



CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda items 4 and 3:	
Economic planning and projections	
United Nations Development Decade	
Report of the Economic Committee	191
Agenda item 22:	
Question of a meeting of the <i>ad hoc</i> Working Group on	
the Question of a Declaration on International Economic	
Co-operation	192
Credentials of representatives	192
Agenda item 3:	
United Nations Development Decade	
Report of the Co-ordination Committee	193
Agenda items 12 and 17 (<i>h</i>):	
Evaluation of programmes of technical co-operation	
Development and co-ordination of the activities of the	
organizations within the United Nations system:	
co-ordination at the country level	
Report of the Co-ordination Committee	193
Agenda item 19:	
Implementation of the recommendations of the <i>ad hoc</i>	
Committee of Experts to Examine the Finances of the	
United Nations and the Specialized Agencies	
Report of the Co-ordination Committee	193
Agenda item 20:	
Review of public information activities	
Report of the Co-ordination Committee	193
Agenda item 28:	
Relation between the Economic and Social Council and	
non-United Nations intergovernmental organizations in	
the economic and social field	
(a) Report of the Secretary-General	
(b) Proposal by Iran, Pakistan and Turkey	
Report of the Co-ordination Committee	196
Agenda item 2:	
General discussion of international economic and social	
policy (<i>concluded</i>)	199

President : Mr. M. KLUSAK (Czechoslovakia).

Present :

Representatives of the following States: Belgium, Cameroon, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, France, Gabon, Guatemala, India, Iran, Kuwait, Libya, Mexico, Morocco, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Sierra Leone, Sweden, Turkey, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela.

Observers for the following Member States: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Brazil, China, Greece, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, United Arab Republic, Uruguay, Yugoslavia.

Observers for the following non-member States: Federal Republic of Germany, Holy See, Switzerland.

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

The representative of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

AGENDA ITEMS 4 AND 3

**Economic planning and projections
(E/4362 and Corr.1 and Add.1)**

United Nations Development Decade (E/4376)

REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC COMMITTEE (E/4421)

1. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the report of the Economic Committee on agenda items 4 and 3 (E/4421) and to vote on draft resolutions I, II and III, contained in paragraph 23 thereof.

I. ECONOMIC PLANNING AND PROJECTIONS

Draft resolution I was adopted unanimously.

II. UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT DECADE

Draft resolution II was adopted unanimously.

III. UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT DECADE

2. Sir Edward WARNER (United Kingdom) said he wished to make it clear that his Government reserved freedom of action on the report to be submitted by the Secretary-General under operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution. He hoped that in accomplishing the task entrusted to him the Secretary-General would bear in mind all the alternative ways in which the knowledge, experience and views of eminent persons were being drawn on or could be drawn on in the future.

3. Mr. BLAU (United States of America) said that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution in the Economic Committee and would do so in the Council on the understanding that the provisions of operative paragraph 1 were broad enough to enable the Secretary-General, in assessing the present United Nations Development Decade and planning for the years ahead, to

consider alternate ways and means of obtaining the views, experience and judgement of eminent persons whether or not associated with Governments or international agencies.

4. Mr. GREGH (France) recalled that when the draft resolution had been examined in the Economic Committee his delegation had expressed reservations concerning the financial consequences of its provisions and the participation of experts in the proposed meeting on economic development. Observing that the titles of draft resolutions II and III were the same, he suggested that confusion might be avoided if a different title were found for draft resolution III.

5. Mr. FORTHOMME (Belgium) recalled that his delegation had abstained from voting on the draft resolution in the Economic Committee.

6. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the draft resolution.

Draft resolution III was adopted by 24 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

AGENDA ITEM 22

Question of a meeting of the "ad hoc" Working Group on the Question of a Declaration on International Economic Co-operation (E/4367)

7. Mr. GRIGORESCU (Romania) said that at its twelfth session the General Assembly had envisaged the need to adopt principles on international economic co-operation, Romania being one of the sponsors of the resolution that had been unanimously adopted on the subject (resolution 1157 (XII)). Since that time, the Romanian delegation had endeavoured to secure the adoption of a declaration on international economic co-operation, and it hoped that an active working group, composed of experts appointed on the basis of equitable geographical distribution, might start preparing a draft declaration of the principles which should guide States in their economic relations with each other. The consultations his delegation had had with other delegations had revealed that, although many delegations agreed that there was a need for such a declaration, they nevertheless considered that a decision on the matter should be deferred until a later session. In particular, some delegations were of the opinion that a decision should not be taken until the results of the second session of UNCTAD were known, while others felt that no decision should be taken until the Secretary-General had submitted his report in pursuance of General Assembly resolution 2218 A (XXI). While it respected those opinions, the Romanian delegation wished to point out that it was not suggesting the appointment of a new working group. It merely advocated the adoption, as soon as possible, of a declaration which would contain principles relating to the independence and national sovereignty of States, equality in law and non-interference in the domestic affairs of States. It would be wrong for the Council to delete from its agenda an item on which it should take action.

8. Mr. CHADHA (India), referring to paragraph 7 of the Secretary-General's note on the matter (E/4367), said that when, at its fortieth session, the Council had deferred until its forty-third session a decision on the matter of further meetings of the *ad hoc* Working Group on the Question of a Declaration on International Economic Co-operation, it had done so on the assumption that the second session of UNCTAD would take place in 1967. In view of the fact that that session had been postponed until early 1968, it seemed to the Indian delegation that the considerations which had prompted the Council to defer a decision on the matter until its forty-third session were still valid and justified deferment of a decision until the forty-fifth session of the Council. The Indian delegation proposed, therefore, that the item should be included in the agenda for the forty-fifth session of the Council.

