



ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Wednesday, 24 March 1965,
at 11 a.m.

Thirty-eighth Session
OFFICIAL RECORDS

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|------|
| <i>Statement by the President</i> | 17 |
| <i>Agenda item 7:</i> | |
| <i>Review and reappraisal of the Council's role and functions (continued)</i> | 17 |
| <i>Agenda item 8:</i> | |
| <i>Question of a meeting of the ad hoc Working Group on the Question of a Declaration on International Economic Co-operation</i> | 19 |
| <i>Agenda item 12:</i> | |
| <i>Consideration of the provisional agenda for the thirty-ninth session and establishment of dates for opening debate on items</i> | 20 |
| <i>Agenda item 10:</i> | |
| <i>Confirmation of members of functional commissions of the Council</i> | 21 |

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, United Republic of Tanzania.

Observers for the following Member States: Australia, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Colombia, Cuba, Finland, Greece, Haiti, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, Philippines, Spain, Sweden, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey.

Observer for the following non-member State: Switzerland.

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

The representative of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Statement by the President

1. On behalf of the Council, the PRESIDENT congratulated the United States on its latest achievements in outer space.

AGENDA ITEM 7

Review and reappraisal of the Council's role and functions (continued)

2. Mr. S. KHALIL (United Arab Republic) considered that it was too early for any useful discussion of item 7. On the one hand, the problem was far too large, and could not be seriously considered except on the basis of the voluminous documentation to be prepared by the Secretariat, while on the other hand the debate could not be limited to the mere question of co-ordination or to the determination of the future relationship between the Economic and Social Council and the Trade and Development Board. It was only logical to wait until the latter organ had held its first session. Such was the position of principle of the United Arab Republic.

3. That being understood, he had some preliminary remarks to make regarding the points made during the discussion. Some representatives had expressed the view that the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) should be subordinate to the Economic and Social Council; but while it was true that General Assembly resolution 1995 (XIX) established UNCTAD as an organ of the General Assembly and provided for co-operation between it and the Economic and Social Council, that did not involve any subordination; the two organs must evolve side by side, and not compete with one another. Moreover, as the representative of Canada had pointed out at the 1357th meeting, it would be absurd for the Council to discuss the trade and development needs of the developing countries when a new and much more broadly-based organ had been set up for that very purpose. That was yet another reason not to subordinate UNCTAD to the Council, since such an act might bring to nothing all the efforts to achieve greater effectiveness in that sphere. Finally, the new machinery had not yet been fully perfected, and its organization, functioning and arrangements for co-operating with the Council were yet to be discussed at the next session of both the Trade and Development Board and the General Assembly.

4. For those reasons, his delegation considered that the Council should begin by reviewing its past activities, with special emphasis on the weak spots, so that there could be a useful discussion on how to remedy them. The General Assembly would then consider the preliminary reports on the Council's activities, after which the question of the Council's future role and functions could be taken up.

5. Mr. BENITES (Ecuador) thought that it would be useful for the Council to carry out an immediate and searching evaluation of its activities with a view to improving its methods of work. The question was not one of a power struggle between different organs

of the United Nations, but of better utilization of their capacities in the interest of international co-operation. The United Nations must be dynamic, and must not become the tool of a policy based on the maintenance of a balance of power. The dynamic interpretation of the Charter had brought about the emancipation of many peoples which had only a short time previously been under colonial rule. The paradox was, however, that considerable differences in degree of economic development still existed in an increasingly interdependent world, and the decisions taken at the Geneva Conference represented a step towards a levelling of those differences. It was for those reasons that Ecuador gave its fullest support to the Conference and to the Trade and Development Board, while hoping that the interdependence of economic and social issues would remain the legitimate concern of the Economic and Social Council. The two organs should be mutually complementary, but the Council's functions should nevertheless be reviewed so that it could adapt itself to the new requirements. That task could not be begun at the current session, however. He too was of the opinion that the Secretariat must assemble systematic documentation regarding the suggestions, decisions and action of the Economic and Social Council, the Trade and Development Board and the specialized agencies if the Council was to have an objective basis for its discussions at its following session.

6. Mr. HIREMATH (India) felt that it was premature to consider the present agenda item until the Council had a clearer idea of how the new body would function. However, the preliminary exchange of views had served its purpose; there was even some measure of agreement that the Council should be primarily concerned with co-ordinating activities and defining policies, without encroaching on the work of the Trade and Development Board. But those ideas would have to be debated at length. It was important, at all events, that the Secretariat should provide the fullest possible documentation in good time for the Council's next session.

