



ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Friday, 8 August 1969

FORTY-SEVENTH SESSION

at 3.5 p.m.

OFFICIAL RECORDS

PALAIS DES NATIONS, GENEVA

CONTENTS

I. COMPUTERS

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 18:	
Development and co-ordination of the activities of the organizations within the United Nations system:	
(a) Reports of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination and of the joint meetings of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination and the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination	
(b) Report of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination	
(c) Reports of the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency	
(d) Expenditures of the United Nations system in relation to programmes	
Report of the Co-ordination Committee	247
Agenda item 21:	
Measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council and calendar of conferences and meetings for 1970 and 1971	
Report of the Co-ordination Committee	248
Financial implications of actions taken by the Council at its forty-seventh session	250
Agenda item 22:	
Arrangements regarding the report of the Council to the General Assembly	251
Adjournment of the session	251

President: Mr. SCHEYVEN (Belgium).

AGENDA ITEM 18

Development and co-ordination of the activities of the organizations within the United Nations system:

- (a) Reports of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination and of the joint meetings of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination and the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination
- (b) Report of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination
- (c) Reports of the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency
- (d) Expenditures of the United Nations system in relation to programmes

REPORT OF THE CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE
(E/4741)

1. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the report of the Co-ordination Committee on agenda item 18 (E/4741) and suggested that the Council should examine and vote *seriatim* on the five draft resolutions in paragraph 13 of the report.

It was so decided.

2. Mr. ASTAFIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) reaffirmed the position taken by his delegation in the Co-ordination Committee; it was important to ensure that draft resolution I did not add to United Nations expenditure.

3. Mr. DECASTIAUX (Belgium) said that his delegation would support draft resolution I which was entirely in accord with his country's concern to modernize the United Nations. However, his delegation had some reservations with regard to the financial implications, which remained unclear.

4. Mr. DIALLO (Upper Volta) associated his delegation with the reservations expressed by the last two speakers.

5. Mr. HILL (Assistant Secretary-General for Inter-Agency Affairs) said that the increased activities proposed in draft resolution I could not be undertaken fruitfully without the appointment of experts on a temporary basis. The cost involved would be in the order of \$32,000 in 1970. He assured the Council that the Secretary-General would not proceed to appoint the experts in question until and unless the General Assembly decided to approve a sufficiently large increase in the staff for ACC and inter-agency affairs.

6. Mr. Malcolm O. COLE (Sierra Leone) said that, in the light of the statement by the Assistant Secretary-General, his delegation could vote in favour of draft resolution I.

Draft resolution I was adopted by 20 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

7. Mr. MBAPILA (United Republic of Tanzania) said that his delegation had abstained from voting because it was still in doubt about the financial implications of the resolution.

II. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE FOR PROGRAMME AND CO-ORDINATION ON THE UNITED NATIONS WORK PROGRAMME

8. The PRESIDENT reminded the Council that draft resolution II had been approved unanimously by the Co-ordination Committee. If he heard no comments, he would take it that the Council decided to adopt the draft resolution unanimously.

It was so decided.

III. SUPPLEMENTARY ARRANGEMENTS FOR HANDLING THE REPORTS OF THE JOINT INSPECTION UNIT

9. Mr. MARTIN-WITKOWSKI (France) said that his delegation was a sponsor of draft resolution III.

10. In the Co-ordination Committee his delegation had requested the Secretariat to supply, for purposes of clarification, a document setting out the existing procedures for transmitting and handling reports of the Joint Inspection Unit. He had received such a document, but it was in a working language other than his own. He requested the Secretariat to circulate it as an official document in all the working languages of the Council.