9. Mr. BLAU (United States of America), supporting the proposal made by the Indian delegation, said that in addition to the considerations advanced by that delegation the Council and the General Assembly had undertaken certain tasks which had a bearing on the question. Firstly, the Secretary-General had been requested to prepare, for the period following the Development Decade, a compendium of guidelines and principles which might be derived from the past actions of the Council and the General Assembly. Secondly, the Council had just authorized the Committee for Development Planning to prepare a "charter" for the forthcoming Development Decade (resolution 1260 (XLIII)). While the United States delegation hoped that most of the charter would involve practical action rather than principles, there was nevertheless a suggestion that part of it would involve principles. Finally, the Commission for Social Development had undertaken to prepare a "charter" for social development which would also have some bearing on the matter under discussion. It seemed therefore, that the Council would be in a better position in 1968 to decide whether it would be useful for the *ad hoc* Working Group to resume its deliberations.

10. Mr. GREGH (France) said that his delegation supported the proposal made by the Indian delegation.

11. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should agree to postpone until its forty-fifth session a decision on the question of a meeting of the *ad hoc* Working Group on the Question of a Declaration on Economic Co-operation and to include the question in its agenda for that session.

It was so decided.

Credentials of representatives (E/4420)

12. The PRESIDENT drew the attention of the Council to the report of the President and Vice-Presidents on the credentials of representatives to the forty-third session of the Council (E/4420).

The meeting was suspended at 4.10 p.m. and resumed at 5.40 p.m.

Mr. Rahnama (Iran), Vice-President, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 3

United Nations Development Decade (E/4376)

REPORT OF THE CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE (E/4419)

13. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should take note of the report of the Co-ordination Committee on agenda item 3 (E/4419).

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEMS 12 AND 17 (h)

Evaluation of programmes of technical co-operation (E/4312, E/4337, E/4338)**Development and co-ordination of the activities of the organizations within the United Nations system: co-ordination at the country level (E/4336)**

REPORT OF THE CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE (E/4418)

14. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the report of the Co-ordination Committee on agenda items 12 and 17 (h), (E/4418), and to vote on draft resolutions I and II contained in paragraph 7 thereof.

I. Co-ordination at the country level

Draft resolution I was adopted unanimously.

II. Evaluation of programmes of technical co-operation

Draft resolution II was adopted unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 19

Implementation of the recommendations of the "ad hoc" Committee of Experts to Examine the Finances of the United Nations and the specialized agencies (E/4337, E/4391, E/4401 and Corr.1)

REPORT OF THE CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE (E/4417)

15. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the report of the Co-ordination Committee on agenda item 19, and to vote on the draft resolution in paragraph 4 thereof.

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 20

Review of public information activities (E/4337, E/4341, E/4394)

REPORT OF THE CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE (E/4416; E/L.1180)

16. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the report of the Co-ordination Committee on agenda item 20 (E/4416) and the draft resolution submitted in paragraph 5 thereof.

17. Mr. CHOLLET (France) drew attention to the amendment to the draft resolution proposed by his delegation

(E/L.1180) which was to add a new paragraph after operative paragraph 1 of the Co-ordination Committee's draft resolution. In the text of that amendment, the words "in consultation with the specialized agencies concerned" should be added after the word "resources" in the first line. The purpose of the amendment was to clarify the Secretary-General's recommendation relating to the establishment of Regional Information Bureaux (see E/4341, paras. 29-33). The French delegation wished to make it quite clear that the new bureaux should be established only through the redeployment of the existing staff in the information services. If the establishment of the new bureaux should lead to a reduction in the staff of those centres whose activities had not been entirely satisfactory, that could be regarded as sound administrative management. It would be useful if, in establishing the new centres, the Office of Public Information (OPI) were to get in touch with certain specialized agencies, such as UNESCO, whose opinions would be worth considering. The French delegation hoped, by introducing the amendment, which had been drafted in close collaboration with the representative of OPI, to ensure that the draft resolution would be adopted unanimously by the Council.

18. Mr. ZAKHAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation, which attached great importance to the information activities of the United Nations, considered that the Secretariat was under a duty to ensure full impartiality in accordance with General Assembly resolution 13 (I). Unfortunately, the work of OPI had a number of shortcomings; it was regrettable, for example, that various publications on United Nations activities failed to reflect certain important principles such as those embodied in the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty,¹ and to provide information on the progress made with its implementation. The same was true of other declarations as well as important decisions illustrating United Nations work in the economic and social fields.

19. He also drew attention to shortcomings in the provision of information on the positions of individual Governments with respect to the liquidation of colonialism, and on the decisions adopted on this subject by the United Nations. In the information material published by the United Nations, the inadmissible practice was still continued of saying nothing about the positions adopted by countries supporting anti-colonial principles, and of representing in a favourable light those taken up by representatives of the colonial Powers. There was ample evidence to show that the Secretariat's information and publishing work was pro-Western and biased; besides being detrimental to the interests of States Members, that was in flagrant contradiction of the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter.

