



ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL
Resumed Forty-first Session
OFFICIAL RECORDS

Thursday, 17 November 1966,
 at 11.10 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 10:</i>	
<i>Composition of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (continued)</i>	17
<i>Agenda item 6:</i>	
<i>Calendar of conferences for 1967.</i>	19

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, Chad, China, Ghana, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Libya, Malaysia, Malta, Mexico, Norway, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia.

Observer for the following non-member State: Federal Republic of Germany.

Representatives of the following specialized agencies: International Labour Organisation; United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; World Health Organization; International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

The representative of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

AGENDA ITEM 10

Composition of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (*continued*) (E/4280, E/L.1146/Rev.1)

1. Mr. VARELA (Panama) said that the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts to Examine the Finances of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies, transmitted to the Council by a note by the Secretary-General (see E/4280), clearly emphasized the competence of the experts invited to serve on the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination. In that respect, the revised text of the draft resolution before the Council (E/L.1146/Rev.1) merely repeated operative paragraph 3 corresponding to the initial draft. However, that paragraph was vague for it merely requested the States concerned to keep in mind the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts without the Council explicitly endorsing them. He

therefore proposed that operative paragraph 3 should be replaced by the following text:

"Requests each of such Member States to indicate the government expert whom it would designate to serve on the Committee, on the basis of the following conditions; (a) that he should have a high degree of experience and competence in the United Nations and related organizations in the economic, financial and social areas; (b) that he should also have a high degree of experience and competence in the governing bodies of the specialized agencies and subsidiary bodies of the United Nations."

Such an amendment would bring the revised draft into line with General Assembly resolution 2150 (XXI).

2. The Committee for Programme and Co-ordination would hold only two sessions in 1967 and the total time allotted to it was fifteen days. If it were to do useful work, its members should be intimately acquainted with the operation and activities of the United Nations and its related organizations and should be able to formulate positive recommendations without delay. The problems of co-ordination had preoccupied the General Assembly, the Second Committee and the Economic and Social Council for many years and in that respect the competence of the experts was more important than the principle of equitable geographical distribution.

3. Mr. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) said that his delegation shared the concern of the representative of Panama. However, the Council should avoid wording which would make participation in the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination difficult by the establishment of conditions, and should remember that the idea of a "high" degree of competence was relative. It would perhaps be wiser for the Council to urge the Member States concerned to bear in mind the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts.

4. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) proposed that the following wording should be added at the end of operative paragraph 3: "Any alternate to such experts should also have experience and competence in the United Nations, the specialized agencies and other bodies of the United Nations".

5. Mr. AHMED (Pakistan) agreed with the United States representative. The big Powers could easily find experts or alternates with the qualifications described by the representative of Panama but the same was not true of many developing countries. He requested the representative of Panama to accept the amendment proposed by the United States representative.

6. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) felt that the amendment proposed by the representative of Panama could cause serious difficulties for many

developing countries. His delegation would prefer to retain the initial text or, if necessary, to change it slightly by inviting the States concerned to take into account the conditions set forth in operative paragraph 3 when designating experts. He pointed out that the Russian text of operative paragraph 1 was not entirely in harmony with the English text and asked the sponsors of the draft resolution now under consideration whether they had been able to consult the sponsors of the draft resolution concerning the general review of programmes and activities which was before the Second Committee.^{1/}

7. Mr. DJOUDI (Algeria) felt that the Panamanian amendment was tantamount to inviting the African countries not to submit any candidates at all. Most of those countries were newcomers to the United Nations and could not boast of a high degree of experience in the subject. However, if experience was needed, common sense could often constitute a useful substitute.

8. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination would probably be confronted with two sets of problems: technical problems, which would require a thorough knowledge of the operation of the United Nations, and political problems concerning the policy of the United Nations and its related organizations. Those questions would be tackled at different levels and it seemed unwise to insist that an alternate or alternates should have the competence of the principal representative. The Council should avoid unduly rigid formulae which would unnecessarily complicate the representation of certain countries. The Panamanian amendment might therefore be simplified without abandoning its basic idea. The proposal put forward by the representative of Greece could also be made more flexible so as to make it clear that only a sound knowledge of the machinery of the United Nations was expected of alternates.

9. Mr. ELM (Iran) supported the Panamanian amendment. Without underestimating the force of the objections put forward by the representatives of Pakistan and Algeria, his delegation was convinced that every effort should be made to ensure that the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination was as efficient as possible.

10. Mr. VARELA (Panama) pointed out that the amendment submitted by his delegation had received only limited support and announced that he preferred to withdraw it. The comments on it had given rise to concern that the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination would be unable to secure positive results. Considerations of efficiency should prevail over equitable geographical distribution and Panama admitted that it did not have experts sufficiently qualified to serve on the Committee.

11. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece), speaking on a point of order, said that he was surprised at the withdrawal of the Panamanian amendment. His delegation was ready to re-submit that amendment in its own name.

12. The PRESIDENT proposed that the meeting should be suspended to allow the preparation of an acceptable text of operative paragraph 3.

The meeting was suspended at 11.50 a.m. and resumed at 12.10 p.m.

13. Mr. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) announced that the sponsors, having consulted a number of interested delegations, had agreed to amend operative paragraph 3 as follows: (a) after the words "curriculum vitae", the words "keeping in mind" would be replaced by the words "giving due consideration to"; (b) the following words would be added at the end of the paragraph: "any alternates to such experts should also have knowledge of the work of the United Nations, the specialized agencies, the International Atomic Energy Agency, and other bodies of the United Nations."

14. Mr. FORSHELL (Sweden) requested that in operative paragraph 1 the word "countries" should be replaced by the word "States".

15. Mr. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) accepted, on behalf of the sponsors, the amendment proposed by Sweden. In reply to the USSR representative, he pointed out that, although they had not consulted all the co-sponsors of the draft resolution before the Second Committee, they had consulted as many as they could reach. As a result, the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1146/Rev.1 had noted that there was general agreement on the desirability of reaching a conclusion on the question now before the Council so as to facilitate agreement in the Second Committee and that there was a readiness to show flexibility in reaching a conclusion in that committee. However, it was beyond the power of the sponsors of the draft resolution before the Second Committee to bind all the members of that Committee to a given conclusion.

16. Mr. Donald MACDONALD (Canada) said that his delegation failed to see the link between the draft resolution now before the Council and the draft resolution before the Second Committee. The Council was not concerned with a new initiative but with the arrangements to be made following the reconstitution of the Special Committee on Co-ordination and its transformation into the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination. That latter Committee would continue to exist long after the draft resolution which was submitted to the Second Committee if adopted, would have become pointless. The Economic and Social Council had the task of ensuring that the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination served it as efficiently as possible and it should not let itself be distracted by activities taking place elsewhere. The draft resolution before the Second Committee remained an open question and the best way of conducting the general review envisaged in that resolution was for the General Assembly to refer the matter to the Economic and Social Council for consideration at its forty-third session.

17. Mr. DJOUDI (Algeria) proposed the deletion in operative paragraph 8 of the French text of draft resolution E/L.1146/Rev.1 of the words "comme précédemment", since the conditions under which the

^{1/} See Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-first Session, Annexes, agenda item 52, document A/6544, para. 6.

Committee for Programme and Co-ordination would operate would not be the same as before.

18. Mr. FERNANDINI (Peru) asked that in paragraph 8 of the Spanish text the words "el Vicepresidente" should be replaced by the words "los Vicepresidentes".