11. Mr. HILL (Assistant Secretary-General for Inter-Agency Affairs) confirmed that in response to the French delegation's request for information in the Co-ordination Committee, a draft had been prepared in consultation with the Joint Inspection Unit. It was an interpretation by that Unit of existing procedures and had not been cleared by the Secretary-General. Those procedures were in some respects in a confused state at the present time and he agreed that it would be useful to have a discussion of the matter at the next joint meeting of ACC and CPC. In the meantime the Secretariat would endeavour to revise the document and issue it in the necessary languages in time for the joint ACC/CPC meeting in October 1969.

12. The PRESIDENT drew the attention of delegations to paragraph 5 of draft resolution III setting forth the proposed future procedure for handling certain reports of the Joint Inspection Unit. If he heard no further comments, he would take it that the Council decided to adopt the draft resolution unanimously.

It was so decided.

IV. REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEE FOR PROGRAMME AND CO-ORDINATION ON CO-ORDINATION MATTERS, OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE ON CO-ORDINATION; OF THE JOINT MEETINGS OF THE COMMITTEE FOR PROGRAMME AND CO-ORDINATION AND THE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE ON CO-ORDINATION, AND OF THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY

13. Mr. DIALLO (Upper Volta) said that, in the Co-ordination Committee, his delegation had had some misgivings about the wording of the operative paragraph in part III of the draft resolution which called upon the Commission on Human Rights to consolidate certain types of information. After receiving assurances from the sponsors, his delegation had been able to support the draft resolution. However, he hoped that the Secretariat would be able to find a more appropriate translation of the word "consolidate" in order to bring the French text into line with the original English.

14. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no further comments, he would take it that the Council decided to adopt the draft resolution unanimously.

It was so decided.

V. DEVELOPMENT AND CO-ORDINATION OF THE ACTIVITIES OF THE ORGANIZATIONS WITHIN THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM

15. Mr. VIAUD (France) pointed out that the list of sponsors which headed draft resolution V in the French text of the report was incomplete. His country and Bulgaria were also sponsors.

16. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) pointed out that the reference to the Council's co-ordinating role appeared twice in operative paragraph 2. It had been agreed in the Co-ordination Committee that that reference should be made only once, at the end of the paragraph.

17. The PRESIDENT said that the comments which had been made would be taken into account by the Secretariat.

18. Since draft resolution V had been approved unanimously by the Co-ordination Committee, he took it that the Council would also wish to adopt it unanimously.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 21

Measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council and calendar of conferences and meetings for 1970 and 1971

REPORT OF THE CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE (E/4742)

19. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the report of the Co-ordination Committee on agenda item 21 and to vote on the recommendations in paragraph 14 and on the draft resolution on measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council and calendar of conferences and meetings for 1970 and 1971, which appeared in paragraph 15. The Committee had approved the recommendations in paragraph 14 (b) and (c) by a majority vote and all the other recommendations in that paragraph unanimously.

20. Mr. ASTAFIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring to the recommendation in paragraph 14 (b), said that his delegation had reservations concerning the proposal for the Commission on Social Development to meet biennially.

The recommendation in paragraph 14 (b), was adopted by 24 votes to 2.

The recommendation in paragraph 14 (c), was adopted by 24 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

21. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) said that paragraph 14 (t) did not make it clear to whom and when the Secretary-General was requested to report on the results of his study. His delegation considered that the Secretary-General should report to the Council at its resumed forty-seventh session.

22. Mr. VIAUD (France) associated his delegation with the United Kingdom representative's remarks. He noted that, according to the draft Calendar of Conferences and Meetings for 1970 (paragraph 16) the Governing Council of UNDP was tentatively scheduled to hold a special session from 16 to 20 March 1970 to examine the Capacity Study. He realized that the final decision concerning the dates would rest with the Governing Council, but wished to point out that the Study, which would probably be issued only a few weeks before the scheduled beginning of the session, was very important and should be examined carefully by Governments so that their delegations would arrive at the special session fully prepared. He therefore thought that it would be better to hold the special session early in April 1970. In any event, the Governing Council would know more about the matter in January and would be able to take an appropriate decision.

23. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that paragraph 10 of the report made it clear that any decision taken at the present stage was subject to further consideration. It seemed reasonable to assume that the Governing Council, in reaching a final decision concerning the special session, would take care not to set a date that would conflict with another important meeting. On that understanding, he could support the suggestion made by the French delegation.

24. Mr. KASSUM (Secretary of the Council) suggested that the study to be made by the Secretary-General under paragraph 14 (t) might be examined by the Council at its forty-eighth session in January 1970, when it examined its programme of work for the year. That would allow time for a comprehensive paper to be prepared.

25. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) still thought that the study should be examined at the resumed forty-seventh session because, if it was decided that the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees should henceforth report direct to the General Assembly, it would presumably be necessary to modify the Statute of his Office. That was a decision which only the General Assembly could take.

26. Mr. KASSUM (Secretary of the Council) said that the Secretariat would try to prepare the paper in question in time for the resumed forty-seventh session.

27. The comments which had been made concerning the Governing Council's special session would be taken into account by the Administrator of UNDP in making his recommendations.

28. Mr. RODRÍGUEZ LARRETA (Uruguay) asked why it was proposed that the Council's forty-eighth session should be held in two parts.

29. Mr. KASSUM (Secretary of the Council) explained that the original calendar proposed by the Secretary-General had been along traditional lines. However, the Co-ordination Committee had discussed ways and means of helping the Council to deal with its heavy agenda. An informal working group of the Committee had put forward the proposals reflected in the draft calendar for 1970. As the United States representative had already pointed out, the Council was asked only to approve the schedule in principle, subject to further consideration at the resumed forty-seventh session.

30. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) explained that the question had been discussed at great length in the Co-ordination Committee because, under the old calendar, delegations had had difficulty in attending first the Headquarters session of the Council in spring and then the summer session held shortly thereafter at Geneva.

31. The resumed forty-eighth session to be held in May 1970 would deal only with the reports of the Commission for Social Development, the Commission on Human Rights and the Commission on the Status of Women. Therefore, members would not be obliged to send large delegations. The new calendar had been proposed in an attempt to improve the organization of the Council's work and to enable it to discuss important items more thoroughly.

32. Mr. RODRÍGUEZ LARRETA (Uruguay) said that, notwithstanding that explanation, his delegation was not convinced that it would be useful to hold the forty-eighth session in two parts. He requested that his delegation's opposition to that arrangement should be clearly reflected in the Council's report. In 1961 the spring session had been held in April and the summer session in July; that arrangement had allowed sufficient time for the necessary preparations.

33. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) observed that so many new organs and committees had been established since 1961 that the organization of the Council's work was now much more difficult. If the Council met in April, it would be unable to discuss the report of either the Commission on Human Rights or the Commission for Social Development; neither of those Commissions would conclude its session until the latter part of March.

The recommendations in paragraph 14 as a whole were adopted.

The draft resolution set forth in paragraph 15 was adopted unanimously.

34. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to examine paragraph 16 and the attached draft Calendar of Conferences and Meetings.

35. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) noted that four of the five functional commissions scheduled to

meet in 1970 were to hold their sessions at the Geneva Office of the United Nations. His delegation believed that some balance should be maintained between New York and Geneva. Furthermore, the Statistical Commission was currently engaged in a survey of statistical operations throughout the United Nations system, and since the United Nations Statistical Office was in New York it seemed appropriate for that Commission to meet there. His delegation therefore proposed that the Statistical Commission should meet in New York instead of Geneva. Moreover, if the Commission did not meet until October 1970, as proposed in the draft Calendar, it would not have met for two and a half years, an interval considered by statisticians to be far too long, and its report would not be submitted to the Council until 1971. His delegation therefore proposed that the Statistical Commission should meet from 10 to 20 February 1970.

