



ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Fifty-second Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Friday, 2 June 1972,
at 3.30 p.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Károly SZARKA (Hungary).

AGENDA ITEM 15

Consideration of the provisional agenda for the fifty-third session (*concluded*) (E/L.1488 and Corr.1, E/L.1494, E/L.1495 and Amend.1)

1. Mr. GOBBA (Observer for Egypt) recalled that the representative of Kenya had proposed at the preceding meeting that consideration of item 6 of the provisional agenda (E/L.1488 and Corr.1), concerning permanent sovereignty over natural resources of developing countries, should be deferred until the fifty-fourth session of the Council. He appealed to the representative of Kenya to withdraw that proposal since further consideration of that question was of vital importance to the many developing countries whose economies were dominated by foreign interests.

2. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) said that, while the proposal by the officers of the Council (1817th meeting) to shorten the agenda for the fifty-third session had received considerable support, a number of delegations felt strongly about particular items and were not able to accept that proposal in its entirety. His delegation, for example, shared the view expressed by the representative of Japan at the previous meeting that item 15 of the provisional agenda should not be postponed until the resumed fifty-third session, which would meet in October, since the Council's report on that item would then reach the General Assembly very late in its twenty-seventh session and might not be acted upon. As a way out of the present impasse, he suggested that the Council might begin its resumed fifty-third session a week or before the opening of the General Assembly's twenty-seventh session and devote two or three days to discussing item 15 and perhaps one or two other items to which delegations attached particular importance and urgency. After considering those items, the Council would adjourn until October, when it would meet as usual to complete its resumed session.

3. Mr. OLIVER (Deputy Secretary of the Council) said that he had consulted the Office of Conference Services regarding the possibility of beginning the resumed session of the Council before the next session of the General Assembly. He had been told that it would be possible to accommodate a small number of meetings either the week immediately before the opening of the General Assembly or the week before that.

4. Mr. OGISO (Japan) supported New Zealand's proposal for an early resumed session of the Council.

That proposal fully met his delegation's concern that the General Assembly should have before it the Council's report on item 15 early in its twenty-seventh session so that it could give careful consideration to the idea of establishing an international university.

5. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said it would be appropriate to close the debate on the item under consideration. The large number of proposals made by individual delegations in addition to the proposal by the officers of the Council had in no way simplified the Council's task, and further debate would serve little purpose. With particular regard to the proposal put forward by the representative of New Zealand, he noted that the idea of an early resumed session of the Economic and Social Council was entirely without precedent and expressed doubt that delegations would be prepared to attend such an early session and discuss item 15 immediately before the General Assembly's session. In the circumstances, it would be better to give precedence to the Bureau's proposal rather than to vote separately on the numerous amendments and other proposals before the Council. While rule 65 of the Council's rules of procedure required that amendments should be voted on first, rule 87 provided that any rule could be amended or suspended by the Council. He therefore proposed, in accordance with rule 87, that rule 65 should be suspended and that the Bureau's proposal should be voted on first.

6. Mr. FRAZÃO (Brazil) expressed support for the Tunisian proposal made at the preceding meeting to retain item 15 and envisage the possibility of deferring certain other items and said that he could not agree to the proposal just made by the representative of Greece if that would mean that the Tunisian proposal would not be put to the vote.

7. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) said that he had anticipated the present impasse in which the Council found itself facing a number of conflicting proposals. He therefore felt vindicated in the view he had consistently maintained that the Bureau's proposal should be voted on without any modification whatsoever. He wondered, however, whether the Bureau's proposal might be regarded as including the suggestion made by New Zealand and supported by Japan.

8. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) moved closure of the debate in accordance with rule 53 of the Council's rules of procedure and requested that his amendment should be put to the vote in accordance with rule 65.

9. The PRESIDENT said that if there was no delegation wishing to oppose the motion, the debate would be closed.

It was so decided.

10. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should proceed to a vote on the Bureau's proposal first, as had been suggested by the representative of Greece.

11. Mr. OGISO (Japan) recalled that his delegation had made a formal proposal that item 15 should be kept on the agenda. That proposal, as an amendment to the Bureau's original proposal, should be voted on first in accordance with rule 65 of the rules of procedure.

12. The PRESIDENT recalled that the representative of Greece had proposed that the Council should apply rule 87 in order to suspend rule 65 so that the Bureau's proposal could be voted on first.

13. Mr. ZAGORIN (United States of America) asked the President to clarify whether the Bureau's proposal included the suggestion made by the representative of New Zealand that an early resumed session should be held before the next session of the General Assembly and that the first order of business at that session would be item 15 of the provisional agenda.

14. The PRESIDENT said that the proposal referred to by the United States representative had been made by the representative of New Zealand and not by the Bureau.

15. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) welcomed the statement just made by the President and recalled that he had formally proposed suspension of rule 65 of the Council's rules of procedure. If certain delegations still insisted on special consideration for item 15 of the provisional agenda, he would ask for a separate vote on items 16 and 9 and would support the proposal made by the representative of Kenya to restore item 17 and delete item 6. In order to avoid a lengthy and controversial debate, he proposed that the Council should vote first on the Bureau's proposal, which did not include suggestions that specific items should be deferred until an early resumed session.

16. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) pointed out that the Greek proposal to suspend rule 65 was inadmissible under rule 89 of the Council's rules of procedure, which stipulated that: "A rule of procedure may be suspended by the Council provided that 24 hours notice of the proposal for the suspension has been given. The notice may be waived if no member objects." In the present case, the 24 hours' notice had not been given, and he would certainly object to waiving the notice. Accordingly, there was no impediment to the application of rule 65 of the rules of procedure, as he had originally requested.

17. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) reiterated that his delegation would vote for the Bureau's proposal and oppose any amendments to it. Nevertheless, he felt

that the Bureau's proposal would meet with greater acceptance among the members of the Council if it incorporated the idea of an early resumed session.

18. Miss LIM (Malaysia) agreed with the United Kingdom representative that the idea of an early resumed session was a very good one and that it would offer the Council a way out of its present difficulties.

19. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that, while the compromise solution favoured by the United Kingdom and Malaysian representatives was attractive, his delegation still had misgivings with regard to the idea of an early resumed session, which was unprecedented and might create unforeseen difficulties; he suggested that the Council's decision at the present stage should refer simply to the resumed session, omitting the word "early". The final decision as to the date of the resumed fifty-third session could be taken by the Council at its summer session.

20. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) expressed appreciation to all delegations which had supported the suggestion he had made at the beginning of the meeting. He did not agree with the representative of Greece that the Council should defer to the summer session its decision on the idea of an early resumed session. He felt that the Council should express itself in that regard without further delay.

21. The PRESIDENT recalled that the representative of Kenya had made a formal proposal at the preceding meeting and asked him whether he wished to maintain that proposal.

22. Mr. NDUNG'U (Kenya) said that his delegation would not insist on the proposal it had made if the Bureau's proposal was to be voted on first and adopted by consensus. If, however, any other proposal was put to the vote, his delegation would ask for a vote on its own proposal.

23. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) requested that the Council's decision should be taken by consensus, without a vote.

24. The PRESIDENT said that that was for the Council to decide.

25. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) said that if the Bureau could accept the proposal made by New Zealand, his delegation would have no objection to voting on the Bureau's proposal first. Otherwise, he would maintain his own proposal and request a separate vote on it.

