



ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Twenty-ninth Session
OFFICIAL RECORDS

Tuesday, 5 April 1960,
at 11.15 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| Opening of the session | 1 |
| Tribute to the memory of His Majesty King Norodom Suramarit of Cambodia | 1 |
| Agenda item 1: | |
| Election of President and Vice-Presidents for 1960 | |
| Election of the President | 1 |
| Election of the First Vice-President | 1 |
| Election of the Second Vice-President | 1 |
| Question of the representation of China | 2 |
| Agenda item 2: | |
| Adoption of the agenda | 2 |
| Arrangement of business at the session | 3 |

President: Mr. C. W. A. SCHURMANN
(Netherlands).

Present:

Representatives of the following States: Afghanistan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Denmark, France, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Spain, Sudan, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela.

Observers for the following Member States: Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Canada, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Mexico, Peru, Philippines, Tunisia, Yugoslavia.

Observers for the following non-member States: Federal Republic of Germany, Holy See.

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; World Meteorological Organization.

The representative of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Opening of the session

1. Mr. MICHALOWSKI (Poland), Acting President, declared open the twenty-ninth session of the Economic and Social Council.

Tribute to the memory of His Majesty King Norodom Suramarit of Cambodia

2. Mr. MICHALOWSKI (Poland), Acting President, invited the members of the Council to observe a

minute's silence in memory of His Majesty King Norodom Suramarit of Cambodia.

The Council observed a minute's silence.

AGENDA ITEM 1

Election of President and Vice-Presidents for 1960

ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT

3. Mr. MICHALOWSKI (Poland), Acting President, invited the Council to elect its President for 1960.

4. Mr. PHILLIPS (United States of America) nominated Mr. Schürmann (Netherlands).

5. Mr. PENTEADO (Brazil) and Mr. AUBOIN (France) supported the nomination.

Mr. Schürmann (Netherlands) was elected President by acclamation.

Mr. Schürmann (Netherlands) took the Chair.

6. The PRESIDENT thanked the members of the Council for their expression of confidence in him; the honour done him was essentially a tribute to his country, which, in the work of the Council, had always taken a keen interest in United Nations efforts to promote the economic and social welfare of peoples, fundamental human liberties and rights, and health and education. He assured his colleagues that, with the assistance of the Vice-Presidents, of all the representatives—including those of the six States newly elected or re-elected to the Council, whom he welcomed—and of the new Secretary of the Council, he would do his utmost to ensure that the work of the session was carried out in a satisfactory manner.

ELECTION OF THE FIRST VICE-PRESIDENT

7. Mr. SOSA RODRIGUEZ (Venezuela) nominated Mr. Schweitzer (Chile).

8. Mr. SHANAHAN (New Zealand) supported the nomination.

Mr. Schweitzer (Chile) was elected First Vice-President by acclamation.

9. Mr. Schweitzer (Chile) thanked the members of the Council for having called upon him to assist the President.

ELECTION OF THE SECOND VICE-PRESIDENT

10. Mr. MATSUDAIRA (Japan) nominated Mr. Adeel (Sudan).

11. Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan) and Mr. DUDLEY (United Kingdom) supported the nomination.

Mr. Adeel (Sudan) was elected Second Vice-President by acclamation.

12. Mr. ADEEL (Sudan) thanked the members of the Council for the honour they had done him.

Question of the representation of China

13. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) deplored the fact that there was no representative of the People's Republic of China taking part in the session. The absence of such a representative, who alone would be qualified to speak on behalf of his country in the Council and in the other bodies of the United Nations, could not but be detrimental to the Council's work.

14. Mr. CHENG Paonan (China) said that it was extremely regrettable that the representative of the Soviet Union had seen fit to disturb the Council's work by raising a matter which was entirely divorced from the problems before the Council and which had long been recognized as pure propaganda. Unlike the Communist régime, which had been imposed on the people against their will, the Government which he represented was the only one which had been lawfully established and which was recognized as such by the United Nations and the only Government which could speak on behalf of all the Chinese people.

