



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 14:	
Programmes of technical co-operation (<i>concluded</i>)	
(a) United Nations programmes of technical assistance	
(b) Expanded Programme	
(c) Report of the <i>ad hoc</i> committee established under Council resolutions 851 (XXXII) and 900 (XXXIV)	
Report of the Technical Assistance Committee . . .	41
Agenda item 30:	
Financial implications of actions of the Council	43
Agenda item 12:	
Reports of the regional economic commissions (<i>continued</i>)	45

President : Mr. A. PATIÑO (Colombia)

Present :

Representatives of the following States: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, India, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Senegal, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Yugoslavia.

Observers for the following Member States: Belgium, Canada, Chile, China, Ghana, Hungary, Iraq, Ireland, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Sweden, Venezuela.

Observers for the following non-member States: Federal Republic of Germany, Holy See, Switzerland.

Representatives of the following specialized agencies: International Labour Organisation, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, International Civil Aviation Organization, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, International Monetary Fund, World Health Organization, Universal Postal Union, International Telecommunication Union.

The representative of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

AGENDA ITEM 14

Programmes of technical co-operation (E/3783) (*concluded*)

- (a) United Nations programmes of technical assistance
- (b) Expanded Programme
- (c) Report of the *ad hoc* Committee established under Council resolutions 851 (XXXII) and 900 (XXXIV)

REPORT OF THE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE

1. Mr. WODAK (Austria) said that, although his country had entered the field of technical assistance at a relatively

late stage, it was fully aware of the ever-growing demand. Having itself been a recipient, it was now considering, within its limited means, how to extend assistance to other countries. It was studying with great interest various modes of technical assistance, especially the associate experts scheme, which had been developed in recent years between the United Nations and some European countries, notably the Netherlands and Sweden.

2. The annual report of TAB (E/3739 and Add.1) contained much valuable information about the increased activities that had taken place under the Expanded Programme. There had been some discussion whether greater emphasis should be laid on the employment of experts or on the granting of fellowships. His delegation believed that no fixed rule should be laid down, but that it should be left to individual countries to state, when transmitting their requests to the Board, what kind of assistance they preferred. The success of an expert should be judged to a certain extent by the results achieved in training counterpart personnel. Group training was often preferable to individual training, while training within the region offered definite advantages. The employment of experts from the developing countries themselves, provided they could be spared, was beneficial to both the expert and the country he was assigned to. His delegation therefore had no difficulty in supporting part III of the draft resolution contained in annex II to the report of TAC (E/3783).

3. The recruitment procedures applied so far gave rise to certain difficulties for countries that were newcomers to the field of technical assistance. The time allowed to national recruitment services to publicize job descriptions was too short, while the time which elapsed between the submission of applications and the acceptance of candidates was too long.

4. Being of the opinion that the new system of programming was a decided improvement, his delegation intended to support the draft resolution contained in annex II to the report. As to the OPEX programme, his delegation firmly believed that it was for the developing countries to decide for themselves what kind of assistance they needed most. If countries felt they urgently needed operational personnel, there seemed to be no reason why such assistance should not be included in the Expanded Programme. His delegation would have preferred the draft resolution (annex IV) to contain some references to the proposal made by TAB to the effect that the use of EPTA funds for OPEX activities should be limited to a certain percentage of the country target figure — say, 20 per cent. In view of the special reference made in operative paragraph 3 (a) of the draft resolution and in view of the assurance given by the Executive Chairman

that TAB would exercise considerable care in dealing with such projects, the Austrian delegation would be glad to support the resolution in question, provided it was not restricted to newly independent countries.

5. Turning to the question of co-ordination, he noted with satisfaction that the position of the resident representatives had been strengthened in the last two years. The resident representative should be informed as far as possible of the bilateral technical assistance activities undertaken in the country he was assigned to. His delegation agreed that co-ordination between multilateral and bilateral programmes should be a national responsibility, and that it should be undertaken by the resident representative only at the request of the governments concerned.

6. No hasty decision should be taken on the question of a merger between the various United Nations programmes. The report of the *ad hoc* Committee of Ten (E/3750) was only an interim report, and his delegation welcomed the initiative taken by TAC in providing the *ad hoc* Committee with as much information as possible in order to enable that committee to gain a clear picture of the opinions prevailing in the various countries. The Austrian delegation therefore gladly supported the draft resolution contained in annex VII to the report of TAC.