26. Mr. FRAZÃO (Brazil) said that as the representative of Tunisia had agreed to withdraw his proposal on condition that the Bureau's proposal should be put to the vote first, there seemed to be no further impediment to an immediate decision on the Bureau's proposal.

27. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council approved the provisional agenda contained in document E/L.1488 and Corr.1, as amended in the course of the discussion — namely, by the postponement of items 5, 7, 9

(c), 11 (f), 17 and 18 to the fifty-fourth session, on the understanding that item 15 would be considered at meetings of the resumed fifty-third session to be held a few days before the opening of the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly.

It was so decided.

28. Recalling that the representative of the Netherlands had asked whether the new members of the sessional committees who were not members of the Council itself would have an opportunity to participate in the Council's work at its forthcoming session, the PRESIDENT stated that the practice followed at the current session would be applied at the next session as well.

29. Replying to a question raised by the observer for India at the preceding meeting, he said that the report of the working group on the question of the United Nations revolving fund for natural resources exploration could be discussed in connexion with item 11 (a) of the provisional agenda.

30. In conclusion he asked the Council whether it approved the establishment of an informal working group, as proposed by the United Kingdom, to consider rationalization of the Council's methods of work and structure. If he heard no objection, he would assume that the Council concurred with that proposal.

It was so decided.

31. The PRESIDENT said he would inform members in due course of the date and place of the first meeting of the working group.

32. In reply to a request made by the representative of Kenya for clarification, he explained that all the items proposed for deferment would be taken up at the fifty-fourth session, except for item 15, which had been deferred until the resumed fifty-third session.

33. Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he wished to record his reservation concerning the decision to convene a resumed session. He agreed with the representative of Greece that the Council was taking an unprecedented decision in convening a session immediately prior to the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly.

34. He also assumed that the convening of the session at such a time would not have additional financial implications and would not create a precedent.

35. Mr. ABHYANKAR (Observer for India) said his delegation was satisfied with the explanation given by the President regarding discussion of the revolving fund for natural resources exploration under item 11 (a) (United Nations Development Programme).

36. In connexion with the Council's decision to defer consideration of item 5 (Fiscal and financial matters) until the fifty-fourth session, he wished it to be placed on record that, given the importance of item 5 (b) (Transfer of operative technology at the enterprise level), his

delegation hoped that the Secretary-General's report for that session would be somewhat more exhaustive than the three-page summary which was to have been provided.

37. Mr. NDUNG'U (Kenya) said that, in a spirit of compromise, his delegation had accepted the President's suggestion regarding item 15, on an international university. However, in view of his delegation's formal proposal that item 17 (Tourism) be included in the agenda of the fifty-third session, he reserved the right to state his views on that question during the fifty-third session.

AGENDA ITEM 14

Elections (*concluded*)*

38. The PRESIDENT said that the Council had still to fill vacancies in the Statistical Commission, the Population Commission, the Commission for Social Development, the Committee on Natural Resources, the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination, the Committee on Science and Technology and the Committee on Review and Appraisal.

Statistical Commission

39. The PRESIDENT observed that there were two vacancies, namely, one for Asian States and one for Latin American States. One candidature had been put forward, namely, that of Uruguay.

Uruguay was elected by acclamation for a four-year term beginning 1 January 1973.

Population Commission

40. The PRESIDENT pointed out that there was one vacancy for Latin American States and one candidate, namely, Costa Rica.

Costa Rica was elected by acclamation for a four-year term beginning 1 January 1973.

Commission for Social Development

41. The PRESIDENT said that there was one vacancy for Latin American States and one candidate, namely, Colombia.

Colombia was elected by acclamation for a four-year term beginning 1 January 1973.

Committee for Programme and Co-ordination

42. The PRESIDENT noted that there was one vacancy for Latin American States, and one candidate, namely, Guyana.

Guyana was elected by acclamation for a three-year term beginning 1 January 1973.

Committee on Science and Technology

43. The PRESIDENT said that five members remained to be elected from African States, seven

* Resumed from the 1816th meeting.

members from Asian States, one member from Latin American States and three members from Western European and other States for a term of office of six months beginning 1 June 1972.

44. There was one candidate from Asian States, namely, Mongolia; one from Latin American States, namely, Haiti; and one from Western European and other States, namely, Spain.

Haiti, Mongolia and Spain were elected by acclamation for a six-month term of office beginning 1 June 1972.

Committee on Review and Appraisal

45. The PRESIDENT said that six members remained to be elected from African States, five members from Asian States, one member from Latin American States and two members from Western European and other States for a term of office ending 31 December 1973.

46. There was one candidate from Latin American States, namely, Honduras, and two candidates from Western European and other States, namely, Belgium and Greece.

Belgium, Greece and Honduras were elected by acclamation for a term of office ending 31 December 1973.

47. The PRESIDENT said that elections for the remaining vacancies would be held during the fifty-third session.

AGENDA ITEM 6

Transport development:

- (a) **Establishment of a United Nations transport economics and technology documentation centre;**
- (b) **United Nations/IMCO Conference on International Container Traffic: report of the Intergovernmental Preparatory Group**

REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC COMMITTEE (E/5173)

48. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the report of the Economic Committee on item 6 contained in document E/5173. In paragraph 9 of the report, the Committee recommended that the Council decide that further consideration of item 6 (b) of the Council's agenda be deferred to the fifty-third session of the Council. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council endorsed that recommendation.

It was so decided.

49. The PRESIDENT said that, with regard to item 6 (a), the Economic Committee took note, in paragraph 4 of its report, of the statement made by the representative of the Secretary-General on that question. In the absence

of any other proposal, he suggested that the Council decide that no further action was required on that question.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 4

Population

REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC COMMITTEE (E/5175)

Draft resolution contained in paragraph 38 of document E/5175

50. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the report of the Economic Committee on item 4 contained in document E/5175. In paragraph 38, the Committee recommended a draft resolution on population and development for adoption by the Council. The Committee had adopted the draft resolution by 33 votes to none, with 15 abstentions.

51. Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested a separate vote on paragraph 3 of section B of the draft resolution.

52. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) requested a separate vote on the words "with the financial assistance of the United Nations Fund for Population Activities" in paragraph 5 of section B.

A non-recorded vote was taken.

Paragraph 3 of section B was adopted by 13 votes to 6, with 5 abstentions.

The words "with the financial assistance of the United Nations Fund for Population Activities" in paragraph 5 of section B were retained by 16 votes to 5, with 5 abstentions.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 19 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

53. The PRESIDENT observed that in paragraphs 39, 40 and 41 of document E/5175, the Economic Committee recommended that the Council decide that the Population Commission should hold a short special session in mid-1972; that the Population Commission's seventeenth session be held at Geneva in November 1973; and that it take note of the report of the Population Commission on its sixteenth session. The decision contained in paragraph 39 to hold a short special session of the Population Commission in mid-1972 has been taken in the Committee by a vote of 17 to 9 with 19 abstentions. He called for a vote in the Council on the recommendation contained in paragraph 39.

A non-recorded vote was taken.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 39 was adopted by 10 votes to 6, with 9 abstentions.

54. The PRESIDENT noted further that the recommendation contained in paragraph 40 that the seventeenth session of the Population Commission should be held at Geneva in November 1973 had been taken by the Economic Committee by a vote of 26 to none, with 18 abstentions.

A non-recorded vote was taken.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 40 was adopted by 17 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 41 that the Council should take note of the report of the Population Commission on its sixteenth session was adopted without objection.

