



ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Thursday, 21 December 1961,
at 3.10 p.m.

Resumed Thirty-second Session
OFFICIAL RECORDS

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 28:</i>	
<i>Work of the Council in 1962 (concluded)</i>	7
<i>Inclusion of an additional item in the agenda. . .</i>	10
<i>Agenda item 33:</i>	
<i>Question of an increase in the membership of</i> <i>the Technical Assistance Committee</i>	11
<i>Organization of work</i>	11

President: Mr. E. PENTEADO (Brazil).

Present:

Representatives of the following States: Afghanistan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Denmark, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Italy, Japan, Jordan, New Zealand, Poland, Spain, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Observers for the following Member States: Canada, Greece, India, Indonesia, Pakistan, Yugoslavia.

Representatives of the following specialized agencies: International Labour Organisation; Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations; United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; World Health Organization.

The representative of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

AGENDA ITEM 28

*Work of the Council in 1962 (E/L.922 and Corr.1,
E/L.923 and Add.1) (concluded)*

1. Mr. SCHACHTER (Secretariat), in reply to a question asked at the previous meeting, confirmed that when the Secretary-General inserted item 9 in the draft list of agenda items for the thirty-third session as it appeared on page 4 of his draft programme for 1962 (E/L.922 and Corr.1), he had acted in accordance with the provisions of Economic and Social Council resolutions 277 (X) and 351 (XII). Those resolutions dealt with the forwarding to the Council of allegations regarding infringements of trade union rights and established between those allegations no distinction based on their place of origin. Subsequently, the Council in its resolution 474 (XV) had decided to forward to the ILO the allegations which related to States members of that organization. In regard to the other allegations, therefore, the two first-named resolutions were still valid. Moreover, that interpretation had been confirmed by practice in a number of cases, such as those of Spain (before its admission to the United Nations), the territory of Trieste, and the Saar. The Secretariat had accordingly had no other course but to communicate those allegations to the Council.

2. Mr. NATORF (Poland), supported by Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), said that it was difficult for him to accept that interpretation, and asked that the words "Two such communications have already been received" should be put to the vote. If those words were retained, he would ask for a separate vote on item 9.

3. Mr. MALINOWSKI (Secretary of the Council) explained that the Council was being asked to approve the list of items for its agenda which appeared on page 4 of document E/L.922. The information given in that document was of a supplementary nature. Annotations to the agenda could be modified subsequently, in the light of the Council's views or of circumstances which might arise before the opening of the spring session. It might not be in accordance with practice for the Council to take, by a vote, a decision on one of the items appearing on pages 5 to 8.

4. The PRESIDENT thought that, in view of the Secretary's statement, the Council should vote solely on the list of items for its provisional agenda as it appeared on page 4 of document E/L.922.

5. Mr. PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan) said he had no objection to the procedure adopted with regard to the particular item in question. He thought, however, that in principle every United Nations document submitted to any United Nations body was submitted as a whole. He could not accept the idea that the Secretariat should amend the documents which it had submitted, because of objections or criticism from one or two delegations. That might result in dangerous precedents being created. If certain delegations raised objections with regard to any particular item, the best course was to take a vote.

6. Mr. NATORF (Poland) recalled that at the previous meeting he had expressed the hope that the Secretary-General would reconsider his position and, as a result, amend document E/L.922. However, in order to avoid procedural difficulties he would not insist on the deletion of the words "Two such communications have already been received"; he would simply ask that item 9 in the draft list of agenda items for the thirty-third session be the subject of a separate vote.

7. After a further exchange of views, the PRESIDENT put item 9 in the draft list to the vote.

The item was retained on the agenda by 15 votes to 3.

8. Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) explained that he had voted against the retention of item 9, not for reasons of substance but because of the irregular way in which the Secretariat had presented the matter. If there were allegations of infringements of trade union rights, the USSR delegation was prepared to examine them.

9. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the draft list of agenda items for the Council's thirty-third session, appearing on page 4 of document E/L.922.

The draft list was approved unanimously.

10. The PRESIDENT invited members of the Council to consider the draft list of agenda items for the Council's thirty-fourth session.

11. Mr. VIAUD (France) wondered whether the postponement, to the spring of 1963, of the United Nations Conference on the Application of Science and Technology for the Benefit of the Less Developed Areas involved any amendment to the work programme for 1962 as submitted to the Council. Under Council resolution 834 (XXXII) adopted in August 1961, that Conference might take place in 1962, but its terms were such that it did not seem necessary to modify it. Moreover, item 12 on the draft list of agenda items for the thirty-fourth session provided for the study of questions relating to science and technology. It seemed, at first sight, that those questions could be considered independently of the Scientific Conference, which would not be held until 1963. He did not think, therefore, that the change made in the date of the Conference involved any amendment of item 12.

