



## ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Resumed Forty-ninth Session  
OFFICIAL RECORDS

Friday, 6 November 1970,  
at 3.15 p.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. J. B. P. MARAMIS (Indonesia).

## AGENDA ITEM 6

**Interagency co-operation relating to computers  
(E/4933; A/8008/Add.2, A/8072; A/C.5/1305)**

1. The PRESIDENT recalled that the Council had received during the meetings of the forty-ninth session in July a special report of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (ACC) (E/4893), dealing with electronic data processing in United Nations organizations and that, in resolution 1551 (XLIX), it had endorsed in principle the idea of creating a common system of data processing in Geneva and of transferring from New York the services directly necessary for its operation. That decision had been taken subject to further consideration at the resumed forty-ninth session, and the Council had requested the Secretary-General to arrange for his report to the General Assembly together with the comments thereon of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and the report of the Auditor General of Canada to be submitted through the Council at its resumed forty-ninth session.

2. The Council had before it that report of the Secretary-General (A/C.5/1305), and a note (E/4933). It also had before it the comments of the Advisory Committee (A/8008/Add.2) and the report of the Auditor General of Canada (A/8072).

3. Mr. STARK (Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management) said that, in endorsing in principle the creation of a common system of data processing at Geneva, the Council had expressed the opinion that, in accordance with the principles stated in paragraph 2 of its resolution 1455 (XLVII), the establishment of the common system would make it possible for the specialized agencies concerned to stabilize their computer equipment at present levels. He drew the attention of the Council to the report of the Advisory Committee (A/8008/Add.2), which recommended that the General Assembly should authorize the Secretary-General, subject to appropriate action by the legislative bodies of UNDP and WHO, to proceed with his four proposals aimed at (a) participation by the United Nations with WHO and UNDP—and other agencies which might later agree—in the establishment of a separate data processing facility at Geneva, to be known as the International Computing Centre (ICC); (b) United Nations participation with other agencies in the Inter-Organizational Board for information systems and related activities; (c) transfer of part of the staff of the existing United Nations Computing Centre and its data banks from New York to Geneva, for incorporation into ICC; and (d) outposting of part of the staff of the United Nations Statistical

Office from New York to Geneva (see A/8008/Add.2, paras. 5 and 37).

4. The Secretary-General's report and the comments and recommendations of the Advisory Committee thereon were likely to come up for discussion in the near future in the Fifth Committee, where their financial implications in particular would be discussed. In that connexion, it would no doubt be of importance for the Fifth Committee to know whether the Council reaffirmed the endorsement which it had given in principle in its resolution 1551 (XLIX) to the creation of the International Computing Centre at Geneva, as a form of co-ordination between the United Nations and the specialized agencies, which would bring them the benefits of modern computer methods and of a high-powered computer installation. During the discussion, the members of the Council would certainly not fail to take into account the proposal of the Advisory Committee in paragraph 38 of its report that

“the Assembly might wish to invite all other agencies in the United Nations system to consider seriously the possibility of joining with the United Nations, UNDP and WHO, as partners in the International Computing Centre in Geneva, with the aim of deriving the full benefits from its capacity. In the view of the Advisory Committee, participation in the common facility should commend itself in the first place to all agencies in Geneva, especially to those which have indicated their need to expand their computer installations, that is, the ILO and ITU. In this connexion, the Committee endorses the conclusions of the Auditor General of Canada that those agencies should reconsider their plans to acquire additional independent capacity in the light of the services which could be provided by ICC. Indeed, the Advisory Committee believes that experience in the operation of ICC might demonstrate to all Geneva-based organizations that it would be more advantageous to them to entrust all their computer operations to the Centre, rather than indefinitely to retain their in-house capacities”.

5. No doubt the Council might, in the light of the discussions at its current meeting, wish to propose that regular reports should be made to it on the amount of work carried out by ICC on behalf of each organization of the United Nations system represented in ACC.

6. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) welcomed the recent trend, apparent in a large number of studies and proposals submitted to the Council, to consider electronic data processing on an interagency basis with a view to achieving more effective results. If technically advantageous and feasible, it would certainly be desirable to use joint computer installations, rather than act separately with a risk of duplication. Naturally, any progress made in that direction should not impair the action which each organization within the United Nations system should take in its

own sector, nor involve the establishment of unwieldy co-ordination machinery. It should be stressed that, in spite of its recommendation that the General Assembly should authorize the Secretary-General to proceed with his four proposals, the Advisory Committee entered certain reservations with regard to them in paragraphs 28 and 29 of its report. Apart from the United Nations, only UNDP and WHO had unreservedly subscribed to the proposed scheme, which, according to the Advisory Committee, was not an ideal one, and even UNDP had not rejected the idea that the facility might have certain disadvantages. In the circumstances, it might be advisable to study more closely how it could be improved.

