

30. Since there was the requisite number of candidates within each group, he would assume, if he heard no objection, that the Council wished to elect those candidates without recourse to a secret ballot.

*It was so decided.*

(b) EXECUTIVE BOARD OF THE UNITED NATIONS  
CHILDREN'S FUND

31. Mr. VAN GORKOM (Netherlands) announced that his country was withdrawing its candidature for the current election. It did so in order to facilitate the elections, and in the firm hope that it would be elected in 1975, when his Government would again put forward its candidature.

32. Mr. AKSOY (Turkey), speaking on behalf of the group of Western European and other States, announced that that group was submitting the candidatures of the following States: Canada, Finland, Federal Republic of Germany and New Zealand.

33. The PRESIDENT suggested, at the request of the representative of Brazil, that the election should be deferred until the following meeting to allow time for further consultations.

*It was so agreed.*

(c) ELECTIONS POSTPONED FROM PREVIOUS SESSIONS

*Committee on Review and Appraisal*

34. The PRESIDENT said that there were vacancies for two members from African States and four members from Asian States for a term of office of four years expiring on 31 December 1977.

35. The Ivory Coast was a candidate for one of the seats for African States, and Iran and Jordan were candidates for two of the seats for Asian States. If he heard no objection, he would assume that the Council wished to elect those candidates by acclamation.

*It was so decided.*

36. The PRESIDENT suggested that, since there were no candidates for the remaining vacancies, the

Council should postpone until the fifty-sixth session the elections to fill those vacancies.

*It was so decided.*

*Committee on Science and Technology  
for Development*

37. The PRESIDENT said that there were vacancies for two members from African States and one member from Western European and other States for a term of office of three years expiring on 31 December 1976, and for five members from African States and one member from Western European and other States for a term of office expiring on 31 December 1975.

38. Mr. AKSOY (Turkey), speaking on behalf of the group of Western European and other States, announced that Australia was a candidate for the seat allotted to that group for the period ending on 31 December 1976.

39. Mr. FASLA (Algeria) announced that his country was a candidate for one of the seats allotted to the group of African States for the period ending on 31 December 1976.

40. The PRESIDENT said that since there were no other candidates for the seats in question, he would take it that the Council wished to elect Algeria and Australia by acclamation.

*It was so decided.*

41. The PRESIDENT suggested that, since there were no candidates for the other vacancies, the Council should postpone until its fifty-sixth session the election to fill those vacancies.

*It was so decided.*

*Committee for Programme and Co-ordination*

42. The PRESIDENT suggested that since there was as yet no candidate for the one vacant seat to be filled by a member of the group of African States for a term of office of three years expiring on 31 December 1976, the Council should postpone until its fifty-sixth session the election to fill that vacancy.

*It was so decided.*

*The meeting rose at 12.25 p.m.*

## 1891st meeting

Thursday, 10 January 1974, at 3.30 p.m.

*President:* Mr. KARHILO (Finland).

E/SR.1891

*Organization of work*

1. The PRESIDENT said that he had held the necessary consultations with the other officers on the responsibilities to be assigned to the Vice-Presidents. He was now therefore in a position to recommend that the Council should appoint Mr. Akhund (Pakistan) Chairman of the Economic Committee, Mr. Šmíd (Czechoslovakia) Chairman of the Social Committee and Mr. Gabre-Sellassie (Ethiopia) Chairman of the Co-ordination Committee. Mr. Barceló Rodríguez

(Mexico) would be entrusted with the Chairmanship of any other sessional body that the Council might decide to establish. At its fifty-sixth session, the Council might consider it advisable to set up a committee to deal with the question of the rules of procedure, as prescribed in rule 88 of those rules. In order to promote informal negotiations, the Council might also wish to assign to Mr. Barceló Rodríguez the task of undertaking informal consultations on specific issues before the Council.



2. If he heard no objections, he would take it that the Council accepted those proposals.

*It was so decided.*

### AGENDA ITEM 6

#### Calendar of meetings (*concluded*) (E/L.1578)

3. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) said that he did not have complete information concerning the Preparatory Committee for the World Food Conference, since the United Nations Office at Geneva had not yet replied regarding the possibility of recruiting the necessary interpreters. Eleven interpreters were required and the cost would be \$105 per day for each interpreter. The meeting could be held in New York at no extra cost. The session could also be held at Rome since the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations had offered to provide the conference services required for the date scheduled; the only additional expenses would be for the travel of staff from New York to Rome.

4. Mr. HOSNY (Egypt) proposed that the first session be held at Rome and the second at Geneva.

5. Mr. CAVAGLIERI (Italy) said that his delegation would prefer the session to be held at Rome or, failing that, in New York.