7. Mr. ARKADIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, after being dominated for so long by the colonial powers, the newly independent countries urgently needed technical assistance. However, the effectiveness of United Nations aid could be considerably improved if certain structural defects in its programmes were remedied. First and foremost, the regular programme must be merged with the Expanded Programme so that all available resources were concentrated on essential projects and not dissipated over a whole range of minor activities as was the current practice. While the need for assistance in the field of industrialization was increasing, the amount of money actually spent on it had decreased from 8.6 per cent of total resources in 1960 to 5.8 per cent in 1962. A similar decrease had occurred in the allocation of funds for the training of national technical personnel. Unfortunately, while the resources allocated to such vital fields as industrialization and training had been diminishing, administrative expenses had been rising rapidly and had reached the extraordinary proportion of 20 per cent of total funds.

8. The Expanded Programme and the Special Fund currently commanded resources amounting to \$222 million, which was three times higher than the amount that had originally been considered sufficient. Unfortunately, those funds were swallowed up mainly by overhead costs and expenditure on experts and fellows, instead of being spent on projects that would really promote the developing countries' industrialization. He therefore proposed that a working group should be set up to study the trends in expenditure during the past five years and to assess whether funds had been rationally spent. That suggestion had already been made in TAC, and one representative in particular had pointed out that countries were forced by the EPTA rules to ask for expert services even when they needed mainly equipment and some advice concerning its

installation. The time had come to break free of narrow rules and provide assistance that was really needed by the developing countries.

9. Far too much had been allocated for pre-investment studies and not enough for the provision of industrial plant. Technical assistance should be administered wholly on a voluntary basis and contributions should be made only in national currencies. At the same time, the powers of the regional economic commissions in the technical assistance field should be strengthened. The staff of the Special Fund and the Expanded Programme should be moved to Europe where they would be closer to the developing countries of Asia and Africa, and also to the headquarters of the specialized agencies. The resolutions adopted by the General Assembly on the subject of decentralization should be implemented much more quickly. Experts from the socialist countries should be utilized to a much greater extent, and the virtual monopoly enjoyed by experts from western Europe should be broken. Finally, the OPEX situation was very unsatisfactory. The scheme had originally been put forward merely as a temporary measure, but it had since been legalized and made a permanent feature of EPTA. The funds being used for the OPEX programme could much better be devoted to more useful projects.

10. Sir Ronald WALKER (Australia) agreed with the USSR representative concerning the need for critical evaluation of the work being done in the field of technical assistance. A large part of the admirable report of TAB to TAC (E/3739 and Add.1) was in fact devoted to the problem of evaluation, a subject that had been frankly discussed at Copenhagen. Undoubtedly, serious efforts were being made to overcome the difficulties and to ensure that all the funds available for technical assistance were well spent. He agreed with the Japanese representative that greater publicity should be given to the achievements of the technical assistance programmes, and would refer in particular to the successful projects carried out in Iraq and Indonesia mentioned in paragraphs 483 and 491 respectively of the TAB report.

11. The TAC had unanimously adopted the draft resolution contained in annex II of its report, which emphasized the importance of training nationals of developing countries within those countries themselves or within the regions where they were situated. The section of the report of TAC dealing with the United Nations regular programmes was of particular interest because General Assembly resolution 1768 (XVII) had clearly established the role of TAC as the governing body for the regular programme. Questions concerning the future of the regular programmes had been highlighted in Copenhagen through the statement made to TAC by the Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs, who at the 1269th meeting had raised before the Council some of the issues involved.

12. The Australian delegation at Copenhagen had been among those which, recognizing the flexibility and usefulness of the United Nations regular programme, saw no reasons for drastic administrative changes affecting the existing relationship between the Expanded and regular

programmes, while admitting that some change in emphasis might be called for in activities under the regular programme. His delegation, which believed that a cautious approach to the matter was called for, looked forward to hearing more next year about that subject from the Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs.