7. For that reason his delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft which was adopted as resolution 1551 (XLIX). The reasons for its attitude were unchanged, and his delegation considered that the reservations expressed in the replies of most of the specialized agencies indicated that the complete centralization of United Nations and specialized agencies computer facilities was neither feasible nor viable, or that the existing proposals needed to be improved. In either case, any premature action might jeopardize attainment of the objectives on which unanimous agreement had been reached. Furthermore, if it was possible to establish effective co-operation only between the United Nations, UNDP and WHO, some changes would appear to be desirable, particularly with regard to the site of the new Centre, and the question should be studied in greater depth.

8. His delegation would therefore abstain in the vote on the draft decision which had been circulated, but of course it continued to be in favour of efforts to streamline work within the United Nations system.

9. Mr. LEGNANI (Uruguay) supported the draft decision which had been circulated to the members of the Council, adding that it gave formal expression to the efforts to centralize the work of all organizations in electronic data processing. If adopted, it would mark the beginning of an intermediate stage in the adoption of an over-all programme which could be consolidated subsequently. The importance of the ultimate objective should not be underestimated, to the extent that it was essential for co-ordinating the work of the United Nations and its specialized agencies.

10. With regard to the financial implications, the adoption of the Secretary-General's proposals (see E/4933) would obviously involve very heavy expenditure, but it should be borne in mind that a considerable proportion would be start-up costs, in other words a non-recurring capital contribution equivalent to an initial investment. His delegation considered that the potential advantages to be derived from the installation of the facility entirely justified such an investment.

11. Mr. GUPTA (India) said that he was in complete agreement with the points of view expressed by the Secretary-General in his note (E/4933) and by the Advisory Committee in its report (A/8008/Add.2). He hoped that the proposed International Computing Centre would be operated on the broadest possible base and that not only all the agencies in the United Nations system should consider seriously the possibility of joining, as the Advisory Committee suggested in paragraph 38 of its report, but that

individual Member States too should avail themselves of the new facility. His delegation would support the draft decision which had been circulated.

12. Mr. ESTABLIE (France) said that the effort to ensure co-ordination in the field of electronic data processing was certainly important both for the United Nations and for its specialized agencies. Accordingly, he felt that the proposals of the Secretary-General deserved the support of the Council, for they marked the beginning of the most practical form of co-ordination ever attempted. However, his delegation urged all the specialized agencies concerned to consider participating in the Centre in order to make full use of its capacity.

13. Mr. OLDS (United States of America) recalled that, during the Council's debate at its forty-ninth session in July, his delegation had supported the idea of establishing a common facility for data processing. However, he wished to make some comments on the specific proposals made and to raise some questions. Firstly, the proposal under consideration was part of the over-all effort to achieve co-ordination within the United Nations system. The effort was praiseworthy in itself, but it must be admitted that it had given rise to certain decisions which were not fully consistent with the good intentions which had prompted them. In the case in point, it must be noted that, apart from UNDP and WHO, no specialized agency had firmly committed itself to participation in the facility. It might be asked whether in the cases of UNDP and WHO it would not have been better to wait until the legislative bodies of the specialized agencies had themselves decided on the matter before referring it to the General Assembly. Secondly, the proposals of the Secretary-General implied that the new Centre would be set up at Geneva. Apparently, the disadvantages which might result from the coexistence of computing services in Geneva and New York had not been sufficiently weighed and the views of the governing bodies of the specialized agencies on the procedures for installing the new facility should be sought. Finally, his delegation warned the Council against thinking that the centralizing of data processing would automatically result in better co-ordination of the work of the United Nations and its specialized agencies. At best, the establishment of the new Centre would avoid some duplication in the information field and would expedite the distribution of data, but it would be wrong to give it top priority on the supposition that it would automatically bring about the co-ordination of programmes and plans within the United Nations system.

