

UNDP

Mr. President:

This unprinted amendment -- in which I am joined by my distinguished colleague Senator Mondale -- is quite simple in purpose. It seeks to restore \$9.9 million to the authorization for the United States contribution to the UN Development Program.

All of us have been concerned about the very real problems in foreign aid. There is certainly waste, and inefficiency, and distorted priorities. There is certainly a need for reform. And I am hopeful that by our action on this bill -- plus hard, thoughtful work in the months ahead -- we can provide the American people with a sensible strategy of foreign assistance that serves the national interest.

In that process, however, we will only make matters worse if we shortchange current programs which represent the most productive and forward-looking approaches to aid.

The United Nations Development Program is unquestionably one of those promising and worthy efforts.

The record of the UNDP stands up so well against the major criticisms leveled against foreign aid.

2.

-- It has been said, for example, that too much of our aid program never reaches the poor and hungry people for whom it is intended...that our dollars are too often lavished on expensive projects that have little benefit for the common people. But if that is true for other programs, it is just not the case for UNDP. Its funds and energies are concentrated in areas which cry out for help.

. Since 1959 the UNDP and its Special Fund predecessor have financed more than 75 agricultural surveys and feasibility studies for land use. It has financed more than 40 development planning and technical training projects in agriculture.

. Its funds have also been concentrated in the development of public utilities, in housing, in education and science, and in applied research.

. This is not some vast boondoggle. These are the hard, essential building blocks of development. These are the programs that will allow the developing countries someday to stand on their own, which ought to be the ultimate purpose of all our foreign assistance.

. The cutback of \$9.9 million from the \$100 million requested by the Administration does not punish the vested interests or the inefficient bureaucrats. It will exact its toll from those who can least afford it -- children in Africa and Asia and Latin America who will not be taught because teachers cannot be trained...farmers who will not be able to revive the exhausted soil on which their lives depend, and who will not be able to get their crops to market to escape the grinding poverty of their fathers...and of course the untold numbers of sick who might have been spared if UNDP and its agencies had been there to establish, as it has in so many countries, a public health program.

. These are the more dramatic examples, but there are less visible benefits that seem to me equally important. To take only one instance, there is the UNDP forestry programs that provide wood for homes and paper for books.

. In more than 120 countries around the world, UNDP is ~~working~~ to help other people make the best possible use of their own natural resources, their own talents, their own energies. When we cut that program, we would not simply the dignity of men, but also the growth of the whole world's economy.

-- But the case for UNDP is more than what it does. Its strength is also how it does it. Critics of foreign aid have

charged -- and rightly so -- that too often other countries do not shoulder their fair share of the burden of aid. Yet UNDP is a heartening exception to that problem.

. 119 countries have already pledged almost \$117 million for the 1972 program. This represents an increase of 17.1% over their pledges for 1971. The increase for 1971 over pledges for the previous year was only 5.8%. For example, the United Kingdom has increased its pledge by 33% and other countries with more modest resources have pledged even larger sums.

. What does this program really cost the American people? What do they ~~they~~ get for their money?

. Last year's UNDP contribution came to 43 cents per American...or one hundredth of one percent of our GNP. On that basis we were 24th in the world ~~in~~ terms of percentage of gross national product contributed.

. As for the return on our investment, every \$1 contributed by the U. S. to the UNDP generated more than \$6 worth of development work. The countries receiving UNDP assistance pay for over half the cost of project activities.

5.

. All this means that since 1959, at a cost of less than a penny a week from each of us, the UNDP has given new productive skills and new hope to tens of millions of people. I think the Senate would be hardpressed to find any development program, at home or abroad, with a better return on investment.

-- Finally, there is the charge that foreign aid does not ~~dir~~ directly benefit our own economy. Here too UNDP stands remarkably free of criticism.

. From 1959 to 1971, UNDP contract orders from American firms totalled nearly \$60 million. In that same period, over 90 American firms and organizations were awarded some 140 contracts for consulting services, totalling nearly \$40 million.

. And this is not one of those programs which can be faulted on the grounds that the recipient countries are forced to purchase goods and services from favored concerns in the United States. The role of private investment in the UN Development Program is exactly what we should be striving for in every area of aid -- free competition in which American firms are successful because of their merit rather than artificial government constraints.

6.

In my view, all this adds up to exactly the kind of productive, equitable, and mutually beneficial approach to development that will be the standard to follow as we reshape our foreign aid programs.

As it is, the \$100 million originally requested by the Administration for UNDP is a meager investment for all the benefits America and the world receive from the program. And it must be borne in mind that even if we in the Senate authorize the full \$100 million, the conference process with the House may well yield no more in final appropriations than the \$86 million the U. S. contributed to UNDP last year.

In sum, Senator Wondale and I are asking only that we hold even with this essential program while the Congress and the Administration rechart national policy on foreign aid.

For we are confident that this recharting will lead us precisely in the direction of the UNDP approach.

And in the meantime, it would be tragic and senseless to cripple the best in foreign aid simply because we are trying at the same time to clean out the worst.

I urge the Senate to pass this amendment to restore the full requested authorization for UNDP.



MINNESOTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Copyright in the Walter F. Mondale Papers belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org