



**ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL**

Wednesday, 21 December 1966  
at 3.25 p.m.

*Resumed Forty-first Session*

OFFICIAL RECORDS

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 9:</i>	
<i>Basic programme of work of the Council in 1967 and consideration of the provisional agenda for the forty-second session (concluded) . . .</i>	67
<i>Closure of the session . . . . .</i>	70

*President:* Mr. Tewfik BOUATTOURA (Algeria).

*Present:*

Representatives of the following States members of the Council: Algeria, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ecuador, France, Gabon, Greece, India, Iran, Iraq, Luxembourg, Morocco, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Venezuela.

Observers for the following Member States: Belgium, Japan, Kuwait, Libya, Malta, Netherlands, South Africa, Turkey, Yugoslavia.

Representatives of the following specialized agencies: International Labour Organisation; Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations; World Health Organization; International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

AGENDA ITEM 9

Basic programme of work of the Council in 1967 and consideration of the provisional agenda for the forty-second session (concluded) (E/L.1147 and Add.1 and 2, E/L.1148 and Add.1, E/L.1151)

1. Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said, with reference to paragraph 5 of document E/L.1147 on the draft programme of work prepared by the Secretary-General, that his delegation had serious doubts about the desirability of postponing the fifth report on progress in land reform until 1969. It would be much better to adhere to the terms of Council resolution 1078 (XXXIX) and request the Secretariat to have the report ready in 1968.

2. With reference to paragraph 9 of the same document, he recalled that many members of the Council had opposed the practice which had begun in 1966 of considering the reports of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) and its affiliates at the resumed summer session during the crowded final days of the General Assembly. The USSR delegation agreed with their point of view and felt it would be much better to discuss those reports during the spring or summer sessions of the Council.

3. With reference to the preliminary annotations to the draft list of items for the forty-second session (see E/L.1147), he proposed that item 13 (Advisory services in the field of human rights) should be discussed as part of item 11 (Report of the Commission on Human Rights) and that the question of the punishment of war criminals included under item 11 should appear in the agenda as a separate item.

4. Mr. PIÑERA (Chile) agreed with the representative of the USSR that the postponement of the publication of the fifth report on progress in land reform until 1969 was undesirable. He also agreed that the reports of IMF and IBRD and its affiliates should be discussed more fully at the Council's summer session with the active participation of the representatives of those bodies as part of the debate on the world economic situation.

5. Mr. KITTANI (Secretary of the Council) pointed out that in 1966 the Council had already put into practice the proposal mentioned in paragraph 9 of document E/L.1147. Accordingly, the Council might consider during 1967 the procedure it would adopt in 1968.

6. Mr. BLAU (United States of America) said that the proposals made during the debate did not take due account of the fact that the yearly cycle of IBRD and IMF did not correspond with the yearly cycle of the Economic and Social Council. The recent debate on the reports of those two bodies had been somewhat listless because of the fatigue which all delegations felt at the end of a tiring Assembly. Moreover, some delegations had suggested and the representatives of the Bank and the Fund had agreed that the Council might profit from the more active participation of the representatives of the Bank and Fund at the summer session during its debate on the world economic situation or on the United Nations Development Decade. Furthermore, the Council might consider the reports of IBRD and its affiliates and IMF at its resumed summer session, but at an earlier date when delegations were not so tired and soon after the reports in question would have been published. The Council might consider those reports at its resumed session in conjunction with the report of UNCTAD which should enable the Council to have a meaningful discussion of the trade and financial aspects of development.

7. Mr. PIÑERA (Chile) thought that the Council could take up at its summer session special reports from IBRD and IMF outlining major policy developments or it could examine the annual reports of those bodies at its resumed summer session when considering such items as the United Nations Development Decade and the report of UNCTAD.

8. Mr. Amjad ALI (Pakistan) supported the suggestions that had been made by the United States representative. At the resumed session the Council could discuss the annual reports of IBRD and its affiliates and IMF immediately after their publication and then at its summer session it could consider special reports from those two bodies on the main developments in the world financial situation.

9. Mr. KITTANI (Secretary of the Council) pointed out that the suggestions that had been made so far did not contradict the proposal put forward in paragraph 9 of document E/L.1147. The intention of that proposal was that the Council should discuss the reports of IBRD and IMF in November rather than December. There was nothing to prevent the Council requesting supplementary reports for consideration at its summer session.

