



**ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL**

Thursday, 21 December 1961,  
at 11 a.m.

**Resumed Thirty-second Session  
OFFICIAL RECORDS**

**NEW YORK**

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Inclusion of additional items in the agenda . . . . .</i>	1
<i>Order of consideration of agenda items . . . . .</i>	1
<b>Agenda item 29:</b>	
<i>Accession of the Republic of San Marino to the Convention on Road Traffic of 19 September 1949 . . . . .</i>	1
<b>Agenda item 30:</b>	
<i>Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies: draft annex relating to the International Development Association . . . . .</i>	2
<b>Agenda item 31:</b>	
<i>Application from the Mongolian People's Republic for membership in the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East and inclusion in the geographical scope of the Commission . . . . .</i>	2
<b>Agenda item 32:</b>	
<i>Invitation to Switzerland to attend in a consultative capacity sessions of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East and of the Economic Commission for Latin America . . . . .</i>	2
<b>Agenda item 26:</b>	
<i>Membership of the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees . . . . .</i>	2
<b>Agenda item 28:</b>	
<i>Work of the Council in 1962 . . . . .</i>	3

**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, Colombia, Greece, India, Indonesia, Israel, Netherlands, 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.

*In the absence of the President, Mr. Penteado (Brazil), first Vice-President, took the Chair.*

1. The PRESIDENT read out a cable of good wishes from the President, Mr. Shanahan, who was unable to be present, and suggested that a cable should be sent to him in reply, conveying the Council's best wishes for the coming year.

*It was so decided.*

**Inclusion of additional items in the agenda (E/L.921, sections II and III; E/L.921/Add.1 and 2)**

2. The PRESIDENT remarked that he had been urged by a number of delegations not to prolong the resumed session beyond the early afternoon of the following day. He deplored the tendency, increasingly apparent in all United Nations bodies, to give prime consideration to the scrupulous observance of a pre-established time-table—a tendency which resulted in delays, postponements of items and confusion at the end of a session.

3. He drew the Council's attention to the Secretary-General's notes concerning the agenda of the resumed thirty-second session (E/L.921 and Add.1 and 2) and suggested that the additional items mentioned therein should be included in the agenda.

*It was so decided.*

**Order of consideration of agenda items (E/L.921 and Add.1 and 2)**

4. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should consider the items on its agenda in the order shown in document E/L.921, taking up item 31 (Application from the Mongolian People's Republic for membership in the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East and inclusion in the geographical scope of the Commission) and item 32 (Invitation to Switzerland to attend in a consultative capacity sessions of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East and of the Economic Commission for Latin America) between items 30 and 26.

*It was so decided.*

**AGENDA ITEM 29**

**Accession of the Republic of San Marino to the Convention on Road Traffic of 19 September 1949 (E/3558, E/L.927)**

5. Mr. FRANZI (Italy) introduced draft resolution E/L.927, in which his delegation proposed that the Economic and Social Council should resolve to admit the Republic of San Marino as a Party to the Convention on Road Traffic signed at Geneva on 19 September 1949. He recalled that article 27, paragraph 3, of the Convention provided that: "From 1 January 1950, this Convention shall be open for accession by those of the States referred to in paragraph 1 of this article which have not signed this Convention and by any other State which the Economic and Social Council may by resolution declare to be eligible". He pointed out that the Council had already agreed that other States, including Monaco, the Federal Republic of

Germany and the Vatican City State, should be admitted as Parties to the Convention.

*Draft resolution E/L.927 was adopted unanimously.*

### AGENDA ITEM 30

**Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies: draft annex relating to the International Development Association (E/3559)**

6. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should consider the draft resolution contained in document E/3559 adopted.

*It was so decided.*

7. Mrs. MIRONOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) remarked that if the draft resolution had been put to the vote, her delegation would have found it difficult to participate in the voting, since the Soviet Union was not a Party to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies.