AGENDA ITEM 5

Natural resources

REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC COMMITTEE (E/5176)

55. The PRESIDENT said that, in response to a request by the representative of Italy, the Secretary of the Council would read out a statement on the financial implications of convening a panel of specialists in connexion with the proposed United Nations water conference (section E of the draft resolution contained in document E/5176).

56. Mr. OLIVER (Deputy Secretary of the Council), said that draft resolution E/AC.6/L.438/Rev.2 had been the subject of a written statement of financial implications (E/AC.6/L.438/Rev.1/Add.1) circulated to the Economic Committee. The financial implications of convening the panel had been given as \$6,025. That figure was composed of \$1,975, which was the cost of interpretation for one week, and something over \$4,000 for documentation.

57. The financial implications of the amendments contained in document E/AC.6/L.442/Rev.2 were somewhat higher, since the panel would meet for five weeks, greatly increasing the conference servicing, and 600 pages of documentation would be required, as compared with less than 100. Furthermore, it would be necessary to engage three consultants for three months, and to provide for the participation of representatives of the regional economic commissions in the work.

58. As to the financial implications of convening an international water conference in 1975, or shortly thereafter, he regretted that at the present stage there was not enough information available to give a meaningful estimate of costs. It would be necessary to know, for example, where and for how long the conference would meet, how many committees there would be in addition to the plenary, what volume of documentation would be needed in the preparatory stages, during the conference and after the conference (as published conference proceedings) and whether preparatory meetings would be

held. It would also be necessary to know the extent of public information activities in connexion with the conference.

59. Mr. CAVAGLIERI (Italy) thanked the Secretary of the Council for the information given, and said he appreciated that it was impossible for the time being to estimate the costs of the conference.

60. Mr. PRAGUE (France), thanking the Secretary of the Council for the information, said he was not surprised that it was impossible to state the specific financial implications of holding the conference. His delegation took the view that the decision to hold the conference was premature, and had been taken blindly, without any knowledge of what type of conference would be held and what it would deal with.

61. With regard to the other sections of the draft resolution before the Council, he wondered whether, since no mention had been made of financial implications, he was right in assuming that there would be none, particularly with regard to the study requested on permanent sovereignty over natural resources. He wished to have information on that question before a vote was taken.

62. Mr. SADDLER (Office of the Controller) said that the draft resolution before the Council had been very carefully considered and would not give rise to a request for additional resources, except as indicated in the papers before the Council. As to the study on permanent sovereignty, it was the intention of the Secretary-General to utilize the resources at his disposal to carry out the study to the best of his ability.

63. Mr. DUNN (United States of America) said that the Secretary of the Council had neglected to state the financial implications of the amendments contained in document E/AC.6/L.442/Rev.2, which amounted to some \$82,000. He requested confirmation from the representative of the Controller that the financial implications had been very carefully estimated.

64. His delegation strongly endorsed the Secretary-General's position on budgetary restraint, as stated in the note by the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Council (E/L.1490). However, in the Economic Committee, the Director of the Resources and Transport Division, in explaining the financial implications of the amendments (E/AC.6/L.442/Rev.2), had said that the reason why they were so high was that, because of financial restraint, it would be necessary to hire consultants, at a cost of \$82,000. He objected to using the policy of financial restraint as an excuse for attaching high costs to government proposals. As the representative of France had pointed out, the Secretary-General was able to absorb costs in connexion with the complicated and voluminous study on permanent sovereignty, but was unable to do so when a proposal did not meet his desires.

65. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) said that the stated position on financial implications was thoroughly unsatisfactory. In the vote in the Economic Committee

his delegation had abstained on draft resolution E/AC.6/L.438/Rev.2 as a whole largely because it had been unable to accept either the need for what section D provided for, or the explanation of financial implications of sections D and E.

66. While he readily understood that the Secretariat had been unable at the time to estimate the full cost of the proposed conference, it was wrong to take a decision on a conference which had not been adequately studied and would cost so much money, while at the same time inflating the cost of studies proposed in an amendment, all of which and more would be needed if any water conference were to be held and to be of use.

67. He was also worried, however, about the financial implications of section D. The Committee on Natural Resources had been told at its second session that the study requested in paragraph 1 of section D of the draft resolution could be carried out without financial implications. Yet no one had explained then or since how that very extensive and largely unnecessary study could be carried out without diverting the Secretariat from other work on development, which was more important.

68. His delegation was therefore seriously considering whether it should vote against the draft resolution.

69. Mr. SADDLER (Office of the Controller) said that, according to the oral statement made by the Secretary in the Committee on Natural Resources, the figure of \$82,000 was based on certain assumptions: it was based on the substantive evaluation of a Secretariat unit in terms of what was required to implement the amendments contained in document E/AC.6/L.442/Rev.2. A comparison of the terms of that document with draft resolution E/AC.6/L.438/Rev.2 indicated that there were one or two sizable differences in the basis on which the estimates had been prepared. In the case of document E/AC.6/L.442/Rev.2, the implication was that the request should be carried out in full co-operation with the specialized agencies and the regional economic commissions. That would give rise to travel costs incurred by representatives of the regional commissions participating in the panel, unless the Council felt it desirable for them to participate by correspondence, in which case no cost would be incurred.

70. Similarly, the estimate of the number of pages of documents was different in each case. In the case of the amendments (E/AC.6/L.442/Rev.2), 600 pages had been estimated, although it was difficult for the Controller to say how much documentation was required in a substantive study.

71. The Secretary-General was not asking at that stage for the financial resources to carry out the work; he was merely providing an estimate of the resources required if the Council should decide that the work was needed.

72. In the case of the draft resolution (E/AC.6/L.438/Rev.2), a considerably smaller number of pages of documentation would be required. On the other hand, the Director of the Resources and Transport

Division had stated that he was unable from within his resources — in view of his work programme, which involved a very sizable operational programme — to carry out work without additional consultants, at a cost of \$22,500.

73. As to the proposed study on permanent sovereignty, he said that the work would engage a Secretariat unit other than the Resources and Transport Division. What was certain was that, if the volume of work required was to be carried out from within the resources available to the Secretary-General, time must be taken from other work.

74. Mr. FRAZÃO (Brazil) said he strongly rejected the assumption underlying the inflated financial implications of the amendments contained in document E/AC.6/L.442/Rev.2, of which his delegation was a sponsor.

75. According to the representative of the Controller, part of the high costs could be attributed to the co-operation of the regional economic commissions and the specialized agencies with the proposed panel of specialists. Yet the amendments did not specify how that co-operation should take place. Obviously, if it was carried out by correspondence, travel costs would not be incurred. The case of documentation was similar: although it was difficult to estimate the number of pages required, the highest possible figure seemed to have been chosen.

76. Thus, the figures for the financial implications, given by the Secretariat at the last minute, had been intentionally put at the highest possible level for the purpose of influencing the Economic Committee's decision with regard to the amendments.

77. Mr. BARNEA (Director, Resources and Transport Division) said that the version of the draft resolution submitted by the Brazilian and other delegations had been much more ambitious, and had involved the use of greater time and resources than the version finally recommended by the Economic Committee. The amendments of those delegations (E/AC.6/L.442/Rev.2) had called for full co-operation not only with specialized agencies but also with the regional economic commissions concerned. Co-operation with the regional economic commissions by mail presumably would not have been very practicable, and the estimates given had been for more direct contacts. Secondly, the Brazilian amendment had called for a review of all international water activities, the broadest review ever attempted. The report proposed in that amendment would have involved more preparatory work than the Water Resources Section, with its present staff, could have handled. It had been felt that three consultants would have been required to assist the intergovernmental panel of experts because of the large volume of work involved. In the draft resolution finally recommended by the Economic Committee, on the other hand, the panel was required only to prepare a precise draft agenda and organizational proposals for the water conference.

78. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) said he felt that a study of international water activities should be made, but he doubted the wisdom of convening an intergovernmental panel to carry it out. The study should instead be made by the Secretariat, with the assistance of consultants. He did not intend to reopen the debate on the question, but wished to request a separate vote on section E of the draft resolution.

79. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the various sections of the draft resolution contained in paragraph 43 of the report of the Economic Committee (E/5176).

80. He noted that the representative of Tunisia had requested a separate vote on paragraph 2 of section A of the draft resolution.

A non-recorded vote was taken.

Section A, paragraph 2, was adopted by 25 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

81. The PRESIDENT observed that the representative of France had requested a separate vote on section D.

A non-recorded vote was taken.

Section D was adopted by 22 votes to 4, with 1 abstention.

82. The PRESIDENT recalled that the representative of Greece had requested a separate vote on the third preambular paragraph of section E.

A non-recorded vote was taken.

The third preambular paragraph of section E was adopted by 16 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.

83. The PRESIDENT recalled further that the representative of Tunisia had requested a separate vote on section E as a whole.

A non-recorded vote was taken.

Section E as a whole was adopted by 12 votes to 5, with 8 abstentions.

84. The PRESIDENT noted that the USSR representative had requested a separate vote on section F.

A non-recorded vote was taken.

Section F was adopted by 22 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

A non-recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution as a whole.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 22 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

85. The PRESIDENT noted that the Economic Committee had recommended in paragraph 44 of its report that the Economic and Social Council take note of the

report of the Committee on Natural Resources on its second session. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council approved that recommendation.

It was so decided.

86. Mr. DENOT MEDEIROS (Brazil) noted that his delegation had abstained in the voting on the draft resolution just adopted. As he had stated in the Economic Committee, where his delegation had been forced to take the same stand, that abstention must not be interpreted as reflecting any lack of interest in natural resources development, which everyone agreed was the vital issue for all developing countries without exception.

87. It had abstained, first, because it believed that the final text of the resolution was unbalanced. It placed undue emphasis on water resources, as compared to the other two main areas of international co-operation in natural resources, mineral and energy resources. It thereby condoned a trend which had been apparent during the first two sessions of the Committee on Natural Resources, a trend which was at variance with the more diversified approach to natural resources problems advocated by his delegation and other members of that Committee.

88. More important, section E of the resolution contained recommendations which prejudged and distorted the results of consultations that would have in any case to be held among interested Governments concerning the United Nations water conference, if the conference was to succeed or even take place at all. His delegation regretted very much that the Economic Committee had not found it possible to adopt the more cautious and technical approach embodied in the amendments submitted by the delegations of France, New Zealand, the United States and the United Kingdom and his own delegation (E/AC.6/L.442/Rev.2). Those amendments had sought to rephrase section E while at the same time leaving room for all possibilities, including that of convening the conference.

89. His delegation deeply regretted that those proposals had been discussed in a climate of artificially induced polarization which would surely harm all future work in the area unless preconceived attitudes could be replaced by understanding and compromise. Brazil had always favoured, and would continue to favour, the furtherance of international co-operation in the development of water and all other resources, provided that all avenues of understanding were kept open and provided that the Council and other competent organs began seeking real agreements and solutions acceptable to all. Haste would only complicate further what was already a highly complex and sensitive issue to some countries and groups of countries. The resolution, by attempting to impose supposedly global solutions, such as the United Nations water conference as presently conceived, on problems that primarily concerned regional affairs, would do a disservice to international co-operation in the field of natural resources and might dangerously harm the efforts currently under way in more appropriate regional organs.

90. The second set of reasons which had prevented his delegation from supporting the resolution had to do with his Government's dissatisfaction with the behaviour of the Director of the Resources and Transport Division with regard to the Council's work on agenda item 5. His Government considered that the Director's stand on natural resources items in the Council and related organs could be interpreted as not in conformity with Article 100, paragraph 1, of the Charter, which stated that the Secretary-General and the staff "shall refrain from any action which might reflect on their position as international officials responsible only to the Organization". That was how grave the situation had become. The last-minute presentation by the Secretariat in the Economic Committee of what his delegation considered to be inflated financial implications of the amendments proposed by Brazil and other delegations constituted yet another in a chain of regrettable events which clearly indicated that the Director's actions were biased against the positions taken by Governments in the course of discharging their sovereign rights as Members of the United Nations. The Director's stand was not compatible with his capacity as an international official under the terms of the Charter. His delegation was not asking for any explanation whatsoever, since it was certain that the unexplainable could not be explained. It would not bring up the matter again at the present session, but wished to put on record its strongest protest and its amazement, indignation and shock at the Director's attitude. It wished to share its deep concern with other delegations before the Brazilian Government, together with like-minded Governments, considered what measures could be taken in the future to remedy the present deplorable state of affairs.

AGENDA ITEM 13

Report of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination

REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC COMMITTEE (E/5177)

91. The PRESIDENT drew the Council's attention to the report of the Economic Committee (E/5177) on the item. In paragraph 3 of that report, the Committee recommended that the Council should take note of the report of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination on its eleventh session (E/5159), and should decide to choose the reports of the World Health Organization and the World Meteorological Organization for in-depth examination at its fifty-third session. Unless he heard any objection, he would assume that the Council endorsed that recommendation.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 11

Science and technology:

- (a) Terms of reference of the Committee on Science and Technology;
- (b) World Plan of Action;
- (c) Question of United Nations sponsorship of the Protein Advisory Group

REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC COMMITTEE (E/5178)

92. The PRESIDENT drew the Council's attention to the report of the Economic Committee in document E/5178.

93. Mr. OLIVER (Deputy Secretary of the Council) pointed out that in the French text of draft resolution I, paragraph 1 (b) (E/5178, para. 22) the words "*De renvoyer à l'automne 1972*" should be replaced by words corresponding to the English text of the same paragraph, which simply said "To postpone".

94. Mr. GROS (France) said he wished, without reopening the inconclusive debate that had been held on the Economic Committee, to point out some mistakes in the report.

95. In the French text of paragraph 1 (b) of the draft resolution referred to in paragraph 6, the word "*permettre*" should be replaced by "*permettre*".

96. His delegation had observed earlier (1814th meeting, para. 18) that there had been very serious printing errors in the French version of the *World Plan of Action for the Application of Science and Technology to Development*¹ which had completely distorted the presentation of the Plan. In particular, the end of Part One (chapter V) and the introduction to Part Two had been grouped together as a single chapter. He therefore wished to propose that the following words should be added at the end of paragraph 15 of the report of the Economic Committee: "and to serious printing errors in the French text of the document". In that connexion, although his delegation had initially insisted that those responsible for the errors appear before the Council, he had since been approached by representatives of those services and was satisfied with their offer to explain the reasons for the errors in writing.

97. In the French text of draft resolution I, paragraph 1 (b), he proposed that the paragraph should begin with the words: "*De renvoyer à une date ultérieure. . .*".

