



**ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL**

Tuesday, 18 December 1962,  
at 3.25 p.m.

*Resumed Thirty-fourth Session*

OFFICIAL RECORDS

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Inclusion in the agenda of additional items . . . . .</i>	1
<i>Order of consideration of agenda items . . . . .</i>	1
<i>Agenda item 25:</i>	
<i>Calendar of conferences for 1963</i>	
<i>Place of meeting of the summer session of the Technical Assistance Committee . . . . .</i>	1
<i>Agenda item 32:</i>	
<i>Implementation of recommendations of the ad hoc Committee established under Council resolution 851 (XXXII): section IV of the re- port of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination . . . . .</i>	2
<i>Agenda item 30:</i>	
<i>Work of the Council in 1963 . . . . .</i>	2

*President:* Mr. Jerzy MICHALOWSKI (Poland).

*Present:*

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

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.

Inclusion in the agenda of additional items (E/L.975)

1. The PRESIDENT drew the Council's attention to the note by the Secretary-General (E/L.975) concerning the agenda for the resumed thirty-fourth session. He suggested that the additional items mentioned in sections II and III of that note—only two of which were separate items, the other two being part of item 28 (Elections)—be included in the agenda.

2. Mr. KLUTZNICK (United States of America) thought it would be preferable to postpone the review of the composition of the United Nations/FAO Intergovernmental Committee on the World Food Programme until the thirty-fifth session.

3. Mr. UNWIN (United Kingdom) said that his delegation attached the highest importance to that item, which should receive more attention than the Council could devote to it at the resumed thirty-fourth session. While he hoped that the Council would give a favourable reception to the views expressed by the Council of FAO, he joined the United States representative in suggesting the postponement of the item until the thirty-fifth session.

4. The PRESIDENT suggested that the additional items mentioned in the note by the Secretary-General (E/L.975), with the exception of the item to which the United States and United Kingdom representatives had just referred, should be included in the agenda of the resumed thirty-fourth session.

*It was so decided.*

Order of consideration of agenda items

5. The PRESIDENT understood that some delegations would prefer that the Council should not take up immediately the item entitled "Reports of the regional economic commissions: report of the Economic Commission for Africa". Accordingly, he suggested that the Council should consider first the question of the place of meeting of the summer session of the Technical Assistance Committee, then the item entitled "Implementation of recommendations of the ad hoc Committee established under Council resolution 851 (XXXII): section IV of the report of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination", and then the work of the Council in 1963. Thereafter, the Council could consider the report of the Economic Commission for Africa, and subsequently deal with the elections.

6. Mr. VERAS (Brazil) suggested that the Council deal with the elections before considering the report of the Economic Commission for Africa.

7. The PRESIDENT pointed out that the elections, apart from the fact that they traditionally came last, necessitated preliminary exchanges of view between delegations and that it would therefore be better to keep them at the end.

8. Mr. CARRILLO (El Salvador) and Mr. ARKADYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) supported the President's suggestions.

9. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should follow the course which he had just proposed.

*It was so decided.*

AGENDA ITEM 25

Calendar of conferences for 1963

PLACE OF MEETING OF THE SUMMER SESSION OF THE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE (E/3697)

10. The PRESIDENT recalled that the Council had decided to postpone a decision regarding the place of meeting of the summer session of TAC until after the November 1962 session of that body, as Denmark had indicated that it intended to invite TAC to meet at Copenhagen. He asked delegations to refer to the communication from Denmark (E/3697) and to the report of the Secretary-General to the Fifth Committee of the General Assembly on the financial implications of accepting the Danish Government's offer (A/C.5/956). He suggested that the Council should gratefully accept that invitation.

*It was so decided.*

11. Mr. PARSONS (Australia) was pleased to observe that the Council was unanimous in accepting the very generous invitation of Denmark, which, like the other Scandinavian countries, had always made a very notable contribution in the technical assistance field. He was gratified by the Council's decision and merely expressed the hope that the enthusiastic acceptance of the Danish invitation would not lead the members of the Council to regard as no longer in effect the tradition whereby TAC met either at Geneva or at Headquarters.