7. Mr. DJOUDI (Algeria) said that it was his delegation's wish that the two bodies should supplement rather than compete with each other. As the role of the Conference would soon be determined, there was no need to hurry the discussion. It would doubtless be useful to hold consultations with the Trade and Development Board. In the meantime, the exchange of views had not been without interest and those views would certainly be taken into account at the Council's next session.

8. Mr. DE SEYNES (Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs) said that he was grateful for the opportunity to put forward certain ideas on behalf of the Secretary-General, to whose statements at the thirty-seventh session of the Council (1320th and 1326th meetings) the present discussion was in part due. Ideas sometimes took a path in the course of a debate which their originator could not have accurately foreseen. The Secretariat had the impression that as far as the reappraisal of the Council's role was concerned, they had prematurely crystallized around certain points which were not essential. The delimitation of functions between the new and the old machinery, for example, about which some delegations seemed to

have serious misgivings, represented in the Secretary-General's opinion only a very small part of the problem, and by far the easiest to solve. The functions laid down for the Conference on Trade and Development had been defined very precisely and questions relating to areas of interest common to the new and the old machinery, far from leading to conflicts of competence, ought to be susceptible of solution quite naturally in the light of experience. At all events, the General Assembly was the only body indisputably competent to solve any conflicts. He hoped that the discussion would have helped to dispel the idea in the minds of some delegations that there was a question of rivalry between two sets of organizations, an idea which had certainly not been in the Secretary-General's mind when he had made his proposals to the Council at the thirty-seventh session.

9. Yet another impression emerged from the debate, showing that it would be better not to let ideas crystallize prematurely. Some statements had implied that the Council was engaged in working out an overall plan to give it a new lease on life so that it could carry out its task more effectively than in the past. Since the situation was different for each of the Council's main functions, the Secretariat considered that it would be better to examine those functions one by one, in order to see why the Council had not been able, in each particular case, to discharge its responsibilities under the Charter and what should be done to enable it to do so. The Soviet Union representative had mentioned a number of economic and social fields of vital importance which, although within the purview of the Council, had perhaps not always received sufficient attention. The situation in each of those fields and the remedies to be adopted should be considered not only in a big general debate on structure and organization, but also, and even more thoroughly, when problems of substance were examined. The debate on structure and organization, although necessary, should not, therefore, reach a conclusion until the discussion of specific problems had made it possible to determine for each particular field what progress should be made, what methods should be adopted and what machinery should be established or improved. The answers might differ according to the subject.

10. At the 1357th meeting the representative of Iraq had spoken of the Council's function of formulating economic and social policies and had stressed the need for the Council to ensure that it had the benefit of all the expertise it needed for that difficult task. Personally, he thought that that was the key to the problem and that although the power of policy decision in the strict sense rested in the last analysis with the General Assembly, the Council could play a leading role for the Assembly by acting as what was sometimes called a "meditation room", provided that in each particular field it had available to it the expertise necessary to distinguish itself by the quality of its views and reports. The problem differed according to the field. When the technical expertise had already been organized and analysed by a specialized agency, the work of that agency had to be placed in the more general context of the Council in order to determine more precisely how it would fit into a general policy of world development. That was a problem which the Economic and Social Council had never completely

solved. In other fields, in which expertise was assembled by functional, i.e., expert, commissions, it would be necessary for the Council to scrutinize the reports of those commissions more carefully and not confine itself to taking note of them and for it to consider how to improve the performance of each commission, if necessary, in order to improve the performance of the Council itself and of the system centred on it. There were yet other fields, some of which were apparently arousing increasing interest, where the mobilization of expertise had not yet been organized but where it would be possible to discover methods of doing so by studying the actual problems involved.

11. In conclusion, he considered that if the opinion he had just expressed met with the Council's approval, the process of reviewing the role and functions of that body should continue over a fairly long period of time, in each of its subsidiary bodies, during their consideration of each agenda item, and not exclusively in a general debate on organization and structure. When the Secretary-General had made his statement at the thirty-seventh session of the Council, he had wished to imbue the Council with a "spirit of reform" which would inspire it in each of its actions and in each of its organs in the years to come, rather than to invite it to conduct a major debate within a limited period. Nevertheless, the Secretariat was, of course, at the Council's disposal to prepare whatever documentation it might deem necessary.