15. Mr. TCHOBANOV (Bulgaria) associated himself unreservedly with the comments made by the representative of the Soviet Union. At a time when the Council was about to examine the problems of the economic development of the under-developed countries, it was deplorable that a country such as the People's Republic of China, which, starting with a very low level of living, had made such rapid progress that it would soon be incorrect to classify it among the under-developed countries, should not be able to describe its remarkable achievements.

16. Mr. MICHALOWSKI (Poland) regretted that the Chinese people and Government were not represented on the Council. The continuation of that abnormal situation was detrimental to the Council's work. He hoped that it would soon be remedied by an act of political wisdom and historic justice.

17. Mr. PHILLIPS (United States of America) reaffirmed his Government's view that the right of the present representatives of the Republic of China to serve on the Council could not be denied. It was deplorable that any member would even suggest that the Council should welcome representatives of a régime which departed drastically from normally accepted standards of international conduct and which showed nothing but contempt for the principles for which the United Nations stood.

AGENDA ITEM 2

Adoption of the agenda (E/3316 and Add.1)

18. Mr. ADEEL (Sudan) proposed, on behalf of his own delegation and those of Afghanistan and Japan, the inclusion in the agenda, under rule 13 of the rules of procedure, of a supplementary item entitled: "Measures to be adopted in connexion with the earthquakes in Morocco". He did not propose to describe in detail a disaster of which all were well aware but he would point out that the two violent earthquakes and the tidal wave which had occurred at Agadir on the night of 29 February 1960 had caused material damage estimated at \$100 million in that important trading and tourist port. Furthermore, according to the latest estimates 15,000 persons had been killed, 8,000 had been injured and 30,000 had been left homeless. Morocco, a country which was valiantly endeavouring,

in spite of its limited resources, to raise the level of living of its population, was not able to contend alone with such a catastrophe, which was without precedent in its history. It was the duty of the international community to come to its aid. Many Governments and organizations had already given the victims considerable assistance, for which Morocco was certainly grateful. The United Nations, for its part, could not remain indifferent. He requested the Council to consider that supplementary item in plenary meeting at the earliest possible date.

19. Mr. AUBOIN (France) supported the proposal wholeheartedly. In connexion with the disaster, which had caused consternation throughout the entire world, his Government wished once again to express to Morocco its sincere and profound sympathy and felt that the United Nations could not remain inactive. UNICEF had already granted Morocco emergency aid amounting to \$50,000. The meeting of the Council afforded a further opportunity to assist the victims of that tragic event.

20. Mr. MICHALOWSKI (Poland) supported the proposal submitted by the three delegations since it was the duty of the Council to provide assistance to the victims of the disaster as a matter of urgency.

21. Mr. DE LEQUERICA (Spain) said that his country, which had close links with Morocco, had been appalled by the news of the earthquakes at Agadir, in which thousands of Spanish residents in the town had perished. The United Nations was in duty bound to direct and co-ordinate the assistance which Morocco needed.

22. Mr. PHILLIPS (United States of America) agreed that the proposed new item should be examined without delay.

23. Mr. SOSA RODRIGUEZ (Venezuela) considered that by helping the victims of the Agadir disaster the Council would be serving the cause of international solidarity, which was the very basis of the United Nations.

24. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) supported the proposal that the question should be included in the agenda and expressed the profound sympathy of the Government and people of the Soviet Union with the Government and people of Morocco.

25. Mr. DUDLEY (United Kingdom) associated himself with those representatives who had expressed their delegations' sympathy for the people of Morocco. He was ready to examine the proposed supplementary item, which was of the greatest importance, as early as possible.

26. Mr. TCHOBANOV (Bulgaria) supported the proposal made by the delegations of Afghanistan, Japan and Sudan and expressed the sympathy of the Bulgarian Government and people for the sufferings of the people of Morocco.

27. The PRESIDENT proposed that, if there were no objections, the supplementary item "Measures to be adopted in connexion with the earthquakes in Morocco" should be included in the agenda.

