



ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Monday, 1 March 1965,
at 3.20 p.m.

Resumed Thirty-seventh Session
OFFICIAL RECORDS

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 47:</i>	
<i>Question of the extension of the term of office of the members of the Commission on International Commodity Trade and of the election of members of the Commission (concluded)</i>	5
<i>Agenda item 48:</i>	
<i>Adjustments in the Calendar of Conferences for 1965 (concluded)</i>	
<i>Date and place of the summer sessions of the Technical Assistance Committee and the Committee on Housing, Building and Planning.</i>	5
<i>Place of the third and fourth sessions of the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development. . .</i>	6
<i>Agenda item 39:</i>	
<i>Elections</i>	
<i>Election of nine additional members of the sessional committees of the Council</i>	6
<i>Agenda item 42:</i>	
<i>Work of the Council in 1965</i>	7
<i>Statement by the Acting President</i>	9

Acting President: Mr. Akira MATSUI (Japan).

Present:

Representatives of the following States, members of the Council: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Canada, Chile, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, France, Gabon, Iraq, Japan, Luxembourg, Pakistan, Peru, Romania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Representatives of the following States, additional members of the sessional Committees: Cameroon, Denmark, Ghana, India, Iran, Madagascar, Mexico, United Arab Republic and United Republic of Tanzania.

Observers for the following Member States: Australia, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Greece, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, Senegal, Sweden, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Observer for the following non-member State: Switzerland.

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

AGENDA ITEM 47

Question of the extension of the term of office of the members of the Commission on International Commodity Trade and of the election of members of the Commission (concluded)

1. Mr. MALINOWSKI (Secretary of the Council) read out the following draft resolution, which the Secretariat had prepared in answer to the request made by the representative of the United Kingdom at the previous meeting:

"The Economic and Social Council,

"Taking note of recommendation A.V.1 of the Final Act of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development and of General Assembly resolution 1995 (XIX), of 30 December 1964,

"1. Decides to discontinue the Commission on International Commodity Trade;

"2. Agrees to transfer the functions of the Commission to the Committee on Commodities of the Trade and Development Board of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development."

2. Sir Keith UNWIN (United Kingdom) said that he found the text perfectly satisfactory. The Trade and Development Board's attention should, however, be drawn to the fact that all the functions at present carried out by the Commission on International Commodity Trade should be taken into account when the terms of reference of the Committee on Commodities were drawn up. He hoped that the Secretariat would attend to that.

3. The ACTING PRESIDENT proposed that the Council should adopt the draft resolution just read out by the Secretary.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 48

Adjustments in the Calendar of Conferences for 1965 (E/4001, E/4002) (concluded)

DATE AND PLACE OF THE SUMMER SESSIONS OF THE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE AND THE COMMITTEE ON HOUSING, BUILDING AND PLANNING

4. Mr. HILL (Secretariat), replying to questions put at the previous meeting, said firstly, that, it would be possible for the Technical Assistance Committee (TAC) to meet at Geneva a week earlier than scheduled, that is on 7 June. The choice of that date, however, would entail additional expenditure of about \$10,000 for language services staff and about \$1,000 for other posts. Secondly, to convene TAC in New York rather than Geneva would mean a saving of about \$25,000 if the session started on the scheduled date and lasted

two weeks. The cost would be higher for a three-week session. If, moreover, the opening date were put forward to 7 June, there would be additional expenditure amounting to some \$10,000.

5. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) asked the representative of the Secretary-General to explain why the expenses would be greater if TAC met on 7 June instead of 14 June.

6. Not being a member of the Committee on Housing, Building and Planning, Iraq could have no definite views on where it should meet. But perhaps the savings that could be made if it met in New York would make it easier to accept the additional expense entailed by keeping the TAC session at Geneva.

7. Mr. BLAU (United States of America) expressed surprise that it should be possible to advance the date of the TAC session to 7 June, since the International Labour Conference was scheduled to meet on that date at the Palais des Nations.

8. Mr. RENAUD (France) considered that the Council did not yet have all the necessary information to reach a decision. His delegation, while ready to go along with the views of the majority, wished to make a reservation on an important matter of principle: if the Council decided, for reasons of economy or convenience, to hold the next session of TAC in New York, it must expressly state that the decision was an exceptional one which in no way affected the principle of alternating sessions between New York and Geneva, of which his delegation was strongly in favour.

