

lic of Germany agreed with the analysis of the world economic situation made by IMF and that he had stressed the need for Governments to move with the utmost caution in dealing with rapid inflation, bearing in mind the dangers of recession and unemployment. He also noted that the representative of France agreed with the analysis made by IMF and that he had stressed the importance of problems of financing and the central role which IMF must play in that field. With regard to the question raised by the representative of the People's Republic of China concerning the status of China in the Fund, he said that the Executive Directors, the executive organ of IMF, had considered the question in October 1973, following a communication from the Government of the People's Republic of China. At the request of the Executive Directors, arrangements were made for a representative of the Fund to meet with the representative of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations, in order that the Fund might be provided with certain necessary information. So far, such information had not been provided.

72. He was pleased to note that the representative of Japan agreed with his analysis of the international economic situation, and he shared his view that the new Development Committee must not duplicate the work of other United Nations bodies and OECD. The representative of Pakistan had stressed the need to increase the transfer of real resources to the developing countries; he (Mr. Witteveen) agreed that the gravity of the economic situation in some developing countries called for such action, but it would be difficult to obtain more aid from the developed countries, which at present had serious balance-of-payments problems, although it was absolutely essential that the industrialized countries should maintain their assistance to the developing countries. Furthermore, he believed that IMF should do its utmost to help the developing countries, particularly those most seriously affected by the current crisis, and that they should benefit as a matter of priority from the oil facility of the Fund. He was glad that the United Kingdom representative had approved the development of the facility; he agreed with him that in combating inflation, account must be

taken of the dangers of recession, and in particular of unemployment. He stressed the need also for international co-operation, in view of the close interdependence of countries with regard to development. IMF was studying those problems and would produce an analysis of the world economic situation. He thanked Iran for its support of the Fund's oil facility and appreciated its disappointment that the industrialized countries were not making a greater contribution; it must not be forgotten, however, that they themselves were in a difficult financial situation. They would surely not refuse to give their support when they were in a position to do so; Canada and the Netherlands were already prepared to make a contribution. With regard to the surplus of \$65 thousand million held by the oil-producing countries, he was aware that, as the representative of Iran had pointed out, those countries were using the funds to accelerate their own development. In reply to the representative of France, he announced that he might be able, in the future, to present the IMF report at the summer session of the Economic and Social Council.

73. Mr. CHANG Hsien-wu (China), replying to the Managing Director of IMF, said that he could not accept the explanations which the latter had given to justify the Fund's position towards the People's Republic of China. Once again, he recalled that the General Assembly had decided, in its resolution 2758 (XXVI), to expel forthwith the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek from the place which they unlawfully occupied at the United Nations and in all the organizations related to it. Many United Nations agencies had implemented the resolution, but the World Bank and IMF continued to ignore it. IMF must unconditionally implement that resolution. He thanked the representative of Pakistan for his support.

74. The PRESIDENT said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Economic and Social Council decided to take note with appreciation of the report of IMF.

The decision was adopted [decision 61 (LVII)].

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.

1928th meeting

Tuesday, 26 November 1974, at 3.20 p.m.

President: Mr. Aarno KARHILO (Finland).

E/SR.1928

AGENDA ITEM 6

World Food Conference:

- (a) Report of the World Food Conference (E/5586, E/5587 and Add.1-4);
- (b) Emergency measures in regard to the supply of fertilizers and pesticides (E/5596)

1. Mr. HANNAH (Deputy Secretary-General of the World Food Conference), introducing the report, in provisional form, of the World Food Conference (E/5587 and Add.1-4) on behalf of the Secretary-General of the Conference, said that he had accepted a role in

the secretariat of the World Food Conference only because of his belief that the gravest responsibility facing the entire world was the problem of feeding the hungry people in the developing countries. That problem should be of direct concern to all people of all races, all religions, all colours and all political or economic persuasions. The Conference had accomplished far more than could have been realistically expected by even the most optimistic. In that respect, he wished to thank the Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs, the members of the Economic and Social Council secretariat and the Chairman of the Preparatory Committee for their role in ensuring the success of the

meetings of the Preparatory Committee and the Conference itself.

