



**ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL**

*Thirty-fifth Session*  
OFFICIAL RECORDS

Monday, 15 April 1963,  
at 3 p.m.

**NEW YORK**

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 24:</i>	
<i>Fifteenth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (concluded) . . . . .</i>	97
<i>Inclusion of an additional item in the agenda of the thirty-fifth session. . . . .</i>	98
<i>Agenda item 25:</i>	
<i>Advisory services in the field of human rights. . . . .</i>	98
<i>Agenda item 9:</i>	
<i>Transport development (concluded) (resumed from the 1252nd meeting). . . . .</i>	98
<i>Agenda item 19:</i>	
<i>Consideration of the provisional agenda for the thirty-sixth session and establishment of dates for opening debate on items</i>	
<i>Adoption of the provisional agenda for the thirty-sixth session . . . . .</i>	98
<i>Arrangement of business for the thirty-sixth session . . . . .</i>	99

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

**Present:**

Representatives of the following States: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, 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: Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, Indonesia, Israel, Nepal, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Sweden, Thailand, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist 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.

*In the absence of the President, Mr. Walker (Australia), First Vice-President, took the Chair.*

**AGENDA ITEM 24**

**Fifteenth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (E/3737 and Add.1, E/L.994) (concluded)**

1. The PRESIDENT invited the representative of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions to address the Council.

2. Mr. AGUIRRE (International Confederation of Free Trade Unions) recalled that the Special Committee

appointed by the Secretary-General under General Assembly resolution 1775 (XVII) had recommended that Governments consider the proclamation on Human Rights Day of an amnesty covering political or other prisoners. The Commission on Human Rights had endorsed that recommendation, which appeared in paragraph 5 (e) of the annex to its draft resolution (see E/3743, chap. XIII, draft resolution IV). Such practical action by Governments would make the fifteenth anniversary a real cause for celebration. At the same time, every effort must be made to attain the full exercise of fundamental freedoms in all countries. Although much had been done to combat colonialism and fascism throughout the world, new forms of those phenomena were still apparent and peoples were still being prevented from exercising their free will. Not until all restrictions on human liberty were removed and all political prisoners released would it be possible to celebrate Human Rights Day in a satisfactory manner.

3. Mr. JEANNEL (France) said that his delegation shared the concern expressed by other representatives about the financial implications of the measures suggested for the celebration of the fifteenth anniversary of the Universal Declaration. However, financial arguments should not outweigh moral ones. Since the first Declaration of the Rights of Man had been elaborated by the French Revolution and had been drawn up in French, and since the text on which the United Nations had worked in order to establish the Universal Declaration had also been drawn up in French and by French experts, it was only right that the inscription on the plaque to be placed at Headquarters should also be in French, even if it was decided that only one language should be used. The arguments put forward in favour of using the language of the country where the plaque was situated were unconvincing.

4. Mr. TELL (Jordan) proposed that the whole idea of the plaque should be dropped. The Council would thus be spared a lengthy debate on where it should be put and on the language to be used. It would be far better if the plaque were visualized in the minds of individuals all over the world in any language they chose. He suggested that part II of the United States amendments (E/L.994) should be withdrawn and that the phrase "except for paragraph 3 (b)" should be added at the end of paragraph 2 of the draft resolution recommended by the Commission on Human Rights.

5. Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America) supported the Jordanian proposal and withdrew part II of his amendments. He suggested, however, that paragraph 3 (b) should be omitted from the annex to the draft resolution, that the other sub-paragraphs should be relettered and that paragraph 2 of the draft resolution should read:

"2. Requests the Secretary-General to undertake the necessary preparations for the celebration of the fifteenth anniversary of the Declaration as set out in the annex to the present resolution, substan-

tially in accordance with the plan contained in the report of the Special Committee (ST/SG/AC.4/6) and incorporating the recommendations of "the Commission on Human Rights".

6. Mr. TELL (Jordan) accepted that proposal.

7. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the draft resolution of the Commission on Human Rights contained in the report of the Commission (see E/3743, chap. XIII, draft resolution IV), as modified by the United States amendments.

*The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted unanimously.*

#### Inclusion of an additional item in the agenda of the thirty-fifth session (E/3744)

8. The PRESIDENT proposed to include in the agenda of the current session the question entitled "Advisory services in the field of human rights". The question would be included in the agenda as item 25.

*It was so decided.*

### AGENDA ITEM 25

#### Advisory services in the field of human rights (E/3744)

9. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the note by the Secretary-General (E/3744) and the annexed statement of financial implications. In paragraph 4 of the annex, the Secretary-General had suggested that the question should be considered by the Technical Assistance Committee at its session in June 1963.