14. Furthermore, he wondered whether the outposting of parts of the staff of the New York Statistical Office to Geneva might not weaken that service; he drew the Council's attention to the Advisory Committee's warning in paragraph 15 of its report that the measure must not have an adverse effect on the activities that would continue to be performed at Headquarters. His delegation would like the representative of the Secretary-General to confirm that there would be no such adverse effect. He would also like to know to what extent the procedures for UNDP participation in the facility would be compatible with the recent reorganization of its services in the light of the conclusions of the *Study of the Capacity of the United Nations Development System*.<sup>1</sup> The relations of the re-

<sup>1</sup> United Nations publication, Sales No.: E.70.I.10.

gional and national institutions with the new Centre must be carefully organized. Furthermore, his delegation would like to know when the new Centre, whose installation was planned for the beginning of 1971, could begin to operate effectively. Finally, since the World Bank Group had recently announced the establishment of a Computer Department, his delegation assumed that consultations were under way between UNDP and IBRD in order to avoid any duplication; it would welcome clarification on that point.

15. In so far as satisfactory replies were given to the questions he had just raised, he saw no reason why the agreement in principle given by the Council in resolution 1551 (XLIX) should not be confirmed.

16. Mr. STARK (Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management) said, in reply to the representative of Brazil, that the Secretariat believed that the time would come when a common facility would bring about the highly effective co-ordination of the data processing activities of the United Nations and all its specialized agencies. However, that was a long-term objective, and it would be regrettable to forgo any measure in that direction on the pretext that at the present stage the proposed system was not perfect. The establishment of the Centre at Geneva would be the first step in a policy of co-ordination and even standardization of data at the interagency level, and any further delay must be avoided since each organization might individually devise its own computerization programme. It seemed that the best course would be to leave well alone.

17. He explained, in answer to the representative of the United States, that the outposting to Geneva of part of the New York Statistical Office would involve only a relatively modest proportion of the staff and there would be no adverse effect on the services at Headquarters.

18. Mr. OLVER (Director, Financial Management and Administrative Policy Division, United Nations Development Programme) recalled for the benefit of the United States representative that the Administrator had found himself in a difficult situation when a decision had had to be made concerning UNDP participation in the establishment of a central installation. The matter had been too urgent to wait for the Governing Council to consider his report, which it had requested in June, on various aspects of the problem, in particular the compatibility of the new Centre with the new decentralized structure of UNDP. Without an official statement of the Governing Council's views, the Administrator had considered it wisest to conform to the spirit of the Capacity Study, particularly the recommendations in chapter six. In addition, he had requested the Auditor General of Canada to help him in preparing his report to the Governing Council on procedures for UNDP participation, which would be submitted in January 1971. In the circumstances, he had felt that the only possible course was to give the green light, subject to the Governing Council's decision after it had considered the report on the subject.

19. Mr. LOFTUS (Director, Statistical Office) said that while the transfer of a small number of statistical office staff posed certain problems, they could be resolved. The need for a central installation had been felt for a long time,

and studies had shown that it would be advantageous to locate the proposed Centre at Geneva. It was often difficult, of course, to compare the data submitted by different agencies which used different criteria, but centralization should improve the quality of the work. Naturally, the Statistical Office would maintain very close relations with the Centre. On the basis of past experience, it was reasonable to suppose that if the installation of equipment was begun in March 1971 the Centre could be in operation within two weeks to one month. Discussions concerning co-ordination with the World Bank Group were being held in a spirit of close co-operation. The material used was not identical with United Nations material, but the problems were not insurmountable, since the Statistical Office was already processing information supplied by some 100 countries and adapting them to general use on a unified basis. The IBRD had a great deal of information on the foreign debts of various countries, which was used in close co-operation with the Statistical Office. The proposal now envisaged was consistent with the recommendations of the Capacity Study and would certainly improve operation. Information from the specialized agencies could then be processed more efficiently, so that the achievements of the Second Development Decade could be better assessed. The data themselves were neutral, of course, as the United States representative had said, but better co-ordination of data collection and processing was essential to the general co-ordination of activities between agencies.