6. Mr. ROUGE (France) said that in addition to the advantages, in particular the financial advantages, of that solution it would be preferable to choose New York as the site of the meeting since the preparatory work had been started at Headquarters. It would be more convenient for delegations to continue the work in which they had participated from the beginning rather than to bring their colleagues at Geneva up to date on events which they had not followed.

7. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested precise information on the total travel cost, subsistence allowances included, from New York to Rome for the staff needed. Before stating its position, his delegation wished to know the reply of the Secretariat concerning the small Conference secretariat referred to in General Assembly resolution 3180 (XXVIII) and the premises and equipment for the World Food Conference.

8. Mr. OLIVERI LOPEZ (Argentina) said that it should be determined whether the additional cost which the meeting of the Preparatory Committee at Geneva would entail depended on the cost of interpretation, amounting to about \$5,000, a figure which did not appear to be very high. He pointed out that the persons who were directly concerned with that question were at either Geneva or Rome.

9. Mr. HOSNY (Egypt) said that his delegation had been informed only two days before of the proposal to hold the session in New York and it had not yet been able to adopt its position on the matter.

10. Mr. SANDERS (United States of America) said that the Preparatory Committee had to meet within one month and it would therefore be preferable, for the efficiency of its work, for it to meet in New York.

11. His delegation would prefer the first meeting to be held at Rome for the reasons it had already stated at the preceding meeting, but it would accept a compromise solution. The proposal to hold the first session in New York would also appear to be acceptable. He made it clear, however, that no decision should be taken

on the second session since that question was within the competence of the Committee, which would consider it at its first session.

12. Apart from the financial implications, the choice of New York for the first session offered advantages which had been mentioned by the representative of France. Perhaps consultations should therefore be held in order to arrive at a consensus.

13. Mr. BERLIS (Canada) noted that the details concerning the venue and dates of the session had been published only recently. His delegation felt that, owing to its imminence, the session should be held in New York. Any other arrangement would prove less effective and more costly.

14. Mr. FASLA (Algeria) suggested that the Council should immediately hold consultations in order to arrive at a satisfactory solution.

15. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) confirmed that the figure quoted by the Argentine delegation concerning the cost of interpretation was correct. \$5,500 should be added to it for the travel expenses of staff to be sent to Rome.

16. Replying to the first question of the representative of the Soviet Union, he said that the cost would amount to \$7,100.

17. Mr. CURTIN (Australia) expressed his delegation's preference for New York as the site of the meeting, but supported the proposal by the representative of Algeria. On the other hand, he felt that no decision should be taken on the place of the second session.

18. Mr. HOSNY (Egypt) supported the Algerian proposal: a consensus on the matter had to be reached.

19. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) again stated that his delegation would prefer the session to be held at United Nations Headquarters.

20. Mr. BARCELO RODRIGUEZ (Mexico) and Mr. OLIVERI LOPEZ (Argentina) supported the Algerian proposal.

21. The PRESIDENT suggested that the meeting be suspended in order to enable delegations to hold consultations.

*The meeting was suspended at 4 p.m. and resumed at 4.35 p.m.*

22. Mr. BARCELO RODRIGUEZ (Mexico) announced the results of the consultations: the first session of the Preparatory Committee would be held in New York; the second at Geneva. The World Food Conference would be held in Rome.

23. Mr. JAIN (India) felt that it was for the Committee to recommend where the proposed small secretariat should be established and the dates when it should meet.

24. The PRESIDENT said that paragraph 1 (d) of document E/L.1578 would be amended accordingly. The first session would be held in New York from 11 to 15 February, the second at Geneva and the third at Rome, provided that the necessary services were available. The Preparatory Committee would recommend the dates for the last two sessions.

25. If he heard no objections, he would take it that the Council adopted draft decision E/L.1578, as amended.

*It was so decided.*



26. Mr. BREITENSTEIN (Finland) raised certain points, in connexion with the summer session to be held at Geneva, which he had already mentioned the previous year. His delegation welcomed the possibility of holding meetings in the new conference rooms of the Palais des Nations, but it had the impression that the conference services were not as they should be. The calendar of meetings, and of the working groups in particular, was far from well organized in every case. He therefore hoped that the Secretariat would make the necessary arrangements on the matter with the Geneva Conference Division. On the other hand, while the documentation was quickly and efficiently prepared at Headquarters, the same did not apply at Geneva where the work was delayed because draft resolutions in particular were not distributed on time in all languages. Delegations even had to wait 2½ weeks for the publication of summary records.

