



ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Thursday, 31 July 1969

FORTY-SEVENTH SESSION

at 3.5 p.m.

OFFICIAL RECORDS

PALAIS DES NATIONS, GENEVA

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 7:	
Regional co-operation:	
(a) Reports of the regional economic commissions and of the United Nations Economic and Social Office in Beirut	
(b) Report on the meetings of the executive secretaries (concluded)	153
Agenda item 8:	
Reports of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme:	
(a) United Nations Development Programme	
(b) United Nations Capital Development Fund	
(c) Technical co-operation activities undertaken by the Secretary-General (concluded)	157

President: Mr. SCHEYVEN (Belgium).

AGENDA ITEM 7

Regional co-operation:

- (a) Reports of the regional economic commissions and of the United Nations Economic and Social Office in Beirut (E/4639 and Add.1, E/4640, E/4641, E/4651 and Add.1, E/4659, E/4726; E/L.1264/Rev.2, E/L.1266, E/L.1271, E/L.1272)
- (b) Report on the meetings of the executive secretaries (E/4709) (concluded)

1. The PRESIDENT called upon the Council to vote on the French amendments (E/L.1272) to draft resolution E/L.1264/Rev.2.

The French amendment to paragraph 1 of the draft resolution was adopted by 13 votes to 12, with 1 abstention.

2. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the French amendment to paragraph 4 of the draft resolution.

3. Mr. VIAUD (France) accepted the suggestion made by the USSR delegation at the previous meeting that the words "member States of the various African sub-regions", in the French amendment to paragraph 4, should be replaced by the words "member States of the Economic Commission for Africa".

4. Mr. ROUAMBA (Upper Volta) asked for particulars concerning the situation which would thus arise. Referring to the four spheres mentioned at the end of the amendment as requiring certain studies and consultations, he thought it risky to include such a limited enumeration.

5. Mr. de SEYNES (Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs) said that operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution E/L.1264/Rev.2 and the French amendment were aimed at establishing certain advisory services. Such services were already in existence and it was legitimate to think that the texts in question were designed to intensify them and systematize their use. Their cost was charged to part V of the regular budget of the United Nations. They might also be charged to UNDP; in that case, their financing would be carried out under the same conditions as UNDP financing of certain services, such as, for example, those of the FAO agricultural advisers. Otherwise it would be necessary to revert to the usual ways of financing the services of experts for a given Government; that, however, was different from the organization of advisory services on a more or less permanent basis, such as draft resolution E/L.1264/Rev.2 and the French amendment seemed to entail.

6. Mr. RODRÍGUEZ LARRETA (Uruguay) reiterated his objections to both texts and was surprised that a draft resolution supposedly covering all the regional economic commissions should contain provisions relating to only one of them. For that reason his delegation would abstain from voting.

7. Mr. ROUAMBA (Upper Volta) was surprised that the Uruguayan delegation, at the current stage of the discussion, should be raising fundamental objections to a draft resolution that had been submitted some time before; such objections should constitute an amendment submitted in the proper form. Draft resolution E/L.1264/Rev.2 was the outcome of the combination of two texts, one of which had concerned ECA. In view of the special problems besetting ECA, it had been decided to deal with the matters of concern to it in the eighth preambular paragraph and in operative paragraph 4. That was not a new procedure and there was nothing surprising about it.

8. The explanations given by the Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs were entirely satisfactory to his delegation, although it thought that the French amendment was not entirely in accordance with the purpose of the draft resolution.

9. Mr. RODRÍGUEZ LARRETA (Uruguay) said that he was entitled to explain his delegation's vote on an amendment which erred on the side of partiality as did the draft resolution to which it referred.

10. Mr. OLDS (United States of America) proposed the following amendment:

"Urges the United Nations Development Programme and other appropriate agencies to give favourable con-

sideration to such requests as may be made by the member States of the regional economic commissions, severally or collectively, for placing at their disposal the services of experts and such other services essential to the development of the regions.”

