



CONTENTS

Page

Financial implications of actions of the Council	209
Agenda item 8:	
Development and utilization of human resources	
Report of the Co-ordination Committee	210
Agenda item 29:	
Work programme of the United Nations in the economic, social and human rights fields and its budgetary requirements	
Report of the Co-ordination Committee	210
Agenda item 17:	
Development and co-ordination of the activities of the organizations within the United Nations system	
(a) Reports of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination and of the joint meetings of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination and the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination	
(b) Report of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination	
(c) Reports of the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency	
(e) Arrangements for facilitating the work of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination	
(f) Co-ordination and co-operation among institutes concerned with planning, training and research	
(g) Expenditures of the United Nations system in relation to programmes	
(i) Co-ordination at the regional level	
(j) Transfer to the United Nations of the responsibilities and assets of the International Relief Union	
Report of the Co-ordination Committee	210
Agenda item 21:	
Calendar of conferences and meetings for 1968 and 1969	
Report of the Co-ordination Committee	211
Agenda item 5:	
External financing of economic development of the developing countries	
(a) International flow of capital and assistance	
(b) Promotion of private foreign investment in developing countries	
(c) Outflow of capital from the developing countries	
Report of the Economic Committee (concluded)	215
Agenda item 23:	
Arrangements regarding the report of the Council to the General Assembly	217
Adjournment of the session	220

Gabon, Guatemala, India, Iran, Kuwait, Libya, Mexico, Morocco, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Sweden, Turkey, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Venezuela.

Observers for the following Member States: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, China, El Salvador, Greece, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Poland, South Africa, United Arab Republic, Uruguay, Yugoslavia.

Observers for the following non-member States: Federal Republic of Germany, Holy See, Switzerland.

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

The representative of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Financial implications of actions of the Council (E/4423)

1. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that although the United States delegation had supported the activities the financial implications of which were set out in the Secretary-General's report (E/4423), it wished to reserve its position on how and when those activities should be financed. It would state its final position on those questions in the debate on the supplementary estimates for 1967 and the revised estimates for 1968 at the twenty-second session of the General Assembly.

2. Mr. MARTIN-WITKOWSKI (France) strongly supported the position taken up by the United States representative and made a similar reservation on behalf of his Government.

3. Mr. FORTHOMME (Belgium) made the same reservation on behalf of the Government of Belgium.

4. Mr. ZAKHAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) made the same reservation on behalf of the USSR Government. With reference to the second sentence of paragraph 3 of the Secretary-General's report (E/4423), he expressed the hope that in covering the additional expenditure, the Secretary-General would have as little

President : Mr. M. KLUSAK (Czechoslovakia).

Present :

Representatives of the following States: Belgium, Cameroon, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, France,

recourse as possible to contingency funds under General Assembly resolution 2243 (XXI).

5. Sir Edward WARNER (United Kingdom) said that, like previous speakers, he wished to reserve his Government's position on the financial implications of actions of the Council. His delegation would state its position in the Fifth Committee at the twenty-second session of the General Assembly. In the meantime he would like to point out that the financial implications of the items on tax reform planning—\$31,860 in 1969—and on tax treaties between developed and developing countries—\$45,200 in 1968—were substantial.

6. Mr. DE SEYNES (Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs) said that he wished to draw the Council's attention to the very embarrassing position in which delegations placed the Secretariat when they voted in favour of programmes but failed to support their financial implications. To his mind, that emphasized the crying need for the reform and improvement of United Nations procedures for programming and budgeting.

7. Mr. MARTIN-WITKOWSKI (France) said that his delegation had no wish to make difficulties for the Secretariat. He strongly endorsed the Under-Secretary's remarks regarding the need for improvements in the United Nations programming and budgetary procedures.

8. The PRESIDENT said that the Council would eventually have to give that matter its consideration. In the meantime, he suggested that it should take note of the Secretary-General's report (E/4423).

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 8

Development and utilization of human resources (E/4353 and Add.1 and Add.1/Corr.1)

REPORT OF THE CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE (E/4428)

9. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the Co-ordination Committee's report on agenda item 8 (E/4428) and to vote on the draft resolution contained in paragraph 4 thereof.

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 29

Work programme of the United Nations in the economic, social and human rights fields and its budgetary requirements (E/4331/Rev.1 and annex and addenda)

REPORT OF THE CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE (E/4426)

10. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the Co-ordination Committee's report on agenda item 29 (E/4426) and to vote on the draft resolution contained in paragraph 5 thereof.

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 17

Development and co-ordination of the activities of the organizations within the United Nations system

- (a) Reports of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination and of the joint meetings of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination and the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (E/4383 and Corr.1, E/4395, E/4404)
- (b) Report of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (E/4337 and Add.1-2)
- (c) Reports of the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency (E/4333 and Add.1, E/4334, E/4339, E/4344, E/4345, E/4346 and Add.1, E/4347, E/4348 and Add.1, E/4349 and Add.1, E/4350 and Add. 1-2, E/4357, E/4399)
- (e) Arrangements for facilitating the work of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination
- (f) Co-ordination and co-operation among institutes concerned with planning, training and research
- (g) Expenditures of the United Nations system in relation to programmes (E/4351)
- (i) Co-ordination at the regional level (E/4335 and Corr.1 and Add.1)
- (j) Transfer to the United Nations of the responsibilities and assets of the International Relief Union (E/4402 and Add.1)

REPORT OF THE CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE (E/4425)

11. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the Co-ordination Committee's report on agenda item 17 (E/4425) and to vote on draft resolutions I to VIII contained in paragraph 16 thereof.

I. WORLD CAMPAIGN FOR UNIVERSAL LITERACY

Draft resolution I was adopted unanimously.

12. Mr. MARTIN-WITKOWSKI (France) said that although he welcomed the unanimous adoption of the resolution on the World Campaign for Universal Literacy he wished to emphasize that adult education must receive due attention, for which audio-visual means should be used to ensure maximum effectiveness.

II. REPORTS OF THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES, THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY AND THE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE ON CO-ORDINATION

13. Mr. ATTIGA (Libya) said that one question which had been discussed in the Co-ordination Committee was not mentioned in operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution II. He therefore proposed the addition of a new point (e) to be worded as follows: "Statistical research and publications".

That amendment was adopted.

Draft resolution II, as amended, was adopted unanimously.

III. DEVELOPMENT OF INFORMATION MEDIA

Draft resolution III was adopted unanimously.

IV. DEVELOPMENT OF ACTIVITIES IN THE FIELD OF POPULATION

Draft resolution IV was adopted by 19 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

14. Mr. WECKMANN MUÑOZ (Mexico) said he had voted for the resolution although he had abstained when it was approved by the Co-ordination Committee. His attitude had been dictated by the fact that family planning was a very delicate subject to which some countries had objections on religious and other grounds. By intervening in such issues, the Council might hurt those countries' susceptibilities. It was for each country to seek its own path and, if it wished for family planning, the initiative should come from within, not from without. The family was the nucleus of society and it should not be subjected to extraneous pressures.

15. Mr. MA'A BITOMO (Cameroon) said he had abstained from voting on the draft resolutions because, in Cameroon, the family was a sacred institution. Although he understood the problems of countries with population explosions, the problem did not arise in his own country. To be strictly logical, he should have voted against the draft resolution, but he had preferred to abstain out of deference to the views of countries with serious population problems.

V. ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A JOINT INSPECTION UNIT

Draft resolution V was adopted unanimously.

VI. NATIONAL CO-ORDINATION AND CO-ORDINATION OF STATISTICAL QUESTIONNAIRES

Draft resolution VI was adopted unanimously.

VII. REPORTS OF THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES, THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY AND THE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE ON CO-ORDINATION

Draft resolution VII was adopted unanimously.

VIII. TRANSFER TO THE UNITED NATIONS OF THE RESPONSIBILITIES AND ASSETS OF THE INTERNATIONAL RELIEF UNION

Draft resolution VIII was adopted unanimously.

16. The PRESIDENT drew attention to paragraph 17 of the Co-ordination Committee's report, which contained texts to be annexed to the resolutions that the Council had just adopted.

The texts in paragraph 17 were adopted.

AGENDA ITEM 21

Calendar of conferences and meetings for 1968 and 1969 (E/4400)

REPORT OF THE CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE (E/4427)

17. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the Co-ordination Committee's report on agenda item 21 (E/4427). With reference to sub-paragraph 3 (h) of that

report, he wished to suggest that the dates for the twenty-third session of the Economic Commission for Europe (ECE) should be from 17 April to 3 May 1968, as originally proposed in the draft calendar of conferences and meetings prepared by the Secretary-General (E/4400), instead of from 10 to 28 April 1968. Those dates should be approved, however, on the understanding that the Council would request the Executive Secretary of ECE to make appropriate arrangements, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Commission, to mark during the session the special significance of 1 May as International Labour Day, and that that decision would be reflected in the records of the Council.

It was so decided.

18. Mr. ATTIGA (Libya) recalled that the Committee for Development Planning had taken note with appreciation, in paragraph 92 of its report (E/4362 and Corr.1), of the invitation extended by the Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) to hold the third session of the Committee in Addis Ababa in accordance with the principle that to vary the place of meeting of United Nations bodies gave their members an opportunity of gaining first-hand knowledge of conditions in different regions and enabled the people of the regions to see what United Nations bodies were doing. The Economic Committee had recommended that the invitation should be accepted, but the Co-ordination Committee had thought that, because of the financial implications of holding the session in Addis Ababa, the Committee for Development Planning should meet at Headquarters (see E/4427, para. 3 (c)). That seemed a little high-handed, as the Economic Committee had already considered the financial implications of its decision. The Council must now resolve the conflict between the two.

19. Mr. MA'A BITOMO (Cameroon) said that his delegation had been in favour of holding the session in Addis Ababa even though the financial implications were heavy. It had done so because the Secretariat lacked precise information about Africa, and holding the meeting in Addis Ababa would enable it to establish contact with leaders there. That such contacts were needed was obvious from the fact that the reports of the specialized agencies on development planning did not do justice to Africa, not because the secretariats were unwilling to give that continent due importance but because they lacked information. His delegation had thought that those compelling reasons would prevail and it was therefore surprised that the Co-ordination Committee had decided otherwise. He urged the Council to reverse the Co-ordination Committee's decision.

20. Sir Edward WARNER (United Kingdom) drew attention to the unanimous decision of the Co-ordination Committee set out in paragraph 5 of its report recommending the Council to call the particular attention of its subsidiary organs to General Assembly resolution 2116 (XX) and expressing its concern at the tendency of the subsidiary organs to seek to extend their sessions and to increase the number of their own subsidiary bodies. The Committee was also recommending that the Council

should request the Secretary-General to help the subsidiary organs to review their programmes with the object of shortening their agendas and the length of their sessions.

21. Though there was now no time for the formalities of a Council resolution, the matter was important and urgent. The multiplicity and length of sessions were getting beyond control: an illustration from the calendar of conferences and meetings for 1968 contained in the Co-ordination Committee's report was the scheduling of simultaneous sessions of the Commission on the Status of Women, the Commission on Human Rights and the Commission for Social Development. It would be extremely difficult for his delegation—and equally or even more so for other delegations—to service all three sessions. If the number of sessions could not be reduced, a determined effort should be made to bring order into the agendas and reduce the length of sessions. He hoped the Council would unanimously adopt the Co-ordination Committee's recommendation and that the Secretary-General would report back not later than the forty-fifth session on the results of his efforts to achieve the recommended aims.

22. Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (United Republic of Tanzania) proposed that the decision in paragraph 3 (*d*) should be reversed and that the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations should meet from 15 to 29 January 1968 as originally planned. He also asked the reason for the recommendation to change the date to 11 to 15 March, when many members of the Committee who were particularly interested in the Committee's agenda would be attending the second session of UNCTAD in New Delhi. No reasons were given for the change, and there appeared to be no other important meetings that would clash with the original dates.

23. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America), referring to the question raised by the representative of Libya on the 1968 session of the Committee for Development Planning, said that the question had been the subject of prolonged debate in the Co-ordination Committee. His own delegation believed that important subsidiary bodies of the Council should meet in the field, particularly in Africa, because of the benefits to the region concerned. The decision to recommend that the Committee for Development Planning should hold its next session in New York instead of Addis Ababa had not been based on purely financial considerations, as the Co-ordinating Committee's report implied. Financial considerations were important, and had to be taken into account; but in the present case, since the Committee would be dealing with the difficult and complex task of preparing for the second United Nations Development Decade, it had been felt that the session should be held in a place where all the necessary facilities, including expert staff, were available. It had therefore been reluctantly decided that, for the particular session in question, New York would be better than Addis Ababa. Moreover, since the session would consist of closed meetings of experts, it would be unlikely to be of much use in helping the countries of the African continent. All the members of the Co-ordination Com-

mittee had recognized the importance of holding as many sessions of subsidiary bodies as possible in Africa.

24. Mr. NAVA CARRILLO (Venezuela) said he had abstained from voting on the question in the Co-ordination Committee. The United States representative had stressed the financial aspect and its importance in relation to the benefits accruing to developing countries where meetings were held. It was of inestimable benefit to the developing countries that meetings should be held there, for responsible people in those countries were thus enabled to enjoy the great benefit of participating in the work. The advantages would be all the greater if the particular session in question were attended by experts. He could not understand the United States representative's point about closed meetings.

25. Mr. RAHNEMA (Iran) said that something must be done to change a situation in which it was perpetually argued that meetings had to be held in Geneva or New York because it was cheaper and because the developing countries did not possess the necessary facilities. Conferences must be decentralized. There was also a need for more co-ordination of activities and for the establishment of priorities. In the Council itself better co-ordination was needed, so that the Council and its Committees, which had the same representation, should not take different decisions.

26. While his delegation would in principle vote for the holding of a conference in a developing country, it felt that in the case of the next session of the Committee for Development Planning the arguments of the United States representative in the Co-ordination Committee had been very compelling. The determining factor in the Co-ordination Committee's decision had probably been the fact that it would cost \$26,000 to hold the session in New York, but \$80,000 more to hold it in Addis Ababa. It was a pity the \$80,000 could not be spent on improving facilities at the headquarters of the Economic Commission for Africa. His delegation would abstain from voting on the issue in the case under discussion, since a session held in Addis Ababa under existing conditions would obviously be detrimental to the work of the Committee for Development Planning. The Council must try to find a long-term solution, perhaps by strengthening the regional economic commissions, so that they might accommodate conferences without the constant recurrence of the question of cost and facilities.

27. The PRESIDENT said that the points concerning conditions at the headquarters of the regional economic commissions were well taken. The Council might well adopt a resolution on the lines indicated by the representative of Iran.