98. His delegation regretted that the Economic Committee had not been able to reach a decision on several essential matters, thereby causing considerable delay in intergovernmental action to promote the application of science and technology to development. Apparently, the Committee on Science and Technology would be unable to hold its first session until February 1973. He felt that in view of the special nature of that Committee, it should not hold a session which dealt only with procedural matters and involved no substantive work. Procedural matters could be disposed of by the Council before the session.

99. The PRESIDENT assured the French representative that the Secretariat would take steps to correct the errors he had pointed out. He hoped there would be no similar occurrences in the future.

¹ United Nations publication, Sales No.: E.71.II.A.18.

100. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) proposed that in paragraph 1 (b) of the draft resolution referred to in paragraph 6, the words "the autumn" should be replaced by the words "the fourth quarter". "Autumn" was too imprecise a word, and would obviously be inapplicable if the session was held in the Southern Hemisphere.

101. He did not see how it was possible to postpone the first session of the Committee indefinitely without indicating at least an approximate date.

102. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand), speaking in explanation of his delegation's vote on the draft resolution before the Council, said that although his delegation intended to agree to defer consideration of the terms of reference of the Committee and consequently to postpone the Committee's first session, it felt that it was little short of a disservice to the Council to take that action in view of the limited time available. The remaining differences on the subject were largely semantic and could be ironed out with a little more time. His delegation was prepared to support broader terms of reference for the Committee. In any case, every effort should be made to avoid a stalemate, as the outcome of the discussion would have a bearing on the Council's prestige.

103. Mr. GROS (France) said that in the circumstances, it was inevitable that the first session of the Committee on Science and Technology would be postponed indefinitely. Moreover, the Committee had no terms of reference as yet and members should not seek to prejudge the work of the Council at its fifty-third session.

104. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) said that he had not suggested that the actual date for the session of the Committee should be decided, but at least that a time-limit should be fixed. The Committee had been established in July 1971 and had to meet at least once during 1972. The Council had to adopt terms of reference for the Committee at its fifty-third session. The question could not be deferred indefinitely. The fourth quarter was three months long, and during the General Assembly, technical experts were available who could take part in the Committee's first session. At all costs, the Committee should meet in 1972.

105. Mr. GROS (France) did not think it was advisable for the General Assembly and the Committee on Science and Technology to meet concurrently, since the latter would require a calm atmosphere for its work. Furthermore, it was unlikely that meeting space would be available in New York. Accordingly, if a session was held during the fourth quarter, it would have to take place in Geneva. In that respect, he wished to state in advance that he would accept whatever financial implications were involved. However, with regard to the Tunisian proposal, he would add a note of caution: the Committee should hold its first session during the fourth quarter, provided that the Council had adopted its terms of reference at the fifty-third session. The text which the Council was about to adopt should be legally sound and had to take such requirements into account. It should therefore expressly state that condition, which his delegation considered implicit in the proposal.

106. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation shared the concern expressed by the representative of Tunisia. The Council had already taken decisions concerning the establishment of the Committee and its composition. He therefore agreed that it should begin its work as soon as possible. In that connexion, he drew attention to paragraph 7 of the report of the Economic Committee (E/5178), which reproduced an amendment proposed by his delegation and designed to replace paragraph 1 (b) of the draft resolution. Unfortunately, the proposal had not received the support it deserved. The proposal provided an alternative to deferring the first session of the Committee on Science and Technology: at its first session (19-30 June 1972) the Committee would be instructed to consider the question of its terms of reference and to communicate its views on the question to the Economic and Social Council at the fifty-third session so that they might be taken into consideration by the Council when finally formulating the terms of reference of the Committee. His delegation considered that it was the most reasonable approach in view of the opinions expressed by members in the Council. The Committee's opinion concerning its terms of reference would be most important and would enable the Council to come to a rapid decision at its fifty-third session. On the other hand, his delegation could not agree to convening the Committee during the fourth quarter of the year, when the General Assembly would be in session, or deferring the Committee's session until 1973, particularly in view of the importance of the Committee's work. The Soviet proposal would enable the Committee to meet on schedule and submit its views to the Council at its fifty-third session.

107. Mr. FIGUEROA (Chile) reminded the representative of Tunisia that the Economic Committee had held an exhaustive debate on the terms of reference of the Committee on Science and Technology and the timing of its first session. The results of that debate were reflected in paragraph 10 of E/5178. As the representative of Tunisia was aware, a separate vote had been taken on the part of paragraph 1 (b) which concerned him. By a large margin, the Committee had agreed to delete a certain portion of the original text. He therefore appealed to him not to insist on his proposal, which would only reopen the debate.

108. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) recalled that in the Economic Committee he had stressed that the Committee on Science and Technology could not be convened in June in the absence of a decision by the Council concerning its terms of reference. The fourth quarter would then be all that was left of 1972. However, he was prepared to withdraw his proposal, and would revert to the matter at the fifty-third session when the calendar of conferences was discussed, for it was absolutely essential that a decision should be taken.

109. Mr. FLEMING (Observer for Argentina) said that his delegation had regretted the decision adopted by the Economic Committee and wished to associate itself with the remarks made by the representative of Tunisia. It had wanted the Economic and Social Council to take a final decision on the terms of reference of the important Committee on Science and Technology at its fifty-second

session, but after considerable discussion, it had realized that it would not be possible for the Council to do so since there had not been enough time to work out terms of reference acceptable to all members. In the absence of a substantive agreement concerning the terms of reference, it had been constrained to agree to postpone the first session of the Committee.

110. The Council could not postpone a decision concerning the terms of reference of the Committee after the fifty-third session. The question whether the first session of the Committee should be organizational or substantive was largely one of semantics. Organization was, however, extremely important, and he did not think it was possible for an organ to become substantively active immediately following its establishment. In addition, the task of the Committee on Science and Technology was more complicated than that, for example, of the Committee on Review and Appraisal, which, after disposing of standard items such as the opening of the session, the election of officers, etc., could proceed to more substantive work. In the case of the Committee on Science and Technology, consideration would have to be given to its relationship with the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development and to the priority to be accorded to the items on its agenda in the light of its terms of reference. In conclusion, he trusted that a final decision on the terms of reference of the Committee on Science and Technology would be taken at the fifty-third session of the Economic and Social Council.

111. Mr. DENOT MEDEIROS (Brazil) thanked the representative of Tunisia for having withdrawn his proposal. Like the representative of Tunisia, he trusted that the Council would take a decision on the date of the first session of the Committee on Science and Technology in conjunction with the more substantive question of its terms of reference and with the question of the calendar of conferences, which was to be on its agenda for the summer session.

112. It was his understanding that the representative of the Soviet Union had referred to the Soviet proposal to explain his position, but had not intended to reintroduce it to the Council at that stage. If that was the case, he suggested that the Council could adopt draft resolution I by consensus.

113. Mr. GROS (France) considered that the Council had exhausted the discussion. His first statement had been directed merely to questions of form. He suggested that the debate should be closed.

114. Mr. ABHYANKAR (Observer for India) said he was dismayed that the Council had not been able to reach an agreement concerning the Committee on Science and Technology at its fifty-second session and hoped that it would do so at its fifty-third. He feared, however, that further postponement was not unlikely and considered that such postponement might gravely prejudice certain vital questions connected with the Second United Nations Development Decade.

115. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the draft resolutions contained in paragraph 22 of the report of the Economic Committee (E/5178).

116. He recalled that the Economic Committee had adopted draft resolution I concerning the terms of reference of the Committee on Science and Technology by 42 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

A non-recorded vote was taken.

Draft resolution I was adopted unanimously.