27. Mr. LINDENBERG SETTE (Brazil) supported the remarks made by the representative of Finland.

28. Mr. JAIN (India) endorsed the views of the Finnish delegation with regard to documentation. Language problems had arisen during the group contacts and negotiations. He suggested therefore that the Council should be provided with the services of one or two additional interpreters.

29. The PRESIDENT said that the Secretariat would no doubt take note of the comments which had just been made.

#### AGENDA ITEM 4

#### Basic programme of work of the Council for 1974 and consideration of the provisional agenda for the fifty-sixth session (*continued*) (E/5437 and Corr.1)

##### DRAFT DECISION SUBMITTED BY THE BRAZILIAN DELEGATION

30. Mr. BRITO (Brazil) introduced a draft decision consisting of three paragraphs concerning the documentation needed for the comprehensive policy review of operational activities throughout the United Nations system, the subject of item 5 (a) of the list of items to be included in the agenda for the fifty-seventh session of the Council (see E/5437 and Corr.1). A thorough policy review had been necessary for a long time. The draft decision was designed to serve as a basis of discussion for the Council's summer session.

31. In paragraph 1, the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), on the basis of the report by the Administrator, was invited to submit to the Economic and Social Council at its fifty-seventh session a preliminary report on the manner in which the operational activities undertaken by the United Nations system could promote the objectives of the International Development Strategy, including, as appropriate, proposals to improve policies and procedures to that end. The Governing Council might be asked how it planned to further those objectives. The procedure he had described would enable the Council to define a new policy better suited to the needs of the developing countries and could thus enhance the usefulness of those operational activities. The paragraph had been carefully worded in order to avoid prejudging the conclusions of the report. It could, however, be said that the United Nations system should be better prepared to give the necessary assistance in development planning.

32. In paragraph 2, the Council invited the specialized agencies and the United Nations organs concerned to submit to it at its fifty-seventh session, through the UNDP Governing Council, reports on the operational activities which they had undertaken and relevant aspects of co-ordination. The specialized agencies already presented reports of that kind but they should concentrate more on long-term activities and on policy.

33. In paragraph 3, the Council invited the Secretary-General to submit to it at its fifty-seventh session his views on the role of the United Nations system in operational activities for development.

34. His delegation would have preferred a slightly different emphasis, but the draft decision was a compromise text.

35. Mr. ROUGE (France) said that he had great difficulty in working on a document published only in English. His delegation was worried about the words "preliminary report" in paragraph 1 of the draft decision submitted by the Brazilian delegation. Did the sponsors of the decision have in mind a rough draft followed by a later report, or a report which would not go into every detail? As far as his delegation was concerned, it could only be a condensed report, for there was no question of requesting a new Jackson report.

36. Mr. HOSNY (Egypt) supported the draft decision submitted by the Brazilian delegation; he thought it balanced and well expressed. In drawing up the report requested in paragraph 1 it was indeed necessary to take account of the views of the United Nations bodies concerned with operational activities. Similarly, paragraph 2 emphasized the need to co-ordinate co-operation between UNDP and other United Nations organs concerned, since such co-operation was an indispensable condition for the success of the activities of the United Nations development system. Concerning paragraph 3, it was normal practice to invite the Secretary-General to submit his views, the more so since he had practical experience of operational activities, as the United Nations Office of Technical Co-operation came directly under his authority. He hoped that the draft decision would lead to definite improvements.

37. Mr. GRANQVIST (Sweden) said he was happy to note the changes which had been made in the draft decision. However, the report requested in paragraph 2 concerning the country-programming procedure apparently duplicated the information requested by the General Assembly in resolution 2975 (XXVII).

38. Mr. BARCELO RODRIGUEZ (Mexico) supported the draft decision but hoped that the term "preliminary report" was not too narrow and that the report could include, for example, the activities of multinational corporations.

39. Mr. JAIN (India) said that the aim, in the final analysis, was for the fifty-seventh session to have available a study on the operational activities of United Nations bodies to serve as a basis for the comprehensive policy review of operational activities throughout the United Nations system. In view of the chronic proliferation of reports, it would be sufficient to request, instead of the reports provided for in paragraphs 1 and 3, a single report, to be prepared by the Secretary-General after consultation with UNDP and the United Nations bodies.

40. Mr. SANDERS (United States of America) thought that it was indeed time for the Council to



carry out a comprehensive policy review of operational activities throughout the United Nations system. However, he was not sure that the draft decision went in the right direction. The question was extremely important, but the Council must beware of acting too hastily and must take care not to get into deep waters. In the first place, the draft decision seemed to request so many reports that the Council would not be able to consider them properly at its fifty-seventh session. Furthermore, the bodies from which reports were requested would not have time to prepare them with the necessary application and dedication. He had no specific proposal to make because he had not yet consulted his Government; he could say, however, that the Government of the United States took a lively interest in the question and that it would like to consider the draft decision carefully before giving its opinion.

41. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, if it was decided to defer the question to allow more time for thought, his delegation would request that the text should be circulated in all languages so that it could study it more closely.

42. Mr. AKE (Ivory Coast) supported the request made by the Soviet delegation. A matter of principle was involved: the Council should not consider any document whatsoever until the text had been circulated in all languages.

43. He also supported the proposal made by the representative of India that the Council should request only one report. He doubted whether the specialized agencies would have time to prepare such a detailed report for the summer session of the Council.

44. Mr. BRITO (Brazil) requested the representative of the Ivory Coast to make an exception for once and agree to work with an English text, since there was no time to have it translated.

45. The French representative's interpretation of the words "preliminary report" was correct; the sponsors' intention was indeed to request a condensed report, which should be relatively brief and should concentrate more on the substance than on procedure.

46. Referring to the point made by the representatives of India and the Ivory Coast, he said that the sponsors' intention was not to request a separate report from the Administrator of UNDP; a chapter setting forth the Administrator's views might well be included in the report of the UNDP Governing Council. The reports requested from the specialized agencies were nothing new; the Council was merely asking them to expand a little the part of their regular reports which dealt with the substance of operational activities.

47. Similarly, it was the practice for the representative of the Secretary-General to make an oral statement on the matter when consideration of an agenda item was begun. The difference in the present instance was simply that such a statement would be made in writing and a little in advance. The only really new element was the report requested from the Governing Council of UNDP. However, that was the logical consequence of the decision taken by the Council at its preceding meeting to undertake, at its fifty-seventh session, a comprehensive policy review of operational activities throughout the United Nations system.

48. In reply to the representative of Sweden, he pointed out that the reports requested in General Assembly resolution 2975 (XXVII) were more concerned with the machinery for carrying out operational activities than with policy in respect of such activities.

49. Mr. KASEMSRI (Thailand) was inclined to agree with the representative of India; paragraphs 1 and 3 could be combined, requesting a single report, to be drawn up by the Secretary-General after consultation with the specialized agencies, in which the Secretary-General would put forward his point of view.

50. The object of paragraph 2 was, it seemed, to invite the specialized agencies and the United Nations organs concerned to expand the part of their reports dealing with the substance of their operational activities. In his opinion, that idea would be made clearer if the final phrase of the paragraph was deleted.

51. In paragraph 1 of the draft decision, perhaps the word "preliminary", which some found ambiguous, might be replaced by the word "initial".

52. Mr. HAQ (Pakistan) on the whole supported the draft decision submitted by the Brazilian delegation; however, there were constitutional problems involved. For instance, the Governing Council of UNDP probably lacked the requisite competence to request certain organs, such as the Trade and Development Board or the Industrial Development Board, to submit reports to it. Moreover, the Governing Council of UNDP did not seem in a position to carry out by itself a comprehensive review of operational activities throughout the United Nations system.

53. In order to take those difficulties into account, the draft decision could be amended so as to provide, in paragraph 1, that the Governing Council would report on UNDP's operational activities and not on operational activities throughout the United Nations system, and, in paragraph 2, that the specialized agencies and the United Nations organs concerned would submit their reports direct to the Council and not through the Governing Council of UNDP.

54. Mr. GRANQVIST (Sweden) said he still felt, contrary to the representative of Brazil, that the information requested from the specialized agencies and the United Nations organs concerned at the end of paragraph 2 duplicated the study provided for in paragraph 5 of General Assembly resolution 2975 (XXVII). It should therefore be stipulated that the secretariats of those agencies and organs did not have to take into account the last part of paragraph 2 of the draft decision if they found that the information which it requested was already included in the reports they were drawing up in application of resolution 2975 (XXVII).

55. The PRESIDENT, after consulting the Secretariat, said that, if the Council so desired, it would be possible to hold an extra meeting on the following day, by which time the draft decision could be translated into all languages.

56. Mr. AKE (Ivory Coast) endorsed that suggestion, since his delegation could not support a text which had not been distributed in all languages.

57. Mr. HEMANS (United Kingdom) said that to prolong the session would raise difficulties for many delegations. He suggested that the Council should move on to the next item on the agenda and that meanwhile consultations should be held among the delegations concerned in order to reach a consensus.

