnu la nécessité d'arriver à un consensus sur les recommandations de l'Examen et sur leur mise en oeuvre."

Y a-t-il d'autres observations?

R.G. PETTITT (United Kingdom): I had asked to speak on paragraph 8 before you decided it was adopted. We had reservations on the new first sentence.

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): Yo creo, Señor Presidente, que el colega del Reino Unido tiene razón en el fondo. Es una cuestión en cierta medida de interpretación o de redacción, ya que en la forma actual estamos diciendo que vamos a ser unánimes sobre las recomendaciones del examen. En realidad la unanimidad que deseáramos es sobre el resultado del proceso de examen después de que la Conferencia considere todos estos documentos.

Nosotros estaríamos dispuestos a aceptar la propuesta del Reino Unido que dice: los resultados del proceso del examen.

Creo que esto es lo que queremos, sobre los resultados del proceso del examen. Esto es lo que ha dicho Reino Unido y esto es lo que queremos.

LE PRESIDENT: Nous avons un texte qui a été rédigé après mûre réflexion. Ne pouvons-nous pas nous en tenir à cette phrase: le Conseil a reconnu la nécessité d'arriver à un consensus sur les recommandations de l'Examen et sur leur mise en oeuvre"?

Gerald J. MONROE (United States of America): There is a difference, at least in the English, as it comes across. I must say that I agree with my Colombian colleague's proposal except that it would be grammatically easier in English, and would save time, to splice in the term "eventual" and retain the sentence structure as it currently appears. That, I think, is the most elegant, and the easiest, way to proceed. Otherwise, while the intent is the same, we would have to do some serious alterations to the grammar of the two sentences.

LE PRESIDENT: Le Conseil approuve-t-il ce texte tel que rédigé, à savoir: "le Conseil a reconnu la nécessité d'arriver à un consensus sur les recommandations de l'Examen et sur leur mise en oeuvre"? Nous enlevons donc les mots "à l'unanimité", puisqu'ils gênent, et "le mécanisme".

R.G. PETTITT (United Kingdom) : I suspect that "the mechanism" is not the source of the trouble. The trouble is in the words "recommendation of the Review". The proposal of the delegate of Colombia, "the results of the Review", if that was the correct translation, would be totally acceptable to me.

Jacques WARIN (France): Je ne suis pas d'accord avec la proposition du délégué de la Colombie parce qu'elle affaiblit la portée de cette phrase que nous avons discutée mot à mot au Comité de rédaction.

Je voudrais simplement dire à mon collègue du Royaume-Uni qu'il n'a aucune crainte à avoir. Cette phrase signifie que nous voulons arriver à un consensus sur les recommandations, ce qui veut dire à contrario que, s'il n'y a pas de consensus il n'y aura aucune recommandation adoptée. Il n'a qu'à faire obstacle au consensus et aucune recommandation ne sera adoptée. Je trouve donc que la phrase est très bien calculée et qu'elle définit ce que nous avons voulu dire.

LE PRESIDENT: Je pense exactement comme le délégué de la France. Le consensus est en soi un droit de veto déguisé. Peut-on accepter cette phrase?

Gerald J. MONROE (United States of America): There is something strange. I am losing my grasp of the discussion, quite frankly. I think the problem is the limiting character of the phrase "the recommendations of the Review". In order to remove ourselves from this problem, our British associate has proposed a very small addition, which, I think, in and of itself is relatively harmless and meets, as I see it, the original intent of the drafting group when they struggled through this package: that is, simply the addition of the word "eventual" before "recommendations". I could agree with "outcome". We can do it that way, too. It is just more difficult. I will accept "the outcome".

LE PRESIDENT: Pour recommandations éventuelles

DIRECTOR-GENERAL: "Eventual recommendations" means that they are unknown. When you speak about "recommendations", of course you speak about recommendations which exist. How can you say that the Council could not agree on eventual recommendations? Is it necessary to agree on eventual recommendations ?

Ibrahima KABA (Guinée): Notre Conseil au cours de ses débats s'est effectivement préoccupé des recommandations, expression employée tout le long du rapport par le Comité conjoint. Page 23 les recommandations sont énumérées; donc c'est bien de recommandations dont 11 s'agit et non pas de résultats.

D'autre part, s'agissant du mécanisme il n'en a jamais été question; cependant il a été question du financement. Ce problème du financement a préoccupé notre Conseil.

Je propose que l'on maintienne le mot "recommandations" et que l'on remplace le mot "mécanisme" par "financement": le financement de leur mise en oeuvre.... et c'est effectivement le reflet des débats de notre Conseil.

C. Srinivasa SASTRY (India): Since we are spending a lot of time on this sentence may I suggest an alternative drafting solution for your consideration. We would suggest: "the Council recognized the need for reaching a consensus on the conclusions on the recommendations of the review and their implementation".

LE PRESIDENT: C'est: conclusions et recommandations?

C. Srinivasa SASTRY (India): Conclusions on the recommendations of the review.

Gerald J. MONROE (United States of America): Speaking for my delegation I will accept the statesmanlike proposal of my Indian associate.

João Augusto DE MEDICI S (Brazil): I have a proposal on the same line. I would propose "final recommendation", but I am ready to accept the proposal.

DIRECTOR-GENERAL: Conclusions of the recommendations means you can conclude on something after having examined the recommendation. It is not the same.

Earl W. WEYBRECHT (Canada): I think the suggestion made by the delegate of Brazil would possibly meet the concerns of a lot of the delegates here if the wording along the lines that "The Council was unanimous on the need for reaching a consensus on the final recommendations of the review and the mechanism for their subsequent implementation."

LE PRESIDENT: Est-ce que nous acceptons l'ajout "recommandations finales de l'Examen"? Cela me semble bien. Y a-t-il d'autres remarques sur le paragraphe 8?

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): Quisiera estar seguro de que el mecanismo va a desaparecer y se adopta la propuesta del Congo.

LE PRESIDENT: Le Conseil a reconnu la nécessité d'arriver à un consensus sur les recommandations finales de l'examen et sur leur mise en oeuvre. Le paragraphe 8 est approuvé. Paragraphe 9 approuvé.

Paragraphs 1 to 9, as amended, approved

Les paragraphes 1 à 9 ainsi amendés, sont approuvés

Los párrafos 1 a 9 así enmendados, son aprobados

Draft Report of Plenary, Part III, as amended, was adopted

Projet de rapport de la plénère, III partie, ainsi amendée, est adoptée

El proyecto de informe de la Plenaria, Parte III, así enmendado, es aprobado

R.G. PETTITT (United Kingdom): As I recall during the debate some delegations noted the experts' observation that the organizational structure of FAO had not been reviewed since 1974, and that organizational or management structures should change to reflect changing needs. Some delegations recommended that the Conference should consider the possibility of a review of FAO's management structure. We would like to see this idea reflected in the text at the end of paragraph 9.

LE PRESIDENT: Je n'ai pas entendu parler de cela. Le délégué du Royaume-Uni pose une question relative à la structure de la gestion de la FAO.

LE DIRECTEUR GENERAL: Il s'agit d'une nouvelle étude que propose le Royaume-Uni.

Joseph TCHICAYA (Congo): Le Directeur général m'a précédé; j'allais poser la question de savoir si l'on voulait mettre en oeuvre une nouvelle étude; lors de ses débats le Conseil a été clair; nous avons dit que ce processus devait prendre fin au cours de cette Conférence. S'il s'agit d'une nouvelle étude nous ne sommes pas d'accord; et le Conseil s'est exprimé sur la question.

LE DIRECTEUR GENERAL: Le rapport est déjà adopté et je ne vois pas comment on peut maintenant aller dans une nouvelle direction.

LE PRESIDENT: Je ne me souviens pas qu'on ait évoqué cette question au Conseil; je ne sais pas qui aurait posé la question; il faut revoir le verbatim et si cela a été évoqué en parler.

R.G. PETTITT (United Kingdom): I was merely trying to make the report coincide with what actually happened. I am not suggesting that there was agreement on this point. So I would suggest, to be historically correct, one could simply insert at the end of paragraph 9 the following sentence: - "Some delegations recommended that the Conference should consider the possibility of a review of FAO's management structure or organizational structure".

LE DIRECTEUR GENERAL: Ce point n'a pas été à l'ordre du jour. S'il a été évoqué par le représentant du Royaume-Uni on peut dire "un pays membre" mais ce n'était pas à l'ordre du jour et ce n'est pas dans les thèmes de la Résolution 6/87.

LE PRESIDENT: Pourrait-on ajouter: un membre a dit cela... je veux bien, mais personnellement je dois être clair: je ne me souviens pas qu'il y ait eu une discussion sur ce problème de structure.

Igor MARINCEK (Suisse): Je m'en souviens très bien; ce n'est pas sur la question de l'Examen de la FAO que la délégation britannique a parlé de cela; nous avons parlé lors du dernier Conseil de structure de management; ce sont des questions dont on a même discuté lors de la dernière Conférence; c'est un souci; il est clair que les structures doivent évoluer avec les tâches de l'Organisation; de toute façon le Directeur général est libre de donner à son Secrétariat les structures les meilleures possibles permettant de donner suite aux décisions de la Conférence et je ne vois pas du tout en quoi cela lui pose des problèmes.

Sra. Grafila SOTO CARRERO (Cuba): Me disculpa que a estas alturas haga una intervención, pero precisamente el desarrollo del debate me obliga a eso. Creo que nosotros llevamos bastante tiempo que nos hemos dedicado, se han utilizado dos años de trabajo para realizar un estudio en base a unas Resoluciones adoptadas por la 24 Conferencia. En ese sentido, la delegación de Cuba ha hecho todos los esfuerzos, y otras delegaciones también, porque se cumplimenten los acuerdos, se discutan los exámenes, en fin, se hagan toda una serie de cuestiones que lleven efectivamente a lograr un mejor funcionamiento de nuestra Organización. Pero más allá, no podemos aceptar. Nosotros nos negamos totalmente a que se traten cuestiones que no están amparadas en la Resolución que nos llevó al análisis de este estudio.

