



**ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL** *Wednesday, 16 November 1966,*

*Resumed Forty-first Session*  
OFFICIAL RECORDS

NEW YORK  
*at 3.25 p.m.*

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
<i>Agenda item 10:</i>	
<i>Composition of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (continued) . . . . .</i>	<i>11</i>

**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, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Sierra Leone, 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: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, China, Ghana, Guatemala, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Libya, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Norway, Portugal, South Africa, Trinidad and Tobago, Turgkey, Yugoslavia.

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

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; International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

The representative of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

*In the absence of the President, Mr. Murgescu (Romania), First Vice-President, took the chair.*

AGENDA ITEM 10

Composition of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (continued) (E/4280, E/L.1146)

1. Mr. VARELA (Panama) said his delegation had serious doubts about draft resolution E/L.1146. If adopted, it would constitute a dangerous precedent and would tend to undermine the authority of the General Assembly. The Philippine representative had argued at the previous meeting that the General Assembly had merely urged that the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts to Examine the Finances of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies should be given attentive consideration. However, in operative paragraph 1 of resolution 2150 (XXI), the General Assembly had approved the report

of the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts,<sup>1/</sup> and its recommendations, and, in operative paragraph 2 had spoken of their "earliest implementation". It would therefore be extremely unwise for the Council to go against the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee and decide to change the size of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination.

2. His delegation also had serious doubts about the amount of time allotted to the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination in the Calendar of Conferences for 1967 (E/4269). It was to meet for five days in May and ten days in June, which was quite inadequate in view of the enormous amount of work allotted to it.

3. In operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution the sponsors had used the words "keeping in mind the recommendation of the Ad Hoc Committee that the Government representatives have a high degree of experience and competence. . .", whereas in fact that provision should be mandatory for Governments. He hoped that the paragraph would be much more strongly worded.

4. Mr. ZOLLNER (Dahomey) said his delegation was prepared to accept the amendments which the representative of Czechoslovakia had proposed orally at the previous meeting except for the proposal to increase the number of seats of the Eastern European countries from two to three. He was afraid that such a proposal would induce other groups to claim additional seats and would destroy the delicate numerical balance already achieved. The figure of sixteen which the sponsors had recommended seemed to be the most practical; to increase it or decrease it would be equally difficult. He did not feel that the adoption of the draft resolution as it stood would undermine the authority of the General Assembly; that body had merely approved the report of the Ad Hoc Committee in general and the Council was perfectly entitled to change the recommendations in points of detail. Nor should the phrase "Western European and other countries" give rise to difficulties; it had been used in other resolutions and everyone was aware of the countries referred to. Although the wording of the draft resolution might be improved in some instances, his delegation approved of it in substance.

5. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) felt it was extremely dangerous for the Council to decide upon sixteen members when the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts had made a recommendation, endorsed by the General Assembly and transmitted to the Council by a note of the Secretary-General (see E/4280), that it should have twelve. The arguments put forward by the Philippine delegation at the previous meeting had

<sup>1/</sup> See Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-first Session, Annexes, agenda item 80, document A/6343.

failed to convince him of the need for a membership of sixteen and for strict adherence to the group system. The Council was setting up a committee of experts where the rotation of seats of the kind agreed upon at the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development was not necessary. According to operative paragraph 4, four seats was to be allocated to Western European and other countries but three of them would go to permanent members of the Security Council: the United States, the United Kingdom and France. As a result, the smaller countries of Western Europe would have only one seat between them.

6. Apart from those considerations, his delegation preferred the figure of twelve recommended by the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts. It was important that they really should be experts. To make that point clear it might be advisable to delete the word "government" before the word "expert" in operative paragraph 3. The persons concerned should not be diplomats or civil servants but highly qualified experts in United Nations affairs. Some thought should also be given to the nomination of alternates so that the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination could devote its full time to the problems before it. He suggested that the words "having in mind that members of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination should devote their full time to its work during its sessions" should be added after the words "as soon as possible" in operative paragraph 2.

7. His delegation had no objection to the Czechoslovak amendments to operative paragraphs 1 and 7 but felt strongly that operative paragraph 4 should be consistent with the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts. The Council should also remember that the Second Committee of the General Assembly had before it a draft resolution<sup>2/</sup> in which it was proposed that nine members should be added to the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination to enable it to conduct a general review of the economic and social activities of the United Nations family. In other words, if the Council should decide to set up a committee of sixteen members and if the draft resolution before the Second Committee were adopted, the Committee would actually have twenty-five members, which would be much too large. He hoped that the sponsors would explain how their draft resolution could be reconciled with the draft resolution before the Second Committee.

