



ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Resumed Forty-eighth Session
OFFICIAL RECORDS

Friday, 22 May 1970,
at 3.30 p.m.

NEW YORK

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

AGENDA ITEM 12

Work programme of the United Nations in the economic, social and human rights fields (*continued*) (E/4787, E/4793 and Corr.1-4, E/4793 (annex), E/4837 and Corr.1 and Add.1, E/4846 and Add.1 and 2, Add.3 and Corr.1, Add.4-15; E/L.1312, E/L.1318)

1. Mr. OUEDRAOGO (Upper Volta) said that the United Nations work programme contained in the report of the Secretary-General (E/4793 and Corr.1-4) was, on the whole, acceptable to his delegation. Referring to the comments of the Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs, he agreed on the need for administrative decentralization to the regional economic commissions, which would make the work programme more effective. During the Council's previous session, many delegations had agreed that the regional commissions should be given a more effective role in the field and, in particular, that the Economic Commission for Africa should be strengthened.

2. Referring to the discussion during the previous meeting of the role of interdisciplinary planning advisory teams, he said that there appeared to be a link between the establishment of such teams and the development of an integrated system of programming and budgeting. It was somewhat surprising that the USSR representative should have regarded their possible establishment as a move to abandon fixed-term planning; that was not the meaning of paragraph 13 of document E/4793. Planning was no longer a question of principle or of ideological choice but a vital necessity, particularly for developing economies. Was rigid planning really suited to the needs of developing States? Assured sources of finance were necessary if planning targets were to be fixed and met and, in the case of the developing countries, that usually involved recourse to external assistance. That was where the difficulty arose. Neither the United States nor the USSR nor the United Kingdom were in a position to guarantee to a developing country the financing of a long-term plan. A developing country could not adopt a rigid five-year plan on the basis of optimism alone. A most important feature of the proposal to establish such teams was that their services would be continuously available. The importance of such continuing advisory services and the resulting closer acquaintance with the problems facing the developing countries was obvious. Notwithstanding the remarks of certain major Powers at the previous meeting, his delegation vigorously supported the establishment of interdisciplinary teams, in the conviction that only by flexible planning in the light of changing conditions could the developing countries overcome their problems. Draft resolution E/L.1318 did no more than reproduce the recommendation of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination with

regard to the interdisciplinary teams, but the Council was not bound to take decisions only in the light of what CPC recommended. He did not agree with arguments that the financing of the teams from the regular budget would associate the staff and resources of the United Nations with UNDP activities. That was not implied in the Secretariat's presentation of the issue. He did, however, recognize the need for equitable co-ordination and integration of the activities of the interdisciplinary teams and the missions of the World Bank and UNDP. The establishment of interdisciplinary teams would thus enable the Council to play a new role.

3. With regard to operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, he agreed with the United States representative that it should be made clear whether the reference to "the increased role of the United Nations" referred to the whole United Nations system or to the United Nations as such. The Secretary-General's report failed to make clear the relationship between the work programme of the United Nations and those of the specialized agencies. His delegation could accept paragraph 3 if the sponsors made it clear that the reference was to the United Nations system as a whole.

4. Mr. FAROOQ (Pakistan) said that while he recognized that the delay in the submission of the report of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination on its fifth session (E/4846 and Add.1 and 2, Add.3 and Corr.1, Add.4-15) had been unavoidable, he wished to stress the need to streamline and expedite the issuance of documentation. In that connexion, he drew attention to the Committee's own recommendation in paragraph 15 (1)(c) of its report on its fourth session (E/4787) that reports of subsidiary bodies should be issued as early as possible in advance of the Council's session.

5. The CPC's performance had improved and it had made useful recommendations; if the presentation of the latter was not to the Council's liking, it should issue appropriate corrective guidelines. He referred in that connexion to his delegation's suggestion that the Council might direct CPC to include draft resolutions in its future reports. Another possible course would be to introduce a combination of decisions taken by consensus and by voting.

