



ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Forty-eighth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Wednesday, 14 January 1970,
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. J. B. P. MARAMIS (Indonesia).

AGENDA ITEM 9

Basic programme of work of the Council in 1970 and consideration of the provisional agenda for the forty-eighth session (concluded) (E/L.1293, E/L.1296)

1. The PRESIDENT proposed, in the light of the comments made by delegations during the two preceding meetings, that consideration of item 5 entitled "Report of the Committee on Housing, Building and Planning" and item 6 entitled "Teaching of the purposes and principles, the structure and activities of the United Nations and the specialized agencies in schools and other educational institutions of Member States" should be postponed from the forty-eighth to the resumed forty-eighth session. In fact, both items were of a primarily social nature and, moreover, the report which the Council was to consider under item 6 would not be available within the required time-limit for the first part of the session.

2. Conversely, since the agenda for the resumed forty-eighth session was overloaded, he proposed that consideration of item 5 entitled "Narcotic Drugs" which now appeared on the agenda for the resumed forty-eighth session might be brought forward to the forty-eighth session in March/April. With regard to the report of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, it would not be possible to observe the six-week rule or to submit the report to the CPC for consideration at its January session. However, since the Commission was currently holding a special session exclusively to consider a revised Draft Protocol for the Control of Psychotropic Substances, its report would not be of as much concern to the CPC as its reports on its regular sessions. The remainder of item 5 was concerned with the report of the International Narcotics Control Board, a Treaty organ, and therefore presumably not of direct interest to the CPC, and with an interim report by the Secretary-General on technical assistance in narcotics control. Since it was only an interim report, the CPC could always take note of the final report at a later session.

3. In conclusion, even if the Council decided to advance the item on narcotic drugs to the forty-eighth session, the elections for members of the International Narcotics Control Board would still be held in May after the Committee on Candidatures had had time to meet and submit its report to the Council.

4. Mr. JHA (India), later supported by Mr. OSMAN (Sudan), approved the President's suggestions regarding the provisional agenda for the forty-eighth session but suggested that the Council might postpone item 8 entitled "Non-governmental organizations", from the forty-eighth

session to the resumed session in May. In fact, the Commission on Human Rights was to meet in February-March and, since its agenda was very heavy, it was extremely probable that its session would be prolonged by a few days and that it would not end before 31 March. In that case, and considering that the same representatives were concerned with human rights and non-governmental organizations, they would only have three days to consider the question of non-governmental organizations. The previous year's experience had proved that it was absolutely impossible to complete that item in such a short time. He had held informal consultations with members of the Council and the majority of delegations were in favour of postponing the item until the resumed session in May. It might be necessary to ask the Secretariat if the resumed session could begin a few days earlier so that the Council would have sufficient time at its disposal.

5. Mr. VIAUD (France) fully supported the Indian representative's suggestion. He had not made the suggestion himself at the previous meeting because he had realized that, if consideration of item 8 were postponed, the resumed forty-eighth session would have to be prolonged and that he could hardly make such a suggestion without consulting other delegations. The Indian representative had been perfectly right in saying that there was no question of the Council's taking a final decision at that stage; it was simply a matter of enabling delegations to inform their Governments that the report of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations would probably be considered in May rather than in March. Members knew that the session of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations would end on 20 February. It was unlikely that its report would be circulated before the first week in March, which left very little time to transmit it to Governments and allow them to study it with all the care which that extremely delicate question warranted.

6. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) approved the various suggestions made by the secretariat of the Council regarding the agenda and the changes suggested by the President.

7. His delegation had already expressed its approval of postponing consideration of item 8 until the resumed session and the arguments put forward by India and France had only strengthened his conviction. It was absolutely imperative to postpone it since the report which the Council was to consider would definitely not be ready within the prescribed time limit. However, his delegation did not feel that it would be necessary to prolong the resumed session in May. The President had just suggested that item 5 entitled "Narcotic Drugs", on the agenda for the resumed session, should be considered during the forty-eighth session. The Council could therefore use the time thus saved during the resumed forty-eighth session to

consider the question of non-governmental organizations instead of the item relating to narcotic drugs. His delegation would therefore support the postponement of consideration of item 8, but it was absolutely opposed to extending the duration of the resumed session.

8. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) supported the proposals made by the President at the beginning of the meeting, but there appeared to be a contradiction in the Indian representative's statement with respect to item 8. That representative had stated that the Council was not called upon to take a final decision immediately, but, if it took no decision, item 8 would obviously remain on the agenda for the forty-eighth session in March/April. However, other delegations had apparently interpreted the Indian representative's proposal as a recommendation to postpone consideration of item 8 until the resumed session, and that could not be done without a decision by the Council.

9. Mr. JHA (India) confirmed that the Council would not have to take a decision as long as the Secretariat had not considered the possibility of bringing forward the start of the resumed session by a few days, with a view to enabling the Council to consider the question of non-governmental organizations at that time. Item 8 would no longer appear in the provisional agenda for the forty-eighth session but it would not appear in the agenda for the resumed session as long as the Council had not taken a decision on it, in the light of the information transmitted to it by the Secretariat.