#### AGENDA ITEM 32

Implementation of recommendations of the ad hoc Committee established under Council resolution 851 (XXXII): section IV of the report of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (E/3695)

12. The PRESIDENT recalled that in its resolution 900 A (XXXIV), the Council had requested the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination to consider the report (E/3639) of the ad hoc Committee established under Council resolution 851 (XXXII) and report its views to the Council at its resumed thirty-fourth session. He drew representatives' attention to the pertinent observations of ACC recorded in paragraphs 16 to 59 of its twenty-seventh report (E/3695).

13. Mr. ARKADYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) wished to state his country's position concerning the recommendations of the ad hoc Committee, to which ACC had devoted section IV of its twenty-seventh report. Those recommendations included some very important ones designed to increase the effectiveness of the United Nations programmes of technical cooperation, with due consideration given to the needs of the less developed countries. It was essential that the competent United Nations organs, and ACC in particular, should have access to all the requisite information concerning the implementation of the recommendations of the ad hoc Committee and the results which were achieved.

14. In paragraph 19 (b) of the ACC report, it was indicated that the fixing of priorities for requests for assistance was the established right of Governments themselves in the context of their over-all development plans. That was a very interesting and a very important principle. His delegation supported that recommendation of ACC, more especially since that principle was not always observed in practice, particularly so far as the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance was concerned. As his delegation had noted in November at the 281st meeting of TAC, the draft programme had one serious defect: as in the past, it was based, not on the principle of direct allocation to recipient Governments of the funds available under the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance so that the Governments were able to use the funds in question as they wished in the light of their economic development plans, but on the principle of the allocation of the funds to the specialized agencies, which thus had an opportunity to influence the recipient Governments when priorities were fixed and the operating conditions of the projects were established. That influence was not always—far from it—exercised in the interests of the developing countries.

15. He also drew the Council's attention to paragraph 29 of the ACC report, in which it was said that TAB had reaffirmed the present practice whereby experts provided under EPTA might undertake, where appro-

priate, executive and operational responsibilities in addition to their advisory and training functions. His delegation felt that the special régime applicable to OPEX programme experts could not be extended to United Nations experts; it could not subscribe to a system whereby experts were led to intervene directly in the administrative machinery of the countries concerned. Subject to those reservations, it saw no objection to the Council's taking note of the ACC report, and it agreed that the report should be communicated to the ad hoc Committee.

16. Mr. VIAUD (France) felt that the Council could not take an immediate stand on the important ACC report and that it would be best to transmit the report to the ad hoc Committee with a request that the latter communicate its observations to TAC and to the Governing Council of the Special Fund, which, in turn, could transmit their views to the Council at its thirty-fifth session.

17. The PRESIDENT suggested that the ACC report (E/3695) should be communicated to the ad hoc Committee, so that the latter might examine it further and consider what action should be taken on it.

*It was so decided.*

#### AGENDA ITEM 30

Work of the Council in 1963 (E/3702, E/L.976, E/L.977)

18. The PRESIDENT drew the attention of the Council to the list of questions in the draft programme prepared by the Secretary-General (E/L.976), to which it was naturally necessary to add the question of the composition of the United Nations/FAO Inter-Governmental Committee on the World Food Programme, just postponed until the thirty-fifth session for consideration. He also drew the attention of the Council to the Secretary-General's note concerning disposal of items arising out of the seventeenth session of the General Assembly (E/L.977) and to the report of the Secretary-General concerning the work of the Council in 1963 (E/3702). It appeared that it would be necessary to consider paragraph 8 of document E/3702 at the same time as document E/L.976. The Council might consider it preferable not to take up the Secretary-General's report—except for certain paragraphs—at the current session.