6. Referring to the statement by the Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs (1686th meeting), he said that the determination of priorities was a highly complex problem which had yet to be solved satisfactorily. The United Nations work programme must be tailored to the needs of the entire membership of the Organization and, as various countries were at differing stages of development, it was impossible to devise a comprehensive system of priorities for international activities which would also be suitable for individual needs. The developing

countries were anxious to devote increasing resources to such sectors as development planning, international trade, industrialization, science and technology, the development of natural resources and transport—all of which were of the greatest importance for developing economies, particularly on the eve of the Second United Nations Development Decade. There was an obvious need for more resources to meet the challenge of the Development Decade and, in that connexion, he fully agreed with the Norwegian representative that when programmes existed resources should be made available to implement them. As to the USSR representative's remarks (1687th meeting) regarding the increase in the United Nations budget, he noted that a study was being made of the real as opposed to the apparent dollar increase in United Nations expenditure, by comparison with increases in national budgets during the preceding ten years.

7. The Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs had suggested that the determination of priority areas should be left to the Secretary-General. Yet how could the latter determine priorities without knowing the extent of the resources which would be forthcoming? Not only had targets to be clearly stated, but the necessary resources had to be assured. The whole question was linked with the proposed system of programme budgeting. Action to implement the recommendations of the report on programming and budgets in the United Nations family of organizations¹ was required, but the matter was not as simple as it appeared because the outcome of *A Study of the Capacity of the United Nations Development System*² had also to be taken into consideration. He recalled in that connexion that the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management had informed CPC that programme budgeting would be an improvement but not a panacea, and had observed that even the most advanced of the developed countries had not yet adopted such a system. In the circumstances, his delegation was inclined to feel that until the programme budgeting system was adopted, the determination of priorities should be left to the Secretary-General, in the light of decisions by intergovernmental bodies as to the objectives to be achieved.

8. His delegation supported the Committee's recommendation for the establishment of interdisciplinary teams to help the developing countries in the formulation of their plans. Such teams would assist in the identification of gaps in development plans and would have an over-all view of the various sectors of development. They should be financed under section 3 of the regular budget; that would eliminate any possible problems of co-ordination. It was to be hoped that the teams would be kept fully occupied so that no wastage of resources occurred and that the Secretariat would inform the Council periodically of their performance so that it could review their composition or functions. Referring to the Upper Volta representative's remarks on co-ordination and integration of the activities of the interdisciplinary teams and World Bank and UNDP missions, he said that such activities should aim at ensuring the best utilization of existing resources and facilitating the availability of additional resources to meet growing needs. His delegation opposed the imposition of any ceiling in that

connexion; the growth of United Nations activities should be matched by a growth in resources.

9. With regard to the lack of sufficiently qualified personnel resulting from the geographical representation factor, his delegation's understanding of recruitment policies was that the Secretary-General could, in the interests of efficiency, engage well-qualified candidates on a short-term basis. While the equitable geographical distribution of posts should continue to be the objective, it should not be pursued at the expense of the effectiveness of the work programme. In that connexion, he drew attention to the statement in the report of the Joint Inspection Unit on the Economic Commission for Africa (E/4733, para. 19) that most African Governments, because of the present shortage of trained manpower, were unwilling to release suitable men for service with the United Nations and its technical missions but were quite willing to have non-Africans as technical experts for a long period.

10. His delegation agreed that the management survey teams were doing useful work but it hoped that the work programme would not be neglected as a result of the relocation of manpower resources on the recommendation of such teams.

11. It was to be hoped that the monitoring and surveillance of United Nations activities in the context of the Second Development Decade would be such that periodic statements on progress could be made.

12. His delegation agreed to the work programme proposed and hoped that the necessary resources would be forthcoming. It could support draft resolution E/L.1318 and suggested that such resolutions should in future be prepared by CPC. It would accept the majority view with regard to the presentation of future CPC reports.

13. Mr. TODOROV (Bulgaria) said that his delegation fully supported the views of the Chairman of CPC (1686th meeting). It also understood the difficulties of delegations which had looked in vain to CPC for assistance in the solution of complex organizational problems relating to the United Nations work programme. The difficulties which had prevented CPC from making clearer and more specific recommendations to the Council had not been merely procedural. The CPC had been confronted with several major problems of principle which the Council should now consider and which were reflected in the reports of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination, of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and in the report on programming and budgets in the United Nations family of organizations.³ The first problem was the delineation of the jurisdiction of inter-governmental, or legislative, bodies, on the one hand, and executive organs, on the other. The Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs had observed that the intergovernmental bodies concerned themselves with organizational details, which hampered the Secretary-General in preparing sound work programmes, and had suggested that the Secretariat needed more flexibility and freedom in that connexion. Delegations had not taken that issue up—although it was one of the utmost importance. His

¹ Document A/7822, annex.