117. The PRESIDENT announced that the Economic Committee had adopted draft resolution II on the question of United Nations sponsorship of the Protein Advisory Group by 39 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions.

A non-recorded vote was taken.

Draft resolution II was adopted by 24 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

118. The PRESIDENT said that paragraph 23 contained the recommendation that the Council should decide to resume its consideration of the World Plan of Action for the Application of Science and Technology to Development at its fifty-third session, and request the Committee on Science and Technology to consider that question at its first substantive session.

119. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) said that the procedure outlined in paragraph 23 was dependent on a decision having been taken concerning the Committee on Science and Technology. He did not see how the Council could approve the recommendation contained in paragraph 23 now that it had decided to defer discussion of the terms of reference of the Committee on Science and Technology to the fifty-third session of the Council and to postpone the Committee's first session. Since the terms of reference of the Committee on Science and Technology were not known, it was not possible to request it to consider the World Plan of Action. He requested that a vote be taken on the recommendation contained in paragraph 23.

A non-recorded vote was taken.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 23 was adopted by 23 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

AGENDA ITEM 7

Statistics

REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC COMMITTEE (E/5180)

120. The PRESIDENT noted that, in paragraph 3 of its report (E/5180), the Economic Committee had recommended that the Council should take note of the report of the Secretary-General on technical assistance programmes of the United Nations system.

The recommendation contained in paragraph 3 was adopted.

AGENDA ITEM 8

Human rights questions:

- (a) Report of the Commission on the Status of Women;
- (b) Report of the Commission on Human Rights;
- (c) Allegations regarding infringements of trade union rights

PART I OF THE REPORT OF THE SOCIAL COMMITTEE (E/5169 (part I))

121. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the report of the Social Committee on agenda item 8, which the Committee had drafted in three parts (E/5169, parts I, II and III). Part I dealt with subitem (a), part II with subitem (b), and part III with subitem (c). Draft resolutions I to XIII which had been approved by the Committee and recommended for adoption to the Council in connexion with item 8 (a) were contained in paragraph 34 of document E/5169 (part I).

122. He called for a vote on the draft resolution, noting that the Social Committee had adopted it unanimously.

Draft resolution I was adopted unanimously.

123. Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution, subject to the reservations which it had expressed in the Social Committee and in the Commission on the Status of Women.

124. The PRESIDENT observed that draft resolution II had been adopted in the Social Committee by 39 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

A non-recorded vote was taken.

Draft resolution II was adopted by 22 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

125. The PRESIDENT said that draft resolution III had been adopted unanimously by the Social Committee.

Draft resolution III was adopted unanimously.

126. The PRESIDENT said that the Social Committee had adopted draft resolution IV by 36 votes to none, with 6 abstentions. The representative of France had requested a separate vote on paragraph 2 (a) of the draft resolution and he would accordingly put it to the vote.

A non-recorded vote was taken.

Paragraph 2 (a) of draft resolution IV was adopted by 18 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

127. The PRESIDENT recalled that the representative of Brazil had requested a separate vote on paragraph 2 (b) (ii) of draft resolution IV and accordingly put it to the vote.

A non-recorded vote was taken.

Paragraph 2 (b) (ii) was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 12 abstentions.

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

128. Miss JAUREGUIBERRY (Observer for Argentina) said that in the Social Committee her delegation had voted for draft resolution IV and pointed out that the general principles set forth in paragraph 2 had already been incorporated in Argentine law. She regretted, however, that the specific principle stated in paragraph 2 (b) (ii) had been included without defining its scope. Her delegation understood that the recommendation contained in that paragraph was not directed at those countries which, like Argentina, followed the system of *jus soli*, whereby everyone born in the territory of Argentina was considered an Argentine citizen irrespective of the nationality or civil status of the parents. She requested that her statement should be reflected in the summary record and in the report of the Economic and Social Council on its fifty-second session.

129. The PRESIDENT said that draft resolution V had been adopted unanimously by the Social Committee.

Draft resolution V was adopted unanimously.

130. The PRESIDENT said that the Social Committee had adopted draft resolution VI by 39 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

A non-recorded vote was taken.

Draft resolution VI was adopted by 23 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

131. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) said his delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution.

132. The PRESIDENT said that draft resolution VII had been adopted in the Social Committee by 36 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

A non-recorded vote was taken.

Draft resolution VII was adopted by 19 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

133. The PRESIDENT said that draft resolutions VIII to XI had been adopted unanimously by the Social Committee.

Draft resolutions VIII to XI were adopted unanimously.

134. The PRESIDENT said that the Social Committee had adopted draft resolution XII by 40 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

A non-recorded vote was taken.

Draft resolution XII was adopted by 24 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

135. The PRESIDENT said that draft resolution XIII had been adopted by consensus in the Social Committee.

Draft resolution XIII was adopted unanimously.

PART II OF THE REPORT OF THE SOCIAL COMMITTEE (E/5169 (part II))

136. The PRESIDENT drew attention to part II of the report of the Social Committee, in paragraph 27 of which the Committee had recommended a number of draft resolutions and recommendations for adoption by the Council.

137. Mr. SABIK (Poland) said his delegation wished to comment particularly on paragraphs 2, 4 and 12 of draft resolutions V, VI and VII respectively.

138. At an earlier meeting, the representative of the United Kingdom had stressed, in connexion with the rationalization and improvement of the methods of work of the Council, the need to avoid proliferation of organs and to reduce the volume of documentation. His delegation shared that view, and believed moreover that concrete steps to remedy the situation should be taken at the present session. It therefore regretted that the resolutions contained provisions which tended in the opposite direction.

139. Paragraph 12 of draft resolution VII referred to the possibility of the establishment of some form of permanent machinery to give advice on the elimination of slavery, but at the present stage delegations had no idea what form such machinery should take, or even whether it was necessary. Since the draft resolution had not been studied fully in the Social Committee, the matter should be given more detailed attention in the Commission on Human Rights; accordingly, his delegation requested a separate vote on paragraph 12.

140. Paragraph 2 of draft resolution V provided for a special session of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Periodic Reports of the Commission on Human Rights. As his delegation had stated in the Social Committee, it considered such a session to be unnecessary, since the *Ad Hoc* Committee could perfectly well discharge the tasks required of it by the draft resolution at its regular session in 1973. Again, his delegation wished to request a separate vote on the paragraph in question.

141. Paragraph 4 of draft resolution VI authorized the Commission on Human Rights to extend its session in 1973 to six weeks. That was also unnecessary; the concern generally felt at the delay in considering the reports of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities was adequately expressed by paragraph 3 of the draft resolution.

142. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) said that although the question of slavery had not been discussed as fully as some delegations might have liked in the Social Committee, paragraph 12 of draft resolution VII did not prejudge the issue of machinery. It merely asked for an examination of the possibility of establishing some form of permanent machinery to give advice on the elimination of slavery. That request was not prejudicial.

143. The representative of Poland's objection to extending the session of the Commission on Human Rights (draft resolution VI, para. 4) was well taken in the

context for the need of greater efficiency in the work of the Council and its subsidiary organs. Nevertheless, greater efficiency implied not only a saving of time, but greater thoroughness. The situation with regard to the reports of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities was a special one, in that a backlog had arisen which must be dealt with. The aim of the proposal in paragraph 4 of draft resolution VI was to remedy that situation in the hope that a similar backlog would then not recur. The proposed extension was exceptional and not intended to be any precedent.

