

UNITED NATIONS ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS



ELEVENTH SESSION, **395th**
MEETING

THURSDAY, 20 JULY 1950, AT 10.30 A.M.
PALAIS DES NATIONS, GENEVA

CONTENTS

	Page	Page
Non-governmental organizations (<i>continued</i>). —		
(b) Review of non-governmental organizations in consultative status: report of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations (E/1697, E/1697/Add.1 and E/1775); (c) Question of non-governmental organizations' handbook: report of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations (E/1776)	173	
Draft rules for the calling of non-governmental conferences: report of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations (E/1777)		174
Report of the International Labour Organisation on training for apprentices and technical workers (E/1705)		175

President: Mr. Hernán SANTA CRUZ (Chile).

Present: Representatives of the following countries:
Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Denmark, France, India, Iran, Mexico, Peru, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Representatives of the following specialized agencies:

International Labour Organisation, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, World Health Organization.

Non-governmental organizations (*continued*):¹

- (b) REVIEW OF NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS IN CONSULTATIVE STATUS: REPORT OF THE COUNCIL COMMITTEE ON NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS (E/1697, E/1697/Add.1 and E/1775);
- (c) QUESTION OF NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS' HANDBOOK: REPORT OF THE COUNCIL COMMITTEE ON NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS (E/1776)

1. The PRESIDENT drew the attention of the members of the Council to the report and resolutions adopted by the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations (E/1697, E/1697/Add.1 and E/1775) and to the resolution on a handbook of non-governmental organizations (E/1776) adopted at the 85th meeting of that Committee. He called on the Chairman of the Committee to introduce the report.

2. Mr. CORLEY SMITH (United Kingdom), Chairman of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, said that the Committee had held a series of meetings and discussed thoroughly the question of the

status of various non-governmental organizations in consultative relationship with the Council. He emphasized the fact that it had been the unanimous view of the Committee that the particular status granted by it to an organization in no way reflected the Committee's opinion of the importance of that organization or of the value of its work. He had stated on two or three occasions that he knew of organizations which had been placed on the register which were, in his opinion, much more important and valuable than were certain other organizations in category A or B. The question of the particular type of consultative status accorded a non-governmental organization was simply the Committee's view of what particular relationship that organization should have with the Council. He hoped that fact would be borne in mind when the Council considered the recommendations which the Committee had made for altering the consultative status of certain organizations.

3. The PRESIDENT called for a vote on draft resolution A.

4. Sir Ramaswami MUDALIAR (India) said that, while he had no observations to make on the merits of the draft resolution, he would point out to the Council that the number of resolutions submitted to it was nearing the five-hundred limit, and he thought that in many cases resolutions could be combined, and thus reduce the number. He suggested, for example, that the draft resolutions in the report under consideration, which all related to the same subject, could quite well be combined into one single text.

5. The PRESIDENT, in reply, said that the various draft resolutions submitted by the Committee would eventually be combined into one resolution composed of several sections.

6. He put draft resolution A to the vote.

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

¹ Item 45 (a): "Hearings of non-governmental organizations", was disposed of at the 381st meeting.

7. The PRESIDENT called for a vote on draft resolution B.

8. Mr. WALKER (Australia) asked for an explanation as to why certain organizations formerly in category C had been placed in category B, while certain organizations in category B had been placed on the register.

9. Mr. CORLEY SMITH (United Kingdom), speaking as Chairman of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, said that it would be recalled that, at its tenth session, the Council had decided to abolish category C.² As the review of non-governmental organizations had not been scheduled to take place until after the end of that session, the Council had decided, as a temporary measure, to put the category C organizations on the register and to reconsider their status later. When the status of those organizations was reconsidered in detail, it had been decided that the Lions International—International Association of Lions Clubs, the Rotary International, and the World Organization of the Teaching Profession, should be recommended for category B status.