That wording would accommodate any arrangements which might seem appropriate to a given commission.

11. Mr. VIAUD (France) and Mr. NESTERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) accepted that amendment.

12. Mr. SINGH (India) said that he would accept the text proposed by the United States representative provided that no reference was made to any particular body. There was no reason why UNDP should be singled out, and he suggested that the reference to it should be deleted.

13. Mr. OLDS (United States of America) accepted that suggestion.

14. Mr. VIAUD (France) could not accept that proposal. It would be possible, however, to take the Indian representative's idea into account by changing the first sentence of his amendment to read: “*Urges* the appropriate institutions, including the United Nations Development Programme”

15. The PRESIDENT suggested that the meeting should be suspended.

It was so decided.

The meeting was suspended at 3.45 p.m. and resumed at 4 p.m.

16. Mr. NESTERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the various forms of wording suggested actually cloaked important fundamental differences. In one case—and specifically that of UNDP—the institutions concerned were powerful, well-financed organizations which based their work on voluntary contributions and could give favourable consideration to any request which might be submitted to them. In the other case, if the reference to UNDP was omitted, as the Indian delegation had proposed, the draft resolution would relate not only to such organizations but to all organizations financed under the United Nations regular budget.

17. The Secretary-General's report on the financial implications of the recommendations of the regional economic commissions (E/4726) must be taken into account and the matter should be referred to the appropriate United Nations financial bodies. It was true that priority must be given to the requests submitted by the regional economic commissions, and his delegation had said that those commissions were essential for strengthening the activities of the United Nations, but it had specified that their work should first be made more effective.

18. In the circumstances, it would be preferable to retain the text proposed by France and the United States.

19. The PRESIDENT put the Indian amendment to the vote.

The amendment was adopted by 14 votes to 2, with 10 abstentions.

20. The PRESIDENT announced that the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1264/Rev.2 accepted the amendment proposed by the French delegation, with the sub-amendments proposed by the Indian delegation. He put draft resolution E/L.1264/Rev.2, as amended, to the vote.

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 22 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

21. Mr. AHMED (Sudan) regretted that his delegation, which had co-sponsored the draft resolution, had had to abstain from voting because one of the most important elements of the text had been deleted.

22. In another connexion, his delegation hoped that the report which the Council was to submit to the General Assembly would include a sentence calling attention to the fact that the issue had given rise to divergent opinions, which it would be advisable to take into account. The sentence in question might read: “The Economic and Social Council requests all those concerned to take particular note of the various views expressed during the consideration of resolution [here the serial number of the resolution which the Council had just adopted would be inserted], particularly at the 1624th and 1625th meetings of the Council.”

It was so decided.

23. Mr. NESTERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that while his delegation approved of much of the resolution that the Council had just adopted, some doubts had prevented it from supporting the text as a whole.

24. In the first place, with regard to the financial aspects, his delegation considered that account should be taken of the Secretary-General's report (E/4726) on the financial implications of the proposed measures. Account should also be taken of the statement by the Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs that the manner of resolving the financial problems involved had not yet been made perfectly clear. That was why his delegation considered that a definitive decision could not be taken until after the matter had been examined by the competent United Nations bodies; a halt should be called to the constant increase in the Organization's budget, which was not at present accompanied by a parallel increase in the economic and social activities of United Nations bodies. The United Nations could and should find ways and means of intensifying its assistance to the developing countries by making its work more effective.

25. In the second place, the resolution underlined the need to reinforce the role of sub-regional organizations

within the purview of ECA. His delegation considered that, first and foremost, the work of the regional economic commissions should be considered as a whole: it might be easy to separate, but it was more difficult to reunite, and it was important to preserve the integrity of the commissions.

26. Miss HARELI (Observer for Israel), speaking under rule 75 of the rules of procedure, said that her delegation would not reply to the totally unjustified references made to her country during the discussions on agenda item 7; those references had been made for political reasons and there were other bodies in the United Nations to deal with such matters.

