

7. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council), referring to the programme of work for the second week of the session, said that it would be preferable for the Economic Committee to consider population questions after item 7, rather than before it as proposed in document E/L.1755.

8. Mr. BENHOCINE (Algeria) noted that, according to the programme of work suggested in document E/L.1755, item 3 was to be considered in plenary meetings during the second week of the session, when the Social Committee would also be meeting to consider items 10 and 14. He therefore proposed that, in order to enable smaller delegations to participate fully in the deliberations of both the Social Committee and the Council, items 10 and 14 could be considered in either the first or third weeks of the session. Alternatively, the Social Committee could be asked to organize its work so that it would meet as infrequently as possible during the second week.

9. Mr. HERRERA VEGAS (Argentina) supported the proposal made by the representative of Algeria.

10. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) said that, because of the limited facilities available, the Social Committee and the Council would be unable to meet simultaneously. There was therefore no danger that meetings would overlap.

11. Mr. EHSASSI (Iran) said that, since a number of the documents relating to item 11 had been issued only very recently, that item should be considered after items 10 and 14 to allow delegations sufficient time to consider the documents in question.

12. The PRESIDENT said that the organization of the work of the two Committees would be discussed by the Committees themselves.

13. Mr. ALFONSO MARTINEZ (Cuba) said that his delegation would be represented in the discussion of item

11 by persons coming from Havana for that purpose. Consequently, while he did not oppose the suggestion made by the representative of Iran, he felt that each of the Committees should be allowed to determine its own time-table.

14. Mr. MARSHALL (United Kingdom) agreed with the views expressed by the representative of the Soviet Union with regard to the problem of documentation. He suggested that the Council could discuss the question when considering the provisional agenda for the sixty-third session.

15. Referring to the organization of work for the current session, he said that it might be best to adopt the programme as proposed in document E/L.1755. A number of Governments which intended to send experts to participate in the deliberations of the Council were working on the basis of that programme, so that any change might create problems. The Committees should be allowed to organize their own programme of work.

16. Mr. BRUCE (Canada) said that, if the Council was to discuss the question of documentation at the end of the current session, it might save time if the Secretariat could prepare a brief paper on the situation with regard to documentation.

17. The PRESIDENT said that the Bureau and the Secretariat would take care of the matter. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt the programme of work proposed in document E/L.1755, on the understanding that details of the programmes of work of the Economic and Social Committees should be left to the discretion of the Committees themselves.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 11.25 a.m.

2047th meeting

Tuesday, 19 April 1977, at 10.55 a.m.

President: Mr. Ladislav ŠMÍD (Czechoslovakia).

E/SR.2047

Statement by the representative of the United States of America

1. Mr. YOUNG (United States of America) emphasized the importance which his Government attached to the work of the Economic and Social Council and said that the most critical task confronting the Council was the advancement of the quality of life of humankind in all its aspects. If the Council was to be successful in its work, its members must establish a common agenda directed against the basic human misery which it was within its capacity to eliminate or alleviate; they must focus on the common enemies of humankind rather than on denunciation and polemics

against each other; they must concentrate their energy on problem-solving and not ideological arguments; and they must work towards building an effective consensus founded on those basic commitments already undertaken in the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other major international instruments.

2. Because of the concern of the Government and people of the United States with the problems dealt with by the Council, he felt compelled to warn against what he sensed was a certain impatience among the people of the United States with international development programmes or "foreign aid programmes". It was not that the people of the

United States, or of any other nation, were basically opposed to helping other peoples but that they had often been disappointed that their efforts had not resulted in any appreciable help for the poor of the world or in the liberation of the oppressed. No one could doubt, for example, the idealism or generosity of the people of the United States when in the 10 years between 1969 and 1978 the United States would have delivered more than \$10 billion worth of food. It was often asked, however, why the poor of a rich nation should be taxed in order to aid the rich of a poor nation. A significant part of the dissatisfaction of the people of the United States with the programmes of international development stemmed from the fact that efforts had been directed to giving military rather than economic and social aid and to bolstering repressive régimes. If the commitment of the people to economic and social programmes of development and to human rights programmes was to be maintained, leaders must be able to demonstrate that such programmes really worked and affected in a real and positive way the lives of the hungry, the poor, the oppressed, the tortured and the homeless.