19. Mr. KLUTZNICK (United States of America) said that the report of the Secretary-General (E/3702) merited detailed study, in view of its importance for the organization of the Council's work. As the report had been distributed only on 13 December, it seemed wise to postpone its consideration until the Council's thirty-fifth session; in that way, delegations would be able to give to it all the attention desirable.

20. The PRESIDENT suggested that consideration of the report of the Secretary-General (E/3702) should be postponed until the Council's next session, with the exception of paragraphs 8, 10 and 11, on which a decision should be reached without delay.

21. Mr. KLUTZNICK (United States of America) supported the President's suggestion.

22. Mr. VIAUD (France) also supported that suggestion. However, although he had not yet been able to study the report in detail, he would like to make a few preliminary remarks. A review of the programme of meetings and conferences seemed eminently desirable: there were quite a large number of committees and

technical groups whose activities absorbed a sizable proportion of the Secretariat's resources throughout the year. But although some of those bodies did not need to meet every year, there were others which should not be obliged to limit the number of their sessions. Certain adjustments might also be desirable in the case of the regional economic commissions, which, with the exception of ECLA, held annual sessions. An exception should, however, be made in the case of the Economic Commission for Africa, which was of recent creation and had to face problems more numerous and urgent than those of the other commissions. For the time being, therefore, ECA needed to hold meetings more often, on the understanding that when it had become more firmly established it would be able, without inconvenience, to reduce the frequency of its sessions.

23. He also recalled the position adopted by France at the last session (1236th meeting) with regard to the adequate and timely consideration by the Council of the financial implications of its actions. The French delegation regretted that discussion of such implications generally came at the end of the session and was often hurried, whereas consideration at an earlier stage might enable the Council to effect certain services. It attached very great importance to that question, which quite clearly required more thorough examination.

24. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should examine paragraphs 8, 10 and 11 of the report of the Secretary-General (E/3702) at the current session and postpone consideration of the rest of the report until its next session.

*It was so decided.*

25. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider paragraph 8 of the report of the Secretary-General (E/3702), sub-paragraph by sub-paragraph.

(i) *Declaration on international economic co-operation*

26. Mr. ARKADYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he had no categorical objections to raise. The paragraph as a whole was worded flexibly and with a great deal of diplomacy. But it was essential to avoid anything making for delay. The Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs could perhaps inform the Council whether the Secretariat was in a position to provide the necessary services for the meetings of the working group appointed to formulate a declaration on international economic co-operation and of the Preparatory Committee of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, even if such meetings were held at very close intervals. The Soviet Union delegation hoped that it would be possible to hold those meetings without their interfering with the Secretariat's work.

27. Mr. DE SEYNES (Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs) stated that the Secretariat was in a position to provide the necessary services for the two meetings. The Preparatory Committee was to meet during the last two weeks of January in order to settle questions of organization; and a second meeting, at which the technical problems could be examined in greater depth, would be held in May 1963. It was intended to hold a third meeting at a later date, when the Council had fixed, at its July session, the date on which the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development would convene.

28. The Secretariat had considered that it might be preferable to start work on the formulation of the declaration on international economic co-operation once the ample documentation prepared for the Conference had become available. But that was of course for the Council to decide, and the Secretariat could provide the necessary services for the meetings at any date.

29. Mr. KLUTZNICK (United States of America) asked whether it would not be better to keep to the original time-table, in the hope that some of the difficulties could be solved between now and the thirty-fifth session and that the working group would by then be in a position to submit an adequate report.

30. Mr. ARKADYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) likewise thought that, in view of the information given by the Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs, it would be preferable not to modify the planned time-table.

31. The PRESIDENT suggested that the working group should meet, as planned, from 4 to 15 February 1963 and should report to the Council at its thirty-fifth session.