C. Srinivasa SASTRY (India): On the suggestion made for having the review of management we would submit that this would not be consistent, internally speaking, on the resolution that they already accepted where we said that the Council concluded that the review should not be prolonged and the time has come to act on the recommendations. Point 1

Point 2: although a resolution to this effect was made in the last Conference, to which reference was made by the distinguished delegate from Switzerland, we are aware that it did not specifically figure in Resolution 6/87 which was passed and which indicated the five items which are to be coordinated with the review.

Thirdly, Mr Chairman, if a review like this is contemplated, in the opinion of the Indian delegation it could not stem out of a stray remark made during the course of a discussion in a meeting of the Council. It has to be based on whatever justification is needed. Therefore we would submit that this may not be included.

R.G. PETTITT (United Kingdom): I would think that the proposition is as valid for discussion as the remainder of paragraph 9, but if it is the case that there are objections to this I think they should be recorded to balance the insertion. Whether it was some delegations or one, needs to be verified by checking with the verbatims. I can certainly remember one at least - there may well have been others which may be an historic fact, but I think it should be followed, in view of the comments made by colleagues, with another sentence saying "however a number of delegations were of the view that such a review was outside the purview of Resolution 6/87.

David COUTTS (Australia) I certainly did not want to prolong the debate but there is an issue here and it is very important and I think we ought to try and find a way to reflect it in the report. Australia has said countless times that we felt that Resolution 6/87 did not go far enough. We said that during the last Conference and we have said it during the examinations, and I am pretty sure I said it during my intervention. The reason we think it did not go far enough is that it did not look at these sort of things in the way we wanted it to. I was not going to raise that again and I will not raise it again except to say that I think it would be useful if we could find a way to put it in. Personally I do not think it goes with paragraph 9. I think that is a different thing. The Director-General had this review and we are all very appreciative of that, and it has shown up some good things and I hope that many of them are followed up, but if the UK and Switzerland insist on this insertion perhaps we need a paragraph 10 which will accept comment in the offsetting remarks that others have.

Joseph TCHICAYA (Congo): Je suis tenté de donner satisfaction à ceux qui voudraient exprimer leur point de vue dans ce rapport. Nous ne devons pas avoir peur que des opinions exprimées dans cette salle figurent dans le rapport, mais il est de notre devoir de l'équilibrer et, si l'on retient la formulation qui nous est proposée, j'aurai un complément à proposer pour contrebalancer l'idée qui vient d'être avancée. Et je vais vous le lire.

Après le libellé qui nous a été lu tout à l'heure j'ajouterais "le Conseil a néanmoins retenu que le processus d'examen de l'Organisation devrait prendre fin au terme de cette Conférence, l'après Conférence devant être mise à profit pour mettre en oeuvre les recommandations finales". C'est une formulation qui peut être améliorée mais l'idée est celle-là.

R.G. PETTITT (United Kingdom): I have no objection to the inclusion of a sentence along those lines provided it ascribes this view to a number of delegations, if it is a number, rather than one spokesman. I think it must be a number from earlier remarks, but it is not a unanimous view.

In our view, whether or not a review process continues is a matter for the Conference to decide. It should not be prejudged at this stage.

LE DIRECTEUR GENERAL: En tant que Directeur général, je n'ai pas compris de façon explicite le sens de la proposition de M. le délégué du Royaume-Uni. Pourrait-il nous répéter la phrase et nous expliquer de quoi il s'agit?

Déjà, dans le rapport des experts et dans celui des deux Comités 11 a été question d'examiner un aspect du "management structure", de la structure interne. Il s'agit des opérations de terrains, de notre programme d'assistance technique en général. On a même étudié la possibilité de confondre ensemble deux unités que nous appelons AGO et DDF. S'agit-il de cela ou de tout? La structure interne, la structure externe, le Conseil, la Conférence, les Comités... Il faut donner un sens à cette demande exprimée par la Grande-Bretagne.

Le représentant de la Suisse dit qu'il ne se rappelle plus quand il a parlé, peut-être au dernier Conseil, il y a deux ans ou à la Conférence... On ne peut pas parler ici de choses d'il y a deux ans.

Le représentant de la Suisse nous dit qu'on en a parlé; je le crois; mais une petite phrase qui n'a l'air de rien du tout peut signifier beaucoup de choses. Je demande quelle est la portée et le sens de cette étude proposée par quelques délégués; 11 est de leur droit de s'exprimer mais en tant que Directeur général, j'aimerais savoir de quoi il s'agit.

R.G. PETTITT (United Kingdom): I agree with the delegate of Australia that it is perhaps less confusing to have this as a separate paragraph. I also agree it is confusing that the management studies, the studies commissioned by the Director-General, have acquired the name "Management Review" because management review in common parlance means something broader than this. The proposition which was put forward by, as I understand it, a number of delegations was that the Conference should consider whether a management review in the straightforward sense, and indeed in the sense which was described in some detail in the paper put forward by the United Kingdom for the previous Conference, should be considered.

My proposition was that to allow this to be inserted one now has a new paragraph which would read, if I may read the full text, "Some delegations recommended that the Conference should consider the possibility of a review of FAO's management structure". Then I would add, "However, a number of delegations were of the view that such a review was outside the purview of Resolution 6/87".

João Augusto DE MEDICIS (Brasil): My proposal was very much on the lines of what has just been said by the delegate of the United Kingdom together with what was said before by the delegate of the Congo. Perhaps in a milder way my idea was to have a last paragraph, paragraph No. 10, saying "Reference was also made by one delegation to the possibility of a review of the management structure of the Organization. Most delegations, however, believed that this review was outside the scope of Resolution 6/87 and that the review process should be concluded by the Twenty-Fifth Conference". I do not know whether that helps or not.

LE PRESIDENT: J'ai compris que le Royaume-Uni ne voit pas d'objection à la proposition du Congo, qu'on ajoute quelque chose qui balance, qui dise qu'on ne doit pas aller plus loin que la prochaine Conférence. Si tel est le cas, peut-être le Conseil accepterait-il qu'il y ait quelque chose de "balancé" comme l'a dit le Représentant du Brésil. En tout cas j'ai la liste des délégués qui ont demandé que l'on arrête le processus. Beaucoup de délégués ont demandé que l'on mette un point final; la Colombie a d'ailleurs employé un mot italien: basta. Si vous voulez tenir compte de la proposition du Royaume-Uni, il faut tenir compte également du fait que beaucoup de délégués ont demandé que l'on arrête les études.

Gian Luigi VALENZA (Italie): Vous venez de dire, et c'est tout à fait exact, que de toute façon ce paragraphe vient après le paragraphe 8 qui parle de consensus et de la nécessité d'arriver à un consensus. Cela donne tout de suite le sens d'une division dans le Conseil. Si division il y a, il ne faudrait pas la faire apparaître. Il faudrait trouver une formule qui puisse dire la vérité et toute la vérité. Comme l'a dit notre collègue du Congo, la majorité était pour ne pas poursuivre cet examen. D'autre part, je me demande si c'est le cas de trancher ici ou de renvoyer la question à la Conférence.

R.G. PETTITT (United Kingdom): My anxiety is only to have the report reflect the reality of the situation. It could possibly be by show of hands that we decide whether one or a number did make the point I made. So if it is only one I am quite happy, or equally if it is the view of the majority that this is outside the scope of Resolution 6/87 I have no objection to that. In my view it is not outside the scope.

As to the suggestion of Brazil that a number thought that the review process should stop, I think that if we add that we will probably have to go on adding another point saying that other delegations considered that whether it should stop should be decided by the Conference and they would not wish to pre-empt their decision. So we are going on and on. I would rather stop with my first sentence and my original proposal about the reservations.

Jacques WARIN (France): La discussion devient un peu surréaliste, parce qu'il y a quelques heures nous avons adopté une conclusion que je vais vous lire du paragraphe 3 du document REP/3:

"Tout en reconnaissant que l'amélioration des systèmes et des approches est un processus continu, le Conseil a conclu que l'Examen ne doit pas être prolongé."

Nous avons conclu. Le paragraphe est adopté. Je trouve que l'adjonction du Royaume-Uni est, non pas superfétatoire, mais en contradiction avec le paragraphe 3 et nous ne pouvons pas le prendre en considération.

LE PRESIDENT: Il appartient à la Conférence de se prononcer sur la proposition du Royaume-Uni. On parlera de ces questions à la Commission II. Il y a une instance plus forte que le Conseil qui pourra examiner cela de près. Nous devrions maintenant pouvoir conclure cette étude. J'appelle de tous mes vœux le succès de la prochaine Conférence. Ce sera un point cardinal. Il y aura là 158 membres, je formule le vœu que ce travail de deux ans avec toute une équipe d'experts, de comités, de membres du Conseil et de la Conférence aboutira à renforcer la FAO et à augmenter son rayonnement. Nous sommes unanimes à vouloir cela. Bien sûr il y a des sensibilités différentes, des réactions différentes, c'est normal, mais il y a la volonté d'aller de l'avant.

DRAFT REPORT - PART IV

PROJET DE RAPPORT - QUATRIEME PARTIE

PROYECTO DE INFORME - PARTE IV

PARAGRAPHS 1 TO 11 INCLUDING DRAFT RESOLUTION

PARAGRAPHERS 1 A 11 Y COMPRIS LE PROJET DE RESOLUTION

PARRAFOS 1 A 11 INCLUIDO EL PROYECTO DE RESOLUCION

LE PRESIDENT: Paragraphe 1, approuvé. Paragraphe 2?

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): Proponemos que se suprima el párrafo 2. Lo mismo propondremos cuando lleguemos a los párrafos 23 y 24 de esta misma parte IV del Informe.

LE PRESIDENT: Il y a duplication... Cette remarque me paraît fondée et si vous en êtes d'accord on peut supprimer le paragraphe 2. Par conséquent le paragraphe 3 deviendra le paragraphe 2.