28. Mr. QURESHI (Pakistan) observed that the United Kingdom representative's point concerning the difficulty of providing representation at meetings did not apply in the present case, as the Committee for Development Planning was a committee of experts.

29. As to the United States representative's comments, preparation for the second United Nations Development

Decade was only one of the items on that Committee's agenda. The other main item, the problems of plan implementation (with special reference to Africa), had been instanced in support of the arguments for holding the meeting in Africa. It had been pointed out that the discussion of a similar problem in Latin America had been very beneficial to the countries of that region, and that the same would be true for Africa. As a member of the Committee for Development Planning, he assured the Council that the Committee had recommended the holding of its meeting in Addis Ababa in full knowledge of the possible personal inconvenience to some of its members; the overriding consideration had been the importance of the agenda item and the Committee's interest in the development of the African continent.

30. Mr. ZOLLNER (Dahomey) agreed with the observations of the Iranian representative. The argument was always advanced that it was difficult to hold meetings away from Headquarters because of the lack of facilities in other places, but little was done to remedy the situation. It was vital for meetings to be decentralized. By its very title, the Committee for Development Planning was of high importance for the developing countries and his delegation supported the idea that it should hold at least one session in a developing country, preferably in Africa, which was the continent most needing development. He did not attach great importance to the recurrent argument about working conditions: he had observed in the past that no session held in a developing country had ever been followed by complaints about conditions. He did not believe that the work of the Committee for Development Planning would suffer if it met in Addis Ababa. As to the United States representative's remarks, he had noted that whatever general principles the United States delegation might profess, when it came to a particular case it always produced the familiar arguments about facilities and conditions. He did not believe that the United States representative's arguments applied only to the case under discussion. He could not help feeling that the real reason for preferring New York to Addis Ababa had to do with working conditions in Addis Ababa. He assured the Council, however, that on the premises of the Economic Commission for Africa it was possible to work in air-conditioned rooms, which was not always the case in the United Nations buildings.

31. Mr. ATTIGA (Libya) said that some additional facts had been brought to his attention since his earlier statement. First, whereas the English text of the calendar of conferences and meetings for 1968 recommended by the Co-ordination Committee did not indicate the place of the meeting of the Committee for Development Planning, the French text mentioned Addis Ababa. Second, the Economic Committee's discussion of where the next session of the Committee for Development Planning should be held had been related to that Committee's work programme. Although the United States delegation had produced the same arguments as in the Co-ordination Committee, the Economic Committee had recommended approval of the future programme of work (see E/4421, operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution I), and the Council had adopted the recommendation by its resolu-

tion 1259 (XLIII). In paragraph 92 of its report, the Committee for Development Planning noted with appreciation the invitation of the Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Africa to hold its third session at the Commission's headquarters, and expressed the hope that the invitation could be accepted and the session held early in 1968. Paragraph 93 of the same report stated that on the assumption that the session would be held in Africa, the Committee suggested that the item on its agenda relating to problems of plan implementation should be studied in the context of conditions prevailing in that continent. If a decision were taken to hold the meeting in New York, it would have to be made clear that the priority of the agenda items had been changed. The contradictions to which he had drawn attention, though not substantive, should be discussed.

32. Mr. MA'A BITOMO (Cameroon) supported the comments of the Libyan representative. With reference to the remarks of the United States representative, he said that if the purpose of the second United Nations Development Decade was really to help the developing countries, that representative could hardly deny that a developing country, particularly an African one, would stand to benefit most from the discussions of the United Nations experts on preparations for the Development Decade.

33. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that his delegation had always supported the idea of holding meetings at places other than New York and Geneva, and would continue to do so.

34. Referring to the Cameroonian representative's observations, he said that his delegation fully recognized that Africa required assistance, and should obtain it in the most effective possible way.

35. As to the point raised by the Dahomean representative, he explained that his delegation had not been influenced solely by any financial implications in arriving at its conclusion that the Committee for Development Planning could work better if it met in New York. Nor had it been guided in any way by considerations of comfort, particularly as Addis Ababa was itself very comfortable. In his view, the overriding consideration was that the Committee should meet where it could have immediate access to all United Nations facilities, including computer facilities, in preparing a world-wide development strategy for the nineteen-seventies.

36. In previous years, the dates and places of meetings had been decided by the Interim Committee on Programme of Conferences; but now the function of that Committee had been transferred to the Co-ordination Committee whose duty it was to deal with the work programme as a whole and ensure a coherent pattern of meetings. The Co-ordination Committee had indeed not confined its attention to the programme of the Committee for Development Planning, but had decided, contrary to a formal recommendation on the subject, that the Commission on the Status of Women should meet not at Geneva but in New York, in order to make way for the Commission on Narcotic Drugs. The views and wishes of commissions and committees were taken into considera-

tion, but might well be overridden by more telling arguments. The Economic Committee had not decided on the place of the meeting of the Committee for Development Planning; that was the function of the Co-ordination Committee, which took an over-all view of the situation. It was for the Council, on the basis of all the relevant facts, to reach a decision on the matter, although its decision might well be changed at a later date by the General Assembly.

37. He appealed to the representatives of the African countries to weigh the various arguments presented very carefully; the important question was whether they really considered that the Committee could do just as good a job in Addis Ababa as in New York.

38. The Committee for Development Planning had, it was true, met in Latin America the previous year, but there were two major differences between Latin America and Africa. The first was that Santiago was the centre of almost all Latin American planning bodies, and the second was that the term "implementation of planning" had been selected in the light of conditions in Latin America, where the entire planning process had been carried further than anywhere else in the world. In Africa, on the other hand, it would be better not to place undue emphasis on the implementation of plans, which in many cases had not yet been established, but to think of other ways in which the African countries could be assisted in the preparation of development plans.

39. Mr. ATTIGA (Libya) said that the Council had failed to clear up the juridical aspect of the problem. There was no doubt that the Co-ordination Committee was competent to recommend the place and date of meetings, but in the work programme under consideration, the Economic Committee had related a specific topic to the place of the meeting. Indeed, it had been assumed that the meeting would be held in Africa and that related work would be carried out together with the secretariat of the Economic Commission for Africa. It would therefore be completely contradictory to decide now that the meeting should be held in New York.

40. On the subject of suitable working conditions, he said that the Committee for Development Planning, which had been entrusted with responsibility for laying down guidelines for the second Development Decade, was surely the best judge of the conditions in which it could work most effectively. In any event, the Committee itself had welcomed the idea of holding its meeting in Africa. He also noted that the Committee would not undertake any statistical projections or computations. That work would have to be done by follow-up groups. The Committee's basic function was to formulate proposals and guidelines.

41. In conclusion, he noted that the United States representative's suggestion that it might be premature for the Committee to tackle problems of plan implementation would imply that the Council did not approve of the Committee's work programme.

42. Mr. ZOLLNER (Dahomey) said that the United States representative had failed to adduce any new arguments. His point about the transfer of the session of

the Commission of the Status of Women to New York merely indicated the desirability of holding certain meetings outside New York and Geneva.

43. He emphasized that the place of meeting had no bearing on the work of the Committee for Development Planning, whose reports were drafted on the basis of various other studies undertaken before the session. Facilities for such studies did not therefore have to be available during the actual session. The Committee would clearly once again base its work on studies prepared at New York, so that the place of its brief session would not influence its performance.