### AGENDA ITEM 31

**Application from the Mongolian People's Republic for membership in the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East and inclusion in the geographical scope of the Commission (E/3560, E/L.924)**

8. Mr. PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan) recalled that his had been one of the delegations which had submitted to the General Assembly the draft resolution requesting the admission of the Mongolian People's Republic to the United Nations. It was in the same spirit that his delegation had taken the initiative in submitting draft resolution E/L.924 concerning the admission of Mongolia to the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, for the Afghan delegation was confident that the Mongolian People's Republic would make a valuable contribution to the work of ECAFE and of the Economic and Social Council. He hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted unanimously.

9. Mrs. MIRONOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) remarked that the General Assembly had taken a very important decision in admitting to the United Nations the Mongolian People's Republic, a State founded in the third century which had attained a high level of economic and cultural development, now having 6,500 experts who had pursued advanced studies, and maintaining diplomatic relations with twenty-two States. The admission of the Mongolian People's Republic to ECAFE would facilitate that body's work and lead to closer links between its members. She therefore strongly supported the Afghan draft resolution.

*Draft resolution E/L.924 was adopted by 15 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.*

### AGENDA ITEM 32

**Invitation to Switzerland to attend in a consultative capacity sessions of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East and of the Economic Commission for Latin America (E/3562 and Corr.1, E/L.925, E/L.926)**

10. Mr. SILVA SUCRE (Venezuela) said that his delegation had proposed the inclusion of the present item in the agenda for the reasons stated in the explanatory memorandum contained in document E/3562. He thanked the delegations of Afghanistan and Japan

for having invited Venezuela to join them in presenting draft resolution E/L.925, and he was happy also to introduce draft resolution E/L.926 on behalf of his delegation and the delegations of Brazil, El Salvador and Uruguay. As both drafts were being submitted in conformity with the Council's normal procedure, he hoped that they would be adopted unanimously.

11. Mr. OKAZAKI (Japan) stated that Switzerland's contribution to the economic and social activities of the United Nations was universally recognized. The Japanese delegation was sure that Switzerland's attendance at sessions of ECAFE would be most advantageous, and it hoped that draft resolution E/L.925 would be adopted unanimously.

12. Mr. PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan) said that his delegation was glad to submit draft resolution E/L.925, because in its view Switzerland, although not a member of the United Nations, had always made a valuable contribution to the work of the various United Nations organs. He hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted unanimously.

13. Mrs. MIRONOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that her delegation would vote for the draft resolutions. She hoped that the Economic and Social Council would be equally unanimous in the future—for instance, when it considered whether to invite the German Democratic Republic to take part in the work of the Economic Commission for Europe.

*Draft resolution E/L.925 was adopted unanimously.*

*Draft resolution E/L.926 was adopted unanimously.*

### AGENDA ITEM 26

**Membership of the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (E/L.890, E/L.928)**

14. Mr. KLUTZNICK (United States of America) said that draft resolution E/L.928 was designed to settle the question of the membership of the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, not by election, but in the light of the fact that the General Assembly had decided to review, not later than at its seventeenth session, the arrangements for the Office of the High Commissioner with a view to determining whether the Office should be further continued beyond 31 December 1963. The sponsors of the draft resolution thought that, in the circumstances, it would be useful to keep the present membership of the Executive Committee until the General Assembly had taken a decision on the future of the Office of the High Commissioner.

15. Mrs. MIRONOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that the High Commissioner had announced, at the fifteenth session of the General Assembly, that in Europe all the camps for refugees would soon be closed and the refugees resettled. At the sixteenth session of the General Assembly he had promised to submit a plan for the resettlement of all the European refugees. In the circumstances, she did not think that the present Executive Committee should be kept until 1963. It could be dissolved sooner, and the countries where the refugees were living could be made responsible for them. The delegation of the Soviet Union would therefore abstain from voting on the draft resolution.