2. That the food problem was one of global proportions was demonstrated by the basic documentation, which included documents E/CONF.65/3 and E/CONF.65/4 and the report of the Preparatory Committee on its third session (E/CONF.65/6), which the Committee had before it, under cover of a note by the Secretary-General (E/5586), and the fact that the Conference had been attended by high-level representatives of 133 countries and numerous organizations. He was surprised that some people felt the Conference had been little but a torrent of words. Less than a year had elapsed since the General Assembly had approved the idea of the Conference, and in that time the situation had changed dramatically, to the point where there was now growing recognition that a world food crisis was imminent or had already arrived. It was essential not to lose the potential that now existed for achieving substantial and meaningful breakthroughs in three areas: the requirement for greatly increased food production, particularly in the developing countries; the achievement of improved food security; and realistic progress towards relief for the hungry in the poorest countries.

3. Part one of the report of the Conference (E/5587) included information on its background and organization and a summary of the general debate and other proceedings. Part two consisted of the Programme of Action, including the Declaration on the Eradication of Hunger and Malnutrition. That Declaration had been drafted by the First Committee of the Conference, whose mandate had also covered consideration of measures for increasing food production and improving nutrition. Of the 15 resolutions adopted on the report of that committee, resolutions I to XII largely concerned the responsibilities of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). Resolution XIII requested the Secretary-General of the United Nations to convene a meeting to consider matters relating to the establishment of an International Fund for Agricultural Development, and resolutions XIV and XV were general and advisory.

4. The Second Committee of the Conference had been responsible for matters relating to food security, the global information and early warning system on food and agriculture, and improved food aid policies. Among the resolutions adopted on the report of that committee, resolution XVI dealt with one of the key points on which substantial division had been feared but had failed to materialize. The need for intelligent forward planning of agricultural production was clear, and it was hoped that the proposed system would help in that respect by anticipating droughts and other phenomena affecting crop yields. Resolution XVII urged all Governments to co-operate in achieving the first priority, the re-establishment of adequate world food reserves. Until two or three years ago, the main problem in the event of food shortages had been the purchase and shipment of stocks from the food surplus maintained on the North American continent. That surplus had now disappeared. He hoped that contributions to the rebuilding of adequate stocks would come more in the form of food-stuffs than of finance. Much attention had been focused on resolution XVIII, concerning an improved policy for food aid, and he therefore commended it to the Council's attention.

5. The Third Committee of the Conference had been responsible for considering international trade, stabilization and agricultural adjustment. Its discussions had resulted in the adoption by the Conference of resolution XIX, calling upon Governments and United Nations agencies to promote the expansion and liberalization of trade, with special reference to food products.

6. The most important of the resolutions was resolution XXII, paragraph 1 of which called for the establishment of a World Food Council, at the ministerial or plenipotentiary level, and described its functions. Paragraphs 2 and 3 urged improvements in the functioning of the United Nations system and requested that the resolution should be taken into account when the United Nations studied that question in 1975. He drew particular attention to paragraph 4, subparagraphs (a) to (d), concerning the organization of the proposed Council. A decision on the size of the Council had been left to the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly because it had been felt that success would depend on the inclusion in that body of an appropriate number of representatives of food-exporting and food-importing countries, whether developing or developed, of various regions, such as East and West Africa, and of the countries of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC). Many participants in the Conference had felt that little practical action would ensue unless there was such a high-level political body that could promote both United Nations programmes and bilateral programmes—which often provided more food than multilateral schemes—and could perhaps help in obtaining contributions to the world food effort from the oil-exporting countries.

