



**ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL**

Wednesday, 10 April 1963,  
at 3.15 p.m.

Thirty-fifth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 17:</i>	
<i>Integrated programme and budget policy (concluded) . . . . .</i>	73
<i>Agenda item 14:</i>	
<i>Review of the composition of the United Nations/FAO Inter-Governmental Committee on the World Food Programme . . . . .</i>	74
<i>Agenda item 20:</i>	
<i>Approval of the appointment of the Secretary of the Permanent Central Opium Board . . . . .</i>	75
<i>Agenda item 3:</i>	
<i>Declaration on international economic co-operation . . . . .</i>	75
<i>Agenda item 13:</i>	
<i>Non-governmental organizations . . . . .</i>	75

*President:* Mr. Alfonso PATIÑO (Colombia).

*Present:*

Representatives of the following States: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, India, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Senegal, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Yugoslavia.

Observers for the following Member States: Afghanistan, Brazil, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, Greece, Nepal, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Thailand, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, United Arab Republic.

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 17

Integrated programme and budget policy (E/3702, E/3741, E/L.988) (concluded)

1. Mr. UNWIN (United Kingdom) said he had listened with much interest to the statement made by the Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs at the preceding meeting. With reference to paragraph 6 of the Secretary-General's report (E/3741), it must be remembered that the difficulties of recruiting temporary personnel caused by the multiplicity of meetings also placed a heavier burden on the permanent staff. Generally speaking, his delegation approved of the suggestions in paragraph 12 and would comment on them in greater detail during the Council's summer session.

2. He thanked the sponsors of the draft resolution (E/L.988) for having accepted the amendments which had been suggested to them, and he supported the revised text. An effort should indeed be made to reduce the number of meetings of all United Nations organs. The return to the biennial pattern for certain organs would be a step forward, although, for practical reasons, exceptions to that rule might perhaps be necessary. Specific decisions on that matter could probably be taken during the summer session, particularly for the functional commissions and standing committees of the Council. With reference to operative paragraph 1 (a) of section II of the three-Power draft resolution, he agreed with the Argentine and French representatives that mention should also be made of paragraph 16 of the Secretary-General's report (E/3702). With regard to paragraph 1 as a whole, he agreed with the United States delegation that the Council should accept on a provisional basis the outline proposed by the Secretary-General, on the understanding that it was indicative rather than mandatory. For that reason, the United Kingdom delegation would prefer the outline to be adopted unchanged, for, if certain delegations insisted on adding certain items to it, that would tend to make it more rigid. In that case, too, his delegation would have proposals to make. He hoped therefore that all delegations could accept it in its present form, on the understanding that necessary amendments could be made to it during the Council's summer session. It was in any case essential that the two items in paragraph 1 of section II of the resolution should be put into practice without delay, even if they were to be modified later in the light of experience.

3. Mr. PASTORI (Uruguay) felt that the problem should still be studied carefully for it was not a question of reducing United Nations activities but rather of making them more effective by establishing a rational budgetary policy. His delegation had listened with considerable interest to the statement made at the 1253rd meeting by the Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs. It also welcomed the proposal made by the Australian representative at the end of that meeting to add two paragraphs (3 and 4) to the operative part of section I of the three-Power draft resolution.

4. To meet the objections raised by the Argentine, French and United Kingdom representatives, in section II of the draft resolution, paragraph 1 and the first part of paragraph 2 would be amended to read as follows:

"1. Approves, for purposes of immediate implementation, the procedure for considering financial implications, as outlined by the Secretary-General in paragraphs 5, 16 and 19 of his report (E/3702);

"2. Accepts, on a provisional basis, the outline for a functional classification of United Nations projects . . ."

5. All those proposals would have to be very carefully examined during the next session of the Council.

6. Mr. SOLODOVNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) felt that, if the outline proposed by the Secretary-General was to become effective immediately, operative paragraph 1 (b) of section II of the three-Power draft resolution should be more explicit on that point: it should request the Secretary-General to complete the outline as soon as possible, taking into account the opinions expressed by the Council at its thirty-fifth session, and to submit a final text at the thirty-sixth session. In its present form, the draft resolution merely approved the Secretary-General's proposals but failed to mention the proposals which had been made by various representatives during the discussion. If, as it seemed, the Council's discussions were to be ignored, there seemed little point in holding them. If the majority of delegations wished to take an immediate decision on the outline proposed by the Secretary-General, the latter should forthwith examine his draft in the light of the comments made by the Council and should submit the amended outline to the Council. To act otherwise would be to undermine the prestige and even the usefulness of the Council.