8. Mr. KITTANI (Secretary of the Council) pointed out that the use of the words "States Members" in operative paragraph 1 meant that the usual provisions for accredited representatives to be accompanied by alternates and advisers would apply.

9. Mr. S. K. SINGH (India) recalled the discussions regarding co-ordination in the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts. The experts had agreed that, under the United Nations Charter, the Council played "a central role with respect to studying and reporting on international economic, social, cultural, educational, health and related matters dealt with by the United Nations and the specialized agencies..."<sup>3/</sup> It was in order to enable the Council to play that role that the Ad Hoc

Committee had recommended that twelve experts should be elected to the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination. The Ad Hoc Committee had given particular attention to the actual number of experts and had concluded that, in the interest of geographical distribution and efficient operation, twelve was the most satisfactory. Actually, if one seat was taken away from each group mentioned in operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, there would be a total of eleven and one additional seat could be rotated. In that way, the recommendation of the Ad Hoc Committee could be complied with.

10. When the report of the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts had been discussed in the Fifth Committee of the General Assembly, there was a strong feeling that the recommendations of the experts should not be tampered with. It was also felt that co-ordinating bodies should not be allowed to proliferate and that co-ordination was the ultimate aim of the Council. It was interesting to note that two of the countries sponsoring draft resolution E/L.1146 had been represented on the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts and all of them had supported General Assembly resolution 2150 (XXI) endorsing the report of the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts. He therefore strongly urged that the integrity of the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee should be maintained because, if the Council tampered with their proposals, other bodies might well follow their example.

11. Mr. FILALI (Morocco) said his delegation had been ready to support the draft resolution but the arguments put forward in regard to the authority of the General Assembly and of the Council had placed his delegation in an embarrassing position. The Council should be informed whether it was legally entitled to modify a decision already taken by the General Assembly.

12. Mr. KADLEC (Czechoslovakia) said that the amendments his delegation had proposed (1148th meeting) to operative paragraphs 1 and 7 seemed generally acceptable. In view of the opposition to his proposal which was that the number of seats allocated to the Eastern European countries should be increased, he would not press it, provided that no attempt was made to alter the composition already recommended in operative paragraph 4. He certainly could not accept the reduction of the membership of the Committee to twelve with the grouping suggested by the Indian representative.

13. Mr. RAHNEMA (Iran) said he could not agree with the representative of France that the Council could not change the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts. In the Fifth Committee of the General Assembly certain reservations about the Ad Hoc Committee's report had been expressed although that report had been approved by the Fifth Committee and by the General Assembly. The Council was therefore required to respect the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee as far as they were practicable. In any case, it was not really a question of deciding exactly how many members the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination should have, but rather of avoiding conflict between the General Assembly and the Council in the interest of joint action. It would be unwise for the Council to take

<sup>2/</sup> Ibid., agenda item 52, document A/6544, para. 6.

<sup>3/</sup> Ibid., agenda item 80, document A/6343, para. 82.

a decision which would tie the hands of the General Assembly in its efforts to bring about a general review of the economic and social activities of the United Nations family. He therefore suggested that the adoption of the draft resolution should be postponed, that the views of the Council should be communicated to the Second Committee, and that a final decision should be taken at a later stage.

14. Mr. KITTANI (Secretary of the Council) drew the Council's attention to paragraph 5 of the Secretary-General's note (E/4280). The Council's decision regarding the composition of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination would have a bearing on the final calendar of conferences for 1967 and should therefore be taken without delay, in order to allow the Fifth Committee the time to consider the calendar.

15. Mr. RAHNEMA (Iran) said that proper co-ordination was vital to the whole of the United Nations system, and the submission of draft resolutions designed to achieve the same aims in three different organs had led to an extremely confusing situation. In view of the need to finalize the calendar of conferences for 1967, the Council might perhaps meet for one day immediately after the conclusion of the debate in the Second Committee. It must not take a hasty decision which it might later regret.

16. Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (United Republic of Tanzania) said that the Council was not bound to accept every detail of the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts as a result of their approval by the General Assembly. Although the Ad Hoc Committee had naturally submitted its report as a whole to the General Assembly, it had quite properly addressed the recommendations contained in paragraph 90 to the Council, in recognition of the Council's responsibility for co-ordination under the provisions of the United Nations Charter. Furthermore, the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination was a subordinate body of the Council, which had full powers to decide on its composition without reference to the General Assembly.