² United Nations publication, Sales No.: E.70.I.10.

³ Document A/7822, annex.

delegation did not consider that the Under-Secretary-General's views were borne out by the Organization's history. The question of who was empowered to set priorities was relevant in that context. The Committee considered that the intergovernmental bodies should do so and his delegation agreed with that view.

14. The second problem was the question of the relationship between the programming and budgeting processes. It had been dealt with in the report on programming and budgets in the United Nations family of organizations but it had not been fully solved and his delegation awaited the views of the Advisory Committee and the Secretary-General on that report. The Committee for Programme and Co-ordination would not be in a position to discuss the question until those comments were available. At the present stage, his delegation could say no more than that it fully supported the USSR representative's remarks in that connexion (1687th meeting).

15. The third difficulty was the question of the priority to be accorded programmes and projects within programmes. In his view, it was for the Council, assisted by CPC, to decide on the order in which United Nations programmes were to be implemented. The sequence of projects, too, should be decided by intergovernmental bodies. Both CPC and the Secretary-General had referred to the need to establish guidelines for intergovernmental bodies in the determination of priorities. As CPC had indicated, budgetary resources would never be sufficient to implement all programmes of the United Nations system, so that an order of priority must be established. The Council might ask CPC to discuss the principles in question and make recommendations on the subject to the Council.

16. His delegation thought that the idea of establishing interdisciplinary teams was, on the whole, sound and was prepared to support it. However, it had misgivings with regard to some detailed aspects. The objectives of the teams should be properly defined; it should be made clear that they were to help Governments identify targets and set up their own planning bodies. He referred in that connexion to the UNDP Governing Council's discussion of the question of assisting developing countries in plan preparation. The establishment of the teams should be related closely to UNDP activities and they should be financed by UNDP. His delegation would welcome details as to the relationship between the proposed teams and World Bank missions. With regard to co-ordination at the national level, the UNDP Governing Council's view had been that countries were sovereign and it was for them, as opposed to resident representatives or the representatives of specialized agencies, to ensure such co-ordination.

17. His delegation was unable to support operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution E/L.1318 because the Secretary-General's work programme for 1971 had not attributed appropriate importance to, for example, science and technology. Nor could it support operative paragraph 5, which would mean that the interdisciplinary teams would be financed from the United Nations regular budget.

18. Mr. DE SEYNES (Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs) said that he was pleased to note that the comments of delegations on the present item

showed an increased awareness of the internal problems faced by the Secretariat. It would be of great help to the Secretariat if the dialogue between the legislative and executive organs of the United Nations could continue in the same constructive spirit.

19. With regard to the question of the recruitment of personnel, he realized that it was difficult for the Council and CPC to be fully aware of a whole series of factors which conditioned the implementation of the work programme, and he expressed appreciation of the Pakistan representative's understanding of the need for flexibility in that connexion, which was one of the most decisive factors in enabling the Secretariat to provide Governments with the services which they needed.

20. He was gratified also by the fact that almost all delegations had expressed interest in the proposal to establish interdisciplinary planning advisory teams. At the previous meeting, the USSR representative had expressed concern at the concept of planning set forth in paragraphs 13 to 19 of the report of the Secretary-General (E/4799 and Corr.1-4). In that connexion, he endorsed the view expressed by the Upper Volta representative that it was dangerous for a developing country to be over-rigid in the drafting of its development plan. Very often, developing countries did not have all the relevant data at the initial planning stage, and it was essential, therefore, to leave open the possibility of revision in the light of new experience and new data. He did not agree with the USSR representative's view that the flexible approach to planning proposed in document E/4793 was incompatible with long-term planning, and it seemed to him that the assumption of that representative that United Nations development activities were biased in favour of the interests of private capital was based on a misunderstanding. Long-term planning was essential in the private as well as the public sector, but it was not possible to forecast with complete accuracy all factors which might necessitate revision of the initial plan.