*Draft resolution E/L.928 was adopted by 15 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.*

## AGENDA ITEM 28

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

16. The PRESIDENT asked the Council first to take a decision on the draft programme prepared by the Secretary-General (E/L.922 and Corr.1).
17. Mr. DE SEYNES (Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs) informed the Council that the Scientific Advisory Committee had recently decided at Geneva that the United Nations Conference on the Application of Science and Technology for the Benefit of the Less Developed Areas, which was to have been held in August 1962, would be postponed until the spring of 1963. The date provisionally fixed was 27 March 1963, and a definite date would be decided upon later. The date had been discussed by the Council, the Fifth Committee of the General Assembly and the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions. The Secretariat had informed the Fifth Committee that it would be ready to organize the Conference in August 1962, provided that Governments, and particularly those represented on the Scientific Advisory Committee, gave all necessary co-operation. After a review of the question, some of the Governments represented on that Committee had thought it better to postpone the Conference until the spring of 1963, and the Committee had unanimously decided in favour of such a postponement.
18. The financial and administrative implications would be submitted to the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions at its spring session, but the Secretariat had thought that the Council should be informed of the situation before it considered its work programme for 1962.
19. Mrs. MIRONOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that her delegation had only just received document E/L.923 in English. She asked that it should be considered at the next meeting.
20. Mr. MALINOWSKI (Secretary of the Council) said that the document had just been issued and that the Russian version was to be circulated during the morning.
21. Mrs. MIRONOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) referred to item 9 (Allegations regarding infringements of trade union rights) of the draft list of agenda items for the thirty-third session (E/L.922 and Corr.1) and observed that the two communications which it mentioned (E/3564) did not relate to the matter in question. There was no question of an infringement of trade-union rights, which was the subject of Economic and Social Council resolutions 277 (X), 351 (XII) and 474 (XV), but of a legitimate measure which had been taken by a sovereign State, the German Democratic Republic, to protect its security and which had no bearing on the resolutions referred to. To take up that matter would be to bring the cold war into the Council's deliberations. The Soviet delegation strongly objected to that question being considered at the thirty-third session of the Council, and it regretted that the Secretariat had seen fit to publish those libellous documents and to take them into account.
22. Mr. KLUTZNICK (United States of America) wondered whether in the present instance there might not be a misunderstanding. The question appearing as item 9 had traditionally been on the agenda. The representative of the Soviet Union referred to a document which was not before the Council, and the United States was not in a position to consider the substance of the matter. Item 9 allowed the consideration of allegations that were received by the Secretary-General before 13 February 1962, and its deletion would prejudice the question. It was important, on the contrary, for it to be retained and for the Council to decide at its next session whether the allegations received deserved to be considered.
23. In reply to a question from Mr. NATORF (Poland), Mr. MALINOWSKI (Secretary of the Council) said that the Secretariat placed the item on the provisional agenda as soon as it received communications, and that it was for the Council to decide whether or not the item should be retained. If no communication had been received by the time that the provisional agenda was issued, the item was mentioned in the introduction to the draft programme.
24. Mr. TCHOBANOV (Bulgaria) said that the communications referred to a trade-union official who carried out his activities in the Federal Republic of Germany and perhaps in West Berlin. As that official had been in the territory of Eastern Germany, he could not be there in the exercise of his duties. It therefore could not be said that trade-union rights had been infringed, and there was no reason to place the question on the Council's agenda.
25. The reasoning of the United States representative was rather strange. That representative had noted that the document had been circulated late and that he could not judge whether its inclusion in the agenda was justified, yet he proposed that it should be included. That was not a sufficient reason, and the United States representative would have been more convincing if he had proposed that the consideration of the question should be postponed until a later meeting.
26. Mr. PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan) said that he did not underestimate the misgivings expressed by the Soviet delegation, but that it had not been possible to keep the cold war out of any organ of the United Nations. In view of the explanations of the United States delegation, Afghanistan thought that the Secretariat had only done its duty in proposing that the question should be placed on the provisional agenda. Since the statements of all delegations would be laid before the Council, he saw no reason to oppose the inclusion of the item in the provisional agenda.
27. Miss SALT (United Kingdom) said that, since Economic and Social Council resolution 277 (X) requested the Secretary-General to bring allegations regarding infringements of trade-union rights received from Governments or trade-union or employers' organizations to the attention of the Council, the Secretariat could not have acted otherwise. The United Kingdom delegation could not accept Bulgaria's interpretation. It was not for the Council to decide at that stage whether or not the allegations were admissible. On the contrary, without prejudging the validity of the allegations in any way, or their suitability or otherwise for discussion by the Council, the Council should therefore now put the question on the provisional agenda of its thirty-third session without prejudice to whether or not it should be accepted for discussion at that time.
28. Mrs. MIRONOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted that the United Kingdom representative had not quoted the relevant passages of Economic and