Masayuki KOMATSU (Japan): My delegation has difficulty in this paragraph, particularly the second sentence which begins in the fourth line. The sentence begins from, "In that regard". This sentence touches upon the authorization to borrow, but as far as our delegation recognizes by hearing the debate, I don't think this was fully debated. Maybe, if we are not mistaken, I got some explanation from the Secretariat, namely the Director-General, but as it is clearly presented, the Japanese position, the Japanese Government is not in the position to recognize, to approve, the FAO to use the method to exercise external borrowing. So I would like to propose the modification of the second sentence, and sentence read: "In that regard, the Council noted that" - then I will put some modification - "should this situation continue FAO may not pay for" - and I direct to delete the sentence which begins, "The Director-General" up until "pay for" and the sentence continues "basic".

So that the full sentence is something like as follows: "In that regard, the Council noted that should the situation continue FAO may not pay for basic and uncontrollable expenditure and commitments for which no further cash would be available once the Working Capital Fund and the Special Reserve Account resources were exhausted".

LE DIRECTEUR GENERAL: Comme je suis concerné je tiens à expliquer à M. le délégué du Japon ainsi qu'à celui de l'Australie et à ceux qui n'ont jamais accepté la résolution de la Conférence qui m'autorise à emprunter si nécessaire, que je respecterai cette résolution à moins qu'une autre résolution ne dise le contraire. Je ne l'utiliserai qu'en cas de nécessité; jusqu'ici je ne l'ai pas utilisée.

Le Japon a tardé de trois mois pour payer sa contribution, est-ce que les Etats-Unis tarderont l'année prochaine?... J'ai besoin d'argent et je ne vais pas laisser cette Organisation se noyer, se perdre et se mouvoir à droite et à gauche en aveugle... Il faut respecter les décisions de la Conférence; je ferai de mon mieux pour ne pas emprunter mais cela ne dépend pas de moi mais des Etats-Unis; ils ont la clé en main. Le Japon a tardé à payer, la Grande-Bretagne et la Hollande ont payé en deux fois, l'Italie a payé en une seule fois. Tout dépend des pays membres.

Une résolution de la Conférence existe et m'autorise à emprunter; elle a été votée par la majorité; je respecte l'avis de la minorité qui existe, mais j'ai en vue l'intérêt général de la FAO. Quelle que soit la phrase que l'on introduit elle ne changera pas les règles de la Conférence; j'affirme ici que je n'ai aucunement l'intention d'emprunter et j'espère que je ne le ferai pas.

David COUTTS (Australia): I actually originally put my flag up on para 2, but I wasn't quite quick enough. I won't object to the deletion of that paragraph, but I would indicate that I do not agree with the other suggestion that we delete the later paragraphs, 23 and 24.

On the paragraph you were talking about, personally I can accept leaving paragraph 3 as it is, but I would want to add that some delegations indicated that they could not accept or did not find acceptable that the Organization borrow.

LE DIRECTEUR GENERAL: Je n'y vois aucun inconvénient mais il faut respecter les décisions prises par la Conférence et qui engagent tous les Etats Membres. Cette phrase ne me gêne aucunement mais je ne serai pas intimidé par des instructions qui me seraient données par quelques Etats Membres. J'ai prêté serment de n'être influencé par quiconque et de suivre les instructions de la Conférence et du Conseil. C'est ce que je ferai.

Ce n'est pas la première mais la dixième fois que cette phrase revient. Certains Etats Membres ne souhaitent pas que j'utilise cette facilité; ce n'est pas mon rapport mais celui des délégués; j'ai déjà dit à plusieurs reprises que je ne laisserai pas la FAO se noyer pour donner satisfaction à quelques pays. Je suis obligé de recevoir des instructions de tous les Etats Membres et de travailler dans l'intérêt général. S'il faut que j'emprunte je le ferai si nécessaire.

Raymond ALLEN (United Kingdom): I had understood that the report was meant to reflect the actual debate. I think the delegate of Australia was right when he said that a number of delegations did say that they opposed borrowing, and I think that should be reflected in the report.

Igor MARINCEK (Suisse): Je tenais simplement à rappeler que la position de mon pays, dans toutes les enceintes et dans toutes les Organisations internationales, a toujours été que nous sommes contre le recours à l'emprunt, nous l'avons toujours exprimé au sein de la FAO et demandons donc que l'on retienne une formule qui l'indique: la formule australienne soutenue par le Royaume-Uni me semble très bonne.

C. Srinivasa SASTRY (India): Mr Chairman, on the afternoon of the 7th when you were good enough to call my name, I was out of the hall. With your permission, you had introduced into the verbatim record the intervention that India would have made. While it figures in the printed verbatim record CL 96/PV/A, I will, with your permission, read two small paragraphs from the Indian intervention.

"We would also compliment the FAO Secretariat on their prudent financial management, despite the serious financial difficulty and for having managed the situation without borrowing. However, Member Nations should realize that if this situation persists, there would be no escape from borrowing. We should make it clear to the Director-General that he should feel free, at his discretion, to use the authority vested in him by the Conference resolution to borrow money."

This is a power which is already vested in the Director-General through a resolution of the Conference, and we are only reiterating the power vested in him. I do not think it is appropriate to enter any caveats on a power given to the Director-General by resolution of the Conference.

Sra. Margarita LIZARRAGA SAUCEDO (México): Mi delegación fue de las que se expresaron también en ese sentido. Y recordarle al Director General que él tenía toda nuestra autorización, se la había concedido así la Conferencia para hacer uso, y que realmente él prudentemente lo ofreció, en espíritu del diálogo, que dejaría estar hasta lo último, haría todos los recursos para no hacerlo. No lo ha hecho. Quiere decir que hay una cuestión sana de esto. Pero que el Consejo recuerda que tiene la facultad. Eso sí se ha hecho. Yo creo que podrá quedar así el párrafo.

Atif Y. BUKHARI (Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of) (original language Arabic): Having listened to the Director-General, I do not have much to add. We are in a very astonishing situation. There are some members and some countries which are asking for zero growth, while they have not paid their contributions. They are refusing the resort to borrowing without giving us any other alternative. We do not know what to do. How can we advise the Director-General as far as this question is concerned? I have no objection whatsoever to the proposal made by our colleague Mr Coutts of the Finance Committee of adding "some members".

LE PRESIDENT: Nous avons une résolution de la Conférence que nous devons tous respecter. La Conférence peut changer les résolutions, mais tant qu'elles existent nous devons les respecter. Nous sommes en train de discuter quelque chose qui a été décidé par la Conférence. Avons-nous qualité au Conseil, avec le tiers des membres de la Conférence, pour discuter des décisions de la Conférence? Je trouve cela un peu difficile à admettre. Si vous voulez, on peut ajouter un paragraphe disant: "Quelques membres...". Mais cela n'a pas de portée pratique. Cela rappellerait simplement que quelques membres ne seraient pas d'accord.

DIRECTOR-GENERAL: I have a text which maybe will satisfy Australia, Canada and the countries which would like to add a sentence saying they are opposed to borrowing. Un certain nombre de pays réaffirment leur opposition. Ce n'est pas la première fois.

Je voudrais dire aussi que pour satisfaire la Grande-Bretagne, les Etats-Unis, le Canada, l'Australie et la Suisse, je n'ai pas recouru à des emprunts. Mais qui est-ce qui a payé les pots cassés? Ce sont les Etats Membres, puisque 68 millions de dollars ont dû être coupés, que j'aurais pu très facilement emprunter puisque je pouvais emprunter sans limite. Donc j'ai déjà fait, je crois, le maximum. J'ai coupé 68 millions de dollars. Mais croyez-vous que je puisse encore couper des millions de dollars? Je n'ai pas emprunté, j'ai attendu patiemment trois ans, je suis prêt à attendre encore. Ce n'est pas une affaire personnelle, mais je me sens coupable d'avoir coupé 68 millions de dollars pour faire plaisir à ces quelques pays. Encore ces pays payent-ils leurs cotisations et nous permettent de fonctionner. Mais je prie instamment les Etats

Membres qui ont des arriérés de payer à temps. C'est le seul moyen que j'ai pour que certains pays réalisent que s'ils ne payent pas, je serai contraint d'emprunter. Je sais que certains pays ne sont pas autorisés à payer les intérêts sur leurs arriérés ou des emprunts. C'est semble-t-il le cas des Etats-Unis. If you want to make a plea, you must be clear.

LE PRESIDENT: Je vais demander au Directeur général de bien vouloir vous lire sa proposition.

LE DIRECTEUR GENERAL: Un certain nombre de pays ont réaffirmé à cette occasion leur opposition à ce que le Directeur général recoure à des emprunts.

Gonzalo BULA HOTOS (Colombia): Podríamos aceptar la adición propuesta por el Director General, pero, en ese caso, la segunda frase, que actualmente dice "el Consejo tomó nota", debe ser modificada en la siguiente forma: "A este respecto, el Consejo estuvo de acuerdo en que el Director General", etcétera. Y luego la salvedad de los países que no están de acuerdo con ello.

LE PRESIDENT: Nous avons une proposition du Directeur général, je vais demander l'autorisation aux délégués qui ont demandé la parole avant cette proposition s'ils voient une objection à ce que l'on prenne position sur la proposition du Directeur général. Personnellement, je propose que l'on retienne cette rédaction pour que nous puissions avancer.

Earl W. WEYBRECHT (Canada): I have no particular difficulty with the sentence which was just read out by the Director-General. However, I agree that the second sentence - which, in my view, to some degree ties in with the point made in the fourth sentence, may need to be revised slightly. Possibly this could be accomplished by saying, "The Council was reminded", rather than, "The Council noted". I think that would more realistically reflect the discussion. Certainly not all members of the Council commented on this. I do not have a specific count as to those who would agree and those who would not, but I would suggest that that wording be changed somewhat.

LE PRESIDENT: Il y a une proposition concrète et nous pourrions avancer avec cette proposition. On pourrait donc dire: "A cet égard, le Conseil a convenu....".

C. Srinivasa SASTRY (India): "Reminded" by whom?

LE PRESIDENT: Vous avez raison, puisqu'il y a majorité, on peut dire: "Le Conseil a convenu". Est-ce que c'est acceptable?