It was so decided.

28. Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan), referring to item 11 (Question of a declaration on freedom of information) of the provisional agenda (E/3316) said that the order in which steps should be taken in that respect should

be in accordance with their importance. In his opinion, there was no necessity to draw up a declaration until an instrument having binding force, as would the Convention on Freedom of Information which was before the General Assembly, had been adopted. Moreover, it should be borne in mind that there was already a declaration on freedom of information: that which appeared in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. There would be no point in drawing up a new declaration; if some definite action was to be taken in the matter a convention should be adopted. He would not press for the deletion of the item from the agenda if the majority of the Council would prefer it to be retained, but he asked those delegations which had proposed its inclusion to explain their intentions and what practical results they hoped to achieve. The Afghan delegation would not be able to agree to any steps which might prejudice the adoption of a convention.

29. The PRESIDENT pointed out that item 11 of the agenda had been included following a decision taken by the Council at its twenty-eighth session (resolution 732 (XXVIII)). It could not therefore be said that any particular delegation had proposed its inclusion.

30. Mr. PHILLIPS (United States of America) said that he did not wish to go into the substance of the matter but would emphasize that the delegations which supported the proposal for a declaration had no intention of interfering with the conclusion of a convention by the General Assembly.

31. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) agreed with the representative of Afghanistan. The work done by the General Assembly in connexion with the draft convention had already led to practical results; moreover the Assembly had decided in its resolution 1459 (XIV) to give priority to the item at its fifteenth session. The General Assembly's work would be needlessly complicated if it had before it two documents on the same subject. The proposal to include the question of a declaration in the agenda was an attempt to obscure the essential problem of the conclusion of a convention on freedom of information. There was no reason why the General Assembly should not examine the text of the declaration after it had completed its work on the draft convention.

32. The PRESIDENT proposed that the Council adopt the agenda as listed in the note by the Secretary-General (E/3316), with the addition of the supplementary item (E/3316/Add.1) which the Council had decided to include.

It was so decided.

Arrangement of business at the session (E/L.854)

33. Mr. PAZHAWAK (Afghanistan), supported by Mr. ADEEL (Sudan), proposed that the Council should begin by examining the item "Measures to be adopted in connexion with the earthquakes in Morocco". Thus the work of the Council would begin with an auspicious gesture of international solidarity. The delegations of Afghanistan, Japan and the Sudan had submitted a draft resolution on the subject (E/L.856).

34. Mr. SHANAHAN (New Zealand) said that he would prefer the examination of that item to be deferred until the next day, to give delegations time to study the draft resolution.

35. The PRESIDENT proposed that the Council should defer its examination of the item to the next morning. That would avoid the necessity of devoting two meetings to the subject, which might occur if delegations were not given time to study the draft.

It was so decided.

36. Mr. DUDLEY (United Kingdom), supported by Mr. PENTEADO (Brazil), proposed that agenda item 6 (Economic development of under-developed countries) should not be examined in plenary meeting. The item consisted of four sub-items relating to different subjects which could hardly be dealt with together and which formed the subject of separate Secretariat documents. The best procedure would be to refer the item to the Economic Committee direct.

37. Mr. PAZHAWAK (Afghanistan) observed that that item was the most important one the Council had ever had to consider. While some aspects of it could be examined in detail in Committee, a large number of questions which were of crucial importance for the under-developed countries could with advantage be the subject of a general discussion, which would undoubtedly facilitate the Committee's work. It was for that very reason that the Secretary-General had proposed a preliminary debate in plenary meeting. He hoped that the representatives of the United Kingdom and Brazil would heed the opinion expressed by a representative of an under-developed country and would not press their proposal.

38. Mr. CHENG Paonan (China) said that he supported the United Kingdom representative's proposal for two reasons: firstly because item 6 of the agenda did not relate to the problem of the Economic development of under-developed countries as a whole but dealt with four technical aspects of that problem, and secondly, because he thought it preferable that the over-all problem, in view of its importance, should be studied at the Council's summer session at which there would be meetings at the ministerial level.