3. In a spirit of searching for consensus in combating the enemies of all peoples, he wished to make some general comments and specific suggestions for the work of the current session.

4. Some truths could never be repeated too often, the most fundamental of which was that man was born to be free. Everything which the Economic and Social Council did should be devoted to the well-being of human beings, irrespective of race, religion, sex, age or economic condition. That truth was valid for all countries, whether or not they were Members of the United Nations, as it was an idea inherent in the human condition. It was in the nature of humankind to strive for dignity and justice, to hunger for freedom and to seek to live in community.

5. It was the duty of public officials, and especially of the governing élite of every nation, to do their utmost to realize those common goals of humankind. In that connexion, he quoted from a statement made by the new Prime Minister of India, Mr. Desai, at a meeting of non-aligned nations at New Delhi in which he had said that there had to be a moral and spiritual base for development along with its materialistic content and that freedom from want and freedom from fear had to be secured in order to make that base.

6. The words of the Indian statesman did not imply that all societies had to be perfect, since no system and no amount of money could create perfect justice. At the same time, however, there were some things which simply must never be accepted, such as the governing élites not doing their best to meet basic human needs and to prevent starvation and malnutrition, or their using the power of government to coerce their people, or their tolerating barbarous cruelties inflicted by lower-level officials.

7. The Western democracies had often been accused of giving the highest priority to political rights and of paying insufficient attention to economic and social rights. That was not so, and he drew attention in that connexion to a very important document in the history of his country, President Roosevelt's 1941 message to Congress, in which

the latter had described a world in which every inhabitant of every nation would enjoy freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom from fear and freedom from want. The current United States administration confirmed the country's commitment to those ideals, a commitment manifested over the past 30 years by its co-operation in a series of economic development programmes.

8. The inseparable nature of those human freedoms would always be borne in mind by policy-makers in the United States, and the very name of the Council clearly implied that it should do likewise.

9. Development could not be measured in terms of gross national product, and the lustre of material achievements was soon dulled if people feared political repression or not being able to feed themselves and their children.

10. The problems of hunger, torture and racism could be attacked in the Economic and Social Council with near-unanimity and high expectations of success.

11. With regard to the first-mentioned of those problems, he noted that 400 million people—15 per cent of the world's population—were starving and that many more received only minimal food requirements. That situation was not simply the legacy of international manipulations, as some would have it, but reflected mistaken perceptions of development and growth, particularly ignorance of the needs of rural populations. Millions of Americans had left the farms to seek their fortunes in cities, where many had failed to find what they had sought. If developing countries could learn from the mistakes of others, they could adapt productive systems to meet their own special conditions of climate, geography and human resources.

12. The international community could and should do much to help in that area. Countries with food surpluses could provide food aid. Through the International Fund for Agricultural Development, the United States and other countries with the financial means to do so would support efforts in the poorest countries to increase production. In addition, efforts should be made to attain the goal set at the seventh special session of the General Assembly to reduce by half the food now wasted because of poor storage. Furthermore, a system of nationally held grain reserves should be established in order to endure basic food security. It was also necessary to devise technologies and systems which took into account the relationship among food production, available resources and the environment. New systems were needed which did not rely heavily on expensive products and which were better able to deal with natural disasters. In that connexion, the creative initiative of France in establishing the Club des Amis du Sahel provided a good example.

13. Without freedom from want, words on economic development or on human rights would have little meaning to the great majority of the world's people. Similarly the problem of hunger could not be attacked without remembering justice as the goal of human society. Efforts at increasing food production would not be successful unless all nations faced up to the problems of poor distribution of land ownership and income. Without justice there could be no true stability, and there could be no true social stability

until everyone had enough to eat. Hunger continued to be a scourge in the modern world, and the growing gap between the affluent minority and the great majority of poor only highlighted the problem. While famine was a real possibility, small groups in almost every nation lived lives of luxury and waste. And if the hungry remained silent, they were not blind or deaf. Common humanity required the Economic and Social Council to find new and effective means to solve the problem.