27. It was, however, necessary to point out that the resolution just adopted was not perfectly clear. UNESOB and the regional economic commissions did not have the same status. UNESOB was part of the United Nations Secretariat and was not an intergovernmental regional economic commission. It could have no policy-making functions, because such functions could be exercised only by intergovernmental bodies. Nothing contained in the resolution could change that fact.

28. A regional economic commission for the Middle East had not yet been set up for reasons which were well known and which her Government very much deplored. It was Israel's fervent hope that that commission would come into being and it was fully prepared to co-operate in its establishment in order to further economic and social development in the region.

29. Mr. KHANACHET (Kuwait) observed that the Economic and Social Council, a sovereign body, had adopted the resolution in question with full knowledge of the facts and that the observations which had just been made on the subject were at variance with the resolution. Further, declarations of intent were not enough and practical action was necessary, but not of the kind at present to be seen: the aggression continued with the expulsion of populations and the procession of misery and persecution resulting from Israel's occupation of Arab territories.

30. His delegation requested that its statement should be reproduced *in extenso* in the Council's report to the General Assembly.

31. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the draft resolutions on the annual reports of ECE, ECAFE, ECLA and ECA, as submitted by those commissions in part IV of their reports.

The draft resolution on the report of ECE (E/4641) was adopted unanimously.

The draft resolution on the report of ECAFE (E/4640) was adopted unanimously.

32. Mr. NESTERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted that some of the measures recommended in the

ECAFE report had major financial implications. His delegation had endorsed that report, but it considered that all questions of a financial nature associated with the extension of the Commission's work should be examined by the competent organs of the General Assembly.

The draft resolution on the report of ECLA (E/4639) was adopted unanimously.

33. The PRESIDENT pointed out that, as suggested in paragraph 489 of the ECLA report, the Commission had decided to request the Council to add the following paragraph to article 12 of the Commission's terms of reference: "For those years in which the Commission does not hold a session, the Executive Secretary shall submit to the Economic and Social Council a full report of its activities and plans, including those of any subsidiary bodies, after approval by the chairman of the session in question and after circulation to Governments of member States for their comments and any necessary modifications."

34. He requested the Council to vote on that paragraph.

The paragraph was adopted unanimously.

35. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that, when ECLA had decided at the beginning of its last session to dispense with summary records, many translators and précis-writers had found themselves out of work and had spent their time sight-seeing. It would be desirable, when certain organs decided to dispense with summary records or to limit documentation in compliance with the recommendations of the General Assembly, that the Secretariat should take the necessary steps to ensure that such a situation did not recur.

36. Mr. de SEYNES (Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs) replied that the Office of Conference Services had inevitably had to keep the necessary précis-writers on hand so long as the Commission had not actually decided to dispense with summary records. So far as sight-seeing by conference staff was concerned, he was certain that the authorities in New York and in Santiago, Chile, had made sure that such activities were not charged to the United Nations budget.

37. The PRESIDENT recalled that the French delegation had proposed a number of amendments (E/L.1271) to the draft resolution on the ECA report (E/4651).

38. Mr. VIAUD (France) thought that the Council should take note of the resolutions adopted by ECA; to endorse them might give the impression that the Council was encroaching on ECA's responsibilities. That, in any case, was the practice in regard to the draft resolutions relating to the other regional economic commissions. Further, the Council could not take the place of the African delegations by endorsing resolution 190 (IX), on relations with OAU; it

would be more appropriate for the Council to take note of ECA's intention to establish working relations with OAU.

39. Mr. DANIELI (United Republic of Tanzania) would not object to the substitution, in paragraph 3 of the draft resolution on the ECA report, of the words "Takes note in particular, of the resolutions" for the words "Endorses particularly the resolutions", but thought that it would be better to retain the reference to the specific resolutions adopted by ECA rather than to refer to "the resolutions in part III".