20. Mr. KASATKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had carefully studied the documentation and had no objection to the establishment of the Centre at Geneva. However, it was important that all the specialized agencies with headquarters at Geneva should participate in its operation. Unfortunately, according to the documentation, not all the difficulties in that regard had been cleared up. His delegation had already drawn attention to that kind of problem, asking for clarification before the resumed forty-ninth session of the Council. It appeared that the ILO and ITU had their own computing centres and that not all the representatives of the specialized agencies had expressed a willingness to participate in establishing the Centre. Of course, any proposal to improve and rationalize operation was worthy of careful study, but it seemed that a mistake had been made at the very outset. The initiative had been taken by ACC, which was not, perhaps, the organ best qualified to act in that matter; it would have been preferable for the General Assembly to make the decision. Delegations would then have been able to ensure that their representatives in the governing bodies of the specialized agencies took similar action. If the Council decided to adopt the proposal now before it, the specialized agencies should be urged to co-operate in the undertaking. In conclusion his delegation would support the proposal, on the understanding that the General Assembly would be asked to appeal to the specialized agencies for a commitment to participate in the operation of the Centre.

21. The PRESIDENT proposed that the Council should adopt the following draft decision:

“The Economic and Social Council, recalling its resolution 1551 (XLIX) of 30 July 1970, decides (1) to take note of the proposals contained in the note by the Secretary-General on interagency co-operation relating to computers (E/4933), having considered the report of the

Secretary-General on the electronic data processing in the United Nations system of organizations (A/C.5/1305), the comments of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions on that report (A/8008/Add.2) and the report of the Auditor General of Canada on electronic data processing in the United Nations system of organizations (A/8072); (2) to transmit these proposals to the General Assembly together with a record of its discussions on the question; (3) to commend the proposals contained in the note for the establishment of the International Computing Centre (ICC), as an effective form of co-ordination that would bring to the co-operating agencies the advantages of a large-scale computer installation and the greater efficiency of modern computer methods; (4) to express the hope that all organizations represented in the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination will review their electronic data processing work with a view to co-ordinating it with that of the ICC and consider the possibility of participating in the ICC; and (5) to request the Secretary-General to submit regular reports to the Council on the work carried out by the ICC on behalf of each organization of the United Nations system."

22. Mr. OLDS (United States of America) proposed that the words "to express the hope" in item 4 should be replaced by the words "earnestly request". Since under Article 63 of the Charter the Economic and Social Council had not only the right but the responsibility to co-ordinate the activities of the specialized agencies by providing them with guidelines, it would be preferable to use a stronger expression than the one used in the original text.

23. Mr. GUPTA (India) recalled that his delegation had already stated its position. In the present case he would have no difficulty in supporting the United States amendment. He proposed, in addition, that in item 4 the word "possibility" should be replaced by the word "desirability", which seemed more logical. Some doubts might still exist with regard to the drawbacks of the project, but his delegation agreed with the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management and the Director of the Statistical Office, that some risks had to be taken. The proposal should bring improved co-ordination and more fruitful operation. His delegation hoped, however, that the result would not be excessive centralization. The machinery must not allow the application of formulae that had not been officially approved. In any case, the decision would have to be taken by the General Assembly.

24. Mr. BRADLEY (Argentina) said that his delegation, like others, had abstained when the vote was taken on the draft which the Council had adopted as resolution 1551 (XLIX). His delegation was not opposed to the principle of the draft but had felt that the draft had not been submitted in an absolutely convincing form. If the majority of the Council now adopted it, his delegation would not oppose the will of the other delegations. It was, however, worth noting that the text before the Council differed from the original text. He requested, in any case, that his delegation's position and reservations should be reflected in the record.

25. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) stated that his delegation felt some apprehension, especially because the share of the

specialized agencies seemed too limited and because the transfer of the personnel of the Statistical Office from New York to Geneva might hamper the activities of that service. After hearing the explanations that had been given and having regard to the United States amendment and the Indian amendment, his delegation was now in a position to vote in favour of the text before the Council.

26. Mr. KASATKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that the original text of item 4 should be amended to read "recommend to" and not "earnestly request".

27. Mr. OLDS (United States of America) had no objection to the USSR proposal, except that a more flexible wording would be preferable in the present state of affairs.

28. Mr. KASATKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that, under the Charter, the Council could and even should make specific recommendations.

29. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) said that if the Council adopted the expression "recommend to" it would give the impression that it was making a formal pronouncement. It would seem preferable to adopt a more neutral tone and merely say "earnestly request".

30. Mr. ESTABLIE (France) shared the views of those delegations which had advocated that the Council should make fairly energetic recommendations since the Council had the task of co-ordinating activities.