44. Members of the Committee themselves were the best judges of the conditions most suited to their work; and they seemed to have no objection to Addis Ababa.

45. Mr. RAHNEMA (Iran) said that the point raised by the Libyan representative was extremely important; regardless of where the session was to be held, the Committee's work programme should in no way be changed, and emphasis should continue to be placed on problems and conditions in Africa. A meeting in Addis Ababa would surely facilitate consideration of such problems.

46. Mr. GREGH (France), referring to rule 53 of the Council's rules of procedure, moved the closure of the debate, since he considered that the Council could reach a decision on the basis of a majority vote.

The motion was carried.

47. After some further discussion in which Mr. ZOLLNER (Dahomey), Mr. FORTHOMME (Belgium), Mr. ATTIGA (Libya), Mr. RAHNEMA (Iran), Mr. GREGH (France) and Sir Edward WARNER (United Kingdom) took part, the PRESIDENT put to the vote a proposal submitted by the Dahomean representative and amended by the Belgian representative, reading as follows: "The Council confirms that the session of the Committee for Development Planning should be held at Addis Ababa as recommended by the Committee for Development Planning."

The proposal was adopted by 16 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.

48. Mr. KASATKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that in reaching its decision on the question in the Co-ordination Committee, the Soviet delegation had been influenced by the difference in cost between holding the session in New York and Addis Ababa. After hearing the arguments put forward by the representatives of Libya and Dahomey, it realized that the matter had not been thoroughly debated in the Co-ordination Committee. As it felt unable, however, at that later stage, to reverse its previous decision, it had abstained in the vote just taken.

49. Mr. REYES (Philippines) said that the Libyan and Dahomean arguments in favour of holding the session in Addis Ababa had not been advanced when the matter was discussed in the Co-ordination Committee. The Philippine delegation felt unable to reverse its previous

decision and had therefore abstained in the vote just taken. It welcomed with satisfaction, however, the fact that the Council had decided that the session was to be held in Addis Ababa.

50. Mr. BERGQUIST (Sweden) suggested that the Council should defer until the resumed forty-third session a decision on the Tanzanian proposal that the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations should meet in New York from 15 to 19 January 1968.

51. The PRESIDENT said that the Council's task was to examine the calendar of conferences and meetings and report thereon to the Secretary-General. He would therefore put the Tanzanian proposal to the vote.

The proposal was rejected by 4 votes to 2, with 20 abstentions.

52. Mr. ATTIGA (Libya) observing that the forty-fourth session of the Economic and Social Council was to be held from 6 to 31 May 1968, asked why the Council's suggestion, made at its forty-second session, that the spring session should be held in the first week of April had been disregarded.

53. Mr. PARRY (Canada) said that the documents to be examined by the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination, the Council's preparatory body, would not be ready before mid-April. If the spring session of the Economic and Social Council were advanced to the first week in April, that Committee would be unable to perform its essential function, namely, to report to the Council. The Council had just adopted resolution 1275 (XLIII) on the work programme of the United Nations in the economic, social and human rights fields and its budgetary requirements, on the assumption that the Committee would be able to meet before the spring session. If the dates proposed for the forty-fourth session of the Council were now changed, the resolution might be rendered nugatory.

54. Mr. ATTIGA (Libya) thanked the Canadian representative for his explanation. It should be remembered, however, that the Council had specifically recommended that meetings of subsidiary bodies should be arranged to fit in with the Council's meetings, not *vice versa*.

55. The PRESIDENT suggested that the recommendations in paragraph 5 of the Co-ordination Committee's report (E/4427), to which the United Kingdom representative had drawn attention, should be adopted together.

It was so decided.

56. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should approve the calendar of conferences and meetings for 1968 and the tentative programme of meetings for 1969 as submitted by the Co-ordination Committee, subject to the amendments just adopted by the Council.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 5

External financing of economic development of the developing countries

- (a) International flow of capital and assistance (E/4327, E/4366 and Add.1, E/4371 and Corr.1, E/4375 and Corr.1, E/4408)
- (b) Promotion of private foreign investment in developing countries (E/4274 and Corr.1 and Add.1-2, E/4293 and Corr.1 and Add.1)
- (c) Outflow of capital from the developing countries (E/4374 and Corr.1 and Add.1)

REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC COMMITTEE (E/4424; E/L.1186, E/L.1187) (concluded)

57. Mr. SHOURIE (India) said that since the United States amendment (E/L.1186) to draft resolution III contained in paragraph 23 of the Economic Committee's report (E/4424) seemed likely to be adopted unanimously, the Indian delegation withdrew its sub-amendment (E/L.1187).

58. Mr. GREGH (France) suggested that the word "balanced" should be deleted from paragraph 1 of the United States amendment. The Secretary-General would surely never contemplate establishing an unbalanced working group.

59. Mr. CUHRUK (Turkey) said that the sponsors of the original draft resolution (E/AC.6/L.371) were prepared to accept the United States amendment on the understanding that the *ad hoc* working group would be composed of experts working in their private capacity. The purpose of the word "balanced" was to ensure that there would be a certain balance in the working group between the developed and the developing countries. The sponsors would abide by the United States decision in the matter.

60. Mr. BLAU (United States of America) said that in an endeavour to change the original text as little as possible, the United States delegation had retained the word "balanced". As, however, the United States amendment in effect defined the balance sought by specifically stating that the experts were to come from developed and developing countries and represent different regions and tax systems, there seemed no reason why the word should not be deleted.

61. Mr. WECKMANN MUÑOZ (Mexico) suggested that if the word "balanced" were deleted a word, or words, reflecting that idea should be inserted further on, before the word "representing".

62. Mr. REYES (Philippines) said that his delegation would agree to the deletion of the word "balanced" provided the principle of balance usually maintained in the United Nations was adhered to. The restriction of membership to government experts and tax administrators did not seem likely to ensure a balance between the different sectors of a country.

63. Mr. SHOURIE (India), supported by Mr. FORTHOMME (Belgium), suggested that the word "balanced" should be deleted from paragraph 1 of the United States amendment, and that the word "adequately" should be inserted before the word "represented".

It was so decided.

64. Mr. BLAU (United States of America), referring to the comment by the Philippine representative, said that the United States delegation had substituted the words "government experts" for the words "persons with relevant knowledge in this field" because it would be quite possible for Governments to appoint private persons to serve on the working group. In the United States, for example, it was quite usual for the Treasury to recruit private persons as consultants. The United States delegation had no intention of excluding tax accountants, for example, from membership of the working group.

65. Mr. QURESHI (Pakistan) supported by Mr. ATTIGA (Libya) suggested that the word "government" should be deleted from paragraph 1 of the United States amendment.

66. Mr. SHOURIE (India) suggested that the phrase should read "tax administrators and government experts". That would imply that non-government tax administrators could be appointed to the working group.

67. Mr. BLAU (United States of America) said that his delegation could accept the Indian proposal, but would have some difficulty in accepting the Pakistan proposal. If the word "government" were deleted, the financial implications of the proposal for the United Nations would be considerably increased.

68. Mr. FORTHOMME (Belgium) said that the United States amendment did not meet the Belgian delegation's main fear, namely, that a working group might be established before a decision concerning the functions of that group had been taken. In a spirit of compromise, however, the Belgian delegation would accept the text of the United States amendment provided the word "government" was retained.

69. Mr. REYES (Philippines) asked why the deletion of the word "government" would result in an increase in the financial implications of the proposal for the United Nations.

