



CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Agenda item 14: Consideration of the provisional agenda for the twenty-sixth session and establishment of dates for opening debate on items (concluded)	105
Agenda item 5: Economic development of under-developed countries (concluded) Water resources (concluded) Report of the Economic Committee	107
Agenda item 13: Financial implications of actions of the Council . . .	108
Agenda item 6: Question of the establishment of an Economic Commission for Africa (concluded) Site of the headquarters of the Economic Commission for Africa (concluded)	108
Closure of the session	109

President: Mr. George DAVIDSON (Canada).

Present:

The representatives of the following States: Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Finland, France, Greece, Indonesia, Mexico, Netherlands, Pakistan, Poland, Sudan, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yugoslavia.

Observers from the following States: Albania, Bulgaria, Ethiopia, Haiti, India, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Laos, New Zealand, Romania, Spain.

The representatives of the following specialized agencies: International Labour Organisation; Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations; United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization; World Health Organization.

The representative of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

AGENDA ITEM 14

Consideration of the provisional agenda for the twenty-sixth session and establishment of dates for opening debate on items (E/3068 and Add.1, E/3103, E/L.786) (concluded)

1. The PRESIDENT noted that the USSR representative had proposed (1020th meeting) that international co-operation in the fields of science, culture and education (General Assembly resolution 1164 (XII)) should form a separate sub-item of item 3 of the agenda of the twenty-sixth session (General review of the development and co-ordination of the economic, social and human rights programmes and activities of the United Nations and the specialized agencies as a whole) and that the question should be referred to the Social Committee rather than to the Co-ordination Committee.

2. Mr. SCOTT FOX (United Kingdom) agreed with the first part of the proposal, but hoped that the USSR representative would not press the second. To refer the question to the Social Committee would only complicate matters and might even result in a double debate, since the sections of the specialized agencies' reports on that subject would inevitably come under review in the Co-ordination Committee in the general context of the reports themselves; in any event the question would be considered in plenary meeting.

3. Mr. SCHURMANN (Netherlands) agreed with the USSR and United Kingdom representatives that the question was sufficiently important to form a sub-item of item 3. His delegation had no strong views on the second part of the USSR proposal.

4. Mr. ARKADEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) emphasized that it was particularly important that the question should be thoroughly considered at the twenty-sixth session, since most countries realized the desirability of intensifying exchanges between the East and the West and since in resolution 1164 (XII) the General Assembly requested the Economic and Social Council to submit a report on the subject to it at its thirteenth session. As the Co-ordination Committee would meet before the Council it would be unable to examine the question thoroughly. It should therefore be considered in a plenary meeting. The Council could decide subsequently what procedure to follow.

5. The PRESIDENT formally proposed that the question should become a sub-item of item 3. The Council would consider it in plenary meeting and would then decide what course to follow.

It was so decided.

6. The PRESIDENT proposed that the Council should approve the provisional agenda of the twenty-sixth session (E/3068 and Add.1) subject to the various amendments that had been made.

It was so decided.

7. The PRESIDENT called upon the Council to consider the arrangement of business for the twenty-sixth session (E/L.786). The amendments made to the provisional agenda would entail corresponding changes in the plan: in particular, in the list of items to be considered in committee after preliminary debate in plenary, item 3 would have to be divided into two parts, the first of which, 3 (a), would consist of the present item 3 and the second, 3 (b), would reproduce the title of General Assembly resolution 1164 (XII) (Development of international co-operation in the fields of science, culture and education) and would make no mention of reference to committee. The title of item 2 (a) (Survey of the world economic situation) would be altered to read: "Survey of the world economic situation, including questions relating to employment and to the expansion of world trade", in accordance with the decision taken by the Council at the preceding meeting.

8. Mr. GREZ (Chile) asked that item 5 (International commodity problems) should first be examined in plenary meeting.

It was so decided.