20. For example, the English text of the Press release issued by the Information Service at Geneva on 19 July 1967 contained a gross distortion of the USSR representative's statement made in plenary that day (1490th

¹ General Assembly resolution 2131 (XX).

meeting). On that occasion he had referred to the enormous material damage caused by Israel's aggression against the Arab countries. In the Press release, the words "Israeli aggression" had been placed in inverted commas, and it would be most interesting to know why the Secretariat officials concerned had taken it upon themselves to "correct" the authorized representative of a sovereign Government in his assessment of political events. A similar shortcoming was evident in the summary records, since, in the provisional record of the 1490th meeting, the statement of the Libyan representative, a member of the Council, had been summarized in only one-and-one-half pages, whereas three-and-one-half pages had been devoted to the statement made by the representative of the aggressor country. That, surely, was a flagrant example of partiality. His delegation hoped that the Director-General of the Geneva Office would look into the facts and take the necessary measures to prevent the recurrence of such incidents. He recalled that in his statement at the 1490th meeting the observer for the aggressor country had flagrantly violated the Council's terms of reference and rules of procedure by trying to refer to matters that had nothing to do with the agenda. Members of the Council, and specifically the Libyan representative, had rightly drawn attention to the facts. The representative of Tel Aviv, however, had convened a Press conference at the Palais des Nations and had read out the full text of the statement he had intended to make in the Council. That statement, which was permeated by reactionary Zionist propaganda, contained a number of slanderous accusations directed against the USSR, in which country, as it was unnecessary to repeat, all national groups, large and small, enjoyed the right to instruction in their own language and unlimited opportunities of developing their economy, national culture and art. The Jewish Autonomous Region had been established as part of the Russian Federation a few years after the October Revolution in a fertile area to enable the Jews, in the same way as all other national groups, to develop their economy and culture. There was no discrimination on grounds of colour or race in the Soviet Union, and the Jews were the equals of all the other nationalities which went to make up the Union; they enjoyed all the rights of citizens of the USSR and took an active part in State and public life. In that connexion, he cited a statement made by the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR at a Press conference held in New York on 26 June 1967, in which he had emphasized that there had never been any anti-semitism in the Soviet Union.

21. The Soviet delegation hoped that the forum of the United Nations and the Secretariat's information services would in future be used in the interest of peace-loving peoples and not to serve the mercenary purposes of States pursuing a course of military aggression.

22. Though the various criticisms he had voiced were in no way meant to belittle the positive side of the Secretariat's information activities, it was the Council's task to detect shortcomings and, in the light of current requirements and the noble aims of the United Nations, indicate ways and means whereby the work of OPI and other United Nations organs concerned with information could be improved.

23. His delegation agreed with the view expressed by the Secretary-General that the Governments of Member States were primarily responsible for informing world public opinion about United Nations activities (see E/4341, para. 14); clearly, therefore, it would be wrong to transfer that task to the Secretariat's information services.

24. He suggested that a radical improvement in the quality of information work could be achieved not by the establishment of a cumbersome and costly apparatus, but by the elimination of various shortcomings.

25. His delegation questioned the value of the Secretary-General's proposals concerning the establishment of Regional Information Bureaux, for the reasons given by the USSR representative in the Co-ordination Committee. In that connexion he noted that the French delegation's proposed amendment to the draft resolution before the Council did much to promote a sounder understanding of the views and intentions of the Secretariat, as presented at the Co-ordination Committee's 327th meeting by the Director of the United Nations Information Centre at Paris. His delegation would therefore support the French amendment.

26. The USSR delegation considered that OPI should ensure that information material reflected all aspects of United Nations activity, that the various problems discussed by the United Nations should be given adequate treatment in accordance with the United Nations Charter, and that OPI should deal mainly not with past activities, but with present ones, designed to put an end to aggression, maintain peace and develop international co-operation. The OPI must therefore adopt a radically different attitude to the dissemination of information on political problems and above all the problem of universal peace and security.

27. The OPI should therefore constantly consult States Members of the United Nations, or at least those represented in the Consultative Panel on Public Information, on the subject matter of its programme. It would also be highly desirable to set up editorial boards for United Nations periodicals such as the *Yearbook*, and include on those boards staff members from States with different social systems. It would also be logical that the most important pamphlets, articles and other information material should be sent to States Members for their opinion.

28. Moreover, his delegation recommended that the following important topics should be included in the Secretariat's publications programme: the role of the United Nations in efforts to prevent interference in the domestic affairs of Member States, United Nations activities in the matter of decolonization in 1965-1967, the struggle of the colonial peoples for their liberation and consolidation of their political and economic independence, the United Nations and the problem of general and complete disarmament, partial disarmament measures such as the non-dissemination of nuclear weapons, United Nations efforts to liquidate the vestiges of colonialism, the solution of the problem of South West Africa, the elaboration by the United Nations of principles of inter-

national trade relations and principles of international economic co-operation, the role of the United Nations in the task of defending the sovereignty of the developing countries over their natural resources, and the United Nations and the struggle against the policy of armed aggression pursued by certain Western countries.

29. His delegation also considered that the time had come to reorganize the leadership of OPI and to increase the number of its staff from African, Asian and socialist countries by reducing the over-representation of the western countries, as indicated by the USSR representative on 16 February 1967 at the meeting of the Consultative Panel on Public Information.

30. Mr. MA'A BITOMO (Cameroon) said that he hoped the Secretariat would reply to the serious allegations made by the Soviet delegation.

31. The PRESIDENT drew the Council's attention to rule 75 of the rules of procedure and said that the observer for Israel had requested permission to exercise his right of reply.