10. The PRESIDENT put draft resolution B to the vote.

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

11. The PRESIDENT put draft resolution C to the vote.

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

12. The PRESIDENT put draft resolution D to the vote.

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

13. The PRESIDENT called for a vote on draft resolution E.

14. Sir Ramaswami MUDALIAR (India), referring to draft resolution E (E/1697/Add.1), said that, although he agreed with the Committee's proposal, he felt that the reasons for the withdrawal of consultative status from the International Association of Democratic Lawyers and the International Organization of Journalists should be stated.

15. Mr. CORLEY SMITH (United Kingdom), speaking as Chairman of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, said that the Committee had spent considerable time on the question of the withdrawal of consultative status from the two organizations mentioned, and had discussed the question at length at various meetings. The Committee had reached the conclusion that consultative status could be given only to an organization which was able and willing to consult with the Council. An organization which took advantage of the granting of consultative status to denounce other organizations and certain governments, and contributed nothing in the way of constructive advice to the Council, could hardly be said to be in consultative status in any real sense of the term. None of the communications

received from the organizations in question had had any real bearing on the work of the Council.

16. There were aggravating factors, such as the expulsion of national professional organizations from the journalists' organization simply on the ground of a change of government in the particular country concerned, which seemed to the Committee to detract very considerably from the organization's claim to be representatives of a profession on a world-wide basis, and therefore, after considerable thought, the Committee had reached the unanimous conclusion that it would be better for the Council if consultative status with the two organizations in question was terminated.

17. The PRESIDENT put draft resolution E to the vote.

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

18. Sir Ramaswami MUDALIAR (India), referring to the *Yearbook of International Organizations* mentioned in the draft resolution submitted by the NGO Committee (E/1776), said that it was an excellent book and contained a full description of the activities, aims and objectives of various non-governmental organizations. The Secretary-General should therefore be requested to give the Union of International Associations every assistance and help in connexion with the *Yearbook*, and no handbook on non-governmental organizations should be published by the United Nations.

19. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the draft resolution referring to the handbook of non-governmental organizations (E/1776).

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

Draft rules for the calling of non-governmental conferences: report of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations (E/1777)

20. Mr. CORLEY SMITH (United Kingdom), Chairman of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, introducing document E/1777, said that the Committee had considered the two possible sets of rules for the calling of non-governmental conferences submitted to it by the Secretary-General, and had decided unanimously that the shorter and more flexible set of rules was best adapted to the summoning of such conferences. During its deliberations, the Committee had succeeded in increasing the flexibility of the shorter form of rules, and paragraph 2 of rule 2 authorized the Council to entrust the Secretary-General with any of the details connected with the summoning of conferences.

21. The Committee had added rule 3 because it felt that, as a matter of courtesy, Member States should be informed by the Secretary-General when conferences of non-governmental organizations were to be held. He pointed out that those persons who had to attend conferences abroad often had to obtain government approval, in view of various currency and other restrictions. It would therefore be helpful if governments were informed in advance when a non-governmental conference was to be held.

² See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council*, tenth session, *Resolutions*, No. 288 B (X).

22. Mr. WALKER (Australia) asked for clarification of the meaning of the last phrase of paragraph 2 "... or authorize him to introduce such modifications as circumstances require." If that phrase meant that the Secretary-General should be authorized to modify the terms of rule 1, the Australian delegation would prefer to see it deleted. If, however, the intention was that the Secretary-General, acting on behalf of the Council, should lay down certain points covered by sub-paragraph 1 (a) of rule 2, his delegation would have no objection.

23. Mr. CORLEY SMITH (United Kingdom), speaking as Chairman of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, said that paragraph 2 of rule 2 referred simply to paragraph 1 of that rule. Paragraph 2 merely authorized the Secretary-General in case of *force majeure* to alter the date or place of a conference or to make any other necessary arrangements.

24. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that his delegation warmly supported the draft resolution on draft rules for the calling of non-governmental conferences, as submitted by the Committee. There was a wide difference in the nature and purposes of such conferences, and it would be undesirable to draw up too detailed a set of rules. His delegation hoped that the Council would adopt the resolution.

25. He suggested that in the last line of rule 3 the word "addressed" should be replaced by the word "issued".

It was so agreed.