70. Mr. LACHMANN (Secretariat) said that the travel and living expenses of government-appointed experts would be borne by the Governments concerned, whereas the travel and living expenses of experts appointed by the Secretary-General in accordance with the provisions of the draft resolution would be borne by the United Nations.

71. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the Pakistan proposal that the word "government" should be deleted from paragraph 1 of the United States amendment to draft resolution III.

The proposal was adopted by 11 votes to 8, with 7 abstentions.

72. Mr. ATTIGA (Libya) said he had voted in favour of the deletion as all tax administrators were by definition government officials, and it would still be possible to appoint both government and non-government experts.

73. Mr. GELBER (Canada) said that, in view of the deletion, he would abstain from voting on draft resolution III as a whole for the reasons he had given in the Economic Committee.

74. Mr. FORTHOMME (Belgium) said he would abstain from voting on the draft resolution whether the word "government" was deleted or not. The fact that experts were nominated by Governments did not mean that they could not express views that differed from those of their Government. His own Government often appointed experts precisely because it wished to hear opinions different from its own and so find a solution.

75. Mr. GREGH (France) also said he would abstain from voting on the draft resolution. He was surprised at the implied suggestion by the representative of Libya that a working group to consider the formulation of tax agreements between developed and developing countries might include persons who were not sent by Governments. Taxes were administered by a public authority and were essentially the concern of government officials. The term "government expert" was established in United Nations practice. The experts should be appointed on that basis.

76. Mr. MA'A BITOMO (Cameroon) said he had voted against the deletion for the same reason as the representative of France.

77. Mr. SHOURIE (India) suggested that, for the sake of obtaining unanimity on the draft resolution, the words "experts and tax administrators" should be replaced by "tax specialists and government experts".

78. Mr. QURESHI (Pakistan) said he had no objection to such an amendment.

79. Mr. ZOLLNER (Dahomey) said he could not accept that amendment for the same reason that had compelled him to vote against the deletion of the word "government". The proposed working party should consist of experts chosen by the Secretary-General in agreement with Governments. The experts need not be government officials, but if they were private persons not chosen in agreement with Governments there was a risk that their positions would conflict with those of Governments and make it difficult to achieve useful results.

80. Mr. BLAU (United States of America) said that, to accommodate that view, he would suggest that the words "nominated by Governments but" should be inserted after the word "administrators".

81. Mr. ZOLLNER (Dahomey) agreed with that wording, although it went a little further than the point he had made.

82. Mr. ATTIGA (Libya) found it difficult to reconcile the suggestion that the working group should consist only of experts nominated by Governments with their acting in a personal capacity. If they were nominated by Governments they were unlikely to express any views that conflicted with those of their Governments. He would not, however, oppose the amendment if it was acceptable to the Council.

83. Mr. SHOURIE (India) said that, for the sake of unanimity, he also would support the amendment as just suggested by the United States representative.

84. Mr. RAHNEMA (Iran), Mr. BRILLANTES (Philippines) and Mr. CUHRUK (Turkey) also accepted that suggestion.

The United States suggestion that the words "nominated by Governments but" should be inserted after the word "administrators" in paragraph 1 of the amendment E/L.1186 was adopted.

85. Mr. MA'A BITOMO (Cameroon) recalled that when he had asked for a clarification in the Economic Committee, he had been told that the word "fully" in the fifth line of the operative paragraph of draft resolution III represented a compromise. Although he was prepared to accept that word he had some misgivings about its implications. At present the countries from which the capital originated received all the tax revenue from it, and he failed to see how that could be reconciled with the idea of fully safeguarding the revenue interests of both the developing and the developed countries. He would nevertheless vote for the draft resolution provided that his comment was included in the summary record.

86. Mr. ATTIGA (Libya) expressed the same view.

87. Mr. ZOLLNER (Dahomey) shared the misgivings expressed by the representative of Cameroon. If one of the aims of the proposed consultation was to avoid double taxation, for example, he failed to see how an equitable solution could be found by fully safeguarding the revenue interests of both sides. He would therefore prefer to delete the word "fully", as it was incompatible with the express purpose of the resolution, although he would not request a separate vote on it.

88. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the United States amendment (E/L.1186), as amended, to draft resolution III.

The United States amendment, as amended, was adopted by 18 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

89. The PRESIDENT, before putting to the vote the amended text of draft resolution III contained in paragraph 23 of the Economic Committee's report (E/4424), invited the Council to vote separately, in accordance with the request of the United States representative, on the third preambular paragraph and on the second part of the fifth preambular paragraph, from the word "especially" to the word "investment".

The third preambular paragraph was adopted by 8 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

The passage beginning with the word "especially" and ending with "investment" in the fifth preambular paragraph was adopted by 14 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.

Draft resolution III as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 23 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

90. Mr. BLAU (United States of America) said he had voted for the resolution as a whole for the reasons he had given when introducing his amendment (1506th meeting). He had abstained in the two separate votes because, although he believed in the general validity of the main ideas embodied in the two passages concerned, the form in which they were expressed in the resolution was too broad and universal.

AGENDA ITEM 23

Arrangements regarding the report of the Council to the General Assembly (E/L.1166)

91. Mr. POZHARSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Council's report should be comprehensive, refer to all the main issues discussed during the session, and record the differences of opinion on the assessment and solution of those problems. As stated in the note by the Secretary-General (E/L.1166), the report would then be likely to facilitate the work of the General Assembly and be a useful source of information for the general public. The report should therefore give due prominence to the extensive discussion on the question of the liquidation of the economic consequences of Israel's military aggression against the United Arab Republic and other Arab countries. That discussion had taken place during the debate under agenda item 2 on the world economic situation, which had been adversely affected by that aggression. The occasion for it had been the Soviet delegation's letter (E/4409) on Israel's responsibility for the economic loss it had caused to the Arab and other States, the USSR's draft resolution (E/L.1172/Rev.1) and the amendment thereto presented by Kuwait, Libya and Morocco (E/L.1174). The General Assembly and the public should be informed of the fact that a considerable number of Council members had supported the Soviet proposals. The report should also record the position taken by the aggressors' protectors, who had prevented the Council from taking a decision on the liquidation of the economic consequences of Israel's war against the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan.

92. During the discussion on problems of long-term economic development programmes, including the next Development Decade, it had been emphasized that the achievement and maintenance of world peace was of primary importance for such programmes, as stated in Council resolution 1260 (XLIII) on the United Nations Development Decade. By adopting a resolution containing that statement, the Council had in effect condemned the policy of military aggression, which currently found open expression in the United States' war against the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and the Viet-Nameese people, and Israel's aggression against the Arab States.

Many representatives had referred to the aggression against Viet-Nam, and that should be noted in the Council's report.

93. In view of the abnormal situation and reactionary régime in Greece, some delegations had expressed the view that the International Symposium on Industrial Development should be held in some other country because, if it was held in Greece, the level of participation would be considerably reduced and the Symposium would be unable to accomplish its task successfully. The Council's report should record the views of those delegations.

94. It should also report fully the discussion on long-term economic planning in developing countries and the role of the United Nations in that process, since the views of countries with different economic and planning systems should be taken into account. His delegation also attached importance to the Council's discussion on the improvement and extension of objective public information on United Nations activities in the economic and social fields.

