



ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Tuesday, 21 January 1964,
at 2.55 p.m.

Resumed Thirty-sixth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 32:</i>	
<i>Elections (concluded)</i>	
<i>Appointment of members of the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development (concluded)</i>	53
<i>Closure of the session</i>	55

President: Mr. Alfonso PATIÑO (Colombia).

Present:

Representatives of the following States: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Chile, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, France, India, Iraq, Japan, Luxembourg, Senegal, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yugoslavia.

Observers for the following Member States: Denmark, Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, New Zealand, Romania, 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.

In the absence of the President, Mr. Hájek (Czechoslovakia), Second Vice-President, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 32

Elections (concluded)

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE APPLICATION OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY TO DEVELOPMENT (E/3852 AND CORR.1) (concluded)

1. The PRESIDENT recalled that, at its 1310th meeting, the Council had agreed to postpone consideration of the appointment of the members of the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development, following its decision in resolution 997 (XXXVI) to increase the Committee's membership from fifteen to eighteen. The Secretary-General had held further consultations with Governments with a view to presenting nominations for the three additional seats on the Committee. The Council had before it a note (E/3852 and Corr.1) containing the names of the nominees presented by the Secretary-General, together with the biographical notes requested by the Council.

2. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) said that it was clear from resolution 980 A (XXXVI) that the Council should select the members of the Advisory Committee and not merely confirm appointments made by the Secretary-General.

Unfortunately, the Council was unable to make a selection because the Secretary-General had submitted only eighteen names for the eighteen seats on the Advisory Committee. His delegation had reservations about one of the nominees. Mr. Abba Eban was a scholar of oriental languages and was the only nominee without a scientific or economic background. Mr. Eban, who was the Deputy Prime Minister of Israel, occupied a primarily political post which was not entirely related to the field of science and technology. He had been associated with the Weizmann Institute of Science and with various scientific conferences, but in a purely administrative or representative and not a scientific capacity. The nomination of Mr. Eban did not therefore conform to the conditions laid down in paragraph 4 of resolution 980 A (XXXVI). Furthermore, the candidate could not be said to represent any geographical region. The overwhelming majority of the countries in the Middle East region would dispute the suitability of an Israel national to represent their area.

3. He therefore suggested that the Council should postpone its decision on the appointment of the members of the Advisory Committee and request the Secretary-General to submit additional names.

4. Mr. CHANDERLI (Algeria) supported the Iraqi suggestion. Mr. Eban did not have the necessary scientific qualifications for appointment to the Advisory Committee and was a controversial political figure. The country of which he was a national was not representative of the Middle East region. In addition, a question in which Israel was involved had been before the General Assembly for several years.

5. Mr. DE SEYNES (Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs) said that the Secretariat had interpreted resolution 980 A (XXXVI) in the light of the discussions at the thirty-sixth and resumed thirty-sixth sessions of the Council. It had thought that, if the Council had wanted to adopt a method such as that suggested by the representative of Iraq, it would have used a different language in resolution 980 A (XXXVI) and would have spoken of the election by the Council of members chosen from a list submitted by the Secretary-General. At the resumed thirty-sixth session, in December 1963, no objection had been raised to the method being followed by the Secretariat, which had accordingly followed the same method in submitting the enlarged list of nominees.

6. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) said that if the Council had wanted to confirm appointments made by the Secretary-General, it would have expressed that wish in resolution 980 A (XXXVI). In any case, the appointment by the Council of persons nominated by a third party could not preclude an election.

7. In reply to a question from Mr. PARSONS (Australia), Mr. DE SEYNES (Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs) said that at least ten days would be required for the Secretary-General to hold the necessary consultations and submit additional names.

8. Mr. UNWIN (United Kingdom) considered that the choice of certain persons from a number of candidates constituted an election and that was something which had not been called for in resolution 980 A (XXXVI). He wished to know whether the holding of an election would constitute a reversal of the Council's earlier decision.

9. Mr. MALINOWSKI (Secretary of the Council) said that that was a question of interpretation of the resolution, which was a matter for the Council itself to decide.