26. Mr. DE LACHARRIÈRE (France) expressed his approval of the formula proposed by the Council NGO Committee, because it had the merit of being flexible enough to be adapted to different circumstances. His delegation, nevertheless, wished the scope of the proposed rules to be defined clearly and without any possibility of doubt. They concerned non-governmental conferences, and it was to be understood that inter-governmental conferences were subject to other rules. In the opinion of the French delegation, conferences composed of representatives of both governments and non-governmental organizations should be considered as inter-governmental conferences and the rules in question should not apply to them. Further, the rules should not apply to meetings of experts appointed by the Secretary-General, at the invitation of the Economic and Social Council, such as the committees which had been appointed to deal with the questions of full employment and of slavery.

27. He pointed out that paragraph 2 of rule 2 enabled the Council to delegate a considerable part of its powers to the Secretary-General. The French delegation admitted that in principle, but it wished to stress the responsibility which it laid upon the Secretary-General. Inter-governmental conferences should be technical and should not encroach on general policy, which was the concern of governments and inter-governmental bodies. The Secretary-General would have to see that they kept to that character in so far as he was able to do so.

28. Mr. ENTEZAM (Iran) felt some doubt concerning the wording of paragraph 2 of rule 2 of the draft rules.

He did not consider that the Secretary-General should be entrusted with the task of laying down the terms of reference of non-governmental conferences, and he therefore proposed that the text of the paragraph should be amended to read as follows:

"2. The Council may decide to entrust the Secretary-General with any of the tasks listed in sub-paragraphs (b), (c), (d) and (e) of paragraph 1 . . ."

29. Mr. CORLEY SMITH (United Kingdom), speaking as Chairman of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, said that the Committee had unanimously supported the inclusion of the second part of paragraph 2 of rule 2. He felt, however, that it would not weaken the rule if that part of paragraph 2 were deleted. The phrase "or authorize him to introduce such modifications as circumstances require" had been inserted because a considerable interval might elapse between the issue of the authorization by the Council and the actual convening of a conference of non-governmental organizations, and it therefore seemed desirable to give the Secretary-General wide powers.

30. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) agreed with the representative of Iran that the terms of reference of a conference of non-governmental organizations should be determined by the Council. There might, however, be occasions when the Council might decide to outline certain general terms of reference which would need some clarification, and in that case the Council might well decide to ask the Secretary-General to make that clarification. He emphasized the point that paragraph 2 of rule 2 did not give the Secretary-General any automatic authority.

31. With regard to the second part of paragraph 2, he pointed out that it might be necessary to change the date of a conference after the date had already been decided on by the Council; such arrangements could well be left to the Secretary-General. He did not, therefore, feel that any amendment to rule 2 was necessary.

32. Mr. ENTEZAM (Iran) said that, in the light of the remarks made by the Chairman of the Committee and the United States representative, he would withdraw his proposal.

33. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the draft resolution submitted by the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations on draft rules for the calling of non-governmental conferences (E/1777), as amended by the United States representative.

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

Report of the International Labour Organisation on training for apprentices and technical workers (E/1705)

34. The PRESIDENT drew the attention of members of the Council to the report of the International Labour Organisation on training for apprentices and technical workers (E/1705), submitted in pursuance of General Assembly resolution 201 (III), and to the draft resolution

submitted by the French delegation in that connexion (E/L.71).

35. Mr. HEPLER (International Labour Organisation), introducing the report submitted by the International Labour Office, said it was a pleasure to submit a report on a subject of such importance to the Council. As the report was self-explanatory, he did not intend to make a detailed statement, but he would like to draw the attention of the members of the Council to a few points.

36. First was the fact that the organization and expansion of vocational training abroad was of great concern to countries which were anxious to develop their national economies, and to the international organizations which were striving to help them to attain that objective. Every technical conference had considered that question, and ILO was ready, in co-operation with other agencies, to intensify its efforts in that field.