12. The PRESIDENT invited the Council's members to comment on the usefulness of a meeting of the Council at the ministerial level at its thirty-fourth session.

13. Mr. LEWANDOWSKI (Poland) recalled that the Council had decided, in its resolution 818 (XXXI), to consider preparations for a meeting of the Council at the ministerial level at the thirty-fourth session. Owing to the heavy work of the Second Committee, the Polish delegation had not, to its regret, had time to devote to that question all the attention it deserved. It had, nevertheless, engaged in certain consultations which indicated that views on the subject were very divided. The Polish delegation considered the idea a very interesting one; but the first meeting which had been held at the ministerial level had revealed certain difficulties, such as the inability of some delegations to send representatives. Generally speaking, it was considered that, if such meetings were to continue, they should be better organized. In particular, it had been pointed out that their programme of work should be drawn up carefully. It seemed, therefore, better to defer consideration of that question to the Council's spring session; in that way, the various delegations could study the matter and make constructive proposals.

14. Miss SALT (United Kingdom) pointed out that her delegation had no difficulty in agreeing to a meeting of the Council at the ministerial level because the United Kingdom delegation to the Economic and Social Council was usually headed by a minister. The last meeting that had been held at the ministerial level had been useful but would probably have produced more tangible results if a greater number of ministers had attended. During the United Nations Development Decade, the Council would be called upon to discuss important questions, and if it decided to hold such meetings, it would be necessary above all for the delegations of the less developed countries to be represented at the ministerial level, at least for the principal questions. As to the matters to be discussed, the most important items should be grouped together so that they might be dealt with while the ministers were present. She supported the Polish proposal according to which no final decision would be taken at the current session but the question would be examined at the spring session.

15. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan) thought that meetings at the ministerial level should not be held every year because of the difficulties which that would entail for certain countries.

16. Mr. KAKITSUBO (Japan) said that he was in favour of such meetings, which could produce constructive results and enhance the Council's prestige, but on condition that they were properly prepared and organized. Although meetings of that kind had been held during the thirtieth session of the Council, many Member States had expressed dissatisfaction at their outcome because of the insufficient number of countries that had been represented by ministers. His delegation was of the opinion that if the Council decided to hold meetings at the ministerial level, there must be adequate preparation and the number of items to be discussed must not exceed one or two. It agreed with the Polish delegation that that question should not be discussed in detail at the current session but should be postponed to the session to be held in the spring of 1962.

17. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that in his delegation's opinion the meetings which had already been held at the ministerial level had been profitable not only for the delegations that had taken part in them but also for all other Member States. The holding of such meetings could be advantageous if there was a specific agenda comprising only a small number of items that would be of interest to the ministers and lead to profitable discussions, and if the meetings were carefully prepared in advance on the basis of preliminary studies carried out by the Secretariat. His delegation therefore found it difficult to come to an immediate decision on the holding of such a meeting at the thirty-fourth session of the Council but would be ready to discuss the matter next April. If, however, the Council decided at that time to hold such a meeting at its thirty-fourth session, little time would be left for selecting the items to be discussed or for preparing the necessary documents. Hence, even next April, the French delegation might still be doubtful with regard, not to the usefulness of such meetings, but to the possibility of holding one of them in the month of July 1962.

18. Mrs. MIRONOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that her delegation had no difficulty in accepting the Polish proposal. Despite the drawbacks pointed out by the representative of Japan, experience had shown that a meeting at the ministerial level was of considerable advantage and made possible a more profitable discussion. Such a meeting must inevitably enhance the Council's authority in economic and social questions. If the meeting was held at the thirty-fourth session, the members of the Council would have time to determine whether they would be able to send their ministers.

19. Mr. LEWANDOWSKI (Poland) commented on the observation by France that such a meeting must be very carefully prepared and suggested that the Council should adopt a proposal whereby the Secretary-General would be invited to make suggestions concerning the items to be examined at the meeting at the ministerial level.

20. Mr. SERAFIMOV (Bulgaria) said that his delegation was entirely in favour of holding a meeting at the ministerial level at the thirty-fourth session. Past experience had demonstrated the usefulness of those meetings, and in his opinion they should

be held not only at the thirty-fourth session but periodically.

21. The PRESIDENT said that in the absence of any objection he considered as adopted the formal proposal by Poland that the question before the Council should be postponed to the spring session.

It was so decided.

22. Miss SALT (United Kingdom) asked if it would be possible for the Secretariat to prepare a working paper setting out the items that might serve as a basis for discussion.