9. Mr. SCOTT FOX (United Kingdom) observed that at the twenty-fourth session item 9 (Proposal for the establishment of an international administrative service) had been referred to the Technical Assistance Committee for detailed examination. It might perhaps be well to take a similar decision at the present time.

10. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) thought that in view of the highly technical character of the question it would be wiser for the Technical Assistance Committee to examine it before the Council.

11. Mr. SCOTT FOX (United Kingdom) supported that proposal.

It was so decided.

12. The PRESIDENT noted that two supplementary questions had been added to the provisional agenda, one of them relating to the admission of further associate members to the Economic Commission for Africa and the other to the election of members of the Commission on International Commodity Trade. He proposed that the former question should be considered in plenary meeting in the first week and the latter in plenary meeting in the last week of the session.

It was so decided.

13. Mr. TURPIN (France) would have preferred the question to be examined rather later. He reserved his delegation's right to revert to the point when the final plan of work was adopted.

14. The PRESIDENT proposed that the Council should approve the plan for the arrangement of business (E/L.786) subject to the amendments that had been made.

It was so decided.

15. The PRESIDENT pointed out that according to Council resolution 664 B (XXIV), the Co-ordination Committee was to meet one week before the opening of the Council's twenty-sixth session. He proposed that after examining the Secretary-General's reports on the programme of work and on the financial implications of actions of the Council the Council should, if it had time, examine some of the other reports laid before it in connexion with item 3, such as, for example, those referred to in resolutions 665 A and C (XXIV) and also perhaps the report on the development and co-ordination of programmes of the United Nations Children's Fund. That procedure would, of course, in no way affect the discussion of item 3 in plenary meeting.

It was so decided.

16. Mr. DE SEYNES (Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs), replying to a remark made by the Mexican representative at the preceding meeting, explained that the disparity between the agenda of the spring session and that of the summer session was largely due to the rigid organization of the work of the United Nations organs, a state of affairs which it was difficult to remedy.

17. With regard to the documentation for the summer session, he assured the members of the Council that

a considerable part of it would be distributed in accordance with the six weeks' rule, at least as far as the English was concerned. It would be impossible, however, to comply with that rule for certain documents. The amount of work involved in the translation and reproduction of documents should be realized. Moreover, the decisions taken at the twelfth session of the General Assembly concerning the geographical distribution of the staff of the Secretariat had created difficulties in recruiting staff for the Department of Economic and Social Affairs which had affected its work. Lastly, the completion of some of the documentation depended on the collection of information which was not always transmitted in good time by Governments.

18. With regard to the participation of the Executive Secretaries of the regional commissions in the Council's work, he pointed out that as the work was at present organized they would have to spend three weeks in Geneva. That was a very onerous obligation for senior officials who had a great deal of work to do. The Executive Secretaries would therefore be grateful if the Council would interpret rather loosely the resolution adopted in 1954 (resolution 557 B II (XVIII)), it being understood that they would continue to make every effort to comply with the wish expressed by the Council in 1954.

19. Mr. COSIO VILLEGAS (Mexico) said that while the explanation given by Mr. de Seynes was undoubtedly reasonable, the fact remained that the sessions of the Council provided the only opportunity for direct contact between the Executive Secretaries and between them and the members of the Council. In resolution 671 A (XXV) establishing the Economic Commission for Africa, the Council had in fact stressed the need for liaison between the organs of the United Nations. Moreover the regional commissions had been criticized on occasion in the past in the Co-ordination Committee and but for the presence of the Executive Secretaries the Council might have formed a wrong impression of the commissions' activities. It would therefore be most unfortunate if the Executive Secretaries were to cease to take part in the Council's work.

20. Mr. TURPIN (France) observed that the participation of the Executive Secretaries in the Council's work was the best way of achieving the co-ordination of the activities of the regional commissions; the need for which had been stressed by the Council in the course of the session. While their absence might be justifiable in exceptional circumstances, it was preferable for the Council to organize its work in such a way as to make it unnecessary for the Executive Secretaries to be present for an unduly long period.

