



CONTENTS 1 - 1962

	Page
Opening of the session	1
Agenda item 1:	
Election of President and Vice-Presidents for 1962	1
Agenda item 2:	
Adoption of the agenda	1
Organization of work	4

President: Mr. Jerzy MICHALOWSKI (Poland).

Present:

Representatives of the following States: Australia, Brazil, Colombia, Denmark, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, India, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Poland, Senegal, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Yugoslavia.

Observers for the following Member States: Austria, Bulgaria, Greece, Israel, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Spain, Thailand.

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; World Meteorological Organization.

The representative of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Opening of the session

1. Mr. DE SEYNES (Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs), Acting President, declared the thirty-third session of the Economic and Social Council open.

AGENDA ITEM 1

Election of President and Vice-Presidents for 1962

2. Mr. JHA (India) proposed Mr. Michalowski (Poland) for the office of President of the Economic and Social Council for 1962.

3. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) and Mr. KLUTZNICK (United States of America) seconded the nomination.

Mr. Michalowski (Poland) was elected President by acclamation.

Mr. Michalowski (Poland) took the Chair.

4. The PRESIDENT expressed his warmest thanks to the members of the Council. It was the first time that the representative of a socialist country had been elected President of the Economic and Social Council — an augury, he hoped, of sincere co-operation between States, which alone would enable the Council to succeed in its task. After welcoming the new members, he invited the Council to nominate candidates for the post of First Vice-President.

5. Mr. ZOPPI (Italy) nominated Mr. Patiño Roselli (Colombia).

6. Mr. DE CARVALHO SILOS (Brazil) seconded the nomination.

Mr. Patiño Roselli (Colombia) was elected First Vice-President by acclamation.

7. Mr. PATIÑO ROSELLI (Colombia) thanked the members of the Council for the honour it had done his country, which had always followed the activities of the Economic and Social Council closely. The importance of the Council was constantly increasing and gaining greater recognition. While Colombia fully appreciated the results already attained, it felt that much remained to be done by the Council if the growing needs of the under-developed countries were to be satisfied.

8. Mr. OKAZAKI (Japan) nominated Mr. El-Farra (Jordan) for the office of Second Vice-President.

9. Miss SALT (United Kingdom) seconded the nomination.

Mr. El-Farra (Jordan) was elected Second Vice-President by acclamation.

10. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan) thanked the Council for the honour it had done his country and himself.

AGENDA ITEM 2

Adoption of the agenda

(E/3567 and Add.1 and 2, E/L.932)

11. Mr. KLUTZNICK (United States of America), referring to item 10 of the provisional agenda (Allegations regarding infringements of trade union rights), stated that the unwarranted arrest or kidnapping and treatment that Mr. Heinz Brandt, the editor of a German trade union journal, was receiving from the authorities of East Germany was certainly a violation of human rights and an infringement of trade union rights. He could not, however, support the request of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions

(E/3564) that the Council should invite the Commission on Human Rights to investigate this matter, since in resolution 728 F (XXVIII), the Council had approved the statement that the Commission on Human Rights recognized that it had no power to take any action in regard to any complaints concerning human rights. The allegation before the Council was one against the occupation authorities of East Germany — i.e., the USSR. Under Council procedures, allegations against members of the ILO should be directed to that organization, not to the United Nations. It appeared, therefore, that item 10 should be deleted from the Council's agenda. The ICFTU, which had access to the ILO, should submit the allegation to that organization, which had established fact-finding machinery for those matters. In adopting that position, the United States delegation was guided solely by considerations of procedure; it should not be supposed that it condoned the inhuman treatment inflicted on Mr. Brandt.

12. Miss SALT (United Kingdom) agreed that the matter was not one for consideration by the Council. She therefore supported the United States proposal.

13. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) was glad to note that agreement was apparently being reached on the agenda without undue delay; that would help to establish an atmosphere of mutual understanding from the outset. He agreed with the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom that item 10 had no place in the Council's agenda, but for different reasons: if the Council took up the so-called "infringement" of trade union rights, it would be intervening in the affairs of a sovereign State, the German Democratic Republic. The Soviet delegation did not wish to prolong the debate, but it could not remain indifferent to insinuations that the USSR was responsible for steps taken by the authorities of the German Democratic Republic which, in the circumstances, were quite legitimate. He hoped that the Council would adopt the provisional agenda, with the exception of item 10.

14. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should delete item 10 of the provisional agenda as it appeared in the note by the Secretary-General (E/3567).

It was so decided.

15. The PRESIDENT suggested that the two supplementary items referred to in document E/3567/Add.1, entitled "Revision of the Agreement between the United Nations and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization" and "Creation of the Latin American Institute for Economic and Social Planning", should be included in the agenda.

It was so decided.

16. Mr. VIAUD (France) remarked that the addendum to the Secretary-General's note (E/3567/Add.2) concerning the inclusion of a supplementary item entitled "Assistance to the committee established by resolution 52 (IV) of the Economic Commission for Africa" was very brief and gave no indication of what deci-

sion the Council might have to take. The Council usually considered the reports of the regional economic commissions in July and he did not see that the question was in any way exceptionally urgent.

17. Mr. DE SEYNES (Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs) said that it was with a view to securing the earliest possible implementation of the proposal to establish an African development bank that the Economic Commission for Africa had requested in resolution 52 (IV) (E/3595) that all preparatory steps should be taken within six months following the adjournment of the spring session of the Economic and Social Council. In the circumstances, it might perhaps be necessary to make an exception to the rule in order that the preparatory work mentioned in the ECA resolution might be completed as soon as possible. There was no practical difficulty or reason of principle to prevent the Council considering the matter at its thirty-third session, particularly since the agenda of that session was less heavy than that of the thirty-fourth session.

18. Mr. VIAUD (France) pointed out that, strictly speaking, the Economic and Social Council did not approve the resolutions of the regional economic commissions but took note of them. Sometimes the implementation of a resolution could begin the moment it was adopted. For example, measures were being taken or envisaged to give effect to the resolution of the Economic Commission for Africa concerning the establishment of an African Institute for Economic Development and Planning. In any case, the resolutions of the regional economic commissions were usually examined during the summer session of the Economic and Social Council, at the same time as the discussion of their annual reports. A debate on a resolution during the spring session might raise certain difficulties because the resolution would be separated from the report explaining and justifying it. His delegation would not, however, oppose the inclusion of the proposed new item, provided the Council reserved the examination of the resolution in question for its summer session and confined itself at the present session to the adoption of the necessary administrative and budgetary measures. In that case, he presumed that the Secretariat would submit to the Council a statement of the financial implications before the latter took up the question.

19. Mr. DE SEYNES (Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs) said that he did not think it necessary, in order to adopt a common-sense solution, to embark upon a legal argument about whether resolutions of the regional economic commissions were or were not of a definitive nature, for that point had never been made clear. The Council had every reason to include the supplementary item in its agenda, since it had in any case the right of comment and action, and ECA had specifically requested it to take early action.

20. Mr. VIAUD (France) agreed, in the circumstances, to the inclusion of the item in the agenda. When the Council took up the item it could decide what form its action should take.

21. The PRESIDENT suggested that the supplementary item mentioned in document E/3567/Add.2 should be included in the agenda.

It was so decided.

22. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that he had some comments to make on item 8 of the provisional agenda (Natural resources). Of the documents mentioned in the annotations to the provisional agenda (E/3567), the second biennial report of the Water Resources Development Centre (E/3587) and the report on the proceedings and results of the United Nations Conference on New Sources of Energy (E/3577) had been issued only very recently and the French text had not yet appeared. His Government had therefore been unable to have those two technical reports considered by the competent departments and his delegation could not take part in a detailed discussion of the subject. He therefore requested that the consideration of the two reports should be deferred until the thirty-fourth session; that would be all the more advisable in that the provisional agenda for the thirty-fourth session included an item relating to the applications of science and technology.