10. Mr. ATTLEE (United Kingdom) pointed out that, in view of the late inclusion of the item on advisory services, it was hardly surprising that his delegation was without instructions. However, he could say, in the light of his Government's general policy, that some parts of the draft resolution contained in the Secretary-General's note (E/3744) required careful study and might give rise to reservations. Furthermore, the financial implications were not quite clear.

11. In the circumstances, it would be wise for the Council to refer the item, as the Secretary-General had suggested, to the Technical Assistance Committee at its session in June, but strictly without comment. If the Council felt that comments should be made, at least one delegation would have reservations.

12. Mr. FINGER (United States of America) agreed with the United Kingdom representative. The Technical Assistance Committee would be in a much better position to consider how the programme of advisory services could be incorporated in the technical assistance programme for 1964 with the funds available.

13. Mrs. MIRONOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that her delegation would also have difficulty in considering the item at the current session and in supporting a proposal having financial implications which were not clear. In particular, it was important to know whether the money was to come from the regular budget or from the Expanded Programme. She agreed that the item should be referred to TAC without comment.

14. Mr. JEANNEL (France) also supported the procedure suggested, while adopting a positive attitude towards the proposal to hold regional courses on human rights.

15. Mr. ANJARIA (India) said his country, too, favoured the regional courses but had no objection to the matter first being considered by TAC.

*The Council decided to refer the question entitled "Advisory services in the field of human rights" without comment to the Technical Assistance Committee for consideration at its session in June 1963.*

### AGENDA ITEM 9

#### Transport development (E/3721, E/L.989) (concluded)

*(resumed from the 1252nd meeting)*

16. Mr. MATSCH (Austria) referred to his delegation's draft resolution (E/L.989). The Secretary-General, in his report on work done and recommendations concerning transport development (E/3721), shared the opinion of all traffic authorities that international transport instruments should be continuously revised. However, as there was no time to consider the matter at the present session, the Council should decide to place it on the agenda of the thirty-sixth session.

17. Mr. FINGER (United States of America) pointed out that the wording of the first paragraph of the draft resolution might imply that international transport instruments should be in a continuous state of revision, which obviously was not what the Austrian representative had intended. He suggested that the paragraph should be worded as follows:

*"Noting the report of the Secretary-General on transport development (E/3721) and in particular the reference therein to international transport instruments (paras. 28-32), including the world-wide agreements of 1949 on road vehicles and signals of highways, established under the aegis of the United Nations".*

18. He also suggested that, in the operative paragraph, the words "procedures for" should be inserted before the word "revision" and that the word "provisional" should be inserted before the word "agenda".

19. Mr. MATSCH (Austria) accepted those amendments.

20. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the draft resolution of Austria (E/L.989), as amended.

*The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted unanimously.*

### AGENDA ITEM 19

Consideration of the provisional agenda for the thirty-sixth session and establishment of dates for opening debate on items (E/3730 and Add.1 and 2, E/L.992)

ADOPTION OF THE PROVISIONAL AGENDA FOR THE THIRTY-SIXTH SESSION (E/3730 AND ADD.1 AND 2)

21. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider first the list of agenda items and the provisional agenda for the thirty-sixth session contained in the Secretary-General's notes (E/3730 and Add.1 and 2).

22. Mr. ORNATSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) suggested that the question covered by item 2 (b) (Economic projections and development planning) should be listed as a separate item in its own right. His delegation considered development planning to be of particular importance to the developing countries, and he noted that the Secretary-General had listed it separately in his tentative outline for a functional

classification of United Nations projects and activities (E/3702, annex). However, in view of the very heavy agenda for the thirty-sixth session and of the fact that the report of the Consultative Group on Planning for Economic Development would not be ready in time, he would not object to a joint discussion at that session of the two sub-items of item 2 (World economic trends), namely item 2 (a) (Surveys of the world economic situation) and item 2 (b) (Economic projections and development planning), provided that they were taken up separately in future years.

23. The preliminary annotations in the Secretary-General's note (E/3730) indicated that too much documentation was being submitted in connexion with item 4 (General review of the development, co-ordination and concentration of the economic, social and human rights programmes and activities of the United Nations, the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency as a whole); the purpose of co-ordination should be to reduce documentation. Moreover, according to the Secretary-General's working paper on arrangement of business at the session (E/L.992), items relating to science and technology, which were not the concern of the Co-ordination Committee, would nevertheless be referred to that committee.