10. Mr. FINGER (United States of America) said that his delegation would have been prepared to approve the nominees put forward by the Secretary-General and had reservations regarding the advisability of postponing a decision. Any further delay would inconvenience the experts concerned and mean that the Advisory Committee would be able to do little useful work in time for the submission of its report to the Council. The decision to hold an election would not be an interpretation but rather a reversal of the decision embodied in resolution 980 A (XXXVI).

11. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) felt that his suggestion did not constitute a reversal of the Council's earlier decision. The idea of an "appointment" did not exclude the possibility of an election by voting.

12. Mr. FINGER (United States of America) moved the suspension of the meeting.

The meeting was suspended at 4.10 p.m. and resumed at 4.40 p.m.

13. Mr. FINGER (United States of America) thought that the Council should appoint the persons nominated by the Secretary-General as quickly as possible in order that they might have sufficient time to prepare for the meetings of the Advisory Committee. His delegation therefore proposed a compromise, that the Council should confirm immediately the names listed in the Secretary-General's note and that any controversial names should be voted upon by secret ballot.

14. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) suggested, as an amendment to the United States proposal, that the Council should postpone its decision on any controversial candidate until a later meeting in order to give an opportunity for consultations among members of the Council and with the Secretary-General. The Secretary-General would be requested to submit additional names and the Council could then meet to appoint a member to fill the vacant seat.

15. He drew attention to the fact that the Council, following the Secretary-General's suggestion (E/L.1036) had decided to deal with the question of the appointment of the members of the Advisory Committee under item 32, which was entitled "Elections".

16. Mr. CHANDERLI (Algeria) supported the Iraqi proposal. His delegation felt that the Council's decision should be unanimous. It therefore proposed that the debate on the appointment of members should be deferred for forty-eight hours so that the Secretariat might submit additional names in order to enable the Council to make a choice.

17. Mr. UNWIN (United Kingdom) recalled that the Secretary-General, in suggesting to the Council at its thirty-sixth session (1271st meeting) that it might wish to establish an advisory committee on the application of science and technology to development, had made reference to the report of the Administrative Commit-

tee on Co-ordination (E/3765) in which it had been suggested that the Advisory Committee should include scientists, economists and administrators with an intimate knowledge of United Nations activities. The United Kingdom delegation had agreed with that view.

18. Although his delegation had felt that the Committee should be an advisory body with a small membership to ensure efficiency, it had agreed first to fifteen members and then to the enlargement of the membership to eighteen, because that was the majority view. His delegation was now prepared to accept all the names in the Secretary-General's list. The persons nominated had been selected as individuals and not as national or regional candidates, although the Secretary-General had of course taken regional considerations into account. The Secretary-General had also ascertained whether the persons whose names he put forward would be available at the time when they would be needed. The experts would have urgent work to do as soon as they were appointed and he did not believe that the Council should postpone a decision in the matter. He therefore favoured the United States proposal. If any candidate was rejected, the Secretary-General would have to suggest a replacement.

19. Mr. CHANDERLI (Algeria) observed that the Secretary-General had included only one administrator in his list of nominees. It would have been preferable to propose for that position someone from an area less open to controversy. The United States proposal, as amended by the representative of Iraq, would partly meet the Algerian point of view.

20. Mr. FINGER (United States of America) said that his delegation could not accept the Iraqi amendment because it would have the effect of changing the appointment procedure to one of election. He believed that the matter should be put to the vote. He observed that at least one other nominee, besides Mr. Eban, was qualified principally as an administrator.

21. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) said that there was really no irreconcilable conflict between the United States and Iraqi proposals. He merely sought postponement of the decision regarding controversial candidates for a few days and he therefore appealed to the United States representative not to press for an immediate vote in such cases. The Iraqi delegation opposed the appointment of Mr. Eban because he was not a genuine scientist and because it believed that an administrator appointed to the Advisory Committee should not be a controversial figure.

22. Mr. FINGER (United States of America) would have agreed to a postponement of two or three days if the representative of Iraq had not attached other conditions. In the circumstances, he felt obliged to maintain his proposal.

23. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the proposals before it. He put to the vote the Iraqi amendment to the United States proposal.

The Iraqi amendment was rejected by 7 votes to 6, with 5 abstentions.