23. Mr. FRANZI (Italy) supported that proposal.

24. Mr. JHA (India) pointed out that another of the documents mentioned under item 8, the study on the capital requirements of petroleum exploration and methods of financing (E/3580), had been issued very recently and he feared that the Council would not have time, at the current session, to give the matter all the attention it deserved. His country attached considerable importance to petroleum exploration and considered that Governments should have more time to examine the study. He therefore proposed that consideration of that study, too, should be postponed until the next session.

25. Mr. DE CARVALHO SILOS (Brazil) said that he could not associate himself with the Indian representative's proposal. The study, which had been undertaken at the proposal of his country, had already been considered by the Committee for Industrial Development. The Council could perhaps consider it during the third week of the session.

26. Mr. LEWANDOWSKI (Poland) noted, in connexion with item 8 of the provisional agenda, that neither France nor India had formally proposed that the consideration of the reports referred to should be postponed. Brazil, for its part, was anxious that the study on the capital requirements of petroleum exploration and methods of financing should be considered at the current session. It might perhaps be better to approve the inclusion of item 8 and to decide later, in the light of the practical possibilities, whether some parts of the item should be postponed to the thirty-fourth session, the provisional agenda for which, it should be borne in mind, was already very heavy.

27. Mr. VIAUD (France) repeated that his delegation was unable to send the documents he had mentioned to the competent departments in his country and would therefore lack the instructions necessary for their con-

sideration. He therefore requested, under rule 14 (4) of the rules of procedure, that consideration of those documents and of the document mentioned by the Indian representative should be postponed to the thirty-fourth session of the Council.

28. Mr. JHA (India) felt that members of the Council should have an opportunity to give such an important study as the one on the capital requirements of petroleum explorations and methods of financing careful consideration. He did not, however, wish to oppose the delegation of Brazil, which was anxious that the item should be placed on the agenda of the current session.

29. The PRESIDENT pointed out that agenda item 8 was entitled "Natural resources" and did not include any sub-items. The documents referred to in the annotations were simply mentioned for reference purposes. The present discussion was therefore premature.

30. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that, in that case, he requested that consideration of the whole of item 8 should be postponed until the summer session of the Council.

31. Mr. DE CARVALHO SILOS (Brazil) objected to such a postponement, for he attached extreme importance to the study of the report on the methods of financing petroleum exploration. He thanked the representative of India for not having pressed for its postponement.

32. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he did not consider the arguments advanced in support of the deletion of agenda item 8 to be valid. The documents referred to appeared to give rise to fears which were entirely unfounded and it would be wise to let delegations have an opportunity to express their views on problems which they deemed to be important.

33. Mr. LEWANDOWSKI (Poland) urged the French representative not to request postponement of the whole of item 8. He saw no reason why the Council should forgo consideration of the Secretary-General's report on work being done in the field of non-agricultural resources (E/3578), to which there had been no objection. Moreover, by deciding to place the item on natural resources on its agenda, the Council would not be committing itself in any way to taking a decision at the current session.

34. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that he had not originally intended to request postponement of item 8 in its entirety, but only to draw attention to the fact that it would be physically impossible for his delegation to consider two of the reports mentioned. His delegation would not oppose the inclusion of item 8 provided the Council did not consider those two reports at its current session.

35. Mr. JHA (India) felt that the best course would be to retain item 8, bearing in mind the comments made by the Polish representative.

36. The PRESIDENT suggested that item 8 should be retained on the agenda, on the understanding that the delegations of France and India had reservations

regarding the consideration of the first, third and fourth documents mentioned in the annotations to item 8 of the provisional agenda (E/3567).

It was so decided.

37. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should adopt the agenda as it appeared in the note by the Secretary-General (E/3567 and Add.1 and 2), item 10 having been deleted.

It was so decided.

Organization of work

38. The PRESIDENT recalled that under rule 85 of the rules of procedure, non-governmental organizations in categories A and B which desired to be consulted would have to apply in writing so that the request reached the Secretary-General no later than forty-eight hours after the adoption of the agenda.

The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.