36. Mr. MARTIN-WITKOWSKI (France) pointed out that, in order to preserve a proper balance, the General Assembly had adopted a series of resolutions, of which the latest was resolution 2478 (XXIII), establishing the conditions under which functional commissions of the Council might meet at Geneva. Since the fifteenth session of the Statistical Commission had been held in New York, the principle of alternation between New York and Geneva would be impaired if the sixteenth session were held at Headquarters.

37. Mr. ASTAFIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the recommendation made by the Co-ordination Committee in paragraph 16 of its report was not an accurate reflection of the Committee's discussions; it had been repeatedly pointed out that the draft Calendar of Conferences and Meetings was merely provisional and could be modified at the Council's resumed forty-seventh session. In his delegation's view, no final decision on the Calendar should be taken until that time.

38. Mr. KELSO (Observer for Australia), speaking under rule 75 of the rules of procedure, said that the Chairman of the Statistical Commission, who was an Australian, was strongly of the opinion that the Commission's sixteenth session should take place after an interval of two rather than two and a half years.

39. Mr. DECASTIAUX (Belgium) observed that one provision of General Assembly resolution 2478 (XXIII)—namely, operative paragraph 6 (e)—was already being violated in that the Council's 1969 summer session at Geneva was not closing six weeks before the opening of the General Assembly's session. In order to uphold the balance and the principle of alternation, he would prefer the Statistical Commission to hold its sixteenth session at Geneva.

40. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said he did not think anyone would maintain that the pattern of conferences laid down by General Assembly resolutions should be immutable in the face of strong objective arguments for one or the other meeting-place.

41. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) observed with reference to the principle of alternation that in 1969 the Population Commission was holding its second successive session at Geneva. However, he believed that, in determining the meeting-place of the Statistical Commission, the professional preference of statisticians should have priority; he therefore supported the United States proposal.

42. Mr. GALLARDO MONTERO (Mexico) said that he agreed with the representative of Belgium that the Statistical Commission should hold its sixteenth session at Geneva. In addition he fully shared the Uruguayan representative's views with regard to the division of the Council's forty-eighth session.

43. The PRESIDENT put the United States proposal to the vote.

The proposal was not adopted, 10 votes being cast in favour and 10 against, with 7 abstentions.

44. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council decide to adopt in principle the Calendar of Conferences and Meetings for 1970 and the tentative Calendar of Meetings for 1971, subject to further consideration, if necessary, at its resumed forty-seventh session.

It was so decided.

Financial implications of actions taken by the Council at its forty-seventh session (E/4740)

45. The PRESIDENT drew attention to document E/4740, which presented in summary form the financial implications of the actions of the Council at its forty-seventh session, submitted in accordance with rule 34 of the rules of procedure. Those implications would be discussed at the appropriate time by the competent organs of the General Assembly. The Secretary-General would review them and, as required, make provision in the revised budget estimates for 1970, to be submitted to the General Assembly at its twenty-fourth session.

46. Mr. VIAUD (France) said his delegation would comment on the revised estimates at the appropriate time. However, he noted that the estimates of the costs of convening the conference on the problems of the human environment remained the same as those calculated before the Council had adopted resolution 1448 (XLVII) requesting the Secretary-General to make all efforts to reduce the costs of the Conference. In the circumstances, those figures seemed to have little meaning.

47. Mr. de SEYNES (Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs) agreed that the figures were meaningless. The Secretariat would make every effort to obtain new estimates of the financial implications in the light of Council resolution 1448 (XLVII). In his view, the procedure for discussion of financial implications by the Council was often pointless.

48. Mr. OLDS (United States of America) asked why, if the procedure was pointless, it continued to be followed. The Council would do well, at some future stage, to explore the possibility of more adequate methods of dealing with programme projections and financial implications.

49. Mr. de SEYNES (Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs) agreed that the present system was ineffective, and that discussions of a possible reform of the whole programming and budgetary system of the United Nations would be desirable.