23. Mr. DE SEYNES (Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs) explained that the question of meetings at the ministerial level had originated in a proposal which had been presented in 1959 by the late Secretary-General, Mr. Dag Hammarskjöld. That proposal had been based on the fact that an organ such as the Economic and Social Council, which under the United Nations Charter was responsible for formulating directives of international scope, could function efficiently only if the ministers having direct responsibility for economic and social questions occasionally held meetings at which they might learn each other's views. The need for those meetings had become even greater by virtue of the fact that the ministers of some Powers had become accustomed to meeting frequently in other United Nations organs. The Secretariat would, moreover, have no difficulty in meeting the wishes of Poland if the members of the Council as a whole were of the same mind. The document to be prepared by the Secretariat would indicate the arrangements which, in view of the short time available to the ministers, would be necessary in order that a meeting at the ministerial level might be held, and it would make suggestions concerning the subjects to be discussed. The preparation of that document would not have any financial implications.

24. Mr. PAZHAWAK (Afghanistan) said that if the question under discussion had been put to the vote, his delegation would have abstained in view of the fact that a meeting at the ministerial level entailed many difficulties, if only that of obtaining a sufficient number of participants. Also, the preparations for a meeting of such importance demanded more time than was available. He was accordingly opposed to a meeting at the ministerial level being held at the thirty-fourth session.

25. Mrs. MIRONOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) made a number of comments on other items of the programme. The Soviet delegation saw no reason why the economic and social consequences of disarmament should not be discussed at the thirty-fourth session, but it emphasized that the Secretariat must accelerate its work in order to supply documents at the proper time. With reference to paragraph 7 of document E/L.922, she said that there was no point in establishing a small committee to consider the candidates for election to the Permanent Central Opium Board. Such a study could be undertaken directly by the Secretariat without any need for a special body involving uncalled-for administrative expenses. The Soviet delegation would vote against that proposal if it was put to the vote.

26. Mr. FRANZI (Italy) remarked that, all through the year, it had been difficult to obtain essential documents in all the working languages at the proper time. He hoped that the Secretariat would do its

utmost to meet the necessary deadlines the following year.

27. Mr. VIAUD (France) endorsed the Italian appeal and requested that documents should be circulated early enough for delegations to have time to study and ponder them. During the current year, delays had been greater than usual.

28. Mr. MALINOWSKI (Secretary of the Council), replying to the objection raised by the Soviet Union concerning paragraph 7 of document E/L.922, pointed out that the establishment of a small committee would have no financial implications since, in conformity with established practice, it would be composed of members of the Economic and Social Council permanently resident in New York.

29. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan) said that the appointment of a small committee seemed to him to be a practical solution and that the question was an important one. Such a procedure had been adopted previously in similar circumstances, and he formally proposed that the Council should establish such a committee.

30. The PRESIDENT stated that, if there was no objection, he would consider the Jordanian proposal adopted.

It was so decided.

31. The PRESIDENT drew the Council's attention to the note by the Secretary-General on the disposal of items arising out of the sixteenth session of the General Assembly (E/L.923 and Add.1).

32. Mrs. MIRONOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring to the comments appended to the draft resolution on the activities of the United Nations in the field of industrial development, which had been adopted by the Second Committee (A/5056 and Corr.1, draft resolution VII),^{1/} and which was reproduced in document E/L.923, said that the Council should transmit a report on the action taken on that resolution not only to the regional economic commissions, but also to the Governing Council of the Special Fund. That was important, because Governments submitted their requests to the Governing Council of the Special Fund. She also emphasized the need to accelerate studies of economic and social co-operation and, in particular, to stimulate economic co-operation. The Secretariat must intensify its efforts to prepare the necessary documents for that purpose.

33. Mr. MALINOWSKI (Secretary of the Council) pointed out that resolutions were transmitted to the regional economic commissions because they were subsidiary organs of the Council and did not receive such information from the General Assembly. That was not so in the case of the Special Fund.

34. The PRESIDENT stated that, if there was no objection, he would consider to have been accepted the proposals contained in documents E/L.923 and Add.1 together with the necessary changes in the list of agenda items for the thirty-third and thirty-fourth sessions (E/L.922 and Corr.1). The Secretary-General would take action accordingly.

It was so decided.

35. The PRESIDENT proposed that the members of the Council agree that the Secretariat should make suggestions concerning the order in which the various

^{1/} Subsequently adopted as General Assembly resolution 1712 (XVI).

items on the agenda of the thirty-third session might be considered.

It was so decided.