32. Sir Edward WARNER (United Kingdom), supported by Mr. PARRY (Canada), said it should be possible at that late stage of the Council's work to refrain from polemics. He hoped the observer for Israel would be able to withdraw his request.

33. Mr. EILAN (Observer for Israel), speaking under rule 75 of the rules of procedure, said that he regretted he was unable to withdraw his request to exercise his right of reply.

34. The PRESIDENT suggested that, in accordance with rule 75 of the rules of procedure, the observer for Israel should be allowed to address the Council.

It was so agreed.

35. Mr. EILAN (Observer for Israel), speaking in accordance with the provisions of rule 75 of the rules of procedure, said that the Soviet representative had referred in his statement to a Press conference which had been convened recently in the Palais des Nations by the Permanent Representative of Israel. At that conference the Head of the Israel mission to the United Nations Office at Geneva had drawn attention to the tragic plight of the Jewish minorities in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and in some Arab countries since the outbreak of hostilities in the Middle East. It was not surprising that the Soviet representative should object to the world Press being acquainted with the plight of a national minority in the Soviet Union. What was surprising was that he should expect the Secretariat of the United Nations to collaborate in denying a Member State the normal facilities for stating its views on any subject, particularly a subject so central to United Nations work on human rights. The position of the Jewish minority in the Soviet Union was not a new subject in United Nations discussions. The religious, cultural and sometimes racial discrimination practised against that minority had frequently been discussed in the Commission on

Human Rights and other United Nations bodies. It was the unquestionable duty of the Israel delegation to draw the attention of the world community once again to a new wave of threats and intimidations unleashed by the Soviet authorities against the three million Jews of the Soviet Union since the aggravation of the situation in the Middle East. The cartoons currently being published in the Soviet Press were sufficient to invalidate the claim that there was no anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union was not the only Member State to have opposed the discussion in the United Nations of certain matters relating to human rights. The verdict of the vast majority of the Member States of the United Nations on such issues had, however, been unmistakable. The United Nations had the right and the duty under its Charter to concern itself with breaches of human rights wherever they might occur; and Member States had the right and the duty to bring those matters to the attention of the world community.

36. Mr. ZAKHAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that during the past few days the representative of the aggressor State had been trying the patience of the Council; his most recent statement was a tissue of lies and misrepresentations, and did not call for an answer.

37. Mr. ATTIGA (Libya) recalled the statements he had made previously (1490th meeting), when the representative of Tel Aviv had first requested the floor.

38. Time and time again representatives of Tel Aviv had displayed the same arrogance, defiance and disrespect for law and order; they heaped abuse upon the United Nations and even the Secretary-General, and yet used the United Nations as a platform for their propaganda. They made an appearance only when they wished to speak and studiously ignored anything about or done by the United Nations which was not to their liking. But perhaps it was not surprising that a State which had been established by armed aggression and which consistently defied the various purposes of the United Nations should send its representative to mislead public opinion by their distorted statements. Nor was it surprising that one of its representatives had again insisted on taking the floor despite the appeals made by the members of the Council friendly to it.

39. His delegation, too, had been rather surprised that on the very day when the Council had decided to call the representative of Tel Aviv to order for speaking at excessive length, the Secretariat should so far have departed from a proper impartiality as to have arranged for a Press conference for him, and for the translation of his remarks.

40. At that Press conference, reference had been made to the plight of the Jewish minority in the Arab countries, despite the fact that impartial observers were in agreement that the only place where the Jews had found peace and friendship was precisely in those countries. Indeed, as early as the fourteenth century, persecuted Jews had taken refuge in the Arab countries, and in 1948, when the Zionists had evicted some one million Arabs from their land, the Jewish minorities had remained in the Arab

countries and even continued to occupy public positions. The Zionists wished, however, to instil into the minds of those Jewish minorities that their first duty was to the Zionist State; and they were stirring up trouble among them. Any unfortunate reactions which had occurred since the latest Israel aggression had been due to the fact that the Zionists had forced the Jewish minorities to regard themselves as citizens of a foreign State.

41. In any event, the position of the Arab minorities in the Zionist State compared most unfavourably with that of the Jewish minorities in the Arab countries. Despite the passage of nineteen years, the Arab minority in Israel was still regarded as a group of second-class citizens, who were segregated in all walks of life. The 300,000 Arabs in question had only four representatives in Parliament, and those representatives were often picked rather than freely elected. Moreover, specific laws had been enacted to enforce discrimination in all walks of civic and economic life. World public opinion would one day learn the truth, and only then would a fruitful and friendly dialogue be possible. Continued distortion of the facts would not, however, bring that day nearer.

42. He regretted that, although his delegation had spoken at the 1490th meeting for approximately the same time as the representative of Tel-Aviv, during the discussion of the USSR proposal for the inclusion in the Council's agenda of a supplementary item entitled "Responsibility of Israel for the economic damage caused to Arab and other peace-loving states by its aggression against the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan" (see E/4409), only one-and-one-quarter pages had been devoted to his statement in the provisional summary record, while two-and-one-half to three pages had been devoted to that of the Tel-Aviv representative. His delegation, however, had implicit faith in the impartiality of the Secretariat, for if any doubt as to its objectivity were to arise, the world would be left without any forum whatsoever. Unfortunately, the impartiality of the United Nations was called in doubt by a number of other facts, but he expressed the hope that a sincere effort would be made to ensure complete objectivity and honesty in recording what was said by all delegations.