13. An important step forward had been taken by TAC in adopting the draft resolution contained in annex IV to its report on the provision of operational personnel under the Expanded Programme. Australia had supported the establishment of the original United Nations OPEX scheme as well as the UNESCO and WHO programmes for the provision of operational personnel. The Australian delegation at Copenhagen had been glad to support an extension of what was being done currently, by the use of EPTA funds, on a limited scale and for an experimental period, if that would meet the wishes and requirements of developing countries.

14. A useful discussion had taken place in Copenhagen on the co-ordination of technical assistance activities in the field. His delegation was pleased to note that the introduction of the ten principles laid down by ACC in its report (E/3765, para. 19) had brought about some improvements, although it was clear that the resident representatives were not being accorded everywhere the central rôle they should have in the process of field co-ordination. His delegation looked forward to further progress in co-ordination in the future.

15. Finally, the Australian delegation had been pleased to support the draft resolutions annexed to the report of TAC and would be pleased to support them once again in the Council.

The draft resolutions concerning the Expanded Programme contained in annexes I, II and III to the report (E/3783) were adopted unanimously.

16. Mr ZAPOTOCKY (Czechoslovakia) requested a separate vote on operative paragraph 1 of the draft of TAC resolution contained in annex IV.

That paragraph was adopted by 12 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions.

The draft resolution contained in annex IV (Question of the Provision of Operational Personnel under the Expanded Programme), as a whole, was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

17. Mr. VIAUD (France) said he had voted for paragraph 1 of the operative part and for the resolution as a whole on the understanding that the financing of OPEX-type activities under EPTA should, of course, be offset by a reduction in the amounts allocated to OPEX-type activities under the regular programme.

The draft resolution contained in annex V (Report by the Secretary-General on the United Nations Programmes of Technical Assistance) was adopted unanimously.

The draft resolution contained in annex VI (United Nations Regular Programmes for Technical Assistance in Human Rights and in Narcotic Drugs) was adopted by 16 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The draft resolution contained in annex VII (Report of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination in the Field and Report of the ad hoc Committee established under Council resolution 851 (XXXII) on Co-ordination of Technical Assistance Activities) was adopted unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 30

Financial implications of actions of the Council (E/3797, E/3801)

18. Mr. WEIDINGER (Austria) said that the rapid growth of conference and meetings activity during 1960, 1961 and 1962 at New York and Geneva had placed a heavy burden on governments and the United Nations Secretariat and might have a harmful effect on the efficiency and results of international conferences. While not wishing to go into details at that stage of the session, his delegation emphasized its whole-hearted agreement with the view expressed by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions concerning the absolute necessity for urgent and energetic action if the programme of conferences and meetings was to be a realistic one, and if its essential aims were to be achieved (E/3801, para. 28). It also fully supported the proposals contained in paragraph 12 of the Secretary-General's report on integrated programme and budget policy (E/3741) and hoped that the Council would endorse them.

19. Mr. UNWIN (United Kingdom) said that his delegation supported the view expressed in paragraph 5 of document E/3797 that 1964 should be regarded as a year of consolidation and containment and hoped that the Council would adopt that view as a basic premise. It was also obvious that a differential rate of growth must be introduced if the United Nations was to respond adequately to General Assembly resolution 1797 (XVII) in furtherance of an integrated programme and budget policy. There was general agreement in the Council that the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development should have first priority, although it might cost more than had been originally estimated. Among the other fields of activity referred to in the annexes to document E/3797, his delegation favoured increasing the allocations for the Economic Commission for Africa, but felt that any increases for the Committee on Housing, Building and Planning and the Committee for Industrial Development should be contingent on the realization of economies elsewhere.

20. His delegation fully endorsed the statement in paragraph 34 of document E/3801, in which the Advisory Committee strongly urged the Council to accept the suggestions offered by the Secretary-General in paragraph 12 of his report on integrated programme and budget policy. The best way to achieve rationalization would be to accept those suggestions *in toto* and without debate, since although all delegations were agreed on them in principle, the discussion of details might give rise to some differences of opinion.

