



ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Wednesday, 16 November 1966,
at 11.30 a.m.

Resumed Forty-first Session
OFFICIAL RECORDS

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Message of sympathy to the International Labour Organisation</i>	7
<i>Agenda item 5:</i> <i>International Symposium on Industrial Development (continued)</i>	7
<i>Agenda item 10:</i> <i>Composition of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination</i>	8

President: Mr. Tewfik BOUATTOURA (Algeria).

Present:

Representatives of the following States members of the Council: Algeria, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ecuador, France, Gabon, Greece, India, Iran, Iraq, Luxembourg, Morocco, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Sierra Leone, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela.

Observers for the following Member States: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chad, China, Cuba, Cyprus, Guatemala, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Liberia, Libya, Malaysia, Malta, Mexico, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Yugoslavia.

The observer for the following non-member State: Federal Republic of Germany.

Representatives of the following specialized agencies: International Labour Organisation, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, World Health Organization, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

The representative of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

In the absence of the President, Mr. G. Murgescu (Romania), First Vice-President, took the Chair.

Message of sympathy to the International Labour Organisation

1. The PRESIDENT announced that one of the buildings of the International Labour Office at Geneva had been destroyed by fire the previous night. He wished to convey the Council's sympathy to the International Labour Organisation (ILO) and to its Director-General.

2. Mr. Feisal ABDEL-RAHMAN (International Labour Organisation) thanked the President and the Council for their expression of sympathy. He read out a statement from the Director-General of the ILO, in which Mr. Morse said that the fire which had destroyed the building housing two important departments of the International Labour Office was particularly distressing because the units affected were those dealing with the industrialization of the developing countries. Arrangements were being made to resume work in new premises without interrupting technical co-operation activities any more than necessary. Those activities were no longer centralized at Geneva. The replacement of the records and documents destroyed would be a difficult task, but it was not the ILO's first crisis and it would overcome it with the help of its devoted and experienced staff, who fortunately had escaped injury.

AGENDA ITEM 5

International Symposium on Industrial Development (continued) (E/4277)

3. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to continue the discussion it had begun at the previous meeting of the question of providing summary records of sessions of the International Symposium on Industrial Development.

4. Mr. KITTANI (Secretary of the Council) read out the following text, which had been prepared at the Council's request and might constitute a draft resolution on the question:

"The Economic and Social Council,

"Having re-examined the question of summary records of meetings of the International Symposium on Industrial Development,

"Decides to amend rule 16 of the draft rules of procedure for the Symposium as follows:

"Summary records of plenary sessions shall be provided."

If a draft resolution along those lines were to be adopted, the costs of providing summary records of sessions would be reduced by about half, from \$115,000 to \$57,000, without prejudice to the reporting of basic decisions.

5. Mr. LOPEZ (Philippines) formally introduced the text read out by the Secretary of the Council as a draft resolution and withdrew the proposal he had made at the previous meeting that rule 16 of the draft rules of procedure for the Symposium should be deleted.

The draft resolution was adopted without objection.

AGENDA ITEM 10

Composition of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (E/4280, E/L.1145)

6. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the draft resolution submitted by Canada, Pakistan, Philippines, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America and Venezuela (E/L.1146) concerning the composition of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination.

7. Mr. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) introduced draft resolution E/L.1146 on behalf of the sponsors. The operative part was based on the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts to Examine the Finances of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies and of the Special Committee on Co-ordination.^{1/} Although the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination was to be composed of experts, countries would be elected to it and the principle of equitable geographical distribution should therefore be observed. In the opinion of the sponsors, twelve members would be insufficient for that purpose, and they therefore proposed a membership of sixteen. They also considered it important for the Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions to participate in meetings and for the reconstituted Committee to hold joint meetings with the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (ACC). He hoped that the new Committee for Programme and Co-ordination would be able to do useful work in an atmosphere of goodwill and mutual respect.