21. With regard to the integration of programming and budgeting procedures, it was not a question of according one supremacy over the other, but rather of continuously examining one in the light of the other. He was well aware of the need for discipline and agreed that there were some sectors of the United Nations work programme where stricter programming would be advisable. In that connexion, he drew attention to the fact that the ILO had reformed its programming procedures along the lines suggested in the report of the Secretary-General, and, after initial difficulties, the advantages of the reform had been generally recognized.

22. Referring to the comments made by the Bulgarian representative, he stressed that he had never suggested that there should be any change in the respective jurisdictions of the legislative and executive organs of the United Nations. The power of final decision regarding all plans and programmes prepared by the Secretariat would, naturally, lie with the intergovernmental bodies. However, the Secretariat would be able to organize its work more effectively if it was not bound by over-rigid and over-specific instructions concerning its methods of work.

23. The United States representative had questioned the usefulness of the proposed interdisciplinary planning

advisory teams. He hoped that the misgivings expressed would be dispelled by practical experience. There would not be any overlapping between the functions of the teams and those of UNDP missions, since the latter were involved only in a relatively small sector of the economic and social activities in each country, while the proposed teams would assist Governments in planning in all sectors. The teams would collaborate with UNDP and would be able to give the latter useful assistance in areas involving UNDP technical assistance.

24. Similarly, there were no grounds for concern that the teams' activities might conflict with those of IBRD missions. The latter were normally sent to a country for a few weeks for the purpose of appraising the country's suitability for IBRD investment. Moreover, even if conflicts should arise between the functions of the interdisciplinary teams, World Bank missions and UNDP field staff, it should not automatically be assumed that it was the interdisciplinary teams which were superfluous. On the question of financing the new teams a flexible approach should be taken. There were a number of possible alternatives. Analogies could be drawn between the teams and the regional commissions and also between the teams and UNDP. He trusted that a generally acceptable compromise solution could be devised.

25. He agreed with the Bulgarian representative that the application of science and technology to development was a question of great importance and one with regard to which United Nations activities must be intensified.

26. In conclusion, he expressed appreciation of the useful comments made in the Council. The Secretariat would take due account of them.

27. Mr. SKATARETIKO (Yugoslavia) said that the work of the interdisciplinary teams would be concentrated on the less advanced countries, and his delegation had thought it was clearly understood that such work would be financed only by the United Nations regular budget.

28. His delegation agreed with what was stated in paragraph 40 of document E/4793 concerning the determination of priorities. It wished to propose two amendments to operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution E/L.1318; the words "goals and" should be added between "bearing in mind the" and "objectives", and the latter word should be followed by the words "and the policy measures". The goals and objectives set for the Second United Nations Development Decade could not be achieved without policy measures.

29. With regard to the role of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination, his delegation felt that no effort should be spared to ensure that the most effective machinery was available. It could not accept arguments for economies on the grounds of the burden on taxpayers in Member States, since the effect on individual taxpayers of United Nations appropriations in national budgets was infinitesimal. No representative could fairly expect the mere size of his country's contribution to lend weight to his arguments.

30. Mr. OUEDRAOGO (Upper Volta) said that the Under-Secretary-General's statement had highlighted a

number of matters of concern to his delegation, including the need for flexibility in planning. That was especially important in the case of countries such as his own, which were largely dependent on agriculture—a field in which the history of the Soviet Union itself showed the difficulties involved in adopting rigid planning. Moreover, as the Under-Secretary-General had said, if interdisciplinary teams were set up and some overlapping of activities resulted, it should not be automatically assumed that it was those teams which were superfluous. The whole question of ways and means of co-ordination and integration should be carefully considered.

31. The major contributors to the United Nations budget should bear in mind that other delegations also were affected by increases in their assessments, and should not overlook the effect on developing countries of a relatively higher increase to further the purposes of an organization which was less widely understood by the inhabitants of such countries than by those of the developed countries.

32. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that the text of draft resolution E/L.1318 was longer and more complex than his delegation had expected and, if adopted, would bind the Council for the next two or three sessions to a programme which seemed more appropriately a matter for the Committee for Development Planning. The steps advocated in paragraph 37 of document E/4793 for determining priorities should be acceptable to all; however, the relative importance attached to the various objectives by different agencies and Governments would have to be borne in mind. Furthermore, it would be difficult to decide what priority to assign to project activity as vague as that described, for example, in the third sentence of the paragraph 6 of the work programme on social development concerning the project on social policy and income distribution (see E/4793, chap. IV, sect. C). His delegation also felt that, in the fields referred to in paragraphs 13 and 14 of that programme the United Nations was trying to go too fast and too far. His delegation would therefore hesitate to support the draft resolution as it stood.