9. In calculating the savings that would be possible, not only the expenses of the United Nations should be taken into account but also those of certain specialized agencies and States for which meetings might be less expensive at Geneva than in New York.

10. Mr. HILL (Secretariat), replying to the representative of Iraq, said that the temporary staff engaged for the TAC session would be same as the one which would service the summer session of the Economic and Social Council. If the TAC session began on 14 June, there would be no interval between the end of the TAC session and the beginning of the Council session. If the TAC session was put forward to 7 June, the temporary staff would remain unemployed for a week between the sessions of the two bodies.

11. He assured the United States representative that due note had been taken of the fact that the International Labour Conference and the TAC session would coincide. That was inevitable, since the Conference would last until 25 June.

12. Sir Keith UNWIN (United Kingdom) said that he was willing to accept the Secretary-General's suggestion that TAC and the Committee on Housing, Building and Planning should meet in New York in 1965, in view of the considerations of economy which had prompted the proposal. It was understood, however, that the decision would on no account establish a precedent.

13. Mr. ARKADYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that for TAC to meet in New York would create certain difficulties for the Soviet Union, which would have to send representatives to New York for TAC and other representatives to Geneva for the Eco-

nomical and Social Council, whereas normally the same representatives took part in the sessions of both bodies.

14. Since the work of the Committee on Housing, Building and Planning was less closely linked with the Council's activities than was that of TAC, perhaps that Committee could meet in New York, while TAC could meet at Geneva, from 14 to 25 June.

It was so decided.

15. Mr. DE SEYNES (Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs) suggested that the Council should leave it to the Secretariat to organize the session of the Committee on Housing, Building and Planning in New York, in August or September depending on the available services and space.

It was so decided.

PLACE OF THE THIRD AND FOURTH SESSIONS OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE APPLICATION OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY TO DEVELOPMENT

16. The ACTING PRESIDENT drew the Council's attention to the proposal that the third session of the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development should, at the invitation of UNESCO, be held at UNESCO House, in Paris, from 31 March to 9 April 1965.

It was so decided.

17. The ACTING PRESIDENT next drew the Council's attention to the provisions of Council resolution 1047 (XXXVII) and paragraph 5 of document E/4001, concerning the fourth session of the Advisory Committee.

18. Mr. BLAU (United States of America) considered that the meetings of the sub-groups were much more important than another meeting of the Advisory Committee itself and supported the Secretary-General's proposal that the second session, which the Committee was to have held in 1965, should be cancelled, on the understanding that the balance of funds available would be used to cover the expenses of the meetings of the sub-groups.

19. The ACTING PRESIDENT proposed that the Council should adopt the proposal of the Secretary-General which the representative of the United States had just put forward.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 39

Elections

ELECTION OF NINE ADDITIONAL MEMBERS OF THE SESSIONAL COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL

20. The ACTING PRESIDENT announced that the following States were candidates: Cameroon, Denmark, Ghana, India, Iran, Madagascar, Mexico, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania.

21. Mr. Amjad ALI (Pakistan) considered that since there were nine posts and nine candidates, the Council could elect them by acclamation.

22. Mr. TREMBLAY (Canada) said he had no objection to that procedure, provided it did not create a precedent.

It was so decided.

The representatives of Cameroon, Denmark, Ghana, India, Iran, Madagascar, Mexico, the United Arab Republic and the United Republic of Tanzania were elected members of the sessional committees of the Council by acclamation.

23. The ACTING PRESIDENT congratulated the representatives of the countries just elected to the Council's sessional committees and invited them to take places at the Council table.

Mr. Beleoken (Cameroon), Mr. Bloend and Mrs. Wright (Denmark), Mr. Quao (Ghana), Mr. Hiremath (India), Mr. Esfandiary (Iran), Mr. Rakotomalala (Madagascar), Mr. Carranco (Mexico), Mr. S. Khalil (United Arab Republic) and Mrs. Danieli (United Republic of Tanzania) took places at the Council table.

AGENDA ITEM 42

Work of the Council in 1965 (E/L.1067 and Corr.1)

24. The ACTING PRESIDENT invited the Council to begin preliminary consideration of its programme of work for 1965. A decision had to be taken on the draft list of items for the Council's thirty-eighth session contained in the draft programme prepared by the Secretary-General (E/L.1067 and Corr.1).

