



**ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL**  
**OFFICIAL RECORDS**

**FIFTIETH SESSION**

**Volume I**

**E/SR.1733 - 1737**

**ORGANIZATIONAL MEETINGS**

**11-13 January 1971**

**UNITED NATIONS**

**New York, 1971**

### INTRODUCTORY NOTE

The *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council* consist of the summary records of the plenary meetings (incorporating corrections requested by delegations and any necessary editorial modifications), annexes and supplements.

The complete list of delegations and the check list of documents of the fiftieth session are contained in volume II of the Official Records.

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>		<i>Page</i>
<b>Organizational meetings of the fiftieth session . . . . .</b>	iv	<b>AGENDA ITEM 6:</b>	
		Actions arising out of decisions of the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth session . . . . .	9
<b>1733rd (opening) meeting</b>		<b>AGENDA ITEM 7:</b>	
<i>Monday, 11 January 1971, at 3.40 p.m.</i>		Basic programme of work of the Council in 1971 and consideration of the provisional agenda for the fiftieth session . . . . .	10
OPENING OF THE SESSION . . . . .	1	<b>STATEMENT BY THE UNDER-SECRETARY-GENERAL FOR ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL AFFAIRS . . . . .</b>	<b>14</b>
AGENDA ITEM 1:			
Election of the President and Vice-Presidents for 1971 . . . . .	1	<b>1736th meeting</b>	
AGENDA ITEM 2:		<i>Wednesday, 13 January 1971, at 10.55 a.m.</i>	
Adoption of the agenda . . . . .	1	<b>AGENDA ITEM 5:</b>	
ORGANIZATION OF WORK . . . . .	2	Measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council ( <i>continued</i> ) . . . . .	17
<b>1734th meeting</b>		<b>1737th meeting</b>	
<i>Tuesday, 12 January 1971, at 10.55 a.m.</i>		<i>Wednesday, 13 January 1971, at 3.20 p.m.</i>	
ORGANIZATION OF WORK . . . . .	3	<b>AGENDA ITEM 4:</b>	
AGENDA ITEM 5:		Confirmation of members of functional commissions of the Council . . . . .	21
Measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council . . . . .	3	<b>AGENDA ITEM 3:</b>	
<b>1735th meeting</b>		Elections . . . . .	21
<i>Tuesday, 12 January 1971, at 3.25 p.m.</i>		<b>AGENDA ITEM 5:</b>	
AGENDA ITEM 5:		Measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council ( <i>concluded</i> ) . . . . .	21
Measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council ( <i>continued</i> ) . . . . .	7		

**AGENDA FOR THE ORGANIZATIONAL MEETINGS OF THE FIFTIETH SESSION  
OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL**

**adopted by the Council at its 1733rd meeting, on 11 January 1971**

1. Election of the President and Vice-Presidents for 1971
2. Adoption of the agenda
3. Elections
4. Confirmation of members of functional commissions of the Council
5. Measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council
6. Actions arising out of decisions of the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth session
7. Basic programme of work of the Council in 1971 and consideration of the provisional agenda for the fiftieth session



**ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL**

Monday, 11 January 1971,  
at 3.40 p.m.

**Fiftieth Session**  
**OFFICIAL RECORDS**

NEW YORK

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

*President:* Mr. R. DRISS (Tunisia).

*Opening of the session*

1. The ACTING PRESIDENT declared open the fiftieth session of the Economic and Social Council and drew attention to the provisional agenda for organizational meetings of the session (E/4937).

**AGENDA ITEM 1**

**Election of the President and Vice-Presidents for 1971**

2. The ACTING PRESIDENT recalled that, pursuant to rule 20 of the rules of procedure, as amended by Council resolution 1193 (XLI) of 20 December 1966, the Economic and Social Council should elect a President and three Vice-Presidents for 1971. The Vice-Presidents should be elected on the basis of equitable geographical distribution from the regional groups other than the one to which the President belonged.

3. The Presidency for 1971 fell to the African group. There were two candidates: Mr. R. M. Akwei (Ghana) and Mr. R. Driss (Tunisia). In accordance with rule 67 of the rules of procedure, the election would be decided by secret ballot.

*At the request of the Acting President, Mr. de Azevedo Brito (Brazil) and Mr. Arvesen (Norway) acted as tellers.*

*A vote was taken by secret ballot.*

<i>Number of ballot papers:</i>	27
<i>Invalid ballots:</i>	0
<i>Number of valid ballots:</i>	27
<i>Abstentions:</i>	1
<i>Number of members voting:</i>	26
<i>Required majority:</i>	14

<i>Number of votes obtained:</i>	
Mr. R. Driss (Tunisia) . . . . .	16
Mr. R. M. Akwei (Ghana) . . . . .	10

*Having obtained the required majority, Mr. Driss (Tunisia) was elected President of the Economic and Social Council for 1971.*

*Mr. Driss took the Chair.*

4. The PRESIDENT, after having thanked the members of the Council for the confidence they had shown in him and

having paid a tribute to his predecessor, invited the Council to proceed to the election of its Vice-Presidents.

5. Mr. LEGNANI (Uruguay) nominated Mr. J. A. de Araújo Castro (Brazil) for one of the posts of Vice-President.

6. Mr. KARIM (Pakistan), Mr. HEDEMANN (Norway) and Mr. ANTOINE (Haiti) seconded the nomination.

*Mr. de Araújo Castro (Brazil) was elected Vice-President by acclamation.*

7. Mr. KOMATINA (Yugoslavia) nominated Mr. K. Szarka (Hungary) for the second post of Vice-President.

8. Mr. FAKHREDDINE (Sudan) and Mr. FRANZI (Italy) seconded the nomination.

*Mr. Szarka (Hungary) was elected Vice-President by acclamation.*

9. Mr. FRANZI (Italy) nominated Mr. C. Caranicas (Greece) for the third post of Vice-President.

10. Mr. MARAMIS (Indonesia) and Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon) seconded the nomination.

*Mr. Caranicas (Greece) was elected Vice-President by acclamation.*

11. The PRESIDENT said that, in accordance with rule 20 of the rules of procedure, each of the Vice-Presidents should serve as Chairman of one of the sessional Committees and the Council, upon the recommendation of the President, should decide over which sessional Committee each Vice-President should preside.

12. He proposed to hold consultations on the matter with the officers of the Council and hoped to submit his recommendations to the Council before the closure of the organizational meetings.

**AGENDA ITEM 2**

**Adoption of the agenda (E/4937)**

13. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to take up consideration of item 2 of the provisional agenda for the organizational meetings of the session (E/4937). If he heard no objections, he would take it that the Council decided to adopt the agenda.

*The agenda was adopted.*

---

*Organization of work*

14. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should first take up item 5 at its next meeting, and items 6, 7, 3 and 4.

15. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council agreed to his suggestions.

*It was so decided.*

16. Mr. VIAUD (France) asked whether it might not be possible to indicate more precisely when each question would come up for discussion, in order to facilitate the work of the members of the Council.

17. The PRESIDENT said that he would hold consultations with the officers of the Council and submit a suggestion on the matter at the beginning of the next meeting.

*The meeting rose at 4.40 p.m.*



## ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Fiftieth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Tuesday, 12 January 1971,  
at 10.55 a.m.

NEW YORK

*President:* Mr. R. DRISS (Tunisia).

*Organization of work*

1. The PRESIDENT, referring to rule 20 of the rules of procedure of the Economic and Social Council, said that as a result of the informal consultations he had mentioned at the previous meeting, it had been decided that Mr. K. Szarka (Hungary) would serve as Chairman of the Social Committee, Mr. J. A. de Araújo Castro (Brazil) as Chairman of the Co-ordination Committee and Mr. C. Caranicas (Greece) as Chairman of the Economic Committee.

2. Referring to a question raised by the French representative at the previous meeting, he suggested that the agenda items should be considered in the following order: 5, 6, 7, 4 and 3.

*It was so decided.*

**AGENDA ITEM 5**

**Measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council (E/L.1369)**

3. Mr. MARAMIS (Indonesia), President of the Council in 1970, introducing his note of 31 December 1970 on measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council (E/L.1369), thanked all delegations, particularly those which were not members of the Council, which had participated in the informal discussions. There had seemed to be agreement among the participants in those discussions that the role of the Council should be reaffirmed and its methods of work improved to enable it to discharge more effectively the functions conferred upon it by the Charter. It had also been noted that those functions would assume added importance in the discharge of the responsibilities the General Assembly might wish to entrust to the Council for the review and appraisal of the objectives and policies of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade (General Assembly resolution 2626 (XXV)). A great many suggestions had been made for improving the organization of the Council's work and there had seemed to be agreement that a distinction should be made between suggestions relating to organizational matters, which could be put into effect immediately, and suggestions concerning the Council's structure, which might require far-reaching changes in its practice and procedures. Since the proposals had been made informally and did not have official status, he would not attempt to summarize them. He suggested, rather, that the Council should invite delegations to submit their proposals in a more formal manner and should devise procedures for translating those proposals into practical recommendations that could be considered by the Council at its fiftieth session. One possibility would be to invite the officers of

the Council and the Secretariat, in consultation with delegations, to undertake the task. Alternatively, a working group of the whole might be established for that purpose.