Earl W. WEYBRECHT (Canada): Mr Chairman, this was a matter I believe that had been touched on by the Director-General: I do not have his precise words but rather than prolong the discussion on this I would be prepared to accept the original wording "the Council noted" in return for withdrawing the suggestion that I had made.

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): Si dejamos la redacción en su forma actual, no tendría necesidad de agregarse nada. O dejamos el texto como está o se hacen los dos cambios.

LE PRESIDENT: Est-ce que vous voulez que l'on dise: "Le Conseil a considéré" au lieu de "convenu"? C'est une prise de position.

K.P. ALLEYNE (Trinidad and Tobago): Chairman. I do feel we can really move on with the paragraph as it is together with the recommended sentence from the Director-General. I think that takes care of all of the concerns. We could even go with "the Council was reminded" and so on. I think we can move on.

LE PRESIDENT: On dira: "Le Conseil a considéré". Nous passons au paragraphe 4.

Earl W. WEYBRECHT (Canada): Mr Chairman, I have some concerns on the reference in the sentence to "no other alternative but to borrow monies", and would prefer that that element be taken out, with some adjustments of course, to make the sentence retain the additional points, but I do have some difficulty with the wording "no other alternative but to borrow monies".

So I would suggest, Mr Chairman, that the wording be along the lines that the Director-General was in an unprecedented situation and needed to take whatever measures required to ensure the survival of the Programme of Work and Budget.

Muhammad Saleem KHAN (Pakistan): I do not think it really makes any difference if we have this here or we do not have it, but to help us to move forward maybe we could say "would be constrained to borrow monies". Instead of saying "having no other alternative", say "would be constrained to borrow monies".

DIRECTOR-GENERAL: The Canadian proposal is because whatever measures would include borrowing etc.!!! So I would like, I think, that we should not persist with your proposal.

LE PRESIDENT: On pourrait dire: "Il devra prendre toutes les mesures qui s'avéreront nécessaires."

Le paragraphe 4 est approuvé. Paragraphe 5? Ce paragraphe est également approuvé. Nous passons au paragraphe 6.

Igor MARINCEK (Suisse): C'est la première fois que je vois cette résolution. Est-ce que l'on pourrait me dire dans quel document soumis à l'examen du Conseil cette résolution a été proposée et discutée?

Masayuki KOMATSU (Japan): My delegation also would like to get clarification by what process this idea of coming up to the draft resolution comes. I understand that some debate is going on to discuss about the possibility to go to the International Court of Justice or other measures, but I do not know. Somebody talks about some measures, but to our knowledge with other members equally treated, what we need is some strong appeal, and an appeal to be repeated to the Member Nations which have contribution ideas, to add them to immediately fuel their obligation. So the point is that maybe I would like to have a clarification of why and by what process this should be needed, and my feeling is that maybe this may not be necessary. The second point is maybe a reserve.

LE PRESIDENT: Je dois rappeler, pour éclairer l'information des membres du Conseil, que lorsqu'on a discuté un après-midi de la situation financière - et cela a été notifié dans le verbatim - il avait été envisagé plusieurs possibilités. Dans mon intervention, j'avais dit qu'il serait peut-être possible de préparer un projet de résolution pour donner un aspect plus solennel à ce Conseil. Si le Conseil ne suit pas cette proposition, il est libre de trouver une autre formule, mais pour l'histoire, je dois dire que j'avais proposé un projet de résolution au cas où on aurait voulu donner un aspect solennel à cet appel.

Igor: MARINCEK (Suisse): Ceci ne répond pas à la question. Il se pose deux questions. Peut-être le Conseil juridique pourra-t-il répondre. Nous avons eu un débat sur le point relatif à la situation financière. Dans ce point, nous n'avons pas eu l'examen d'une telle résolution. Est-ce que vous pouvez nous dire avec qui cette résolution a été préparée et est-ce qu'il est possible, d'après le règlement, d'introduire une résolution en dehors de la discussion sous le point de l'ordre du jour, c'est-à-dire au niveau de l'adoption du rapport.

João Augusto DE MEDICIS (Brazil): Mr Chairman, thank you. You answered both questions. You said resolutions are of your own authorship, that you prepared the resolution, and if the Council is not prepared to accept it you were prepared also to drop it. Anyhow Mr Chairman, I think that perhaps a solution could be that we change this last paragraph 6, so if you do not want to engage in a long discussion on this resolution, saying something that the first part would be the same;"The Council regretted that, even at this dramatic juncture in the existence of the Organization, its appeals were apparently not heard and it felt that the Conference might consider the possibility of adopting a resolution on this subject".

Then we have another sentence saying;"A draft resolution prepared by the Independent Chairman of the Council is attached as annexed to the Report".

LE PRESIDENT: Y a-t-il des réactions à cette proposition? Puisque je suis en cause, je l'accepte.

Igor MARINCEK (Suisse): Nous l'accepterions avec une simple petite modification, à savoir souligner que celle-ci n'a pas fait l'objet d'un débat au sein du Conseil.

LE PRESIDENT: Lorsque j'ai fait cette proposition, je n'ai pas noté de réaction négative. C'est pour cela que le Comité de rédaction, qui a préparé ce texte, a cru bon de le faire. Si le Conseil avait dit non, je ne crois pas que le Comité de rédaction l'aurait préparé.

Sra. Mónica DEREGIBUS (Presidenta del Comité de Redacción): Quisiera, Señor Presidente, aclarar que el Comité de Redacción no sólo no preparó al texto, sino que no tuvo oportunidad de examinarlo, y es más, alguno de sus miembros me manifestó su sorpresa por ver un texto de Resolución porque no sabía que hubiera circulado ninguna Resolución en el Consejo.

Raphael RABE (Madagascar): Je voudrais seulement signaler que, dans son intervention, la délégation de Madagascar avait également recommandé que l'on propose un projet de résolution à la Conférence sur ce point qui est très important. Donc, Monsieur le Président, vous dites que vous avez fait cette proposition, mais notre délégation avait fait la même. Il ne s'agit donc pas d'une proposition du Président seulement mais aussi de certains délégués. Nous pensons effectivement qu'il est opportun de proposer un projet de résolution à la Conférence et, en tout cas, on ne peut utiliser ce document qui est déjà prêt, peut-être pas pour l'approuver ici mais pour le transmettre à la Conférence.

Jacques WARIN (France): Je considère que le délégué du Brésil a fait une proposition très constructive et je m'y rallie entièrement. La proposition que vous avez faite, Monsieur le Président, et qui a débouché sur ce projet de résolution, est-elle aussi constructive. Vous avez eu l'élégance de la reprendre à votre compte et je pense donc que la formulation du Brésil -"le Président a estimé souhaitable de préparer un projet de résolution" - est acceptable. Puisque vous reprenez cela à votre compte, nous n'avons pas besoin d'indiquer que ce projet de résolution n'a pas fait l'objet d'un débat au Conseil.

Ms Joan DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America): Mr Chairman, my delegation would like to see paragraph 6 deleted. As the Chairmn of the Drafting Committee just indicated, this resolution was not considered in the Drafting Committee. None of us have had a chance to read it throughly. We appreciate very much the efforts that you put out in order to produce a resolution for us, but as in many other things, this Council is running out of time. My delegation does not think it is appropriate at this point to include a text of a such a long resolution in such detail.

As far as the proposal made by the distinguished delegate from Brazil, my delegation cannot accept the text in which it is indicated that the Council regretted, and my delegation would also like to delete the word "dramatic". My delegation could accept a language that indicated that "some members felt the Council's appeals" and some modification of the language "the Council regretted".

Atif Y. BUKHARI (Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of) (original language Arabic): Mr Chairman, as my colleague from Madagascar has already said, many delegates as a matter of fact talked about this, and I have heard that some members referred to the possibility of adopting a strong resolution by the Council. His Excellency Ambassador De Medicis referred to this issue and he tabled a very good proposal with which we concur. We may, by way of clarification, add and say that this draft resolution is presented to the Conference by the Council in this form. We do agree to the proposal of the distinguished Ambassador from Brazil.

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): Lamentaríamos Señor Presidente que llegara hasta esta Sala Roja el eco de voces poco gratas que se oyeron en el Comité de Redacción. Nosotros pensamos que usted ha cumplido la voluntad del Consejo, a la que nadie se opuso, de preparar este proyecto de resolución.

Apoyamos lo que ha dicho Brasil sin que se agregue nada. Usted tiene todo el respaldo y el respeto del Consejo. Pero con ánimo de compromiso para atender las dos propuestas que se hicieron, podríamos aceptar que en vez de: el Consejo lamentó, dijéramos: el Consejo estuvo feliz. Luego: en vez de dramática situación, decir: sonriente y florida situación.

Sra. Grafila SOTO CARRERO (Cuba): En realidad, Señor Presidente, la Delegación de Cuba hubiese querido suprimir la discusión de todos los párrafos que no pudieron ser discutidos en el Comité de Redacción, ya que no fue solamente éste, fueron muchos párrafos los que no pudieron ser discutidos. La Delegación de Cuba hubiera querido suprimir todos y no estar en definitiva tanto tiempo trabajando en este Consejo; sin embargo no es posible eso. En este sentido la Delegación de Cuba le agradece a usted, Señor Presidente, la preparación de esta documentación y apoya en todas sus partes la propuesta hecha por el distinguido Delegado de Brasil.

Joseph TCHICAYA (Congo): Je pense, pour ma part, que cette discussion est quelque peu inutile. Elle est inutile parce que, ce matin, avant que nous nous séparions, il avait été entendu que certaines questions seraient discutées au niveau du Comité de rédaction et d'autres, qui ne pouvaient pas l'être, le seraient au Conseil. Je ne vois donc pas très bien pourquoi on pense que tout devait être discuté au Comité de rédaction.

