



ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

FIFTY-FIRST SESSION

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Wednesday, 28 July 1971

at 10.45 a.m.

PALAIS DES NATIONS, GENEVA

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 17:	
Measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council (<i>continued</i>)	187

President: Mr. DRISS (Tunisia)

AGENDA ITEM 17

Measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council (*continued*)* (E/4986 and Add.1-9, E/L.1382, E/L.1408/Rev.2, E/L.1422, E/L.1431, E/L.1435, E/L.1451, E/L.1458)

1. The PRESIDENT announced that the amendments in documents E/L.1421 and E/L.1423 to draft resolution E/L.1408/Rev.2 had been withdrawn.

2. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) proposed, on behalf of his own delegation and those of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the United States of America, Ghana, Haiti, Indonesia, Italy, Jamaica, Kenya, Lebanon, Madagascar, Malaysia, Niger, Norway and Tunisia, that the Council should examine together the three items inscribed in the programme for the day, namely agenda items 17, 10(b) (Future institutional arrangements for science and technology) and 3(a) (System of over-all appraisal of progress in implementing the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade). All those items concerned the organization of the Council and its subsidiary bodies, their structure and the organization of their work.

3. He drew the Council's attention to draft resolution E/L.1451, sponsored by the above-mentioned delegations, which dealt with those three items.

4. Mr. NESTERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked what was the real reason behind the move to alter the agenda.

5. Mr. MOJSOV (Yugoslavia) said that he too would like further information on the reasons behind the proposal. He urged the President to recall the decision taken by the Council when it had adopted the agenda for the session. Item 3(a) was not mentioned in the programme for the fourth week appearing in document E/L.1426, and he wondered why it was now being brought up.

* Resumed from the 1784th meeting.

6. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that it seemed inappropriate to examine those three items together before the Council had received the report of the Economic Committee on item 3(a). He was rather surprised by the new proposal, which in fact seemed somewhat in the nature of a *diktat*.

7. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that the Council should make practical arrangements for considering, either directly in plenary or through committees, all the draft resolutions referred to it. Many delegations considered that certain agenda items were linked and it might be advisable for the changes which were to affect the Economic and Social Council to be considered together. Seen from that angle, the Sudanese proposal seemed to be a practical move designed to enable the President to organize the work on a rational basis.

8. Such a combination should not, however, affect certain draft resolutions with which his delegation was connected and which it would like to see adopted. If the proposal was accepted, his delegation would state which were the draft resolutions on which, in its view, a vote should be taken before the end of the session.

9. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) said that the sole purpose of his proposal was to simplify the Council's work. Moreover, it should not cause any surprise, since the Greek draft resolution (E/L.1458) also dealt simultaneously with the same three items.

10. He pointed out to the representatives of Yugoslavia and Greece that rule 17 of the rules of procedure authorized the Council to amend its agenda. The fact that the Economic Committee's report on item 3(a) had not yet been circulated did not constitute an obstacle, since the Council could always consider in plenary a question being discussed in one of its committees.

11. Mr. FRAZÃO (Brazil), replying to the French representative, pointed out that the effect of the proposed procedure would be to avoid taking a vote on some of the texts submitted to the Council, including document E/L.1431 and other amendments to the draft resolution by Greece and New Zealand (E/L.1408/Rev.2), as also on certain draft resolutions transmitted by the Economic Committee. It would be a distortion of the procedure normally followed.

12. Mr. MOJSOV (Yugoslavia) read out rule 17 of the rules of procedure. That rule made no provision for the merging of several agenda items and it authorized the addition to the agenda of only urgent and important items.

13. Mr. CHAMMAS (Lebanon) rejected the assertion that a *diktat* was being imposed on the Council. The only

question was whether or not the Sudanese proposal was acceptable. The golden rule was that the agenda was intended to simplify the work of the Council, not to complicate it. With regard to the Yugoslav representative's comments, the last sentence of rule 17 related only to the addition of new items; the Sudanese proposal was not for the addition of a new item to the agenda but for the simultaneous consideration of three closely connected items.

14. It was astonishing that the Greek representative, who had himself presented a draft resolution dealing with those three items together, should criticize a proposal made for the very purpose of combining them.

15. If, during the discussion, the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1451 could be persuaded that the procedure they were proposing was not appropriate, they would not press for its application. That, however, was most unlikely.

16. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) said that the procedure proposed by the Sudan might not be the only one possible but it was certainly the best.

17. Mr. KITCHEN (United States of America) supported the statements of the Sudanese, French and Lebanese representatives and thanked the United Kingdom representative for his comment. The issue had already been raised at the fiftieth session, when Greece and New Zealand had submitted a draft resolution and recommendations which combined questions relating to science and technology and the review and appraisal of the objectives and policies of the International Development Strategy. At that time his own and other delegations had indicated their intention to call for a vote on the matter, and Yugoslavia and Brazil had stated that if those questions could be considered together it would make for a more methodical consideration of them at the summer session.

18. His delegation wished to affirm that it had never been the intention of the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1451 to prevent the consideration of other draft resolutions connected with those items. It thought that the Council would be able to accomplish its work more easily if it considered the draft resolution in question first, and after that the other documents before it.

19. Mr. AMERASINGHE (Ceylon) said that he could not subscribe to the view expressed by the Sudanese and United Kingdom representatives to the effect that the proposed procedure was the only one possible or the best that could be devised. The combination of those items would indeed be contrary to rule 17 of the rules of procedure and a distortion of the agenda. He was not convinced that the review and appraisal of the objectives and policies of the Development Strategy were necessarily linked with questions relating to the organization of the Council's work.

20. At present, under the pretext of reorganizing the Economic and Social Council, an attempt was being made to ensure that it was the Council, and not the General Assembly, which took the initiative in determining how that appraisal should be carried out. That was, and should remain, a question within the competence of the General

Assembly. There was great danger of creating an irregular situation if the Economic and Social Council set up a committee for that purpose and if the General Assembly decided to take other steps for the review and appraisal of the objectives and policies of the Strategy.

21. His delegation therefore appealed to the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1451 to agree that those items should be considered separately.

22. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) suggested that the most practical method would be to consider all the three items together – not as a whole, but simultaneously; their combination was in no way a violation of rule 17 of the rules of procedure.

23. With regard to the Greek representative's statement, the Economic Committee's report on item 3 (a) (E/5059) had just been circulated. His own country's position was similar to that of France. As one of the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1408/Rev.2, which dealt with item 17 only, he hoped that the simultaneous consideration of the three combined items would not prevent the Council from considering that draft resolution at a suitable time.

24. Mr. CHTOUROU (Tunisia) associated himself with the representatives of Sudan and Lebanon, who had proposed the simultaneous consideration of agenda items 17, 10 (b) and 3 (a). The proposal violated none of the rules of procedure, for the Council was free to decide on the procedure to be followed in studying the items on its agenda.

25. A decision should first be taken on the Sudanese proposal and then it should be decided what documents were to be considered. Such a procedure, which in no way prejudged any decisions that the Council might take regarding the draft resolutions, would be perfectly in order.

26. Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya) said that many of the arguments put forward went beyond questions of procedure. The proposal of the Sudanese representative was not, in fact, contrary to the Council's rules of procedure. By associating itself with the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1451, his delegation had in no way wished to impose a *diktat* upon the Council. His delegation had joined the sponsors of many other draft resolutions. He saw no reason why draft resolution E/L.1451 and all the draft resolutions dealing with the questions covered in parts A, B, and C of that draft resolution should not be considered together if necessary.

27. Mr. FRAZÃO (Brazil), replying to the representative of the United States, declared that the Brazilian delegation had never agreed to the "package deal" principle. He would give further explanations on that point later on.

28. Mr. NESTERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he was well aware, as was anyone with any experience of conferences, that procedure was not the only issue in the Council's present discussion and that the proposal made by the delegations of fifteen countries was not as harmless as it looked. In fact, it was designed to gain

acceptance of the "package deal" advocated by certain delegations, including that of the United States, on which the Council had been unable to reach agreement. It was impossible to accept such an important proposal, involving a far-reaching re-organization of the Council, without holding prior consultations with a view to arriving at a common position. The Council would be well advised to exercise caution and to defer its consideration of the matter to a later date, so that it could give it further study and if necessary take a decision based on careful consideration.