4. Mr. DE ARAÚJO CASTRO (Brazil) said that the fact that little progress had been made in endeavours to improve the organization of the Council's work was not a cause for pessimism. On the contrary, as a result of the impasse reached on the question of structural changes, members would be forced to re-examine their policies towards the Economic and Social Council and search for an understanding on which the necessary political will for action could be based. That political will would be achieved only when both developed and developing countries realized that they must face and solve the problems of development regardless of any commitments their decisions might imply. So long as issues were evaded and measures for promoting development watered down it would be difficult to reach agreement on basic reforms. Reforms were significant only when they were designed to attain a specific goal and they became possible only when that goal had the political backing of all interested parties. The Council's first task should be to bring its policies and actions more closely into line with the interests of the 127 States Members of the United Nations. If it was to deal only with such questions as the environment and population control, the Council could be allowed to become impotent and useless. His delegation was convinced, however, that, in accordance with the provisions of the Charter, all United Nations bodies had an important role to play in the promotion of development. National interests could not be accepted or tolerated. The nature of the problems to be dealt with, particularly in connexion with the political will for action, was a clear indication that work to improve the Council should be carried on by means of consultations in which all members of the Council could and should participate.

5. In conclusion, he congratulated the former President of the Council, on having prepared a cautious and wise paper on measures to improve the organization of the Council's work. His delegation did, however, take exception to the wording of the third and fourth sentences of the third paragraph of the note, which did not seem to reflect accurately the discussions in the informal meetings.

6. Mr. HEDEMANN (Norway) recalled that at its forty-ninth session the Council had decided<sup>1</sup> that suggestions for improving the organization of its work should be submitted to it at its fiftieth session, when it would start to devise procedures for translating the suggestions into practical recommendations. His delegation was not sure that the Council as a whole was the organ best suited to sift the suggestions made and formulate specific recommendations.

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Forty-ninth Session, 1722nd meeting.*

Rather, it was inclined to support the idea, put forward during the informal meetings, that a small working group should be established to perform that task. The group could consist of the officers of the Council and five or six members drawn from the different geographical areas. Since Asia was not represented among the Council's officers, arrangements might be made for two Asian countries to serve on the working group. Any Council member not represented in the group would have the right to submit written proposals by a specific date. The working group should consider those written suggestions, together with suggestions made during the informal meetings, and, in strict observance of the six-week rule, submit recommendations to the Council for consideration at its fiftieth session, to be held in April-May 1971. It was important that during the current organizational meetings the Council should take some decision which would enable it to make progress in its endeavours to improve the organization of its work.

7. Mr. AKWEI (Ghana) endorsed the Norwegian proposal. The Council should appoint an official working group, which would be serviced in the normal way, to examine thoroughly all the suggestions made on the subject. In that connexion, his delegation agreed with the former President of the Council that the suggestions made in the informal meetings should be submitted in a more formal manner. His delegation could accept the Norwegian representative's suggestion concerning the composition of the working group and would have no objection to special arrangements being made for Asia. It wished to emphasize, however, that the working group should be open-ended and that any member of the Council wishing to participate in its work should be able to do so. The working group should take steps to ensure that its report was available in sufficient time to allow the Council to discuss the question early in its fiftieth session.

8. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) said that an attempt must be made to improve the Council's methods of work so as to enable it to discharge more effectively the functions conferred on it by the Charter. His delegation was prepared to consider with an open mind any changes that such improvement might involve. The note (E/L.1369) prepared by Mr. Maramis, the former President of the Council, provided a useful basis for discussion, although his delegation would have preferred a more detailed indication of the suggestions put forward during the informal meetings. As was suggested in the last paragraph of that paper, member delegations should be invited to present their proposals in a more formal manner and procedures for translating those proposals into practical recommendations to be considered by the Council at its fiftieth session should be devised. If the momentum of the informal discussions was not to be lost, that time-table should be adhered to. It was important that all States Members of the United Nations should have an opportunity to consider the role of one of the Organization's most important bodies, for only in that way would the Council be able to discharge the responsibilities entrusted to it by the Charter. It was important, too, that those delegations which had been active during the informal discussions and which were no longer members of the Council should be allowed to make suggestions for improving the Council's work, if they wished to do so. His delegation was of the opinion, therefore, that a working group of the whole should be established to perform the

task outlined in the last paragraph of the note. Nevertheless, if the majority of the Council so wished, it could accept the first possibility mentioned in that paragraph, namely, that the officers of the Council and the Secretariat, in consultation with delegations, undertake the task. It could also accept the Norwegian proposal, provided that the working group established was open-ended and that any delegation wishing to do so could participate in its work. In conclusion, he endorsed the Ghanaian representative's suggestion that any group established should have official status.

9. Mr. VIAUD (France) suggested that the problem was one of adapting the Council to its new responsibilities rather than of transforming it. There were two main reasons why the Council should be adapted to meet its new responsibilities. In the first place, the Council must be in a position to exercise direct and special responsibility in the review and appraisal of the objectives and policies of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade. Secondly, the Council must be enabled to fulfil its function of co-ordinating programmes within the United Nations and of co-ordinating the activities of the United Nations and those of the specialized agencies. The latter function would assume particular importance during the Second Development Decade.

10. His delegation doubted the usefulness of establishing a working group to consider the suggestions already made for improving the organization of work of the Council. Before that was done, Governments should be requested to submit their written comments on the question. That was particularly necessary since not all Member States would be represented in any working group that might be established, and on such an important matter the views of all Governments should be known. The comments of Governments could be incorporated into a Secretariat report for submission to the Council at its fiftieth session. If it considered such a step necessary, the Council would then be able, later in that session, to appoint a working group of the whole which could meet some time between the fiftieth and fifty-first sessions of the Council.

11. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) recalled that although the problems raised by the item under consideration had been identified more clearly during the informal discussions, no consensus had been reached on how they might be solved and how the Council's procedures might be improved. It had been suggested that a working group should be established to consider the various proposals submitted by the members of the Council. His delegation had supported that suggestion, but it had understood that the proposals would be circulated to Member States for their comments. That had not been done, however, and his delegation considered that it would be difficult to establish a working group at the present stage, without knowing how Member States would react to the various proposals.

12. With regard to the proposal of the French delegation that Member States should submit their comments in writing within two months, he felt that such a procedure might not be feasible. His delegation wished to propose that members of the Council should submit their proposals to the Secretariat, which would incorporate them in a docu-



ment to be submitted to the fiftieth session. Governments and Member States would have an opportunity of explaining their views at that time, and it would then be possible to establish a working group to formulate specific recommendations and report to the Council at its fifty-first session in July 1971.

13. Mr. OLDS (United States of America) said his delegation believed that the evolution of the United Nations system had dramatically affected the quality and quantity of the Council's work. The Council's failure to come to terms with the nature of that evolution had made the possibility of further fragmentation of the system a very real one. His delegation had hoped that the informal discussions called for at the Council's forty-ninth session would have clarified the nature of the problem before the Council was confronted with further fragmentation. For example, there had been reports that new machinery might be needed to assume monitoring functions related to the Second United Nations Development Decade, and to deal with environmental problems and those relating to the sea. If Governments were more confident of the Council's capacity to deal with such problems, they would be less inclined to remove them from the Council's sphere of competence.

14. It was important for Governments to reflect on the problem of improving the organization of the Council's work, but it was the Council's responsibility to recommend a policy which would bring about substantive improvements. His Government was prepared to participate in that effort, in order to provide the Council with a clear description of procedures, policies and practices designed to improve its work. It believed that a body smaller than the Council should be given immediate responsibility for assembling and clarifying the wealth of suggestions already at hand and for formulating specific proposals. His delegation considered the Norwegian proposal, as modified by Ghana, acceptable. It endorsed the idea that former members of the Council who had participated in previous deliberations on the question should be invited to participate in the working group, and felt that Governments should also have the opportunity of expressing their views.

15. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that his delegation had always been concerned with developing measures to strengthen the role of the Council. It had expressed its views in the General Assembly and had submitted detailed proposals.<sup>2</sup> Moreover, it had actively participated in the exceptionally fruitful informal discussions which had been held in 1970.

16. Mr. Maramis, President of the Council in 1970, had observed that there were different views concerning various important matters on which, because of the complexity of the problems involved, it had not been possible to reach unanimous agreement, and had stressed the need for a very cautious and prudent approach to principles which were fundamental to any body established by the Charter, such as the Council. His delegation fully supported the view that any United Nations body was based on certain permanent principles without which no effective action was possible. It

adhered to the central idea that principles which were of lasting and fundamental value must be retained, but that did not mean that it would not be possible to introduce certain changes in the operational methods of the Council, for example, those affecting its relations with other United Nations bodies.

17. His delegation agreed with Mr. Maramis' views regarding practical measures for a better utilization of the Council's time and resources. It also believed in the need for better co-ordination of the activities of the Council and those of the Second Committee, and agreed that the vast quantity of documentation produced tended to prevent the Council from selecting for consideration the most vital and urgent questions.

18. In addition, it was extremely important for the Council to avoid hasty decisions in the complex fields of human rights and economic and social development. During the past twenty-five years a very special system had evolved in the United Nations; difficulties had arisen, but they were concerning details affecting the relationships between the Council and the specialized agencies. Those details were currently under examination, but the development was only a recent one, and extreme caution should therefore be observed, in order to ensure that no hasty and premature decisions were taken in connexion with the future organization of the Council's work.

19. Mr. Maramis had proposed that detailed discussion of measures to improve the organization of the Council's work should be taken up at the fiftieth session, and not before. His delegation fully supported that view and wished to propose that the Council should not risk prejudging matters by fixing a schedule for taking decisions, since haste would be highly detrimental.