Je pense qu'à ce sujet, mon collègue du Brésil a fait une proposition très constructive et que tout le monde devrait s'y rallier. Cette proposition englobe tout ce que l'on voudrait ajouter. Je crois qu'il faut surtout éviter que le texte soit redondant et c'est pour cette raison que je me rallie à la proposition faite par le délégué du Brésil.

Quant aux dernières propositions qui ont été faites pour supprimer tel ou tel mot, pour que l'on dise "la plupart", etc., 11 me semble que vous connaissez ma position sur ce point. J'ai, dès le départ, indiqué que le Conseil devrait se démarquer de ce genre de procédure. Je crois en effet que, lorsque la majorité s'est prononcée sur une idée, il faut dire que c'est le Conseil. Pour sortir de cette impasse, notre ami du Brésil a eu la sagesse de faire sa proposition et j'invite tous les membres du Conseil à s'y rallier.

John A. YENNIMATAS (Grèce): Personnellement, je me rallie à la proposition du Représentant du Brésil. Toutefois, dans un effort de compromis, on pourrait adopter le paragraphe 6 tel que proposé mais sans le texte de ce projet de résolution.

Mauricio CUADRA (Nicaragua): Nosotros creemos, Señor Presidente, que el numero de delegaciones que lamentó la dramática situación fue casi unánime en este Consejo. Consideramos que debe mantenerse este texto que refleja claramente la firmeza con que realizamos esta situación.

En cuanto al Proyecto de Resolución, estamos de acuerdo en que un proyecto elaborado por usted con la mejor voluntad posible fue anunciado aquí por usted mismo, se escuchó bien claro, y no vemos porqué no puede acogerse la propuesta del Embajador de Brasil, que viene a permitir que la Conferencia conozca lo que ha sido en realidad una verdadera intención hecha por el Presidente Independiente del Consejo y que acogemos la mayoría de las delegaciones. Queremos que se mantenga el dramatismo y la fuerza del párrafo y que se acoja la propuesta del Embajador de Brasil.

Ms Joan DUDIK-GAYOSO (United States of America): I think we are in a little difficulty here because most of us have not had a chance to go through all of the text.

I should like to point out to the Council that this issue in this particular place is in fact superfluous. The status of contributions is dealt with in paragraph 12 of the document before us. The text of that paragraph reads: "The Council noted the status of contributions at 7 November 1989... as well as the details of amounts received from each Member Nation..." In paragraph 18 the question of arrears is dealt with. That paragraph reads: "In this connection, the Council noted with great concern that, at 7 November 1989, a total amount of \$94 million of arrears of contributions remained outstanding, including \$78 million overdue from the largest contributor". It goes on to indicate how many Member Nations have made cash payments and how many had paid their arrears in full.

Notwithstanding the very considerable discussion in the Drafting Committee in which the members of the Drafting Committee upheld the principle of non-discrimination against members, my delegation can accept in its entirety paragraph 18.

Paragraph 20 on the same page deals with the question of the need for all Member Nations to pay their contributions. With very small changes my delegation can accept that paragraph, which notes "with very great concern that notwithstanding the positive response made by many Member Nations to the Director-General's special appeals... 93 Member Nations had made no payment, or only partial payment... and that 53 Member Nations were in arrears for 1988 and prior years...".

My delegation would seek a change in that paragraph in terms of the fact "that there was no information available regarding the date and amount of assessments due from the largest contributor". Specifically, my delegation went into great detail in this Council to explain exactly what information was available. I know that that information was not sufficient to the members of this Council. However, it was provided.

Furthermore, in that last sentence my delegation would like an indication to be included that no definite information was available regarding the date and amount of assessments due from many Member States, rather than "from the largest contributor".

Sra. Mercedes FERMIN GOMEZ (Venezuela): Muy brevemente, Señor Presidente, sólo para expresar nuestro apoyo a la propuesta de Brasil; en toda su extensión, con la cual estamos perfectamente de acuerdo, y en mantener el párrafo 6 como está redactado.

João Augusto DE MEDICIS (Brazil): As a country which also has outstanding contributions, and so is affected by the draft resolution proposed in this paragraph - I believe there is not only one country as my country is affected - I am prepared to accept this.

It is very easy to solve the problem raised by the United States delegate. We just transfer paragraph 6 to after paragraph 18 and add that as a new paragraph 19. So we have exactly what is wanted, in the same line of thought as the United States delegate wants. I hope that we can adopt that.

I am in exactly the same position as the United States, because my country is also a debtor to this Organization. I regretted that very much in my speech. I said that I am not proud of it. But anyway as another debtor of the Organization I can accept that.

Jacques WARIN (France): Je ne sais pas si la proposition que vient de faire le délégué du Brésil pourrait être acceptée par la déléguée des Etats-Unis. Personnellement, je ferais une autre proposition qui serait beaucoup plus neutre. J'ai constaté hier, lors du débat sur la situation financière, que de nombreux délégués s'inquiétaient de l'ampleur des arriérés et lançaient un appel pour un règlement rapide de toutes les contributions. On a même parlé de sanctions éventuelles à l'encontre de ceux qui ne versaient pas leurs contributions à temps.

J'ai relevé également, Monsieur le Président, que vous avez conclu en disant que la Conférence verrait peut-être un avantage à ce qu'il y ait un projet de résolution en ce sens. Et personne n'a objecté à cette proposition. Je trouverais dommage de ne pas utiliser ce projet de résolution comme matériel pour la Conférence. Je pense qu'il pourrait être mis en annexe à ce rapport. Et pour avoir une formulation extrêmement neutre, on pourrait libeller le paragraphe 6 comme suit: "Un projet de résolution recommandant le règlement rapide des contributions, préparé par le Président du Conseil, est placé en annexe au rapport". On peut mettre cette petite phrase n'importe où. A mon avis, il serait préférable de la mettre à la fin du paragraphe 4. Le problème réel est celui-ci: maintenons-nous ou non le projet de résolution? je considère qu'il faut le maintenir en le mettant en annexe au rapport et en le présentant d'une manière très neutre.

LE DIRECTEUR GENERAL: Moi, j'ai besoin d'un projet de résolution. Je vais lire aux membres du Conseil l'article 5.10 du Règlement financier:

"Le Conseil peut donner au Directeur général un avis sur les mesures qu'il convient de prendre pour hâter le versement des contributions. Le Conseil peut soumettre à la Conférence toute recommandation qu'il juge nécessaire à cet égard"

J'ai bien dit que le problème numéro un, ce sont les arriérés de contributions. Nous vivons dans une situation impossible et j'ai demandé au Conseil de m'aider. Cela a d'ailleurs donné lieu à la discussion la plus importante. Et je dirai dans mon discours d'ouverture que c'est le problème numéro un, parce que cette situation se détériore. Je pourrais emprunter mais certains pays vont être mécontents.

A mon avis, ce projet de résolution doit être inclus. C'est à vous d'en décider. Mais qu'est-ce que cela veut dire, en annexe? Fera-t-il partie du rapport? Va-t-on le traiter comme l'annexe au rapport du Comité du programme? Personnellement, je pense que si vous décidez de présenter une résolution, cela m'aidera à recevoir davantage de contributions en temps utile et dans l'esprit de l'article 5.10 du Règlement financier.

David COUTTS (Australia): For once I am on the side of the angels here. We certainly agree with the general statement in this draft resolution. For my part, I think I could probably agree to it being sent to Conference, although I do have a problem with the expression on the second page noting the Council resolution about borrowing and would be more comfortable if that was not there. But given that we have already indicated that some countries cannot accept borrowing in paragraph 3, I think that is probably covered. I think I would be prepared to agree that the resolution stays in and if some countries do not agree they can indicate that.

Hannu HALINEN (Finland): Mr Chairman, I can certainly agree with the major thrust in the Resolution as such. The difficulty for my delegation are the formalities, the agreed ways and means in which we do conduct our business. It is very unfortunate that this text comes to us so late and without being discussed in the Drafting Committee. Therefore, my first preference would be to go along with the Greek position, not to have the text produced here. However, I could also accept the French position of having it as an annex perhaps and then discussed in the Conference.

LE PRESIDENT: Nous avons deux propositions: celle de M. l'Ambassadeur du Brésil qui semble avoir été approuvée par un grand nombre de délégués et celle de M. l'Ambassadeur de France appuyée par M. le délégué de Finlande.

Compte tenu de la situation dramatique, je puis vous dire que ce qui m'a le plus frappé dans ce Conseil, c'est la situation financière qui se dégrade visiblement.

Personnellement en mon âme et conscience, et bien que devant quitter ce Conseil, je serai toujours préoccupé par le fait que nous n'avons peut-être pas fait tout ce que nous aurions dû pour aider l'Organisation à travailler dans des conditions raisonnables. Pour moi c'est un cas de conscience et je le dis en toute honnêteté.

Je serais personnellement d'accord avec la proposition de M. l'Ambassadeur du Brésil à la nuance près que l'on ajoute dans le texte du rapport, comme l'a dit M. Coutts, que certaines délégations ne sont pas d'accord, ce qui est tout à fait normal. Il est tout à fait normal de le dire et de l'écrire et la Conférence décidera; ce sera à elle d'en juger.

Mais je dois dire, en tant que Président du Conseil, et en mon âme et conscience que la situation de l'Organisation m'a beaucoup frappé.

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): Las ultimas intervenciones constructivas nos animan a aceptar la propuesta que se ha hecho y que yo creo podría formalizarse si al texto de Brasil que decía:".... presentó un Proyecto de Resolución", se le agrega:"cuyo texto se adjunta como anexo al Informe para consideración de la Conferencia".

LE PRESIDENT: Je n'ai personnellement pas d'objections mais l'essentiel est qu'il y ait un projet de résolution quelque part. Qu'en pense le Conseil? Personnellement je suis d'accord avec la proposition du Brésil amendée par M. Coutts.

Joseph TCHICAYA (Congo): Il est évident que le Conseil ne pourrait qu'être content si ce projet de résolution est entériné par le plus grand nombre des Etats Membres de notre Organisation; et le plus grand nombre c'est au niveau de la Conférence.