29. Instead, it was proposed that the agenda should be changed. That was contrary to rule 17 of the Council's rules of procedure. Logic had been mentioned, but there were different ideas on that subject. He saw no logic in amalgamating the items; the effect would be to broaden the scope of the discussion and to complicate the Council's work still further. Moreover, such a procedure would prejudice the consideration of the draft resolutions and was designed to gain acceptance of the "package deal" principle. He was therefore unable to accept the arguments of the United States representative and he appealed to the sponsors of the proposal to take the views of other delegations into account and not to impose upon them a procedure differing from that already approved by the Council. In any case, under rule 50 of the rules of procedure, a motion to adjourn the debate on an item had to be given priority.

30. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) said that he had no intention of taking sides in the discussion and considered that it lay with the Council to take the decision it considered appropriate.

31. There were, however, two elements in the Sudanese proposal: there was firstly the question of considering the three agenda items together, and secondly that of giving draft resolution E/L.1451 priority over the other draft resolutions dealing with the same matters.

32. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) said that he could not accept the comments made by certain delegations questioning the intentions of the sponsors of the proposal. It was true that the proposal was prompted by considerations which had nothing to do with procedure. Its object was to simplify the work of the Council and to overcome the difficulties by reconciling the various points of view. The sponsors were not trying to impose their opinion on other delegations and the fact that their proposal had met with the agreement of the majority of the members of the Council could not be held against them. He therefore asked that the proposal should be put to the vote.

33. Mr. CHAMMAS (Lebanon) regretted that some delegations had taken the discussion beyond the question of procedure and were determined to link the Sudanese proposal with draft resolution E/L.1451. It was not a question of changing the items on the agenda or renumbering them but merely of considering three items together. That was contrary neither to the rules of procedure nor to the established practice in United Nations bodies, in which agenda items were often taken together to speed up work.

The Council should therefore keep to the procedural aspect, which in no way prejudged any later decisions on substance. At the present stage, it would be premature to take any position on draft resolution E/L.1451.

34. Draft resolution E/L.1451, of which his delegation was a sponsor and which was designed to link the improvement of the organization of the Council's work with an increase in the number of its members, had been widely supported among the members of the Council, although two quite different matters were involved. In addition, an amendment (E/L.1459) to the draft resolution had been submitted and should be considered, in view of its importance to the International Development Strategy. It would, however, be impossible to discuss it without taking into account the substantive question.

35. His delegation had already stated its belief that the Council could not dissociate the question of the organization of its work from all the related problems, such as the increase in the number of Council members, the Council's role in the application of science and technology to development and the possible establishment of a committee on that matter, and that General Assembly resolution 2626 (XXV) on the International Development Strategy could not be put into effect without the Council reviewing and appraising the progress accomplished. He quoted operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution I transmitted to the Council by the Economic Committee (E/5059, para. 6) and said that if the intergovernmental bodies of the specialized agencies could be requested to consider procedures for review and appraisal of the Strategy, there was even more reason for the Council to do so; that was the aim of parts A and B of draft resolution E/L.1451.

36. In view of the requirements of the International Development Strategy and the urgent necessity of implementing it, he hoped that the members of the Council would decide to examine together all the draft resolutions concerning items 17, 10 (b) and 3 (a) of the agenda.

37. Mr. ANTOINE (Haiti) said that, although his delegation was one of the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1451, it had not been consulted concerning the Sudanese procedural proposal designed to facilitate the work of the Council.

38. He pointed out that the President had full authority to direct the discussion, i.e. to decide whether the Council had sufficient information to take a decision at that stage.

39. Mr. GROS ESPIELL (Uruguay) said that he did not propose to explain why, in his view, it would be a mistake to consider agenda items 17, 10 (b) and 3 (a) within a single draft resolution. He would deal only with the procedural question.

40. He agreed with the Yugoslav representative that to consider three separate agenda items within a single draft resolution would be contrary to rule 17 of the rules of procedure, which, in an obviously exhaustive list, mentioned only four cases in which the Council would be justified in revising its agenda. That rule did not authorize the Council to amalgamate several items of its agenda. The

Council could not disregard its rules of procedure, which legally restricted its freedom of action. If it did, it would be violating rules 87 to 89. If, in order to keep within the law the Council wished to suspend rule 17, it would have to apply rule 89 of the rules of procedure.