7. In conclusion, he drew attention to the closing remarks of the Secretary-General of the Conference as reproduced in chapter VIII of the report, especially paragraphs 4 to 11 and 13 to 15 and those parts of paragraph 12 in which the Secretary-General had indicated that the main challenge for national Governments and the international community as a whole would now be the effective implementation of the resolutions, the importance that the Conference attached to that point being reflected by the attention it had devoted to follow-up arrangements. He (Mr. Hannah) wished to point out that the world should not approach the food problem by asking whether it could be solved by reducing population growth, since, even with the immediate institution of a policy of aligning the birth-rate with the death-rate, the total world population would continue to grow for a further 70 years. The Secretary-General of the Conference had said that the first step towards solving the food problem must be the early approval by the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly of the conclusions of the Conference. The final answer to the question how soon the goals could be reached would, of course, depend largely on the reactions of individual Governments. As the Secretary-General had recalled, those participating in the Conference had taken a pledge to ensure that "within a decade no child will go to bed hungry, that no family will fear for its next day's bread, and that no human being's future and capacities will be stunted by malnutrition".

8. Mr. DE SEYNES (Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs), speaking on behalf of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, expressed the Organization's gratitude to the Government of Italy

for its great and successful efforts in support of the World Food Conference.

9. Mr. BARCELO (Mexico) said he was gratified at the speed with which the report of the World Food Conference had been produced, and also thanked the Government of Italy for its hospitality. His delegation had supported the establishment of both the World Food Council and the International Fund for Agricultural Development because they met the major concerns expressed by the President of Mexico to FAO in 1972 regarding the establishment of a world food bank. As the President of Mexico—the only Head of Government to attend the Conference—had said, the future of mankind was in the balance. Great efforts had been made in Rome to find ways of feeding the world's hungry and providing the technical and financial support needed to develop agriculture for that purpose. The Mexican idea of a world food bank had been largely met by the general interest expressed in the establishment of the World Food Council, in which all countries could address themselves to the urgent need for change in the current economic order in keeping with new international market conditions for agricultural exports, particularly with a view to supplying food for those nations which lacked it. The question of land and the provision of enough food for a growing population were problems that almost all nations had had to face at some stage. He warned that conformism and distortion of the facts were used by those who were opposed to change and to the implementation of the new international economic order.

10. He wished to make it clear that his delegation did not lay the blame for the current international economic chaos on those who, after great effort, had managed to acquire some of the profits which formerly had not accrued to developing countries from the sale of raw materials, and with which they hoped to improve the situation of their peoples. He stressed the need for the developed countries to provide direct and effective support for the International Fund for Agricultural Development; only thus could international solidarity improve conditions for the poorest people of the world. Although many of his delegation's concerns had not been fully met at the World Food Conference, it welcomed the progress made and was certain that FAO would carry out the structural changes needed in the current situation and that the world was on the threshold of a new period of history.

11. Mr. CAVAGLIERI (Italy) thanked the Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs and the representative of Mexico for their expressions of appreciation to his Government. His delegation was well aware of the scope of the problems dealt with at the World Food Conference. He was glad that it had been a success and hoped that further progress would be made in the future.

12. Mr. KITCHEN (United States of America) said that his delegation had spoken at the World Food Conference and did not have much to add at the current stage. His Government appreciated all the hard work that had gone into the Conference and the drafting of the report. He had not had sufficient time to review the voluminous contents of that report and felt that delegations should have an opportunity to concentrate on the role which the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly were called upon to play in accordance with the recommendations of the Conference. The Council could either agree to transmit the report

immediately to the General Assembly for discussion in the Second Committee, where a larger number of delegations could participate, or first discuss it itself. Either course of action would be acceptable to his delegation.

13. If both the Council and the Assembly were prepared to accept the report and recommendations of the World Food Conference as they stood, a minimum of immediate action was clearly required of both organs. For instance, the Assembly would have to develop the terms of reference of the World Food Council and decide how many members it should have and how they should be nominated and confirmed.