Mais il faut d'abord que le Conseil entérine ce projet de résolution et qu'il l'envoie à la Conférence pour approbation. C'est bien cela que nous disions; il faut que les choses soient claires. Il ne faut pas que l'on puisse croire que nous l'envoyons pour qu'elle soit jetée dans les oubliettes; et il faut que cela soit bien noté dans notre rapport.

Salim SARRAF (Liban): Vu l'importance de la résolution je me rallie plutôt à la position du Brésil. J'aimerais vous remercier parce que vous êtes allés au devant des desiderata de la majorité des membres en proposant cette résolution.

C. Srinivasa SASTRY (India): Mr Chairman, I do not know French, but on page 25 of PV/4 Revision 1, in paragraph 2, you said in your summing up that "if the Council agrees I will be asking for a draft resolution to be prepared which will be considered by the Drafting Committee and come before the Council on Friday for consideration to be placed before the Conference". I do not know French, but I understand that. Your having said that in the meeting of the Council itself, and the Draft having been prepared for consideration by the Drafting Committee, and the Drafting Committee for various reasons not having had time to consider this, it is appropriate that the Council itself takes a view. We would support the proposal made by the distinguished delegate from Brazil.

LE PRESIDENT:... avec l'amendement de M. Coutts... pas d'objections ?

Ibrahima KABA (Guinee): La question traitée par cette résolution est l'essentiel de ce qui nous préoccupe. Personne ne peut le contester. Comment peut-on mettre de côté cette importante résolution dont nous avons été saisis par M. le Président lors de notre session.

A notre avis ce texte devrait être partie intégrante de notre rapport et transmis à la Conférence.

Ms Joan DUDIK GAYOSO (United States of America): Mr Chairman, I wish to indicate that if the Brazilian proposal includes changes in paragraph 6, which would be moved to the end, which would indicate not the view of the Council, but the view of some delegations, my delegation could accept the proposal.

LE PRESIDENT: Pourrait-on accepter cette dernière remarque du délégué des Etats-Unis pour en sortir et avancer?

C. Srinivasa SASTRY (India): What changes have been made in paragraph 6? It is not clear to me what the wording is. But I think it must be made clear that it is the Council's recommendation of the Resolution for the Conference. It cannot be the recommendation of some members of the Council to the Conference.

LE PRESIDENT: Nous pourrions ajouter pour être honnêtes qu'un certain nombre de membres ont manifesté qu'ils n'étaient pas d'accord; cela me semble raisonnable. Nous mettrons un ajout comme quoi un certain nombre de délégations ne sont pas d'accord. Paragraphe 7: approuvé, Paragraphe 8: approuvé, Paragraphe 9: approuvé, Paragraphe 10: approuvé, Paragraphe 11: approuvé.

Paragraphs 1 to 11, including draft resolution, as amended, approved

Les paragraphes 1 à 11, y compris le projet de résolution, ainsi amendés, sont approuvés

Los párrafos 1 a 11, incluido el proyecto de resolución, así enmendados, son aprobados

PARAGRAPHS 12 to 24 PARAGRAPHS 12 à 24 PARRAFOS 12 a 24

LE PRESIDENT: Paragraphe 12 approuvé, paragraphe 13 approuvé, paragraphe 14 approuvé, paragraphe 15 approuvé, paragraphe 16 approuvé, paragraphe 17 approuvé, paragraphe 18 approuvé, paragraphe 19 approuvé. Paragraphe 20?

Ms Teresa HOBGOOD (United States of America): My delegation would like to add the following phrase to paragraph 20 after the word "contribution". The phrase would read, "because its legislative process had not been completed." Mr Chairman, there are other changes that we would like to make to this sentence, if I may read them. In the sixth line, after the word "no", we would like to add "definite". In the following line, after the word "from", we would like to add the following, "many member countries and".

I can read the last two lines if it would help: "and that there was no definite information available regarding the date and amount of assessments due from many member countries and no information available regarding the date and amount of assessments due from the largest contributor because its legislative process had not been completed."

João Augusto DE MEDICIS (Brazil): I am prepared to accept the proposal by the US delegation, with a last sentence added. It would read, "Some developing countries, however, indicated that their delay in payment was due to factors beyond their control, in particular the serious economic crisis faced by them due, among other factors, to the burden of external debt." At least one delegation, the delegation of Brazil expressed that, Mr Chairman.

Gonzalo BULA HOTOS (Colombia): Espero expresarme claramente. En primer lugar, no tengo problemas en aceptar que se agregue "definitiva", "información definitiva". Ni tampoco que se agregue la referencia a otros países deudores, naturalmente con el agregado de Brasil. En cuanto al proceso legislativo incompleto, convendría observar que el párrafo 20 empieza por las palabras: "El Consejo tomó nota". A nosotros no nos incumbe nada el proceso legislativo. Podríamos en cambio aceptar cuando dice "por el mayor contribuyente", "cuyos representantes declararon que el proceso legislativo aun no se ha completado". Espero que esto sea constructivo. "Cuyos representantes" pero no el Consejo, "cuyos representantes declararon que el proceso...". Espero que así podamos aceptar este párrafo y avanzar.

Mauricio CUADRA (Nicaragua): Nosotros tampoco tenemos problemas con la mayoría de las reformas planteadas, pero también teníamos un poco de problema con lo que ha señalado el distinguido representante de Colombia en la frase final, puesto que encontrábamos un poco raro el referirnos al proceso legislativo del mayor contribuyente. Estaba un poco incompleto. O se pone el nombre del país del mayor contribuyente cuyo Congreso no ha completado el proceso legislativo, o se hace una referencia más acertada como la que ha señalado el Embajador de Colombia. Pero hay que completar un poco la redacción. El proceso legislativo, ¿de quién?

Joseph TCHICAYA (Congo): J'appuie la proposition faite par mon collègue et ami de gauche et amendée légèrement par le Nicaragua; il me semble important de citer le pays d'autant plus que dans ce rapport je note qu'on a cité un nombre de pays qui ont payé, ou alors il faudrait dire que le Conseil ne cite que lorsque c'est favorable et que, lorsque c'est défavorable, on ne cite pas le nom du pays. Il faut être clair dans le rapport.

Igor MARINCEK (Switzerland): The Brazilian delegate made an additional sentence, and I think while we are not in economic commission here, but he stated that that problem was beyond the control of his country. I think we should not qualify things which this body is not really able to judge. I think every country has also some responsibility in the difficulties it has. There are responsibilities from outside, but I think we should not really make such statements.

Salim SARRAF (Liban): Je vais faire une petite remarque concernant la proposition des Etats-Unis. Je suis très content de l'ajout présenté par la Délégation des Etats-Unis parce que cela enlève toute équivoque et une fausse interprétation sur la raison du non-paiement des contributions.

Jacques WARIN (France): Je me demande si, au stade où nous sommes, nous n'aurions pas intérêt à faire plus court plutôt que plus long. Si chacun commence à donner les raisons pour lesquelles il ne paye pas, cela nous entraînera dans de longs débats. Il me semble que l'amendement proposé par la Représentante des Etats-Unis est justifié sur les contributions dues par un grand nombre de pays et par le plus gros bailleur de fonds. Mais dans un esprit de compromis je trouverais préférable que le Brésil retire son propre amendement et que les Etats-Unis retirent leur proposition finale. Nous aurions ainsi un texte plus court.

C. Srinivasa SASTRY (India): I have two proposals to make. The first one for the consideration, particularly the distinguished delegate from the USA, and the second for the Council. I would first read the last two lines as they stand, because I don't think the last two lines as they stood before the amendments really convey the information. "... and prior years, and that there was no information available regarding the date and amount of assessments due from the largest contributor." There is definite information available about the amount of assessments due from

the largest contributor. The only information not available at least about the dates of payment and the schedule of payment. I do not know whether I made myself clear. If I have, I would suggest that the draft would read the last line as follows, the last line of the whole draft, "date and payment schedule - for the assessments due from the largest contributor". Once we get that cleaned up, so that the position becomes clear.

The second suggestion I would like to make for consideration is, instead of repeating the word so many times, these last two lines as amended by me would read like this for your consideration: "... and prior years, and that there was not definite information available regarding the date and the payments schedules for the assessments due from the largest contributor - whose representative informed the Council that its legislative process had not been completed - as also many other Member Countries".

Atif Y. BUKHARI (Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of) (original language Arabic): I would support what France has said and that is that we should be trying to finish up with this paragraph and in so doing it would be better to shorten it rather than lengthen it, because no matter what we add we are not going to be changing facts. They exist; the reality is there. I don't know if the delegate of the United States insists on their addition, but I think it would be the right of the developing countries, as has been pointed out by the delegate of Brazil, to add their sentence. The US has proposed an amendment and therefore the developing countries would also have a right to add a few words as proposed by Brazil. However, if the US could accept withdrawing their proposal, as well as Brazil, then the paragraph could remain as it stands.

Joseph TCHICAYA (Congo): Je me rallie à ceux qui pensent qu'il ne faut pas allonger ce texte et surtout ce paragraphe. Je crois sincèrement qu'en ajoutant les amendements du Brésil et des Etats-Unis, le texte sera certainement plus précis mais le texte gagnerait trop en longueur.

Voilà pourquoi je pense que nous pouvons retenir cette formulation: aucune information précise n'est disponible concernant l'échéancier du règlement des contributions dues par le plus gros bailleur de fonds et d'autres pays débiteurs.

Je crois qu'en retenant cette formulation, nous pourrions rallier l'ensemble des délégués. En tout cas je le souhaite et je vous en remercie.

Sra. Graflia SOTO CARRERO (Cuba): En realidad, la Delegación de Cuba preferiría mantener el párrafo 20 tal como lo ha presentado el Comité de Redacción. Sin embargo, si se insiste en la propuesta hecha -que mi Delegación no tiene inconveniente en aceptar- por la Delegación de Estados Unidos, sería siempre con el añadido propuesto por la Delegación de Brasil.