24. The preliminary annotations to item 26 (Financial implications of actions of the Council) indicated that a report on the financial implications associated with decisions at the thirty-fifth and thirty-sixth sessions would be presented at the latter session; he therefore suggested that the Council might save time by not considering financial implications at the current session.

25. Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America) remarked that, in view of the heavy agenda, it would seem better to combine items, rather than to separate them. Development planning might conceivably be considered on a separate basis, but it was difficult to see how economic trends could be discussed without reference to economic projections. If it appeared desirable in future years to treat development planning separately, a decision could be taken at the appropriate time.

26. Mr. ORNATSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that although, logically, surveys of the world economic situation related to the past and economic projections to the future, his delegation was simply asking that item 2 (b) should be listed separately for consideration at the forthcoming session as an indication of its importance.

27. Mr. VIAUD (France) felt that there was no need to divide item 2. Heads of delegations could speak in the general debate, and there would be nothing to prevent the Economic Committee, when it came to discuss the more technical aspects, from taking up the two sub-items separately.

28. He noted that there was no reference, in the annotations to item 4, of the debate at the current session (agenda item 17) on integrated programme and budget policy and the draft resolution (E/L.988) adopted at the 1254th meeting. The annotations should be revised accordingly for the information of Governments.

29. Item 5 (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development) and item 9 (International commodity problems) should be linked, since the reports of the Commission on International Commodity Trade and

the Preparatory Committee of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development would both take up the important subject of compensatory financing to offset export price fluctuations.

30. One general point which had been raised on several occasions in connexion with the Council's summer session was the question of co-ordination discussed first in plenary and then in the Co-ordination Committee. The debate in plenary provided the only real opportunity for the Council to hear the chief officers of the various specialized agencies, and his delegation had always felt that there should be a special item on the agenda relating to the activities of the specialized agencies, quite apart from the question of co-ordination. He was making no formal proposal, but if item 4 could be subdivided and the first sub-item entitled, for instance, "Statements by the chief officers of the specialized agencies", that would indicate the Council's interest in the agencies' activities without, of course, implying that the Council wished to exercise any control over them.

31. The PRESIDENT said that, in the absence of any formal proposals, he would consider the list of agenda items and the provisional agenda as set forth in the Secretary-General's notes (E/3730 and Add.1 and 2) approved by the Council.

*It was so decided.*

#### ARRANGEMENT OF BUSINESS FOR THE THIRTY-SIXTH SESSION

32. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the Secretary-General's working paper on the arrangement of business at the thirty-sixth session (E/L.992).

33. Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America) suggested that item 2 (World economic trends) and item 3 (World social trends) of the provisional agenda should be discussed jointly. Past experience had shown that much of the material covered by the two items was closely interrelated, with the result that considerable repetition took place. The suggestion was not a new one, having been put forward in Council resolution 830 K (XXXII), paragraph 2, and welcomed with satisfaction by the General Assembly in resolution 1675 (XVI), paragraph 4. However, no action had been taken on that proposal, and he believed that the time had come to give the matter further consideration.

34. Mr. VIAUD (France) noted that discussion of the report of TAC on item 14 (Programmes of technical co-operation) was scheduled for the first week, and he requested an assurance that the report would be available in time for delegations to study it before the debate.

35. In the fourth week, item 5 was scheduled for discussion in plenary and item 9 for debate in committee. He suggested that item 5 should be advanced by a few days, since many delegations would assign the same representatives to the debate on both items.

36. Item 26, on financial implications, was scheduled, as usual, for the end of the session. It had been suggested, during the debate at the current session on integrated programme and budget policy, that the Secretariat should submit estimates of the financial implications of the Council's activities at the beginning of the session, but that would appear to serve no useful purpose unless the estimates were then debated.

37. The United States representative's suggestion was an attractive one, but he feared that, if it was accepted, the debate on world social trends—a most difficult subject because of its general character—might take second place to the discussion of economic problems. Economic development might be impeded if insufficient attention was given to social problems, and he hoped that the Council would allow delegations which wished to speak separately on the two items to do so. He noted also that, whereas the item on world economic trends would be referred to the Economic Committee after the general debate, world social trends would be considered only in plenary.

38. Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America) said that his suggestion was merely that delegations wishing to combine their statements on the two items should be permitted to do so, while others would be free to comment on them separately. That procedure would not change the situation with regard to the reference of items to committees, but he believed, in any event, that many aspects of the world social situation were dealt with by the Social Committee under item 16 (Report of the Social Commission). His delegation was fully aware of the importance of the social aspects of development, which might well receive greater attention if the debate covered the two items.

