



## ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

FORTY-SEVENTH SESSION

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Thursday, 31 July 1969

at 10.10 a.m.

PALAIS DES NATIONS, GENEVA

## CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 16: International Education Year Report of the Economic Committee .....	147
Agenda item 4: Economic planning and projections Report of the Economic Committee .....	147
Agenda item 8: Reports of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme: (c) Technical co-operation activities undertaken by the Secretary-General ( <i>continued</i> ) .....	147
Agenda item 7: Regional co-operation: (a) Reports of the regional economic commissions and of the United Nations Economic and Social Office in Beirut (b) Report on the meetings of the executive secretaries ( <i>resumed from the 1621st meeting</i> ) .....	148

*President:* Mr. SCHEYVEN (Belgium).

## AGENDA ITEM 16

## International Education Year

## REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC COMMITTEE (E/4729)

1. Mrs. MIRONOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested separate votes on paragraphs 3 and 4 of the draft resolution submitted by the Economic Committee in its report (E/4729). As her delegation had explained in the Economic Committee, it favoured the underlying purpose of the draft resolution but considered those paragraphs unnecessary.

2. The PRESIDENT put paragraphs 3 and 4 to the vote.

*Paragraph 3 was approved by 22 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

*Paragraph 4 was approved by 22 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

3. Mrs. MIRONOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), explaining her vote, said that the draft resolution was extremely important and that, as a matter of principle, there should be no restriction on any States desiring to participate in the International Education Year. That principle was recognized in the preamble, but was limited in the operative part to "Member States".

4. The PRESIDENT put the draft resolution as a whole to the vote.

*The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.*

## AGENDA ITEM 4

## Economic planning and projections

## REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC COMMITTEE (E/4730)

5. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) said that, in the Economic Committee, his delegation had expressed certain reservations concerning the reports of the Committee on Development Planning on its fourth and fifth sessions (E/4682). The last sentence of the text which the Economic Committee had recommended (E/4730) to the Council for insertion in its report to the General Assembly did not reflect those reservations.

6. Mr. KODACHENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that the words "and taking into account the opinions expressed during the course of the present discussions" should be added to the text recommended by the Economic Committee.

7. The PRESIDENT suggested that the reservations expressed by the representatives of the United Kingdom and the USSR might be met by including a reference to them in the summary record.

8. Mr. KODACHENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) and Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) agreed to that suggestion.

9. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objection, he would take it that the text recommended by the Economic Committee in paragraph 3 of document E/4730 should be inserted in the Council's report to the General Assembly.

*It was so decided.*

## AGENDA ITEM 8

## Reports of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme:

(c) Technical co-operation activities undertaken by the Secretary-General (E/4663; E/L.1269/Rev.1, E/L.1270) (*continued*)

10. Mr. KHANACHET (Kuwait) was happy to say that the informal negotiations held since the item had been

previously dealt with had culminated in an agreement. Consequently, the original draft resolution on the international corps of volunteers co-sponsored by his delegation (E/L.1269) had been withdrawn and replaced by a new agreed draft resolution (E/L.1269/Rev.1). He hoped that the text in its new form would receive wide support.

11. Mr. HUDA (Pakistan) said that various delegations, including his own, were awaiting instructions from their Governments concerning the position they should adopt on the draft resolution. Since it appeared possible that, in due course, the draft could be adopted unanimously, he suggested that the vote should be postponed until later in the day.

12. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that, as a result of informal talks held between his delegation and others, he would withdraw his amendments (E/L.1270) to the original eight-Power draft resolution (E/L.1269). His delegation was strongly in favour of the underlying idea of the draft resolution and had always supported it. The amendments it had submitted were based on the desire to ensure that the efforts made by various countries at the national level to establish a volunteer corps should be taken into account in connexion with the proposed international corps. The type of resolution his delegation wanted was one which would enable international organizations to make use of volunteers already recruited by Governments.