20. His delegation agreed with the French delegation that the establishment of a working party at the present time would impede future discussion of the question and would deprive Governments of the opportunity of expressing their views. The Secretariat should first request Member States to submit their views in time for the fiftieth session. After the replies had been received, the Secretariat could work out certain proposals. Such a procedure would be more rational and democratic; discussion would not be limited to a restricted group, and the views of Governments could be taken into consideration.

21. Mr. ANTOINE (Haiti) said that the question under consideration involved important issues. In his view, a working group should be established forthwith for translating into practical recommendations the proposals and suggestions made regarding the improvement of the Council's work. The results of the group's work should be transmitted to Member States for consideration and comment, and the group, in co-operation with the Secretariat, should then prepare a report for submission to the Council at its fifty-first session.

22. Mr. ARIFF (Malaysia) said that his delegation had no strong views regarding the approach the Council should take to the question of measures to improve the organization of its work. Such measures could be divided into two categories: those relating to working methods, which could

<sup>2</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fifth Session, Second Committee*, 1319th meeting.

be settled immediately, and those relating to structural questions, which had far-reaching implications and might require amendment of the Charter. His delegation believed that any body which studied the question should proceed with caution. He agreed that a working group should be set up and that it should be open-ended, so that it would be truly effective. The suggestion that the members of the working group should be chosen on a geographical basis was an excellent one, and Mr. Maramis should certainly be a member of the group. The role of the Council as defined in the Charter should be strengthened, but not at the expense of the General Assembly, since that would erode the latter's prerogatives. The Council agenda should be examined carefully to exclude certain miscellaneous items; effective pruning of the agenda would be difficult, but not impossible. Certain functions now performed by the Council might perhaps be transferred to the General Assembly, since the existing situation gave rise to substantial duplication of discussions. The Council had already adopted the procedure of transmitting the report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to the General Assembly without debate, and that procedure could perhaps be applied to the reports of other commissions.

23. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece), referring to the fifth paragraph of document E/L.1369, said that a distinction should be drawn between questions relating to such areas as co-ordination of General Assembly and Council discussions, the preparation and presentation of documentation and the structure of the Council's agenda, and questions concerning committee organization. If the President submitted to the Council a paper containing specific suggestions on the first-mentioned areas, the Council would readily accept them; the difficulty lay, rather, in the area of committee organization. With regard to the suggestions made concerning future action, he doubted, as did the French representative, the advisability and feasibility of establishing a working group to consider the suggestions already made for improving the organization of work of the Council. The most important task facing the Council and the United Nations in 1971 was clearly the review and appraisal of the objectives and policies of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade. That was the only task likely to enhance the role of the Council in 1971 and beyond. He agreed with the French representative that a questionnaire concerning the review and reappraisal of the Council's work should be submitted to all Member States and that Governments should reply within two months so that their comments could be discussed at the fiftieth session and the fifty-first session.

24. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon) expressed his appreciation to Mr. Maramis, President of the Council in 1970, for leading the informal discussions on means of improving the Council's work. His delegation had at first been inclined to support the Norwegian proposal, but the doubts expressed by the representatives of France, Greece and the USSR concerning some procedural aspects had led his delegation to review its position.

25. In his view, the time had come to pass from the exploratory stage to the preparatory stage. A working

group could be set up which would, with the Secretariat's assistance, collect all the suggestions which had been advanced so far by inviting delegations to formalize their ideas; at the same time, a questionnaire could be submitted to Governments. The working group would collect information for submission to the Council at its fiftieth session, but it would not engage in any substantive discussion of ways and means of improving the Council's procedures.

26. Mr. FAJARDO (Uruguay) said that in fact the proposal to set up a formal working group supplemented the proposal to submit a questionnaire to Governments. Member States hoped that the Council would be the first to express an opinion regarding measures to improve the organization of its work. The Council should therefore set up a formal working group whose conclusions would be submitted to Member States for comments. The Council could then consider the replies of Governments at its fiftieth session or possibly at its fifty-first session. In any case, his delegation's position was flexible and he hoped that a consensus could be reached.

27. Mr. AYOUB (Tunisia) observed that the Council had before it two alternative proposals; the proposal to set up forthwith a working group to consider the proposals submitted during the informal discussions and the French proposal to postpone the establishment of the working group until the Council had been apprised of Governments' views on measures to improve the organization of its work. The French proposal would have the advantage of enabling Governments which were not members of the Council to submit proposals. He therefore considered that the working group should begin its work after the fiftieth session; it should be formal and have summary records, so that States which were not members of the Council could be informed of its debates.

28. Mr. ORČIĆ (Yugoslavia) recalled that a year earlier his delegation, together with the Indian delegation, had informally circulated a working paper stating that the Economic and Social Council should play a more effective role in its review of the over-all economic and social situation, in identifying the major lags and constraints in the field of development and in recommending ways and means for their removal, as well as indicating new policy directions in a dynamic context. The forum of the Council should be used for inducing Governments to exercise their political will for resolving major issues in the field of economic and social development and thus providing new impetus to the development process. The prestige, status and effectiveness of the Council would depend on the way in which it discharged that function. Any proposal for the improvement of the Council's method of work should be considered. The main aim of the discussions should be the adaptation of the Council to present needs. No comprehensive study on the matter was available at present, and document E/L.1369 did not provide an adequate basis for further discussion. The present series of organizational meetings should be used for further serious preliminary discussions. All Member States should be able to offer suggestions on measures to improve the organization of the Council's work.

*The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.*



**ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL**  
*Fiftieth Session*  
**OFFICIAL RECORDS**

Tuesday, 12 January 1971,  
 at 3.25 p.m.

NEW YORK

*President: Mr. R. DRISS (Tunisia).*

**AGENDA ITEM 5**

**Measures to improve the organization of the work  
 of the Council (*continued*) (E/L.1369)**

1. Mr. TORRES (Peru) paid a tribute to the efforts made on the President's initiative at the resumed forty-ninth session to improve the work of the Economic and Social Council. The statements heard at the 1734th meeting made it clear, however, that the greatest caution must be observed with regard to that question, which was extremely complex, for, besides mere procedure, it also involved a more serious aspect, namely, the reform of the structure of the Council itself. Although progress could be made on the first point in the immediate future, it would be premature for his delegation to submit specific proposals at the present stage: it would do so at the fiftieth session.
2. In any case, his delegation did not approve of the establishment of a working group which would be entrusted with the task of submitting proposals on the question to the Council at its fiftieth session: the views of Governments should first be ascertained through the official channel. Furthermore, the establishment of a small group to study the question would in principle be unacceptable. In view of the subject's importance, consultations should be held on the broadest possible basis, in order to produce a more satisfactory result.
3. He reserved his delegation's right to deal with the question in greater detail later in the discussion.
4. Mr. LOUYA (Democratic Republic of the Congo) said he was glad that the outgoing President had recommended at the forty-ninth session that measures to improve the organization of work of the Council should be considered at the fiftieth session. Nevertheless, he fully shared the view expressed at the preceding meeting by the representative of Ghana to the effect that a more thorough study must be made before the Council took a decision. Moreover, as the Economic and Social Council was an intergovernmental body, the views of all States Members of the United Nations should be sought.
5. As to whether consideration of the question should be entrusted to a special committee or a working group, his delegation preferred the latter alternative. Should that course be followed, the important question at issue would be sure to remain one of the Council's primary concerns, whereas if it was entrusted to a special committee, it was likely to get side-tracked.
6. Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya) agreed that it was necessary to reorganize and rationalize the Council's work. Undue

haste should be avoided, however, and the views of States Members of the United Nations should be obtained. His delegation therefore proposed that, once those views had been received, a working group should be established to process and summarize the results of the consultations. At the beginning of the Second United Nations Development Decade, the Council was facing the problems before it in a new frame of mind and with full awareness of the difficulties involved in economic and development planning. The Council must therefore ensure that all the principles on which it was to base its work were taken into consideration, and should consequently allow itself sufficient time to review the question.

7. He would revert to the question later in the debate.

8. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) recalled that his delegation had for some time believed that the effectiveness and prestige of the Council had been considerably less than envisaged in the Charter. In none of its four major spheres of action—formulation of policy recommendations, review of policy implementation, co-ordination of the diverse activities of the United Nations and initiation of action in unexplored areas—had the Council been able to act in a determined and concerted fashion. That could not, however, be blamed solely on poor organization or defects in the Council's structure; it could also be ascribed to resistance to its action by international economic forces. It was nevertheless heartening to note that the trend towards stagnation had given way to a more dynamic approach, as exemplified by the adoption of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade (General Assembly resolution 2626 (XXV)). It was imperative to ensure the success of that highly important decision and to make certain that the action envisaged was not jeopardized by the static working methods and procedures which had evolved during the past two decades.

9. The present committee structure and the method of consideration of items by the Council were not conducive to decisions which were truly meaningful in the context of the present international economic situation. Items referred to the Council by subsidiary bodies, functional commissions, specialized agencies and Secretariat departments were considered concurrently in its committees or in plenary, with no intergovernmental guidance. Each item, moreover, went through three or four stages of consideration in various bodies and was considered separately in its policy, co-ordination and work programme aspects. The reorganization measures to be adopted should minimize the waste of time and energy resulting from those procedures. For example, the committee structure of the Council should be streamlined: at present, each item was considered by a functional body or a specialized agency, the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (CPC) and a sessional committee before it was taken up in plenary. In

most cases, such repeated consideration was unjustified. If the particular importance of a subject did require that it be considered in that manner, Governments and the Secretariat must still be given ample time between each stage of discussion to review the status of the question and, if necessary, to revise their attitude. The difficulty involved in such repeated consideration of agenda items could also be eliminated if all their aspects, namely, "policy", "programme" and "co-ordination", received combined consideration. To that end, the Secretariat or the organ concerned should submit their recommendations or decisions dealing with those various aspects, in sufficient detail, a method which, in many cases, would eliminate the need for examination by CPC and the Council's Co-ordination Committee.