Inclusion of an additional item in the agenda (E/3565)

36. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) explained that two documents had just been circulated to the members of the Council—document E/3565, stating the intention of El Salvador to propose an increase in the membership of the Technical Assistance Committee (TAC), and document E/L.929, containing the text of a draft resolution. Since 1957, when the membership of the Committee had been changed, the number of States Members of the United Nations had increased from 81 to 104, and activities in the economic field had increased considerably. It was thus a natural consequence that Member States should be given greater opportunities to take part in those activities. It was the opinion, not only of members of the Economic and Social Council, but of others, that so important a body should increase its membership. He then read out draft resolution E/L.929. Some delegations had expressed concern that the proposal had been presented so late, but the Council had, on occasion, adopted resolutions in similar circumstances. Moreover, the Economic and Social Council had already decided to increase the membership of its functional commissions, the Executive Board of the United Nations Children's Fund and the Committee for Industrial Development.

37. Mr. VIAUD (France) remarked that it seemed hardly possible, a few hours before the close of the thirty-second session, to include the item in the agenda and to debate it. Elections would have to be held immediately for the appointment of the additional members. Thus, the Council would be establishing new offices without prior notice to the Members of the United Nations, and delegations would not have time to receive instructions from their Governments. The Council had no right to take a decision in such circumstances, and he requested that the question of an increase in the membership of TAC should not be included in the agenda of the current session.

38. The PRESIDENT explained that the draft resolution raised a preliminary problem, that of amending the agenda, and that that problem must be settled before proceeding to a debate on the substance of the matter.

39. Mr. KLUTZNICK (United States of America) said that, in view of the French representative's remarks, the question raised by the representative of El Salvador should be settled by a decision of the President or by a vote. The United States delegation, for its part, was in favour of including in the provisional agenda a supplementary item entitled "Question of an increase in the membership of the Technical Assistance Committee". As the question was of great importance, it was desirable to begin discussion of it at the current session, when the agenda was not too heavy. The United States delegation reserved the right to speak, if necessary, on the substance of the problem.

40. Mr. MAÑUECO (Spain) agreed with the representative of France. Under rule 14, paragraph 4, of the rules of procedure, the Council should normally include in its agenda for the session only items for which adequate documentation had been circulated to

members six weeks before the beginning of the session of the Council.

41. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) formally proposed, under rule 13 of the rules of procedure, the inclusion in the provisional agenda of a supplementary item concerning an increase in the membership of TAC. Rule 14, paragraph 4, cited by the representative of Spain, did not establish a strict principle, and the general rule which it laid down was open to exceptions.

42. The PRESIDENT drew the attention of the Spanish representative to rule 14, paragraph 1, of the rules of procedure, which stated that the Council should adopt its agenda for its sessions, subject to the provisions of rule 17.

43. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that rule 13 could not apply to the present case, since it referred to supplementary items included between the time when the provisional agenda was considered and the opening of the session. The only rule which could be invoked was rule 17, which stipulated that the Council might revise its agenda during a session and might add items, on condition, however, that such items were urgent and important ones. As there were no grounds for asserting that the question raised by the representative of El Salvador met those requirements, the French delegation could scarcely agree to the inclusion of the item in the agenda.

44. Mr. SILVA SUCRE (Venezuela) thought that the Council could very well include the item in its agenda under rule 17, since it was indeed an urgent and important one. He would therefore vote for the Salvadorian proposal.

45. Miss SALT (United Kingdom) stressed that for the moment the Council was only discussing a procedural question. The proposal of El Salvador had been submitted late, and the delegations ought to be able to consult their Governments before taking a decision. A decision to increase the membership of TAC would not, moreover, seem desirable at that stage. The Council at its last session had established an ad hoc committee of eight members (resolution 851 (XXXII)) to review the technical assistance activities as a whole, and it ought to wait for that committee's recommendations before taking an important decision concerning the membership of TAC. For that reason the United Kingdom delegation would vote against including in the agenda the item proposed by El Salvador.

46. Mr. NORRISH (New Zealand) agreed with the representative of El Salvador that the matter was extremely important. The Council had a precedent to guide it, because during the first part of the thirty-second session it had decided to increase the membership of certain organs.

47. Mr. VELAZQUEZ (Uruguay) supported El Salvador's proposal. He would vote in favour of including the additional item in the agenda and in favour of draft resolution E/L.929.

48. Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) saw no objection to the Council's including in its agenda the item proposed by the representative of El Salvador. It was desirable to increase the membership of TAC, because that body would thus be in a more favourable position to carry out its task.

49. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the proposal by the representative of El Salvador that the agenda

should be revised by the addition of an item entitled "Question of an increase in the membership of the Technical Assistance Committee".