33. With respect to the question of interdisciplinary teams, the views of the least developed countries should carry the most weight, since they were in the best position to say whether such teams would be useful. His delegation questioned the value of the proposed teams, which were bound to lead to overlapping with the activities of the missions and experts from IBRD, the International Monetary Fund and other agencies already in the field. His delegation, therefore, had doubts about operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution in question.

34. If the draft resolution was to be voted on paragraph by paragraph, his delegation would propose certain amendments. For example, in operative paragraph 2 it would like to add the words "in principle" after the word "approves" and to replace the word "implications" by "possibilities".

35. His delegation fully endorsed the United States representative's statement at the previous meeting concerning the Council's ability to deal with the question of work programmes; it hoped that the Council could deal with the points raised in that statement at its forty-ninth session, or that the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination

would take them up when its sixth session opened during the coming week.

AGENDA ITEM 10

36. Mr. AYOUB (Tunisia) said that as the idea of providing continuing advisory services had been endorsed almost unanimously by the General Assembly in its resolution 2563 (XXIV), his delegation was surprised that there should be any opposition to the proposed interdisciplinary teams. It was also puzzled by the references to UNDP financing of such teams, since the General Assembly had intended that they should be organized through the regional economic commissions, which would mean that they would be financed from the United Nations regular budget.

37. Mr. GUPTA (India) explained that operative paragraphs 7 and 8 of draft resolution E/L.1318 had been designed to deal with the problems referred to by the Greek representative, while the reference in operative paragraph 5 to paragraph 15 of document E/4846/Add.11 dealt with the matter of financing raised by the Tunisian representative. He shared the United States representative's view that programming and budgeting should be considered jointly. That representative had suggested the inclusion of an operative paragraph on the Council's role in monitoring the Second United Nations Development Decade. Because of differences of views, no such paragraph had been included in the original draft, but it could be added if the Council saw fit. He agreed with the United States representative's remarks concerning operative paragraph 3.

38. With regard to the sixth preambular paragraph, the sponsors accepted the United Kingdom representative's proposal that the word "inhibited" should be replaced by "impeded" and that the word "limitations" should be preceded by "unnecessary". They also agreed to include the words "having considered it" before "in the light of" in operative paragraph 2. The Yugoslav delegation's amendments to operative paragraph 3 were accepted, as was the Soviet delegation's proposal that, in operative paragraphs 9 and 10, the words "Council's comments and decisions thereon" should be replaced by "comments of members in the Council". The sponsors also agreed that, in operative paragraph 6, the reference to the General Assembly should precede the reference to the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination and the Council and that, in operative paragraph 3, the word "system" should be inserted before "is likely to play".

39. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation endorsed the Upper Volta representative's remarks. He hoped that, in view of the comments made by a number of members, the sponsors of the draft resolution would agree to add the words "in principle" after the word "approves" in operative paragraph 2.

40. Mr. GUPTA (India) said that the sponsors of the draft resolution had taken note of all the other proposed amendments and had accepted them. The second amendment proposed by the Greek delegation, whereby the word "implications" would be replaced by "possibilities", would lead to the reopening of discussion on the entire text, and his delegation would have to consider the matter with the other sponsors.

Transport questions (*continued*)*:

- (a) Review of the activities of the United Nations system of organizations in the transport field (E/4794 and Add.1, E/4795 and Add.1-4, E/4846/Add.4);
- (b) Transport of dangerous goods (E/4783; E/L.1315, E/L.1316, E/L.1317);
- (c) Question of convening a United Nations meeting on containerization (E/4796 and Add.1 and 2, E/4846/Add.4)

41. The PRESIDENT said that, after extensive consultations with Members, he had drafted the following consensus on the question of convening a United Nations meeting on containerization:

"The Economic and Social Council decides that a conference on international container traffic shall be convened jointly by the United Nations and the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization, covering the topics and areas of action outlined in annex I of document E/4796, to be held in Geneva as early as practicable, preferably in 1972. The Council requests the Secretary-General to undertake the necessary preparations in collaboration with the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization and in co-operation with other appropriate intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations."

42. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) said that, while his delegation would not delay the adoption of the consensus, he wished to record his delegation's formal reservations in the light of the statement he had made earlier in the debate.

43. The PRESIDENT said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Council approved the consensus which he had read out.

It was so decided.

44. Mr. FRANZI (Italy) said, on the subject of item 3 (b) of the agenda, that his delegation had submitted the amendment in document E/L.1317 because it felt that the Group of Rapporteurs on the Packing of Dangerous Goods should be placed on an equal footing with the Group of Experts on Explosives and that it should be explicitly stated in operative paragraph 2 (a) of draft resolution E/L.1315, that the Group of Rapporteurs too should continue to function as a subsidiary body of the Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods.

45. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) explained that the Group of Rapporteurs had not been referred to in paragraph 2 (a) of the draft resolution because it was already officially a subsidiary body of the Committee of Experts. The sponsors had felt it necessary to state explicitly that the Group of Experts on Explosives should continue to function as a subsidiary body of the Committee of Experts in order to give official recognition to a *de facto* situation, since the Group of Experts on Explosives had not officially been placed under the Committee's authority. He

* Resumed from the 1684th meeting.

hoped, therefore, that the Italian representative would not press his amendment to a vote.

46. Mr. FRANZI (Italy) said that, in the light of the explanation given by the United Kingdom representative, his delegation would withdraw its amendment and would support the draft resolution, with the USSR amendment (E/L.1316).

47. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) said that the amendment submitted by the USSR delegation introduced a new element into the draft resolution, since it made specific suggestions concerning the future work programme of the Committee of Experts. That Committee might usefully consider the topics listed. However, in view of the fact that IMCO was considering similar questions in connexion with the transport of dangerous goods by sea, and since the matter was a highly technical one, the sponsors could accept the USSR amendment in principle only and on the understanding that the suggested work programme might have to be adapted in the light of the views expressed in IMCO and in the Committee of Experts itself.

48. Mr. OUEDRAOGO (Upper Volta) said that his delegation was ready to support draft resolution E/L.1315, with the amendment in document E/L.1316. He proposed, however, that in the new operative paragraph 5 the word "consider" should be used only once, at the beginning of the paragraph, rather than being repeated in each subparagraph.

49. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation accepted the sub-amendment proposed by the representative of Upper Volta.

50. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) said that he too could accept that sub-amendment.

Draft resolution E/L.1315, as amended, was adopted unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 9

The role of the co-operative movement in economic and social development (*continued*)* (E/4807 and Corr.1, E/L.1314)

51. Mr. RAHMAN (Pakistan), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1314, said that, in opera-

tive paragraph 1, the words "should be" would be replaced by "is", and that, as suggested by the Jamaican delegation, the word "appropriate" would be inserted before "concerned" in operative paragraphs 2 and 3. In operative paragraph 4, the word "all" would be included before "Member States".

52. It was hoped that the Council would be ready to vote immediately on the draft resolution.

53. Mr. OUEDRAOGO (Upper Volta), referring to operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution, said that he did not see how the Council could reaffirm something which, as far as he was aware, was not yet on record as having been affirmed. In operative paragraph 4 it was still not clear, despite the amendment accepted by the sponsors, to whom assistance was to be provided. Was it intended that all Member States should give appropriate assistance to their co-operative movements, or that co-operative movements in different countries should help each other? The latter interpretation would be understandable if operative paragraph 4 was linked to operative paragraph 3. His delegation would like the purpose of operative paragraph 4 to be clarified.

54. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that, in operative paragraph 4, the word "advisory" should be added before "assistance".

55. Mr. FRANZI (Italy) said that, while his delegation agreed with the Upper Volta representative with regard to operative paragraph 1, it felt that the wording should be left as it was, at least until the next session, when there would be an opportunity to consider whether it was still appropriate.

56. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) proposed that the Secretary should confirm whether the Council had or had not previously affirmed the importance of the co-operative movement in the strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade. If the Council was in fact making a reaffirmation, it was a matter of record, and if the original affirmation had said "should be" the word "is" could not be used now.

57. The PRESIDENT suggested that voting on the draft resolution should be postponed to a later meeting.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.

* Resumed from the 1684th meeting.