21. Mr. YOKOTA (Japan) said that in the light of the recent fourth special session of the General Assembly, his

delegation felt that all concerned should exercise restraint in the planning and execution of future United Nations activities. His government would welcome an ever-expanding United Nations, but in view of the obvious necessity of placing the organization on a sound financial basis, it endorsed the opinion expressed in paragraph 5 of document E/3797 that 1964 should be regarded as a year of consolidation and containment. He noted that in paragraph 29 of its report (E/3801) the Advisory Committee had made the following statement: "The success of a conference or meeting depends to a large extent upon the quality of the preparatory work; such work requires much careful study by the Secretariat and there comes a time when its volume is such that it can be undertaken only at the price of serious disruption of regular work." The Advisory Committee had added, in paragraph 30, that "the proliferation of conferences and meetings also creates serious problems for individual member governments". For those reasons, his delegation hoped that the Council would adopt the suggestions made by the Secretary-General in paragraph 12 of his report.

22. Mr. VIAUD (France) recalled that at the current session the Council was employing a new procedure for the study of financial implications, which it was to be hoped would yield positive results. Since the Council was to revert to the consideration of that item at the end of the session, its essential object for the time being should be to consider the financial implications in relation to the programme of work as then constituted. His delegation considered that to the extent to which certain decisions involved extra expenditure and, more particularly, activities in a specific sphere, there should be a corresponding reduction in other spheres. He hoped that the Secretariat would be able to submit proposals regarding the activities which might be thus curtailed. Only on that condition would 1964 be a year of consolidation and containment, as planned. It was those considerations which should guide the Council in dealing with three subjects which, at least for the year under review, were interrelated — financial implications, the programme of work and the programme of meetings.

23. In respect of the programme of meetings of the Council and its subsidiary bodies, 1964 would be an exceptional year, since Headquarters in New York — and to a less extent the European Office in Geneva — would be unavailable and the Conference on Trade and Development was to be held. Members must therefore be prepared to make sacrifices: to cancel or postpone certain meetings of functional commissions, technical committees and working parties. It seemed difficult to compel the regional economic commissions to reduce the number of their meetings; they were in a different position. However that might be, the Council would have to impose a measure of discipline on itself and its subsidiary bodies — functional commissions, technical committees and working parties. Like the United Kingdom delegation, his delegation was inclined to think that a general decision would be easier to adopt, and it might be prepared to follow the United Kingdom in that matter. Document E/3741 submitted by the Secretariat for the thirty-fifth session, to which the United States and

Japanese representatives had referred, contained excellent suggestions.

24. His delegation had been disappointed that document E/3797 contained no reference to the costs of the Conference on Trade and Development. The Secretary-General of the Conference, it was true, had said that such an estimate would be difficult to provide at that stage. It was to be hoped, however, that when the Secretariat submitted its estimates for the Conference it would explain the factors on which its calculations were based. The supplementary expenses might in fact be calculated differently according to whether the Conference was held at Geneva or in New York. It was probably unnecessary to assume that expenses would be those of the more distant base. In a great many instances, the expenses for staff would be less than might be expected, and a meeting at Geneva might be less costly than one in New York. However that might be, all the information required for an assessment of the cost would have to be obtained.

25. With reference to the financial implications of the other measures proposed in document E/3797, he noted that, as could be seen from the resolution in annex VI to document E/3783, certain expenses arising out of the resolutions of the Commission on Human Rights and the Commission on Narcotic Drugs might possibly, in the opinion of TAC, be financed from the current allocations under the regular programme. He hoped that what was regarded as merely a possibility in document E/3797 would become a certainty, and that the two items in question would not appear in the statement of financial implications to be laid before the Council at the end of the session.

26. For the rest, his delegation considered that an increase in expenditure was acceptable in principle, particularly so far as ECA and ECLA were concerned, but it had reservations regarding the volume of expenditure. The explanations supplied were somewhat perfunctory. He was aware that the figures might be revised in the Fifth Committee of the General Assembly, but in his view the current first debate in the Council on the item might serve a useful purpose, and it was to be hoped that positive results would emerge from the discussion at the end of the session. The most important thing was to achieve efficiency and to facilitate as much as possible the work of the General Assembly's subsidiary bodies.

27. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had repeatedly expressed dissatisfaction at the continuing growth of United Nations administrative expenses, which in most cases had been due not to any increase in useful activities, but to an unnecessary increase in office staff and the duplication of work. While not in any way opposing the discussion of important problems by United Nations bodies, his government thought that the organization's work could be better improved by increasing efficiency than by multiplying the number of meetings. It saw no reason, for example, why the duration of the session of the Council's Commission on Human Rights should be increased from four to five weeks. In view of the urgent nature of the problems presented by the United Nations

Conference on Trade and Development, however, the next session of the Commission on International Commodity Trade should be held in 1964. It would also be advisable for the sessions of that commission as well as of the Social Commission and the Committee for Industrial Development to be held on the old annual basis. The Soviet delegation would have no objection if the sessions of the Council's other functional commissions were held every two years instead of annually. With respect to technical assistance, his delegation's position was already well known: the existing organization of United Nations technical assistance under the regular programme was faulty and, in effect, constituted an obstacle to any genuine expansion in that field. The Soviet delegation could not agree with the proposal to increase technical assistance expenditure under the regular budget.

28. It was difficult, at that early stage in the session, to take any decision concerning financial implications of the Council's actions; each draft resolution would obviously have to be considered on its own merits as it was presented, and bearing in mind the financial implications. His delegation therefore reserved the right to discuss the question of financial implications in each particular case, both in the Council and in the Fifth Committee of the General Assembly.

29. Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America) said that his delegation agreed emphatically with the representatives of Austria and Japan concerning the need for economy and self-discipline within the Organization. He also agreed with the Soviet representative that it was difficult, at that stage of the session, to take any decisions concerning financial implications: each case would obviously have to be considered as it arose. In that connexion, however, he had been somewhat puzzled by paragraph 5 of document E/3702, which had implied that the Council would have available, at the present session, the initial budget estimates for 1964; he wondered whether those budget estimates would, in fact, be forthcoming.

30. Sir Ronald WALKER (Australia) welcomed the initiative taken by the Council in considering the financial implications of its actions at the beginning of the session as well as at the end. His delegation fully supported the suggestions made by the Secretary-General in paragraph 12 of his report. At the thirty-fifth session, it had expressed the view that in the programming of conferences the problem was not only to decide which meetings should be held, but also to ensure that they were planned in such a way as to concentrate on the most urgent problems. Since the agenda of United Nations organs were drawn up by themselves, it was only natural for them to display enthusiasm for their own subjects and to turn a deaf ear to suggestions for their postponement. It was the Council's responsibility, therefore, to face the realities of the present situation and make a serious effort to adjust its programme of work to the available resources.

31. Mr. SEYNES, Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs, replying to the United States representa-

tive, said that the document containing the Secretary-General's budget estimates (A/5505) had been circulated to delegations from 13 May 1963 onwards. The fact that it was not in the hands of all delegations was due to the manner in which financial implications were considered. A few years previously, budgetary matters had been the sole responsibility of the General Assembly, and the Council had made reservations whenever a delegation had advanced proposals which might encroach on that prerogative of the Assembly. However, in view of the great increase in expenditure, the Council had admitted that it had if not the final, at least an intermediate responsibility in the matter, since it was one of the principal organs initiating expenditure in the United Nations. That responsibility, however, and the means by which it was exercised were not yet sufficiently well defined. It was not easy for the Council, which was a body initiating expenditure, at the same time to carry out a policy of economy.

32. The new procedure for the review of financial implications was merely a first stage towards a more logical confrontation of the programmes and budgetary resources. It might be hoped, however, that at a later stage circumstances would permit a closer relationship to be established between resources and requests laid before the Council for their utilization. For the time being, during its initial study of the matter, the Council was merely called upon to reflect before undertaking the consideration of activities which would involve additional expenditure.

AGENDA ITEM 12

Reports of the regional economic commissions (E/3727/Rev.1, E/3735, E/3759 and annex, E/3764, E/3766/Rev.2, E/3786, E/3798; E/L.1001/Rev.1, E/L.1002, E/L.1003) (continued)