43. Mr. de SEYNES (Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs), speaking in the absence of the Director-General of the United Nations Office at Geneva, said it had been the normal practice in the United Nations for nearly twenty years for heads of delegations to hold Press conferences. It was not for members of the Secretariat to interfere with that practice. Such Press conferences were entirely the responsibility of those who held them; although they involved the use of interpreting services, the Secretariat could not accept any responsibility for their content. As to the comments on the provisional summary record of the 1490th meeting, the point mentioned had not been brought to his attention, nor, he would imagine, to the attention of the Director-General of the United Nations Office at Geneva. He could answer for the impartiality of all members of the United Nations Secretariat. Since the comment had been made, however, the matter would be investigated.

44. Mr. REYES (Philippines) said that his delegation, which, in the Co-ordination Committee, had co-sponsored the draft resolution now before the Council, would have preferred the original text, which, in its view, was more flexible and allowed the Secretary-General and the Secretariat officials responsible for information services more scope in following up the Secretary-General's laudable initiative. It had been stated, however, that the French amendment, although more restrictive than the draft resolution, had been studied by the representatives of the Secretary-General, and that it would still allow the Secretary-General sufficient flexibility to test the very useful idea of establishing Regional Information Bureaux within existing staffing patterns and financial resources. On the basis of those assurances, as well as that of the French representative that the draft resolution as amended by him would make it possible to achieve unanimity, the Philippine delegation would be prepared to accept the French amendment.

The French amendment (E/L.1180), as amended by the sponsor, was adopted unanimously.

The draft resolution (E/4416, para. 5), as amended, was adopted unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 28

Relations between the Economic and Social Council and non-United Nations intergovernmental organizations in the economic and social field

(a) Report of the Secretary-General (E/4342)

(b) Proposal by Iran, Pakistan and Turkey (E/4323/Add.2, E/4405)

REPORT OF THE CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE (E/4422)

45. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the report of the Co-ordination Committee on agenda item 28 (E/4422) and the draft resolution contained in paragraph 4 thereof.

46. Mr. QURESHI (Pakistan), referring to operative paragraph 3 in part B of the draft resolution, said that some of the subsidiary bodies had already established arrangements for such relationships, and there would be no need for the Secretary-General to submit proposals. In other cases he might find it very desirable to do so. His delegation looked forward to receiving recommendations from those subsidiary bodies. → E/4342, para. 54

47. Mr. ATTIGA (Libya) said he supported the draft resolution. His delegation at the forty-second session of the Council had supported the request for the present item to be put on the agenda, in the belief that it would result in mutual benefit to the Council and the intergovernmental organizations concerned. One of the stated aims of the United Nations and the Council was the promotion of regional economic and social integration as a means of accelerating development. The Council would be adding to its many and varied channels of communication by encouraging the co-operation of the increasingly numerous intergovernmental organizations.

48. He welcomed the reference in the Co-ordination Committee's report to the co-operation between the Governments of Turkey, Iran and Pakistan, and he hoped their example would be followed by others. He had also welcomed the statement by the Executive Director of ECA (1491st meeting) that a number of intergovernmental organizations were being set up in the African region. His own country was a member of the Maghreb association, which, though still in its initial stages, would eventually help in the promotion of economic integration in that region.

49. He hoped that, since the aims and purposes of the draft resolution had now been made clearer, some of the earlier abstentions and reservations would be withdrawn.

50. Mr. MURGESCU (Romania) said that in the discussions in the Co-ordination Committee his delegation had explained its reasons for voting in favour of part A of the draft resolution, but had expressed reservations on part B—which, incidentally, was not really linked with part A. His delegation could not understand the need or the value of the list of organizations that it was proposed the Secretary-General should submit to the Council; nor did it believe that the participation of a large number of additional intergovernmental organizations would in any way help the Council in its work. The Co-ordination Committee had not accepted his delegation's suggestion that it should postpone a decision on part B, and the result of the vote had only strengthened his delegation's belief that its doubts were shared by others. Part B had been approved by ten votes (little more than one-third of the membership of the Committee), with seven abstentions. He regretted that the Committee, while postponing decisions on many other important matters, had not done so on a question which had been the subject of so many doubts and reservations. His delegation would not vote in favour of part B, and would raise the matter when the Council's report came before the General Assembly. He asked for a separate vote on part B.

51. Mr. MA'A BITOMO (Cameroon) said that, during the debate on the reports of the regional economic commissions, his delegation had stressed the importance of regional economic co-operation in Africa (1495th meeting). He felt that the Executive Secretary of ECA had not attached sufficient importance to the work of the Central African Customs and Economic Union. He hoped more attention would be given to that body during the second Development Decade, since it had already done much for co-operation in the region and merited more practical assistance and more encouragement.

52. Mr. VARELA (Panama) said he had serious doubts as to the draft resolution's legality. Parts A and B both in effect conferred consultative status on intergovernmental bodies, without giving any indication of the degree of that status. Council resolution 288 (X) set out in detail the arrangements for granting consultative status, and the meaning of the different categories. One of the basic prerequisites for the grant of consultative status—whether category A or category B—was that the organizations should be non-governmental. The draft

resolution ran counter to resolution 288 (X), since its purpose was to give consultative status to intergovernmental organizations. In the circumstances, his delegation would abstain from voting on both parts of the resolution.