95. During the discussion on international economic and social policy and the activities of the regional economic commissions and UNIDO, many representatives had referred to the "awakening of European awareness", the international character of all United Nations activities, the need to eliminate discrimination against certain countries, and the admission of the German Democratic Republic and other countries to participation in United Nations activities. It was time certain countries reconsidered their position on those issues in the spirit of the general principles and objectives of the international community. The substance and tone of statements made by representatives on all those issues should be recorded in the Council's report.

96. Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT (United States of America) said that he was sorry to have to intervene at that late hour, but the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics had just stated that the Council had declared itself against military aggression by the United States in Viet-Nam and by Israel against the Arab States. That was untrue, and the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics knew that the Council had not so declared itself.

97. He was not surprised that the Council was once again involved in an extraneous debate on serious political questions, particularly the situation in the Middle East. The USSR representative had threatened to bring the matter up under every item on the Council's agenda, and he had certainly carried out his threat, even under that last agenda item. He (Mr. Goldschmidt) had so far made brief statements confined to the question of competence and procedure; but the USSR representative had again spoken of aggression and aggressors, even though he knew that the Security Council and the General Assembly had, by decisive votes, refused so to describe any State. In view of the charges and insinuations that had been made against the United States Government, which he categorically rejected, he was compelled to put on record its position on the Middle East.

98. In keeping with its position in the United Nations political organs, and despite the clear rejection of that

position, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics had consistently tried to persuade the Council to take action on the assumption that there had been aggression by Israel, despite the plain truth that, in the light of the events both recent and remote which had led to the fighting, it would not be equitable or constructive to issue a one-sided condemnation. The core of the USSR approach to the serious situation in the Middle East was to put everything back as before. As his country's permanent representative to the United Nations had said, the USSR was attempting to run the film back through the projector to that point in the early morning of 5 June 1967, when hostilities had not yet broken out. Such an approach would be a prescription for renewed hostilities. Nothing would be done to resolve the deep-laying grievances on both sides that had fed the fires of war in the Middle East for twenty years. Once again, there would be no bar to an arms race.

99. His own country believed that a new start must be made in the area; there must be a stable, fair and enduring peace. On 19 June 1967, President Johnson had enunciated five principles which offered a sound basis for such a new start. They were: justice for the Arab refugees, limitations on the wasteful and destructive arms race, political independence and territorial integrity for every State, the recognized right of every nation to live and to have that right respected by its neighbours, and the right of innocent maritime passage. That was a prescription for peace which would usher in a new era of economic and social progress in the Middle East.

100. He had departed from his usual practice of making procedural statements in order that the record might give a balanced picture, in view of the continuous innuendoes which he had so far ignored.

101. The Secretary-General's note set forth the procedures, principles, and arrangements which had been approved by the Council in past years for the preparation of its report to the General Assembly. That was a useful framework and should be adopted for the preparation of the current report. The representative of the USSR had stated that he wanted the debates on the Middle East included in the report. His own delegation would not object to the inclusion of a brief factual reference to the decision taken by the Council on the question of the inscription of the Soviet item or on the USSR's abortive move to have the Council adopt a resolution springing from that item. He was confident that the President, Vice-Presidents and Secretariat would prepare a suitably balanced report.

102. The representative of the USSR had made a false statement on Viet-Nam. The Council was not the competent forum to consider the urgent issue of peace in that country. There were competent forums both within and outside the United Nations. The correct United Nations forum was the Security Council; and the subject was, in fact, on the agenda of that organ and could be considered there, if the USSR withdrew its objection and implied threat of a veto. His own country would continue its search for peace in Viet-Nam, which could be reunified if free and unfettered elections were held in both parts of the country. The United States would accept the result

of such a free election. The current hostilities were due to aggression by North Viet-Nam. South Viet-Nam was currently exercising its right of self-determination.

103. He was sorry that extraneous issues of that kind had been brought up in the Council, which was not a political body; and he hoped it would now be possible to return to the procedural question under discussion.

104. Mr. ATTIGA (Libya) said that since the Arab-Israel conflict had been brought up again he could not, as representative of an Arab country, leave it to the two great Powers. As he understood it, the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics had made the perfectly reasonable request that the Council's report to the General Assembly should honestly reflect the views that had been expressed on that subject. There was no question of being one-sided; views had been expressed in favour and against. Not less than eight representatives had spoken in favour of the USSR proposal for the inclusion of an additional item on the Council's agenda; less than eight representatives had said that the Council was not competent in the matter. He could see no objection to the request that the report should give a true reflection of the discussions. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics had not said that the Council had declared itself against the military aggression of Israel against the Arab States, but that a number of representatives had done so.

105. The representative of the United States of America had said that neither the Security Council nor the General Assembly had pronounced on the subject of aggression. That was perfectly true, but did not mean that Israel was not the aggressor. Neither of those bodies was a court of justice, and neither of them had defined aggression. If, however, the question had been before a court of justice, he had no doubt that a verdict of flagrant and premeditated aggression would have been found. Unfortunately, Israel had been able to solicit the support of some important countries and to delude a large part of world opinion. He felt sure, however, that all fair-minded and unprejudiced people would agree that the recent actions by Israel constituted aggression.

106. The representative of the United States of America had just stated that his Government desired peace in the Middle East. Such a statement was very perplexing to the Arabs. In 1914, President Wilson had opposed the political manoeuvres then going on in Palestine. That position was in accord with the fourteen points which he had subsequently laid down. It was all the more distressing to find that, in 1967, the United States of America was supporting aggression in the Middle East. Israel was encouraged and supported by the resources of the United States and other countries. They were the very countries which said they wanted peace and justice and which claimed to stand for the territorial integrity of all Member States. They had mobilized opposition to the withdrawal of Israel from the territories it had conquered. The United States had abstained on the resolution forbidding the unilateral annexation by Israel of Jerusalem, a part of Jordan. The Council's report should fairly reflect all the points of view that had been expressed.

107. Mr. POZHARSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said the representative of the United States of America had challenged his views on the composition of the Council's report. In that connexion, he pointed out that paragraph 1(d) of the Secretary-General's note stated that the report "should include such essential information regarding the more important resolutions and actions of the Council and its subsidiary bodies as to make the report by itself a reasonably comprehensive document for the purposes of the General Assembly, and a useful source of information for the general public". It was on that basis that he had suggested that the report should reflect the course of the discussion on some of the more important points raised. The economic and social consequences of Israel aggression was such a point, as was the aggressive war waged by the United States of America against the Viet-Name people. The views of representatives concerning the question of holding a seminar in Greece was another. He could not agree that those subjects fell outside the scope of the report.

108. In the opinion of his country, Israel had carried out flagrant and unprovoked aggression against the Arab States with the criminal collusion of United States imperialism, which could not be separated from the imperialist aggression by the same country in Viet-Nam. In the latter case, there was naked use of force while, in the former, the United States had preferred to remain on the sidelines. It was, nevertheless, a fact that the action by Israel had been applauded in the United States Congress.

109. Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT (United States of America), speaking on a point of order, said that nothing in his own statement had justified such an abusive reply by the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The questions he was raising were entirely outside the competence of the Economic and Social Council. His delegation had agreed that a balanced reference to the discussions should be made. In view of the late hour, he hoped that would be the end of the matter.

110. The PRESIDENT said that the item currently before the Council was a procedural one, but representatives might reasonably comment on the contents of the report. There had been frank discussion throughout the Council's debates which, he hoped, would continue to the end. Nevertheless, care should be taken not to exceed the scope of the agenda item.