13. Although, in a spirit of compromise, his delegation had accepted the revised draft resolution, it regretted that the principle he had enunciated, which was fully recognized in the preamble, was not fully expressed in the operative part. He hoped that the Secretary-General would not feel limited in any way by the more restrictive language of the operative paragraphs but would establish a link between the international corps of volunteers and the various national volunteer corps. If his views were reflected in the summary record, the Secretariat would be able to take them into account.

14. Mr. MOPOLLO-DADET (Congo, Brazzaville) said that, like the representative of Pakistan, he was awaiting clarification and instructions from his Government. He therefore hoped that the vote on the draft resolution could be postponed until the next meeting.

15. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objections, the vote would be postponed until the following meeting.

*It was so decided.*

#### AGENDA ITEM 7

##### Regional co-operation:

##### (a) Reports of the regional economic commissions and of the United Nations Economic and Social Office in Beirut (E/4639 and Add.1, E/4640, E/4641, E/4651 and Add.1, E/4726; E/L.1264/Rev.2, E/L.1271, E/L.1272)

##### (b) Report on the meetings of the executive secretaries (E/4709) (resumed from the 1621st meeting)

16. The PRESIDENT said that the draft resolutions in part IV of the reports of ECE (E/4641), ECAFE (E/4640), ECLA (E/4639) and ECA (E/4651) were before the Council. Amendments to the last-mentioned draft resolution had also been submitted by France (E/L.1271).

17. In the case of the draft resolution submitted by ECLA, the Council would recall that the executive secretary of that commission had stated that ECLA's terms of reference should be amended. If the draft resolution concerning ECLA's annual report were adopted, he would assume that the Council also approved the amendments proposed by the Executive Secretary.

18. In addition to those four draft resolutions, the Council also had to act on the draft resolution on the role of the regional economic commissions and UNESOB in the Second United Nations Development Decade (E/L.1264/Rev.2). He suggested that the various draft resolutions should be considered in the order in which he had enumerated them.

19. Mr. DANIELI (United Republic of Tanzania) proposed that revised draft resolution E/L.1264/Rev.2 should be considered before the others. The Council had been unable to discuss the reports of the regional economic commissions and of UNESOB the previous week because no agreement had been reached on the draft resolution in question.

20. He informed the Council that Yugoslavia had become a sponsor of the revised draft resolution, which attempted to take account of the views expressed by various delegations at the 1621st meeting, with particular reference to those of the French delegation.

21. In the last operative paragraph, the reference to sub-regional offices had been dropped since the sponsors had been informed that, apart from ECA, none of the regional economic commissions had sub-regional offices.

22. Mr. de SEYNES (Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs) said that ECLA also had some sub-regional offices.

23. Mr. OLDS (United States of America) did not think that the order in which the various draft resolutions were taken up was very important. However, the revised draft resolution had originally been predicated on the report of ECA. It would therefore appear more appropriate to deal with the reports of the other regional economic commissions first, then with the ECLA report and lastly with the revised draft resolution.

24. Mr. DANIELI (United Republic of Tanzania) said that the revised draft resolution concerned all the regional economic commissions and not ECA alone.

25. Mr. ROUAMBA (Upper Volta) supported the Tanzanian representative's proposal that the revised draft resolution should be taken up first. Apart from the reasons already adduced for that procedure, he pointed out that, if the draft resolutions were adopted in the order suggested by the President, it would imply that they were being taken up in increasing order of difficulty. There was no doubt that the revised draft resolution was the most controversial of the draft resolutions in question.

26. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objections, he would take it that the Council agreed to deal immediately with the revised draft resolution (E/L.1264/Rev.2) and the relevant amendments (E/L.1272).