25. Sir Keith UNWIN (United Kingdom) observed that, in view of its importance, item 6 (Review and reappraisal of the Council's role and functions) should be placed on the agenda of the thirty-ninth session too.

26. Mr. BACKES (Austria) made some remarks concerning some of the items on that list. With regard to item 5 (Water desalination in developing countries), he pointed out that the report of the Secretary-General should be made available to delegations in good time. Item 6 was indeed of the highest importance and should therefore be considered as preliminary and not only at the thirty-eighth but also at the thirty-ninth session. With regard to item 7 (Work programme of the United Nations in the economic, social and human rights fields), it would be useful if the Secretary-General could circulate at an early date a report on the progress achieved in those fields. Lastly, with regard to item 8 (Elections), there was no point, at the present session, in electing members to committees whose terms of office would begin on 1 January 1966, since the Council would meet again in January 1966.

27. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) recalled that serious differences of opinion regarding item 6 had emerged in the Council at its thirty-seventh session. The Council had finally decided (1351st meeting) to place that question on the draft list of items for the thirty-eighth session, because it had been assumed that the item would first go before the General Assembly at its nineteenth session. Since things had turned out otherwise, he wondered whether the item should not be kept on the agenda of the Council's thirty-eighth and thirty-ninth sessions in any case. The question was one regarding which no hasty decision should be

taken before the General Assembly had dealt with it, as it would at its twentieth session.

28. Mr. BLAU (United States of America) agreed with the representatives of the United Kingdom and Austria that the Council should at least embark on a preliminary consideration of that question at its thirty-eighth session, even if a definitive decision in that regard was not to be taken until the thirty-ninth or, what was even more likely, the fortieth session. He pointed out to the representative of Iraq that no delegation had asked for that item to be placed on the agenda of the General Assembly's nineteenth session. Now that the Assembly had decided to establish the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development as an organ of the Assembly, there was nothing to prevent the Council from beginning the review and reappraisal of its role and functions, taking into account the new bodies which it had been decided to set up. For those reasons, his delegation was anxious that that item should remain on the agenda of the Council's thirty-eighth session.

29. Mr. ARKADYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, in proposing to postpone the election of six members of TAC to serve for a term of two years beginning on 1 January 1966, the Austrian representative obviously visualized that the merger of the Special Fund and the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance would have taken place in the interval. But even though some were in favour of such a merger, others were opposed to it, and there was no valid reason to depart from normal practice by anticipating the decision to be taken by the General Assembly.

30. So far as item 6 was concerned, he appreciated the scruples of the representative of Iraq, but the work of reviewing and reappraising the Council's role and functions was a long-term enterprise which could certainly not be completed in a single session either of the Council or of the General Assembly. Nothing should therefore prevent the Council from taking up that item at its thirty-eighth session, even if nothing more transpired than an exchange of views and the submission of proposals which could be considered later. For those reasons, his delegation was in favour of keeping item 6 on the agenda.

31. Mr. BACKES (Austria) agreed with the Soviet Union representative that the normal practice in the matter of elections should indeed be followed; but to press for immediate elections for 1966 would be going to the opposite extreme. Those elections would normally have taken place upon the resumption of the thirty-ninth session, but the Council had decided to cancel its resumed session in December. If the fortieth session of the Council was not to be held in January, however, the date of those elections could be brought forward.

32. Mr. RENAUD (France) pointed out, with regard to item 5, that the document on the cost of the various desalination methods should be considered in the various capitals by specialists. If it was not circulated in time, it would be fanciful to suppose that it could usefully be discussed as early as 22 March.

33. France considered that item 6 should be kept on the agenda. That question should be examined

thoroughly in the light of factors some of which were subject to change; the Council's deliberations, at its thirty-eighth and thirty-ninth sessions, could make a useful contribution to the decision to be taken by the General Assembly.

34. As far as item 8 (Elections) was concerned, the more closely the Council adhered to normal practice, without prejudging decisions which might be taken later, the more it would facilitate the General Assembly's work.

35. Mr. Amjad ALI (Pakistan) shared the French representative's view regarding item 5, and considered that the Council would be better advised to postpone consideration of it until the thirty-ninth session.

