

resources would simply be transferred from one organizational unit to another. The Council should be aware, however, that should the site of the Foundation be elsewhere than at Headquarters, and should there be a consequent transfer of staff, there would be additional costs.

3. The PRESIDENT, replying to a question from Mr. HOHLER (United Kingdom), said that the site of the Foundation would be determined by Governments, either in the General Assembly or in the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). The question could be discussed further in the Fifth Committee of the General Assembly.

4. Mr. HOHLER (United Kingdom) said that his delegation did not consider the statement of financial implications to be adequate.

5. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on draft resolution E/AC.24/L.506.

The draft resolution was adopted by 41 votes to 1 [resolution 1914 (LVII)].

6. Mr. KLEIN (United States of America) said that his delegation had been compelled to vote against the draft resolution. He acknowledged that the proposal was logical, in that it provided that the Centre for Housing, Building and Planning should continue its pre-investment and research activities and that the Foundation would be concerned with financing. Moreover, the language of the draft resolution was fair; it maintained the *status quo* in general, as there would be little disruption of the personnel, status and authority of the Centre.

7. However, the draft resolution was impractical and unwise. It failed to provide the Foundation with technical assistance capability, without which it would be unable to operate. Moreover, it was reasonable to expect that the Foundation would seek funds from the Fund of UNEP in order to engage the services of

subcontractors to carry out technical assistance activities, in which case a conflict would arise in the Governing Council between those delegations which preferred UNEP to concentrate on operational activities and those which preferred it to be a global operation. That conflict could have been avoided by transferring technical assistance activities from the Centre for Housing, Building and Planning to the Foundation.

8. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, which reflected the views of various delegations, including his own.

9. Paragraph 1 of the draft resolution should be discussed further in the Fifth Committee of the General Assembly. A more detailed statement of the financial implications than that provided by the Deputy Secretary was required. His delegation interpreted paragraph 3 to mean that the Economic and Social Council would confine itself to an exchange of views on the subject, and that any further decisions would have to await the results of the United Nations Conference on Human Settlements.

AGENDA ITEM 10

Elections

10. The PRESIDENT recalled that at its 1897th meeting, on 16 May 1974, the Council had decided to postpone the election of members to certain of its committees to the fifty-seventh session. The vacancies were listed in the annotated agenda of the resumed fifty-seventh session (E/5581). No candidates had been nominated, and if he heard no objections, he would take it that the Council agreed to postpone consideration of the item to the organizational session to be held early in 1975.

The decision was adopted [decision 60 (LVII)].

The meeting rose at 12.05 p.m.

1933rd meeting

Monday, 16 December 1974, at 11.15 a.m.

President: Mr. Aarno KARHILO (Finland).

E/SR.1933

REVISION OF THE AGENDA

Request for the inclusion of an additional item in the agenda: item proposed by the Secretary-General (E/L.1617)

1. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to comment on the Secretary-General's recommendation to include in the agenda an item entitled "*Ad hoc* authorization to the Executive Director of the World Food Programme to give food assistance to peoples in colonial Territories in Africa and their national liberation movements".

2. Mr. MACKENZIE (United Kingdom) said that he was reluctant to speak on the proposed item; the note by the Secretary-General (E/L.1617) had been distributed so recently that he had not been able to consult his Government regarding its position on the

draft authorization reproduced in paragraph 10, concerning which some members of the Council of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) had expressed reservations. His Government's position might have changed since the sixty-fourth session of the FAO Council. He therefore suggested that the item should be dealt with at the fifty-eighth session of the Economic and Social Council or, if it was felt to be urgent, that it should be added to the agenda of the organizational session for 1975.

3. Mr. ROUGET (Federal Republic of Germany) supported the suggestion of the representative of the United Kingdom.

4. Mr. FASLA (Algeria) supported the recommendation of the Secretary-General that the item should be added to the agenda of the current session. He was surprised that some delegations should have suggested

deferring it since assistance to national liberation movements was an accepted principle. The explanatory note attached to the note by the Secretary-General was quite straightforward, and he urged that it should be considered without delay.

5. Mr. OLIVERI LOPEZ (Argentina) and Mr. CHABALA (Zambia) supported the observations of the representative of Algeria.

6. Mr. GRANQVIST (Sweden) supported the inclusion of the item in the Council's agenda. His delegation had received the document several days earlier, and considered that a decision could be reached, if not at the current meeting, then at a meeting to be arranged in the afternoon.