58. Mr. ROUGE (France) said that for his part he preferred the Council to prolong the session in order to be able to work on a text translated into all languages. Given the scope of the work requested in the



draft decision, it would be dangerous to take a decision lightly, and it was essential to know exactly what commitment was being entered into.

59. Mr. OLIVERI LOPEZ (Argentina) agreed with the representative of the United Kingdom that the Council should now move on to the next item on the agenda; however, any decision on the Brazilian draft decision should be postponed until the following day so that the Council could work in all languages.

60. Mr. BRITO (Brazil) suggested that the sponsors of the draft decision and the sponsors of the amendments should draw up a revised text to be submitted next day to the Council for a decision.

61. The PRESIDENT suggested that consultations should be held to draw up a revised text. It could then be seen whether it was possible to adopt it later in the meeting.

*It was so decided.*

### AGENDA ITEM 5

#### Elections and confirmation of members of functional commissions of the Council (*concluded*) (E/L.1570)

62. The PRESIDENT said that the Council must elect 10 States Members to the Executive Board of the United Nations Children's Fund. The following countries had submitted their candidatures: Canada, Colombia, Cuba, Finland, Germany (Federal Republic of), India, New Zealand, Pakistan, Thailand, Uganda and Yugoslavia.

63. Mr. SHEMIRANI (Iran) said that the following countries were candidates of the Group of 77: Colombia, Cuba, India, Pakistan, Thailand, Uganda and Yugoslavia.

64. Mr. FASLA (Algeria) affirmed that his delegation had withdrawn its candidature in favour of Uganda, which had been designated by the African group. He added that the representation of the Group of 77, particularly the African group, on the Executive Board of UNICEF was insufficient, and that therefore the geographical distribution by group in that organ should be reviewed.

65. Mr. NAGGAGA (Uganda) thanked the Algerian delegation for having withdrawn in favour of his delegation.

66. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to take a vote by secret ballot.

67. Mr. NDUNG'U (Kenya) and Mr. FALL (Senegal) said that they thought the Council should vote by consensus in the case of the candidatures of countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America in order to redress the existing imbalance where the representation of those countries was concerned; in the case of the other candidatures the vote should be taken by secret ballot.

68. In reply to Mr. KACIMAIWAI (Fiji), who had asked for clarifications concerning the voting procedure, Mr. NDUNG'U (Kenya) referred to the provisions of General Assembly resolution 1038 (XI) concerning the membership of the Executive Board of the United Nations Children's Fund and made a formal proposal that the Council should follow the procedure he had just suggested, having regard to the fact that currently 10 seats on the Executive Board were held

by Western countries, 6 by African countries, 6 by Asian countries, 4 by socialist countries and 4 by Latin American countries, a situation which was far from reflecting equitable geographical representation.

69. The PRESIDENT said that the Council could decide, as provided in rule 72 of its rules of procedure, to choose a form of election other than secret ballot.

70. Mr. FALL (Senegal) noted that rule 72 had not been applied in the elections held by the Council at its preceding meeting and that recourse to consensus in the specific case at hand was particularly justified in that the number of States Members of the United Nations had more than doubled since the adoption of resolution 1038 (XI) in 1957 and that the majority of new States Members which had joined the Organization since that date were States belonging to the third world. He therefore proposed that the candidates of the Group of 77 should be elected by consensus and the candidates of the other countries by secret ballot.

71. The PRESIDENT said that if he heard no objection he would take it that the Council decided not to apply rule 72 and to elect the following countries to membership in the Executive Board of the United Nations Children's Fund: Colombia, Cuba, India, Pakistan, Thailand, Uganda and Yugoslavia.

*It was so decided.*

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Balhocine (Algeria) and Mrs. Auguste (Trinidad and Tobago) acted as tellers.*

*A vote was taken by secret ballot.*

Number of ballot papers:	53
Invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	53
Abstentions:	0
Number of members voting:	53
Required majority:	27
Number of votes obtained:	
Canada .....	44
Germany (Federal Republic of) .....	42
Finland .....	40
New Zealand .....	34

*Having obtained the required majority, Canada, the Federal Republic of Germany and Finland were elected members of the Executive Board of the United Nations Children's Fund.*

### AGENDA ITEM 4

#### Basic programme of work of the Council for 1974 and consideration of the provisional agenda for the fifty-sixth session (*concluded*)

##### DRAFT DECISION SUBMITTED BY THE BRAZILIAN DELEGATION

72. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to resume consideration of the draft decision submitted by the representative of Brazil.

73. Mr. BRITO (Brazil) said that the modifications which he had introduced into the text of the draft decision after his informal consultations should enable it to be adopted by consensus. Those modifications, taking into account the amendments of the represen-