10. In fact, it seemed that it would be desirable for the Council to re-examine its concept of the co-ordination tasks entrusted to it. Efforts in that area should be made with due deliberation, and the need to ensure better co-ordination should never constitute an obstacle to the implementation of the policy decisions of the Council and the General Assembly or a pretext for restricting or delaying the implementation of essential programmes and activities. Similarly, the review by the Council of the programme of its subsidiary bodies should have as its essential aim economic and social progress and should not become an end in itself. Furthermore, a regrouping of the various items before the Council according to rational criteria would enable its members to take a more comprehensive approach to them. To that end, four main groups of items might be distinguished: review of the annual work programme of the Organization, review of the policy and long-term work programme of the functional commissions and the regional commissions, consideration of the reports of bodies such as UNDP and UNICEF, and items relating to co-ordination. The reports of the subsidiary bodies on which the Council was not really in a position to take a decision should be transmitted without discussion to the General Assembly. Such a procedure, which had already been adopted for dealing with the report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, should be extended to the reports of the Commission on Human Rights and of the Commission on the Status of Women. Lastly, the distinction between economic items and social items should be discontinued in the light of General Assembly resolution 2681 (XXV), which endorsed a unified approach to economic and social planning in national development. In his delegation's view, in order to put those suggestions into practice, it was essential to rationalize the Council's work.

11. Another area where immediate action was both necessary and possible was that of reports: the reports transmitted to the Council by the Secretariat were often non-committal and ambiguous and those relating to the discussions of subsidiary bodies lengthy and diffuse; that state of affairs should be remedied. The Council itself should endeavour in its reports to the General Assembly to formulate short and definite decisions proposing solutions to the problems involved.

12. The action which could be taken at the present time would necessarily be limited in scope and nature. As the outgoing President had indicated in his note (E/L.1369),

the informal discussions which had been held so far had been largely exploratory, and the next stage should be to invite Member States to present their proposals and suggestions in a more formal manner and to devise procedures for translating those proposals and suggestions into practical recommendations that could be considered by the Council at its fiftieth session. It should, however, be mentioned that two factors might militate against the success of such negotiations. First, the Council had adopted at its forty-ninth session resolution 1556 B (XLIX), in which it had expressed its readiness to assume responsibility for assisting the General Assembly in the task of the over-all review and appraisal of progress in the implementation of the International Development Strategy, and, pursuant to General Assembly resolution 2641 (XXV), the Council was to take up at its fifty-first session the question of a system of over-all appraisal; it was very possible that those new tasks might require the establishment of new inter-governmental machinery within the Council. Secondly, under its resolution 1544 (XLIX), the Council was also to take a final decision at its fifty-first session on the question of the institutional arrangements for science and technology. It had been proposed in that connexion that a sessional or intersessional committee on science and technology should be established. No comprehensive action to improve the Council's methods of work could be taken until those questions had been decided. There were, nevertheless, certain reforms of a mainly procedural nature which could be undertaken immediately. They might relate, for instance, to the method of reporting, a more rational presentation of agenda items and the calendar of conferences. It would undoubtedly be necessary to request the Secretariat to take all the necessary preliminary steps to put those changes into effect and to report on the matter to the fiftieth session of the Council.

13. In conclusion, he wished to stress that the ultimate objective of a reform of the Council's working methods should be to increase its contribution to the progress and development of the poorer countries.

14. Mr. MARAMIS (Indonesia) said that it might be possible to arrive at a solution without further delay on the basis of the consultations which had been held between various members of the Council and taking into account the proposals of the Lebanese delegation at the previous meeting. The Council might establish a preparatory working group with limited terms of reference, which would send a questionnaire to all Member States. Once the replies had been received, the group would prepare a summary which would then be published and submitted to the Council at its fiftieth session. The group might be composed of three of the four officers of the Council, including the outgoing President. The questionnaire could be prepared by the first week of February, submitted to the Council for approval and then sent out to Governments.

15. In reply to a question by Mr. ČALOVSKI (Yugoslavia), Mr. MARAMIS (Indonesia) said that the working group would have very limited terms of reference and would under no circumstances be concerned with consideration of the replies or the substance of the matter.

16. Mr. ANTOINE (Haiti) stressed that a questionnaire could not be sent to Governments until the Council had

considered the matter. The Council would have to decide what questions should be asked.

17. The PRESIDENT said that it would be necessary to hold consultations before taking a decision and that the matter would be considered further at the next meeting.

*It was so decided.*

## AGENDA ITEM 6

### Actions arising out of decisions of the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth session (E/1366 and Add.1)

18. The PRESIDENT said that the Council had before it a note by the Secretary-General (E/1366 and Add.1), which was divided into four sections. Section A should be considered first, paragraph by paragraph, and the necessary decisions taken on each paragraph. With regard to sections B and C, it would be sufficient to take note of their contents and to request the Secretariat to take them into account when preparing the agenda of the sessions in question.

19. He asked whether there were any comments on paragraph 1 of section A, concerning a unified approach to economic and social planning in national development.

20. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that his delegation approved of the role assigned to the Commission for Social Development. However, the latter would need assistance in its task of harmonizing the economic and social aspects of development. The Council might request the Secretariat to ask for the views of the Committee for Development Planning so that the Commission could be informed of them, if the calendar of conferences allowed. Otherwise a short note by the Secretary-General would be necessary.

21. Mr. DE SEYNES (*Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs*) said that it was difficult to interpret the terms of General Assembly resolution 2681 (XXV). The mandate of the Committee for Development Planning obviously covered all the economic and social aspects of development, and the Committee would undoubtedly take them all into consideration. However, because of the calendar of conferences and meetings, the Committee's report could not be prepared in time for the session of the Commission for Social Development.

*The recommendation by the Secretary-General contained in paragraph 1 of section A was adopted.*

*The recommendations by the Secretary-General contained in paragraphs 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 of section A were adopted.*

22. The PRESIDENT asked whether there were any objections to paragraph 10, entitled "Implementation of the recommendations of the *Ad Hoc* Committee of Experts to Examine the Finances of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies" (E/L.1366/Add.1).

23. Mr. VIAUD (France), supported by Mr. CARANICAS (Greece), said that there was an unfortunate tendency, when faced with time-table problems, to take the easy way

out by organizing additional sessions. It was not customary for CPC to hold additional sessions, and the Economic and Social Council did not examine questions of co-ordination in general at its resumed summer session. He was not sure that the proposal in question was the best one. It had been decided to exclude substantive matters as far as possible from the Council's deliberations during the General Assembly session. It would be better to defer consideration of the matter until a later session, perhaps the fifty-first session, when it could be viewed in clearer perspective. It was unfortunate that in the decision contained in paragraph 28 of its report<sup>1</sup> the Fifth Committee had requested the Secretary-General to prepare his report without regard for the way in which the Council's work was organized. It would suffice for the Secretary-General to submit his report to the Council at its fifty-first session. If that report was not ready until September 1971, it was difficult to see how the Council could refer the matter during the year to a body which had already completed its session. It would be preferable to defer consideration of the matter until the following year.

24. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) asked whether the Secretary-General's report could be prepared in time for consideration by CPC at its ninth session.

25. Mr. AHMED (Secretary of the Council) said that the report could not be completed before September 1971. It was for that reason that an additional meeting of CPC should be considered.

26. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that while he supported the French representative's proposal in substance, he was afraid that the Council's summer session would be overburdened.

27. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation agreed with the French delegation. The matter had already been considered in great detail at one of the special sessions of CPC which had reached the conclusion that certain questions concerning changes in the budget cycle required further close study. CPC had begun to examine the question in accordance with its terms of reference, but additional work was required. The Fifth Committee, having been unable to take a definitive position, had requested the Secretary-General to prepare an additional report, but that report would have to be studied by CPC before the Council considered it. To refer the matter to the Council at its fifty-first session would be to ignore the fact that CPC must be given an opportunity to finish considering it. In short, there were two possibilities: the Secretary-General's representative in the Fifth Committee had said that the report could be submitted to CPC at its ninth session and subsequently considered by the Council at its fifty-first session; alternatively, the Secretary-General's recommendation could be accepted, although, as the representative of France had quite rightly pointed out, the Fifth Committee's action did not take into account the Council's time-table of meetings.

28. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that the report requested from the Secretary-General would include two elements:

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fifth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 82, document A/8266.

first, a mock-up of the 1972 budget estimates and, secondly, a suggested detailed time-table for the preparation and review of a medium-term programme and budget – a matter which was of greater interest to the Economic and Social Council. The Secretary-General could divide his study into two parts: matters of direct concern to the Council could be submitted to CPC in June and to the Council in July, while the more strictly budgetary part could be submitted to the General Assembly at its twenty-sixth session.