João Augusto DE MEDICIS (Brazil): I support the comparable position just made by the delegate of the Congo. I have to say that my amendment was only due to the amendment by the US delegation. If we kept the statistics by the small amendment by the Congo, let's say many countries also then present. But if you need an explanation by the US delegation, I need an explanation from my own delegation because I also gave an explanation. So if I don't put any explanation for any one, I was totally prepared to accept the proposal by the delegation of the Congo. It is a much simpler one, and we can solve our problems.

LE PRESIDENT: Il y a une sorte de consensus sur la proposition du Congo. Je suggère aux honorables délégués de retenir ce compromis du Congo susceptible de faire adopter le paragraphe 20. Est-ce que tout le monde est d'accord?

Ms Teresa HOBGOOD (United States of America): My delegation can accept the position that was made by the Brazilian delegation if our explanation is included. The reason we thought that an explanation was necessary is because my delegation was aware that there were many Member States who were interested in knowing the date and the payments schedule of our contribution, and we thought it necessary to provide an explanation and we think that that explanation should be included in this paragraph. Again, we can accept an explanation of the Brazilian delegation as well.

Dong QING SONG (China) (original language Chinese): I have listened with interest to the statements of the previous speakers. I think we shouldn't have spent too much time on this point. If everyone adds a bit to this paragraph and engages in lengthy discussions, I don't know when our deliberations will be complete. Therefore, I think that we should adopt the version by the Drafting Committee, with the addition proposed by the Congo delegation.

LE PRESIDENT: Je pense que nous sommes d'accord et que nous pouvons adopter la proposition du Congo acceptée par les Etats-Unis qui nous permet de passer au paragraphe suivant, le paragraphe 20 étant approuvé.

Paragraphe 21 approuvé, paragraphe 22 approuvé.

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): Proponemos que se supriman los párrafos 23 y 24.

Sra. Mercedes FERMIN GOMEZ (Venezuela): Sólo para apoyar completamente la propuesta que Colombia acaba de hacer.

Igor MARINCEK (Suisse): Si vraiment nous voulons contribuer à lancer un appel aux pays avec des arriérés, je pense que nous devons insister pour que les textes de base soient respectés. Les textes de base sont clairs et nous devons être factuels dans notre rapport.

David COUTTS (Australia): I did ask for the floor, but, if you are going to keep the paragraphs, Mr Chairman, that is all right. I want to keep the paragraphs.

Sra. Graflia SOTO CARRERO (Cuba): La Delegación de Cuba también preferiría que se eliminara el párrafo 23. Lo hacemos con un sentido de elemental justicia. Nos parece totalmente injusto que países que deban 45 000 dólares ó 50 000 dólares pierdan su derecho a voto y que países que deben 148 millones lo mantengan. En ese sentido, nuestra Delegación apoya la propuesta hecha por el representante de Colombia.

Atif Y. BUKHARI (Saudi Arabia. Kingdom of) (original language Arabic): We fully agree with your proposal to keep these two paragraphs. We are actually encouraging the member countries to pay their contributions and appealing to them to be keen on the future of this Organization.

DIRECTOR-GENERAL: This text is not directed against any country. It provides for measures which are to be found in the Constitution. We always put it in the Finance Committee reports, working guides, etc. They might not lose the vote, because if they make a small payment they might be able to vote. I do not think the text will cause any harm to those countries. We are not putting their names. For the sake of speeding up the report, maybe the delegates of Cuba, Venezuela, Colombia and Congo will agree not to insist.

LE PRESIDENT: Il faut être homogène. Nous avons lancé un appel. Il faut que tous, petits et grands, nous fassions un effort.

Paragraphs 12 to 24, as amended, approved

Les paragraphes 12 à 24, ainsi amendés, sont approuvés

Párrafos 12 a 24, así enmendados, son aprobados

PARAGRAPHS 25 TO 30 INCLUDING DRAFT RESOLUTION

PARAGRAPHERS 25 A 30 Y COMPRIS LE PROJET DE RESOLUTION

PARRAFOS 25 A 30 INCLUIDO EL PROYECTO DE RESOLUCION

LE PRESIDENT: Paragraphe 25 approuvé, paragraphe 26 approuvé, paragraphe 27 approuvé.

Jacques WARIN (France): J'ai une petite remarque à faire sur les paragraphes 28 et 29. Vous vous souvenez sans doute que j'étais intervenu sur ce point, parce qu'il concernait mon pays. Ce rapport reprend en compte le rapport du Comité financier je ne le conteste pas, mais je me demande s'il est bien nécessaire d'indiquer dans le paragraphe 28: "Le Conseil... a noté que les honoraires qu'elle proposait étaient très intéressants." Le Conseil l'a-t-il noté? Je ne me rappelle plus si c'était dans le rapport du Comité financier. M. Bukhari en a-t-il parlé? Je ne crois pas. Je propose de supprimer cette phrase et de dire: "Le Conseil a jugé excellente la communication de la Cour des comptes de France. Il a espéré qu'elle offrirait...", nous supprimerions une ligne.

LE PRESIDENT: Nous sommes saisis d'une proposition de la France demandant de supprimer la phrase disant que les honoraires proposés étaient très intéressants. Je ne me rappelle pas qu'on ait dit cela, cela n'ajoute rien au texte. Personnellement je donnerais suite à la demande de la France.

Jacques WARIN (France) : Sur l'article 29, je présenterais une petite modification. Je me souviens que ceci est inscrit dans le rapport du Comité financier et que M. Bukhari nous en a fait part. Je préférerais que l'on dise: "Le Conseil a été informé que le passage du système actuel...". D'autre part, je voudrais inverser l'ordre de ces deux paragraphes, mettre le paragraphe 29 en 28, et le 28 en 29.

LE PRESIDENT: Nous avons deux propositions de la France. D'une part remplacer "Le Conseil a toute fois considéré" par "Le Conseil a été informé", et d'autre part intervertir l'ordre de ces deux paragraphes.

LE DIRECTEUR GENERAL: Pour être plus précis, le Conseil a été informé par le Comité financier. **LE PRESIDENT:** Est-ce que vous pouvez intervertir les deux paragraphes?

Les paragraphes 25 à 30 sont approuvés tels qu'ils ont été amendés. Les paragraphes 31 à 35 sont approuvés.

Le REP/4 est approuvé.

Nous passons au REP/5 qui est le point 4 de l'ordre du jour: Rapport de la 50ème session du Comité des produits.

Paragraphs 25 to 30 including draft resolution, as amended, approved

Les paragraphes 25 à 30, y compris le projet de résolution, ainsi amendés, sont approuvés

Los párrafos 25 a 30 incluido el proyecto de resolución, así enmendados, son aprobados

Paragraphs 31 to 35 including draft resolution, approved

Les paragraphes 31 à 35, y compris le projet de résolution, sont approuvés

Los párrafos 31 a 35 incluido el proyecto de resolución, así enmendados, son aprobados

Draft Report of Plenary, Part IV, as amended, was adopted

Le projet de rapport de la plénière, quatrième partie, ainsi amendé, est adopté El proyecto de informe de la Plenaria, Parte IV, así enmendado, es aprobado

DRAFT REPORT - PART V

PROJET DE RAPPORT - CINQUIÈME PARTIE

PROYECTO DE INFORME - PARTE V

Paragraphs 1 to 29

Paragraphes 1 à 29

Párrafos 1 a 29

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): Proponemos que el REP/5 sea adoptado sin discusión, en bloque, por aclamación.

LE PRESIDENT: C'est au Conseil de décider s'il veut approuver en bloc le REP/5. Nous considérons le REP/5 approuvé.

Paragraphs 1 to 29 approved

Les paragraphes 1 à 29 sont approuvés

Los párrafos 1 a 29 son aprobados

Draft Report of Plenary, Part V, was adopted

Projet de rapport de la plénière, cinquième partie, est adopté

El proyecto de informe de la Plenaria, Parte V, es aprobado

LE PRESIDENT: Nous pouvons clore le débat et, puisque c'est le dernier Conseil auquel j'ai le privilège de participer, j'aurais voulu dire un mot pour remercier tous ceux avec qui j'ai collaboré. Je voudrais prononcer ceci en arabe (suite langue originale arabe).

Mesdames et Messieurs, il est de mon devoir, à la fin des travaux de cette session du Conseil que j'ai eu l'insigne honneur de diriger, d'adresser mes remerciements les plus sincères aux délégués des pays membres qui ont participé aux délibérations de ce Conseil pendant les quatre dernières années. Je les remercie tous pour leur esprit de compréhension des impératifs de la Présidence du Conseil ainsi que pour leur assistance continue au Président du Conseil dans le but de faciliter sa mission afin de servir l'Organisation et ses objectifs. Ces nobles sentiments ont été le meilleur appui pour moi et m'ont aidé à assumer mes responsabilités de Président en toute bonne conscience avec pour objectif le renforcement de l'Organisation pour lui permettre d'assumer au mieux sa noble mission.

J'ai fait ce qui était en mon pouvoir afin de préserver l'entente et la coopération constructive entre les membres du Conseil d'une part, et la coopération entre le Secrétariat et le Conseil d'autre part. Ceci constitue la garantie du succès et de l'efficacité de notre action. J'espère m'être acquitté de cette tâche avec succès comme j'espère avoir été à la hauteur de la confiance de mon pays, la Tunisie, qui a présenté ma candidature à ce poste. J'espère avoir été digne de la confiance des honorables membres du Conseil avec qui j'ai opéré au cours des dernières années.

La dernière période a été capitale dans la vie de l'Organisation. Le Conseil a pu assumer ses responsabilités d'une façon satisfaisante grâce aux honorables délégués qui avaient conscience de l'importance de leur rôle et du sens de leur responsabilité. Ceci a été l'origine de succès. Je suis persuadé que le Conseil assume un rôle prépondérant dans la vie de l'Organisation. Il prépare la prise de décisions importantes pour l'avenir de l'Organisation. Il constitue également une enceinte privilégiée pour l'examen complet et approfondi de toutes les questions vitales et sensibles. Cet examen permet à l'Organisation une continuité à la lumière de l'évolution et des aspirations des pays membres.