144. Mr. SABIK (Poland) said that the Social Committee had not conducted a full discussion of draft resolution VII, and that the sponsors of that resolution had not answered all the questions concerning it which had been put before the vote. Moreover, the Council's usual procedure was that questions of substance should be fully discussed by the appropriate subsidiary organ before a decision was taken.

145. Mr. STILLMAN (United States of America) requested a separate vote on the words "in accordance with Council resolution 1165 (XLI) to hold in 1973 a six-week session in order to enable the Commission" in paragraph 4 of draft resolution VI.

146. Mr. SEKYIAMAH (Ghana) said his delegation supported draft resolution VI as a whole, and particularly endorsed the provisions of paragraph 4, which would go a long way towards resolving the difficulties facing the Commission on Human Rights. Certainly the Council should guard against the proliferation of organs and against excessively long sessions, but it would not be a waste of resources if the Commission were enabled to solve some of the problems confronting it.

147. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) said that the Social Committee had held detailed discussions on the reports of the Commission on the Status of Women and the Commission on Human Rights. The work of those Commissions was extremely important, and must be carried out expeditiously and reported to the Council as concisely as possible. The Social Committee's session had been particularly useful in that, in addition to acting on the recommendations put forward by the Commissions, it had also given attention to ways in which they might improve their work. The United Nations was currently concentrating on improving its efficiency. The Council must therefore keep a close eye on the need for streamlining its own activities and those of its subsidiary organs. It must ensure that the work of its functional commissions was carried out efficiently, and they in turn would benefit from constructive guidance regarding the orientation of their work.

148. The Commission on the Status of Women was carrying out a particularly important task at a time when the emphasis on ensuring equality for women was increasing. His delegation had supported 11 of the 12 substantive draft resolutions the Commission had submitted to the Council. Its support for the draft resolution on the status of the unmarried mother had been based on the view that the principles it contained represented a

goal towards which all countries should aspire, rather than a set of standards to which present legislation and practice were expected to conform. Nevertheless, New Zealand law and practice already conformed in large measures to those principles. His delegation had supported the draft resolution requesting the Council to proclaim 1975 as International Women's Year; nevertheless, it had shared some of the doubts expressed concerning the proliferation of international years, and had accordingly supported the Netherlands amendment, which would have transformed the proposed year into an international week for the status of women. However, that amendment had not been adopted. His delegation's one abstention, on the draft resolution concerning the protection of women and children in emergency and armed conflict, had been motivated by doubts about certain portions of the text and about the usefulness of adopting the text at the present stage; and by its belief that the continuing work of the International Committee of the Red Cross on the development of international humanitarian law offered the best prospect for progress on the subject.

149. It seemed clear from the debates in the Social Committee on the report of the Commission on the Status of Women that in future a smaller number of resolutions from that Commission would be preferred. The twenty-fourth session had been the Commission's first biennial session, and work had accumulated; however, by linking or grouping recommendations on similar topics, the Commission should in future be able to reduce the total number of draft resolutions it submitted to the Council.

150. The Commission on Human Rights, on the other hand, might be reproached for submitting too few draft resolutions. His delegation was fully aware of the complexities of that Commission's agenda, but nevertheless believed that at its twenty-eighth session it had apportioned its time inefficiently, with the result that it had dealt with only half the items on its agenda in the course of five weeks. The problem with the Commission's agenda had been widely acknowledged in the Social Committee, but views had differed as to the remedy for that situation and the way in which it should be administered. His delegation believed that the highlight of the Social Committee's session had been the successful co-operative effort put into the drafting of an appropriate resolution on the subject. It had supported the revised draft resolution submitted by Ghana and the Netherlands on the understanding that the holding of a six-week session in 1973 was a special measure to enable the Commission to take up outstanding questions postponed by its twenty-eighth and earlier sessions. In adopting such a resolution, the Council would be discharging its proper functions in a responsible and constructive manner.

151. Mr. BUDAI (Hungary) associated his delegation with the comments and proposals made by the representative of Poland with regard to draft resolutions V, VI and VII in paragraph 27 of document E/5169 (part II). A special session of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Periodic Reports, referred to in draft resolution V, was unnecessary, as was the extension of the session of the

Commission on Human Rights authorized in draft resolution VI. In general, his delegation believed that draft resolution to be unusual in the detailed nature of its procedural recommendations. In any case, an extension of the Commission's session would not solve the problems with which it was confronted. Draft resolution VII was also excessively detailed, and the rather obscure reference to "permanent machinery" was in his delegation's view a matter which could be more appropriately discussed in the Commission on Human Rights or one of its subsidiary organs.

152. Mr. VALTASAARI (Finland) said his delegation would abstain in the vote on draft resolution III because his Government had been unable for constitutional reasons to support two of the resolutions referred to in the preamble. However, it had already fulfilled its obligations under paragraph 1 of the draft resolution. His delegation's support for draft resolution IV should be understood in the light of the comments it had made in the Social Committee.

153. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) said that the reference in paragraph 6 of draft resolution I to the possible observance of an international year for eradication of poverty seemed to his delegation entirely inappropriate.

154. The United Nations system had embarked on the Second Development Decade, and the eradication of poverty must be its daily duty. The trend towards the proclamation of international years on more and more subjects was simply a way of avoiding the need to take action on problems. Certainly, the eradication of poverty should be given greater attention, but there was no need to await a decision by the Commission on Human Rights in favour of an international year on the subject. Accordingly, his delegation requested a separate vote on the words "including . . . poverty" in paragraph 6.

155. Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) endorsed the comments and proposals made by the representatives of Poland and Hungary. In the light of the Council's recent discussion of ways of improving its efficiency, immediate measures to remedy the present situation appeared necessary. Self-discipline should be exercised in introducing proposals which would lead to the establishment of new organs, the lengthening of sessions or the holding of additional sessions. There was no need to establish new organs if the functions envisaged for them could be discharged by existing organs, or to hold longer sessions if the tasks envisaged for them could perfectly well be performed by sessions of normal duration. There was no need to convene a special session of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Periodic Reports of the Commission on Human Rights at additional cost to the United Nations regular budget, since that Committee could discharge its functions adequately at its regular session. His delegation could not accept the provisions of draft resolution VI detailing working procedures for the Commission on Human Rights; such provisions were contrary to normal practice, since all United Nations organs were masters of their own procedure. His delegation also could not agree that the session of the Commission should be lengthened, at additional cost to the regular budget of the United Nations. The Social

Committee had not fully discussed draft resolution VII, and no answers had been given to certain questions relating to the nature of the permanent machinery proposed in paragraph 12. The proliferation of organs was undesirable not only in principle, but also because of the additional cost involved, and was particularly unacceptable when the tasks the new organ would perform could perfectly well be carried out by existing organs. Moreover, a procedure whereby the Council by passed the Commission on Human Rights and gave instructions directly to the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities was unacceptable to his delegation.

156. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that the draft resolutions recommended by the Social Committee could scarcely be lauded for brevity. They contained a great deal of verbiage and, in the case of draft resolution VII, something which could be regarded as an entirely new feature. He shared the regret expressed at the untimely death of the Special Rapporteur, but felt that sentiments expressed in the fourth and fifth preambular paragraphs were out of place in the preamble to a draft resolution. In addition, the more the Council debated the draft resolutions, the greater its temptation to add superfluities to the texts.

157. He endorsed the views of the USSR representative regarding the establishment of new bodies and joined the Polish delegation in requesting a separate vote on paragraph 12 of draft resolution VII.