40. Mr. AHMED (Sudan) acknowledged that, in the draft resolutions submitted by the other regional economic commissions, the Council took note of the resolutions adopted, but the expression "takes note" was not strong enough in the particular instance under discussion; ECA had adopted important resolutions with a view to intensifying its work and introducing structural modifications. Rather than adopt a negative neutral attitude, it would be better to maintain the word "endorses".

41. Mr. ROUAMBA (Upper Volta) did not object to the substitution of the words "takes note" for the word "endorses" in the draft resolution on the ECA report; that change was justified on grounds of uniformity and because the Council had already, in the last paragraph of the preamble to resolution E/L.1264/Rev.2, endorsed resolutions 188 (IX) and 189 (IX) relating to the reorganization of ECA.

42. Mr. OLDS (United States of America) agreed with the representative of Upper Volta.

43. Mr. VIAUD (France) understood that the representatives of Tanzania and Upper Volta did not oppose the French proposal to replace the word "endorses", in paragraph 3 of the draft resolution on the ECA report, by the words "takes note". He therefore proposed that a separate vote should be taken on that amendment.

44. The PRESIDENT put the French amendment to the vote.

The amendment was adopted.

45. Mr. DANIELI (United Republic of Tanzania) said that he did not understand the purpose of the French amendment to paragraph 4 of the draft resolution under consideration and he requested the French representative not to press for the new wording.

46. Mr. VIAUD (France) recalled that in a similar case the Council had merely taken note of the working relations established between ECLA and OAS. His delegation had no ulterior motive in putting forward its amendment, as it had no objection in principle to the Council's endorsing the wish of ECA to establish working relations with OAU. Consequently, if the delegations of Tanzania and Upper Volta considered that the text of paragraph 4 of the draft

resolution on the ECA report was preferable, the French delegation would concur.

47. Mr. ROUAMBA (Upper Volta) proposed, in view of the amendment to paragraph 3, the deletion of the word "also". Paragraph 4 would therefore begin: "Endorses resolution 190 (IX) on ...".

It was so decided.

48. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the draft resolution on the ECA report (E/4651), as amended.

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted.

49. Mr. VIAUD (France) pointed out that he had agreed to accept the original text of paragraph 4 of the draft resolution on the ECA report; he wished, however, to remind the Council that the main purpose of the French amendment was to express the hope that the two bodies—ECA and OAU—would work not only in a spirit of co-operation but also on a basis of equality and mutual benefit.

50. Mr. NESTERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) emphasized the magnitude of the financial implications of the ECA report, which would entail an even heavier burden than in the case of ECAFE. All financial questions should be submitted to the competent organs of the United Nations so as to avoid any unnecessary increase in the Organizations's budget.

51. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the draft resolution on regional co-operation submitted by the delegation of Kuwait (E/L.1266).

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.

52. The PRESIDENT pointed out, with regard to the question of simplifying and standardizing documents and procedures in international trade, to which the Council's attention had been drawn both in ECE resolution 4 (XXIV) (E/4641, part III) and in section XII of the report of the meetings of the executive secretaries of the regional economic commissions in 1969 (E/4709), that a number of statements endorsing the endeavours made in that field had been made during the discussions. He therefore suggested that the Council should take note of ECE resolution 4 (XXIV) and of the report of the meetings of the executive secretaries of the regional economic commissions in that connexion.

It was so decided.

Mr. Ahmed (Sudan), Vice-President, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 8

Reports of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme (E/4609, E/4663, E/4706; E/L.1269/Rev.1):

- (a) United Nations Development Programme
- (b) United Nations Capital Development Fund
- (c) Technical co-operation activities undertaken by the Secretary-General (*concluded*)

53. Mr. KHANACHET (Kuwait), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the revised draft resolution on technical co-operation activities undertaken by the Secretary-General (E/L.1269/Rev.1), proposed that the phrase "which fulfil the general principles mentioned below under part 2 (a) and (d) of this resolution" should be inserted in the fourth preambular paragraph after the words "national volunteer schemes". He hoped that that slight alteration would enable the Council to adopt the draft resolution unanimously.

