

ceivable that the working party might not be successful, requiring the full Committee to consider the draft document on review and appraisal, every effort should be made to reach agreement in the working party, in which delegations could speak more freely, since no summary records would be prepared.

23. Mr. MACKENZIE (United Kingdom) proposed that the working party should be asked to report to the Committee not later than 19 November.

24. Mr. RANKIN (Canada) said that he supported the proposal to establish a working party and suggested that, unless there were any objections, the Committee should take a decision forthwith.

25. Mr. PINO SANTOS (Cuba) said that although his delegation had already expressed its views on the review and appraisal exercise in the general debate (1527th meeting), it would like to present them in writ-

ing to the working party and would take part in that body's work.

26. Mr. MAKEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the work of the Committee and the working party should be scheduled as flexibly as possible to ensure that their meetings did not coincide all the time.

27. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee decided to establish a Working Party on Review and Appraisal, the membership of which would be open to all delegations, to consider item 46 and report to the Committee not later than 19 November. The Working Party's meetings would be scheduled as flexibly as possible.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 4.40 p.m.

1535th meeting

Friday, 19 October 1973, at 11.05 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Zewde GABRE-SELLASSIE (Ethiopia).

A/C.2/SR.1535

AGENDA ITEM 47

United Nations Institute for Training and Research: report of the Executive Director (A/9014, A/C.2/L.1291)

1. Mr. NICOL (Executive Director of the United Nations Institute for Training and Research) said that the discussions of the UNITAR Board of Trustees at its twelfth session (25-28 September 1973) had focused on the "project on the future" and the adoption of an international staff training programme. The Board had also concentrated on the question of the United Nations University and on the financial situation of the Institute. Those were the main subjects of concern at the present time.

2. Noting with regret that only a few publications had appeared in languages other than English, he said that he had been exploring with various interested Governments the possibility of publishing the Institute's studies in French, Spanish, Russian and Chinese. At the same time, UNITAR was making efforts to reach a wider public and in particular, to see that its publications reached the Government services to which they were likely to be of interest.

3. UNITAR's financial situation was somewhat difficult: the voluntary contributions from which it derived its funds had been static whereas its administrative and maintenance costs had been steadily increasing. In that connexion, he recalled that the Board of Trustees had made an appeal for an increase in voluntary contributions and he assured that Committee that the greater part of any additional contributions which the Institute might receive would be devoted to training and research and not to financing administrative costs. It was gratifying to find that New Zealand and Mexico were now among the contributors and that a number of countries had increased their contributions.

4. The Executive Director's report (A/9014) provided information on the progress of ongoing programmes and described new and important projects. At the twenty-seventh session, on the basis of the report of the Fifth Committee, the Assembly had decided once again to defer a decision on the United Nations staff college (*ibid.*, para. 5). Yet it was an important and urgent question and it was to be hoped that interested Governments would make special purpose grants to finance the project, if only for a trial period of three to five years. For the time being, the Institute had decided to carry out a limited international staff training programme with grants it hoped to obtain from the United Nations, UNDP and some of the specialized agencies. However, the amounts involved were insufficient and the project could only be experimental.

5. The Institute had established a special information and Communications Unit through which it hoped to strengthen links with other training institutes and specialized organizations concerned with training. Seminars had been organized in New York for permanent missions and UNITAR intended to reorganize those courses in the light of the observations of participants and to organize similar courses in Geneva. Bearing in mind in particular those delegations which had no scientific attaché, UNITAR planned to organize courses on the aspects of science and technology with which the United Nations was dealing. Its courses in international law were proceeding successfully; they brought together eminent jurists from all over the world. In that connexion, he urged Member States to send in the names of their candidates in good time.

6. Since it had limited funds, UNITAR was recruiting a relatively limited number of staff, but it was always glad to welcome and provide facilities for visiting scholars whose work was financed by their Governments or by a university or foundation. On the other hand, it

sought to recruit staff on as wide a geographical basis as possible representing all shades of opinion and political belief.

7. In the field of research, UNITAR was tightening up its projects, which had tended to be too diffuse. It was dealing with two new fields of research, the future and decolonization. The work relating to the Commission on the Future had been given fresh impetus at the meeting of the Steering Committee of the Board of Trustees in London in December 1972, and the Institute had received small special-purpose grants from the Fiat Foundation, the Federal Republic of Germany and the United States United Nations Association. Another meeting of the Steering Committee would be held in Moscow at the beginning of 1974. A long-range project was being undertaken in association with prominent authorities from the State University of New York and the Institute was gaining much from the experience of scholars from various countries. UNITAR's work on decolonization was being preceded by extensive consultations with experts. The Institute considered that the question should be tackled from the political and economic points of view with complete impartiality.