37. Secondly, referring to a point in the report which he felt might be missed, he pointed out that the efforts devoted to the extension of external opportunities in the field of technical training could be effective only if they were accompanied by efforts directed toward the systematic organization of technical training within countries which were suffering from a lack of the qualified personnel necessary to the development of their national economy. The International Labour Organisation was endeavouring to develop the two programmes jointly, and was intensifying its efforts, in various parts of the world, to build up vocational training programmes within countries at the same time as it organized and developed opportunities for training abroad.

38. Thirdly, the programme referred to in the report had been put into effect and was being developed in co-operation with the other international organizations, particularly with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization in the study of the general problems raised by training abroad, and with regional economic commissions of the United Nations, such as the Economic Commission for Europe and the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East. The International Labour Organisation had recently opened a man-power field in São Paulo, Brazil, and co-operation with the Economic Commission for Latin America would be intensified.

39. Mr. JUVIGNY (France) praised the report submitted by the International Labour Organisation, but pointed out that the document went somewhat beyond the strict limits laid down by the General Assembly resolution. However, he would not reproach the ILO on that account, for he stated that technical assistance to countries wishing to develop their economy and the training of technical workers in industrialized countries were complementary processes, and an examination of the report showed how closely they were linked together.

40. He was pleased to note that ILO had already achieved a great deal in assembling and making available to the countries concerned technical documentary material on methods of vocational training, and he hoped that it would continue to publish those monographs on different methods of vocational training, so that the

countries which wished either to improve or to establish services of this kind could apply the methods which were most appropriate to their situation.

41. The section of the report devoted to technical assistance on the spot dealt in particular with the training of instructors for the work of training supervisors in the "demonstration centres". The implementation of the process called "Training within industry", which was envisaged in the report, had been the subject of conferences in which French technicians representing the Government, the employers and the workers had taken part. Moreover, the French Ministry of Labour had already taken certain steps towards co-ordinating activities in this field. A certain number of foreign trainees had already come to France to familiarize themselves with TWI methods. It was desirable that trainees from under-developed countries should train in centres and industries where this form of training was provided. Moreover, technical workers of industrialized countries like France who were experienced in matters of vocational training could and should contribute to the establishment and functioning of centres of activity which were in process of being established in certain regions throughout the world. France was especially interested in the problem of assistance in the organization and development of technical training of foreigners, and considered that the magnitude of the needs existing in that field made it necessary for governments to co-operate financially in that work, either directly or indirectly. France, which was an immigration country, was already making a great effort in that field. For example, with regard to vocational training, aliens were treated on an equal footing with its own nationals. In addition, it had set up vocational training-centres for refugees and displaced persons who, once trained, often left the country to settle in under-developed countries. Finally, his Government was subsidizing vocational training-centres for disabled aliens.

42. The report of ILO attached great importance to the international exchange of trainees, and supported the conclusion of international and bilateral agreements on the subject. France, which showed a decided preference for that kind of training, had already concluded agreements of that type with the signatories of the Brussels Treaty, and with Switzerland, Western Germany and Italy. The French Government considered that that policy should be extended.

43. The French delegation gave its unreserved support to the work of ILO, but it drew attention to the fact that that work was still encountering obstacles which could be surmounted only by close co-operation between governments, employers' and workers' organizations, industrial establishments and trade unions. Furthermore, the measures for the protection of the domestic labour force which governments tended to enact during periods of unemployment should not be allowed to prevent the training of foreign technicians and trainees, whose presence in the country did not give rise to any competition. Rather, in so far as such training contributed eventually to raising the standard of living in under-developed countries, it was a means of developing trade to serve an expansion of world economy.

44. In proposing a draft resolution concerning the report of the International Labour Organisation, the French delegation had only one object—namely, to congratulate that body on the work which it had accomplished and to encourage it to continue and intensify its efforts in the direction indicated.

45. Sir Ramaswami MUDALIAR (India) said that the members of the Council should be grateful for the report submitted to it by the International Labour Office, as it had a close bearing on the problems of economic development of under-developed countries which the Council had been discussing. The question of providing vocational training to the under-developed and undeveloped countries was of special importance. Programmes relating to industrialization and the raising of the standard of living of those countries would make little progress unless the fundamental programme of vocational training was implemented.