111. Mr. POZHARSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said the statement he had just made was a direct answer to the accusations levelled at his country by the representative of the United States of America. The day after the Middle East aggression had begun, a number of members of the United States Congress had said that they supported Israel.

112. His own country had no military bases or oil concessions in the Middle East; its only interest was in a lasting peace in the area. It was extending fraternal assistance to the Arabs in their just struggle. It was the duty of the United Nations to bring the aggressor State and its supporters to their senses.

113. Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT (United States of America), said that his Government had been accused of collusion with Israel. There was no shred of truth in that allegation. No member of the United States Armed Forces and no servant of the United States Government had intervened in the Middle East conflict.

114. Mr. MA'A BITOMO (Cameroon) said his delegation would like the report to stress the external financing of economic development of the developing countries (agenda item 5). The resolution that the Council had adopted (resolution 1272 (XLIII)) was a diplomatic one constituting a compromise between various viewpoints and so phrased as to produce the maximum consensus possible. Many true things had been said in the Economic Committee, which he hoped would be properly covered in the report. The General Assembly should carry out political discussions on the subject at the highest level.

115. Mr. ATTIGA (Libya) said he agreed with the representative of Cameroon. Many representatives had stressed the need to pay attention to the outflow of capital from the developing countries to the developed ones.

116. In view of the late hour, he moved that, under rule 53 of the Council's rules of procedure, the debate on item 23 should be closed and a decision taken.

117. The PRESIDENT said that the observer for Israel had asked for the floor.

118. Mr. ATTIGA (Libya) said he understood that a motion under rule 53 had priority. The observer for Israel had already taken up more than enough of the Council's time, the more so as that country's point of view was well supported by several members of the Council.

119. Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT (United States of America) said he objected to the motion on the grounds of manifest unfairness. The Council should listen to both sides of the question.

120. Mr. MA'A BITOMO (Cameroon) said he deeply regretted that the question of the Israel-Arab conflict had come up once again. In every case, the discussion had degenerated into an exchange of insults. Clearly no solution could be found and there was no point in continuing to discuss the subject.

121. He would like, incidentally, to draw attention to an article in the 4 August 1967 issue of *Le Monde*, about which he wished to protest very strongly. The article stated that, as the African delegations had refused to support the USSR proposal to include in the Council's agenda a draft resolution blaming Israel for the economic consequences of the war in the Middle East, the Council had decided, on the proposal of India, to postpone the vote on that item. That was a distortion of truth, which he requested the United Nations Office of Public Information to rectify, so that the true spirit of the debate could be faithfully reflected. He did not think that if the African delegations had supported the USSR proposal, the supplementary item would have been placed on the

Council's agenda. In any event, the article in question gave an erroneous impression of the position of the African delegations, which were strongly in favour of a withdrawal of Israel troops from the territory they had occupied. He asked the United Nations Office of Public Information to publish a correction of the article.

122. The PRESIDENT said that he would ask the Secretary of the Council to convey the Cameroonian representative's request to the Information Service of the United Nations Office at Geneva.

123. Mr. GELBER (Canada) said that the United Nations stood for fair play for all States. He hoped the Israel representative's right to speak would be recognized.

The Libyan motion for the closure of the debate was carried by 11 votes to 5, with 9 abstentions.

124. The PRESIDENT said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Council wished its report to the General Assembly to be prepared according to the procedure indicated in the note by the Secretary-General (E/L.1166).

It was so decided.

125. The PRESIDENT said that he himself and the Vice-Presidents would try to follow faithfully the guidelines given in the Secretary-General's note.

The meeting was suspended at 8.30 p.m. and resumed at 8.45 p.m.

Adjournment of the session

126. The PRESIDENT, reviewing the work of the Council during the previous year, said that one of the greater merits of the Economic and Social Council was that it provided an opportunity each year to evaluate the economic situation of the world and the various currents of opinion on questions vital to the future of mankind. The view had been expressed that the growing disparity between the economically advanced and the developing countries presented a problem of primary importance. At the same time, the world was divided politically, and the division was keenly felt by all. Those two main aspects of the current situation had to be considered in all their interrelationships if the peace of the world was to be put on a firmer and more lasting foundation.

127. The current situation had been characterized as a "development crisis", yet neither the advanced nor the developing countries were giving development the priority it deserved. There was no longer any doubt that responsibility for the development of the developing countries lay primarily with those countries themselves. As their representatives had said in the Council's deliberations, they must endeavour, through planning, to bring about the rational mobilization of their domestic resources, both human and natural, the reform of institutions, the establishment of modern administrative structures, a complete transformation of traditional societies and the

removal of the remnants of colonialism. But the success of the developing countries' efforts also depended to a large extent on a sufficient flow of aid on acceptable terms from the developed sector of the world economy. It was discouraging to find that the modest objectives set for the Development Decade had little chance of being attained by 1970, and that in 1966 the rich countries as a whole had devoted a smaller percentage of their gross national product to development aid than in 1960. Hopes had been placed on flows of private capital to the developing countries, and it was recognized that efforts could and must be made to increase the amount of such capital and to improve its absorption into the receiving economies. The intellectual and institutional resources for the necessary remedial action were available. The United Nations family had been enriched by new organizations competent in matters of trade and industry, so that all major aspects of development were now covered by specialized organs to which the developing countries could turn according to their own national priorities. Those priorities could not be established without planning. A balance had to be struck in every country between agriculture and industry, without losing sight of the duties which the population explosion imposed on most of the developing countries. Whatever the prospects for a new multilateral food-aid programme might be, it rested with the food-deficit countries to impart new impetus to their agricultural programmes and give special attention to industries that could provide agriculture with the inputs it needed. Programmes designed to increase supplies offered one approach to the demographic problem. The other logical approach was a family-planning policy, and most members of the Council had responded favourably to the Secretary-General's proposals relating to the establishment of a trust fund which would enable the United Nations to take more effective action in that regard. The Council had also recognized the importance of mobilizing human resources. Thus, by focusing attention on the role of planning as a means of development, by stressing the urgent need for population plans, by drawing attention to food problems and by emphasizing the human element, the Council seemed to have taken a global view of development which would undoubtedly have an important bearing on future development programmes.

128. No effort to develop economic co-operation among nations could find its full expression and success in conditions of international political crisis, tension and war. In the course of the general debate, the Council's attention had been drawn to the recent political developments in the world, particularly in the Middle East, and to their effects upon the economies of States. Not surprisingly, the Council had been unable to reach agreement on the issues involved, but the discussion had stressed the fact that international peace was the basic prerequisite of economic and social development.

129. The Council's decision to concentrate at the summer session on a number of economic aspects of far-reaching importance had given an extremely valuable unity and cohesion to the Council's work, which had been centred on economic development. The deliberations had revealed a widespread conviction that planning was an important

means of organizing activities in a rational and systematic manner for the promotion of economic development. The Council had, however, emphasized that it was for each country to devise a planning system that would suit its economic and social structure and enable it to fulfil its aspirations for future progress. The thorough and searching examination, carried out by the recently established Committee for Development Planning, of experience and problems in carrying out development plans, particularly in Latin America, and the judicious recommendations concerning the importance of planning and plan implementation which the Committee had propounded in the report on its second session (E/4362 and Corr.1) unmistakably indicated that the Council's hopes in that body were well placed. In the final analysis, however, the success of development planning would inevitably depend upon the zeal with which efforts were made in individual countries to implement their national plans.