*It was so decided.*

(ii) *Surveys of the world economic situation*

32. Mr. ARKADYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that it would be a pity to limit the World Economic Survey, 1962 to a concise survey of the current world economic situation. It was true that planning problems would be given attention in the Economic Survey of Europe in 1962 and that the Council would have before it, at its thirty-sixth session, an experts' report. However, given the growing importance of planning as an instrument of economic development and the importance attached to the question by the developing countries, it was essential to assemble, without delay, as much concrete information as possible in that field. It should further be remembered that many industrialized countries, including France and the United Kingdom, also appeared to be very interested in questions of planning. While emphasizing that surveys capable of serving as a basis for the economic development of Member States should be made available as quickly as possible, he wished to point out that previous surveys had not always been presented as rationally as might have been wished; subsequent surveys, therefore, should be better balanced. Finally, he was not entirely convinced that the Secretariat lacked resources. The latter might perhaps be used in a different way, so as to be made more productive.

33. Mr. DE SEYNES (Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs) said that it was not without some qualms and hesitation that the Secretariat had proposed to limit the scope of the World Economic Survey, 1962. As the same staff had to prepare the first part of the Survey, relating to economic planning, and simultaneously prepare for the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, it would be difficult for them to discharge both tasks successfully at the same time. The Secretariat fully recognized the importance of the surveys on planning and would neglect no aspect of them. The Council would have before it, at its thirty-sixth session, the report of the group of experts which had met for the first time in August 1962 and was to meet again in March 1963. The Council would also have at its disposal the Economic Survey of Europe in 1962, dealing with planning, which should prove to be a

most useful document, as it was in Europe that a great variety of patterns of planning, used by States with differing economic conceptions, was to be found. A further point was that, work on systems of planning should be considered as a continuous activity spread over several years. Obviously, major changes in the proposed work programme would inevitably have financial implications.

34. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that he too thought it would be unfortunate to have to limit the World Economic Survey, 1962 to a concise survey. If, however, the Secretariat thought that the preparation of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development would absorb a large part of its resources, those resources would obviously have to be assigned to the project deserving the highest priority. Furthermore, it would be recalled that such studies were made available to delegations somewhat belatedly, so that Governments were not always able to examine them thoroughly before the discussion began. The additional time which the Secretariat would have at its disposal might make it possible to assemble more data; moreover, once the records of the United Nations Conference on the Application of Science and Technology for the Benefit of Less Developed Areas had been issued, it would be possible to take into account the section of those records dealing with organization, planning and programming for economic development, which would unquestionably increase the value of the Survey. It was in that spirit and in the light of the financial implications which any change in the Secretariat's work programme would entail, that his delegation accepted the latter's proposal, on the understanding that the complete study of research on planning and programming would not be neglected as a result.

35. Mr. BHADKAMKAR (India) said that the developing countries, which to a certain extent he represented in the Council, were keenly interested in the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, as the discussions in the Second Committee during the seventeenth session of the General Assembly had shown. The Secretary-General's proposal was clearly based on the fact that available resources, both in funds and in staff, were limited, and the Council was therefore obliged to make a choice between the complete success of the Conference and a detailed survey of the world economic situation. He associated himself with the remark just made by the French representative concerning the financial implications of a possible change in the Secretariat's work programme. His delegation was accordingly obliged to support the Secretary-General's proposal.

36. Mr. NATORF (Poland) said that he did not wish to place the Secretariat in an impossible situation; nevertheless, he regretted that the Council should find itself forced to make a choice between the preparation of the Conference and the drafting of the first part of the World Economic Survey, 1962. He feared, moreover, that the work on the Conference would occupy the Secretariat for the whole of 1963 and would accordingly jeopardize the preparation of the first part of the Survey for 1963, relating to planning. Perhaps the Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs could provide information on that point, as also on the stage which the preparation of part I of the Survey had now reached. In 1962, that first part, which had dealt with industrialization, had been submitted to the Committee for Industrial Development at the beginning of March. If part I of the Survey was equally far advanced

now, it might be possible, by expediting the work somewhat, to complete it, at least in its broad outline.

37. Mr. KLUTZNICK (United States of America) said that, although he shared the Soviet representative's interest in the World Economic Survey and in the problems of planning, he supported the proposal of the Secretary-General for the reasons which the latter had given. Making the World Economic Survey more concise would in no way impair its quality; furthermore, the study made by the Economic Commission for Europe and the report of the experts would provide sufficient documentation to enable the Council to give due consideration to the problems of planning.