Social Council resolution 277 (X). In fact the German Democratic Republic was not a member either of the International Labour Office or of the United Nations; consequently the allegations were not admissible and should not appear on the agenda.

29. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan) pointed out that the Council was not considering the final agenda of its thirty-third session and that, by including the item in the provisional agenda, it was not prejudging the validity of the allegations which had been received. Consequently Jordan would support the inclusion of that item in the provisional agenda.

30. Mr. WODAJO (Ethiopia) also supported the inclusion of the item in the provisional agenda. He had no definite opinion on the substance of the matter and did not think that he would have one later. He thought it was regrettable that matters of that kind should be submitted to the Council, because they did not promote the spirit of harmony which should prevail in it; if some delegations, however, felt that those questions should be considered, Jordan was not in a position to oppose that by procedural means.

31. Mr. PAZHAWAK (Afghanistan) hoped that the allegations in question would not be discussed at the present stage.

32. Mr. NATORF (Poland) said that he did not wish to express an opinion on the substance of the question for the moment. Nevertheless he would like to know exactly what the Secretariat's reason had been for including item 9 in the provisional agenda of the thirty-third session, in view of the fact that it could not do so by virtue of the resolutions mentioned. Indeed all the provisions of those resolutions made it clear that, in order to be admissible, the allegations had to concern States members of the International Labour Organisation or Members of the United Nations, a condition that did not apply. Since the Secretariat was not including the item in the agenda automatically, the legal side of the question should be made clear. If it was not justified in including the matter, it would be better for the Secretariat to withdraw the question of its own accord.

33. Mrs. MIRONOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) did not feel that the inclusion of item 9 in the agenda was justified by the existence of the communications mentioned, since that would be going against the Economic and Social Council resolutions. Her delegation, however, was of course ready to consider item 9 if the Council had any admissible allegations before it, since it had nothing against the matter in itself.

34. The PRESIDENT said that the Soviet delegation was apparently proposing the deletion of item 9 of the provisional agenda for the thirty-third session.

35. Mr. KLUTZNICK (United States of America) said that, in contrast to the delegations of the Soviet Union, Bulgaria and Poland, the United States delegation had not yet come to any conclusion concerning the communications mentioned. It would only be able to make up its mind at the thirty-third session. It therefore hoped that the item would appear on the provisional agenda, because its deletion would involve prejudging the attitude the United States would take on that document or on any other allegation which might reach the Secretariat in the meantime.

36. Mrs. MIRONOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that she was not opposed to retaining

the item on the provisional agenda, on condition that the two communications referred to were not mentioned. Only the heading of the item would remain, and the Council would study it if it received any other allegations in the meantime.

37. Mr. NATORF (Poland) formally proposed the deletion of the sentence "Two such communications have already been received" in paragraph 9 of the preliminary annotations to the draft list of items for the thirty-third session (E/L.922 and Corr.1).

38. Mr. TCHOBANOV (Bulgaria) agreed with the representative of Poland. He thought that the President should also state that document E/3564 was not being brought to the Council's attention.

39. Mr. KLUTZNICK (United States of America) stressed that his delegation only wanted to have the opportunity of deciding whether or not the communications should be taken into consideration, and he was surprised that that elementary right was being denied to it. It was willing to postpone any decision on the substance to the thirty-third session, but did not think the Secretariat could be asked to eliminate a document merely because it displeased, as that would be a very dangerous precedent.