*It was so decided.*

27. Mr. SHAHEED (International Labour Organisation) described the ILO's collaboration with the regional economic commission and UNESOB and welcomed the emphasis placed in the draft resolution on the importance of consultation within the United Nations system. Any unilateral change in the process of consultation would disrupt the pattern of collaboration and detract from the effectiveness of international efforts. Since the effectiveness of the regional economic commissions was due largely to their dependence on the strength of the international community as a whole, maximum use of existing resources was of paramount importance. At all levels, including the regional level, the ILO adopted an integrated approach so that its activities were mutually supporting. Its collaboration with the regional economic commissions enabled it to benefit from their regional knowledge and expertise. It also maintained close working relationships with other regional organizations such as OAU, OAS, the League of Arab States, the Council of Europe, CMEA, the Colombo Plan and the South Pacific Commission. Its policy of decentralization and its new field structure were in fact designed to permit day-to-day collaboration with the regional economic commissions.

28. The ILO's African network included the regional office in Addis Ababa, area offices in Cairo, Lagos, Algiers, Dakar, Dar es Salaam, Lusaka and Yaoundé and a country representative in Kinshasa. The process of decentralization was continuing. In 1968, 40 per cent of all the ILO's technical co-operation activities had been in Africa, compared with 14 per cent in 1960. The number of ILO expert missions in Africa had increased from 94 in 1961 to 452 in 1968. 44 of the 106 countries receiving technical assistance through the ILO were in the African region. He gave some details of ILO-executed projects in Africa. Co-operation between the ILO and ECA had been substantially intensified since the second ILO African Regional Conference in 1964. The ILO contributed to the work of the African Institute for Economic Development and Planning, had organized two seminars on labour statistics jointly with ECA, and had collaborated with the ECA Working Group on Manpower and Training. The informal meetings of the heads of the regional offices of United Nations agencies in

Africa, under the chairmanship of the executive secretary of ECA, had further improved co-ordination. The third ILO African Regional Conference, to be held in December 1969, would consider the ILO's technical co-operation programme in Africa, labour administration and employment policy. It was expected that the African countries would outline their activities under the World Employment Programme and indicate what assistance the ILO could provide. ILO regional teams would help countries to formulate programmes for raising the levels of employment and training in the years ahead.

29. Mr. CRANE (United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization) said that FAO was particularly concerned that agricultural development should play its due role in harmonious economic and social development and that it provided technical assistance for that purpose not only during the preparatory stages but also during the execution of programmes and projects. Under arrangements which had proved satisfactory to all concerned, FAO had collaborated closely with the regional economic commissions in the initial conception and preparation of development programmes and projects for which it had a recognized responsibility. It felt, however, that the execution of programmes and projects or sectors of projects within its field of competence should remain its responsibility. Experience had shown that the continuing support of the competent specialized agencies was indispensable during the whole period of programme or project execution; that decisive phase required technical competence and imposed a responsibility which could not be delegated or shared without grave risk. FAO's governing body had discussed the problem on several occasions and wished to be informed in advance of any proposed changes in present practice.

30. Mr. KINGUE (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) reaffirmed UNESCO's willingness to intensify its already valuable co-operation with the regional economic commissions. UNESCO believed that the action it was already taking, which would enable it to establish the joint work programmes mentioned in the seventh preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, should not be a one-way process: the specialized agencies should not be asked to establish programmes on which they had not been consulted. He therefore suggested that the words "formulation and" should be inserted before the word "implementation" in that paragraph. He also suggested that the words "of the United Nations" should be inserted after the word "activities" in operative paragraph 1. That wording was already used in the third preambular paragraph. He did not quite understand what was meant by the last part of operative paragraph 1, or how the technical assistance and development projects were to be co-ordinated.

31. The PRESIDENT said that only members of the Council could propose amendments to draft resolutions and that the changes suggested by UNESCO could therefore be considered only if proposed by a member.

32. Mr. VIAUD (France), introducing the amendments proposed by his delegation (E/L.1272), said that the second

revision of the draft resolution made the first and third French amendments unnecessary and that he would withdraw them. Although he agreed with the idea expressed in operative paragraph 4, he believed that its purpose would be achieved faster if the recommendation was addressed to UNDP, which had the necessary resources and provided experts. If the sponsors agreed to insert the words "by UNDP" after the word "available" in operative paragraph 4 he would withdraw his fourth amendment. It would be more expeditious for ECA countries to submit proposals for the projects they wished to have implemented direct to UNDP for approval by its Governing Council than to make a vague recommendation through the Economic and Social Council and subsequently the General Assembly.