29. Mr. AHMED (Secretary of the Council) said that when the report of the Fifth Committee had been prepared, the original Austrian proposal had not contained the words “through the Economic and Social Council”, which had been inserted at the request of the representative of Pakistan.<sup>2</sup> CPC had held a special meeting in 1970 to examine the report on programming and budgets in the United Nations family of organizations, prepared by Mr. Maurice Bertrand of the Joint Inspection Unit<sup>3</sup> and it had been thought that the same procedure might be followed in 1971.

30. The mock-up to be included in the Secretary-General’s report would show how the budget could be presented and CPC and the Council would therefore certainly wish to have it before them when they considered programme budgeting.

31. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) said that if it was impossible for the report as a whole to be made available before 1 September, it also seemed to him that it would be difficult to divide it. While he understood the point of view of the French delegation, he felt that there was no alternative but to approve the Secretary-General’s recommendation.

32. Mr. DE SEYNES (*Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs*) felt that the form and presentation of a report were important and that it would be contrary to the spirit of the decision taken by the Fifth Committee to split a document into two parts, thus maintaining the dichotomy between programme and budget. If CPC wished to continue its examination of the question, the only possible solution was that recommended by the Secretary-General. Conditions sometimes made it necessary to have recourse to solutions that were not entirely orthodox.

33. Mr. AKWEI (Ghana) supported the position of the Brazilian delegation. Since the General Assembly had to take a final decision on the matter at its twenty-sixth session and since, moreover, the Secretary-General’s report containing a mock-up of the 1972 budget estimates could not be completed before September 1971, the only solution was to accept the Secretary-General’s recommendation, even if that meant somewhat over-burdening the Council at its fifty-first session.

34. Mr. OLDS (United States of America) said he wished to make a suggestion which he hoped would be acceptable to the French delegation. The Secretary-General could be

requested to do his utmost to observe the time-table of the regular sessions of CPC and of the Council so that CPC could consider the report in June. If that proved impossible, the Secretary-General’s recommendation, as contained in document E/L.1366/Add.1, could then be adopted.

35. Mr. VIAUD (France) accepted that proposal.

36. The PRESIDENT said that if there were no objections, he would take it that the Council adopted section A, paragraph 10 (E/L.1366/Add.1), while recommending that the Secretary-General should submit his report as soon as possible.

*It was so decided.*

37. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should take note of the contents of sections B and C and observed that section D was included purely for information.

*It was so decided.*

## AGENDA ITEM 7

### Basic programme of work of the Council in 1971 and consideration of the provisional agenda for the fiftieth session (E/L.1367 and Corr.1 and 2, E/L.1368 and E/L.1370)

38. Mr. AHMED (*Secretary of the Council*) presented the draft programme for 1971, prepared by the Secretary-General (E/L.1367 and Corr.1 and 2) and said that when the list of items for consideration by the Council at its fiftieth and fifty-first sessions had been prepared one of the primary considerations had been to ensure a better distribution of the work-load between the two sessions. A large number of items were usually given to the summer session, with the result that often the Council either had to defer consideration of some of them or give only inadequate consideration to others. As indicated in paragraph 4, an attempt had therefore been made to include in the agenda for the fiftieth session two of the items which should normally have been referred to the fifty-first session. In order to enable the Council to give more coherent consideration to related questions, they had been grouped together under a broad heading. The purpose of such groupings would, however, be lost if the various items were allocated to different sessional committees. The Council might wish to bear that in mind when discussing the organization of the work of each of the two forthcoming sessions.

39. The reason for the proposal to defer consideration of the question of capital punishment to the fifty-second session was given in paragraph 8. Another item had also been omitted from the programme of work for 1971: the proposal for the campaign to focus world-wide attention on and mobilize public and government support for housing, building and planning. In resolution 1507 (XLVIII), the Council had requested the Secretary-General to submit to the fiftieth session reformulated proposals for that campaign. In order to enable the Council to receive carefully considered proposals, however, it might be desirable for them first to be submitted to the Committee on Housing,

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 27.

<sup>3</sup> A/7822, annex.

Building and Planning at its seventh session. It was therefore proposed that the Council should defer consideration of the matter to its fifty-second session.

40. The Council might wish to take up at its fifty-second session the annual reports of the International Narcotics Control Board for 1970 and 1971, as suggested in paragraph 7. The President of the Board would, however, prefer the Council to consider the report for 1970 at its fiftieth session, in view of the current state of drug problems and the attention given to them by world public opinion. There was nothing to prevent the Council from considering the Board's report prior to its examination by the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, as it had done at its forty-eighth session.

41. No item had been included in the work programme for 1971 on the results of the Conference of Plenipotentiaries for the Adoption of the Protocol on Psychotropic Substances, since the Council, in resolution 1474 (XLVIII), had not called for a report by that Conference. If the Conference requested action by the Council on any matter, a supplementary item could be placed on the Council's agenda, for its fiftieth session if possible.

42. The item on the question of the establishment of an international university had been included in the agenda for the resumed fifty-first session pursuant to General Assembly resolution 2691 (XXV). Since the United Nations wished to give UNESCO time to study the matter before convening its own panel of experts, the first meeting of the panel could not take place until July. Moreover, it was necessary to have replies from Governments to the Secretary-General's *note verbale*, and those were due before the end of May. The second meeting of the panel of experts could not take place until after the meeting of the UNESCO Executive Board in September. The report of the Secretary-General to the Council and to the General Assembly would therefore be drafted after those meetings, and the resumed fifty-first session would thus be the earliest time at which the Council could consider the subject.

43. With regard to the note by the Secretary General (E/L.1368) on the documentation for the fiftieth session of the Council, the Secretariat had tried to give a precise list of the documents to be submitted. In many cases, however, the reports of subsidiary bodies unfortunately could not be submitted by the dead-line of six weeks before the session.

44. As to the note by the Secretary-General (E/L.1370) on the organization of work of the fiftieth session, an effort had been made to organize the work of the fiftieth session to ensure an even distribution between the plenary meetings and the sessional committees, and also to ensure that questions already taken up in the CPC and those requiring the presence of experts were not considered twice.

45. Mr. VIAUD (France) saw two reasons for including the narcotics question in the agenda for the fiftieth session. First, it was an important problem which deserved the Council's attention and, secondly, the reports of the International Narcotics Control Board could be submitted to the Council without being taken up by the Commission on Narcotic Drugs. That should not create difficulties for the organization of work. The Social Committee could take

up the question at the end of the first week, before it considered the report of the Commission on Human Rights.

46. Referring to paragraphs 9 and 10 of the draft programme for 1971, he asked whether it would not be possible to invite the four organizations mentioned in paragraph 9 to be represented permanently at the Council's sessions by observers, as were other organizations.

47. With regard to the list of questions to be considered at the fifty-first session, consideration of the question of the appraisal of progress in implementing the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade would probably not be completed in April or May, and should also be taken up in July.

48. Mr. HEDEMANN (Norway) said that his delegation supported the suggestion made by the Secretary-General in paragraph 2 of the draft programme. The question mentioned in that paragraph was a very important one, and the Council should take it up as soon as possible.

49. As there would be barely four or five weeks between the end of the sessions of the Commission on Human Rights and the Commission for Social Development and the beginning of the Council's fiftieth session, he urged that every effort should be made by those bodies to submit their reports, which always contained important proposals, as early as possible before the session began.

50. With regard to item 10 on the list of agenda items for the fiftieth session, he would like paragraph (b), concerning relations with INTERPOL, to be considered in connexion with item 13 on "Non-governmental organizations". The Social Committee could consider the other aspects of item 10 after it had considered item 13.

51. Mr. FRANZI (Italy) supported the proposal of the French delegation, contained in paragraph 7 of the draft programme, regarding the report of the International Narcotics Control Board.

52. The Secretariat's arguments in favour of deferring consideration of the question of capital punishment, referred to in paragraph 8, to one of the Council's 1972 sessions were unconvincing. In paragraph 3 of resolution 2393 (XXIII), the General Assembly had requested the Secretary-General to submit a report on that question during one of the 1971 sessions. Paragraph 2 of that resolution had enabled the Secretary-General to send a questionnaire to Member States to ascertain their attitude towards further restriction or abolition of the death penalty and what changes had taken place since 1965.

53. Forty-eight Governments had so far replied to the Secretary-General's questionnaire. Some Governments perhaps had not felt it necessary to reply, since no changes worthy of note had occurred since 1965. There were many precedents for reports being prepared and questions discussed on the basis of far fewer replies.

54. It therefore seemed difficult to agree to a postponement of the question. It would be more correct to abide by the provisions of General Assembly resolution 2393 (XXIII) and place the question of capital punishment

on the agenda of the Council's fiftieth session. The Secretary-General's report would contain the replies received from Member States and would at the same time give him an opportunity to request the Governments of countries which had not yet done so to reply to the questionnaire. The Council would then consider the report and would conduct its deliberations on the basis of the information submitted to it.

55. He therefore requested that the Council should include on the agenda of its fiftieth session a separate item entitled "Possible further restriction of the use of the death penalty or its total abolition". He also wished the Secretariat to issue the report in question as soon as possible and in good time before the Council's fiftieth session.

56. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) pointed out that an extremely important question—science and technology—had been divided between the fiftieth and fifty-first sessions. It would be much more rational to consider all those problems together. Although that solution admittedly might have the disadvantage of increasing the workload at the fifty-first session, it would certainly allow the Council to complete its work in a more satisfactory manner.