19. Mr. VIAUD (France) was interested to note the declarations of intention made by the representatives of the United States and Canada, which threw new light on that text and on the line those representatives proposed to take at the General Assembly. He hoped that those intentions would be carried out, but doubted whether they would be, since the position adopted in one organ was not necessarily taken in another. He reserved his position on operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution E/L.1146/Rev.1, not only where the number of members of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination was concerned, but also in anticipation of the discussions in the Second Committee, and of the recommendations which the Economic and Social Council would have to take into consideration at its next session and which it would have to apply. He would have preferred to see the discussion on the draft resolution postponed until the General Assembly had made its recommendations. At the present stage, however, he would mark his dissent by abstaining in the vote on operative paragraph 1, while voting for the draft resolution as a whole.

20. Mr. VARELA (Panama) asked for a separate vote on operative paragraph 1.

21. The PRESIDENT invited the Committee to vote on operative paragraph 1 and the draft resolution (E/L.1146/Rev.1) as a whole, as orally amended.

Operative paragraph 1, as amended, was adopted by 20 votes to none, with five abstentions.

The draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was adopted unanimously.

22. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he had voted in favour of the draft resolution on the understanding that the functions of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination would include some of those specified in the draft resolution submitted to the Second Committee. He hoped that the members of the Committee would be receptive to the Council's position and take into consideration the opinions expressed in the Council. It was for the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination to examine co-ordination questions.

AGENDA ITEM 6

Calendar of conferences for 1967 (E/4269 and Corr.1)

23. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to take up item 6 of its agenda, and pointed out that the session proposed for January 1967 in paragraph 7 of the memorandum by the Secretary-General (E/4269 and Corr.1) was not necessary after the decision just taken on agenda item 10.

24. Mr. Donald MACDONALD (Canada) appreciated the many difficulties the Secretariat had had to overcome in drawing up the calendar of conferences after the decision adopted by the Council, in resolution 1156 (XLI), to rearrange its programme of work. He

realized that 1967 had to be regarded as a transition year and for that reason he accepted, for instance, the overlapping of the sessions of the Commission on the Status of Women and of the Commission on Human Rights, although he hoped that there would be no such overlapping from 1968 onwards. He was sorry that the Commission on Human Rights was to hold a session of six weeks and that the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities was to hold a double session in 1967. He nevertheless accepted that programme on condition that it would not constitute a precedent and that the sessions of the two bodies would subsequently return to their previous pattern.

25. The Committee for Programme and Co-ordination would meet twice a year, the first before the spring session of the Council, which would have to take the Committee's recommendations into consideration. For that reason it would be wise to bring the Committee's session forward two weeks, in order to give delegations more time to examine its recommendations.

26. He also regretted that the forty-second session of the Council would overlap with the fifth session of the Trade and Development Board and he hoped that such overlapping would not occur again. During the general debate in the Second Committee, members had discussed the possibility of postponing the second session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) by a few months. If that was possible, the fifth session of the Trade and Development Board could perhaps also be postponed. He would have more to say on that question in December.

27. Regarding the increasing difficulties encountered by the Secretariat in organizing the programme of meetings, as mentioned by the Secretary-General in paragraph 3 of his memorandum, he believed that in future it would be useful to include in the calendar of conferences the meetings of all bodies active in the economic, social and human rights fields, including, in particular, UNCTAD and the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), as that would make it easier for the Council to discover any overlapping.

28. Mr. KAUL (India) shared the Canadian representative's concern regarding the overlapping of the forty-second session of the Economic and Social Council and the fifth session of the Trade and Development Board, in both of which his country was extremely interested. He asked the Council to consider the possibility of postponing the fifth session of the Trade and Development Board.