130. The Committee for Development Planning had also, at the Council's request, assumed responsibility for work designed to facilitate planning for concerted international action during the period following the current Development Decade. A great deal of work remained to be done, however, before any concrete action in that respect could be recommended.

131. The question of the external financing of economic development had again occupied a central position in the discussions of the Economic Committee. The Council had taken a closer look at the various factors affecting the ability of the more developed countries to transfer resources to the less developed ones, and had devoted special attention to the effect of balance-of-payments difficulties in donor countries and to the constraint exercised in those countries at times of full employment and fiscal stringency by the budget and budgetary procedures. The question of drawing more funds from the capital market had also been examined.

132. In reviewing the report of the first session of the Industrial Development Board (E/4385 and Corr.1), the Council had observed that the complexity and diversity of policies and activities in the industrialization of developing countries would require the closest collaboration of all the United Nations bodies concerned. The Council had also given attention to natural resources and transport development. Those two interrelated fields of infrastructure development remained under the direct leadership of the Council at the global level.

133. The discussion on the world food problem had shown that there was general agreement that the chronic problem of malnutrition had been aggravated in recent years. It was also agreed that the problem was essentially one of economic development, which must be faced and ultimately solved by the developing countries concerned. Assistance from the international community was, however, required not only for the modernization of agriculture but for the storage and processing of commodities and their transport from the farm to the consumer. In that connexion, the Council had recognized the probable need to arrange for large-scale transfers of food in the years immediately ahead. That would have to be achieved through interim aid, and the arrangements would have

to be linked with a long-term programme aimed at improving the agriculture of the recipient countries, with minimum strain to their foreign exchange resources and with minimum disruption of regular international trade. The question of multilateral food aid seemed one for which the Economic and Social Council should, in view of its humanitarian as well as technological and economic functions, accept responsibility. The report on increasing the production and use of edible protein prepared by the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development (E/4343) was as opportune as it was valuable, and the Council's resolution on the subject (resolution 1257 (XLIII)) would ensure that the report and its recommendations received the most serious consideration by Governments and all concerned with the "protein gap". Apart from its intrinsic importance, the report illustrated the valuable role an independent body of experts, such as the Advisory Committee, could play in the Council's affairs, and was also a practical example of co-ordination and co-operation between some members of the United Nations family.

134. The demographic question, which was closely linked to the food question, was only one of the numerous social questions the complexity of which demonstrated the need for an integrated and comprehensive approach to the problems of development. It was thus particularly significant that the Council's decisions regarding social development were so closely related to its broad concerns in such areas as planning, policy formulation and technical co-operation. Work in social development itself had been considerably strengthened by the new mandate given to the Commission for Social Development, which had demonstrated its increased ability both to assist the Council in the formulation of broad social development policy and to contribute to a better integration of practical action in the various sectors of development. The constructive beginning of work on the drafting of a declaration on social development was also a matter for satisfaction.

135. Study of the problems posed by the implementation of development plans had brought into clearer focus the need for structural and institutional reform in some key sectors. Thus, the Council had examined the question of land reform and the problems confronting large cities in developed and developing countries alike. The question of the rural exodus would be studied within the context of the Council's programme of research and training on regional development within countries.

136. Efforts in human rights had been given new impetus by the designation of 1968 as the International Year for Human Rights and by the adoption by the General Assembly at its twenty-first session of the International Covenants on Human Rights. Among the texts transmitted by the Council to the General Assembly were the drafts of an international convention on the elimination of all forms of religious intolerance, a convention on the non-applicability of statutory limitation to war crimes and crimes against humanity, and a declaration on the elimination of discrimination against women. In the matter of violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms, including policies of racial discrimination and

apartheid in all countries, and particularly among colonial and other dependent countries and peoples, as well as in the related matter of slavery, the Council had called for intensification of the work of its functional commissions and of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities. It had also broadened the range of information on which the Commission on Human Rights and the Sub-Commission could draw before reaching their findings. The Council had further recommended that the General Assembly should condemn any ideology based on racial intolerance and terror, and that it should urge all eligible Governments to sign, ratify and implement the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and all other conventions directed against discrimination in employment and education. The *Ad Hoc* Working Group established by the Commission on Human Rights to investigate charges of ill-treatment of prisoners in the Republic of South Africa had been instructed to enquire also into allegations of infringements of trade union rights in that country.

137. In considering fundamental economic and social issues, the Council had continued to depend heavily not only on the United Nations Headquarters Secretariat but also on the specialized agencies, the various United Nations programmes, the regional economic commissions and the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination. The free exchange of views between, on the one hand, the agencies and programmes and, on the other, the members of the Co-ordination Committee had contributed to the success of that Committee in dealing with its very heavy agenda, which reflected the increasing importance and complexity of the problems of co-ordination due to the rapid increase in international activities and in the number of autonomous international organizations. In that connexion, the appointment of a full-time Under-Secretary for Inter-Agency Affairs had made it possible for relations between the United Nations and the other organizations of the United Nations family to be given more continuous and through attention. One of the major achievements of the Co-ordination Committee during the current session had been the reconciliation of differences concerning the joint inspection unit proposed by the *Ad Hoc* Committee of Experts to Examine the Finances of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies. The Council had not, however, lost sight of the *Ad Hoc* Committee's recommendations in other areas of particular concern; by its resolution 1264 (XLIII) it had requested its subsidiary bodies to consider matters relating to the implementation of those recommendations and to include in their reports a statement of the action taken. It was to be hoped that the resolution the Council had adopted on the subject of the work programme and co-operation with the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (resolution 1275 (XLIII)) would facilitate progress towards an integrated budget programme.

138. The achievements of the past year were noteworthy; but the Council was still far from measuring up to the problem that had to be faced. An enormous task lay ahead in the struggle for development and peace. It was to be hoped that in the coming years the peoples of the earth would realize more clearly the need for a collective

commitment to international co-operation for development.

139. In conclusion, he thanked the members of the Council for their loyal co-operation and the Vice-Presidents for the part they had played in guiding the work of the Council and its Committees. He also thanked the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee on Programme and Co-ordination for the assistance they had afforded the Council, and the Under-Secretaries, the Secretary of the Council and the whole Secretariat for their invaluable assistance.

140. Mr. ATTIGA (Libya) congratulated the President on his comprehensive statement and on the zeal, energy, impartiality and tact with which he had conducted the Council's debates. Libya, which was a new member of the Council, hoped both to contribute to the Council's work and to benefit from the ideas and experience of other members. Despite all setbacks, Libya still had high hopes in the United Nations, and especially in the Economic and Social Council. He associated his delegation with the thanks the President had addressed to the Vice-Presidents and the Secretariat. His delegation hoped

that the United Nations would eventually become a place where man worked for man without any feelings of parochial, racial or religious prejudice.

141. Mr. FIGUEREDO PLANCHART (Venezuela), speaking on behalf of the Latin American countries, Mr. GREGH (France), speaking on behalf of the Belgian, Canadian, French, Swedish, United Kingdom and United States delegations, Mr. ZAKHAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking on behalf of the socialist countries, Mr. AL-SABAH (Kuwait) speaking on behalf of the Asian countries and Mr. HARKETT (Morocco), speaking on behalf of the African countries, congratulated the President on his conduct of the Council's proceedings. They also thanked the Vice-Presidents and all members of the Secretariat who had assisted the Council in its work.

142. The PRESIDENT declared the forty-third session of the Economic and Social Council adjourned.

The meeting rose at 10 p.m.