38. With regard to the misgivings expressed by the Polish representative, who did not wish to see the same situation arise in connexion with the 1963 Survey, he thought that it was for the members of the General Assembly's Fifth Committee to take the requisite steps to ensure that the Secretary-General would have at his disposal sufficient staff to draw up the first part of that Survey.

39. Mr. DE SEYNES (Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs), replying to the questions asked by the representative of Poland, stated formally that if the Council adopted the Secretary-General's proposal, the preparation of part I of the Survey, dealing with economic planning, would be undertaken in time for it to be submitted to the Council in the summer of 1964. In any case, the documentation intended for the Conference was bound to be completed by the end of 1963, since it would have to be ready for the last session of the Preparatory Committee.

40. So far as the Polish representative's second question was concerned, he pointed out that the part of the Survey which had been published in February 1962 for the benefit of the Committee for Industrial Development had represented only a third of the entire first part of the Survey. The bulk of the work was done, not during the two or three succeeding months, but later. Moreover, the minimum documentation envisaged for the Conference already constituted a very considerable list and there could scarcely be any doubt that the Preparatory Committee would lengthen it. The best way of guaranteeing the quality of the documentation intended for the Conference without reducing its volume would therefore be to spread the study of planning problems over two years, as the Secretary-General proposed.

41. The PRESIDENT suggested that, in the light of the explanations given by the Under-Secretary, the Council should adopt the Secretary-General's proposal contained in paragraph 8 (ii) of his report (E/3702).

*It was so decided.*

(iii) *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*

42. The PRESIDENT observed that the question raised in paragraph 8 (iii) was largely a technical one, since it concerned the possibility of combining several documents.

43. Mr. KLUTZNICK (United States of America) wondered whether consideration of that question should not be deferred to the Council's thirty-fifth session since it was related to the point dealt with

under (a) in the report (E/3702), which the Council had decided to refer to that session.

44. Mr. ARKADYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) expressed surprise at the suggestion that consideration of sub-paragraph (iii) should be deferred to the thirty-fifth session when the same question, formulated in identical terms, was the subject of item 4 of the draft list of questions to be considered at the thirty-sixth session (E/L.976). The wording of that item, moreover, seemed to him to be extremely obscure and to imply an unlimited amount of work and activity, whereas the Secretary-General, as had just been shown, lacked sufficient staff to prepare other studies which were much more important. He felt that activities relating to co-ordination had expanded unduly in recent years and had in a sense come to be an end in themselves, thus giving rise to unnecessary work and expenditure. For example, the Special Committee on co-ordination established at the Council's thirty-fourth session (resolution 920 (XXXIV)) seemed to him quite pointless. He urged members of the Council and the Under-Secretary to reflect on the matter and contemplate a bold solution which would make it possible to control and limit co-ordination activities.

45. Mr. DE SEYNES (Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs) emphasized that the proposal made by the Secretary-General in sub-paragraph (iii) was actually based on considerations akin to those stated by the USSR representative. The obscurity of the title of that sub-paragraph reflected, to some extent, the confusion resulting from successive decisions taken by different bodies with regard to co-ordination, and the Secretariat was trying to introduce a measure of order so as to eliminate any overlapping in the relevant documentation. Sub-paragraphs (d) and (e) of the annotations concerning item 4 of the draft list of questions to be considered at the thirty-sixth session (E/L.976) provided for the preparation of two different reports on subjects which were very closely related. That was what the Secretary-General was seeking to avoid.

46. The PRESIDENT noted that it was not the examination of the question itself which was to be referred to the thirty-fifth session, but the decision concerning the Secretary-General's proposal to combine two documents in one. He therefore suggested that the Council should defer to the thirty-fifth session its consideration of paragraph 8 (iii) together with that of the rest of the Secretary-General's report (E/3702).