46. He was glad to note the serious manner in which ILO had undertaken the work assigned to it by the General Assembly. He noticed from the report that the Office had placed at the disposal of various countries all the literature available regarding institutions where vocational training could be obtained, as well as information regarding training courses and syllabuses. That information was of great value and should prove very helpful to those countries which had hitherto been unable to obtain comprehensive literature on the subject.

47. He agreed with the statement that the country which wished to have technical training made available to its workers abroad should utilize fully all its own opportunities for training the trainee before he was sent abroad to receive more advanced training. He expressed his thanks to the International Labour Office and to its Governing Body, which had approved the proposal that in countries where training was not available steps should be taken by ILO to establish training-centres.

48. However, the next most important step was to provide for training abroad, and he pointed out that the report mentioned that certain difficulties had been met with in that respect. Some of them were real, others were not. Paragraph 53 of the report referred to the fact that it had been argued that language difficulties would arise when the training took place in building yards, and that, generally speaking, the building industry was not ready to accept a programme of exchanges of trainees. He would have thought that, in practical work such as building, language difficulties should not interfere with successful training. That particular difficulty was obviously exaggerated.

49. He noted that the International Labour Office and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization had worked together in the matter of scholarships and training institutions. Quoting sub-paragraphs 1 and 2 of paragraph 58 of the report, he wondered what technical means ILO wished to have at its disposal in order to expand the organization of vocational training abroad.

50. Referring to sub-paragraph 3 of paragraph 58, he agreed that in many countries technical and training schools had opened their doors to foreigners, and in that

connexion mentioned the conference which had been held recently in the Philippines at which countries of South and South-East Asia had been represented. One of the resolutions adopted by that conference was to the effect that, wherever training facilities were available in any of the countries of the region, they would be made available to the citizens of all the countries in the area which lacked such facilities.

51. He requested the representative of ILO to give him more information on the question of training given in undertakings mentioned in sub-paragraph 3 (a) (ii) of paragraph 58. He wished to know how far ILO had been successful in persuading private industrial undertakings to accept trainees. The International Labour Organisation was in a peculiarly privileged position to bring about understanding on that subject, as it was composed of representatives of governments, workers and employers. It had been difficult in the past to persuade private industrial undertakings to accept trainees. Employers were often unwilling to give such training, and the workers themselves were equally unwilling to accept foreigners.

52. Referring to the recommendation adopted at the thirty-third session of the International Labour Conference, he wished the representative of ILO to inform him whether he felt the Organisation was justified in stating that training in private undertakings would be available to scholarship holders and other trainees from under-developed or undeveloped countries. That was the crux of the problem, and he attached the greatest importance to passing from mere oral approval of recommendations to active implementation of them.

53. He suggested that the Council should convey to ILO the hope that it would actively pursue and develop, in co-operation with the United Nations and other specialized agencies, the expanded programme which it had in view.

54. Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) said that his country was extremely interested in the work done by the International Labour Organisation in the field of training for apprentices and technical workers. His Government believed that such training was an essential part of any activities undertaken under the technical assistance programme. He had been impressed by the radical change which had taken place in the attitude of the ILO, which hitherto had been more concerned with conventions than with practical operational activities.

55. Referring to a remark made by the Indian representative, he wished to emphasize the fact that many employers in the United States of America had been willing to offer training facilities to foreign technical workers, thereby contributing to a very great extent to the success of such schemes. He mentioned training provided under the Marshall Plan, the Fulbright Act, and also the assistance given in that field to Latin-American countries.

56. Mr. CORLEY SMITH (United Kingdom) also emphasized his Government's interest in the scheme, and recalled the fact that his country had taken steps in that direction even during the war. As Labour Attaché

to the British Embassy in Brussels, he had done his best to promote exchanges of engineers and trainees between his country and Belgium. Although such bilateral arrangements should not be disregarded, the report of the International Labour Organisation held out promise of activities on a much larger scale in that field. He naturally agreed that training for apprentices and technical workers was an integral part of the technical assistance programme and of the problem of economic development. The ILO could count on the support of his Government, and he wished to mention in that connexion that 2,500 trainees had been given training in public and private enterprises in the United Kingdom in 1949. The ILO deserved all possible encouragement in its undertaking.