7. Mr. MAKEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation supported those representatives who had spoken in favour of the Secretary-General's recommendation. The General Assembly had repeatedly supported the granting of assistance to peoples still under colonial domination and those in the liberated Territories, and to their national liberation movements. In view of the heavy agenda for the afternoon plenary meeting of the General Assembly, he would prefer a decision on document E/L.1617 to be taken immediately.

8. Mr. WILDER (Canada) said that the interpretation of the word "consideration" in paragraph 11 of E/L.1617 caused his delegation difficulty. He did not regard it as a responsible course of action to push through a hasty decision without proper discussion of the item.

9. Mr. ČABRIĆ (Yugoslavia) fully supported the position of those delegations which favoured consideration of the item at the current meeting. He reminded the Council that the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) had at its eighteenth session adopted a similar decision, couched in almost identical terms. Therefore, since the political decision had already been taken, the Council should be able to reach a decision without delay.

10. Mr. GONZALEZ DE COSSIO (Mexico), supported by Mr. DAVID (Liberia) and Mr. CHANG Hsien-wu (China), endorsed the remarks of earlier speakers who wished a decision to be taken without delay.

11. Mr. MACKENZIE (United Kingdom) drew attention to the fact that none of the speakers who supported an immediate decision on the item had answered the point he had raised concerning paragraph 10, namely, that some members of the FAO Council had expressed reservations regarding the wording of the authorization to the World Food Programme. He reiterated that he had had no opportunity to find out from his Government whether its position had changed.

12. Since an earlier speaker had mentioned the possibility of an afternoon meeting, he requested the Secretariat to inform the Council whether such a meeting was possible.

13. Mr. FASLA (Algeria) said that, since it would be desirable for the proposed authorization to be adopted by consensus, his delegation could agree to having the item considered at an afternoon meeting. Naturally, in the event of consensus being reached, delegations had the right to enter reservations.

14. The PRESIDENT informed the Council that an afternoon meeting could be arranged. If he heard no

objection, he would take it that the Council adopted without a vote the proposal of the Secretary-General that the agenda should be revised to include the item entitled "*Ad hoc* authorization to the Executive Director of the World Food Programme to give food assistance to peoples in colonial Territories in Africa and their national liberation movements", for consideration at the following meeting.

The revised agenda was adopted.

AGENDA ITEM 6

World Food Conference (*continued*):*

- (a) Report of the World Food Conference (E/5586, E/5587 and Add.1-4);
- (b) Emergency measures in regard to the supply of fertilizers and pesticides (E/5596)

NOMINATION OF MEMBERS OF THE WORLD FOOD COUNCIL

15. The PRESIDENT reminded the Council that the Second Committee had adopted draft resolution A/C.2/L.1421 regarding the World Food Conference. In accordance with paragraph 8 of that document, the Council was responsible for nominating the members of the World Food Council for election by the General Assembly, the geographical distribution of seats to be according to the pattern given in a foot-note to that paragraph. The part of the report of the Second Committee on item 12 (A/9886/Add.1) that contained the draft resolution in question, had not yet been considered by the General Assembly. However, he suggested that the Council, subject to the adoption of the draft resolution by the Assembly should proceed to nominate the members of the World Food Council so that the Assembly would be in a position to elect the members of the Council as soon as it had adopted the resolution. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council agreed to that procedure.

It was so decided.

16. Mr. GONZALEZ DE COSSIO (Mexico), speaking on behalf of the group of Latin American States, said that the seven candidates for the seven seats allocated to the Latin American region on the World Food Council were: Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Guatemala, Mexico, Trinidad and Tobago, and Venezuela.

17. Mr. CAVAGLIERI (Italy), speaking on behalf of the group of Western European and other States, said that the eight candidates for the eight seats allocated to that group on the World Food Council were: Australia, Canada, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Italy, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and United States of America.

18. Mr. DIETZE (German Democratic Republic), speaking on behalf of the group of Socialist States of Eastern Europe, said that the four candidates for the four seats allocated to that group on the World Food Council were: Hungary, Romania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and Yugoslavia.

19. Mr. FASLA (Algeria) said that the African and Asian States were still holding consultations on their nominations. In view of the possibility that the number of candidatures submitted might exceed the number of seats available, the Council should agree to take note of all candidatures submitted and transmit them without change to the General Assembly, which

* Resumed from the 1630th meeting.

would elect the required number for each region. Otherwise, difficulties might arise concerning the interpretation of the word "nominate".

20. Mr. WILDER (Canada), supported by Mr. OLIVERI LOPEZ (Argentina) and Mr. ČABRIĆ (Yugoslavia), associated himself with the observations of the representative of Algeria. It was the function of the Council to nominate and not to elect.