39. Mr. MALINOWSKI (Secretary of the Council) said it was intended to issue copies of the report of TAC to delegations not less than forty-eight hours before the start of the debate on item 14; otherwise, the discussion would be rescheduled. One reason for placing that item at the beginning of the session was to expedite action on resolutions adopted by TAC.

40. The Secretariat had no comment to make on the question of combining items 5 and 9. The report of the Preparatory Committee of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development was unlikely to be available before the date on which the discussion of item 5 was scheduled to begin, but care would be taken to avoid overlapping with item 9. It had been felt that the Preparatory Committee's report should be studied in plenary and the report of the Commission on International Commodity Trade, being more technical, in committee.

41. It was for the Council to decide whether financial implications should be discussed twice; the Secretariat would welcome a general discussion at the beginning of the session.

42. It had been anticipated that item 3 (World social trends) would be debated in plenary and the report of the Social Commission in committee, but if the Council wished to refer item 3 to the Social Committee, that would be entirely agreeable to the Secretariat.

43. Mr. ORNATSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Council's thirty-sixth session would inevitably take place in the shadow of the forthcoming United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. In view of the extreme importance of that Conference and the possibly controversial nature of the discussions to which it would give rise, delegations should be given an opportunity to express their views as fully as possible. He therefore suggested that item 5 of the provisional agenda should be brought forward from the fourth to the third week. Item 2, on world economic trends, should be advanced to the first week, in accordance with long-established practice, so that it could be discussed when general positions were being defined and when the most senior members of delegations were still present.

44. So far as the United States proposal for a combined plenary debate on items 2 and 3 was concerned, the fact that world economic trends and world social trends were related was insufficient justification for dealing with them together; after all, there was no item on the Council's agenda which could be considered in isolation, but the various items had to be taken up separately, if only because of the mass of documents. He therefore endorsed the French representative's view that a combined debate on the items concerned was unlikely to be fruitful.

45. Like the French representative, he too wondered why item 3 was scheduled for plenary discussion only. The same might be said of item 11 (Industrial development), a topic of extreme importance for the developing countries. Noting that industrial development was closely linked with the application of science and technology for the benefit of the less developed countries, he suggested that the plenary debate on item 11 might be combined to advantage with sub-item 15 (a) (Report by the Secretary-General on the results of the United Nations Conference on the Application of Science and Technology for the Benefit of Less Developed Areas), after which both items could be referred to the Economic Committee for more detailed consideration. In fact, considerable time might be saved in plenary by referring certain items direct to the appropriate committees—for instance, item 10 (World Food Programme) and item 23 (Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees), or that concerning the map of the world.

46. Mr. UNWIN (United Kingdom) wondered whether there was much to be gained by bringing forward the debate on the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. He would expect consideration of that item at the thirty-sixth session to concentrate on practical arrangements rather than general principles, which had already been exhaustively discussed at previous sessions of the Council and elsewhere; further general discussion was likely to be repetitive or anticipatory of the Conference itself. It would therefore be better not to take up item 5 until the report of the Preparatory Committee was available.

47. So far as item 2 was concerned, he wondered whether it was really necessary to discuss world economic trends in committee as well as in plenary. However, if sub-item 2 (b) was to be regarded as a separate item, it could perhaps be referred to the Economic Committee as such.

48. Mr. MALINOWSKI (Secretary of the Council) pointed out that the plenary debate on world economic trends had in the past usually been short; the item had been referred subsequently to the Economic Committee for the consideration of practical measures.

49. Mr. UNWIN (United Kingdom) said that in that case there was much to be said for the United States proposal for a combined debate on items 2 and 3, since there would presumably be no difficulty then in giving proper weight to the social aspects.

50. Mr. VIAUD (France) suggested that discussion of item 3 should follow immediately after item 2; delegations could then treat the two items simultaneously or not, as they chose. Item 3 could then be referred to the Social Committee at the end of the third week, before item 17 (Report of the Committee on Housing, Building and Planning). He hoped that solution would prove satisfactory.



51. He would not press his suggestion that the debate on item 14 should be put back, on the understanding that the schedule could be changed later if the report of TAC was not available on time.

52. It might be sufficient to bring forward the plenary debate on item 5 to the end of the third week; that involved a difference of a few days only, but it should be sufficient to allow the plenary debate on item 5 to be concluded before the Economic Committee took up item 9. Alternatively, item 5 could be left to the fourth week as originally scheduled, on the understanding that item 9 would not go before the Economic Committee until after conclusion of the plenary debate on item 5.