39. Mr. MICHALOWSKI (Poland) said that he fully shared the Afghan representative's opinion. The economic development of under-developed countries was the most important question before the Council at its current session, and consequently it would not be proper to refer that question, and particularly the problem of industrialization, to the Economic Committee without preliminary debate at a plenary meeting.

40. Mr. PHILLIPS (United States of America) supported the United Kingdom representative's proposal in view of the fact that only certain individual aspects of the economic development of under-developed countries were to be studied. The only object of that proposal was to avoid a prolonged general debate which would merely delay the study of the highly technical questions listed in item 6 of the agenda.

41. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stressed that the Secretary-General's proposals on the arrangement of business at the twenty-ninth session (E/L.854) had been drawn up after consultation with the Council members. One of those proposals was that the question of the economic development of under-developed countries should be referred to the Council's Economic Committee after preliminary debate in plenary meeting. If a vote was taken, the normal procedure would be for that proposal to be voted on first, before the United Kingdom representative's proposal.

42. Mr. PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan) also considered that the United Kingdom proposal ran counter to that submitted by the Secretary-General in agreement with the Council members, and that it was absolutely contrary to the practice which the Council had adopted hitherto. There were numerous aspects of item 6 of the agenda which could only be studied within the framework of a general discussion. He thought it undesirable that the general debate should take place in Committee. If it were held at a plenary meeting it would be shorter and would help the Committee in its work. If the United Kingdom representative maintained his proposal, he, as a representative of an under-developed country, would ask that it be put to the vote and would vote against it.

43. Mr. PENTEADO (Brazil) said that it was precisely because the question of the economic development of under-developed countries was so important that he would prefer it to be examined in Committee.

44. Mr. AUBOIN (France) said that the importance of the economic development of under-developed countries, which the members of the Council were unanimous in recognizing, was not in question. He thought that the United Kingdom representative's proposal was a judicious one from the point of view of efficiency. The Council would in any case have an opportunity to revive the study of that question on a broader basis at the summer session.

45. Mr. DUDLEY (United Kingdom) noted that all the Council members were at one in recognizing the extreme importance of the question of the economic development of under-developed countries. That was precisely the reason why they should strive to achieve concrete results in that field, and consequently to avoid all unnecessary controversy. He was sure the majority of the Council shared his views on that point.

46. Mr. PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan) said that, in view of what the United Kingdom representative had just said, he felt obliged to request a vote in order to see how the delegations of the under-developed countries and those of the industrialized countries stood.

47. Mr. SHANAHAN (New Zealand) said that he represented a developing country half-way between

those two categories; it was particularly interested in all the problems encountered by the under-developed countries. The United Kingdom proposal, the sole object of which was to facilitate the Council's work, did not tend in any way to minimize the importance of those problems.

48. Mr. SOSA RODRIGUEZ (Venezuela) did not think that a distinction should be established between industrialized and under-developed countries in connexion with a vote on a procedural matter. He agreed with the representatives of the United States, France and New Zealand that the Council's work would be facilitated if the four technical questions in agenda item 6 were referred to the Economic Committee.

49. Mr. ORTIZ MARTIN (Costa Rica) said that he did not accept the interpretation which the Afghan representative put on the vote which was about to be taken.

50. Mr. PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan) considered that in the present case it was impossible to maintain that the matter was a procedural one. The United Kingdom proposal ran counter to the procedure which had always been followed in the past. He pressed for a vote on the United Kingdom proposal because he could not approve a motion which he deemed contrary to the interests of the under-developed countries.

51. Mr. ADEEL (Sudan) said that the important thing was to make a thorough study of the question of the economic development of under-developed countries and to reach concrete results. He held no strong views for or against the United Kingdom proposal and would therefore abstain from voting.

52. The PRESIDENT put the United Kingdom proposal to the vote.

The proposal was adopted by 13 votes to 4, with 1 abstention.

53. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council adopt the remaining proposals in the Secretary-General's working paper (E/L.854).

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.