57. Mr. AKWEI (Ghana) emphasized the disadvantages of resumed sessions; they should be purely and simply abolished. It was very difficult, especially for small delegations, to give proper attention to debates held in the Council at that time of the year while the session of the General Assembly was in progress. Moreover, it was not clear why reports such as those of the Trade and Development Board could not be considered earlier in the year. In the case of the reports of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, some justification existed since those agencies held their annual conferences in September, but it was the responsibility of the Economic and Social Council to instruct the bodies reporting to it to ensure that their schedule of work did not impede the progress of its own work. His delegation would not insist on a formal decision being taken in 1971, but it would like the Secretariat to prepare a note envisaging the possibility of abolishing the Council's resumed sessions.

58. It was also proposed that the question of the feasibility of an international university should be placed on the agenda of the resumed fifty-first session because of the need to take into account the work programme of UNESCO, which was to consider the question. One might well ask why UNESCO could not make arrangements so that the Council would not have to consider that question at such a late date. In general, his delegation questioned the usefulness of such resumed sessions, during which the reports of various bodies and specialized agencies were read out but could not be properly discussed.

59. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) supported the Brazilian representative's proposal to consider all questions relating to science and technology together at the fifty-first session. In addition, he pointed out to the representative of Ghana that, however desirable it might be, the complete elimination of resumed sessions of the Council hardly seemed feasible. In connexion with the consideration of the reports

of the IMF and IBRD, it should not be forgotten that those agencies' financial year ended in June, that their reports were issued in August and that their annual conferences were held in September. If consideration of those reports was to be delayed until the spring of the following year, the information contained in them would be out of date and their consideration would become pointless.

60. The Secretary-General's note on the organization of the work of the fiftieth session (E/L.1370) specified that agenda item 3, on the outflow of trained personnel from developing to developed countries, would be referred to the Council's Economic Committee. That question was well known and had already been discussed at length; it seemed that it could be considered directly in the plenary.

61. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) said that he generally supported the draft programme for 1971 prepared by the Secretary-General, and particularly the proposal in paragraph 2 that the Council should select as a topic for study in depth the question of a system of over-all appraisal of progress in implementing the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade.

62. His delegation associated itself, however, with the comments made by the Italian representative regarding the advisability of considering in 1971 a report by the Secretary-General on the attitude of Governments towards the possible further restriction of the use of the death penalty or its total abolition, as had been specified in General Assembly resolution 2393 (XXIII). The forty-eight replies received from Governments to the questionnaire addressed to them should make it possible for the Secretary-General to draft his report on the subject. The question could thus be placed on the agenda of the Council's fiftieth session.

63. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) supported the French representative's proposal that the Council should consider the report of the International Narcotics Control Board directly at its fiftieth session without going through the Commission on Narcotic Drugs. There might be a need to consider the terms of reference of the Narcotics Control Board in that connexion.

64. In addition, his delegation fully shared the views expressed by the Italian representative concerning the inclusion of the question of capital punishment in the agenda of one of the 1971 sessions; the General Assembly had made a formal request in resolution 2393 (XXIII) and it was difficult to see why the Secretariat, which had received forty-eight replies to the questionnaire sent to Governments, should not be in a position to prepare a report; the decision to refer the topic of permanent sovereignty over natural resources to the Committee on Natural Resources had recently been taken on the basis of nineteen replies to a questionnaire addressed to Governments. Under the circumstances, he strongly supported the proposal made by the Italian delegation.

65. Mr. HEDEMANN (Norway) joined with the delegations of the United Kingdom and New Zealand in supporting the proposal made by the Italian representative.

66. Mr. ČALOVSKI (Yugoslavia) agreed with the proposal of the representative of France that the Council should



consider the annual report of the International Narcotics Control Board at its fiftieth session. The report was very technical, however, and it should be made available to delegations in time for them to consult the experts in their own countries before the debate. It should be possible to have the report ready by April 1971.

67. He hoped that the discussion in plenary meetings at the fiftieth session of questions relating to social development would not duplicate the debates in the Social Committee.

68. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) commended the Secretary of the Economic and Social Council and his staff for the excellent documentation they had provided. The Council Secretariat, which dealt with an extremely heavy work-load in a most satisfactory manner, should receive the moral support of all the members of the Council and should be allocated all the financial, material and human resources it needed.

69. His delegation fully supported the draft programme prepared by the Secretary-General for the work of the Council in 1971, with one exception, namely, the suggestion contained in paragraph 2. The practice of opening the session with a general discussion of international economic and social policy was extremely beneficial, and it would be inadvisable to replace it by a study in depth of the question of a system of over-all appraisal of progress in implementing the International Development Strategy. That question would in any event be dealt with at the fifty-first session, for which it was on the agenda as item 3. That being so, his delegation urged the Council not to abandon the democratic tradition of opening its session with a general discussion.

70. Mr. MARAMIS (Indonesia) said that the work-load seemed to be evenly distributed between the two sessions. His delegation supported the proposal contained in paragraph 2 of the draft programme. The question of the system of over-all appraisal of progress in implementing the International Development Strategy was extremely important. His delegation also agreed with the proposal of the representative of Norway that item 10 (b) in the annotated list of agenda items for the fiftieth session (Relations with INTERPOL) should be discussed simultaneously with item 13 (Non-governmental organizations), and it supported the Brazilian proposal that the Council examine the question of science and technology at its fifty-first session.

71. Mr. ANTOINE (Haiti) said that the agenda appeared to be very heavy, and items on which study was not very far advanced might be postponed until later. Examples were the question of the abolition of capital punishment, and new items such as aerial hijacking and the kidnapping of diplomats. Such items should be postponed until the fifty-first session.

72. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that he fully appreciated the proposal of the representative of Italy, which had been eloquently supported by the representative of the United Kingdom. However, the Secretariat should not be pressed to produce the report on capital punishment too hurriedly, since the item was not urgent and could wait.

73. Mr. FRANZI (Italy) said that the Secretariat was in a position to prepare the report in question.

74. The PRESIDENT asked whether there was any objection to combining items 10 (b) and 13, as requested by the representative of Norway.

75. Mr. AYOUB (Tunisia) stressed that the question of intergovernmental relations should not be intermingled with that relating to non-governmental organizations. It should be made clear whether INTERPOL was a non-governmental organization.

*The proposal of the representative of Norway was adopted.*

76. The PRESIDENT asked whether there was any objection to the proposal of the representative of France (see para. 45 above) on the question of narcotic drugs.

77. In reply to a question put by Mr. ČALOVSKI (Yugoslavia), Mr. AHMED (Secretary of the Council) said that there was no way of knowing when the report would be ready, but as soon as the item was on the Council's agenda the secretariat of the International Narcotics Control Board at Geneva would be informed.

*The proposal of the representative of France was adopted.*

78. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) recalled that he had proposed that questions relating to science and technology should be discussed all together at the fifty-first session.

79. Mr. VIAUD (France) pointed out that item 9 (b), concerning future institutional arrangements for science and technology, was self-contained and could be discussed more profitably when the reorganization of the Council was under discussion. It would be regrettable if item 9 (b) was postponed until July.

80. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) supported the representative of France, and said that item 9 (b) related to a question which merited separate consideration.

81. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) said that he maintained his position.

82. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that institutional arrangements had already been discussed over the past two years. The right to consider the question of institutional arrangements at the fiftieth session could not be disputed. It was logical that the problem should be considered at both the fiftieth and the fifty-first sessions. Item 9 (a) could be postponed until the fifty-first session, but item 9 (b) should remain on the agenda for the fiftieth session and could also appear on the agenda for the fifty-first session.

*The proposal of the representative of France was adopted.*

83. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece), supported by Mr. ANTOINE (Haiti), drew attention to the fact that the question of capital punishment was not an urgent one.

84. Mr. FRANZI (Italy) asked whether the Council and the Secretariat intended to comply with paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 2393 (XXIII).

85. The PRESIDENT noted that there were three proposals on the subject: the Secretary-General's proposal that the question should be considered at the fifty-second session of the Council; the Italian representative's proposal to consider it in 1971, which had been supported by the New Zealand representative; and a further proposal that discussion of the question should be postponed to a later date.

86. Mr. ANTOINE (Haiti) said that the question of capital punishment deserved to be considered very thoroughly.

87. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Italian delegation's specific proposal that the question should be considered at the fiftieth session was certainly based on sound arguments and was quite as important as the Secretary-General's suggestion. If a vote had to be taken on the question, his delegation would have no choice but to abstain.

88. The PRESIDENT suggested that the discussion on the present item should be postponed until the next meeting.

89. Mr. FRANZI (Italy) said that he had no objection to postponing consideration of the draft programme and leaving in suspense the question of the work of the Council in 1971. He was surprised at the position taken by the USSR delegation; in fact, once again the reason given by the Secretariat for postponing consideration of the question was unconvincing. In 1968, the General Assembly had adopted resolution 2393 (XXIII) requesting the Secretary-General to submit a report; that decision must therefore be implemented. He was surprised to note that some delegations were creating difficulties in that connexion.

90. Mr. AHMED (Secretary of the Council) pointed out that, according to the rules of procedure, documents for the Council must be circulated six weeks before the session. At the time when the draft programme had been prepared, thirty replies to the Secretary-General's questionnaire had been received, but it was true that the number was now forty-eight. General Assembly resolution 2393 (XXIII) did request that a report should be submitted to the Council in 1971. Consequently, the Secretariat could submit a report at the fiftieth session if the Council so desired.

91. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that he could appreciate the Italian representative's insistence if he had received specific instructions from his Government. However, he did not feel that the Council should take any politically motivated decision. A decision in favour of a particular delegation would be a decision against the Secretary-General. That being so, his delegation would have to abstain if a vote was taken, since it did not want to take a position in favour of either the Secretary-General or a particular Government.

92. Mr. ANTOINE (Haiti) said that the problem was very complex, and not all countries had as yet given their opinion. It would therefore be wise to wait until 1972, as suggested by the Secretary-General.

93. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) said that, since the Secretariat was apparently in a position to prepare a report, the question was not one of complying with a delegation's

request, but simply of implementing the General Assembly's resolution.

94. Mr. ANTOINE (Haiti) said the fact remained that there had been only a few replies to the questionnaire.

95. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) requested that the summary record should indicate that the report of the Secretary-General would be amended accordingly.

96. Mr. ANTOINE (Haiti) requested that their delegations' reservations should be noted in the summary record.

97. The PRESIDENT suggested that the programme of work for 1971 as a whole, as amended in the course of the discussion, should be approved; the amendments would include the one proposed by the Italian delegation.

*The work programme of the Council for 1971, as amended, was adopted.*

#### **STATEMENT BY THE UNDER-SECRETARY-GENERAL FOR ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

98. Mr. DE SEYNES (Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs) made a statement which the Secretary-General had asked him to present for the record and for the information of the members of the Economic and Social Council.

99. With reference to Economic and Social Council resolution 1561 (XLIX), of 12 November 1970, on sessions of regional commissions, the Secretary-General wished to inform the Council that in his opinion the terms of the resolution were in complete conformity with the position which he had always taken concerning venue and membership of the Commissions. In the opinion of the Secretary-General, however, the resolution did not touch on the related question whether a State Member of the United Nations not a member of a commission should have access to its sessions in order to be able to follow the discussions and to be in a position to exercise its Charter right to participate on a matter of particular concern to it. The resolution therefore did not affect existing practice in that regard. That practice, which had been consistently followed for many years, was based on certain legal considerations which involved the rights of all States Members of the United Nations and must be followed by the Secretary-General unless a competent principal organ of the United Nations were clearly to define different procedures for the implementation of those rights.

100. It should be noted that that question had never given rise to a problem with respect to sessions held at the normal place of meeting of an organ, but only when the organ had met away from its established headquarters.

101. It should also be noted that the legal considerations and practice in regard to that question had since May 1967 been placed before the International Law Commission,<sup>4</sup>

<sup>4</sup> See *Yearbook of the International Law Commission, 1967*, vol. II (United Nations publication, Sales No.: E.68.V.2), pp. 173, and 174.

incidental to its consideration of the item concerning relations between States and intergovernmental organizations. Should the Council retain doubts on those legal aspects it would be, in the opinion of the Secretary-General, in view of the important constitutional points involved, an appropriate case for recourse to the procedure provided for in General Assembly resolution 89 (I) of 11 December 1946.

102. Mr. AYOUB (Tunisia) said he reserved the right to raise the question in the Council after more thorough legal studies and whenever the need might arise.

103. The PRESIDENT said he had no intention of opening a discussion on the subject which was not a question on the agenda of the Council.

*The meeting rose at 7.10 p.m.*



*President:* Mr. R. DRISS (Tunisia).

**AGENDA ITEM 5**

**Measures to improve the organization of the work  
 of the Council (continued) (E/L.1369)**

1. Mr. MARAMIS (Indonesia) introduced a compromise proposal based on his own proposal as outgoing President (E/L.1369), the proposal of the representative of Lebanon to establish a preparatory working group, and the French proposal (1734th meeting) to circulate a questionnaire. The compromise proposal read as follows:

*"The Economic and Social Council*

*"Decides*

*"(a) to establish a preparatory group consisting of the four members of the Bureau and the outgoing President to prepare, with the assistance of the Secretary-General, a questionnaire and relevant background material on measures to improve the work of the Council;*

*"(b) to request the preparatory group to submit the draft questionnaire as early as possible to an informal meeting of the Council, to be called for by the President;*

*"(c) to request that the final text of the questionnaire be distributed to States Members of the United Nations by the end of January 1971;*

*"(d) to request that Governments should forward their replies to the questionnaire as early as possible and not later than the end of March 1971; and*

*"(e) to request the preparatory group to summarize replies to the questionnaire and to report to the Council at its fiftieth session."*

2. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that his delegation was pleased to be able to support the compromise proposal sponsored by the Indonesian representative, which it hoped would prove acceptable to the Council. With regard to paragraph (e), he assumed that the members of the preparatory group would not be expected to undertake the task of summarizing replies from Governments. Since the replies would be sent to the Secretary-General, it would be logical for the group to summarize them with the Secretariat's assistance, and the text should be amended accordingly.

3. Mr. ORČIĆ (Yugoslavia) said that he, too, did not think that the preparatory group should be requested to summarize the replies, and felt that paragraph (e) should be amended accordingly. As soon as it received the replies, the

Secretariat should circulate them *in extenso* to Member States in time for the fiftieth session of the Council in April/May.

4. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation did not object in principle to the establishment of a group which would prepare data with a view to singling out certain questions that would help the Council to improve its work. However, it considered that no useful purpose would be served by setting up a working group at the present time. There had been no formal discussion giving Council members an opportunity to express their views, and the views expressed during the informal discussions had not been recorded. Consequently, there were no views on the basis of which the group could prepare a list of questions.

5. The establishment of a working group at the present time would also create difficulties for Governments, which could not be expected to express an opinion unless they were properly informed of the views of Council members. Those views should be explained formally and recorded at the fiftieth session of the Council. A working group could then be set up which would have the information it needed to do its work.

6. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece), referring to paragraph (a) of the compromise proposal, said he felt that it would be inappropriate for the questionnaire to be drafted by a preparatory group; that task should be performed by the Secretariat, with the help of the President of the Council. He observed that on 30 December 1970 the Secretary-General had sent to Governments a questionnaire relating to a system of over-all appraisal of progress in implementing the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade. He feared that Governments might be confused as to the relationship between that questionnaire and the questionnaire mentioned in the compromise proposal, which might also refer to the International Development Strategy. With regard to paragraph (b), he agreed that the draft questionnaire should be submitted to an informal meeting of the Council called by the President. He shared the Yugoslav representative's views concerning paragraph (e) and agreed that replies should be circulated *in extenso* to Member States, although that procedure would have financial implications. The compromise proposal should be amended to indicate that the Secretariat should prepare the questionnaire and a summary of the replies submitted by Governments, which would be discussed at an informal meeting of the Council to be held between the fiftieth and the fifty-first sessions.

7. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) said he was concerned to note that the compromise solution was not winning unanimous support. The Council's main objective should be to ensure that constructive discussions would take place at the

fiftieth session, based on proper documentation and Government replies to the questionnaire, which should be prepared by a small authoritative group and submitted to Governments as soon as possible. His delegation supported the proposals contained in the note by the outgoing President (E/L.1369). With regard to paragraph (b) of the compromise proposal, he doubted whether the questionnaire could be formally approved at an informal meeting of the Council. He agreed with the Yugoslav representative that the replies to the questionnaire should be reproduced *in extenso* in a document that would be considered by the Council at its fiftieth session.

8. Mr. YOGASUNDRAM (Ceylon) welcomed the Indonesian representative's new proposal, which constituted a good compromise between the two positions taken at the preceding meeting. He agreed that a preparatory group should be set up and noted that the objections to it appeared to be based on the fact that there had been no substantive discussions on the subject in the Council. He pointed out, for the benefit of the Pakistan representative, that the Secretariat had sent out questionnaires without formal approval in the past.

9. Mr. HEDEMANN (Norway) said he was concerned about the time factor and the urgent need to improve the work of the Council. He felt that the compromise proposal was the best that could be achieved under the circumstances and was therefore eager to support it.

10. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) agreed with the Yugoslav representative that reports and summaries of Government replies should be prepared by the Secretariat as a matter of principle. He considered that a questionnaire would not be the most appropriate means of eliciting the views of Governments, since it might limit the scope of their replies. He felt that the Council should engage in a more substantive debate during the fiftieth session. He had reservations concerning paragraph (e) of the compromise proposal, but he would support the majority view with regard to paragraphs (a), (b), (c) and (d).

11. Mr. QUARONI (Italy) said that his delegation had been of the opinion that, before a questionnaire was sent to Governments, a working group should be established to process the various suggestions made during the informal discussions. The idea of a preliminary sifting of the background material was, however, contained in the compromise proposal, which was therefore acceptable to his delegation. As the French representative had suggested, paragraph (e) of the proposal should be amended to indicate that the summary of replies should be made, in the main, by the Secretariat.

12. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon) said that his delegation was happy to support the compromise proposal. The very valid points raised by the Brazilian, French, Pakistan and Yugoslav representatives could be met by emphasizing that the work was to be done by the preparatory group in collaboration with the Secretariat and that Government replies would be circulated *in extenso*. The representative of the USSR had pointed out that no formal views had been expressed and had suggested that it would therefore be premature to establish a working group. It must be realized, however, that unless some decision such as that

proposed by the Indonesian representative was taken the Council might at its fiftieth session again be faced with the situation of having no formal proposals to consider. The preparatory group would act as a clearing house, process and tabulate Government replies and submit a formal report to the Council at its fiftieth session. The Council might then decide to establish a formal working group to discuss the substantive questions raised by Governments in their replies and to report back to it at its fifty-first session, when the main discussion on the question would take place. The Brazilian representative had suggested that the existence of a questionnaire might limit the scope of the discussion. That difficulty could be avoided by indicating in paragraph (d) that Governments should forward views on the subject as well as their replies to the questionnaire not later than the end of March 1971. By performing the functions proposed in the compromise proposal, the preparatory group would enable the Council to hold fruitful discussions on the subject at its fiftieth session.