*It was so decided.*

(iv) *United Nations Development Decade*

(v) *International flow of capital and assistance*

47. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should adopt the proposals made by the Secretary-General in those two sub-paragraphs.

*It was so decided.*

(vi) *The role of patents in the transfer of technology to under-developed countries*

48. Mr. SEYDOUX (France) said that the question was a very important one, requiring intensive technical study, and he wondered whether it would not be preferable, in view of the Secretariat's heavy work-load for 1964, to postpone submission of the report involved until a date subsequent to the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. He suggested that the Secretary-General's proposal be amended to that effect.

49. Mr. VERAS (Brazil) supported the Secretary-General's proposal, which allowed sufficient time for the assembling of the necessary data and did not unduly delay consideration of a very urgent matter.

50. Mr. SEYDOUX (France) pointed out that his proposal had been designed not to delay the inquiry but merely to lighten the task of the Secretariat. Without pressing his proposal, he suggested that the Council should adopt a more flexible formula which would, for example, permit the Secretary-General to submit an interim report in 1964 if it had proved impossible to complete the final report.

51. Mr. KLUTZNICK (United States of America) appreciated the concern of the Brazilian delegation, which had been the first to raise the question of patents, and of the French delegation; however, if the Secretary-General had proposed the submission of the report in 1964, it was because he believed that the report could be ready by that time, and it seemed therefore that the Council could adopt that proposal.

52. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council adopt the Secretary-General's proposal, on the understanding that, if a further extension of time was necessary, the matter could be re-examined in 1963.

*It was so decided.*

(vii) *Reports of the regional economic commissions*

53. Mr. NATORF (Poland) fully supported the Secretary-General's proposal to combine two reports in one. He was surprised, however, that that item still appeared on the provisional agenda of the thirty-sixth session, since the Council had just decided, in accordance with the Secretary-General's proposal in sub-paragraph (iv), to defer to the thirty-eighth session consideration of the report requested in paragraph 13 of resolution 916 (XXXIV).

54. Mr. DE SEYNES (Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs) explained that two series of reports would be drawn up under the general heading of the United Nations Development Decade. First, reports would be prepared periodically, throughout the ten years in question, in order to keep the Council informed of the projects which would be set up under the Decade; secondly, reports would be drafted, no doubt also periodically, on the progress of the under-developed countries towards achievement of the Decade's objective, *viz.*, a 5 per cent rate of annual growth. It seemed preferable to await the thirty-eighth session for the submission of a report in the second category, since at that time it would be easier to evaluate the rate of growth in the under-developed countries, and that was the purpose of the proposal in sub-paragraph (iv); on the other hand, the Secretary-General could certainly submit at the thirty-sixth session a study on the stage reached in the work, particularly with regard to the regional economic commissions.

55. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should adopt the Secretary-General's proposal contained in sub-paragraph (vii).

*It was so decided.*

56. The PRESIDENT asked the Council to take a decision on the Secretary-General's proposal, made in paragraph 10 of his report (E/3702), to cancel the meeting of the United Nations Consultative Group on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders, scheduled for December 1963 at Geneva.

*The proposal was adopted.*

57. The PRESIDENT drew the attention of members of the Council to paragraph 11 of the Secretary-General's report (E/3702).

58. Mr. HIREMATH (India) was gratified to note that the Secretary-General was not recommending the delaying of the Conference on International Travel and Tourism, which was a matter of great importance. The developing countries urgently needed to increase their foreign exchange earnings and to achieve equilibrium in their balance of payments; and the development of tourism, in addition to promoting understanding between peoples, was a very effective method of attaining those objectives. The Conference, planned for 1961, had already been deferred to 1963, and a further delay would have a harmful effect on the under-developed countries. Moreover, since Italy had generously offered to pay the supplementary costs of the Conference if it was held at Rome, the expenditure involved by the Conference should not be very high.

59. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan) fully supported the remarks of the Indian representative and expressed surprise that the Council should need to reaffirm the urgency of the Conference, which it had already affirmed in its resolution 870 (XXXIII). He wondered, moreover, whether the terms of reference of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions authorized that body to recommend appropriations subject to conditions, when the Council was one of the principal organs of the United Nations.

60. Mr. UNWIN (United Kingdom) expressed agreement with the view of the Indian representative and added that tourism was also an effective means of stimulating the transport industries of the developing countries. The United Kingdom was keenly interested in the Conference and had already begun preparatory work in connexion with it.

61. Mr. DELGADO (Senegal), Mr. WODAJO (Ethiopia), Mr. FINGER (United States of America), Mr. SEYDOUX (France), Mr. CARRILLO (El Salvador) and Mrs. WRIGHT (Denmark) supported the opinions expressed by the previous speakers.

62. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should confirm its previous decision regarding the Conference.

*It was so decided.*

63. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should consider its programme of work for 1963 (E/L.976), as amended by the decisions which the Council had just taken when considering paragraph 8 of the Secretary-General's report (E/3702).

64. Mr. ARKADYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) wished to draw attention to one aspect of the question of the measures to be taken for the effective preparation of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. By its resolution 919 (XXXIV) the Council had, on the basis of a proposal by the United States delegation, set up a special group of experts to study the activities of the various international organizations which were concerned with trade. At its thirty-fourth session the Council had not known that the General Assembly, at its seventeenth session, would take decisions concerning the Conference and would recommend the creation of an expanded preparatory committee. In view of those decisions, however, it would perhaps be possible to centralize the activities of the two bodies in question, especially as the group of experts was to report to the Preparatory Committee.

65. Mr. FINGER (United States of America) agreed that there was a link between the work of the group of experts created by resolution 919 (XXXIV) and that of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, but said that the nature of the group of experts was different from that of the Preparatory Committee of the Conference. The decision embodied in resolution 919 (XXXIV), the text of which had been submitted by several delegations including that of the United States, had been taken irrespective of whether or not the Conference would actually be held: the sponsors of the text had thought that the technical study mentioned in the resolution should be made in any case. Moreover, the group would be composed of experts and not of Government representatives. Since, however, the General Assembly had decided to endorse the Council's decision concerning the holding of the Conference, it was normal and logical for the report of the group of experts to be submitted to the Preparatory Committee, which was to be composed of representatives of Governments. The report would also be submitted to other bodies, including GATT and the Commission on International Commodity Trade, but that did not necessarily mean that the group of experts should be merged with one or other of those bodies.

66. Mr. ARKADYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thanked the United States representative for his explanations, but said it was his understanding that the Secretariat intended to convene the Preparatory Committee on 14 or 15 January 1963. It therefore hardly seemed possible for the group of experts to meet in time for its report to be submitted to the Preparatory Committee. Consequently, it might be possible to set up, within the Preparatory Committee, a small group which would fulfil the task originally assigned to the group of experts.

67. Mr. DE SEYNES (Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs) said the Secretariat contemplated that the group of experts would meet from 18 February to 8 March. The January session of the Preparatory Committee would be devoted solely to the organization of work; the Committee would, however, hold a longer session—probably in May—at which it would be able to study problems relating to primary commodity trade, since the documentation on those problems would be ready then. The report of the group of experts could be included in that documentation.

68. Mr. FINGER (United States of America) thanked the representative of the Secretary-General for making it clear that there was no need to re-open the question of the decision taken by the Council in its resolution 919 (XXXIV).

69. Mr. ARKADYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that, at its seventeenth session, the General Assembly had taken a decision on item 7 of the draft list of agenda items for the Council's thirty-sixth session (E/L.976); it would be logical for that decision to be reflected in the title of item 7.

70. The PRESIDENT recalled that, at its next meeting, the Council would consider the questions arising out of decisions taken by the General Assembly at its seventeenth session. He suggested that the draft programme prepared by the Secretary-General (E/L.976) should be adopted.

*It was so decided.*

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.