21. Mr. LYCHOWSKI (Poland) and Mr. DE FREITAS-VALLE (Brazil) shared that view.

22. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) also agreed with the comments of the Mexican and French representatives. With regard to documentation, he pointed out that in 1957 representatives had not had sufficient time to study the World Economic Survey thoroughly. To avoid a recurrence of that situation it might be possible to issue the analysis of current economic problems in part II in advance of part I, since the problem of inflation, the topic of part I, appeared to have lost some of its urgency. He would be prepared if necessary to agree to distribution only four weeks in advance

but ten or fifteen days would not allow sufficient time for proper study of the documentation.

23. Mr. DE SEYNES (Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs) pointed out that he had not suggested that the Executive Secretaries—who would in fact be at Geneva for the summer session—should not participate in the Council's work. He had merely wished to draw attention to the fact that it was extremely inconvenient for the Executive Secretaries to spend three weeks in Geneva. He would be grateful if the Council could, as the French representative had suggested, arrange matters so that their presence would not be required for so long a period, and if their attendance was not regarded as a sacrosanct duty.

24. The first part of the World Economic Survey, on inflation, which was still very much a question of the moment, would be ready about 15 May. It would probably not be possible to distribute the second part, in which it was desirable to include the most recent possible information, before the second week in June.

AGENDA ITEM 5

Economic development of under-developed countries (concluded)

WATER RESOURCES (concluded)*

Report of the Economic Committee (E/3114)

25. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece), Chairman of the Economic Committee, presented the Committee's report on the question of water resources (E/3114) and called attention to the draft resolution which the Committee recommended to the Council for adoption.

26. Mr. IRWIN (Canada) noted that his delegation had been the only delegation not to support the draft resolution on water resources in the Economic Committee. It had entertained—and continued to entertain—some doubts as to the precise intent of paragraph 3 of section IV, concerning the establishment of a co-ordinating centre. As it now stood, the paragraph appeared to envisage the establishment of an entirely new body, which would have a special status, and for which there was no precedent. The Secretary-General's freedom of action would also be limited. However, as the Secretary-General's representative had stated in the Economic Committee (237th meeting) that the word "centre" would be interpreted in a functional sense, he concluded that the intention was not to set up a unit or autonomous body. In the circumstances, and to make it possible for the Council to take a unanimous decision, his delegation would vote for the Economic Committee's draft resolution.

27. The PRESIDENT suggested that in accordance with rule 75 of the rules of procedure the representative of India, who had requested to speak, should be invited to make a statement.

It was so decided.

28. Mr. RAO (India) said that as a country with some of the largest river basins in the world India was very much interested in the four reports submitted to the Council (E/3058, E/3066, E/3070 and E/3071). Some inaccuracies appeared, however, to have crept into the documents. For instance, in paragraph 7 of chapter 4 of the report on Integrated River Basin Develop-

ment (E/3066), under the heading "Difficulties in co-operating", it was stated that in the case of Pakistan and India, for example, the original water treaties and arrangements drawn up prior to 1947 and tending towards a global pattern rather than a restricted one did not cover the new situation. In 1947 India had formed a single political unit and there could therefore have been no question of "treaties". At most there might have been internal "arrangements" between the Indian provinces. There could not therefore be any particular "pattern" which such non-existent "treaties" could take. It should be noted that an agreement of 4 May 1948 now governed the situation arising out of the partition of India.

29. In paragraph 14 of the same chapter of the report, under the heading "Inadequacy of relevant international law" it was stated that the International Law Association had unanimously adopted the Dubrovnik principles. In fact, there had been five abstentions on the vote on those principles, among them that of Professor Zourek. In any case, it seemed to be premature to comment on the principles of Dubrovnik, since, as the chairman of the drafting committee had pointed out, they had not been finalized. It should be noted that another organization, the Institut de droit international, was conducting a study on the subject and one of its members had already submitted a very useful preliminary report.