14. If the report was to be amended in any way, it was only after that process had been completed that the task of the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly would become clear. He hoped that it would be possible for the Council to have a short debate on the report before it went to the Second Committee; the latter should concentrate in particular on the specific legal actions required of the Assembly to permit rapid implementation of the recommendations of the Conference. Three members of the United States Cabinet and 39 Senators and Representatives had taken part in the Conference, and it would therefore be presumptuous for his delegation to think of changing any of the political decisions contained in the report. It was essential that the recommendations should be implemented as a matter of urgency, as the Secretary-General of the United Nations, the Director-General of FAO and the Secretaries-General of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) and the World Food Conference had said.

15. Mr. ROUGE (France) reiterated the comment made by his delegation at the Conference, namely, that it was indispensable that the Economic and Social Council should examine resolution IV of the Conference closely, and asked how the Council could organize its work to that end.

16. Mr. BOOTHE (Jamaica) said that resolution XXII raised various questions regarding the nature of the World Food Council and its relationship with the United Nations. He would like a clarification of the term "an organ of the United Nations" used in operative paragraph 1. As he had understood it, there were only five such organs in existence. The World Food Council was supposed to report to the General Assembly through the Economic and Social Council. However, if it was established at the ministerial or plenipotentiary level, as proposed in paragraph 1, it would be on the same level as the Economic and Social Council. The reference to a co-ordinating mechanism raised questions in the light of the content of paragraph 4 (b). Clarification was needed concerning the role of the Economic and Social Council in the matter. He drew attention to the somewhat unusual procedure for nomination and confirmation provided for in paragraph 4 (a), and said he questioned whether it would be wise to establish such a precedent. With regard to the first sentence of paragraph 4 (d), it should be made clear that the co-ordination referred to was in the context of food problems; otherwise, the World Food Council would infringe upon the role of the Economic and Social Council. Clarification was also required on the question how the Intergovernmental Committee of the World Food Programme, referred to in paragraph 6, was to be reconstituted and by whom—the World Food Council, the Economic and Social Council, or both together. Paragraph 11 also raised difficulties for the Economic and Social Council, for obvious reasons.

17. The representative of the United States had suggested alternative ways of dealing with the report. His delegation had an open mind on the matter but would like a decision to be taken without delay.

18. Mr. ROSTOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had only received the report of the World Food Conference that morning and had therefore not had sufficient time to study it in detail. It had no objection to transmitting the report to the Second Committee for consideration but would like to confirm its position on the questions discussed at the Conference, either in the Council or in the Second Committee.

19. Mr. MACKENZIE (United Kingdom) said that all members were well aware of the urgency and importance of the issues before them. He hoped that the Council would resist the temptation to renew the debate on the commitments already made by Governments in Rome. It was now necessary to see how those commitments could be implemented. It would be helpful if the President or the Secretariat could give the Council some guidance on the essential steps it should take as a result of the recommendations of the Conference. It was clear that resolution XXII, paragraph 4 (a), called for action by the Council, as did paragraph 11.

20. Mr. TANIGUCHI (Japan) said that the World Food Conference had been most fruitful. All the participants had recognized the importance of the world food problem and had made every effort to find a realistic solution. Some delegations had drawn attention to the lack of clarity in the description of the follow-up action to be taken. However, they must realize that the participants at the Conference had made great compromises in order to deal with the problem as expeditiously as possible. It was essential that debate on the questions dealt with in Rome should not be reopened. His Government was committed to the resolutions contained in the report, and his delegation therefore commended the report to the Council and the General Assembly for adoption, with a view to dealing as rapidly as possible with the urgent world food problem.

21. Mr. HASHMI (India) agreed that members had had little time to study the report of the Conference. Time was of the essence and therefore, despite the procedural difficulties pointed out by the representative of Jamaica, the Council should adopt the report and recommendations of the Conference. Unless the machinery called for in the resolutions was set up immediately, the momentum gained in Rome would be lost. The Council, the Second Committee and the General Assembly should make every effort to take positive action on establishing the World Food Council and the International Fund for Agricultural Development. His delegation would do all it could to help to clarify issues and consolidate the action taken by the Conference.