158. Mr. MAHMASSANI (Lebanon) observed that, unlike the Economic Committee, the Social Committee did not hold sessions at Geneva, and that was one of the reasons why it tended to adopt lengthy draft resolutions. It was his hope that the members of the Council would be as brief as possible in explaining their votes, for the matters contained in the drafts had been discussed at length in the Social Committee.

159. Mr. DENOT MEDEIROS (Brazil) said that he fully supported the comments of the representative of Tunisia with regard to paragraph 6 of draft resolution I. The eradication of poverty depended on a complex set of variables and it should be considered in a much wider context than that of the Commission on Human Rights. Consequently, his delegation would abstain in the separate vote on that paragraph requested by the representative of Tunisia.

160. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom), referring to the remarks of the USSR representative, observed that paragraph 12 of draft resolution VII did not in effect establish a new body. It simply directed the Sub-Commission to examine the possibility of the establishment of some form of permanent machinery. The Sub-Commission would make recommendations to the Commission on Human Rights, which would subsequently be referred to the Council. Similarly, the USSR representative had stated that the adoption of paragraph 2 of draft resolution V would lead to considerable expenditure. His own delegation had supported the paragraph precisely because the Secretariat had stated that a special

session of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Periodic Reports in New York in January 1973 would entail minimal expense.

161. Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) replied that, as he recalled, no document setting out the financial implications of convening a special session of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Periodic Reports of the Commission on Human Rights in January 1973 had been submitted. As to paragraph 12 of draft resolution VII, no one in the United Nations could fail to be aware that a proposal to study the setting up of a new organ ultimately led to the establishment of that body. He hoped that the United Kingdom representative would change his position and support the views of the representatives of Poland and Hungary.

162. Mr. SCHREIBER (Director, Division of Human Rights) drew the attention of the members of the Council to document E/AC.7/L.618/Add.1 and Corr.1, which set out the administrative and financial implications of a draft resolution which had subsequently been amended in the Social Committee and was now before the Council as draft resolution V. The document indicated that, if it was possible to schedule the meetings of the *Ad Hoc* Committee either in the period from 8-16 January 1973 or from 11-19 January 1973, no additional costs would be incurred, since it was believed that they could be included in the regular conference schedule. Consequently, they would be covered by the regular budget, as would, in all likelihood, the issuance of a report.

163. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the draft resolutions relating to the report of the Commission on Human Rights and the recommendations of the Social Committee (E/5169 (part II)).

164. He said that the Social Committee had adopted the text of draft resolution I by consensus. He put to the vote the words "including the feasibility of the observance at an appropriate time of an international year for eradication of poverty", in paragraph 6, upon which a separate vote had been requested earlier by the representative of Tunisia.

A non-recorded vote was taken.

The words "including the feasibility of the observance at an appropriate time of an international year for eradication of poverty", in paragraph 6, were retained by 10 votes to 4, with 12 abstentions.

Draft resolution I as a whole was adopted by 25 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

165. The PRESIDENT said that the Social Committee had adopted the text of draft resolution II by 41 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

A non-recorded vote was taken.

Draft resolution II was adopted by 23 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

166. The PRESIDENT said that the Social Committee had adopted the text of draft resolution III by 23 votes to none, with 22 abstentions.

A non-recorded vote was taken.

Draft resolution III was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 13 abstentions.

167. The PRESIDENT said that the Social Committee had adopted the text of draft resolution IV by consensus. If he heard no contrary view, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt it without objection.

Draft resolution IV was adopted without objection.

168. The PRESIDENT said that the Social Committee had adopted the text of draft resolution V by 32 votes to 5, with 3 abstentions. He put to the vote the words "at a special session to be held in New York from 8 to 16 January or 11 to 19 January 1973", in paragraph 2, upon which a separate vote had been requested earlier by the representative of Poland.

A non-recorded vote was taken.

The words "at a special session to be held in New York from 8 to 16 January or 11 to 19 January 1973", in paragraph 2, were retained by 15 votes to 4, with 7 abstentions.

Draft resolution V as a whole was adopted by 21 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions.

169. The PRESIDENT said that the Social Committee had adopted the text of draft resolution VI by 39 votes to 4, with 3 abstentions. He put to the vote the words "in accordance with Council resolution 1165 (XLI) to hold in 1973 a six-week session in order to enable the Commission", in paragraph 4, upon which a separate vote had been requested earlier by the representative of the United States.

At the request of the representative of Ghana, a recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Bolivia, Chile, Finland, Ghana, Kenya, Madagascar, New Zealand, Niger, Peru, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Against: Brazil, Greece, Hungary, Poland, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America.

Abstaining: Burundi, France, Haiti, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Malaysia, Tunisia, Zaire.

The words "in accordance with Council resolution 1165 (XLI) to hold in 1973 a six-week session in order to enable the Commission", in paragraph 4, were retained by 10 votes to 6, with 9 abstentions.

A non-recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution as a whole.

Draft resolution VI as a whole was adopted by 22 votes to 3, with 1 abstention.

170. The PRESIDENT said that the Social Committee had adopted the text of draft resolution VII by 39 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions. He put to the vote paragraph 12, upon which a separate vote had been requested earlier by the representatives of Poland and Greece.

A non-recorded vote was taken.

Paragraph 12 was adopted by 20 votes to 4, with 2 abstentions.

Draft resolution VII as a whole was adopted by 23 votes to 3.

171. The PRESIDENT said that the Social Committee had adopted the text of draft resolution VIII by 36 votes to none, with 13 abstentions.

A non-recorded vote was taken.

Draft resolution VIII was adopted by 18 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.

172. The PRESIDENT said that the Social Committee had adopted the text of draft resolution IX by 27 votes to 7, with 10 abstentions.

A non-recorded vote was taken.

Draft resolution IX was adopted by 19 votes to 3, with 4 abstentions.

173. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt recommendations (a), (b) and (c) of the Social Committee, as set out in document E/5169 (part II).

It was so decided.

PART III OF THE REPORT OF THE SOCIAL COMMITTEE (E/5169 (part III))

174. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt the recommendation of the Social Committee contained in document E/5169 (part II).

It was so decided.

Other matters

175. The PRESIDENT suggested that, having concluded its consideration of item 8, the Council should take note of the note by the Secretary-General on the financial implications of the recommendations of the commissions and committees of the Council (E/5157) and also of the report of the President and Vice-Presidents on the credentials of representatives to the fifty-second session of the Council and to sessional committees of the Council (E/5179).

It was so decided.

Closure of the session

176. The PRESIDENT expressed his satisfaction at the completion of the Council's fifty-second session in accordance with its original schedule. The enlarged sessional committees, which had met for the first time, had also dealt with all essential questions and, in his view, the experiment had been a useful one. He was pleased to report that the officers of the Council had maintained close contact with one another throughout the session and that a true spirit of co-operation and mutual respect had prevailed at all of their meetings.

177. In addition, he expressed the hope that the problems outlined by Ambassador Frazão in his account

of the work of the Economic Committee could be overcome at Geneva at the next session. Similarly, it was to be hoped that the proposals of the United Kingdom delegation regarding the improvement and rationalization of the work of the Council would make it possible to move ahead more efficiently. The activities of the informal working group were extremely complex and he could do no less than pledge his fullest co-operation at all times.

178. He declared the fifty-second session of the Economic and Social Council closed.

The meeting rose at 7.30 p.m.