



ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Forty-eighth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Tuesday, 13 January 1970,
at 11.10 a.m.

NEW YORK

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

AGENDA ITEM 10

Reconstitution of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (General Assembly resolution 2579 (XXIV); E/4748/Rev.1, chapter III, section A; E/L.1295)

1. Mr. GUPTA (India), introducing draft resolution E/L.1295, recalled that in its resolution 1467 (XLVII) the Council had noted in particular the recommendations of the Enlarged Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (ECPC) set forth in chapter III, section A, of the latter's report (E/4748/Rev.1) and had agreed to revert to the question after that report had been examined by the General Assembly. The Assembly's resolution 2579 (XXIV) had, *inter alia*, requested the Council to reconstitute the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (CPC) at its organizational meetings, in accordance with the recommendations of ECPC. As the text was self-explanatory, he wished only to point out that the geographical distribution specified in paragraph 2 followed the standard pattern and that the decision in paragraph 6 to keep the machinery under review was in conformity with the views expressed by a number of delegations both in the Council and in the General Assembly.

2. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that in the reconstituted CPC certain weaknesses which had in the past affected the work of both CPC and ECPC would be eliminated. Noteworthy features of the activities of both earlier committees had been the extremely close co-operation between developed and developing countries and the outstanding and imaginative contributions made by the latter; he trusted that those same features would characterize the work of the reconstituted CPC. His delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution.

3. During the discussions in the General Assembly, the question had arisen whether CPC merited reconstitution. In his Government's view, the Committee was most useful to the Council in the discharge of the latter's co-ordinating functions, in that it performed the laborious but essential task of studying copious documentation on the work programme of the United Nations and an equal volume of material originating from the specialized agencies. Without such a Committee to perform that function, the Council would be unable to operate effectively.

4. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) said that, according to his recollection, the decision of the Council in resolution 1171 (XLI) had been to begin rather than to continue the practice of having joint meetings of CPC and the Adminis-

trative Committee on Co-ordination (ACC); he therefore hoped that the sponsors of the draft now before the Council would agree to the replacement of the word "continue" in operative paragraph 5 by the word "follow".

5. Mr. GUPTA (India) said that the sponsors would have no objection to that amendment.

6. Mr. TARASOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had always attached great importance to the work of CPC, in which it had actively participated. It therefore welcomed the decision to reconstitute the Committee and would support the draft resolution before the Council. However, in connexion with the reference in operative paragraph 1 to recommendation III A contained in the final report of ECPC (*ibid.*) he wished to draw attention to the statement made by his delegation during the discussions in ECPC to the effect that the specific recommendations in paragraphs 23 and 24 of that report, referring to the selection of special rapporteurs who might be required to travel to various offices of the United Nations and to the engagement of outside consultants, should not involve any marked increase in financial expenditure. He again wished to request the Secretariat to take into account that view of his delegation.

7. Mr. BRADLEY (Argentina) said that the discussions in the Second Committee had made clear the importance of CPC's future functions in connexion with co-ordination, especially in the context of the Second United Nations Development Decade. His delegation had supported General Assembly resolution 2579 (XXIV) and would also support the draft resolution before the Council. The decision to reconstitute CPC was an extremely important and far-reaching one, and he hoped that the reconstituted Committee would be in a better position than its predecessors to take effective action.

8. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that the statement in paragraph 5 that, at the joint meetings of CPC and ACC, Committee members might be represented by the heads of their delegations could in his view be somewhat more strongly worded in order to make its point more effectively. He therefore proposed the replacement of the word "might" by the words "should if possible".

9. His delegation had supported General Assembly resolution 2579 (XXIV) and would vote for the draft before the Council.

10. Mr. GUPTA (India) said that the sponsors would have no objection to the amendment proposed by the representative of Greece.

The draft resolution, as orally amended, was adopted unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 11

**Co-ordination of marine activities
(General Assembly resolution 2580 (XXIV))**

11. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the request to the Council in operative paragraph 1 of General Assembly resolution 2580 (XXIV) to consider instructing CPC, after reconstitution, to examine the need for a comprehensive review of existing activities of the United Nations system relating to the seas and oceans.

12. Mr. CHRISTIANSEN (Norway) said his delegation would be in favour of giving CPC such an instruction, on the express understanding that CPC would take fully into account the activities of the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) of UNESCO.

13. Mr. TARASOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that at a time when the reconstituted CPC had not yet commenced its activities it seemed somewhat premature to refer, as did operative paragraph 1 of General Assembly resolution 2580 (XXIV), to the submission of its recommendations to the Council at its forty-ninth session. The problems involved would require the most careful study, in which the activities of IOC should be taken into account. It might therefore be best for the Council's decision not to reproduce the wording of the General Assembly resolution, but to replace the words "making the Committee's recommendations available to the Council at its forty-ninth session" by the words "the Committee submitting its recommendations to the Economic and Social Council as soon as possible".

14. Mr. MAURTUA (Peru) endorsed the observations of the representative of the Soviet Union. In view of the complexity of the subject, which was recognized in the third and fourth preambular paragraphs of the Assembly's resolution, it would be unwise to insist on an early date for the submission of the Committee's recommendations to the Council.

15. Mr. BRADLEY (Argentina) said that he too supported that view.

16. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) pointed out that General Assembly resolution 2580 (XXIV) simply called upon CPC, after reconstitution, to examine the need for a comprehensive review of existing activities of the United Nations system relating to the seas and oceans. The Committee was not being asked to formulate substantive recommendations in time for the Council's forty-ninth session. The Council might wish to transmit the resolution to CPC on the understanding that the latter would formulate substantive recommendations on the subject for early submission to the Council. The Council could not amend a resolution adopted by the General Assembly.

17. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) said that he thought the suggestions for both the United States and the Soviet representatives were acceptable. It was for CPC itself to

determine its own priorities. The Council should not prejudge the issue by selecting one activity which, if it was to be examined by the Council's forty-ninth session, would have to be given priority.

18. Mr. PRAGUE (France) agreed that it would be wrong at the present stage to require CPC to attach priority to the item under discussion. His delegation favoured the proposal of the Soviet representative, which might be supplemented by a phrase along the following lines: "and having regard to the other tasks before it".

19. After a brief discussion, in which Mr. CARANICAS (Greece), Mr. ARAUJO CASTRO (Brazil), Mr. BRADLEY (Argentina), Mr. TARASOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) and Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) took part, the PRESIDENT read out the following text, which reflected the proposals made during the meeting: "The Council decides to transmit to the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination General Assembly resolution 2580 (XXIV) of 15 December 1969, and invites the Committee, after taking into account its own priorities, to submit its recommendations to the Council as soon as possible".

The text read out by the President was adopted unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 5

**Procedure for the election of members of the International
Narcotics Control Board (continued) (E/4761)**

20. The PRESIDENT informed the Council that the recommendation in paragraph 3 of the Secretary-General's note (E/4761) would not entail any financial implications and that the proposed Committee could meet at Geneva on 9 and 10 March 1970.

21. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council agreed to establish a Committee on Candidatures to review candidates for election to the International Narcotics Control Board.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 7

**Confirmation of members of functional commissions
of the Council (E/4753 and Add.1-3)**

22. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council agreed to confirm the nominations of the members of functional commissions of the Council whose names appeared in the Secretary-General's notes (E/4753 and Add.1-3).

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 12.10 p.m.