40. Mrs. MIRONOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that in her view it would be a regrettable precedent for the Secretariat to contravene the Economic and Social Council resolutions by taking account of communications when it was not authorized to do so. It was possible that the delegations had not had enough time to study all the documents submitted, but that did not justify attempting to include communications which were inadmissible.

41. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan) commented that, under rule 9 of the rules of procedure, the Council worked out, with the assistance of the Secretary-General, the basic programme of its activities for the following year. The information given in document E/L.922 was therefore supplementary information; but the Council was only deciding on the list of items to be included in the provisional agenda. Therefore the Polish representative's proposal did not seem justified.

42. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) noted that the wording of document E/L.922 was vague and did not specifically mention document E/3564, to which some delegations were objecting. Since it was a provisional agenda that was being prepared, his delegation did not think it was necessary to make any change.

43. Mr. NATORF (Poland) thought that the paragraph of Council resolution 277 (X) quoted by the United Kingdom representative merely followed from all the preceding paragraphs. The Polish delegation interpreted that resolution as meaning that certain allegations were admissible if they concerned States Members of the United Nations or members of the International Labour Organisation. He therefore formally asked the Secretariat how it interpreted that resolution.

44. It was possible to delete a sentence of document E/L.922, as he had proposed, because the Secretariat could always undo what it had done. The delegations could raise any matters they wished at the thirty-third session even if those words did not appear. The important thing was not to prejudge the question by insisting on the study of the two communications concerned.

45. Mr. MALINOWSKI (Secretary of the Council) said that the Secretary-General, in submitting his proposal, had based it on Council resolutions 277 (X), 351 (XII) and 474 (XV), particularly on the paragraph of the first one in which the Secretary-General was requested "to bring allegations regarding infringements of trade-union rights received from Governments or trade-union or employers' organizations to the attention of the Council, notwithstanding the provisions of resolution 75 (V) as amended" and also on operative paragraph 11 of resolution 351 (XII) which requested the Secretary-General "in future to transmit to the Council only such communications . . . as reach him not less than seven weeks before the date of the first meeting of the session". He believed that in the past the Council had given decisions on allegations concerning States or territories which were neither Members of the United Nations nor members of the International Labour Organisation, such as the territory of the Saar and the territory of Trieste. If the members of the Council wished, the Legal Counsel might study the matter.

46. Mr. NATORF (Poland) said he did not think that the precedents quoted by the Secretary of the Council were decisive. A study by the Legal Counsel would be very useful if it related to the whole of the provisions of resolution 277 (X). In any case, since the Secretariat had drawn up document E/L.922, it could always modify it.

47. Mr. KLUTZNICK (United States of America) said he was opposed to the idea of a representative asking for a document to be altered because he did not like it.

48. Mr. MALINOWSKI (Secretary of the Council) thought that the representative of Poland was right in the sense that the whole of document E/L.922 was

before the Council. The Council was however specifically required to agree upon the provisional agenda for the thirty-third session and a draft list of agenda items for that session was included on page 4 of document E/L.922. The annotations prepared by the Secretary-General might subsequently be modified in the light of decisions taken by the Council at the resumed session or any other developments occurring between then and the thirty-third session.

49. Mr. KLUTZNICK (United States of America) thought that the only point to be clarified was whether the Secretariat had in fact received two communications. If it had received them, the wording of item 9 was correct.

50. Mr. NATORF (Poland) thought that the Secretariat must have received many other communications which it was not obliged to include. It had to be ascertained whether the two communications in question were relevant. They were not.

51. The PRESIDENT said that if the members accepted the interpretation of the representative of Jordan, according to which the Council only had before it the list of items to be included for the thirty-third session, and not the whole of the document, the problem would be simplified.

52. Mr. MALINOWSKI (Secretary of the Council) commented that it was document E/L.922 which had been submitted for the consideration of the Council.

53. Mr. NATORF (Poland) urged the Council not to make any decision before ascertaining the Legal Counsel's opinion.

54. The PRESIDENT said that the Secretariat would take the necessary action.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.