17. With regard to the Iranian proposal that a decision should be postponed, he recalled that the vote on draft resolution which was before the Second Committee<sup>4/</sup> had been deferred precisely because the sponsors had agreed to await the Council's decision regarding the composition of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination. Once the Council had adopted that decision, the Second Committee would have a number of alternatives open to it.

18. The Greek representative, after observing that "other countries" would hardly ever be represented in the Western European group because of the likelihood that the three permanent members of the Security Council in that group would always be elected, had suggested that the membership of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination should be reduced to twelve, thereby -according to his argument—leaving no seats at all for the "other countries". If the distribution referred to in the draft resolution was indeed inequitable, that argument would logically

lead to an increase, rather than a decrease, in membership.

19. The representative of India has said that recommendations made by experts should not be tampered with, but there could be no discussion of essentially political matters by independent "experts", whose recommendations must inevitably be coloured by their political persuasions. The United Nations had invited the opinion of the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts, and it was for the Council to examine it. The Indian representative has also argued that the composition of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination should be kept to a minimum. However, the vital matter of co-ordination, which as of the highest importance to all delegations, required the widest possible membership. For that reason, if the Council decided on a membership of twelve rather than sixteen, a draft resolution might well be introduced in the Second Committee inviting the Secretary-General to designate twelve or thirteen, rather than nine, additional members for the purpose of the general review.

20. Mr. LOPEZ (Philippines) agreed with the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania that the adoption of the draft resolution would not conflict with the General Assembly's action in approving the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts. That Committee had not been confronted with the very serious problems of equitable geographical distribution with which the Council had been concerned for two sessions, and it was unlikely that the Ad Hoc Committee itself wished the Council to accept, as a matter of principle, every detail of its recommendations. The Council must find the best way of acting in the spirit of the recommendations and should report to the General Assembly that a membership of sixteen would best reflect the principle of equitable geographical distribution.

21. The confusion arising from the question of expertise had not been dispelled by the recommendations contained in paragraph 90 (h) of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts, which referred to governmental representatives in their expert capacity. As the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania had pointed out, there were in fact few, if any, cases where such experts were given carte blanche by their Governments.

22. He hoped that the Iranian representative would not press his suggestion to defer a decision on the draft resolution, since the work of the Second Committee would be greatly facilitated if the Council decided, as it was now ready to do, on the composition of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination.

23. Mr. RAHNEMA (Iran) pointed out that he did not wish the Council to take no action at all: it could give the Second Committee general guidance on the composition of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination. Nevertheless, he reiterated that the Second Committee might find its hands tied if the twenty-seven delegations represented on the Council took a hasty decision in the matter.

24. Sir Edward WARNER (United Kingdom) said that it would be wrong to place too much emphasis on the

<sup>4/</sup> See foot-note 2 above.

question of "experts", and recalled that the Ad Hoc Committee, in paragraph 90 (h) (ii) of its report, had recommended a high degree of experience and competence, rather than technical knowledge or skills usually associated with "experts".

25. The possible temporary enlargement of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination for the purpose of the general review must be borne in mind when considering its permanent membership, which should therefore be kept to a minimum. He pointed out that its size could always be increased, though not reduced after the proposed review, if necessary. His delegation shared the concern regarding the increasing rigid application of rules of geographical distribution and suggested a membership of fourteen, the same as had successfully been used in the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts.

26. It would be unwise for the Council to postpone a decision on the draft resolution.

27. Mr. DJOUDI (Algeria) said that the difficulty had arisen because of the undue haste with which the Fifth Committee had submitted the report of the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts to the General Assembly for its approval, thereby presenting the Second Committee with a *fait accompli*. The Council had two alternatives: it could agree to revert to the matter at a later stage, after the Second Committee had taken a decision and submitted it to the General Assembly, or it could adopt the text before it. The first was preferable, since it would not call into doubt any decisions already taken by the General Assembly.

28. Mr. AHMED (Pakistan) recalled that the Council was trying to decide on the composition of a committee which was already in existence, whereas the Second Committee was discussing quite a different matter, namely, the establishment of machinery to carry out a specific mandate. The work of the Second Committee would be greatly simplified if the Council adopted an immediate decision, as the sponsors of the draft resolution before the Second Committee had been given to understand it would.

29. His delegation did not believe that the Ad Hoc Committee's recommendations must be implemented in every detail. In that connexion, he recalled that Pakistan had expressed certain apprehensions in the Fifth Committee regarding the proposed inspection unit,<sup>5/</sup> and it was his understanding that those apprehensions would be taken into account when the inspection unit was set up.