22. Mr. MWANGAGUHUNGA (Uganda) said that, as he understood the recommendation made by the President at the preceding meeting, the Council would take whatever action was required of it by the report of the World Food Conference to set in train the establishment of the World Food Council and would then transmit the report to the Second Committee of the General Assembly.

23. Mr. FASLA (Algeria) said that the role of the Council and the Assembly was to give effect to the measures called for in the report of the Conference,

and not to reopen the debate on decisions that had already been taken. Either the suggestion made by the President at the preceding meeting of the Council or the transmittal of the report directly to the Second Committee would be acceptable to his delegation.

24. Mr. ABDEL MEGUID (Egypt) agreed with the representative of the United Kingdom that the time had come for action, rather than debate on issues which had already been settled. The Council should concentrate on taking the necessary measures to implement the resolutions adopted at the World Food Conference.

25. The PRESIDENT requested the Secretary to inform the Council of the practice followed in the past in dealing with reports submitted by conferences.

26. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) said that decisions of United Nations conferences had the status of recommendations to the various governing bodies of United Nations organs and specialized agencies. That was the reason why the Secretary-General was not required to submit statements of the financial implications of proposals emanating from such conferences until the governing bodies of the organs and agencies in question took up the conference reports.

27. With regard to the practice of the Council and the Assembly in considering Conference reports, those of the first session of UNCTAD and the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment constituted relevant precedents. In both cases, the reports had contained two types of recommendations, namely, substantive recommendations and recommendations concerning institutional arrangements. The Economic and Social Council had endorsed all the recommendations contained in the UNCTAD report, including the institutional recommendations, and had transmitted them to the General Assembly for appropriate action. In the case of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, the Council had endorsed the recommendations and made comments on the institutional arrangements, which it had transmitted to the Assembly with the report. In both cases, the Assembly had been required to take special action with regard to the creation of the institutions involved; in relation to the establishment of UNCTAD, a proposal had been submitted by the President of the Assembly in accordance with the procedures that were adopted at the nineteenth session; and in connexion with the establishment of the United Nations Environment Programme, a number of delegations had submitted a draft resolution, along the lines of the relevant recommendations of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, which had then been considered and adopted in the usual manner, incorporating amendments made during the debate.

28. As for those recommendations of the World Food Conference which required specific action by the Economic and Social Council, it was for the Council to decide on the proper timing of such action.

29. Mr. MACKENZIE (United Kingdom) said the statement by the Secretary made it clear that the Council's responsibility was simply to transmit the report, with its approval, to the General Assembly and to take action on resolution XXII, paragraph 4 (a). The actual setting-up of the World Food Council was the concern of the General Assembly, not the Economic and Social Council.

30. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) said he did not entirely agree with the representative of the United Kingdom;

he believed that the Council, as the main co-ordinating organ of the United Nations system for economic and social matters had a responsibility to pronounce in some way on the institutional arrangements recommended by the World Food Conference before transmitting the recommendations, together with its own comments, to the General Assembly.

31. Mr. EKBLOM (Finland) endorsed the view expressed by the representative of Pakistan. The report of the World Food Conference was of such a nature that it should not be transmitted to the General Assembly without the Council's comments. The Council should therefore hold a meeting to consider and comment on the institutional arrangements recommended in the report. His delegation would also welcome the clarifications requested by the representative of Jamaica.

32. Mr. FASLA (Algeria) said that the Council should maintain flexibility with regard to complicated questions of procedure. For example, resolution XXII, paragraph 4 (a), if approved by the General Assembly at it stood, would have to come back to the Council for action and then go once again to the Assembly. He wondered whether the urgency of the situation permitted such a time-consuming procedure.

33. It was desirable to hold another meeting to consider the report further, and yet another meeting might be necessary if the Assembly requested the Council to decide the question of the number of members of the World Food Council.

34. Replying to a question put by Mr. KITCHEN (United States of America), Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) said that the introduction of the reports of the World Food Conference in the Second Committee was scheduled for Monday, 2 December, provided that the Council completed its consideration of the report at its meeting on Friday, 29 November, since the General Assembly had to receive not only the report of the Conference but also the Council's report on it.