10. Mr. MUZIK (Czechoslovakia) supported the suggestions that had been put forward. He agreed that the recent discussion of the reports in question and the answers given to questions raised had been somewhat cursory. Additional reports submitted to the summer session would be useful provided they were up to date but they would increase the already voluminous documentation before the Council at that session.

11. Mr. PIÑERA (Chile) felt that the Council could consider special reports from IBRD and its affiliates and IMF at its summer session or hold its resumed session early in October, in other words, to consider their annual reports as soon as possible after the September meetings of IBRD and IMF.

12. Mr. BLAU (United States of America) said he had not intended to suggest that IBRD and IMF should submit additional reports to the summer session of the Council, but that top-ranking representatives of those two organizations should participate actively in the discussion of items 2 and 5 and make comprehensive statements on those subjects to the Council. It seemed that the Managing Director of IMF and the President of IBRD had already agreed to such a procedure.

13. Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (United Republic of Tanzania) agreed that the existing procedure for consideration of the reports of IBRD and its affiliates and IMF was not conducive to a satisfactory discussion. The solution might be, as previous speakers had suggested, to have short preliminary reports on the outstanding features of the year's operations submitted to the summer session of the Council, and full reports, together with very brief synopses, submitted to a resumed session to be held not later than October of each year. Such a procedure would have the advantage of enabling the Second Committee of the General Assembly to consider together the reports of all organizations concerned with development financing.

14. Mr. DJOUDI (Algeria) observed that, since the reports of IBRD and its affiliates and IMF covered the operating year ending on 30 June each year, the preparation of those reports could not be expected to be sufficiently advanced in July to enable even the major highlights to be reported to the Council. It was clear, however, that the existing procedure

was unsatisfactory, since the limited time available in the last days of the General Assembly prohibited detailed discussion of the reports. His delegation supported the suggestions made by the representatives of the United States and Pakistan.

15. Mr. GEORGE (France) considered that the suggestion made by the representative of Chile that representatives of IBRD and IMF should participate more actively in the summer session of the Council would provide an opportunity for the detailed discussion the operations of those institutions deserved. Their participation should not be confined to statements introducing reports which were before the Council; what was required was a comprehensive survey of the role and effectiveness of the international financial institutions in the world economy. His delegation also supported the suggestion that the annual reports of IBRD and its affiliates and IMF should be considered at a resumed session of the Council in October of each year.

16. Mr. CONSOLO (International Bank for Reconstruction and Development) said that he was glad to confirm, on behalf of the President of IBRD, that it was the Bank's intention to participate actively in the proceedings of the summer session of the Council in the manner suggested by the United States representative, namely, when the item on the financing of economic development was being considered. He understood that IMF was similarly prepared to participate in the general discussion of international economic and social policy.

17. Mr. MacLAREN (Canada) said that his delegation was gratified to learn that there would be genuine participation of representatives of IBRD and IMF in the general debate at the forty-third session. The idea of considering the reports of those bodies in October of each year, in conjunction with the report of the Trade and Development Board, was implicit in section I of Economic and Social Council resolution 1156 (XLI); that procedure would also serve the interests of better co-ordination of United Nations economic activities.

18. Mr. PIÑERA (Chile) suggested that the Secretariat should be requested to communicate to IBRD and IMF the views expressed in the Council on the desirability of active participation of their representatives in the general debate on economic and financial matters at the summer session of the Council.

*It was so agreed.*

19. Mr. HILL (Secretariat) said that the reason for the postponement of the fifth report on progress in land reform until 1969 (E/L.1147, para. 5), about which some representatives had expressed concern, was that the specialized agencies concerned had felt it might be advisable to defer publication of the report until some progress had been made in implementing the recommendations of the World Land Reform Conference. The fact that the Council might not wish to have a major debate on land reform as early as one year after that planned for the forty-second session of the Council had also been taken into account.

20. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should adopt as its provisional agenda for the forty-second session the draft list of agenda items contained in document E/L.1147, with the amendments proposed by the representatives of Pakistan (1458th meeting) and the Soviet Union and subject to the observations and reservations expressed in the Council. He suggested that the Council should also approve the draft list of agenda items for the forty-third session, as amended during the discussion.