8. In the development field, several seminars had been held and UNITAR hoped to embark on new aspects of the question. In its brain drain project the Institute had co-operated with several specialized agencies and had made studies and surveys which would prove useful to the Economic and Social Council and the Second Committee in considering the question and taking decisions. In addition, the generous grant made to UNITAR by the Swedish International Development Authority had enabled the Institute to organize regional seminars on the problems of international procurement in cities of Asia, Africa and Latin America. They had already produced results and a manual was being drawn up on that basis which should be useful to all countries, both recipients and donors, in matters of development assistance. The grant from the Swedish International Development Authority was a good example of how a special purpose grant could be used in the interest of all countries, particularly the developing countries.

9. Since UNITAR maintained relations with many universities, it was natural for it to be keenly interested in the question of a United Nations University. Indeed, it had played a significant role in developing the project. However, the Institute and other institutions connected with the United Nations would like some assurance that their funding would not suffer from the founding of the United Nations University. He had noted with satisfaction that certain donor countries had indicated that that would not happen.

10. He warmly thanked the donor countries as well as the other sources of financing for UNITAR for their contributions; he stressed the importance of the observations made by the members of the General Assembly, and also expressed warm appreciation for the devotion of all who were contributing to UNITAR's work.

Mr. Arvesen (Norway) took the Chair.

11. Mr. SADEGHI-YARANDY (Iran) thanked the Executive Director of UNITAR for his report which, in the opinion of his delegation, showed that the Institute was effectively carrying out the tasks entrusted to it by the relevant resolutions and decisions of the United

Nations. The Second Committee should give full support to the research and training programmes UNITAR was engaged in because they were bound to enhance the effectiveness of the United Nations system in maintaining peace and security and promoting economic and social development. Despite limited resources, the Institute had managed to publish 43 studies that it was putting to good use in its various training programmes.

12. With regard to the "project on the future", his delegation welcomed the preparatory work done and hoped that the results would shortly be made available to the Second Committee.

13. Moreover, he felt that the research undertaken by UNITAR on the question of relations between the United Nations and other international organizations was especially important and the progress achieved was satisfactory. He hoped that the studies so far completed would be published as soon as possible.

14. The study entitled *The United Nations and the News Media*¹ constituted a step in the right direction and it was to be hoped that it would create a better understanding of the efforts and aims of the United Nations among the peoples of the world.

15. Since there was still much to be done in achieving co-ordination in economic and social activities undertaken on the international level, he was glad that UNITAR planned to make a detailed study of the various aspects of the question. UNITAR's research activities in other areas, such as the status of women, the peaceful settlement of disputes, and economic and social development, also merited the Committee's attention.

16. In the field of training the Institute had also been successful, as the considerable number of participants in courses and seminars arranged by it demonstrated. He welcomed the inclusion of new courses and seminars in its training programmes.

17. Another important aspect of its training activities was the training of staff members of the United Nations and its specialized agencies. At the sixteenth session of the Governing Council of UNDP his delegation had approved the participation of UNDP in the execution of the modified staff college scheme proposed by UNITAR,² and it hoped that that question would be settled satisfactorily by the General Assembly at its current session.

18. He believed that the measures taken by UNITAR to carry out the United Nations Programme of Assistance in the Teaching, Study, Dissemination and Wider Appreciation of International Law merited support. His Government had been contributing financially to that programme since 1972.

19. It was clear, however, that UNITAR could expand its research and training activities only if it enjoyed more generous financial support. Operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1291, of which his delegation was a sponsor, expressed the hope that such support would be forthcoming.

20. After listening to the statement by the Executive Director of UNITAR, the sponsors of the draft resolution—Denmark, Egypt, Iran, Jordan, Kuwait,

¹ Alexander Szalai with Margaret Croke and Associates, UNITAR ST/7 (1972).

² See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Fifty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 2A*, para. 154.

Lebanon, Mexico, Nigeria, Norway, the Philippines, Poland, Singapore, Sudan, Sweden, Tunisia, the United Arab Emirates and Venezuela—had decided to add to it the following second preambular paragraph:

“Having heard the statement of the Executive Director of the Institute, which conveys the views of its Board of Trustees on the need for increased financial contributions”.