12. Mrs. WRIGHT (Denmark) asked that the statement by the Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs should be issued in extenso.

It was so decided.^{1/}

13. Mr. ARKADYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that the USSR delegation had never thought that there could be any question of rivalry between the Council and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, if only because the General Assembly had very clearly defined the relationship between the two bodies. He reserved the right to comment at the appropriate time on the Council's work programme in the economic field.

14. Sir Keith UNWIN (United Kingdom) thought that it would be a pity simply to cut short the consideration of agenda item 7 without any work being accomplished between the end of the current session and the opening of the thirty-ninth session. It might be advisable for the delegations which had formulated definite proposals to propose to the Secretariat a passage relating to those proposals, to be inserted in the Council's report, and for the Council to request the Secretary-General to assemble and classify the new elements that had arisen during the discussions and to consult with the Governments.

15. Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (United Republic of Tanzania) considered that the summary records of the meetings gave a sufficiently complete account of the Council's debates and that it would be contrary to earlier decisions for the Council to take any official action on that question before its thirty-ninth

session. There was nothing to stop delegations that wished to do so from consulting directly with the Secretariat, which could if necessary sound out other delegations.

16. Mr. QUAO (Ghana) thought on the contrary that some preparatory work must be done by the Secretariat if there was to be any useful debate at the thirty-ninth session. The Council should therefore adopt a text of some kind presenting the proposals which had arisen during the current session and should request the Secretariat to prepare the necessary documents for the next session.

17. The PRESIDENT suggested that the delegations which had formulated definite proposals should meet together informally to prepare a text to be inserted in the Council's report.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 8

Question of a meeting of the ad hoc Working Group on the Question of a Declaration on International Economic Co-operation

18. Mr. HASEGANU (Romania) stressed that it was important to draw up a declaration on the principles of international economic co-operation. The General Assembly had been the first to recognize that in its resolution 1942 (XVIII). The United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, in its Final Act,^{2/} had also recognized the need for agreement on the principles of international co-operation and had recommended continued efforts in that regard. The Council had given proof of its own interest by establishing the ad hoc Working Group.

19. The Working Group had been given a very complex task; and to carry out that task successfully, it had to be representative. The Group had so far formulated only a very few principles. It would prove considerably more effective if its membership was sufficiently increased to ensure a better representation, on a proportional basis, of all the geographic regions of the world. His delegation considered that the reasons why the Working Group's session had been postponed were still valid; nevertheless, it would not oppose the holding of such a session if the Council so desired. Faithful to the spirit of General Assembly resolution 1942 (XVIII), his delegation would support any initiative that would hasten the definition and adoption of the principles of international economic co-operation.

20. Mr. BACKES (Austria) considered that the situation was in no way different from that which had obtained in August 1964, since the General Assembly had been unable, at its nineteenth session, to undertake consideration of the activities of UNCTAD. It would therefore be logical to postpone consideration of the question of a meeting of the ad hoc Working Group until a session of the Council subsequent to the twentieth session of the General Assembly.

21. Mr. ARKADYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought that the Romanian representative had

^{1/} The complete text of the statement made by Mr. de Seynes was circulated as document E/L.1072.

^{2/} Proceedings of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, vol. 1, Final Act and Report (United Nations publication, Sales No.: 64.II.B.11).

been right to stress the importance of drawing up a declaration on international co-operation. Nevertheless, the work of the *ad hoc* Working Group was not new, and the Council had already taken note of it. The views of the Romanian and Austrian representatives could therefore be combined: in the course of informal discussions on that subject, it had been suggested that account should be taken of a new factor, i.e., the establishment of UNCTAD. In order that the Conference should not remain unaware of the work already done by the *ad hoc* Working Group in that field, the Council could send to the Trade and Development Board the Working Group's report containing the principles on which agreement had already been reached; there would then be nothing to prevent the adoption of the Austrian proposal. In that way practical action would be taken with regard to the principles that had already been drafted.

22. Mr. VIAUD (France) observed that the draft declaration on international economic co-operation covered a very wide field since its principles related to economic and social policies as well as trade policies. His delegation had no objection to the idea that those principles should be referred to the Trade and Development Board for its consideration. But that would be useful only in respect of the principles relating to trade, since the other principles did not come within the purview of UNCTAD. At the same time, the mere fact that the Economic and Social Council drew the attention of the Trade and Development Board to the principles of trade policy contained in the draft declaration could in no way be taken to signify approval of those principles.