14. He stressed that economic and social development could not be separated and expressed his Government's support for the recommendation of the Commission for Social Development (see E/5915, chap. I, draft resolution X) that the Secretary-General should be invited to appoint a working group to study ways of better integrating social development activities into the work of the Organization.

15. Referring to the problem of torture, he said that it was most deplorable that at the present time some of the gravest offences to the human person were still being committed. Not only was torture practised in its most horrible forms, but sick minds had utilized science and technology to invent unbelievably cruel and highly sophisticated methods. Torture was not used today primarily as a means of extracting information from hard-core opposition militants but rather as a means of intimidating masses of poor and oppressed people and preventing them from expressing their legitimate aspirations. That was why torture must be combated at the international level so that the poor and oppressed could find more spokesmen and thus be more fully represented in international forums.

16. He recognized that in his own country there still existed subtle but very strong systems of intimidation that inhibited the poor, the discriminated against and dissidents from speaking freely for the redress of injustices. Torture meant three things: physical torture, the problem of "missing persons" and the problem of political assassinations, for kidnapping and murder were intimidating practices which had arisen out of the recent protest movement against torture. "Torture" was a word that was repugnant to the ears, and reasons of politeness prevented discussion of the topic in society. It should be asked whether such politeness was not mere cowardice or an unwillingness to fulfil elementary duties as human beings.

17. After describing some of the methods of torture used in various parts of the world, he recalled that in recent years the General Assembly had taken a number of unanimous decisions reiterating its condemnation of torture and endorsing measures to combat it. At the thirtieth session, the Assembly had adopted, in its resolution 3452 (XXX), the Declaration on the Protection of All Persons from Being Subjected to Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, but in spite of those ringing pronouncements, adopted with unanimous support, torture continued.

18. He was convinced that, in many circumstances, cases of torture were the result of the actions of disturbed or misguided individuals, although, in a few extreme instances, the prevalence and persistence of torture suggested that it had been practised as a deliberate weapon of intimidation by Governments.

19. At all events, it was imperative to put an end to such practices and find means of making better use of the institutions in existence, because what had been done so far was obviously not enough, in spite of the unquestionable value of such instruments as the Declaration against torture and the Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners or the draft body of principles for the protection of all persons under any form of detention or imprisonment, which was currently before the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities; support for those legal instruments by all Governments could be extremely significant in strengthening the barrier against mistreatment of prisoners by lower-level officials.

20. Since the ultimate remedy, namely, publicity and public condemnation, had not yet been fully exploited, steps should be taken that would help to expose cases where torture was part of a consistent pattern of gross violation of human rights and would make it possible to learn from the experience of some Governments which had institutionalized legal norms for the protection of dissidents. That second element was important because it got to the heart of the problem. In some countries, Governments had felt themselves threatened by subversive or terrorist forces, and that situation had led them to be less stringent than they might otherwise have been in controlling the spread of torture. Nevertheless, it was necessary to bear in mind, first, that no conditions which might threaten the existence of a Government could justify resort to torture, as was recognized in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Secondly, torture as a means of maintaining order was ultimately self-defeating, because the reaction which it provoked almost always created even greater problems of public order. Thirdly, historical experience showed that many new and weak Governments had taken hold and had survived without resort to such methods.

21. For all the reasons he had mentioned, it would be worth while to consider establishing a special group of distinguished and impartial experts to investigate under United Nations mandate the problem of torture on a world-wide basis, point out where it persisted, identify the most flagrant instances and find out about cases in which Governments had been successful in combating its practice. His delegation also fully supported the United Kingdom initiative to have the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities formulate guidelines for the protection of those detained on the grounds of mental illness.

22. The United States, which attached great importance to strengthening the United Nations machinery for the protection of human rights, believed that everything possible should be done to exploit the advances made in that area over the past 30 years, to strengthen the structure of the newer procedural devices, like those provided for in Economic and Social Council resolution 1503 (XLVIII), and to provide, in addition, for new initiatives, including the idea of establishing a United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. Furthermore, the Commission on Human Rights must be made a more effective body, and the key to that lay in more complete co-operation with the Commission on the part of all nations.