21. In conclusion, he expressed the hope that the draft resolution would be adopted unanimously.

22. Mr. BJORVATN (Norway) said that he was impressed by the wide spectrum of topics dealt with by UNITAR in its research and training programmes. The basic purpose of its programmes, however, was still to improve the effectiveness and capability of the United Nations system in achieving its major objectives.

23. His delegation concurred with the view that one of the priority tasks of the proposed Commission on the Future should be to provide better insight into the problems and limitations of growth. He was gratified to note that, as part of the preparations for the Commission's work, substantive papers had already been prepared on four aspects of the growth problem: the world food problem, natural resources, energy, and the quality of life. Furthermore, work had been started on a study on the co-ordination of international economic and social action, a very timely subject in the light of the current efforts of the Economic and Social Council to rationalize its economic and social activities.

24. UNITAR had also made a useful analysis of the short-comings of technical assistance methods—the lack of an effective division of labour and of co-ordination between bilateral and multilateral programmes. The series of studies carried out on the transfer of technology also deserved mention, because its conclusions should prove very valuable.

25. His delegation had the impression that UNITAR was very conscious of the need to avoid duplication between its activities and those of other United Nations bodies or institutions outside the United Nations system. Proof of that was the fact that during the year under consideration (1 July 1972-30 June 1973) it had collaborated with some 350 universities, institutes, academies and research centres in 60 countries as was mentioned in paragraph 13 of its report (A/9014). It was to be hoped that such co-ordination and contacts would be pursued in connexion with the work of the Commission on the Future.

26. The Institute's financial difficulties were largely due to the fact that, while its costs had risen, its income had remained relatively static. Governments therefore had the responsibility of ensuring that it would be able to continue its activities at least at their existing level. In that connexion, he announced that his Government intended, for the fourth consecutive year, to increase its contribution to UNITAR to 300,000 Norwegian kroner, approximately \$54,000.

27. He expressed the hope that draft resolution A/C.2/L.1291, of which his delegation was a sponsor, would be adopted unanimously.

28. Mr. CAVAGLIERI (Italy) thanked Mr. Nicol for his report and expressed the hope that under his guidance the Institute would be able to strengthen and expand its activities.

29. His delegation was gratified by the expansion of the Institute's activities in the legal, economic, social and information fields. Training, research and the fostering of international co-operation among scientists and experts were the natural targets of UNITAR. Its new initiatives, such as the action leading to the creation of the Commission on the Future, were indicative of the Institute's imagination and farsightedness. He was also gratified by the contacts it had established with foreign universities and research institutes and believed that, with the experience and vast knowledge of its representatives, UNITAR would make a notable contribution to the success of the new United Nations University. He had taken special note of the large number of seminars and other international meetings organized or supported by the Institute.

30. His Government was aware of UNITAR's current financial difficulties and would, as in the past, contribute to its budget; it hoped that other countries would follow its example. At the same time the administration of the Institute should take all possible measures to keep its general expenses down, as far as was feasible, particularly by taking great care in the use of consultants.

31. Mr. JABBOUR (Lebanon) commended Mr. Nicol on his report, which his delegation had read with great interest. His Government, which always sought to help United Nations efforts, believed that the strengthening of UNITAR was bound to be beneficial to the Organization as a whole.

32. Owing to the dedication and expert guidance of Mr. Nicol, the Institute had obviously made progress. It was devoting much of its work to practical problems such as those concerning the future, technical co-operation and the brain drain; in undertaking a study of co-ordination in various spheres and among a number of agencies, the Institute was motivated by the same concern which had led the Economic and Social Council to adopt resolution 1768 (LIV) on the rationalization of its work.

33. In his delegation's opinion, UNITAR should formulate criteria for increasing the effectiveness of the United Nations.

34. He supported the Institute's information and publications work, but believed that more use should be made of Arabic with a view to reaching more people in Arabic-speaking countries. With regard to the United Nations University, it might be advisable to define clearly the nature of the close co-operation promised by UNITAR.

35. In conclusion, he expressed the hope that the draft resolution, of which his delegation was a sponsor, would be adopted unanimously.