The proposal was adopted by 14 votes to 4.

AGENDA ITEM 33

Question of an increase in the membership of the Technical Assistance Committee (E/L.929)

50. Mr. PAZHAWAK (Afghanistan) said that he had not taken part in the discussion which had preceded the vote on the inclusion of the item in the agenda, because the objections he would have made had been made by other delegations. He nevertheless wished to stress that the draft resolution submitted by El Salvador (E/L.929) could have important consequences. In that connexion it was essential that the interests of all countries, and in particular of those not at present represented on the Economic and Social Council, should be taken into account. The documents submitted by the representative of El Salvador (E/3565, E/L.929) had been circulated in the course of the meeting, and it had not yet, of course, been possible to consult the delegations which had no seat on the Council. However, he was in favour of the principle of an increase in the membership of TAC.

51. Miss SALT (United Kingdom), speaking on a point of order, proposed that the Council should postpone consideration of the Salvadorian draft resolution (E/L.929) until the following day. In that way the delegations would be in a position to ask for instructions from their Governments.

52. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) agreed to the proposal.

53. Mr. VIAUD (France) supported the United Kingdom proposal. He recalled that the Council had not yet touched on the substance of the problem. Although his delegation was not in principle opposed to an increase in the membership of TAC, it felt that in the interest of all the Members of the United Nations a hasty decision should be avoided. As a matter of courtesy to the delegations which were not represented on the Council, the Council should not take a decision at the current session.

54. Mr. KLUTZNICK (United States of America) also supported the United Kingdom proposal. He pointed out that his delegation had long since adopted a very clear stand on the substance of the problem. In the opinion of the United States Government, the action of the United Nations and its organs should be as effective as possible. Although it was generally thought that the efficiency of a body was in inverse proportion to the number of its members, that was not always the case. There could be no doubt, for example, that the decisions of the Economic and Social Council, which had a small membership, lost some of their value by virtue of the fact that the Council did not adequately represent all the regions of the world. The Committee for Industrial Development had thirty members, and at the time when it had been established some representatives had preferred that it should be smaller; nevertheless, in its present form, it had already done useful work. That was why the United States Government would rather take the risk of increasing the membership of a body if that step would have the effect of making it more representative, that was to say, in the last analysis, of in-

creasing its efficiency. He would therefore support the Salvadorian draft resolution.

55. Mr. PAZHAWAK (Afghanistan) reaffirmed that his delegation was not opposed in principle to an increase in the membership of the Technical Assistance Committee. He simply wished to stress that time was needed to study a draft resolution which raised many problems. For example, the Council might perhaps agree upon the new number of seats to be allocated to TAC. When, however, it came to the selection of the new members, it would have to take account of the principle of equitable geographical distribution and the many difficulties which that entailed, and it would have to decide on the term of office of those members. As the solution of those problems would take time, he supported the United Kingdom proposal and asked that the Council should leave itself as much time as possible for taking a decision on the Salvadorian draft resolution.

56. Mr. FRANZI (Italy) said that his delegation was in favour of an increase in the membership of TAC and considered that to be an urgent question. It would have been preferable, however, for the matter to be brought up after the membership of the Economic and Social Council had been increased. Operative paragraph 1 (b) of the Salvadorian draft resolution provided that when the Council elected the twelve members of TAC mentioned in that paragraph, it would have due regard to geographical distribution and to the representation of contributing and recipient countries which had a special interest in the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance. In that connexion he wondered whether the Council would be able to take all those factors into consideration by its next meeting. Under those conditions, it might be advisable for the Council to wait until the following day to consider the draft resolution for increasing the membership of TAC and possibly adopt it, but to postpone the election of new members until the session of April 1962. For that purpose it might be sufficient to replace, in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, the words "in 1961" by the words "at the thirty-third session of the Economic and Social Council".

57. The PRESIDENT said that the Council would continue consideration of the matter at the following meeting.

Organization of work

58. Mr. NATORF (Poland) commented that the Council's work had already been largely accomplished and that there were only three items still to be considered. They might be dealt with at the next meeting. In the circumstances he suggested that the consideration of item 26 (Elections) should be postponed to the following morning's meeting.

59. Miss SALT (United Kingdom) supported the suggestion of the representative of Poland. In her opinion it would be advisable for the Secretariat to inform the Council, at its next meeting, of the financial implications which would arise from the adoption of the draft resolution of El Salvador (E/L.929).

60. The PRESIDENT said that, in the absence of objections, he would consider the suggestion by the representative of Poland to have been accepted.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 5.40 p.m.