53. Mr. ATTIGA (Libya) said that to raise the question of the draft resolution's legality might create misunderstandings. It had been made clear in the Secretary-General's report on the matter (E/4342) that the United Nations Charter mentioned relations with non-governmental, but not with intergovernmental, organizations—possibly because at that time there had been very few of the latter type. Over the years, however, it had proved that relationships did exist between intergovernmental organizations and the United Nations at Secretariat level. The question had been raised at the Council's forty-second session and, although there had been some objections, the majority of delegations had supported the idea. In his opinion, sub-paragraph (b) of the operative paragraph in part A and operative paragraph 2 of part B in no way conflicted with the Charter or the rules of procedure. The draft resolution merely expressed something which had been frequently stated in the Council, and formalized, encouraged and made more explicit a type of relationship that already existed.

54. Mr. CUHRUK (Turkey) said that he did not agree with the views of the representative of Panama, since intergovernmental organizations were only dealt with by *ad hoc* decisions of the Council and the General Assembly. There was no distinction of category between intergovernmental organizations for purposes of consultative status.

55. Mr. LAVALLE VALDEZ (Guatemala) said that he, too, had doubts as to the draft resolution's legality, particularly so far as concerned the reference to the right of participation in Council meetings. Unless he was mistaken, the only references in the Charter to the relationship between the United Nations and other intergovernmental organizations were in Article 57, which referred to such organizations as specialized agencies, and Article 70, which gave them the right to participate, without voting, in the Council's deliberations. Consequently, the only intergovernmental organizations which could participate in the Council's deliberations would be the specialized agencies; and agreements to that end required the approval of the General Assembly, under Article 63 of the Charter.

56. The PRESIDENT pointed out that, as was indicated by the references in the fourth paragraph of the preamble to part A, the Council had already taken similar decisions in respect of other intergovernmental organizations.

57. Mr. MURGESCU (Romania) said he had not questioned the legality of part B of the draft resolution: he merely doubted its value and necessity. The representatives of Libya and Turkey had given interesting explanations, but he would like to know whether there was any constitutional provision in the United Nations which obliged the Council to establish direct relations with the non-United Nations intergovernmental organizations

which were already represented on the regional economic commissions.

58. Mr. HILL (Under-Secretary for Inter-Agency Affairs) said it was true that the United Nations Charter contained no provision for establishing relations with inter-governmental organizations other than the specialized agencies referred to in Articles 57 and 63. It had, however, been agreed in the Preparatory Commission and the United Nations Conference on International Organization that Article 57 of the Charter should not be regarded as precluding the Council from negotiating agreements for bringing other types of intergovernmental agencies into relationship with the Organization (see E/4342, para. 3). On the basis of that understanding, the Council and the General Assembly had made, through the years, a number of arrangements for relationship or contact with intergovernmental organizations—sometimes between the Council and the organization concerned, sometimes authorizing the Secretary-General to establish contacts.

59. In 1966 the Secretary-General had suggested to the Council that one of the areas in which its working methods required re-examination was that of relations with intergovernmental organizations outside the structure of the United Nations family. He had gone on to say that it might be useful for the Council to be better informed of the work of a number of such organizations and for the organizations to become more familiar with the work of the Council and its subsidiary bodies. In the light of such considerations, the Secretary-General had submitted the present report, which had been examined by the Co-ordination Committee. The result of that Committee's discussions were embodied in part B of the draft resolution, which invited the Secretary-General to continue and strengthen his contacts; and, where he considered it would help to further the Council's aims and work, to propose to the Council a list of intergovernmental organizations outside the United Nations system which should be represented by observers. It had never been the Secretary-General's intention to submit a large list, as suggested during the present discussion. What he had had in mind was some extension of existing arrangements to enable the Council to benefit from closer contact with organizations which were important to its work. He had always intended to use any discretion given him—as in the draft resolution—in a conservative and cautious manner.

60. Mr. LAVALLE VALDEZ (Guatemala) said that his doubts concerned not the possibility of the United Nations establishing relations with organizations outside the United Nations, in accordance with the Charter, but the possibility that intergovernmental organizations which were not technically specialized agencies might participate in the Council's discussions.

61. Mr. FORTHOMME (Belgium) said his delegation had supported part B of the draft resolution in the belief that the Council would benefit from relations with intergovernmental organizations outside the United Nations. He was not, however, very happy at accepting a draft

which even at the present stage was causing difficulty to a considerable number of representatives. It was in the Council's interest whenever possible to secure decisions with a larger majority than appeared likely in the present instance. If postponement of a decision on part B would delay the Council's relationship with useful organizations, he would urge that it should be put to the vote. Part A, however, provided the possibility of establishing relationships with any organization which might be useful and which desired such relationship. Since, therefore, the door was kept open, he felt it would be wiser to postpone a decision on part B so as to allow more time for reflection.

62. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that he agreed with the representative of Belgium. The debate had shown that there was in fact no urgent need for a general provision covering organizations which had not shown any interest in relations with the Council. He supported the Belgian suggestion and hoped that eventually, at a later stage, part B might gain unanimous support.

63. Mr. QURESHI (Pakistan) said he maintained his belief in the timeliness of part B. All it tried to do was to establish a working procedure to replace the system of ad hoc decisions in individual cases which had been followed in the past. It did not limit the Council's discretion, nor did it open the door to all organizations that might ask for relations with the Council. He proposed that parts A and B should be voted on separately.

64. Mr. VARELA (Panama) said that he had never stated that the draft resolution was illegal: he had merely expressed doubts. He wished to exercise his right to act in accordance with his conscience.

65. Mr. ATTIGA (Libya) said he would not object to the postponement of a decision on part B, but he would like to know the reasons for postponement. He did not see how parts A and B could be acted on separately. They were interdependent, and any objection applying to one would automatically apply to the other.