33. In its present form, the recommendation that expertise and resources should be made available to ECA would exclude assistance from UNDP, which financed technical assistance for countries only. The assistance recommended could then be financed only by a budget appropriation for ECA itself. That would be inconsistent with the present distribution of functions and responsibilities among United Nations bodies. If operative paragraph 4 was amended as he suggested, the Council would in effect be requesting UNDP to take a specific course of action. The request of the ECA countries would then receive early consideration.

34. He had no objection to the first part of operative paragraph 1. Since he accepted the principle that there should be more substantial and effective decentralization of operational activities in accordance with the resolutions of the Council and the General Assembly, he also accepted the administrative and financial implications of such decentralization. However, if it tried to specify what those implications would be, the Council would encroach on the prerogatives of the General Assembly, which alone was competent to assess the administrative and budgetary implications of decisions taken by United Nations bodies. He therefore suggested the deletion of the second part of the paragraph, starting with the words "and that adequate staff".

35. Mr. STUGU (Norway) was in favour of the ideas expressed in the draft resolution but thought that the proposed amendments had considerable merit. He agreed that the second part of operative paragraph 1 should be deleted, as it was unnecessary or at least premature to refer to the financial and other implications of the proposed action. He would be prepared to accept operative paragraph 4 if it was reworded to read:

*"Recommends further that favourable consideration should be given to requests for the necessary expertise and other adequate resources to be made available to ECA with a view to strengthening its sub-regional offices"*.

36. Mr. ROUAMBA (Upper Volta) agreed that, if the second part of operative paragraph 1 was deleted as suggested by the French representative, the financial and other implications of the proposed decentralization would no doubt be properly assessed and favourable consideration

might be given to providing the necessary means. Authorization of the necessary assistance would presumably be supported by delegations which accepted the principle expressed in the first part of the paragraph. However, the sponsors felt that the draft resolution should give some indication of the resources that might be needed to carry out decentralization. Such a reference was in conformity with the purpose of the draft resolution. The amendments to operative paragraph 4 proposed by France and Norway could raise constitutional difficulties, since UNDP could make expert services and other resources available to the regional economic commissions only on the basis of requests from the States members of those commissions. Moreover, UNDP was not the only possible source of the assistance which would be needed. The sponsors therefore preferred to avoid restricting the recommendation to UNDP and to use a wording which left open the possibility of recourse to other sources of assistance.

37. Mr. AITKEN (Jamaica) said that his delegation had doubts about the implications of operative paragraph 1, since it had not been aware that the expansion and co-ordination of technical assistance and development projects was to be a major function of the regional economic commissions. If those commissions were to be given additional resources, the purposes for which the resources were to be used would have to be clearly specified. If there was doubt on that point, his delegation would find it difficult to accept the second part of operative paragraph 1.

38. Mr. AHMED (Sudan) said that, if the French amendment to operative paragraph 1 were adopted, the paragraph might be taken as a criticism of the Secretary General for not taking more effective measures. If the Secretary-General was to carry out more substantial and effective decentralization, he must be given the means to do so; although the Council was obviously not in a position to allocate funds, it could not consider the recommendations of the paragraph in isolation from their possible cost.

39. Mr. KHANACHET (Kuwait) pointed out that operative paragraph 1 did not constitute a decision by the Council, but merely a recommendation that the appropriate budgetary organs should give the matter their attention.

40. It would be unwise to restrict operative paragraph 4 to UNDP, since there were many other organs competent to provide the necessary expertise and resources.

