

waited too long for the major contributors to agree to participate, the time has come to go ahead without them”.

What are the causes of this situation? In the first place, the Economic and Social Council, with its wide responsibilities for promoting advancement in Economic, Social and Human Rights conditions among the member states of the United Nations, is naturally productive of more dreams and hopes than can ever be realized. Secondly, member governments of more favoured nations have not been willing or able to make sufficient financial resources available for programmes which otherwise appeared practicable.

Perhaps another explanation for the difficulties at the 24th Session lies in the fact that many of the less developed countries know what they want and need more clearly than they did earlier in the history of the UN. In addition many references are being made to the differences in the rates of growth between the developed and less developed countries which, it is claimed, constitute a widening gap between the two groups.

This growing disappointment with ECOSOC on the part of under-developed members has no doubt been aggravated by the negative attitude on the part of the major western powers towards any expansion of ECOSOC activities. We have pointed to this attitude in reports on previous sessions. It was no less obvious at the 24th Session. Such an attitude inevitably tends to promote a sense of frustration, and perhaps financial irresponsibility, on the part of under-developed countries.

It seems possible that unless the Economic and Social Council recovers to some extent the confidence of the under-developed countries in it as a constructive and useful part of the UN machinery, it will decline in prestige and possible usefulness. Confidence in ECOSOC will in large measure depend on the leadership of the more favoured western nations, or at least on their readiness to cooperate in worthwhile programmes. Failing the strengthening of confidence, ECOSOC may easily become a major forum for the USSR to exploit the discontent of the economically under-developed countries.

#### *Position of the Canadian Delegation*

The Canadian Delegation did not have any major specific initiatives to propose at the 24th Session. In the circumstances the Delegation maintained its traditional role of improving, diverting or opposing resolutions submitted by others. In general, the Delegation's attitude to these issues was pragmatic. Its decisions were based on a judgment whether any important question of principle was involved and whether the resolutions in question were likely in practice to yield useful results. Unless some major question of principle was involved, the Delegation was unwilling to take an isolated stand in opposition.

During the Session the Canadian Delegation strongly opposed resolutions which it considered wasteful or unprofitable. Among such resolutions were one on the convening of a conference on new sources of energy suggested by the French Delegation, others by the USSR Delegation on the Common Market, on the convening of a meeting of international economists, and on nuclear tests. The Delegation also pressed for elimination of objectionable features in a resolution on inflation proposed by the US Delegation, in a five-year forward planning of specialized agency programmes suggested by the UK, and in a Polish-Yugoslav resolution calling for a panel of expert economists to advise the Secretary-General on methods for improving international consultation.

In cases where it seemed impossible to defeat a resolution to which the Canadian Delegation had serious objections the Delegation joined with other like-minded delegations in the preparation of amendments designed to make these resolutions generally acceptable or at least innocuous. The texts which finally emerged did not always conform to Canadian preferences but they were at least of a character which permitted Canadian acquiescence.