24. Mr. SOLODOVNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked for a separate vote on the two parts of the United States proposal.

25. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the first part of the United States proposal, to confirm immediately the names of the non-controversial candidates.

The first part of the proposal was adopted unanimously.

26. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the second part of the United States proposal, to vote by secret ballot on any controversial candidates.

The second part of the proposal was adopted by 7 votes to 5, with 6 abstentions.

The United States proposal, as a whole, was adopted by 11 votes to 2, with 5 abstentions.

27. Mr. HIREMATH (India), explaining his vote, said that he attached great importance to the Advisory Committee and would have welcomed a unanimous decision. He had therefore abstained in the vote on the United States proposal, since he supported the Iraqi proposal to postpone the decision.

28. Mr. RENAUD (France) said that he had voted in favour of the United States proposal for two reasons. First, Council resolution 980 A (XXXVI) provided for appointment of members of the Advisory Committee, not for an election, and the Secretariat's interpretation of that resolution had not been challenged until the present meeting. Secondly, any delay in appointing the experts might prejudice the work of the Committee.

29. Mr. SOLODOVNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he had voted for the Iraqi amendment in the belief that a mutually acceptable solution should be found on all issues and that time for consultation should be taken whenever necessary.

30. Mr. DELGADO (Senegal) said that his delegation would have preferred to see a consensus in the Council on the Secretary-General's nominations. He sympathized with the position of the representatives of Algeria and Iraq, but had also tried to see the matter from the Secretary-General's point of view. Being unable to support either the United States proposal or the Iraqi amendment, he had been obliged to abstain.

31. Mr. CHANDERLI (Algeria) said that he wished to explain his delegation's position with respect to the Secretary-General's list of nominees. His delegation had taken its stand throughout the debate on a matter of principle. He could only deplore the fact that the method of appointment had not been questioned in the Council in December 1963, when his delegation had not been present. Since the procedure adopted was so unsatisfactory, he would abstain on the appointment of all the candidates.

32. Mr. UNWIN (United Kingdom) recalled that the procedure which the representative of Algeria had just questioned had been worked out with some care at the Council's thirty-sixth session so that the Council should not appoint people who would not be available; it did not call for a formal election. It had turned out to be a unique procedure, but it was not the first time that the Secretary-General had been requested to select experts for a particular purpose. He believed that the procedure was being correctly applied.

33. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) said that his delegation would be unable to vote for the appointment of Mr. Eban, for the reasons he had already indicated, namely, that the principle of choice had not been fully observed, that Mr. Eban was not qualified to serve on the Advisory Committee under the terms of resolution 980 A (XXXVI), and that he represented no geographical region. It would also abstain on the appointments as a whole because no real choice was available to the Council. However, in order to avoid a secret ballot on every nominee, he would be prepared to accept the appointment of the seventeen non-controversial nominees on the understanding that, had a vote been taken, his delegation and that of Algeria would have abstained.

34. Mr. CHANDERLI (Algeria) saw no objection to that procedure, provided the position of the delegations of Iraq and Algeria were reflected in the summary record.

35. The PRESIDENT suggested, in view of the statements which had just been made, that rule 67 of the rules of procedure should be waived and that the candidates listed in the Secretary-General's note (E/3852 and Corr.1), with the exception of Mr. Eban, should be declared appointed by acclamation to the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development.

It was so decided.

36. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the appointment of Mr. Eban as the eighteenth member of the Advisory Committee.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Cubillos (Chile) and Mr. Radivojević (Yugoslavia) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

<i>Number of ballot papers:</i>	18
<i>Invalid ballots:</i>	1
<i>Number of valid ballots:</i>	17
<i>Abstentions:</i>	3
<i>Number of members voting:</i>	14
<i>Majority required:</i>	8
<i>Number of votes obtained:</i>	10

Having obtained the required majority, Mr. Eban was appointed a member of the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development.

37. The PRESIDENT suggested that the members of the Committee should be appointed for a three-year term.

It was so decided.

Closure of the session

38. The PRESIDENT declared the resumed thirty-sixth session closed.

The meeting rose at 7 p.m.