Permettez-moi de saisir cette occasion particulière pour exprimer mes vifs remerciements à mon ami, le Directeur général, Monsieur Edouard Saouma, qui n'a cessé au cours des quatre dernières années de nous prodiguer ses précieux conseils et de nous faire profiter de sa riche expérience. Il a toujours déployé des efforts soutenus pour faciliter l'aboutissement des solutions requérant l'agrément du Conseil dans son ensemble et pour sauvegarder les intérêts de l'Organisation.

Je remercie les honorables Vice-Présidents qui ont largement contribué à la bonne marche des travaux de ce Conseil.

Je voudrais également remercier et féliciter les Présidents et Membres des Comités de rédaction pour leurs efforts méritoires et inlassables. Leur contribution a été un apport précieux aux travaux de ce Conseil. Je voudrais rendre hommage aux rapporteurs. Permettez-moi d'adresser mes remerciements au Président du Comité du programme et au Président du Comité financier, M. Mazoyer et M. Bukhari ainsi que Monsieur l'ambassadeur Poulides pour les efforts fructueux déployés lors de l'examen des questions importantes soumises au Conseil, telles que l'examen des objectifs, du rôle, des priorités, des stratégies de la FAO.

Je ne manquerai pas de remercier M. Savary, M. Alessi ainsi que M. Tedesco qui m'a accompagné lors de mes voyages et qui était toujours disponible. Je lui en suis reconnaissant et nous pouvons considérer cette personne à juste titre comme étant l'oeil vigilant qui veille à la bonne marche des travaux du Conseil.

Je ne manquerai pas de mentionner les responsables du Secrétariat qui nous ont fait des présentations très claires sur les sujets à débattre, qui ont répondu avec tant de patience à toutes les questions posées par les honorables délégués. Ceci a permis au Conseil de prendre les décisions appropriées en toute connaissance de cause. Comment ne pas citer ces combattants de l'ombre, les traducteurs, les interprètes, qui ont participé à l'élaboration des documents et qui ont facilité les travaux du Conseil, j'adresse un remerciement tout particulier à Mme Combanair. Je vous remercie tous encore une fois et je vous remercie de votre attention.

Applause

Applaudissements

Aplausos

Gonzalo BULA HOYOS (Colombia): Señor Presidente, tal vez mi condición de humilde antecesor suyo en la importante posición que usted deja ahora, me produce la grata satisfacción de poderle decir cuan agradecidos estamos los representantes de Colombia, y seguramente todos los miembros del Consejo, por la excelente labor que usted ha realizado y cuánto admiramos su recia y digna personalidad.

Después de cuatro años de intensa y fructífera labor, usted podrá salir de esta Sala Roja con la frente muy en alto, acompañado por la sincera satisfacción del deber cumplido. Le acompañarán también el respeto, la admiración y simpatía de todos nosotros.

Le deseamos felicidad personal, salud a usted y a su familia y nuevos y crecientes éxitos en el porvenir. Gracias, señor Presidente.

Applause

Applaudissements

Aplausos

Joseph TCHICAYA (Congo): Monsieur le Président, vous arrivez au terme de votre mandat à la tête de notre Conseil.

Je tiens à rendre hommage à votre sagesse toute africaine et je suis fier, en tant qu'Africain, de dire combien vous nous avez honoré ici. Vous avez pendant quatre ans accompli une noble mission et nous sommes contents de vous voir partir non pas par la petite porte, mais par la grande, parce que vous avez mérité de tout le Conseil. Je crois pouvoir dire que vous avez mérité de l'Afrique. C'est pour cela que je suis très fier.

En tout cas, je vous souhaite une excellente santé et je vous souhaite tout le bonheur possible à vous et à votre famille.

Applause

Applaudissements

Aplausos

Atif Y. BUKHARI (Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of) (original language Arabic): Excellencies, I will be very open and frank. Your great ability and deep knowledge of all our subjects, your energy and ability as well as your great modesty, all these have been your traits during your Chairmanship of this Council. All these qualities, Mr Chairman, have merited our respect and our trust in you, Sir. The trust of the Government of Tunisia in your good self was already proved when you were Minister of Agriculture, and this trust continues today in your capacity as Chairman of the Council. We are very proud that you belong to the Middle East and that you have been Chairman of this Council during these past four years.

Mr Chairman, our distinguished colleague and brother, Mr Ben Osman, you are now going to leave us and go to Tunisia, this brother country which is very dear to us. However, we would like to assure you that your portrait will live on in our memory, and we know that through this portrait you will continue to give us your inspiration. We would like to wish you health and success for you and your family. Thank you.

Applause

Applaudissements

Aplausos

Mlle Faouzia BOUMAIZA (Algérie): Monsieur le Président, si nous prenons la parole, ce n'est pas pour retarder davantage la conclusion des travaux du Conseil mais simplement pour manifester l'honneur que nous avons ressenti, en tant que pays voisin du vôtre, de vous voir présider aux destinées du Conseil. Je prends la parole étant donné que l'Algérie sort du Conseil en même temps que vous et pour vous dire que nous espérons avoir apporté une contribution utile aux débats qui se sont déroulés pendant ces trois dernières années. Nous formons nos vœux pour qu'à la Conférence nous arrivions à un consensus.

Monsieur le Président, j'ajouterai quelque chose de personnel. Etant donné que mon mandat finit, en quelque sorte, avec le vôtre, je tiens à vous exprimer publiquement ici toute l'admiration que j'ai eue pour vous, pendant cette période, pour la manière dont vous avez dirigé nos débats et à vous dire l'honneur que j'ai ressenti de voir une haute personnalité du Maghreb représenter ici notre région.

Applause

Applaudissements

Aplausos

Dong QUING SONG (China) (original language Chinese): Mr Chairman, under your Chairmanship we come to the end of this Session. During the last four years you have been Chairman of this Council and all the Sessions over which you have presided have been crowned with success. You have worked for FAO and have made contributions to guarantee the success of FAO's work. All this is a clear indication of your wisdom and ability. We would like to express our gratitude to you for your contribution, and also take this opportunity to express our admiration. Although you are going to leave this post, your portrait in the Red Room will continue to be there to guide us and will remind us of the contribution you have made to this Organization. Before leaving this room I would like to express to you our best wishes for health and happiness for you and your family. Thank you.

Applause

Applaudissements

Aplausos

Gian Luigi VALENZA (Italie): Monsieur le Président, je ne pensais pas prendre la parole ce soir, mais je crois devoir le faire et je le fais avec plaisir, au nom du Gouvernement italien et en celui des gouvernements des pays de l'OCDE,

Je n'ai travaillé et n'ai été témoin de votre travail que pendant la moitié de votre parcours de quatre ans. Mais dans ces deux dernières années, j'ai beaucoup apprécié - et je crois que tous les délégués ont apprécié - votre façon de diriger les travaux du Conseil. Nous regrettons donc votre départ mais, comme l'a dit notre collègue africain, vous sortez par la grande porte et non par la petite. De toute façon, je suis heureux de prendre la parole au nom des pays de l'OCDE parce qu'en fait, l'Italie est le pays le plus proche du vôtre. Vous connaissez les liens qui m'attachent à votre pays; j'en garde un souvenir émouvant et ému.

Je ne peux que vous souhaiter maintenant d'autres travaux et une vie sereine. Et je suis sûr que, chaque fois que nous entrerons dans cette salle, nous regarderons avec plaisir et une certaine émotion votre portrait qui a été dévoilé hier devant nous.

Applause

Applaudissements

Aplausos

Sra. Margarita LIZARRAGA SALCEDO (Mexico): Señor Presidente, había pedido la palabra ya desde que usted inició su discurso de despedida porque, de una manera humilde pero emotiva, quiero decirle lo importante que ha sido su presencia en este foro durante estos cuatro años. Creo compartir el sentimiento de los representantes de América Latina y el Caribe para expresarle a nombre de todos nosotros lo cercano que ha estado siempre y cuánto hemos apreciado sus dotes, no solamente de gran conocedor del tema de la agricultura, sino sus cualidades humanas, que nos hicieron lograr entendimiento en momentos muy difíciles de los debates de nuestra Organización.

Lleve usted, señor Presidente, el testimonio del gran afecto y la gran admiración de todos nosotros y reciba la expresión de los votos más solemnes por su bienestar personal y el de su familia.

Finalmente, ya que estoy en el uso de la palabra, no quiero olvidar el excelente trabajo que también nuestra colega de Argentina ha hecho, como Presidente del Comité de Redacción. Es la primera vez que una mujer preside una responsabilidad de esta envergadura. El trabajo ha sido muy difícil y ella ha sabido sortear las dificultades a nuestro cargo. Gracias, señor Presidente. De nuevo, todo nuestro respeto y nuestra admiración y afecto.

Applause

Applaudissements

Aplausos

Muhammad Saleem KHAN (Pakistan): I was a bit hesitant to take the floor because I thought perhaps I would have the opportunity to speak when your successor is elected, and I would speak on behalf of the Group of 77 countries. I feel immense pleasure at the moment to speak on my own behalf, on that of the member countries of the Group of 77, and of the region to which we belong, the Asian region.

We would like to express our great respect and admiration for the way in which you have conducted the Council during your tender of term of office as Chairman, with tremendous competence and capability, and with great ability and sagacity. The Council and FAO certainly benefited a lot from your contributions. I would like, on my own behalf, and on behalf of the Group of 77, to wish you all the success and prosperity in the future, and to hope that in some capacity you will always be able to come here and participate with us. Thank you.

Applause

Applaudissements

Aplausos

LE PRESIDENT: Nous allons lever la séance car ces messieurs ont bien travaillé aujourd'hui. La Commission des candidatures va se réunir. Je crois que nous partageons les mêmes espoirs et la même volonté et je dois dire que les paroles qui m'ont été adressées me sont allées droit au cœur. Je remercie tous les membres du Conseil, sans exception, de leur esprit de coopération.

The meeting rose at 20.15 hours

La séance est levée à 20 h 15

Se levanta la sesión a las 20.15 horas