31. Mr. GUPTA (India) felt that the Council had power under the Charter to make recommendations. Nevertheless, in the absence of a formal decision by the General Assembly, the deliberative body of a specialized agency was fully entitled to refrain from applying a Council recommendation. If, for example, the ITU thought it rational to have a computing centre of its own and to strengthen it so that it could carry out all the necessary operations, its decision would be justified. That question must be decided primarily in the light of the advantages it afforded and not in the light of its being a general recommendation of the Council.

32. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) stated that his delegation had not had enough time to thoroughly examine the text before the Council. If a vote was to be taken his delegation would be obliged to abstain. In any case it requested that its position be made clear in the record.

33. Mr. ROUAMBA (Upper Volta) regretted that he had not been able to obtain a French translation of the text before the Council. It did seem, however, that the word "decides" at the end of the first sentence could be deleted and the verbs at the start of each part suitably reworded.

34. The PRESIDENT thought that the amendment proposed by the delegation of Upper Volta was an improvement of the text and proposed that the Council adopt the text as modified by the various amendments.

*It was so decided.*

35. Mr. VON STEDINGK (International Labour Organisation) stated that he had refrained from taking the floor

sooner so that he would not give the impression that he wished to influence the members of the Council. The question of the International Computing Centre was on the agenda of the next session of the Governing Body of the ILO. In the meantime, the ILO was actively examining its possible participation in the International Computing Centre. It should, however, be noted that, while the text adopted by the Council mainly concerned equipment, the ILO attached very great importance to problems involving software and wished to participate fully in the Inter-Organization Board. In any event, ILO policy would always be based on the principles of economy and efficiency.

## AGENDA ITEM 7

### Calendar of conferences

36. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia), speaking on behalf of his own delegation and those of Ceylon, Chad, Indonesia, Pakistan, People's Republic of the Congo, Sudan and Upper Volta, read the text of a draft resolution on the Calendar of Conferences.\*

37. The PRESIDENT proposed that the draft resolution should be examined at a later meeting.

*It was so decided.*

### Request for the inclusion of a new item in the agenda

38. Mr. FRANZI (Italy) announced that after informal consultations within the regional groups, a number of delegations had thought it necessary to alter the composition of the Committee on Natural Resources. Consequently, before fixing the date of the elections or conducting them in accordance with resolution 1535 (XLIX), the members of the Council should examine the question of an increase in the membership of the Committee. The election could take place during the resumed forty-ninth session or be postponed until the organizational meetings of the fiftieth session in January 1971. If the agenda item could be altered in that way, the delegations would have time to inform their Governments and possibly to adopt a decision before the end of the forty-ninth session.

39. The PRESIDENT recalled that on 11, 12 and 13 November the members of the Council would have to consider six items: the report of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs on its second special session, the reports of the World Bank Group, report of the IMF, elections to the Committee on Natural Resources and the appointment of a member of the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development, the date and place of the sixteenth session of the Population Commission and the draft resolution just submitted by Tunisia.

40. Mr. FRANZI (Italy) proposed that the title of the item in question should be amended to read: "Composition and election of the Committee on Natural Resources".

41. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) asked whether the Council intended to conduct elections or to re-examine the question

of the composition and elections of the Committee on Natural Resources.

42. Mr. BRADLEY (Argentina) stated that the question of the composition of the Committee should precede the election and that, consequently, the agenda would have to be changed on those lines.

43. Mr. KASATKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), supported by Mr. OSMAN (Sudan), stated that a specific decision had been adopted in July and that the title of the relevant agenda item should be maintained. The question could then be re-examined when that item was taken up.

44. Mr. AHMED (Secretary of the Council) pointed out that, under rule 17 of its rules of procedure, during a session, the Council could revise the agenda for the session by adding, deleting, deferring or amending items. Only urgent and important items should be added to the agenda of the Council during the session. The title of the agenda item as such ought not, therefore, to be amended; instead a new item should be added to the agenda in accordance with the proposal of the Italian representative.

45. Mr. KASATKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he could not accept the interpretation of the Secretary of the Council. The Council would thus have to take a decision on the matter. His delegation had no objection to the holding of further consultations, which would culminate in a decision, but the addition of a new item to the agenda would be tantamount to taking a decision before the results of the consultations were known.

46. Mr. FRANZI (Italy) formally requested that the Council should include a new item in its agenda, in accordance with rule 17 of the rules of procedure. An immediate decision could be taken, since the inclusion of the item did not constitute a substantive question.

47. Mr. BRECKENRIDGE (Ceylon) thought that it would be premature to change the situation by including a new item in the agenda. The consultations were not yet sufficiently far advanced and, furthermore, the inclusion of a new item in the agenda was not a procedural matter but a substantive question which entailed amending an earlier Council decision.