33. Mr. MEHTA (India), introducing the revised draft resolution submitted jointly by the delegations of Ethiopia, India, Jordan, Senegal and Yugoslavia (E/L.1001/Rev.1) expressed the hope that it would meet with the unanimous approval of the Council. There were two minor changes which had subsequently been made in that draft resolution: first, the order of operative paragraphs 3 and 4 should be reversed, and, secondly, the words "upon the request of the Secretary-General of the Conference" should be inserted before the last phrase in operative paragraph 5. The draft was, in essence, a continuing resolution, which carried forward the process of decentralization from General Assembly resolution 1823 (XVII), and it was also in the nature of a permissive measure which would enable the regional commissions to be in a position to render assistance to such developing countries as might seek their advice and assistance. It should not be regarded as in any way an encroachment on the functions of the normal executing agencies of the United Nations in their own special fields of activity, whether for regular and Expanded Programmes of Technical Assistance or for Special Fund projects. In fact, the resolution was meant to be complementary to the existing arrangements. It would enable developing countries to avail themselves of advisory services from the regional commissions, through the United Nations

resident representatives, whenever they felt the need for such advice.

34. Mr. ZAPOTOCKY (Czechoslovakia), submitting his delegation's amendments (E/L.1002) to the joint draft resolution, said that they were designed to stress the special rôle which ECE could play in strengthening the regional economic commissions — a rôle to which the Secretary-General had drawn attention in his statement at the opening of the Commission's eighteenth session.

35. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) congratulated the sponsors of the joint draft resolution, which was simple, specific and of great importance. The Czechoslovak amendments merited insertion, and it was to be hoped that the sponsors would take them into account.

36. The USSR delegation had an amendment to propose; the words "all the" should be inserted before "regional economic commissions" in paragraph 2 and original paragraph 3 of the operative part.

37. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that, in the main, his delegation approved the intention of the sponsors of the joint draft resolution. He would confine himself to two observations. First in operative paragraph 1 the words "*inter alia*" should be inserted after the words "taking into account" since the points of view of TAB, the Special Fund and the specialized agencies would probably also have to be considered. Secondly, operative paragraph 3 referred to the implementation of such programmes and projects for which assistance might be required by the developing countries concerned. He did not think that the regional economic commissions could carry out projects of interest to particular countries. He assumed that the sponsors' real intention had been to entrust the regional commissions with the task of evaluating the results of such projects. He therefore proposed the following wording: "and in evaluating the results of such programmes and projects for which their assistance may be required by the developing countries concerned".

38. The French delegation was in favour of the USSR amendment to document E/L.1001/Rev.1.

39. He would turn next to the Czechoslovak amendments appearing in document E/L.1002. So far as concerned the first of those amendments, he was in favour of scientific and technical co-operation between ECE and the developing countries. He did not see, however, why ECE should play a particularly prominent part in the preparation of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, as suggested in the second part of that amendment. The Council had already adopted resolution 917 (XXXIV) providing for co-operation by the regional commissions in that connexion; the matter had already been studied by the commissions themselves, and he was afraid the Czechoslovak amendment might complicate the situation. There seemed to be no need for the second amendment, since the Secretary-General no doubt already had the proposed action in mind.

40. As to the Czechoslovak draft resolution (E/L.1003), his delegation, while approving the draft in principle,

proposed that the text should be amended as follows: "to transmit the report in its final form to the secretariats of the regional economic commissions". The regional commissions themselves were of course already in possession of the document in question.

41. Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America) welcomed the changes introduced in draft resolution E/L.1001/Rev.1 by the representative of India. With respect to the Soviet amendment, he could agree to the insertion of the word "all" before "regional economic commissions" in operative paragraph 2, but not in operative paragraph 3, where the expression "all the regional economic commissions" would seem to give ECE responsibilities outside its own area of activities. The same criticism would apply to the new introductory paragraph proposed by Czechoslovakia which spoke of the special role of ECE in furthering the development of scientific and technical co-operation between the industrialized and the developing countries. He was not aware that the Commission possessed such a role, which would imply that the Commission's activities were on a world-wide scale and suggested that they were different from those of the other regional economic commissions. He was of the view that the regional commissions should deal with economic problems and not with scientific and technical questions. Moreover, if ECE was in fact to have a special role in furthering the development of scientific and technical co-operation between the industrialized and the developing countries, that question should be considered under item 15 of the agenda concerning action taken subsequent to the United Nations Conference on Science and Technology for the Benefit of Less Developed Areas. Further, the new introductory paragraph proposed by Czechoslovakia implied that ECE would have a larger part to play than the other regional economic commissions in the coming United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, a view to which he could not subscribe. Lastly, with respect to the new operative paragraph 6 proposed by Czechoslovakia, he shared the doubts expressed by the French representative, although he would have no objection if such a report could be embodied in the Secretary-General's annual report.