7. Mr. CARRILLO (El Salvador) said he had listened with great interest to the statement made at the preceding meeting by the United States representative and expressed regret that he was unable to support the three-Power draft resolution. The text obviously had highly desirable objectives but it had several serious drawbacks. Section I requested the regional economic commissions, the functional commissions and the standing committees of the Council to reduce the number of meetings of their subsidiary bodies, but it was difficult to foresee the attitude of the Council, if, as was very likely, those commissions and committees felt that, far from reducing, they could only increase the number of their meetings, in view of the larger number of activities assigned to them. The main drawback of the draft resolution was that it tended to subordinate the achievement of the essential aims of the United Nations to mere financial considerations. The Council should do the opposite: instead of determining activities in the light of the budget, a list of essential activities must first be established and the budget then drawn up accordingly. He regretted that he would have to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution, but in so doing he had the best interests of the Organization at heart.

8. Mr. VIAUD (France) thanked the sponsors of the draft resolution for having accepted the suggested amendments and fully supported the amended text. However, the title of the agenda item seemed unsatisfactory. Although the term "integrated programme" already appeared in General Assembly resolution 1797 (XVII), he would prefer the title "Co-ordinated programme and budget policy".

9. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) noted that a very wide area of agreement had been reached on the three-Power draft resolution and that only the USSR representative's amendment had not been formally accepted by the sponsors. He appreciated that the functional classification in question was in no way final and that it was subject to revision, but he did not feel that the proposed amendment offered the best approach to a revision. In an effort to meet the wishes of the USSR representative, however, he proposed that paragraph 1 (b) of section II of the draft resolution should be worded as follows: "Accepts, on a provisional basis and subject to early revision as appropriate, the outline for a functional classifi-

cation . . .". That text would also meet the Soviet Union representative's further point that the Special Committee on Co-ordination would be discussing the matter.

10. Mr. SOLODOVNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thanked the United States representative for his proposal. The wording mentioned was acceptable to his delegation, provided that the paragraph in question also stated that the views expressed at the current session of the Council should be taken into account.

11. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that he was pleased to announce that the sponsors of the draft resolution agreed to add to paragraph 1 (b) of section II the following phrase: "taking into account the views expressed at the thirty-fifth session of the Council".

12. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the three-Power draft resolution (E/L.988), as modified by the various amendments.

*The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 16 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.*

13. Mr. BAYONA (Colombia) said that his delegation, with deep regret, had voted against the draft resolution. There were several points in it which his delegation could have accepted, but, looking at the problem as a whole, it could not agree with the view that no precedent would be created if the speedy achievement of the purposes of the United Nations was sacrificed and those purposes were allowed to take second place to financial issues which could be settled by other means.

#### AGENDA ITEM 14

##### Review of the composition of the United Nations/FAO Inter-Governmental Committee on the World Food Programme (E/3698, E/L.990)

14. Mr. KIRTLEY (Australia) said that he thought the draft resolution submitted by his delegation and that of the United States (E/L.990) was a logical sequence to section I of General Assembly resolution 1714 (XVI), which set out the criteria for the election of new members to the United Nations/FAO Inter-Governmental Committee. He recalled that the Council of FAO, at its thirty-ninth session in October 1962, had adopted a resolution providing that the ten countries which it had appointed should continue to be represented and recommending that the membership of the Committee should be raised from twenty to twenty-four by the election of two additional members by each appointing body.

15. The Australian delegation hoped that the Economic and Social Council would adopt a resolution permitting the expansion of the Inter-Governmental Committee, which was fully justified, as the Programme had reached a more advanced stage and a number of countries which had made large contributions were not members of the Committee. The Committee would also be more representative if additional recipient countries were admitted. Equal attention should be paid to proper geographical distribution and to a balanced membership of donor countries and recipient countries.

16. The draft resolution (E/L.990) differed in one respect from the resolution adopted by the Council of FAO. Like the latter, the Economic and Social Council could decide to increase its participation in

the Committee from ten to twelve members, but it could also review and, if necessary, adjust the composition of the Committee, in entire conformity with the terms of the General Assembly's request. The wording proposed in the draft resolution was intended to allow for that alternative and to enable the Council to decide either way.