66. Mr. MA'A BITOMO (Cameroon) said he deplored the equivocal positions that were being taken up by some representatives. His own delegation knew from its experience as a member of the Central African Customs and Economic Union that the presence of observers for intergovernmental organizations did much to strengthen regional and inter-regional co-operation and understanding.

67. Mr. MURGESCU (Romania) agreed with the representatives of France and Belgium that there was a considerable difference between parts A and B of the draft resolution. Part A related to co-operation between the Council and intergovernmental organizations on an ad hoc basis and at the request of the members of those organizations whereas part B departed from the procedure followed by the Council in the past and sought to establish the principle that a number of organizations, to be proposed by the Secretary-General, should be granted admission to its deliberations. The difference was clearly a legal one,

and it would surely be wiser to refrain from applying indiscriminately to all intergovernmental organizations criteria which not all of them were claiming.

68. Mr. VARELA (Panama) suggested that when voting on part A, the Council should take a separate vote on sub-paragraph (b) of the operative paragraph. His delegation, for one, would abstain from voting on that sub-paragraph since it doubted the wisdom of the provisions concerned. The same applied to operative paragraph 2 of part B, which he hoped would also be put to a separate vote.

69. Mr. LAVALLE VALDEZ (Guatemala) and Mr. QURESHI (Pakistan) supported the Panamanian representative's request for a separate vote.

70. Mr. BLAU (United States of America) said his delegation would vote for both parts of the draft resolution since it saw no reason to doubt either the legality or the advisability of any of their provisions. It had been the practice of both the General Assembly and the Council since the beginnings of the Organization to accord status to intergovernmental organizations. At the present session, for instance, the OAS had been permitted to make an oral statement before the Council, so it was not as though a fresh principle were being introduced.

Sub-paragraph (b) of the operative paragraph of part A of the draft resolution (E/4422, para. 4) was adopted by 24 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Part A of the draft resolution was adopted by 26 votes to none.

Operative paragraph 2 of part B of the draft resolution was adopted by 17 votes to 2, with 7 abstentions.

Part B of the draft resolution was adopted by 19 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 23 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

71. Mr. ZOLLNER (Dahomey), explaining his abstention from the votes on sub-paragraph (b) of part A and on part B as a whole, stated that, although his delegation had no objection to allowing intergovernmental organizations to participate in Council meetings where appropriate, it believed that organizations wishing to do so should apply individually through Council members.

Mr. KLUSAK (Czechoslovakia) resumed the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 2

General discussion of international economic and social policy (E/4332, E/4343, E/4352 and Corr.1 and Add.1, E/4353 and Add.1 and Add.1/Corr.1, E/4361, E/4362 and Corr.1, E/4363 and Add.1-2, E/4370, E/4378, E/4392, E/4396 and Add.1-3 and Add.1/Corr.1; E/CN.11/L.184, E/CN.11/L.185/Rev.1; E/CN.12/767, E/CN.12/768; E/CN.14/370, E/CN.14/397; E/ECE/656; E/L.1173) (concluded)

72. Mr. BRILLANTES (Philippines) said that his delegation and those of the other sponsors of the draft resolution

in document E/L.1173 had held consultations with various delegations that had wished to suggest amendments. He regretted that the sponsors had been unable to accept most of the oral suggestions made; however, he would have no objection if the Council decided to take a separate vote on the second paragraph of the preamble.

73. To meet some of the points made, the co-sponsors were proposing that the following new paragraph should be added after the second paragraph of the preamble.

“Taking note also, in this connexion, of the statement by the Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs at its 1504th meeting.”

74. The United Kingdom representative had suggested two amendments to the draft resolution. The first concerned the final paragraph of the preamble, in which it was proposed to insert the words “in the light of the Final Act” after the mention of the implementation of the recommendations of the Conference. The sponsors hoped that the United Kingdom representative would not press the matter to a vote.

75. The second United Kingdom proposal was that operative paragraph 3 should be amended by the insertion of the words “to world trade” after the word “benefit”; the sponsors were prepared to accept that amendment, provided that the words “and particularly” were also inserted, as suggested by the representative of India, so that operative paragraph 3 should end with the words “of benefit to world trade and particularly to developing countries”.

76. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that the addition of the new paragraph to the preamble would create an ambiguous situation, for it would imply that the interpretation of the Secretary-General's statement by the Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs differed from the original statement. The draft resolution was an important one, and should not be drafted in haste; he therefore proposed that the Council should take no vote on it for the time being, but should deal with it under item 6, (report of the Trade and Development Board), with which the subject was closely linked.

77. Sir Edward WARNER (United Kingdom) supported the French proposal.

78. Mr. ATTIGA (Libya) said he could see no inconsistency between the second paragraph of the preamble and the new paragraph added by the co-sponsors. The Under-Secretary had given some explanations to dispel the doubts of certain representatives as to the meaning of the Secretary-General's statement, and that interpretation could be safely taken to convey the Secretary-General's meaning. Indeed, the Under-Secretary had made it clear that the Secretary-General was advocating no specific methods of negotiation, but had expressed some general ideas on the action that might be taken.

79. His delegation could not support the French proposal, for it would delay a decision which must be taken if the second session of UNCTAD was to take more specific action than the first.

80. Mr. ENCINAS DEL PANDO (Peru) observed that the Secretary-General's statement quoted in the second paragraph of the preamble referred to a factual situation, recognized by the Secretary-General of GATT and by the developing countries members of GATT. Perhaps the wording of the draft resolution could be improved, but it was essential to retain its substance.