50. Mrs. MIRONOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that there was no merit in a procedure which consisted of stating that certain figures in documents before the Council were meaningless and would be replaced by others. As to the substance of the question, her delegation could support no expenditure which would entail an increase in the United Nations regular budget; in her view, the competent organs of the General Assembly should subject the revised budget estimates to keen scrutiny, bearing in mind the discussions which had taken place in the Council.

51. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) said that, in his opinion, the sum of \$32,000 listed against agenda item 18 should be deleted; the item should have no financial implications.

52. Mr. HILL (Assistant Secretary-General for Inter-Agency Affairs) said that, on the contrary the sum in question would be required if the work contemplated was to be carried out effectively.

53. Mr. HALL (Jamaica) expressed agreement with the United Kingdom representative. There had been lengthy discussions in the Co-ordination Committee on the Secretary-General's note setting out the financial implications of the item (E/AC.24/L.362) as a result of which he had understood that the document in question would be withdrawn. He had therefore been surprised to see the sum of \$32,000 included in the table.

AGENDA ITEM 22

Arrangements regarding the report of the Council to the General Assembly (E/L.1261)

54. The PRESIDENT asked if the members of the Council would authorize him to prepare its report to the General Assembly as indicated in paragraph 1 of the Secretary-General's note (E/L.1261).

It was so decided.

Adjournment of the session

55. The PRESIDENT said that his service as President of the Council had enabled him to serve the interests of the

countries to which Belgium rendered technical assistance and also to perform his duties as Belgian Minister of Co-operation for Development more effectively.

56. He was very much in favour of the "internationalization" of bilateral assistance; he was eager to link Belgian bilateral aid to the assistance provided by international organizations and, so far as possible, to co-ordinate it with other bilateral aid. That was an easy matter at Brussels, the Headquarters of the European Communities. Whenever the representatives of African countries with which Belgium had concluded co-operation agreements came to Brussels, meetings were held with the Common Market authorities and in particular with the European Development Fund. His service as President of the Council had given him the opportunity for closer contact with the President of IBRD and with the Administrator of UNDP.

57. He was also very much in favour of what he called the "multiplier effect". That effect could be achieved through the international agencies when, for example, the help of technicians was made available to the developing countries in formulating worth-while technical projects which they then submitted to the international authorities, thus obtaining international financing which they would have been unable to secure without such co-operation.

58. Belgium had committed itself to pay \$80 million to the European Development Fund over a period of five years, to supply \$4.5 million of food aid under the International Grains Arrangement, and to increase its contribution to UNDP to \$2.5 million for 1970.

59. Unfortunately, however, in Belgium as in most of the industrialized countries today, development aid was not regarded by everyone as a matter of priority. The budgetary situation and the balance of payments of the donor countries carried too much weight in determining and influencing their aid policy. That state of affairs did not meet the needs of the developing countries, which had to make medium-term and long-term plans with a reasonable assurance of sustained financing, and which should not have to share the burden of readjustment imposed by the financial difficulties of the industrialized countries.

60. After an interval of sixteen years, he had returned to the presidency of an organ to which the United Nations Charter entrusted almost unlimited responsibility. Perhaps the international community had not yet been able to define in specific terms the role which should be played by the Council in laying down the guidelines for an international economic and social policy. That was in any case a difficult task, and the developing countries could make progress only through an accumulation of modest and painstaking efforts. However, the current session had yielded no sign of the political will to make such progress a reality. The network of decision-making organs of the United Nations had become more complex in recent years, but there was little to be gained by stripping the Council of yet more of its functions and handing them over to other organs if the political will was lacking.

61. On the other hand, the Council seemed to him to be healthily alert to new problems and new ideas, and had been able to broaden and refine the concept of development. The human environment, the sea-bed, pollution, urbanization, demography, technology and science were approached on the basis of highly professional studies and discussed in a way calculated to enlighten world opinion. In addition, the Council would shortly adopt a long-term comprehensive strategy and would then be in a position to propose at least a minimum of coherence and stronger guidelines for the innumerable development projects. It had managed to attune its thought—if not its action—to the changing currents in contemporary society. In addition it had developed a complex network of machinery which, given the necessary co-ordination, should gradually provide a strong supporting structure.