41. Mr. PATAKI (Hungary) noted that the Lebanese representative did not consider that the Council was simply debating a question of procedure. Whether or not that interpretation by the Lebanese delegation was correct, the fact was that normally the items on the agenda were discussed in sessional committees or in plenary, and only at the end of its discussion did the Council take what decision it deemed best. In its report on item 3 (a) of the agenda, the Economic Committee stated clearly that the Sudanese representative, on a point of order and on behalf of fourteen other countries, had moved the adjournment of the Committee's discussion on that item (E/5059, para. 5). It therefore seemed that there had been a desire to avoid discussing the matter. The Sudanese representative had given no explanation on the subject when he had proposed that items 17, 10 (b) and 3 (a) should be considered together.

42. The very terms of those three items, which together constituted the title of draft resolution E/L.1451, was enough to show that the draft resolution was of very broad scope. There was nothing, however, in the preamble or the operative paragraphs of that long draft resolution to explain why it had been found necessary to link the three items. Until his delegation had heard the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1451 give a valid explanation of why it would be useful to examine the three items together, it would maintain its reservations on the procedure proposed and on the reasons of substance behind that procedural proposal. His delegation thought that the Council should hold a proper discussion in plenary before deciding on each of the items on its agenda.

43. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that he was not at all convinced that the Sudanese procedural motion could help the Council to complete its work more rapidly; although the issue seemed to be one of procedure, it was the substance of the matter upon which the members of the Council disagreed. He therefore appealed to the Sudanese representative not to press his motion, which was one of procedure in name only. It would be more reasonable to take items 17, 10 (b) and 3 (a) separately, in the order in which they appeared in the programme for 28 July 1971. If the aim was really to enhance the prestige of the Council, the question of an increase in its membership should be given mature consideration.

44. Mr. RAZAFINDRABE (Madagascar) said that it was in full knowledge of the facts and after careful thought that his delegation had joined the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1451 and he welcomed the fact that fifteen delegations representing developed and developing countries had been able to bring their positions into harmony.

45. Other international organizations, such as EEC, gladly availed themselves of the "package deal" technique to settle problems that were still outstanding towards the end of a

session. He therefore supported the Sudanese procedural motion and the reasons that had prompted it; it was essential that the Council should come to a decision and not postpone the fundamental question dealt with in draft resolution E/L.1451 to a later session.

46. Mr. ASANTE (Ghana) said that he did not understand why the Sudanese procedural motion was giving rise to so many difficulties, since the procedure proposed was obviously the most practical; in addition it was no novelty, for the Council had already had occasion to follow such a procedure at earlier sessions.

47. He saw no reason to reopen a debate which was over and done with. At the present stage of its work, the Council should examine the substance of the amendments submitted and take a decision by vote as soon as possible.

48. Mr. MOJSOV (Yugoslavia) said that he was not sure how the Sudanese procedural motion should be interpreted if it was put to a vote. Some representatives said that the three items on the agenda would be considered jointly, others said that they would be considered together or considered simultaneously.

49. Mr. ARIFF (Malaysia) said that the Sudanese representative had been right to submit his procedural motion; if he had not, the Malaysian delegation would have done so. Items 17, 10 (b) and 3 (a) of the agenda of the Council were closely linked in content and even overlapped. The sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1451 were not in any way prejudicing the consideration of any of the other draft resolutions that had been submitted but it was important that the Council should take a decision at its fifty-first session on draft resolution E/L.1451, which was the product of considerable efforts.

50. Mr. NESTERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he felt the same uncertainty as the Yugoslav representative about the interpretation which should be given to the Sudanese motion, since some of the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1451 maintained that it was a purely procedural motion while others had no hesitation in saying that it concerned substance.

51. The important point was that the Council was unlikely to be able to overcome any difficulties by following the procedure advocated by Sudan and the other sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1451. He wondered whether delegations would be expected to state their opinions on all the proposals submitted concerning the three items on the agenda in one single statement or whether they would speak several times, in a certain order, and, if so, what that order would be.

52. Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya) said that the Council should confine itself to the simple procedural motion submitted by the Sudanese representative, which should be put to the vote forthwith.

53. Mr. NESTERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking on a point of order, said that if the Sudanese

motion was put to the vote the Council should know beforehand exactly what it comprised.

54. Mr. WIELAND ALZAMORA (Peru) said that he agreed with those who considered that it would be contrary to the provisions of rule 17 of the rules of procedure to combine items 17, 10 (b) and 3 (a) of the agenda. He was convinced that the Council would obtain much more positive results if it considered each of those items separately.