29. Mr. VIAUD (France) regarded the problem raised by the representatives of Canada and India as clear evidence of the situation in which the Council found itself owing to the fact that there was no competent body to prepare the calendar of all meetings relating to economic, social, and human rights questions. If that situation continued—and it would be further aggravated when UNIDO began its activities—the result could well be chaos. He too was anxious that the sessions of the Economic and Social Council and of the Trade and Development Board should not take place at the same time in 1967. The solution might

perhaps be to change the date of the second session of UNCTAD. In his view, the first session of the two annual sessions of the Economic and Social Council took place too late in the year. Its subsidiary and functional organs ought to meet at the end of the year and not at the beginning, so as to enable the Council to resume its normal pattern of sessions, the first taking place in March or April and the second in July, the longer interval between the two sessions being used for purposes of co-ordination. Generally speaking, it would be good if the principal organs met every year at fixed dates, so that Governments would adjust to the calendar and organize their activities more efficiently. Changes in timing were a source of incessant arguments and disputes.

30. He asked delegations of Latin America to consider the possibility of holding the session of the Economic Commission for Latin America in April at the latest, so that documents could be prepared in all the working languages in time for the spring session of the Council.

31. The overlapping of the meetings of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination and of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) would be awkward for some delegations, and perhaps the Secretariat could make alternative arrangements. He proposed in conclusion that the start of the Council's summer session should be brought forward slightly, to 5 July for instance, and that the joint meetings of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (ACC) and the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination be held earlier, eliminating the interval between the end of the meeting of the Governing Council of UNDP and the beginning of the summer session of the Economic and Social Council.

Mr. Fernandini (Peru), Second Vice-President, took the Chair.

32. Mr. ZOLLNER (Dahomey) said he too was concerned about the overlapping of the spring session of the Council and the session of the Trade and Development Board. Like the French representative, he believed that the Council would do better to hold its spring session in April rather than in May, and pointed out that it was on the recommendation of his delegation that the Council had decided, in its resolution 1156 (XLI), that that session ought to take place in the second quarter rather than in May, in order to leave a longer interval between the two sessions of the Council. His delegation therefore advocated strongly that the Council's forty-second session should take place in April, the dates of the sessions of subsidiary organs being adjusted accordingly.

33. Moreover, his delegation would like the Council to consider the possibility of changing the dates of the sessions of either the Committee on Commodities of UNCTAD or the Governing Council of UNDP. Those dates now coincided, and that might inconvenience many delegations.

34. His delegation would like the summer session of the Council to be concluded, if possible, before the beginning of August.

35. Miss BELL (United States of America) associated herself with the Canadian representative's

comments and congratulated the Secretariat on its remarkable success in working out a calendar in which so many complex and interdependent elements were nicely balanced. Bearing in mind the difficulties involved in drawing up the calendar for a year of transition between the Council's old and new methods of procedure, her delegation supported the proposals of the Secretary-General.

36. However, she stressed that the subsidiary organs of the Council would have to make every effort to bring the programme of their meetings into line with that of the Council and she hoped that all the Secretariat services would bear that in mind. With regard to the dates of the sessions of the regional economic commissions, she associated herself with the remarks of the French representative and expressed the hope that the Council would recommend to the commissions that they should hold their sessions on dates which would allow them to submit their report to the Council in conformity with the six-week rule.

37. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked the Secretariat to consider the possibility of holding the forty-second session of the Council in April; according to the calendar annexed to the Secretary-General's memorandum, no other meeting was planned for that month.

38. Furthermore, his delegation would like the resumed summer session to consist of one, rather than two, series of meetings in order to avoid technical difficulties both for the Secretariat and for the delegations; that ought to be possible in 1967 when the situation would be less complex than in 1966.

39. Mr. KITTANI (Secretary of the Council), replying to the various points that had been raised, said, for the benefit of the representative of Canada, that the session of the Commission on Human Rights would last five weeks and not six. With regard to the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination, to which that representative had also referred, at its first series of meetings the Committee was due to consider the programme of work of the United Nations and that its work was thus linked with that of the Council, which normally considered its own programme of work at its spring session; the Secretary-General had therefore thought that it would be best for the Committee to meet immediately before the Council's session and again during it, in order that its report on the programme could be submitted to the Council towards the end of that session.