62. However, the Council had not only to do useful work; it must also ensure that the results of its work reached the outside world. Its general debate, however well prepared with high-quality background material, did not represent a fount of critical collective thought to which those responsible for vital economic decisions could come each year in search of inspiration. One reason was that, despite its length and the number and variety of those entitled to take part, no effort was made to delimit the subjects dealt with, to focus the discussion on a few main points, or to limit the length of speeches. A further reason was that the Council's powers were limited to making recommendations. Nevertheless, it should be able to increase its influence in world affairs if serious efforts were made in the right direction.

63. The general debate at the current session had emphasized the general concern over the population explosion. According to the figures put before the Council, the world population would double in the next twenty-five years. Yet little that was new had emerged from the general debate. The Council had been told that in some areas, including many parts of Africa, under-population was an obstacle to development; that family planning was a personal and social problem that went beyond the competence of economists and statisticians; that lack of education rendered family planning an ineffective remedy for over-population in many areas; and that pleas for birth control made by the representatives of industrialized countries were met with suspicion in many developing countries. But the President of IBRD had called population growth the greatest obstacle to the economic and social progress of the vast majority of under-developed peoples, and the International Conference on Human Rights, 1968, had acknowledged family planning as a necessity for human dignity.

64. During the Council's discussion of the problem, WHO had reiterated that it was not responsible for promoting any particular demographic policy and was not bound by any system of family planning or fertility control. Those were matters for Governments and families to decide, and the function of WHO was to give technical advice to countries requesting it. The Council had learned that the United Nations had established a United Nations Fund for Popu-

lation Activities to assist Member States in drawing up and executing programmes, and that voluntary contributions of \$3.5 million had already been made to the Fund. The Committee for Development Planning had called upon the world community to formulate its position with regard to population growth and to implement a population policy conceived to influence the main determinants of demographic growth. For that purpose, the Committee maintained, knowledge concerning the problem and possible remedies should be widely disseminated, and the appropriate facilities assured. But the Council had made no attempt to define such a policy, to show how those determinants could be influenced, or to identify those facilities. The Council should not be content to watch an already critical situation deteriorating every day and to evade its responsibilities out of a misdirected "respect for the human personality" that would allow the population explosion to cancel out all the progress which could be expected in human welfare. He deplored the fact that the Council had nothing to show for its session on a matter of paramount importance for the future of mankind.

65. With regard to the preparations for the Second United Nations Development Decade, he was deeply concerned at the atmosphere of weariness and disillusion which was now apparent on both sides. Despite the growing needs of the developing countries, despite the population explosion, the net flow of financial resources from the developed market-economy countries had fallen from 0.79 to 0.68 per cent of their gross national product in 1967, and it was to be feared that the reduction in commitments for the last years of the present decade would cause a further drop. Taken as a whole, the rich countries, far from drawing closer to the common target of 1 per cent set by the second session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, were lagging even further behind it. The majority of aid-giving countries seemed to recognize that, at the present rate, assistance efforts were insufficient to provide the stimulus required in the developing countries, but they seemed reluctant to increase their contributions on the grounds that the existing institutional framework was inadequate.