30. In the circumstances, he shared the Canadian representative's views concerning the centre, the establishment of which would only create further difficulties at the current stage, as the Panel of Experts itself had conceded when it had stated that lack of accepted international law on the uses of the streams presented a major obstacle to the settlement of differences (E/3066, chap. 5, para. 44). Further, paragraph 3 of section IV of the draft resolution (E/3114), relating to the centre, did not make it clear that applications for assistance in developing an international river basin should come from all the Governments which had jurisdiction over the basin, in accordance with the existing law and practice.

31. Mr. FARUQI (Pakistan) pointed out that the text criticized by the Indian representative spoke of "treaties and arrangements". The inaccuracy to which attention had been drawn was in fact therefore of little real significance. As to the passage on the Dubrovnik principles, while it was true that the principles had not been unanimously adopted, it should be noted that the participants in the Dubrovnik conference had reached as broad a measure of agreement as had been possible. Finally, as regards applications for assistance, he pointed out that it would be unfortunate if a single country was in a position to block the development of an international river basin.

32. Mr. LE PORTZ (France) associated himself with the congratulations extended to the authors of the reports on the development of water resources. He was pleased to note that the functions of the World Meteorological Organization in that field were mentioned in part II of the draft resolution (E/3114) and hoped that WMO and the Governments concerned would take appropriate action.

33. His delegation had supported the oral amendment proposed in the Economic Committee by the representative of Canada, which had made it clear that the

*Resumed from the 1016th meeting.

proposed centre would not be an office or autonomous unit. His delegation had, nevertheless, voted in favour of the original draft resolution (E/AC.6/L.205) in view of the explanations given in the Economic Committee. The statement of financial implications submitted by the Secretary-General (E/AC.6/L.205/Add.1) confirmed that the intention was not to establish a new body but only to increase the responsibilities of existing units, to strengthen the permanent staff and to recruit consultants in a temporary capacity. In that connexion, he called attention to a contradiction in the document: an expenditure of \$17,000 was foreseen for the recruiting of experts and consultants on short-term contract, whereas reference was made elsewhere in the statement to the possibility of engaging the services of experts for short periods or employing a highly qualified specialist. It would be unfortunate, in view of the complexity and diversity of water resources problems, and the high degree of specialization in that field, if the proposed appropriation of \$17,000 did not permit of the employment of more than one person. Further, as the work of experts was usually of value only in a particular region, it would be well to pay due regard to geographical distribution, in order to take into account the very important work of experts in the under-developed countries.

34. Mr. KAUFMANN (Netherlands) observed that, in paragraph 3 of section II of its draft resolution (E/3114), the Economic Committee stressed the necessity of avoiding duplication between the work of the United Nations and specialized agencies. He hoped that that would also apply to paragraph 5 of section IV concerning the international flow of information. Moreover, it was understood that the interpretation placed by some representatives on the provision for the establishment of a centre did not preclude the establishment of a new organ if the experts considered it desirable. Subject to those considerations the Netherlands delegation would support the draft resolution.

35. Mr. ARKADEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) felt that the Council could not take a decision on legal principles which were not within its competence. Extreme caution should be exercised in that field. With regard to paragraph 3 of section I and paragraph 4 of section IV of the draft resolution, he emphasized that, for the development of the water resources of international river basins, the administrative arrangements and responsibilities should be fixed by agreement between the countries concerned.

36. He observed, on the other hand, that chapter IV of the report on international co-operation with respect to water resources development (E/3071) contained only vague indications on priorities. The Council had recognized that the major problems concerned hydro-electrical equipment and irrigation, which were closely related to the economic development of any country, whether under-developed or not; yet neither the Committee's draft resolution nor the document to which it referred gave priority to those two fields of activity.