8. Mr. Donald MACDONALD (Canada) said that the new Committee should be a small body consisting of a limited number of experts who should focus their attention on data so as to enable the Council to do the same. It would draw the Council's attention to situations in which it should act as co-ordinator. However, a Committee of twelve members was too small to meet the criterion of equitable geographical distribution; he would have preferred increasing the number to fifteen, but on mathematical grounds he would accept a Committee of sixteen members as proposed in the draft resolution. That should be the maximum number in the interests of efficiency.

9. Mr. VARELA (Panama) agreed that the draft resolution was in harmony with the decision taken by the Council in resolution 1171 (XLI), to improve its Special Committee on Co-ordination and also, to a certain extent, with the recommendations made by the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts and transmitted to the Council by a note of the Secretary-General (E/4280). However, he was not entirely convinced by the quantitative rather than qualitative considerations adduced in favour of a Committee of sixteen members rather than twelve. Of course, it was easier to ensure equitable geographical distribution among sixteen seats than among twelve but, on the other hand, it was more difficult to find sixteen experts in the different areas of the world with the qualifications called for by the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts. It would be equally difficult for some countries to do without the services of their experts.

10. Moreover, he feared that the date of 15 December 1966 proposed in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution would not leave the Member States concerned sufficient time to decide on their candidature and to appoint the experts.

11. Mr. AHMED (Pakistan) said that he was pleased that the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts had accepted the suggestion made by his delegation to the Special Committee on Co-ordination with a view to ensuring a measure of continuity in the membership of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination. That Committee's task had been clearly defined in operative paragraph 3 of Council resolution 1171 (XLI), in pursuance of which the Secretary-General had included two meetings of the new Committee in the programme of conferences for 1967—one before the Council's forty-second session and the other before its forty-third session. His delegation had agreed that the Committee should have twelve members, but it would not object to increasing the number for purposes of equitable geographical distribution. While it was true, as the Panamanian representative had said, that the developing countries did not have many experts with the necessary qualifications and that they would find it even more difficult to recruit a larger number, it should be borne in mind that the new Committee was open to all States Members of the United Nations and not only to States members of the Economic and Social Council. It would therefore be easier to find the necessary experts and still observe the principle of equitable geographical distribution. The sponsors had also been careful to mention, in operative paragraph 3, that they had taken account of the recommendation of the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts.

12. The date of 15 December 1966, the deadline by which Member States were to indicate whether they wished to take part in the Committee's work, might be reconsidered if there were not enough candidates by that time, but he hoped arrangements could be made to avoid holding a meeting in January solely for the purpose of electing the members of the Committee.

13. Mr. RAHNEMA (Iran) said that, in proposing a membership of sixteen, the sponsors of the draft had rightly recognized the need to ensure equitable geographical distribution without unduly increasing the membership.

14. The representative of Pakistan had dealt with the Panamanian representative's objections concerning the deadline for presenting candidatures. The Governments concerned would have enough time to designate experts and if some did not, he saw no reason why the Committee should not proceed with its work with a smaller membership, which could later be brought up to strength.

15. He therefore fully supported the draft resolution and particularly endorsed the provisions of operative paragraph 3, which would encourage Governments to appoint experts capable of discharging the very important functions entrusted to the Committee.

3. Mr. KADLEC (Czechoslovakia) said that the delegations of the socialist countries, after carefully studying the draft resolution, were prepared to support it, but had a few comments to make on it.

^{1/} In its resolution 1171 (XLI) of 5 August 1966, the Council decided to change the name of the Special Committee on Co-ordination to "Committee for Programme and Co-ordination".

17. First, operative paragraph 4 gave the impression that only the elections to be held in December 1966 would take account of the principle of equitable geographical distribution, whereas that principle should of course apply as long as the Committee was in existence. He therefore proposed that paragraph 4 should end with the words "on a rotational basis" and that the distribution of the membership should be indicated at the end of paragraph 1 with the words "on the basis of equitable geographical distribution as follows."