The meeting was suspended at 6.10 p.m. and resumed at 6.30 p.m.

Sir Ronald Walker (Australia), First Vice-President, took the Chair.

42. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the joint draft resolution (E/L.1001/Rev.1), said both amendments proposed by the French representative were acceptable. He saw no need to include the USSR amendment in operative paragraph 2 because, when the sponsors spoke of "the regional economic commissions" they meant all the regional economic commissions. The sponsors could accept the first Czechoslovak amendment (E/L.1002, 1) provided it were modified to read: "*Recognizing* the important role of the economic commissions in the preparation of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development". The second Czechoslovak amendment was acceptable pro-

vided it was understood that the Secretary-General would use his own discretion in drawing up the report in question. Finally, the addition suggested by the Indian representative to operative paragraph 5 was acceptable.

43. Mr. PASTORI (Uruguay) said that in some ways the joint draft resolution was unacceptable to his delegation, which was in favour of decentralization provided that the decentralization was relative, taking the need for coordinating the regional commissions' work into account. At the 1268th meeting, he had already referred in that connexion to the work done by ECLA, and in particular to the publication by that commission of a document describing its relations with EEC. Operative paragraph 2 of the joint draft resolution E/L.1001/Rev.1 referred to a "policy" of decentralization, which suggested more than the simple "process" of decentralization mentioned in paragraph 3. If it was a policy that was meant, the policy should first of all be defined, for the implication would be that the idea of a "process" within the context of General Assembly resolution 1823 (XVII) was being abandoned. Despite its desire to support the joint draft resolution, his delegation would be obliged to abstain from voting.

44. Mr. BORISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he would not insist on his delegation's proposal, provided the USSR amendment and the interpretation given to it by the sponsors were indicated in the record of the meeting.

45. Mr. ZAPOTOCKY (Czechoslovakia) said he could accept the change to his first amendment made by the sponsors of the draft resolution, provided it was understood that he would submit the amendment in its original form in connexion with the discussion of item 15.

46. Mr. UNWIN (United Kingdom) proposed that in the final paragraph of the preamble the words "decisions taken" should be replaced by the words "resolutions adopted", because in fact decisions regarding decentralization were taken at Headquarters by the Council and not by the regional economic commissions.

47. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan) accepted that amendment.

48. Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America) said his delegation would have serious difficulty in accepting operative paragraph 3 if the intention of the sponsors was to recommend to the regional economic commissions a new line of action.

49. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan) assured the United States representative that the paragraph was merely intended to confirm an existing mandate.

The joint draft resolution (E/L.1001/Rev.1), as amended, was adopted by 16 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

50. Mr. KRALIK (Czechoslovakia) said that his delegation's object in submitting its draft resolution E/L.1003 was to create favourable conditions for the transmission to the other regional commissions of the experience acquired by ECE. In view of the comments of the French representative, he proposed the following compromise wording for the last part of the text submitted by his delegation: "... to transmit the report in its final form to the Member States of the regional economic commissions, through the intermediary of the commissions' secretariats."

51. Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America) said he had no objection to the draft resolution, but would have some difficulty in voting for the clause "and of the opinions thereon expressed during the discussions of the eighteenth session of the Commission", first because he doubted the propriety of communicating such opinions to the other regional economic commissions, and secondly because, at that late stage, he himself had had no opportunity of ascertaining them.

52. Mr. UNWIN (United Kingdom), agreeing with the United States representative, also suggested that in the last paragraph the word "other" should be inserted before the words "regional economic commissions".

53. The PRESIDENT said that it would be better if the title of the resolution referred only to the annual report of the Economic Commission for Europe.

54. Mr. KRALIK (Czechoslovakia) accepted the United Kingdom proposal. He also agreed to the deletion of the second paragraph of the draft resolution. In addition, his delegation was prepared to omit, as the United States representative had suggested, the phrase in its amendment which referred to the opinions expressed during discussions at the eighteenth session of ECE.

The Czechoslovak draft resolution (E/L.1003), as amended, was adopted unanimously.

The meeting rose at 7 p.m.