23. Referring to the problem of racism and racial discrimination, he pointed out that his country had a particular responsibility in that area. As a nation long afflicted with the problem of racism and racial discrimination, it felt a responsibility to contribute to the world struggle to eliminate all those evils, and the President of the United States had therefore recently called for ratification of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. At all events, it should be borne in mind that the struggle against racism and racial discrimination in the United States, which was still going on, had been waged in general in an open and effective way which minimized violence and that the experience of that country thus offered many examples from which the rest of the world might profit. Although the United States was still struggling to appreciate the richness of diversity and to purge itself of belief in conformity and uniformity, perhaps no nation had made as much progress in its struggle against racism as the United States.

24. What was needed at the present time was a persistent, creative and concerted attack on the problem, which meant guaranteeing respect for human dignity and social justice for all. All delegations had a responsibility to see that the United Nations played a central role in that process, and the priorities which he had suggested might constitute the basis of a new consensus that would enable the world to move forward in the difficult task of realizing the dream of a world of justice and freedom. The Economic and Social Council was one of the principal places where that consensus could be formulated, strengthened and put into practice, especially since it could be hoped that, where it was a question of combating hunger, torture and racism, political rivalries and conflicts would not make consensus impossible. Although political confrontation might be a fact of life and correcting the balance of power was perhaps a prerequisite for the struggle for world justice and peace, that struggle was also a prerequisite for the building of any real world order. Accordingly, political confrontation in the Economic and Social Council was unnecessary and unhelpful, and the Council must unite its forces against the common enemies of humankind.

AGENDA ITEM 1

Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters (continued) (E/L.1756 and Add.1)

25. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) drew attention to the proposals for changes in the calendar of meetings for the remainder of 1977. He explained that it was envisaged that the organizational meeting of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination would be held on 9 May. He pointed out also that document A/AC.172/12/Add.2 set forth the financial implications of the decision to change the date of the session of the Intergovernmental Working Group on a Code of Conduct of the Commission on Transnational Corporations.

26. Mr. VOLOSHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had no objections concerning the proposals for changes in the calendar of meetings for 1977, on the understanding that in all cases the necessary documentation would be available at the appropriate time. Furthermore, if the question of the administrative and

financial implications of the continuation of the *Ad Hoc* Intergovernmental Working Group on the Problem of Corrupt Practices was put to the vote, his delegation would abstain.

27. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objection, he would take it that the Council agreed to the changes in the calendar of meetings for the remainder of 1977 proposed in document E/L.1756 and Add.1.

It was so decided (decision 213 (LXII)).

28. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council), referring to the provisional agenda for the fifth session of the Committee on Natural Resources (E/C.7/63), recalled that the Secretary-General, in accordance with rule 9 of the rules of procedure, had to draw up the provisional agenda of the Council and its standing committees. The practice followed in connexion with the Committee on Natural Resources consisted of consulting the officers of the Committee with regard to the matter.

29. On the basis of an opinion from the Office of Legal Affairs, the Secretariat had informed the officers of the Committee on Natural Resources that under the provisions of Council resolution 1979 (LIX), paragraph 1, the Council had delegated to the Committee on Natural Resources only the function of assisting the Secretary-General in the preparation and organization of the United Nations Water Conference. If the Council had found it desirable or necessary for the Conference to submit its report through the Committee on Natural Resources, it would no doubt have included an express provision to that effect. The decisions of the Water Conference were recommendations to the Council and it was the body which must consider them. For that reason, no statement of financial implications had been submitted to the Conference; that information would be available to the Council when it considered the recommendations of the Conference at its sixty-third session.

30. However, the Secretariat had also understood that there would be no legal difficulty if, through a statement which would be made by the Secretary-General of the Conference, the Committee on Natural Resources was informed of the conclusions of the Conference. That would in no way limit the terms of reference or the freedom of action of the Council when it took up the report of the Conference.