30. Mr. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) said that the comments and suggestions made during the debate had been most helpful to the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1146. The sponsors had accepted the proposal by the representative of Czechoslovakia that the substance of operative paragraph 4 should be incorporated in operative paragraph 1; revised operative paragraph 4 would then refer only to the holding of elections in 1966. The sponsors had been impressed by the concern expressed by many members about the quality of the experts to serve on the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination and had

therefore replaced the words "government representatives" in operative paragraph 3 by the expression "government experts". Operative paragraph 7 would be replaced by a completely new text inviting Governments, the Secretary-General and the executive heads of all United Nations organizations to extend the Committee full co-operation and assistance. Lastly, operative paragraph 8 would be amended in the manner suggested by the representative of Algeria at the previous meeting.

31. The sponsors were convinced that the adoption of the draft resolution would not mark a departure from the accepted pattern of relationships between the Council and the General Assembly and would in no way limit the choices available to the Second Committee in connexion with the general review.

32. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that, when he had spoken earlier of the apparent inconsistency in the position of delegations which had sponsored all three of the draft resolutions involving the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination, he had not meant to imply that it was not the right of sovereign States to change their positions on any matter. That right derived from the fact that delegations to all United Nations bodies acted on the instructions of their Governments; they did not represent groups, and it was regrettable that the device of group negotiation was tending to be used more often, even though the principle of equitable geographical representation was not particularly appropriate, as in the case of the Committee under discussion. The recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts had, in fact, attached far greater importance to the qualifications and experience of the experts to be appointed.

33. It should be borne in mind, moreover, that rejection of that Committee's recommendations would inevitably have political and psychological implications. Naturally, it was open to the United Nations or its autonomous organs to amend them, if a majority of the delegations so wished, but it would be regrettable if such a decision were to be made merely to satisfy a demand for equitable geographical distribution.

34. Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thanked the sponsors of the draft resolution for accepting the amendments proposed by the representative of Czechoslovakia on behalf of the socialist delegations. He did not consider that the action proposed raised any issue of constitutionality; operative paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 2150 (XXI), after all, urged United Nations organs to take action to implement the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee of financial experts as soon as possible and the Council was, in fact, discussing ways and means of so doing. Accordingly, if the interests of Member States could not be adequately met by fixing the membership of the Committee on Programme and Co-ordination at twelve members, his delegation would agree that its membership should be as large as sixteen or eighteen.

35. Experience had shown that one of the major factors impeding the co-ordination of the economic and social activities of the United Nations was the establishment of separate bodies with similar functions. His delegation therefore believed that all

<sup>5/</sup> See Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-first Session, Fifth Committee, 1133rd meeting.

future co-ordination activities should be the responsibility of a single body which should be in a position to carry out such mandates as the proposed general review which was under discussion in the Second Committee. That Committee's draft resolution was not, of course, before the Council, but members must realize that their decision would affect the Committee's action.

36. His delegation would support draft resolution E/L.1146, as amended, on the understanding that the Council recognized that it was intimately connected with the proposals before the Second Committee. He hoped the Council would consider expressing that understanding in a formal note to the effect that its decision had taken into account the desirability of assigning the general review, which was the subject of the draft resolution before the Second Committee to the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination. The Council should also be guided by the consideration that, if arrangements were made for that Committee to hold three sessions each year and if the duration of those sessions was expanded to enable it to undertake the work, there would be a saving of some \$700,000 per annum. In view of all those considerations, his delegation supported the suggestion of the representative of Iran that informal consultations should take place between the sponsors of the Council draft resolution and the sponsors of the Second Committee draft resolution before the Council would make a decision.

37. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that his delegation believed it would be unwise to defer action on the draft resolution, as had been suggested, until the Second Committee had completed its consideration of the proposals for a general review. The suggested consultations between the sponsors of both sets of proposals could clarify the issues, however, and he hoped that the Council would postpone its decision until the following day to allow them to take place.

38. Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (United Republic of Tanzania), supported by Mr. LOPEZ (Philippines), pointed out that, apart from the difficulty of arranging the consultations at such short notice, the sponsors of the draft resolution before the Second Committee, who had decided not to press for a vote until the Council's decision was known, could not guarantee what action the Committee would take on their proposals. No useful purpose would therefore be served by postponing the Council's decision.

39. Mr. VIAUD (France), supported by Mr. RAHNEMA (Iran) and Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), proposed under rule 56 of the rules of procedure that further discussion of draft resolution E/L.1146 should be postponed until the following day.

*It was so decided.*

40. Mr. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) moved the adjournment of the meeting.

*It was so decided.*

*The meeting rose at 6.50 p.m.*