66. If the first Development Decade had not been a success, the reason was that neither side had been willing to make commitments. An international strategy for development should aim to harmonize the policies of Member States and gradually adapt them to converge on a single objective: the establishment of a better-organized world economy. The very notion of strategy implied commitments from the participants. Far too often, in their policy in relation to the developing countries, the industrialized countries thought in nineteenth-century terms and resorted to charity, which could relieve hardship but which had never generated development. The degree of development reached in the developed countries was the result of commitments made by Governments, political parties, employers and trade unions—in short, by all the vital forces of the nation. Responsible men had understood that development required structural reforms which had to be accepted by everybody; that economic problems had to be

tackled through a policy of industrial conversion; that social problems could be solved only through the application of a social policy directed towards the redistribution of income; and that structural policies needed the support of definite commitments and an assurance of continuity. But in their relations with the Third World, the developed countries did not seem to have grasped that the laws which governed the development of national economies also governed that of the world economy. When it came to building an integrated world economy, the developed countries became afraid of planning, although it had become an essential instrument of their growth; they feared to commit themselves.

67. The argument that annual budgeting prevented the industrialized countries from entering into medium-term or long-term commitments towards the developing countries was invalidated by modern budgetary techniques and international agreements. In the United States of America, the Planning, Programming, Budgeting System had revolutionized methods in both the private and public sector; major undertakings and government departments which applied that technique were well satisfied with it and were extending its applications. The System extended the budgeting period to five, ten or even twenty years, divided into annual instalments, and provided a means of linking medium-term or long-term programming with the preparation of the annual budget.

68. Moreover, many cases could be quoted in which international agreements and commitments had paved the way for achievements that would otherwise have been impossible. That applied, in particular, to the Marshall Plan, the establishment of the European Coal and Steel Community, and the establishment of the European Economic Community. In each case the original idea had been revolutionary; it had implied profound changes in outlook, in habits, and even in institutions and economic structures; but, where their own interests were plain, the industrialized countries had not shrunk from innovation.

69. It would also be in their interest, economically and politically, to make commitments to the developing countries, quite apart from the moral imperative which was the most important consideration. It might be difficult for some donor countries to make political commitments, but several industrialized countries had done so. Canada, Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, the Netherlands and Norway had all set themselves to improve their aid to developing countries and to ensure its continuity.

70. However, the establishment of a truly international economy entailed more than fixing the volume of aid and

meeting the due dates. For the developed countries it entailed, *inter alia*, the removal of trade barriers, the diversification of production, and industrial reorganizations calculated to improve the world-wide division of labour. For the developing countries it entailed opening their markets to the products of other developing countries and, more particularly, creating the conditions for development, without which any aid would largely be wasted. The developing countries should draw up national development plans, commit themselves to structural reforms in the social and fiscal sphere, improve agricultural and land tenure, and accept family planning. They should strive to expand their markets and their scope for organized action by bringing their plans into harmony with those of their neighbours, by seeking to make regional agreements, and by lending their aid to countries less advanced than themselves.

71. It had often been said that it was impracticable to set specific development targets for a period as long as a decade. That made it vital to institute procedures of consultation, and to set up machinery to adjust the strategy from time to time and to keep the flow of aid moving satisfactorily. The strategy must on no account be limited to mere declarations of intent at the beginning of the Second Development Decade, which would thereafter remain a dead letter. There must be formal commitments to which every country would subscribe and which would possess all the validity of a treaty.

72. Young people today were questioning the existing world order, in which over 130 sovereign countries claimed the right to run their own affairs with minimum regard for the interests of others; in which States armed against one another; and in which one-third of the people were far richer than the rest. Young people loved danger and rejected the consumer society. They should be offered the opportunity to serve the cause of the developing two-thirds of the world. In nineteenth-century Belgium, poverty, inequality and injustice had given rise to political and ideological movements and to the formation of trade unions and youth groups; young and old had worked together for the fulfilment of their ideals. Statesmen must listen to young people and enlist their support in solving the world's problems. Young people had much to contribute because, although they lacked knowledge and experience, they had a sense of the world as it was. They must be trained to become aware of their potentialities and equipped to work as brothers on a united Earth.

73. After the customary exchange of courtesies, the PRESIDENT declared the forty-seventh session of the Economic and Social Council adjourned.

The meeting rose at 6.40 p.m.