48. Mr. AKWEI (Ghana) said that any member of the Council was entitled to propose the inclusion of a new item in the agenda.

49. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) said that he also supported the Italian proposal, which he regarded as a realistic one. Indeed, the inclusion of a new agenda item would emphasize the need for consultations.

50. Mr. BRADLEY (Argentina) said that he, too, supported the representative of Italy.

51. Mr. SKATARETIKO (Yugoslavia), supporting the representatives of Italy and Pakistan, said that the matter involved a simple procedural question. However he thought that it would be preferable to postpone consideration of the question and leave it to the President to hold consultations or informal meetings.

\* Subsequently circulated as document E/L.1360.

52. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) emphasized that the question raised by the Italian representative deserved careful consideration. Council resolution 1535 (XLIX) was a decision to be respected and not questioned. His delegation proposed that the agenda should be left unchanged and that the Italian proposal should be examined in connexion with the agenda for the fiftieth session.

53. Mr. BRADLEY (Argentina) thought that a dangerous situation was arising and that if the Council drifted further into a new debate without having the question on the agenda, there would be no choice but to put the Italian representative's request to the vote. The Argentine delegation could not accept the Tunisian representative's argument that the Council was unable to amend the decision which it had taken several months earlier. All the Members of the General Assembly had had an opportunity to take note of the question in connexion with the Council's report and many delegations had indicated that they would like to serve on the Committee. In view of the interest shown by a large number of countries, the members of the Council should make an effort and support the Italian representative's proposal.

54. The PRESIDENT noted that a fairly wide area of agreement seemed to be developing and thought that the Council might agree to include in its agenda a new item entitled "Reconsideration of the composition of the Committee on Natural Resources".

55. Mr. TODOROV (Bulgaria) supported the Tunisian representative and said that the Council should abide by the decision which it had taken several months earlier. The delegations which had participated in informal discussions had not taken a unanimous decision to include the item in the agenda and all the geographical groups had not yet been consulted. Consequently, the inclusion of the question in the agenda seemed premature. The best solution would be to elect at the session the twenty-seven members of the Committee on Natural Resources, which would then begin its work and prepare its report. Since the term of office of thirteen of the members of the Committee was two years, the Council would elect thirteen new members of the Committee at its fiftieth session. That would allow other States an opportunity to participate in its work. At that time the Council, on the basis of the experience acquired, could consider the advisability of a possible increase in the membership of the Committee.

56. Mr. MARTOHADINEGORO (Indonesia) supported the position of the Italian representative and said that the election should take place at the resumed session of the Council.

57. Mr. GUPTA (India) considered that the question involved a substantive matter and that a decision should be taken immediately.

58. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) said that the election of the members of the Committee should not be delayed and that, in order to facilitate the work of the Council, his delegation would have no objection to the inclusion of the item in the agenda for a forthcoming session.

59. Mr. KASATKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recognized, like the representative of India, that the question was a substantive one which should not be decided without due consideration. The decision which had already been taken should stand, and his delegation supported the proposal made by the Tunisian representative.

60. The PRESIDENT said that in the absence of a consensus, the Italian proposal should be put to the vote.

61. Mr. GUPTA (India) said he thought that there was a consensus. The Italian proposal could be accepted and the summary record could reflect the reservations expressed by various delegations.

62. Mr. PHILON (Greece) considered that reservations could certainly be expressed with regard to the enlargement of the Committee; nevertheless, his delegation supported the Italian position concerning the reconsideration of the decision taken.

63. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) thought that the Council could decide to reconsider the composition of the Committee, but that if an agreement was not reached, the twenty-seven members should be elected as planned.

64. Mr. GUPTA (India) supported the Italian proposal, on the understanding that the elections would take place at the fiftieth session of the Council.

65. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) supported by Mr. SKATA-RETIKO (Yugoslavia), said that, since the Council had not officially considered an agenda item, the reservations expressed were not valid at the present stage.

66. Mr. LEGNANI (Uruguay) considered that a procedural problem was involved and that the question could be discussed only after it had been included in the agenda.

67. The PRESIDENT said that if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council decided to include in its agenda a new item entitled "Reconsideration of the composition of the membership of the Committee on Natural Resources", account being taken of the reservations expressed by some delegations.

*It was so decided.*

*The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.*