54. Mr. EKONDY-AKALA (Congo, Brazzaville) wished to reiterate the importance which his country attached to the matter under discussion. Since he had not received fresh instructions from his Government, he would confine himself to restating his delegation's position, hoping to clear up some misunderstandings before the Council took a final decision on the matter. He paid a tribute to the sponsors of the draft resolution, most of whom represented developing countries, on their good intentions, but the fact was that it was often difficult to draw a distinction between teams of experts and teams of volunteers, and it was to be feared that international volunteers might often conceal unworthy motives. Several developing countries, for example, had had unfortunate experiences with envoys of the United States Peace Corps.

55. He would not oppose the idea of a study on the establishment of an international volunteer corps provided that the political aspects of the matter were not disregarded. One question was whether the international volunteers to be sent to less advanced countries ostensibly to provide development aid would be armed, as had some French citizens who had been arrested recently when engaged on a mission on behalf of an international organization.

56. In those circumstances, he would be obliged to abstain from voting on the draft resolution under consideration.

57. Mr. VIAUD (France) was satisfied with the amendments made by the sponsors to the original draft resolution and which had enabled the French delegation to withdraw the amendments it had submitted. Furthermore, the addition suggested by the representative of Kuwait to the fourth preambular paragraph of the revised draft resolution was quite acceptable to his delegation, for it was in keeping with the characteristics of the French volunteer services and

was one of the conditions for a unanimous vote, or at least a vote by a large majority, in the Council.

58. Mr. NESTERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) felt that most of the differences had been ironed out in the revised draft resolution, and consequently would be able to support it, although he had one rather important reservation to make with reference to the fourth preambular paragraph which, even in its amended form, was still too general. Although some countries had admittedly had favourable experiences with national volunteers, there were also cases where so-called volunteers sent abroad by national organizations had been expelled by the developing countries that they were supposed to assist. The purposes of volunteer activities also varied a great deal.

59. While voting for the draft resolution as a whole, the Soviet Union interpreted the word "contribution", in the fourth preambular paragraph, as referring solely to the experience acquired by the developing countries themselves. His delegation had already had occasion to voice serious doubts about the idea of establishing an international volunteer corps.

60. Mr. AITKEN (Jamaica) stressed that the draft resolution under consideration could not be interpreted as a call to Governments to slacken their efforts to establish national volunteer services. Jamaica for one had derived great benefit from the work of volunteers, which had enabled it to form a national corps; hence its support for the idea of establishing an international volunteer corps in no way detracted from the regard in which it held national services.

61. Mr. ROUAMBA (Upper Volta) would vote for the draft resolution since, in the matter of volunteers, his country had been luckier than others, for it had managed to derive great benefit from the national volunteer services it had received. That comment seemed called for after the pessimistic remarks of the representative of the Congo (Brazzaville). His delegation would support the draft resolution precisely so that some pitfalls could be avoided in international volunteer work.

62. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the revised draft resolution (E/L.1269/Rev.1), as amended orally by the representative of Kuwait.

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 23 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

63. Mr. SINGH (India) first congratulated all those who had taken part in preparing the draft resolution on the spirit of compromise which they had shown, especially the observer for Iran. Furthermore, on behalf of all the sponsors of the draft resolution, he proposed the inclusion of the following passage in the Council's report to the General Assembly: "The Council welcomed the support

and interest which Governments had shown following the inspiring initiative of His Imperial Majesty, the Shah of Iran”.

64. Mr. CAPPELEN (Norway) and Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) supported the Indian representative’s proposal

concerning the inclusion of a tribute to the Shah of Iran in the Council’s report.

The proposal was adopted.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.