31. Subsequently, the Conference itself had adopted a decision in which it had requested that certain proposals submitted to it by ACC should be examined by the Committee on Natural Resources at its fifth session so that the latter could then submit recommendations to the Council at its sixty-third session.

32. In view of the foregoing, the Secretariat felt that the Council might wish at that point to note that, in accordance with information received from the officers of the Committee on Natural Resources, that body's provisional agenda for its fifth session would include an item on the Water Conference. The Council might also wish to place on record its understanding that in view of the status of the decisions of the Conference, that item was being included

only to give the Committee the opportunity to receive information from the Secretary-General of the Conference on its results and to consider the specific request which the Conference had made to the Committee in connexion with the ACC proposal on institutional questions.

33. Mr. YORK (Federal Republic of Germany) said that he thought the Council could take note of the inclusion of the item on the Water Conference in the provisional agenda of the fifth session of the Committee on Natural Resources, provided it was understood that no undue restrictions would be imposed on the Committee's consideration of the deliberations of the Conference. The Committee on Natural Resources was the subsidiary body of the Council competent to deal with the matter and two years would be lost if the Council waited until its sixty-third session to consider the conclusions of the Conference in depth and then refer them to the Committee.

34. Mr. MARSHALL (United Kingdom) and Mr. VOLOSHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) supported the position of the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany.

35. Mr. LINDENBERG SETTE (Brazil) said that he could not agree with the views expressed by the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany. In his opinion, since the Council was the only body competent to consider the recommendations of the Conference, any deliberations by the Committee on Natural Resources in that connexion might, instead of solving problems, create difficulties for the Council when it took up the question at its sixty-third session.

36. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) said that the only purpose of the opinion from the Office of Legal Affairs had been to clarify what were the terms of reference of the Committee on Natural Resources in connexion with approval of the recommendations of the Water Conference. That approval could be given only by the Economic and Social Council. Furthermore, it should be pointed out that the full report of the Conference would not be completed in time to be submitted to the Committee on Natural Resources at its fifth session and the Committee would therefore receive a provisional version of the recommendations of the Conference.

37. Mr. PETRELLA (Argentina) said he wondered whether it would not be possible to postpone the debate on the matter, which had not been expected at the current session, until all delegations had studied the question and could discuss the suggestions made.

38. The PRESIDENT suggested that the proposal by the delegation of Argentina should be accepted.

It was so decided.

39. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) said that in connexion with agenda item 4 (Restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system), the Council had decided to consider four specific questions, namely: (a) the agreements between the United Nations and the specialized agencies; (b) the terms of reference of the Council's subsidiary machinery; (c) the rules of pro-

cedure of the functional commissions of the Council; (d) the methods in use for the confirmation of representatives on functional commissions, a question raised by the representative of France on which there was a note by the Secretariat (E/5923). Furthermore, the Council had decided to consider in that context the question of documentation. Since the question of the rules of procedure of the functional commissions of the Council was urgent because the current rules were not fully in line with those of the Council, he suggested that the Council should examine that question first and, for that purpose, Friday, 22 April, should be the time-limit for delegations to submit amendments in writing to the draft provisional rules (E/5899).

40. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objection, he would take it that the Council agreed that Friday, 22 April, should be the time-limit for submitting amendments in writing to the draft provisional rules of procedure (E/5899), without prejudice to any other amendments which delegations might wish to submit during the course of the discussion on the matter.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 3

Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (E/5920, E/5921, E/5922)

41. The PRESIDENT suggested that the list of speakers in the general debate on item 3 should be closed on Wednesday, 20 April, at 6 p.m.

It was so decided.