35. Mr. KITCHEN (United States of America) said that, in view of the delicate compromise reached at the Conference after much negotiation, he doubted whether the Council could lend profundity to the negotiations and reach a compromise on the report in one meeting. A number of almost irreconcilable views had been expressed in Rome by States which were not members of the Council. Thus, whatever the Council decided, it was almost inevitable that the debate would be reopened in the Second Committee. At its next meeting, therefore, the Council should clarify the language, intent and background of the issues which raised difficulties.

36. Mr. ČABRIĆ (Yugoslavia) reserved his delegation's right to comment on the report and the resolutions later, either in the Council or in the Second Committee. He felt that resolution XXII paragraph 4 (a), should be clarified, since the procedure suggested was unusual. The Council should decide at its next meeting what action to take on that paragraph. The other questions raised, such as those concerning paragraph 11 of the resolution, could be discussed at a later stage, and even at the beginning of 1975, when the Council held its organizational session.

37. Mr. TANIGUCHI (Japan) recalled that agreement had been reached at the World Food Conference on the basis of a very delicate compromise. As the representative of the United Kingdom had said, the

Council should limit its discussion to the issues in which it was specifically involved.

38. Mr. KAUFMANN (Netherlands) stressed the importance of speedy implementation of the Conference's recommendations. It was true that resolution XXII, paragraph 4 (a), was somewhat unusual, perhaps as a result of a compromise at the Conference. He agreed with the representative of Pakistan that the Economic and Social Council should be involved in the decision-making process. He drew attention to the problem of timing: if action was to be taken by the General Assembly at its current session, consultations must be held quickly on the establishment of the World Food Council.

39. The International Fund for Agricultural Development should be established as soon as possible. He assumed that it was for the General Assembly, and not the Economic and Social Council, to take the necessary decision. With regard to resolution XIII, paragraph 5, he wished to know whether the meeting referred to should be convened before or after the General Assembly had taken its decision. His delegation, which had sponsored resolution XIII at the Conference, believed that it should be before.

40. Mr. OLIVERI LOPEZ (Argentina) said that there could be no question of reopening the debate which had taken place in Rome. All possible compromises had been reached, and those questions on which decisions had not been possible at the Conference could not be resolved in the Economic and Social Council. The substantive recommendations in the report should therefore be transmitted to the Second Committee, and the Council should concentrate on the matters requiring specific action by it. With regard to resolution XXII, paragraph 4 (a), he wished to know whether the Council could make recommendations on the number of members or whether it was necessary to await the Assembly's decision.

41. Mr. SHEMIRANI (Iran) said that no one was anxious to reopen the debate on the substantive recommendations contained in the report. The Council could take note of all such recommendations and transmit them to the Second Committee, limiting its own discussion to institutional arrangements, and specifically to resolution XXII. Before the Council met again on Friday, it would be useful to have further clarifications from the Secretariat and to hold informal consultations among members so that a decision on the World Food Council could be taken at that time.

42. Mr. ABDEL MEGUID (Egypt) said that the urgency of the situation required the Council to act with all possible dispatch. It should therefore endorse the report and attach whatever recommendations or comments it wished, without, however, making any substantial changes in arrangements already agreed upon. Although some delegations had doubts concerning the provisions of resolution XXII, paragraph 4 (a), the Council had an obligation to act, in view of the crucial world food situation. The most important consideration with regard to the World Food Council was to provide for balanced geographical representation irrespective of its total number of members, which the Council would have to determine.

43. Mr. CZARKOWSKI (Poland) observed that it was not possible to give the recommendations of the World Food Conference the very thorough consideration they deserved because the mechanism of the re-

sumed session did not permit it and the Second Committee was already behind in its work. Furthermore, the report had only been distributed on the previous day. His delegation therefore agreed that the Council should act immediately on the urgent matters referred to it directly by the Conference, should not reopen the debate on any substantive issues, and should take note of the report and transmit it to the Second Committee. If there was a need for further discussion in the Council, he agreed with the representative of Yugoslavia that certain points could be considered at the next session.