36. Without opposing the inclusion of item 6 in the agenda of the thirty-eighth session, he felt that it could be more usefully considered at the thirty-ninth session; while it was true that the General Assembly had already established the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development as an organ of the Assembly, the terms of reference of its various subsidiary bodies had not yet been fixed and item 6 could not really be taken up until after the first session of the Trade and Development Board.

37. Finally, in regard to item 8, his delegation supported the position of the Soviet Union and France.

38. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) recalled that the twelve sponsors of the joint draft resolution presented to the Council at its thirty-seventh session (E/AC.241/L.252), had been convinced that the General Assembly would have an opportunity to study the question of the Council's future in detail when considering the reports of the Council and the Conference, items which had appeared on the agenda at its nineteenth session. Nobody had denied that there was an urgent need to review and reappraise the Council's role and functions; the question was whether that important work should be started in the Assembly, where all Member States could give their views, or in the Council. Thus, it was because it had been thought at the time that the General Assembly would take up the question at its nineteenth session that the item had been placed on the agenda of the Council's thirty-eighth session.

39. It must also be hoped that, at its twentieth session, the General Assembly would decide to enlarge the membership of the Council, which would enable it more usefully to study that important matter in 1966. He again stressed that the decision whether or not to keep item 6 on the agenda of the thirty-eighth session should be postponed until the next meeting on 8 March, which would give him an opportunity to hold the necessary consultations.

40. Mr. QUIJANO (Argentina) also felt that item 6 should be kept on the agenda of the thirty-eighth session; by that time the Trade and Development Board might already have documentation available which would help to guide the discussion. In any event, the Council could take up the item again at its thirty-ninth session.

41. Mr. S. KHALIL (United Arab Republic) said that any discussion of item 6 before the Trade and Development Board had been able to state its position and define its terms of reference could only be hypo-

thetical. He was not opposed, however, to the initiation of such a discussion at the thirty-ninth session, if members of the Council so desired, but on condition that no decision should be taken before the General Assembly had taken a stand on the problem. It would be better to proceed normally with the elections to TAC and not make them contingent upon subsequent developments.

42. Mr. DE SEYNES (Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs) said, in reply to the questions that had been asked about the documents dealing with desalination, that the Council would have before it, at the thirty-eighth session, a number of documents concerned, *inter alia*, with ways of furthering the study of desalination and with methods to evaluate the cost of projects in that field. The document dealing with the question of cost was almost ready and would be published a few days before the beginning of the session. In view of the importance of the problem, and the interest it has created everywhere, the Secretariat considered that the document should be submitted to the Council as soon as possible so that it could be used by the other bodies. The Council could then decide either to examine it immediately or to postpone it until the thirty-ninth session.

43. Mr. TREMBLAY (Canada) agreed with those representatives who had advocated the retention of item 6 on the agenda of the thirty-eighth session and its inclusion on the agenda of subsequent sessions. The growing importance of the role of the United Nations in the economic and social field, demonstrated by the establishment of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development as an organ of the General Assembly, made it all the more essential to discuss that item, and the fact that the Council would henceforth have the benefit of the experience of twenty-seven members instead of eighteen would make the results of such discussions all the more useful.

44. Mr. ARKADYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he had listened carefully to the comments and reservations voiced by the representative of Iraq on item 6. In order to give due consideration to the various opinions put forward, the Council could perhaps decide to review at the thirty-eighth session only its activities concerned with social affairs, postponing the more general discussions, particularly those relating to economic affairs, until the thirty-ninth session.

45. Mr. BLAU (United States of America) said he would prefer the Council to begin the discussion of item 6 of the thirty-eighth session. However, his delegation foresaw only a preliminary discussion, which would result in agreement on the scope of the critical reappraisal that the Council wanted to undertake, on the machinery to be set up to enable that study to be continued between the sessions, and, finally, on a decision that the results of the study should be submitted to the Council no earlier than its fortieth session. In that connexion, he pointed out that such an approach would enable the General Assembly to make its views on the question known at its twentieth session.

46. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) recalled that at the thirty-seventh session he had strongly emphasized the need to revitalize the Economic and Social Council to enable

it to play its proper role; however, he had also said that the recommendations adopted at the Conference, although they affected certain decisions of the Council, should not have the result of widening the scope of the Council's work. The position of the United States representative was not reassuring in that respect, for the type of review that he had proposed already seemed to go beyond the preliminary stage and might well make subsequent action by the General Assembly on that question more difficult.

47. As he felt a certain responsibility towards the delegations which shared his views on the question of deciding whether the preliminary discussions should take place in the Council or in the General Assembly, he proposed that those delegations and all members of the Council be given time to consult one another and that, consequently, any decision on item 6 should be postponed until the next meeting of the Council.

48. Mr. ARCA PARRO (Peru) expressed the hope that the document on desalination would be distributed quickly so that delegations might at least be able to begin discussing it, if not to examine it thoroughly. Item 6 was a question of self-examination; it would seem logical that the Council itself should initiate any reappraisal or possible re-orientation of its work. There was nothing to stop the question being submitted later to the General Assembly, where other delegations could express their views and fill certain gaps.

49. Mr. BOUATTOURA (Algeria) said that he shared the views of the representative of Iraq on item 6. He merely wished to add that the Economic and Social Council should not rush into discussions that might well put it at variance with the Trade and Development Board and lead it to prejudge the decisions of the General Assembly. It would be preferable to hold preliminary consultations with the Trade and Development Board and to call on the experience of the General Assembly, many of whose Members had already served on the Economic and Social Council. For those reasons, his delegation felt that item 6 should not be taken up at the thirty-eighth session.

50. Mr. BENITES (Ecuador) considered that the points on which the delegations agreed were more important than those on which they disagreed. They all recognized the importance of item 6. The United Nations Conference on Trade and Development had revealed new ways of dealing with world economic problems and the Council must undertake a reappraisal of its own role.

51. The points of disagreement were related only to procedural questions. First of all, it had to be decided who was competent to undertake the proposed reappraisal. In the opinion of his delegation, it was the Economic and Social Council, although there was nothing to prevent the General Assembly from discussing the matter, too. As to the question of timing, the Council could begin its discussion at the thirty-eighth session, and if it then perceived that the time was not ripe, it would easily postpone the discussion until the thirty-ninth session. The thirty-eighth ses-

sion would be time enough for the Economic and Social Council to decide whether it would be preferable to proceed in stages, as the USSR representative had suggested, or to undertake a preliminary examination, as had been recommended by the United States representative. His delegation was therefore in favour of retaining item 6 on the agenda of the thirty-eighth session.

52. Mr. ESFANDIARY (Iran) reserved the right to speak at a later date.

53. The ACTING PRESIDENT proposed that, in the light of the various opinions that had been put forward, the Council should take the following decisions in regard to the questions to be discussed during the thirty-eighth session. Item 5 would be examined if the documents dealing with desalination reached the Council in time. Any decision regarding item 6 should be postponed until the following meeting, as proposed by the representative of Iraq. In regard to item 8, the Council should wait until the thirty-eighth session to decide whether the elections to TAC would take place at that session or at the spring 1966 session; consequently, the question of those elections would be retained on the provisional agenda. Item 7, for which the necessary documents would be provided by the Secretariat, should be retained on the provisional agenda, as well as item 11 which would be discussed in more detail at the thirty-eighth session. In accordance with the decision taken at its 1352nd meeting, the Council would add the question of a meeting of the ad hoc Working Group on the Question of a Declaration on International Economic Co-operation to its provisional agenda. There had been no comments on the introduction to the draft programme prepared by the Secretary-General. The Council would thus formulate its basic programme for 1965 and establish the provisional agenda for the thirty-eighth session in accordance with rules 9 and 11 of the rules of procedure. Accordingly, the Secretariat would prepare a document indicating, as far as possible, in what order and at what date the Council would discuss the items on the provisional agenda for the thirty-eighth session.

It was so decided.

54. The ACTING PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objections, the opening date of the thirty-eighth session, originally set for 15 March, would be postponed until 22 March.

It was so decided.

Statement by the Acting President

55. The ACTING PRESIDENT announced that Mr. W. R. Malinowski, who had been appointed Director of the Division for Invisibles in the Secretariat of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, was to relinquish his duties as Secretary of the Economic and Social Council. He wished to convey to him the Council's gratitude for the untiring co-operation he had displayed in that post since 1959.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.