53. One of the most important topics to be discussed at the thirty-sixth session was item 15 (Questions relating to science and technology). If the Council was to have a profitable debate on that item in the second week, when the Secretary-General would be present, it was most important that the special report in course of preparation should be circulated well in advance.

54. Mr. DE SEYNES (Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs), replying to the final point raised by the French representative, said that the report concerned, which would in fact be brief, was to be discussed by the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination at the beginning of May; however, he hoped it would be possible to observe the six-week rule.

55. The PRESIDENT noted that there was no objection on the part of the Secretariat to the Council's holding two debates on item 26; in view of the oft-emphasized need for the Council to examine closely the financial implications of its actions, he assumed that delegations would welcome the opportunity to consider the item early in the session as well as at the end. He suggested that the Secretariat should make suitable provision in the schedule.

*It was so decided.*

56. The PRESIDENT recapitulated the French representative's compromise proposal that the plenary debate on item 3 should be scheduled to follow immediately after that on item 2, and noted that there appeared to be no objection; he accordingly suggested that the Secretariat should be asked to make the necessary changes in the provisional programme of work.

*It was so decided.*

57. The PRESIDENT then turned to the timing of the Preparatory Committee's report and the consideration of items 5 and 9. The French and USSR representatives had both suggested that item 5 should be brought forward; however, the Secretary had explained that that would raise difficulties in the matter of documentation, while the United Kingdom representative had pointed out the impracticability of discussing that item before the Preparatory Committee's report was available. It therefore looked as though discussion of item 5 would have to take place as scheduled, namely, at the beginning of the fourth week.

58. Mr. ORNATSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) felt that a difference of a few days could hardly have so great an effect on the documents situation, whereas the advantages of bringing forward the debate were considerable. It should surely be possible to fit the debate on item 5 into the third week, perhaps

by postponing other items of less importance, such as item 24 (Non-governmental organizations).

59. Mr. HAJEK (Czechoslovakia) also felt that the debate on item 5 should begin earlier. Unfamiliarity with the material should not present a problem, for many delegations had been represented on the Preparatory Committee and would therefore not be totally ignorant of the matter.

60. Mr. PARSONS (Australia) felt that it would be better to leave the debate on item 5 where it was; if the Preparatory Committee should fail to conclude its proceedings on time, as had been the case at its first session, it would still be sitting when the Council convened. The Secretariat would thus be expected to give priority to the Preparatory Committee's report at a time when it was already fully engaged with the Council's documentation.

61. Mr. MALINOWSKI (Secretary of the Council) recalled that it would take a week to ten days to produce and circulate the Preparatory Committee's report. It was to be expected that delegations would wish to send the report to their Governments, and it was therefore advisable to allow a further delay of ten days before beginning the debate on it. At the same time, it was true that certain of the less urgent items scheduled for the third week could be postponed, if the Council so wished.

62. The PRESIDENT suggested that, in the light of the various views just expressed, the debate on item 5 should be brought forward to the end of the third week, after the debate on item 7 (Economic and social consequences of disarmament), on the understanding that it would take place then only if the necessary documents had been available sufficiently long in advance.

*It was so decided.*

63. Mr. ORNATSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) repeated his proposal that the debate on world economic trends should be held at the very beginning of the session, in view of its great importance; that had been the usual practice in the past.

64. It was still not clear to him why the question of industrial development was scheduled for debate in plenary only.

65. Mr. MALINOWSKI (Secretary of the Council) said that there were several reasons why the practice of debating world economic trends at the beginning of the session had been abandoned. First, despite every effort, the World Economic Survey, 1962, would not be ready in time for the beginning of the session. Secondly, the first week of the session was short and many of the more senior members of delegations tended to arrive for the second week. Thirdly, the reports of the regional economic commissions (item 12) would have to be discussed during the first week since the Executive Secretaries of the commissions would already be at Geneva at the beginning of the session for consultations with the Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs, and could not themselves afford to stay at Geneva longer than was necessary.

66. With regard to the item on industrial development, he recalled that all members of the Council were in fact represented on the Committee for Industrial Development, and that that Committee's first session had in fact overlapped the Council's session and had been regarded as part of it. For technical reasons, it

had since been decided that the Committee for Industrial Development should meet in advance of the Council and submit draft resolutions to it for approval in plenary. However, there was no reason why the Council should not refer the item concerned to the Economic Committee if it so wished.

67. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council approve the proposals set forth in the Secretary-General's working paper (E/L.992), as modified.

*It was so decided.*

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.