42. Mr. BROAD (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the delegations of the Federal Republic of Germany and France and his own delegation, said that he wished to make some remarks concerning the report of the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (E/5922). First, he wished to point out that chapter I of the report, entitled "Matters calling for action by the Economic and Social Council or brought to its attention", had not been submitted to the Preparatory Sub-Committee for its approval and observations and he presumed that it had been prepared on the initiative of the Secretary-General himself. It followed that the delegations on behalf of which he was speaking bore no responsibility for the contents of that chapter; what was more, they wished to dissociate themselves from some parts of it. While they understood that it was desirable for reports submitted to the Council to contain chapters summarizing the issues which required its attention, it was a matter of principle that any chapter of that type should be submitted to the relevant body for its approval before being included in that body's report. The Secretariat should observe that practice in future reports submitted to the Council. Furthermore, the report unfortunately contained errors and omissions which he did not wish to go into in detail at that point. Nevertheless, he wished to place on record the over-all reservations of the

delegations on whose behalf he was speaking with regard to the report as a whole and he reserved the right to intervene on any specific point if the need to do so arose during the debate.

43. Mr. TEIXEIRA DA MOTTA (Portugal), supported by Mr. ORTNER (Austria), said that possibly the pressure of time and the fact that no summary records had been prepared for the Sub-Committee's session could explain a

series of inaccuracies in the report, which did not truly reflect what had taken place at that session. For that reason, his delegation's position would not necessarily be in line with some parts of the report. He expressed his reservations on some points included in the report and reserved the right to deal with them more fully when he thought it might be necessary to do so.

The meeting rose at 12.10 p.m.

2048th meeting

Wednesday, 20 April 1977, at 11 a.m.

President: Mr. Ladislav ŠMÍD (Czechoslovakia).

E/SR.2048

AGENDA ITEM 1

Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters (continued)

1. The PRESIDENT suggested that, taking into account the discussion at the preceding meeting and the informal consultations held since then, the Council should take note of the fact that the provisional agenda for the fifth session of the Committee on Natural Resources would include an item entitled "United Nations Water Conference" and that, under that item, the Secretary-General of the Conference would inform the Committee of the results of the Conference.

2. Mr. MARSHALL (United Kingdom) asked if it were the case that the Water Conference had requested that the Committee on Natural Resources should consider certain proposals made at the Conference, and whether the Committee's views on the subject would be available to the Council at its sixty-third session.

3. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) said that in the resolution adopted by the Water Conference on institutional arrangements for international co-operation in the water sector, it had been recommended that the proposals for interagency co-ordination presented to the Conference in the report of ACC and the Environment Co-ordination Board should be examined by the Committee on Natural Resources at its fifth session with a view to submitting its recommendations to the Economic and Social Council at its sixty-third session for consideration and implementation. Obviously, the last part of that recommendation clearly indicated that the Conference intended the Council to be the sole organ empowered to consider and implement its recommendations.

4. Miss RICHTER (Argentina) pointed out that the Economic and Social Council had already had before it the report of the Committee on Natural Resources on its fourth session.¹ That report had contained the provisional agenda

for the fifth session, which had included an item on the Water Conference. Since the Council had already approved that report of the Committee on Natural Resources, she wondered what more the Council could do in that regard at the present time.

5. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) explained that, when considering the reports of the Committee on Natural Resources, the Council did not approve the provisional agendas included therein. Thus, the Council had not yet taken any decision concerning the provisional agenda for the fifth session of the Committee on Natural Resources, nor was it being asked to do so now. However, since doubts had been raised concerning the legality of the inclusion of an item in the provisional agenda of the Committee, the Secretary-General wanted the Council to take note of the inclusion of that item.

6. Mr. YORK (Federal Republic of Germany) said that he was prepared to accept the President's suggestion, on the understanding that the Committee on Natural Resources was authorized to examine the proposals of ACC referred to it by the Water Conference, make recommendations thereon to the Council and consider the deliberations of the Conference without exceeding its powers under its terms of reference.

7. The PRESIDENT said that that was his interpretation also.

8. Mr. LINDENBERG SETTE (Brazil) requested clarification as to whether the Committee on Natural Resources would be empowered to consider the decisions of the Conference and to make recommendations to the Council on those decisions in general or only on the question which the Conference had referred to it specifically.

9. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) said that the Committee on Natural Resources could not approve the recommendations of the Conference, since they were addressed to the Council. Nevertheless, the Council could at present, if it saw fit, entrust to the Committee such tasks as it deemed appropriate.

¹ Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Fifty-ninth Session, Supplement No. 3.