10. Moreover, the representative of the Soviet Union had declared that he was in favour of postponing consideration of item 8, but had opposed any extension of the resumed session. There were therefore two different suggestions, but they were not in contradiction.

11. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) considered the objection put forward by the United Kingdom representative very logical: if the Council took no immediate decision, it was hard to see how it could delete item 8 from the provisional agenda for the forty-eighth session. In any event, there was no harm in leaving the item on the agenda, since at the beginning of the session in March the Council could decide either to keep it on the agenda or to postpone consideration of it to the resumed session.

12. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objections, he would take it that the Council accepted the suggestions made by him at the beginning of the session to postpone consideration of items 5 and 6 from the forty-eighth session to the resumed session.

It was so decided.

13. The PRESIDENT proposed that, with respect to item 8, the Council should take note of the reservations which had just been expressed. It was understood that a final decision would be taken at the forty-eighth session in March, on the basis of the information transmitted by the Secretariat concerning the possibility of bringing forward the start of the resumed session by a few days. Meanwhile, item 8 would remain on the provisional agenda for the forty-eighth session in March/April.

14. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) suggested that item 8 should be moved to appear at the very end of the agenda for the forty-eighth session.

15. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he failed to understand why the question appeared so complicated to some delegations. Obviously, the report of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations would never be ready in time for the Council to consider it during the forty-eighth session in March/April. Consideration of the item would therefore have to be postponed to the resumed session and he wondered why a decision to that effect could not be taken immediately, so that the specialists who were concerned with those matters would only need to attend the resumed session. Furthermore, the question was a social one, and in keeping with the general character of the resumed session. Lastly, any other procedure would be discourteous to the representatives of the non-governmental organizations, who would take the trouble to come to the initial meetings only to hear the Council say that it was unable to consider the question. They would have to make a second journey when the Council really took up the item. For all those reasons, it was absolutely necessary for the Council to take an immediate decision.

16. The PRESIDENT suggested, as a compromise, that item 8 should remain on the provisional agenda for the forty-eighth session; in the mean time the Secretariat would study the possibility of advancing the beginning of the resumed session by several days. If the Secretariat made a positive reply, consideration of item 8 would be automatically postponed to the resumed session in May.

17. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he could only restate the point of view which he had previously put forward. For all the reasons which he had already indicated, he urged the Council to take an immediate decision to postpone consideration of item 8 to the resumed forty-eighth session, without any question of changing the duration of the resumed session.

18. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) said that he had previously supported the Indian proposal because he had believed that, once item 8 had been deleted from the provisional agenda for the forty-eighth session, it would have been automatically inscribed on the agenda for the resumed session in May. Since that was not the intention of the Indian representative, he would acquiesce in the opinion of the Soviet Union, and he urged the Council to take an immediate decision.

19. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) and Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) said that they too supported the view expressed by the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, which was a very sound one.

20. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) pointed out that, even if the Council decided to postpone its consideration of item 8 until the resumed session, it would always be possible to refer to that matter in its consideration of item 1 of the agenda for the forty-eighth session.

21. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objections, he would consider that the Council decided to

postpone until the resumed forty-eighth session its consideration of item 8 on non-governmental organizations, at present included in the draft agenda for the forty-eighth session.

It was so decided.

22. The PRESIDENT said that the provisional agenda for the forty-eighth session was adopted and, as was customary, he asked the Secretariat to consult with the delegations and then to draft a document containing its suggestions as to the order in which the Council could consider the various items, with the corresponding dates.

23. Mr. VIAUD (France) drew the Council's attention to the proposal made by the Secretary-General in paragraph 14 of the introduction to the draft programme (E/L.1293) and said that the French delegation was favourable, as it had been the previous year, to the idea that the intergovernmental organizations enumerated in that paragraph should be represented by observers at the forty-eighth and forty-ninth sessions of the Council, in connexion with the consideration of certain items of concern to them. He reminded the Secretariat that, in view of the work the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) had done and was still doing in connexion with the Second United Nations Development Decade, that Organisation attached particular importance to item 3 of the agenda for the forty-ninth session. He therefore hoped that the Secretariat would not fail to invite it to attend, especially during the Council's consideration of that item.

24. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that paragraph 14 of the draft programme actually contained two proposals. The Secretary-General proposed to invite certain intergovernmental organizations to be represented by observers at the forty-eighth and forty-ninth sessions of the Council, in connexion with the consideration of certain items of concern to them, and he also proposed to invite the International Secretariat for Volunteer Service to be represented by an observer at the forty-ninth session in connexion with item 9 of the agenda. The USSR delegation proposed that the Council should decide on the Secretary-General's second proposal in May when it considered the provisional agenda for the forty-ninth session.

25. Mr. BLAU (United States of America) said that he did not think that the Secretary-General's proposal required any decision on the part of the Council. The Secretary-General had simply wished to keep the Council informed as to what he intended to do by virtue of the authority vested in him by the Council itself in resolution 1267 (XLIII).

26. Mr. KASSUM (Secretary of the Council) thought that the interpretation just given by the representative of the United States was entirely correct. The Secretary-General had expressed his gratitude for the assistance a number of organizations had given him in drafting various reports, and he (Mr. Kassum) seemed to recall that the organization concerned had been mentioned on that occasion.

27. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thanked the Secretary of the Council for his explanation

and said that, considering the point made by the representative of the United States, he had no objection to make.

AGENDA ITEM 6

Elections (E/4645 and Add.1-5; E/L.1291, E/L.1294 and E/L.1295)

ELECTION OF THE THIRTEEN MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL COMMITTEE ON NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

28. The PRESIDENT said that, under rule 82 of the rules of procedure, the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations consisted of five members from Afro-Asian States, four members from Western European and other States, two members from Latin American States and two members from socialist States of eastern Europe. The following thirteen States were candidates for election to the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations: Bulgaria, France, Ghana, India, Jamaica, Kenya, Norway, Pakistan, Sudan, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Uruguay.

29. Mr. BRADLEY (Argentina) pointed out that some of the candidates were already members of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations. He therefore proposed that, to save time, their terms of office should be extended and that the voting should be confined to those candidates who were not yet members.

30. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that, since the number of candidatures from each group corresponded to the number of seats to which that group was entitled, the Council could decide to elect all the candidates unanimously, without a formal vote.

31. The PRESIDENT suggested that the rules of procedure should be suspended and that all the candidates should be appointed without a formal vote.

The following States were unanimously elected members of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations: Bulgaria, France, Ghana, India, Jamaica, Kenya, Norway, Pakistan, Sudan, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Uruguay.

ELECTION OF FOUR MEMBERS OF THE UNITED NATIONS/FAO INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE OF THE WORLD FOOD PROGRAMME (E/L.1291)

32. The PRESIDENT announced that the following States had submitted their candidatures to replace the four members whose terms of office had expired: Ireland, Kenya, Pakistan, Sweden and United Arab Republic.

33. Mr. VIAUD (France), speaking on behalf of the States of Western Europe and other States, said that Ireland and Sweden were the two official candidates of the Group.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Connelly (Ireland) and Mr. Orcic (Yugoslavia) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

<i>Number of ballot papers:</i>	27
<i>Invalid ballots:</i>	0
<i>Number of valid ballots:</i>	27
<i>Required majority:</i>	14

<i>Number of votes obtained:</i>	
Pakistan	25
Sweden	25
Ireland	23
United Arab Republic	18
Kenya	16
France	1

Having obtained the required majority, the following States were elected members of the United Nations/FAO Intergovernmental Committee of the World Food Programme: Ireland, Pakistan, Sweden and United Arab Republic.

ELECTION OF THE MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE FOR PROGRAMME AND CO-ORDINATION

34. Mr. VIAUD (France), speaking on behalf of the States of Western Europe and other States, said that the five candidates designated by the Group were the following: Denmark, France, Malta, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America.

35. Mr. ARAUJO CASTRO (Brazil) pointed out, on behalf of the States of Latin America, that Argentina should be added to the list of candidates, which would thus include the following States: Argentina, Brazil, Guyana and Trinidad and Tobago.

36. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the group of socialist States of eastern Europe proposed the following candidates: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

37. Mr. KASSUM (Secretary of the Council) said that Indonesia was withdrawing its candidature.

38. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) said that the African States proposed the following candidates: Ghana, Mauritania, Sierra Leone, Uganda and United Republic of Tanzania.

39. The PRESIDENT pointed out that there were twenty-one candidates for the twenty-one seats to be filled. The candidates were the following: Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Denmark, France, Ghana, Guyana, India, Japan, Malta, Mauritania, Pakistan, Philippines, Sierra Leone, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania and United States of America. He suggested that

the Council should decide that those candidates were elected unanimously without a formal vote.

The following States were unanimously elected members of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (CPC): Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Denmark, France, Ghana, Guyana, India, Japan, Malta, Mauritania, Pakistan, Philippines, Sierra Leone, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania and United States of America.

40. The PRESIDENT announced that he would draw lots to determine the various terms of office of the members of CPC.

41. The term of office of the following members would expire on 31 December 1972: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Denmark, Guyana, Malta, Pakistan and United Kingdom.

42. The term of office of the following members would expire on 31 December 1971: Brazil, India, Japan, Philippines, Sierra Leone, Uganda and United Republic of Tanzania.

43. The term of office of the following members would expire on 31 December 1970: Argentina, France, Ghana, Mauritania, Trinidad and Tobago, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and United States of America.

ELECTION OF THE MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON CANDIDATURES FOR ELECTION TO MEMBERSHIP OF THE INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL BOARD

44. The PRESIDENT recalled that at its 1652nd meeting the Council had decided to establish a Committee on Candidatures for election to membership of the International Narcotics Control Board. After consultations, and in accordance with the task assigned to him, the President suggested that the following thirteen States should be elected members of that Committee: Brazil, France, Ghana, India, Italy, Japan, Pakistan, Tunisia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay and Yugoslavia.

The following States were unanimously elected members of the Committee on Candidatures for election to the International Narcotics Control Board: Brazil, France, Ghana, India, Italy, Japan, Pakistan, Tunisia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay and Yugoslavia.

The meeting rose at 4.20 p.m.