17 The PRESIDENT put to the vote the draft resolution of Australia and the United States (E/L.990).

*The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.*

### AGENDA ITEM 20

Approval of the appointment of the Secretary of the Permanent Central Opium Board (E/3728)

18. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) recommended that the members of the Council should approve the appointment of Mr. Lande as Secretary of the Permanent Central Opium Board. Mr. Lande, who was highly experienced in the subject, would undoubtedly perform a most useful role in that office.

19. Mr. QUIJANO (Argentina) supported the United States representative's proposal.

*The appointment of Mr. Lande as Secretary of the Permanent Central Opium Board was approved.*

### AGENDA ITEM 3

Declaration on international economic co-operation (E/3725)

20. Mr. PARSONS (Australia) advised the Council that informal talks were still taking place, and requested that consideration of the item should be postponed until the following meeting.

*It was so decided.*

### AGENDA ITEM 13

Non-governmental organizations (E/3729, E/L.980)

21. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider first the draft resolution contained in the report of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations (E/3729) and then the draft resolution submitted by Senegal (E/L.980).

22. Mr. JEANNEL (France) said that, in principle, his delegation would favour the adoption of the draft resolution contained in the Committee's report (E/3729), since France had supported the request for consultative status of some of the organizations concerned. However, it could not overlook recommendation No. 296, concerning the United Towns Organization, which had been adopted unanimously by the Council of Europe and which asked member countries to refrain from giving any support, either directly or indirectly, to that organization. For those reasons, his delegation would abstain in the vote.

23. Mrs. MIRONOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) emphasized that the criterion to be applied in connexion with non-governmental organizations was the extent to which their activities were useful to the Council. In that light, rather careful scrutiny should be given to the list of organizations which had not transmitted any information or had never made any worth-while contribution to the Council's work. The Soviet Union delegation would support the draft resolution contained in the Committee's report (E/3729).

24. The United Towns Organization seemed to merit Category B consultative status; it brought together a large number of towns, in forty-eight different countries, embracing a population of more than 50 million, and it was doing useful work both at the international level and in the economic and social fields.

25. Mr. CARRILLO (El Salvador) supported the request of the United Towns Organization for Category B consultative status.

26. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the draft resolution contained in the report of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations (E/3729).

*The draft resolution was adopted by 15 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

27. Mr. CISS (Senegal) pointed out that the United Towns Organization played a major role. He read out two statements by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of his country, who was also the President of the organization, listing its activities in connexion with civic education and the training of intermediate-level cadres and rural organizers in the developing countries, and emphasizing that town twinning was of tremendous importance, in that it furthered international relations and was often a point of contact between East and West.

28. It could not be over-emphasized that the United Towns Organization would not be given a free hand with the fund of \$10 million but would merely administer it, that the fund was no more than adequate in view of the vast and varied work of the organization, and that the purposes for which it would be used were, in the final analysis, the purposes of the Council, i.e., the advancement of man himself.

29. Mr. WEIDINGER (Austria) said that the financing of a private organization scarcely appeared to be an acceptable proposition when one considered the difficulties of the United Nations in financing much more urgent projects.

30. Mr. YOKOTA (Japan) pointed out that his delegation had whole-heartedly supported Category B consultative status for the United Towns Organization, whose work was in conformity both with the spirit and purposes of the Charter and with the activities of the Council, but he questioned the desirability of establishing a fund of \$10 million to finance its work. It should be emphasized, in the first place, that neither the Special Fund nor any other specialized organ of the United Nations was authorized, under its terms of reference, to finance such a fund. It was also extremely doubtful whether the Council had the authority, under its resolution 288 B (X), to sign a contract for the administration of the capital fund and the organization of twinings.

31. In entering into agreements for consultation with non-governmental organizations, the Council, as indicated in its resolution 288 B (X), had sought to enlist the co-operation of such organizations and had certainly made no provision for the granting of financial assistance to further their activities. Besides, the United Nations was grappling with a number of problems with respect to the financing of technical assistance programmes of much more immediate importance to the economic and social advancement of the developing countries and the objectives of the United Nations Development Decade than the fund in question.

32. Consequently, the Japanese delegation believed that the establishment of such a fund was inadvisable if the limited resources available were to be used to the best advantage in accelerating the economic growth of the developing countries.

33. Mr. CISS (Senegal) stated that his delegation was withdrawing its draft resolution (E/L.980).

The meeting rose at 4.55 p.m.