18. Secondly, the delegations of the socialist countries recognized the need for the exchange of views referred to in operative paragraph 7 and wanted that paragraph strengthened along the lines of paragraph 7 of the draft resolution before the Second Committee,^{2/} in which the General Assembly invited the Governments of Member States, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, the executive heads of the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency and of autonomous organizations and research institutions within the United Nations family to extend to the Ad Hoc Committee contemplated in the draft their full co-operation and assistance.

19. Thirdly, the delegations of the socialist countries would like to see that group of countries designated in the draft resolution, as it was in Council resolution 1147 (XLI) of 4 August 1966, by the phrase "socialist States of eastern Europe".

20. Lastly, as those delegations did not regard a membership of sixteen as an absolute maximum and were keenly interested in the Committee's work, they would like the sponsors of the draft to consider increasing the number of members to eighteen, so that three seats could be allocated to the socialist States of eastern Europe.

21. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that he had very serious reservations on the draft resolution. His country felt that the adoption of the draft resolution was a departure from a recommendation of the General Assembly, the highest organ of the United Nations, which all its Members had unanimously endorsed a few days earlier. The arguments put forward to justify the change in the membership of twelve recommended by the Assembly had not been convincing; indeed he wondered why the authors of the draft had limited themselves to sixteen.

22. Furthermore, the General Assembly had recommended the establishment of a committee of twelve experts with a high degree of experience and competence in the United Nations and the specialized agencies, in the economic, social and financial areas. Not only would sixteen experts of that kind be more difficult to find than twelve, as the representative of Panama³ had pointed out, but a body composed of sixteen members took on a different character. Its procedures were necessarily more complex, and the draft resolution failed to state, for example, whether the experts could be represented by alternates.

23. He had found the reference in operative paragraph 4 to representatives "for Western European

and other countries" surprising; the groups of countries represented here were surely not the same as those defined by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. He wondered whether the draft resolution referred to the definition in General Assembly resolution 1991 (XVIII) of 17 December 1963.

24. Quite apart from all those considerations, his delegation wished to warn States members of the Council of the danger involved in reversing their decision only a few days after adopting the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts in the General Assembly.^{3/} He regretted that two delegations which had actively participated in the work of the Ad Hoc Committee had co-sponsored the draft resolution, and he thought he had detected a certain reluctance on the part of the Canadian representative. He shared that reluctance since, in any event his Government's instructions did not permit him to agree to a membership of sixteen, as proposed in the draft. Furthermore, France would have preferred to have the Ad Hoc Committee recommend a greater number of experts, and it was only in reference to many delegations, including those of Brazil, India and the United Arab Republic, that it had agreed to a membership of twelve; accordingly, it could not now go back on its vote in the Ad Hoc Committee and the General Assembly.

25. Mr. DJOUDI (Algeria) said that, on the whole, he supported the draft resolution, which was a good example of synchronization of the work of the General Assembly and the Council. He would merely like the sponsors of the draft to clarify certain points with regard to operative paragraph 8. He did not see how the officers of the Council could properly participate in the meetings of a committee which was henceforth to be a committee of experts; also, it would appear from the last part of paragraph 8 that the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination was to undergo a process of legal mutation, as it were, and cease to be a committee of experts when it held joint meetings with ACC.

26. As far as geographical distribution was concerned, his delegation had not taken part in the preparation of the draft resolution and would determine its position in the light of the discussion.

27. Mr. FERNANDINI (Peru) said that his delegation supported the draft resolution, which met a long-felt need. His delegation had no definite opinion concerning the number of members the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination was to have. Although it would have found a membership of twelve satisfactory and had not been convinced by the arguments in favour of increasing the number to sixteen, it had no objection in principle to the latter suggestion. However, the draft would have the effect of altering the decision taken in Council resolution 1090 G (XXXIX) of 31 July 1965, that the Special Committee on Co-ordination, beginning with 1966, should be composed of the officers of the Council and the Chairman of the Council's Co-ordination Committee, and ten members of the Council elected annually by the Council on the basis of equitable geographical representation. The

^{2/} See Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-first Session, Annexes, agenda item 52, document A/6544, para. 4.