44. Mr. BARCELO (Mexico) said that the resolutions adopted at the World Food Conference were the product of a very delicate process of negotiation and compromise, and there could be no question of amending them in the Economic and Social Council. The Council should not be unduly legalistic or lose time, since it was precisely that kind of inadequate response to urgent situations which had caused certain other United Nations bodies to forfeit the confidence of the international community.

45. With regard to the establishment of the World Food Council, he believed that the mandate of the Economic and Social Council was sufficiently clear for it to take immediate action at its next meeting on the nomination of members. In that connexion, his delegation believed that a brief report by the Secretariat might be useful to the Council in making its choice.

46. Mr. BERLIS (Canada) said that he did not wish to confuse the issue by adding to the plethora of suggestions on how the Council should proceed. He simply wished to voice a warning against the recurrence of a similar procedural discussion at the next meeting. His delegation supported the idea of holding consultations before that meeting. It shared the view that it would not be profitable for the Council to reopen the substantive discussions already held at the Conference. The Council must complete its consideration of the report at its next meeting and submit it to the Second Committee with comments.

47. Mr. RYDBECK (Sweden) agreed with those representatives who had emphasized the urgency of the matter and warned against any attempt to reopen the debate on issues which had been settled in Rome. The

representative of Egypt had explained why the matter was urgent; indeed, the entire work for the Conference had been completed in less than a year because of the urgent need to solve the world food problem. Representation in Rome had been at a very high level, as requested by the General Assembly, and had included many government experts. It was, therefore, obviously unthinkable to reopen the debate. He was sure that the Council would act speedily at its next meeting, so that it could forward the report of the Conference to the Second Committee with its comments or recommendations. Members would obviously have to hold consultations regarding the institutional arrangements, and he hoped that the Council would deal with the matter speedily at its next meeting.

48. Mr. KITCHEN (United States of America) endorsed the comments made by the representatives of Egypt and Sweden. The substantive issues of a political nature dealt with in Rome were covered in resolutions I to XX. No further action should be necessary on those resolutions if the General Assembly and the Council were ready to endorse them. Resolution XXI required no action. Only resolution XXII dealt with issues which involved the Council, in paragraphs 1, 4 (a) and 11. If the Council could focus on those three points, it would enable the General Assembly to proceed with the implementation of the report.

49. Mr. JARPA (Chile) said that, as he understood it, at its next meeting the Council would only discuss the best way to implement the agreements reached in Rome and would not reopen the political and economic debates held during the Conference.

50. The PRESIDENT said there appeared to be a clear consensus that the Council should not reopen the debate on the substantive issues dealt with in Rome. At its next meeting, therefore, it would concentrate on the procedural aspects of the report. He urged interested delegations to hold consultations in the meantime. On the point raised by the representative of Jamaica concerning the legal meaning of the words "an organ of the United Nations", it would be useful to have the opinion of the Office of the Legal Counsel, and he would obtain such an opinion before the next meeting.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.

1929th meeting

Friday, 29 November 1974, at 10.50 a.m.

President: Mr. Aarno KARHILO (Finland).

E/SR.1929

AGENDA ITEM 6

World Food Conference (*continued*):

- (a) Report of the World Food Conference (E/5586, E/5587 and Add.1-4);
- (b) Emergency measures in regard to the supply of fertilizers and pesticides (E/5596)

1. Mr. STEINER (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations) introduced the progress report of the Director-General of FAO on the International Fertilizer Supply Scheme (see E/5596). In

response to Economic and Social Council resolution 1836 (LVI) and upon the recommendation of the Commission on Fertilizers, the FAO Council had established the Scheme at its sixty-third session. The purpose of the Scheme was to ensure the availability of adequate amounts of fertilizers for developing countries and to mobilize financial assistance for those having serious payments problems because of high fertilizer prices.

2. In the past few months, the world fertilizer situation had deteriorated, and several countries—particularly on the Indian subcontinent and in Africa—