36. Mr. OGISO (Japan) said that his country attached great importance to the role of UNITAR in the United Nations system. The success of an institute of the UNITAR type depended less on the quantity of its work than on its quality. He was happy to note that under the able guidance of Mr. Nicol the quality of UNITAR's work had improved. Mr. Nicol's visit to Japan the previous summer had proved extremely useful. Through the press the Executive Director had made the activities of the Institute better known to the Japanese people. Furthermore, he had had extremely fruitful talks with the Ministers for Foreign Affairs, Finance

and Education, and with leaders of the academic world. On hearing his account of the Institute's activities, the Japanese Minister for Foreign Affairs had promised the Executive Director to exert his best efforts to increase Japan's contribution to the Institute. That certainly indicated his Government's recognition of the unique role of UNITAR.

37. His delegation supported the draft resolution, as revised by the sponsors.

38. Miss COURSON (France) thanked the Executive Director of the Institute for his very full statement, and said that the French Government had always followed the Institute's work with great interest. It had received Mr. Nicol in Paris, and had arranged useful interviews for him with a number of people.

39. The annual report showed that the Institute was striving to diversify its fields of research. That was no doubt laudable, but the eclectic approach might hold some dangers, and there might be a risk of dispersal of effort.

40. His delegation considered that the Institute had an outstanding role to play in the training field. The productivity of any administration depended on the competence of its staff, and the staff's interest in the cause it served must be maintained through appropriate training. The Chairman of the United Nations Staff Committee had recently drawn attention to the present disproportion between traditional staff costs and what might be termed staff maintenance costs, on which practically nothing was being spent. Thus the United Nations was in the position of a man who bought a very expensive car, but spent nothing on maintenance. The French delegation had had occasion to criticize that neglect, and considered that it was in the interest of the smooth functioning of the Organization to improve the productivity and training of international officials. Her delegation therefore attached great importance to the question of a United Nations staff college. The General Assembly had had that question before it since its twenty-fifth session, and it was to come up again at the current session for consideration by the Fifth Committee. The French delegation regretted that no decision had as yet been taken on the question, and hoped that if it was not settled at the present session, any interim formula adopted would only be of a very provisional nature. There was no doubt that the establishment of a staff college would be a profitable investment for the Organization.

41. With respect to research, the Institute's second aim, she said that it required from those responsible a patient, devoted and co-ordinated effort. But the report gave the impression that the Institute's multiple concerns were preventing it from concentrating on high priority research projects. Her delegation believed that it should limit its studies, and take a global, and not a sectoral, view of its research work. There was no better subject for research than man's future because such research could show him what direction to take. The Institute should therefore give priority to world problems of global interest, such as pollution, the sea-bed, outer space, energy, and natural resources. However, forward-looking research of that type could not be undertaken by a single institute. UNITAR's task was not so much to carry out the original research, as to organize the research already completed. Its role was accordingly that of an arbiter who, standing apart from

the current ferment of thought and studies, should distinguish the action to be taken at the national and international levels. The Commission on the Future could therefore play a part in orienting research and guiding the choice of action.

42. The French delegation was confident that the new Executive Director would dedicate himself to the aims he had set himself in those two areas, and hoped that he would be given the necessary means to do so.

43. Mr. O'RIORDAN (Ireland) welcomed the increasing focus on the capabilities of the United Nations, including the question of the implementation of resolutions. UNITAR, in making preparations to establish the Commission on the Future, had showed imagination, for that task was highly relevant in future economic planning. Ireland hoped to be able to co-operate in the setting up of a world network of expertise and opinion, including minority or dissident opinion. UNITAR's collaboration with 350 universities, institutes and research centres in 60 countries was heartening, and his delegation hoped that the Institute would be financially able to increase that collaboration.

44. Ireland had been one of the first countries to contribute, within the limits of its resources, to UNITAR. The Government of Ireland had decided, as an expression of its confidence in the Institute, to make a regular annual contribution, subject to parliamentary approval. He hoped to be able to inform UNITAR shortly of the amount of that contribution.

45. Mr. CURTIN (Australia) thanked the Executive Director of UNITAR for his statement, and supported the draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1291), as revised. He also wished to announce that for the first time Australia would make a contribution to UNITAR of 20,000 Australian dollars which was about \$30,000.

46. UNITAR was playing a most useful role, and since 1965 Australia had always voted for the General Assembly resolutions concerning the Institute. However, Australia still had some reservations about the proposed United Nations staff college.