41. Mr. OLDS (United States of America) said that his Government, while strongly in favour of decentralization, was also aware of the need to consolidate and simplify central policy-making. Although it was not the usual policy within the United Nations system to reduce the level of activity in one area in order to strengthen another, he hoped that operative paragraph 1 would take the recommendations of document E/4726 into account, so that its implementation would not impose further financial strain on the system but would lead instead to the reallocation and redistribution of funds already available. In

that context the phrase "without prejudice to any similar activity undertaken by them" was perplexing, since it suggested expansion and co-ordination without regard to any other parallel programmes—a situation which would lead to duplication.

42. With regard to operative paragraph 4, he appreciated the point that its scope should remain as broad as possible. It might be possible to amend the wording so as to incorporate the reference to UNDP in the French amendment without thereby restricting the scope of the recommendation.

43. Mr. VIAUD (France) said he would welcome information on the financial implications of the revised draft resolution.

44. Mr. de SEYNES (Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs), replying to the representative of Jamaica, said that the interpretation which the executive secretaries of the regional economic commissions would place on operative paragraph 1 would be not that the commissions should in any way undertake the functions of recipient Governments, but that they should assist them in the selection and rationalization of programmes. Any other interpretation would constitute a total departure from normal procedures.

45. It should not be forgotten that UNDP was not the only United Nations organ engaged in technical assistance. The United Nations itself had regional advisers, recruited on a permanent basis to provide general advisory services in such fields as economic and social planning, industrial programming, trade and development and public administration. Those items were at present financed under part V of the regular budget, within which some additional resources might be found. However, those resources were not unlimited, since the level of contributions to the regular technical assistance programme had remained constant for a number of years, although the purchasing power of the actual funds had decreased.

46. With regard to the precise financial implications of the draft resolution, it must not be forgotten that there was always an element of uncertainty about such estimates. While it was impossible to predict what the General Assembly's attitude to the recommendations would be, he believed that the Council should indicate as clearly as possible the sources from which it expected their implementation to be financed. It would be necessary to hold consultations with UNDP on the contribution it could be expected to make, and subsequently to negotiate with the services of the administration for the submission of a request for additional credits. The cost of the additional staff would appear, as did all staff costs, in section III of the budget, which was generally adopted as a whole.

47. Mr. SINGH (India) said that the reference to UNDP in the French amendment to operative paragraph 4 raised a question of principle. It was not the responsibility of UNDP to finance offices of the Secretariat or its subsidiary organs; so to involve it would blur the distinction between operational activities and the regular functioning of offices and bypass the procedure for the submission of requests by Governments for UNDP projects. His delegation believed that expenses of the type referred to should be met from the United Nations budget; for example, as the Under-Secretary-General had suggested, through the regular programme of technical assistance.

48. He wished to allay the fears of the United States representative regarding the last phrase of operative paragraph 1; its purpose was clearly to ensure that the regional economic commissions would co-ordinate their activities with those of the specialized agencies, avoiding rather than creating duplication.

49. Mr. RODRÍGUES LARRETA (Uruguay), supported by Mr. GALLARDO MORENA (Mexico) and Mr. AITKEN (Jamaica), said that certain aspects of the draft resolution were somewhat confusing. According to its title, it dealt with the role of the regional economic commissions and UNESOB in the Second Development Decade, but the final preambular paragraph referred to the resolutions of one regional economic commission and operative paragraph 4 referred to the strengthening of the same commission, which might create the impression that the other commissions did not require the same support. It might therefore be preferable to have two separate draft resolutions.

50. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) supported the French amendment to operative paragraph 1. To go into greater detail on the means of achieving decentralization would be to prejudge the forthcoming recommendations of the UNDP Capacity Study and the report of the Commission on International Development established by IBRD (Pearson Commission).

51. Neither the original text of operative paragraph 4 nor the French amendment was entirely acceptable. Both singled out one regional economic commission for specific mention, and while the first would have implications for part V of the budget, the French amendment would mean involving UNDP in a new type of activity which should ideally be conducted for all the commissions rather than one.

52. Mr. NESTERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) supported the French amendment to operative paragraph 4 and suggested the replacement of the words "member States of the various African sub-regions" by "member States of the Economic Commission for Africa".

The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.