40. Referring to the fears expressed on the subject of possible overlapping between the spring session of the Council and the session of the Trade and Development Board, he reminded the Council of the possibility that the calendar of UNCTAD meetings might be altered; however, that point was yet to be decided by the General Assembly. The Council's immediate task was to approve its own programme of meetings for submission to the General Assembly which would incorporate it in the comprehensive calendar of conferences it would establish. Any delegation would therefore be able to submit to the General Assembly proposals aimed at eliminating overlapping.

41. With regard to the date of the Council's spring session, the Secretariat had not been able, in the case of 1967—which was to be a period of transition—to rearrange the dates of sessions of the subsidiary organs so as to allow the Council to meet in April. He thanked the Canadian representative for his understanding attitude towards the Secretariat's difficulties and expressed the hope that it would be possible in future years to make the necessary adjustments in the light of experience; if all the subsidiary organs of the Council could meet between September and March, the spring session could be held in April. He also stressed, in reply to the USSR representative, that the annex to the Secretary-General's memorandum was solely concerned with the programme of meetings of the Council, and that the general calendar of conferences and meetings of the United Nations listed many important meetings for April 1967 which, among other things, would make it impossible for the Office of Conference Services to service a Council session as well.

42. As to the summer session, the duration of which had been reduced by one week in order to compensate for the week that had been added to the spring session, the Secretary-General had proposed that the first week of the session should be eliminated for three reasons: the interval between the spring and summer sessions would be longer; the documents services would have an extra week to arrange for the documents to be distributed in good time and in all languages; and, finally, the summer session would end no later than usual, so that there would be enough time for the preparation of the Council's report to the General Assembly. However, the Secretariat was ready to do as the Council might wish.

43. With regard to the overlapping, to which the representative of Dahomey had referred, between the session of the Committee on Commodities of UNCTAD and that of the Governing Council of UNDP, the problem was not within the Economic and Social Council's province.

44. Lastly, the Secretariat entirely shared the USSR representative's view regarding the resumed summer session. Current experience showed that it was not desirable to leave questions of substance to be dealt with at the resumed session, and every effort would be made in future to restrict the work of the resumed session to the study of the program of work for the following year, which would of course have to take into account the decisions of the Second Committee and the Third Committee of the General Assembly.

45. Mr. VIAUD (France) acknowledged that the drawing up of the calendar of conferences was ex-

tremely difficult, but he would nevertheless like to submit two last suggestions to the Secretariat by way of half-measures designed to achieve part of the objective set for future years.

46. It might be possible to bring forward the Council's spring session by two weeks if the session of the Commission on Human Rights were similarly brought forward. That should not be too difficult, since, according to what was being proposed, the latter session was not due to start until four weeks after the session of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities had ended.

47. As to the summer session, his delegation was ready to conform to the view of the Council, but found the dates fixed for the opening of the session, and for the very important meetings which were to take place immediately after it, extremely inconvenient; it would therefore be very glad if the session could start on 5 July, the joint meetings of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination and the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination being brought forward accordingly, provided that such alteration would not conflict with the previous engagements of the Secretary-General, who was to preside over those joint meetings and then open the session of the Council.

48. Mr. KITTANI (Secretary of the Council) replied that it was difficult at the moment to foresee what the Secretary-General's engagements would be early in July; he therefore suggested that the Council should approve the Secretary-General's proposals on the understanding that it would be able, as on several previous occasions, to decide during its spring session to change the opening date of the summer session.

49. Before he could reply to the French representative's first suggestion, he would have to consult the Office of Conference Services, the Division of Human Rights and the delegations; however, if the session of the Commission on Human Rights were brought forward, it would overlap still more with the session of the Commission on the Status of Women, a circumstance to which the representative of Canada had already objected.

50. He therefore hoped that the Council would approve the calendar as submitted.

51. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to approve the calendar proposed by the Secretary-General (E/4269 and Corr.1), on the understanding that some changes could be made later if necessary.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.