55. Mr. FRAZÃO (Brazil) said that he understood from the comments of the Malaysian representative that a decision on the procedural motion would not prejudice consideration of the other draft resolutions, including the amendment in document E/L.1431 and the draft resolution submitted by the Economic Committee on item 3 (a) (E/5059, para. 6).

56. He preferred to take a philosophical view of the issue, for it was not only one of procedure but also one of form which would lead to decisions on the substance of the matter.

57. Mr. CHAMMAS (Lebanon) pointed out to the Brazilian representative that part A of draft resolution E/L.1451, except for the last phrase of operative paragraph 3, faithfully reproduced the wording proposed in the amendment in document E/L.1431. Consequently, if part A was adopted, there would be no need to put that amendment to the vote, since it would already have been the subject of a vote.

58. Mr. AMERASINGHE (Ceylon) said that he would like the sponsors of the procedural motion to specify whether they wanted agenda items 17, 10 (b) and 3 (a) to be considered together and whether the usual procedure whereby draft resolutions were considered in the order in which they were submitted was to be abandoned.

59. Mr. NESTERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he too thought that the Council would be unable to find a way out of its impasse unless it knew how the sponsors of the procedural motion interpreted it.

60. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) said that the Council had before it a procedural motion to the effect that it should consider items 17, 10 (b) and 3 (a) together and that it should give priority to the consideration of draft resolution E/L.1451.

61. Mr. AMERASINGHE (Ceylon) pointed out that those were two separate proposals calling for two separate votes.

62. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) said that he thought that the Ceylonese representative's comment was relevant and that separate votes should be taken on the two proposals.

63. Mr. NESTERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) objected that the procedural motion under consider-

ation infringed rule 66 of the rules of procedure and that it was necessary above all to respect those rules.

64. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that he had no objection to items 17, 10 (b) and 3 (a) being considered together.

65. As far as draft resolution E/L.1451 was concerned, it seemed to him difficult to request the Council to give priority to a draft resolution which had not yet been introduced. On the other hand, the Council had before it other important and interesting draft resolutions which were not directly subordinated to that draft resolution; he would like to know in what order the Council would consider them.

66. As far as pure and simple procedure was concerned, he was ready to support any proposal provided that it did not prevent the various draft resolutions which had been submitted to the Council being considered and put to the vote.

67. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) read out rule 66 of the rules of procedure governing the decision of the Council whether or not to give priority to the consideration of draft resolution E/L.1451. The draft resolution was an official document of Council. It was not compulsory to introduce it, and in the present case it was not necessary to do so.

68. The PRESIDENT read out rule 66 of the rules of procedure once again, laying particular stress on the second paragraph of that rule. He pointed out that any decision on the question of priority concerned the substantive proposals.

69. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that he thought that the object of the procedural motion was to prevent a vote on the Greek draft resolution (E/L.1458) and he would like to know whether the Sudanese representative was speaking on behalf of all the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1451.

70. He considered, furthermore, that draft resolution E/L.1451 should be introduced to the Council before being put to the vote, and he would like to be able to introduce draft resolution E/L.1458 too. For that reason he moved the adjournment of the meeting in accordance with rule 54 of the rules of procedure.

71. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) acknowledged that draft resolution E/L.1458 took precedence over draft resolution E/L.1451. He was, however, opposed to the adjournment of the meeting.

72. The PRESIDENT, in accordance with rule 54 of the rules of procedure, put the Greek representative's motion for adjournment to the vote.

The motion was rejected by 18 votes to 9.

73. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the proposal that the Council should consider items 17, 10 (b) and 3 (a) together.

The proposal was adopted by 18 votes to 8, with 1 abstention.

74. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the proposal that the Council should consider draft resolution E/L.1451 as a matter of priority.

The proposal was adopted by 16 votes to 9, with 2 abstentions.

75. Mr. CHTOUROU (Tunisia) said that his delegation had voted for the twin proposals of the fifteen countries because it considered that that was the best way of ensuring

progress. He hoped, however, that the Council would consider the Greek draft resolution, in pursuance of paragraph 2 of rule 66 of the rules of procedure.

76. Mr. PATAKI (Hungary) said that his delegation had voted against the procedural motion because it did not solve the problem and only complicated the situation.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.