57. Mr. HERMENT (Belgium) stated that the fact that his Government was engaged in studying a possible reform of technical and vocational training in Belgium and that it had already concluded a certain number of conventions on the exchange of trainees made the problem under consideration one of particular interest to his delegation.

58. Two points seemed to him of particular importance in that connexion. First, it was not merely a question of elaborating new programmes; steps should be taken to review and revise the existing plans and methods with a view to improving them. Secondly, the possibilities of audio-visual methods and of co-ordinating existing resources should be studied. The use of applied psychology in vocational guidance should also be examined.

59. Mr. MARTÍNEZ OSTOS (Mexico) praised the work done by the International Labour Organisation, and said how pleased he had been to hear the statements made by the representatives of two industrialized countries, the United States of America and the United Kingdom, on the efforts made by their countries in that field. He wished to bear witness to the co-operation given by the United States of America in the training of Mexican workers, and he hoped that the Council would lend its full support and encouragement to the suggestions put forward by the International Labour Organisation.

60. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) expressed his delegation's appreciation of the International Labour Organisation's report. The training of technical personnel was indeed a very important and much needed task. He would like to mention in that connexion that ILO had set up a regional vocational training-centre at Sao Paulo, and to express his gratitude to the Organisation for having chosen his country as a centre for the diffusion of modern methods of technical training. His Government was extremely interested in the centre, and would do everything in its power to assist its work.

61. Mr. HEPLER (International Labour Organisation) wished to reply to the two questions asked by the Indian representative. With regard to the additional technical means required by ILO, it would have been more accurate to have spoken of additional financial means. It was obvious that the training programme in question would call for much effort, both within the International

Labour Office itself and in the field, and therefore for a substantial staff. He sincerely hoped that ILO would be able to intensify its efforts in that field as much as possible.

62. As to the question whether private industrial undertakings were really open to trainees, including those from under-developed or undeveloped countries, he would reply that the point had already been largely answered by the United States and United Kingdom representatives. It was true that not all private enterprises were open to trainees, and that much negotiation had been necessary to secure such facilities in the past. A certain amount of resistance had been encountered from both employers and workers. That resistance, however, was decreasing and a greater degree of success was being achieved, and ILO would pursue its efforts in that direction.

63. The PRESIDENT pointed out that many representatives had emphasized the close relationship between the technical assistance programme and the programme for the training of apprentices and technical workers. He wondered, therefore, whether the French representative would not agree to add the following paragraph to his draft resolution (E/L.71):

"Draws the attention of the Technical Assistance Board and of the organizations participating in the expanded programme of technical assistance to the report."

64. Sir Rainaswami MUDALIAR (India) suggested that the third paragraph of the French draft resolution should be amended to read:

"Recommends the International Labour Organisation actively to pursue and develop, in co-operation with the United Nations and other specialized agencies concerned, its extended programme in this sphere in accordance with the proposals outlined in the report."

65. Mr. JUVIGNY (France) accepted the suggestions made by the President and the Indian representative.

66. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the amended text of the French draft resolution (E/L.71), which read as follows:

"The Economic and Social Council

"Having examined the report of the International Labour Organisation on training of apprentices and technical workers,

"Notes the action taken by the International Labour Organisation to facilitate the admission to the world's centres of training of candidates from countries which suffer from a lack of qualified personnel necessary to the development of their national economy,

"Recommends the International Labour Organisation actively to pursue and develop, in co-operation with the United Nations and other specialized agencies concerned, its extended programme in this sphere in accordance with the proposals outlined in the report,

"Recommends the Governments of States Members to give their full co-operation and support to the

International Labour Organisation in its efforts to extend the possibilities of providing apprentices and technical workers with training abroad,

"Draws the attention of the Technical Assistance Board and of the organizations participating in the

expanded programme of technical assistance to the report."

The resolution, as amended, was adopted unanimously.

The meeting rose at 12.35 p.m.