47. Mr. GORITZA (Romania) said that even a brief study of UNITAR's activities showed that the Institute was making a real effort to achieve its aim, which was to increase knowledge of the United Nations system. The Romanian delegation congratulated Mr. Nicol and his staff for the zeal they had shown in carrying out their work.

48. For some time the Institute's work had been taking a new turn, assuming a strictly practical nature, and it was to be hoped that its studies would lead to an improvement in the functioning of United Nations bodies, with increased efficiency and a greater capacity to respond to the needs of the modern world.

49. His delegation had followed with interest the question of establishing a Commission on the Future, and believed that further efforts should be made to achieve the important aims envisaged in that connexion.

50. UNITAR's interest in economic and social development reflected one of the main concerns of the United Nations, and could make an appreciable contribution to the pace of progress in the developing countries.

51. Mr. MACKENZIE (United Kingdom) said that the United Kingdom had always taken a keen interest in UNITAR, and since 1965, British contributions had been regular and substantial. Furthermore, a distinguished British academic figure, Sir Kenneth Younger, was Chairman of the Board of Trustees. It was therefore with particular interest that the United Kingdom delegation had studied the Executive Director's report (A/9014).

52. The United Kingdom was pleased to see that an effort had been made to ensure a wider dissemination of UNITAR's publications. Publicity was an essential element in the success of such an institute, and he hoped that the reorganization referred to in paragraphs 90-93 of the report would continue to bear fruit. In that connexion, the Commission on the Future should be the subject of a strong programme of publicity and publications. Since the Steering Committee had met in London in December 1972, there had been no information on the Commission's findings. He hoped that it would soon be possible to see some of the fruits of the Commission's labours, either before or after the forthcoming seminar in Moscow.

53. The report indicated that UNITAR did not intend to establish the staff college as an autonomous unit, but would offer training in development and management as an integral part of UNITAR's activities. If the Institute's training programme was to maintain momentum, it should not fail to organize the programmes described in paragraph 9 of the report.

54. Attention was focused during the current session on the United Nations University, and he believed that UNITAR should seize that opportunity for future development. The Institute seemed tailor-made to fit in to the proposed University structure, and the draft charter provided that the Executive Director should be an *ex-officio* member of the University Council. For some years UNITAR had been doing the sort of work that the University was likely to take on. Eventually a merger of the two bodies would seem to be logical. But at the present stage what was surely required was the closest involvement of UNITAR in the establishment and organization of the University, and he was confident that the Executive Director would address himself to that task over the next 12 months.

55. Turning to the question of contributions, he said that the United Kingdom had pledged an annual contribution to UNITAR of £42,000 for five years, but that commitment was due to expire in 1974. To maintain its contribution at that level, his Government must first ascertain that UNITAR knew where it was going, and that it was under firm direction. He also wished to be sure that other States Members regarded UNITAR as a useful body, and in that respect his delegation was pleased that earlier speakers had generally expressed their appreciation of the Institute's work. It was to be hoped that expressions of satisfaction would be accompanied by contributions, including some from those countries which most benefited from training courses.

56. Although the staff college had suffered a setback, the United Nations University project could reinvigorate the Institute with the sense of purpose that had been present at its creation.

57. Mr. WRIGSTAD (Sweden) assured the Executive Director of UNITAR of his delegation's support and co-operation.

58. At the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly, his delegation had recommended that the Institute, in view of its limited resources, should concentrate on a few specific projects in the training and research fields. His delegation was pleased to note that progress had been made in that respect.

59. The Swedish International Development Authority had continued to finance the programme of regional seminars on international procurement, since the Swedish Government felt there was a lack of training in that field.

60. He was pleased to announce that for the financial year 1973-1974, Sweden would make a contribution of 300,000 kronor to UNITAR. He hoped that more and more countries would contribute to the Institute, and that draft resolution A/C.2/L.1291 would be adopted unanimously.

61. Mr. TREVIÑO (Mexico) was gratified to note that UNITAR had tried to improve the results of its work and had understood the need for expansion.

62. Through its seminars, conferences and training courses, UNITAR contributed to the dissemination of knowledge and helped to broaden the range of instruments working for peace and progress. His Government was very grateful to the Institute for having organized numerous training courses for officials and diplomats of the developing countries, from which he himself had been able to benefit.

63. His delegation was pleased to note that UNITAR had responded favourably to the proposal of the Mexican Government that the latter should pay for the translation and publication of 10 of the Institute's studies.

Mr. Gabre-Sellassie (Ethiopia) resumed the Chair.