21. Mr. ROUGÉ (France) said that the Council was responsible for taking certain decisions and seemed reluctant to do so. It had just spent time debating whether or not to consider the substance of document E/L.1617. He had not taken part in that discussion, partly because he had been prepared to accept a straightforward answer, whether affirmative or negative, as sufficient, and partly because there had seemed to be political undertones which eluded him. However, the Council would be failing in its duty if it did not take a decision regarding the World Food Council and present the General Assembly with the nominations of the required 36 members for confirmation. The report of the Council to the General Assembly should mention that Cuba had submitted its candidature in addition to the seven formal nominations by the group of Latin American States, but the Council should transmit only 36 names to the General Assembly.

22. Mr. GONZALEZ DE COSSIO (Mexico) said that in the case of the Latin American region, eight candidatures had been put forward for the seven seats allocated to the region. The Council should transmit the names of the eight candidates to the General Assembly, which would elect seven of them to membership of the proposed World Food Council.

23. Mr. MAKEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) supported the Algerian proposal as to the procedure the Council should follow and agreed with the representative of Mexico that, in the case of Latin America, the eight candidatures proposed should be transmitted to the General Assembly.

24. Mr. DE MOURA (Brazil), supported by Mr. JARPA (Chile), said that the group of Latin American States had decided to submit seven nominations, not eight.

25. Mr. BREITENSTEIN (Finland) supported the Algerian proposal.

26. Mr. KITCHEN (United States of America) said that his delegation could accept the suggestion that all candidatures should be submitted to the General Assembly. He asked the Secretariat whether there was any legal precedent for the situation in which the Council found itself.

27. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) said that the Secretariat knew of no precedent for the situation, inasmuch as the formula for the nomination of candidates set out in draft resolution A/C.2/L.1421 was itself unprecedented. There seemed to be no legal impediment to the nomination by the Council of a number of candidates larger than that indicated in the draft resolution.

28. Mr. CZARKOWSKI (Poland) said that the Council should transmit the names of all candidates to the General Assembly. To do otherwise would mean that the Council was encroaching upon the elective function of the General Assembly. He supported the Algerian proposal as the simplest way of dealing with the problem.

29. Mr. ALARCON DE QUESADA (Observer for Cuba), speaking at the invitation of the Chairman, said that he would not presume to comment on the procedural problem facing the Council, but wished to point out that his country was recognized as a member of the Latin American regional group in FAO. Cuba had participated in the World Food Conference as a member of the Latin American group, and his country had also been a member of the contact group in Rome.

30. Mr. GONZALEZ DE COSSIO (Mexico), replying to the representatives of Brazil and Chile, said that in reading out the list of Latin American candidates earlier, he had stated that the Latin American group had nominated seven of its members as candidates for membership of the proposed World Food Council. Cuba, although not formally a member of the group of Latin American States in New York, was considered a member of that group in Rome and Geneva, and had participated actively in discussions on the world food problem. Cuba was therefore entitled to submit its candidature to the Economic and Social Council, and it was open to the Council to nominate eight candidates from the Latin American region, out of which the General Assembly would elect seven as members of the World Food Council.

31. Mr. DE MOURA (Brazil) said that, if the representative of Mexico had been speaking on behalf of the group of Latin American States, he felt obliged to correct him. The group of Latin American States had submitted seven candidatures for the seven available seats.

32. Mr. HASHMI (India) said that his delegation supported the Algerian proposal. It was only logical to forward to the Assembly the names of all States which had shown an interest in becoming members of the Council. His delegation had no objection to transmitting the candidature of Cuba to the General Assembly.

33. Mr. AKSOY (Turkey) supported the Algerian proposal, but expressed concern that further legal difficulties might arise in connexion with the implementation of certain other provisions of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1421.

34. Mr. DIETZE (German Democratic Republic) said that, in view of the information given by the Secretary of the Council, his delegation supported the Algerian proposal.

35. The PRESIDENT said that a consensus seemed to be emerging, and suggested that the Council should adopt the following draft decision: "The Economic and Social Council decides, subject to adoption by the General Assembly of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1421, to nominate for election to the proposed World Food Council the following States: _____."

It was so decided.

36. In reply to a question asked by Mr. CAVAGLIERI (Italy), the PRESIDENT said that the list to be inserted in the blank space would be drawn up in accordance with the pattern given in the foot-note to paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1421. It would include the countries whose candidatures had been submitted and approved by the Council.

37. Mr. ROUGÉ (France) said that if the draft decision read out by the Chairman had been put to the vote, his delegation would have abstained.

The meeting rose at 12.20 p.m.