23. With regard to the date on which the Council should refer those principles to the Trade and Development Board, the most favourable time would be when the Board examined the recommendation of UNCTAD on the principles of trade policy and its recommendation on long-term trade agreements.

24. As regards the other principles which were being considered by the *ad hoc* Working Group, the Economic and Social Council could resume its examination of them after the twentieth session of the General Assembly.

25. The PRESIDENT, taking into account the views that had been expressed, suggested that the Council should not discuss the question until after the twentieth session of the General Assembly. In the meantime, however, and as the USSR representative had proposed, the report of the *ad hoc* Working Group established under Council resolution 875 (XXXIII) on the question of a declaration on international economic co-operation (E/3725) should be transmitted to the Trade and Development Board.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 12

Consideration of the provisional agenda for the thirty-ninth session and establishment of dates for opening debate on items (E/4010, E/4012, E/L.1071)

26. The PRESIDENT asked whether any delegations had comments to make on the provisional agenda for the thirty-ninth session contained in the note by the Secretary-General (E/4010). He recalled that at the

Council's 1355th meeting the United Kingdom representative had proposed that the question of water desalination should be included as an additional item in the agenda of the thirty-ninth session.

27. Mr. ARKADYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought that the expression "social planning" in item 18 (b) was not sufficiently precise. He therefore proposed that it should be replaced by an expression such as "social programmes and targets", which would be more in keeping with the wording of operative paragraph 5 of General Assembly resolution 1916 (XVIII); the sub-item would then read: "Report on social programmes and targets for the second half of the Development Decade".

28. The PRESIDENT considered that amendment to be acceptable and said that in the absence of any formal objection the provisional agenda, as amended and with the addition of the question of water desalination, would be regarded as approved.

It was so decided.

29. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the note by the Secretary-General on the organization of the work of the thirty-ninth session (E/L.1071) and invited the Council to adopt its calendar of work now in order to enable the Secretariat to go ahead with preparations for the Council's forthcoming session at Geneva.

30. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) requested that item 32 entitled "Relations with the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries", which was scheduled for discussion in the fourth week, should be examined by the Council during the first week and, if possible, immediately after the adoption of the agenda.

31. Mr. WILLIAMS (United States of America) expressed the hope that all the necessary documents, particularly those concerning items to be dealt with in the first week, would be made available to delegations well before the start of the thirty-ninth session.

32. Mr. HIREMATH (India) inquired on what date and in which organ the question of water desalination would be first taken up.

33. Mr. VIAUD (France) asked whether item 3 entitled "World economic trends", scheduled to be examined by the Council during the second week, would not be referred, as usual, to the Economic Committee so that delegations might, if they so desired, prepare and discuss draft resolutions. Since Iraq had requested that the question of relations with the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries should be placed on the Council's agenda, the Council might perhaps consider next the possibility of examining the whole question of relations with inter-governmental and regional organizations. He was simply making a suggestion and not asking for the inclusion of such an item in the agenda of the thirty-ninth session. Like the United States representative, he would urge that the documents needed for the consideration of the various questions on the agenda should be made available early so that Governments might have time to study them.

34. Mr. KITTANI (Secretary of the Council), replying to the various questions raised, said firstly, that item 32 could be taken up during the first week of the session. The Secretariat would do everything possible

to make the documentation available in good time, although difficulties sometimes arose because certain documents were prepared by outside bodies. The question of water desalination would be examined first by the Economic Committee during the third week. He stated for the benefit of the French representative that any agenda item appearing in the document under consideration could, after a preliminary discussion in the Council, be referred to one of the Committees and that item 3 was no exception to that rule.

35. Mr. VIAUD (France) thanked the Secretary for his statement. However, if the note by the Secretary-General (E/L.1071) was revised, he would prefer that the fact that item 3 would be referred to the Economic Committee should be explicitly mentioned for the information of the Governments concerned.

36. Mr. ARKADYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring to paragraph 4 of that note, said that it would be preferable not to take a decision, at the current session, on the establishment of a committee on questions relating to the Special Fund and the Ex-

panded Programme of Technical Assistance, but to defer consideration of that matter until the thirtieth session.

37. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should approve the time-table contained in document E/L.1071, with the amendments and additions that had been proposed.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 10

Confirmation of members of functional commissions of the Council (E/4013 and Add.1)

38. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should confirm Mrs. Jeanne Rousseau, the representative of Mali, and Miss Nancy Kajumbula, the representative of Uganda, as members of the Social Commission.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.