^{3/} Ibid., Plenary Meetings, 1458th meeting.

text of the draft would be improved if it was amended to indicate more clearly that the Council was thus reversing an earlier decision. In conclusion, he pointed out that in the Spanish text of operative paragraph 8 the word "Vicepresidente" had erroneously been given in the singular.

28. Mr. PEREZ GUERRERO (Venezuela) said that all members of the Council recognized the importance of the functions to be exercised by the reorganized Committee. His delegation supported the draft resolution and thought that the size of the Committee's membership should be determined by the functions which it was to perform. It was tempting to consider establishing a small committee which would have greater flexibility; however, it would then be difficult to apply adequately the principle of equitable geographical distribution, and that would impair the Committee's effectiveness. On the other hand, a committee of more than sixteen members would be cumbersome and of doubtful utility. The proposed number also took account of the fact that the experts would not be of equal competence or experience. It was important in that connexion to ensure sufficient continuity in the work of the Committee and, accordingly, to make it possible for its members to be re-elected.

29. Noting that the distribution among regional groups in operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution was based on Economic and Social Council resolution 1147 (XLI), he expressed the view that the amendments to operative paragraphs 1 and 4 proposed by the representative of Czechoslovakia could be given consideration. Similarly, operative paragraph 2 could be amended to stress, as had been proposed, the need to associate the secretariats of the specialized agencies with the Committee's work.

30. Mr. VARELA (Panama) said he thought that the members of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination should be experts rather than diplomats dealing with economic questions, whose activity would not be very fruitful. In-service training in that field should be ruled out.

31. The Ad Hoc Committee of Experts had recommended the establishment of a twelve-member committee of experts. In its resolution 2150 (XXI) of 4 November 1966, the General Assembly had not only approved the report of the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts but also urged that the recommendations and comments contained in that report should be given the most attentive consideration by United Nations organs and that appropriate measures should be taken with a view to the earliest possible implementation of those recommendations. The General Assembly reso-

lution posed a delicate problem from both the procedural and the moral standpoint, for it would be illogical for the Council to take decisions contrary to express recommendations of the General Assembly and the Secretary-General.

32. Mr. FORSHELL (Sweden) said that his delegation supported the draft resolution and endorsed his Czechoslovak representative's proposal concerning operative paragraphs 1 and 4 of the draft resolution. It had been his understanding that the seats in the future Committee for Programme and Co-ordination would be distributed on the basis of the present composition of the Council. It would, of course, be possible to select twelve members on that basis, but that would make it necessary to assign fractions of seats to the various regional groups. It would be better to ask the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts to clarify both the reasons why it had proposed a membership of twelve and the geographical distribution which it had had in mind at that time.

33. Mr. VIAUD (France) recalled that a membership of twelve had been formally accepted by both the French and the Swedish Governments. The Council could ask the General Assembly to reverse its decision, but the Council itself did not have the right to change it.

34. Mr. LOPEZ (Philippines) said that the General Assembly's approval of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts did not obligate the Council to accept all its recommendations. The Assembly had actually confined itself to urging the Council, without prejudging its decision, to give the most attentive consideration to the recommendations set forth in the report. The Council would cease to be a deliberative body if it passively approved all the recommendations and comments of the Ad Hoc Committee. He noted, in that connexion, that the geographical distribution provided for in the draft resolution was exactly the same, reduced by half, as that envisaged in operative paragraph 1 of Economic and Social Council resolution 1147 (XLI). He hoped that the representatives of France and Czechoslovakia would do nothing that might jeopardize the compromise represented by the draft resolution.

35. Mr. FORSHELL (Sweden) said that in his view the report of the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts contained recommendations and not instructions. His delegation would have supported the idea of a twelve-member committee if that figure had been compatible with the principle of equitable geographical distribution.

The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.