37. Lastly, he recalled that his delegation had already supported the establishment of a special inter-governmental organ which would be responsible for co-ordinating activities with regard to the development of water resources. Pending the establishment of that organ, the Soviet delegation was prepared to accept the interim measures proposed by the Economic Committee in the draft resolution.

38. Mr. KAUFMANN (Netherlands) proposed the deletion of the comma after the reference to document E/3071 in paragraph 6 of section IV of the English text of the draft resolution (E/3114). That small change would dispel any possibility of misunderstanding.

It was so decided.

39. Mr. ARKADEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that in his view that amendment would not remove his objections.

40. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the draft resolution submitted by the Economic Committee (E/3114).

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.

41. Mr. ARKADEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he would have abstained on paragraph 3 of section I if that paragraph had been put to the vote separately.

AGENDA ITEM 13

Financial implications of actions of the Council (E/3115)

42. Mr. ARKADEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) felt that there was no need to provide for the cost of a possible meeting of the Economic Commission for Africa at United Nations Headquarters, since the Council had agreed that the Commission's first session should be held in Africa.

43. Mr. LE PORTZ (France) thought that no detailed statement of the financial implications of actions of the Council could be made before the summer session. The Secretariat could, however, be requested to provide for reductions under various headings of the budgetary estimates for 1959 in order to avoid an increase in total expenditure.

44. Mr. SCOTT FOX (United Kingdom) concurred with the French representative's views.

45. The PRESIDENT proposed that the Council should take note of the Secretary-General's statement on financial implications of actions of the Council (E/3115).

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 6

Question of the establishment of an Economic Commission for Africa (E/3086 and Add.1) (concluded)

SITE OF THE HEADQUARTERS OF THE ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR AFRICA (E/3086 AND ADD.1) (concluded)

46. Mr. COSIO VILLEGAS (Mexico) asked the representative of Sudan whether he believed that a two-week postponement would allow the African States to reach agreement on the site of the Commission's headquarters.

47. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) did not think that he could give that assurance. The members of the Council should therefore take a decision immediately.

48. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the various proposals concerning the site of the headquarters of the Economic Commission for Africa. The cities proposed were Addis Ababa, Accra, Cairo, Khartoum and Tangier.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Galvao (Brazil) and Miss Pelt (Netherlands) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

<u>Number of ballot papers:</u>	18
<u>Invalid ballots:</u>	0
<u>Number of valid ballots:</u>	18
<u>Abstentions:</u>	0
<u>Number of members voting:</u>	18
<u>Required majority:</u>	10
<u>Number of votes obtained:</u>	
Addis Ababa	11
Tangier	3
Cairo	2
Accra	1
Khartoum	1

Having obtained the required majority, the proposal that the headquarters of the Economic Commission for Africa should be established at Addis Ababa was adopted.

49. The PRESIDENT suggested that, in accordance with rule 75 of the rules of procedure, the representative of Ethiopia, who had requested to speak, should be invited to make a statement.

It was so decided.

50. Mr. ALEMAYEHOU (Ethiopia) expressed his country's deep appreciation to the Council and assured it that his Government would make every effort to co-operate with the Secretary-General and his repre-

sentatives on the new Commission. The staff of the Commission would be most warmly welcomed by the people and Government of Ethiopia.

51. Mr. VIAUD (France) felt that, in view of the early decision taken by the Council, the Commission's first session might be held in Africa.

52. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) was glad that an early decision had been taken. He extended his Government's congratulations to the representative of Ethiopia.

Closure of the session

53. The PRESIDENT briefly recalled the major decisions taken by the Council at its twenty-fifth session, among which the establishment of the Economic Commission for Africa was of particular significance.

54. Mr. ARKADEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), supported by Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America), congratulated the President on the efficient way in which he had conducted the Council's business. He also congratulated the Governments and peoples of Africa on the establishment of the new regional economic commission.

55. The PRESIDENT declared the twenty-fifth session of the Council closed.

The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.