64. Mr. ROUGET (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his country had always maintained good relations with UNITAR and that it would continue to make a large contribution to the Institute, subject to parliamentary approval.

65. The Institute was to be congratulated on its praiseworthy efforts to extend its research work to new spheres such as economic and social development. Such expansion would obviously have financial implications, but that should not be an obstacle provided that the programmes were well planned and co-ordinated.

66. It was regrettable that training should sometimes be neglected in favour of research, and he pointed out that the support of his Government was related to the Institute's capacity to fulfil its role in the training area. It would be advisable for research and training to be dealt with by two separate departments, each with its own director.

67. Some of the Institute's problems were due not only to financial difficulties but also to the fact that the Board of Trustees had not been strict enough in selecting projects. His delegation felt that some priority sectors should be designated such as that on activities relating to the Commission on the Future. Activities should not be launched before a thorough study had been made of their implications and it would be preferable for the Institute to concentrate on those tasks most likely to lead to a satisfactory conclusion.

68. He hoped that there would be an increase in the contributions received by UNITAR, and that the draft resolution would be adopted unanimously.

69. Mr. CAMACHO (Venezuela) said that UNITAR had proved its worth as an organ of the United Nations.

70. The Institute was in continuous contact with research and training institutes and other United Nations bodies. Co-ordination with regional organizations, however, and relations with private research institutes should be improved.

71. He thought that UNITAR should concentrate on problems concerning the developing countries, particularly food, the transfer of technology, pollution and the exploitation of the resources of the sea.

72. The training courses and seminars organized by the Institute were extremely beneficial, but they should in future be oriented towards social and economic development and seek ways for the United Nations to resolve the relevant problems through UNDP, UNIDO and other bodies. His delegation was pleased to note the Executive Director's remarks on the survey of needs pertaining to the orientation and preparation of experts for development. The study of new forms of technical assistance and the effects of progress on the environment had been going on for several years; it was a very timely activity.

73. His delegation, too, was aware of the need to publish all the UNITAR studies in Spanish so that they would be of much more practical use in university curricula.

74. His delegation hoped that the draft resolution, of which it was a sponsor, would be adopted by consensus.

75. Mr. DELIVANIS (Greece) congratulated the Executive Director on the brilliant report he had submitted, which showed how efficiently the Institute was operating. Its work successfully co-ordinated training and research in a truly international climate, and its goals were generally well chosen.

76. His delegation had noted with interest that UNITAR was collaborating with 350 universities, and entirely agreed with the representative of the United Kingdom regarding the collaboration of UNITAR with the United Nations University.

77. UNITAR's activities should be more widely known, since they could serve as an example.

78. He was pleased to see that many delegations appreciated UNITAR's activities; that was clear from the

number of delegations sponsoring draft resolution A/C.2/L.1291 and from the remarks of previous speakers.

Organization of the Committee's work (continued)
(A/C.2/L.1289, A/C.2/283)

79. Mr. BRITO (Brazil), speaking on a point of order, proposed that the afternoon meeting should be cancelled and that the discussion on the report of UNITAR should be postponed until Monday morning, 22 October, in order to enable the working group of the Group of 77 to complete its work on the review and appraisal of the United Nations International Development Strategy, which had a very high priority.

80. He also suggested that, on Monday afternoon, 22 October, the Committee should begin by considering the item on the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (agenda item 48), and that the Working Party on Review and Appraisal should be formally constituted on Thursday afternoon, 25 October.

81. Following a procedural discussion, the CHAIRMAN suggested that the proposals of Brazil should be adopted.

It was so decided.

82. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that in accordance with the decision taken by the General Assembly at its 2152nd plenary meeting the item entitled "Convocation of a world food conference under the auspices of the United Nations" had been allocated to the Second Committee (see A/C.2/283). He therefore suggested that the Committee should consider the item on 10, 11 and 12 December and should defer the completion of its work until 12 December instead of 7 December, as provided for in document A/C.2/L.1289.

It was so decided.

83. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Committee), explaining the arrangements relating to the programme of work, pointed out that each Committee could in principle meet only six times a week.

84. Mr. FLEMING (Argentina) objected to the fact that the Second Committee, which dealt with almost 60 per cent of the activities of the General Assembly, did not have the right to hold more meetings than some Committees which, for example, dealt with only 15 per cent of the workload.

The meeting rose at 1.40 p.m.