81. Mr. FORTHOMME (Belgium) supported the French proposal. The second paragraph of the preamble and the new paragraph were indeed inconsistent, and were unsuitable for inclusion in a legal text. Moreover, the doubts of certain delegations, including his own, had not been entirely dispelled by the Under-Secretary's explanations.

82. Mr. ATTIGA (Libya) said that the sponsors had made every effort to accommodate the views of all delegations, but considered that any further compromise would merely nullify the draft resolution's effect.

83. Mr. GELBER (Canada) considered that the sponsors had shown no spirit of conciliation and that the new paragraph of the preamble did not clarify the situation. He would have liked to have been able to vote for the draft resolution, but would be obliged to abstain from voting because no serious attempt had been made to redraft the second paragraph of the preamble.

84. Mr. VARELA (Panama) said that postponement of the vote would merely open the possibility for a further debate on the subject. He therefore proposed, under rule 53 of the rules of procedure, that the debate on the item should be closed.

The motion for closure of debate was carried by 20 votes to 1, with 5 abstentions.

85. Mr. VIAUD (France) suggested that the Council should now vote on his procedural proposal.

86. Mr. CHADHA (India), speaking on a point of order, said that the French representative's proposal that the draft resolution should be dealt with under item 6 of the agenda was substantive, rather than procedural. The second paragraph of rule 66 of the rules of procedure gave precedence only the motions requiring that no decision should be taken on the substance of proposals. The French motion could not be dealt with under that paragraph, and fell under the provisions of the first paragraph of the rule, whereby proposals had to be voted on in the order in which they had been submitted.

87. Mr. ATTIGA (Libya) supported the Indian representative's views.

88. Sir Edward WARNER (United Kingdom) said he thought it was perfectly clear that the French proposal was procedural, not substantive.

89. Mr. FORTHOMME (Belgium) observed that, even if the French proposal was regarded as substantive, it was

furthest removed in substance from the original proposal, and should therefore be voted on first.

90. Mr. BLAU (United States of America) considered that the second paragraph of rule 66 was fully applicable to the French proposal.

91. Mr. BRILLANTES (Philippines) pointed out that the Council had decided by a large majority to close the debate on the item. That meant that the Council was prepared to take a vote on the substance of the question before it, but the adoption of the French proposal would have the effect of reopening the debate under another item, thus contradicting the Council's decision. If any vote were to be taken on the French proposal, the reference to considering the draft resolution under item 6 should be deleted.

92. Mr. COX (Sierra Leone) and Mr. MA'A BITOMO (Cameroon) supported that view.

93. After a procedural discussion, Mr. VIAUD (France), drawing attention to the option given the Council in the first paragraph of rule 66 to decide not to vote on proposals in the order in which they had been submitted, suggested that the Council should vote on the question whether it should vote first on the French proposal.

94. The PRESIDENT put that motion to the vote.

The motion was defeated by 14 votes to 9, with 3 abstentions.

95. Mr. MA'A BITOMO (Cameroon) said that he had voted against the motion because the effect of the French proposal would have been to re-open the debate which the Council had already decided to close.

96. Mr. ZOLLNER (Dahomey) said he had voted against the motion because it would be illogical to vote under item 6 on a draft resolution relating to item 2.

97. Mr. VIAUD (France) said he wished to dispel any possible misunderstanding concerning the reasons why he had made his proposal. The proposal had not been directed against the draft resolution, but he felt strongly that rejection of the motion was tantamount to a rejection of any further possibility of a meeting of minds.

98. Mr. KASSUM (Secretary of the Council) announced that the amendment proposed by the United Kingdom, to insert in the third line of operative paragraph 3 the words "to world trade and particularly" after the word "benefit", had been accepted by the sponsors of the draft resolution.

99. Mr. FORTHOMME (Belgium) asked for a separate vote on the second paragraph and the new third paragraph of the preamble to the draft resolution.

The second and third paragraphs of the preamble to the draft resolution were adopted by 19 votes to 3, with 4 abstentions.

100. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the draft resolution (E/L.1173) as a whole, as amended by the sponsors at the previous meeting and the present meeting.

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 20 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

101. Mr. GELBER (Canada), Mr. BILLNER (Sweden) and Mr. FORTHOMME (Belgium), explaining their vote, said they regretted having been obliged to abstain from voting on so important a matter, when some concessions would have made it possible to adopt the draft resolution unanimously.

102. Mr. BLAU (United States of America), explaining his vote, said that he regretted having been obliged to abstain, but the Under-Secretary's statement, while clearing up some questions, had left intact his delegation's principal objection—that the phrasing of the draft resolution might imply that the second session of UNCTAD would provide an opportunity for entering into specific

commitments. His delegation was not prepared to enter into such commitments at New Delhi.

103. Sir Edward WARNER (United Kingdom), explaining his vote, said that he regretted having been obliged to abstain from voting on the draft resolution as a whole and to vote against the second paragraph and the new third paragraph of the preamble. The clarification provided by the Under-Secretary had not, however, removed all possibility of misinterpretation of the second half of the second paragraph of the preamble.

104. Mr. ATTIGA (Libya), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution, expressed his regret that the delegations of some developed countries had found it necessary to abstain. Comparison with the original text of the draft resolution showed that all amendments for which the co-sponsors saw good grounds had been accommodated.

The meeting rose at 10 p.m.