*It was so decided.*

21. The PRESIDENT drew the attention of the Council to part I, section (i) of document E/L.1148 and Add.1 concerning the disposal of items arising out of the twenty-first session of the General Assembly and suggested that the Council should adopt the following draft resolution:

"The Economic and Social Council,

"Taking note of General Assembly resolutions 2089 (XX) of 20 December 1965 and 2152 (XXI) of 17 November 1966 regarding the establishment of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization,

"Decides to discontinue the Committee for Industrial Development."

*It was so decided.*

22. Mr. AHMED (Pakistan) said that his delegation accepted the suggestions made in document E/L.1148 and Add.1.

23. His delegation, however, endorsed the action suggested in part I, section (d) only on the understanding that the Commission on Human Rights would consider whether the establishment of national commissions was generally feasible, in view of the wide differences in national constitutional arrangements. In addition to transmitting to the Commission on Human Rights the resolution referred to in part I, section (g), the Council might also wish to urge the Commission to seek ways of securing the widest possible measure of adherence to the Covenants on human rights recently adopted by the General Assembly.

24. The representative of Pakistan endorsed the choice of topics for discussion in depth at the Council's forty-third session contained in the draft programme prepared by the Secretary-General (E/L.1147 and Add.1 and 2). He suggested that a third topic, that of plan implementation, might be added to the two already chosen: the crucial importance of that question had been emphasized by the Committee for Development Planning, and detailed information on the subject would, moreover, be available to the Council at its forty-third session in part I of the World Economic Survey. The Secretary-General could perhaps indicate his views on that suggestion at the forty-second session.

25. Mr. DE SEYNES (Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs) said that the important question of plan implementation had not been included as a topic for discussion in depth because the Secretariat was still not certain what would result, in that regard, from the deliberations of the Committee for Development Planning. However, the necessary documentation,

at least for a preliminary discussion by the Council, could be prepared.

26. Mr. BLAU (United States of America) endorsed the Secretary-General's choice of topics, as well as the suggestion of the Pakistan representative. He expressed the hope that the Secretary-General and the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) would take an active part in discussions of the proposal for a FAO food resources programme and that the Council, in its consideration of the question of world food aid, would be fully informed about the proposed programme.

27. Mr. DE SEYNES (Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs) said that the Council's discussion of world food aid would of course cover that programme, as well as the important question of improving protein supplies.

28. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would consider that the Council approved the subjects listed in document E/L.1147/Add.1 for consideration in depth at the forty-third session, together with the additional subject of plan implementation.

*It was so decided.*

29. The PRESIDENT noted that the Council had now decided on its basic programme of work in 1967 and its provisional agenda for the forty-second session. He suggested that the Secretariat should be requested to prepare, in consultation with delegations, a document indicating as far as possible in what order and on what dates the Council might consider the items on the provisional agenda for its forty-second session.

*It was so decided.*

30. Mr. PIÑERA (Chile) suggested that the dates of the forty-third session should be changed in view of the decision to hold the Trade and Development Board's fifth session from 15 August to 8 September 1967. If the Council's session were brought forward to end not later than 30 July, delegations could either take their holidays or remain in Geneva in preparation for the Board's session.

31. Mr. FILALI (Morocco) opposed that suggestion. The interval between the end of the Council's session and the opening of the Board's session should be as short as possible, so as to avoid additional expenditure which some smaller delegations could ill afford.

32. Mr. BLAU (United States of America) noted that, if the Council's session were brought forward, some delegations represented on the Council, its Committee for Programme and Co-ordination and the Trade and Development Board would have a very heavy, and possibly continuous, workload between May and September. His delegation would therefore be reluctant to accept the Chilean representative's proposal.

33. The PRESIDENT suggested that the dates of the forty-third session of the Council should be maintained, subject to confirmation at the forty-second session.

*It was so decided.*

34. Mr. MUZIK (Czechoslovakia) said that the proposed schedule of meetings of the Committee for

Programme and Co-ordination in document E/L.1151 and particularly the possibility that it might have to adopt its report during the first part of the Council's summer session, would not allow delegations represented on the Committee and the Council sufficient time for study and preparation. He therefore suggested that the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination should meet after the Council's summer session, perhaps early in September at Headquarters. There appeared to be no reason why the enlarged Committee would have to finish its work before 15 August, as stated in paragraph 2 of document E/L.1151.

35. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should approve the dates for meetings of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination set out in document E/L.1151, subject to confirmation at the forty-second session.

*It was so decided.*

Closure of the session

36. After the customary exchange of courtesies, the PRESIDENT declared the forty-first session of the Council closed.

*The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.*