13. Mr. OLDS (United States of America) said that part of the confusion seemed to stem from the fact that some members had not differentiated sufficiently between the formal and informal phases involved in consideration of the problem. It had been argued, for instance, that under the terms of the compromise proposal undue weight was being given to an informal process. It must be remembered, however, that the preparatory group would not be a policy- or decision-making body. It would merely help the Council to collect and summarize data from Governments. Once that had been done, with the assistance of the Secretariat, the Council would be in a position, at its fiftieth session, to decide whether further work on a more formal basis was necessary. In short, the proposal would very well serve the limited purpose for which it was intended.

14. Mr. AKWEI (Ghana) said that it would be difficult for his delegation to endorse the compromise proposal. Although the note by the outgoing President (E/L.1369) had been praised by those who considered that the Council should approach the matter cautiously, it had been a source of disappointment to those who felt that specific measures should be taken without delay to help the Council to improve the organization of its work. It was regrettable, therefore, that the proposal made by the representative of Norway (1734th meeting) that any working group established should be composed of the officers of the Council and one representative from each region had not been adopted. Such a group would have been more representative of the various opinions prevailing in the Council than the preparatory group proposed in paragraph (a) of the compromise proposal.

15. Furthermore, it was doubtful whether the proposed preparatory group would accomplish any meaningful work. Not all members were convinced of the need to send a questionnaire to Governments, many of which had already, in response to questionnaires issued by other bodies, expressed their views on how the work of the United Nations could be improved. In any case, if a questionnaire was sent out, its format should be decided by the Council and the replies it elicited should be summarized by the Secretariat, not the preparatory group. It would seem, therefore, that the terms of reference of the proposed preparatory group should be revised.

16. Some members had hoped that at its present organizational meetings the Council would have established a working group to examine the many suggestions that had already been made on the subject. It was true that those suggestions had been made informally, but it was unlikely that any participant in the informal discussions would have made suggestions which he knew conflicted with his Government's opinion on the matter. All that was necessary was to raise the status of the informal suggestions and thus enable the Council to consider the substance of the matter.

17. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) said that the compromise proposal seemed to reflect all the views expressed on the matter. Since no formal proposals had been made, it would seem premature to establish a working group; the work outlined in the compromise proposal could be done by a preparatory group. In order to allay the concern of those representatives who had expressed misgivings about the wording of paragraph (e), his delegation, which had consulted other delegations on the matter, proposed that that paragraph should be amended to read: "(e) to request the Secretary-General to circulate the full text of replies to the questionnaire upon receipt to the members of the Council". It also proposed that the following paragraph should be added to the text: "(f) to request the Secretary-General to summarize the replies to the questionnaire and to report to the Council at its fiftieth session".

18. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) said that objections to the compromise proposal concerned two points: whether a preparatory group or a working group should be established to prepare the questionnaire; and, whether, at the current stage, Government comments should be directed along certain lines. His delegation considered that at the present stage Government comments were necessary. It had no firm views on the question whether a preparatory or a working group should be established at that stage, but in view of the comments of the Ghanaian representative it would not object to the questionnaire being prepared by a larger group than that suggested in the compromise proposal. In order to meet the objections to which he had referred, his delegation proposed that the compromise proposal should be amended along the following lines. Paragraph (a) could be amended to read: "(a) that the Council's bureau and the preceding President of the Council, in consultation with other interested members of the Council, should prepare, with the assistance of the Secretary-General, a questionnaire and relevant background material on measures to improve the work of the Council". If that amendment was adopted, paragraph (b) would become redundant. Paragraph (c) should be amended to read: "(c) to transmit this questionnaire to States Members of the United Nations by the end of January 1971". The following paragraph should be added between paragraphs (c) and (d): "to transmit also to Member States the records of the discussions of the Council on this subject at its forty-ninth and fiftieth sessions as well as the outgoing President's note (E/L.1369)". In order to take account of the comments made by the representatives of the Soviet Union and Brazil, paragraph (d) should be amended to read: "to request Governments to forward their views on measures to improve the work of the Council as early as possible and not later than the end of March 1971". Paragraph (e) should be redrafted along the lines suggested by the Sudanese representative.

19. Mr. SZARKA (Hungary) said that his delegation still felt that it would be unwise to establish a working group until the Council had had a formal discussion on the subject at its fiftieth session. His delegation also questioned the wisdom of sending out a questionnaire to Governments; if the questionnaire was too detailed it would prejudice Governments' answers and if it was non-committal there was no need for a working group and the task could be given to the Secretary-General. It was doubtful, too, whether an informal meeting of the Council would be able to approve any questionnaire that might be prepared. Moreover, it was unlikely that many Governments would be able to forward their replies to the questionnaire by the time stipulated in the compromise proposal and any action based on an insufficient number of replies would not be very meaningful. It would seem, therefore, that the best procedure would be to place all available documents, including those prepared for the current organizational meetings, before the Council at its fiftieth session, when a decision on how to deal with the item could be taken.

20. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that whereas he had received instructions from his Government on the procedural aspects of the question he had received no instructions on its substantive aspects. It was for that reason that his delegation had suggested that before embarking on the final phase of such an important question the Council should ascertain the views of Governments.

21. With one reservation concerning paragraph (e), his delegation had supported the compromise proposal. It should be noted, however, that it regarded the proposal as a procedural rather than a substantive one. The Council was faced with a compromise and if that compromise was to be fruitful, the preparatory group should realize that while any questionnaire it might prepare could consist of detailed questions on procedure it should not include detailed questions on the institutional aspects of the problem. It would be to the Council's advantage to leave the questionnaire as general as possible. Obviously, the members of the Council should have access to the replies received to the questionnaire, but a summary of the replies prepared by the Secretariat would probably be very useful. It seemed necessary to point out that the Council might not complete its discussions on the matter at its fiftieth session and that it might have to include the item in the agenda for its fifty-first session.

22. There was a danger that the amendments suggested by the representative of Pakistan might jeopardize the compromise reached; they were, therefore, unacceptable to his delegation. Apart from the modification to paragraph (e), which his delegation had proposed, the wording of the compromise proposal should remain unchanged.

23. Mr. ANTOINE (Haiti) said that his delegation considered that the compromise proposal, with the amendments proposed by the Sudanese delegation, was a useful formula which could be adopted by the Council.

24. Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) said that his delegation was in general agreement with the compromise proposal and felt that the Pakistan and Sudanese amendments made it even more acceptable. It could support the amendment to paragraph (a) proposed by the Pakistan

representative, but could not support that representative's proposal to delete paragraph (b), for it doubted whether an informal meeting of the Council could formally approve the questionnaire prepared by the preparatory group. Similarly, his delegation had doubts about the Pakistan proposal to circulate to Member States the records of the discussions in the forty-ninth and fiftieth sessions of the Council.

25. Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya) considered that the Council should leave to the Secretariat the entire responsibility for drafting a comprehensive questionnaire in a form which would effectively take account of views of Member States. An effective start to Council action could be provided by a working group, which would study and synthesize the views of Member States as they were received. Thought should also be given to the possibility of sending the questionnaire to the regional economic commissions as well as to certain specialized agencies whose activities were affected by the Council's work. The working group should have a wide membership and should include officials from the Secretariat and the specialized agencies who were familiar with the Council's work. Furthermore, the working group should be assisted by experts in organization and methods.

26. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that the dual character of the compromise proposal had been noted by the Lebanese and the United States representatives. Some of its factors were formal and others were informal. Therefore, there seemed to be a choice between giving the preparatory group an informal or formal character. However, other aspects of the proposal, such as deadlines, were quite definitely formal. That dichotomy had also been recognized by the Pakistan and Sudanese representatives, who had put forward constructive amendments. His delegation was most gratified to note the constructive approach being taken by delegations; in particular, it supported the views expressed by the Hungarian representative, who had felt that Governments should be given sufficient time to reply to the questionnaire and had stressed that it would be premature to set up a working group at the present time. His delegation felt that the Council should close its discussion on the question by adopting a three-point solution which would accurately reflect the views expressed during the debate. First, a

formal exchange of views on the substance of the problem should take place at the fiftieth session of the Council. Secondly, documents reflecting the formal discussion at that session should be sent to Governments which would submit their views on the basis of that discussion. Thirdly, if the Council at its fiftieth session felt that it would be desirable or necessary to have the views of all Member States, it should request the Secretary-General to circulate a questionnaire for that purpose.

27. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that the Secretariat had the experience and knowledge required to draft the questionnaire and should therefore be assigned that task. His delegation entirely shared the Ghanaian representative's view that the preparatory group should not be exclusive in its composition: it might perhaps be open to any member of the Council who wished to attend its meetings as an observer. In that way, all the members of the Council could be informed of the group's work. A reference to that effect might be included in paragraph (a), and in addition paragraph (e) might be reworded to cover assistance by the Secretariat and the circulation of replies *in extenso*. It would therefore be logical to insert paragraph (b) before paragraph (e). His delegation hoped that the Indonesian representative would take into account the comments of the Ghanaian, USSR and Yugoslav representatives and submit an amended text for final adoption.

28. Mr. AKWEI (Ghana) said his delegation feared that the Council would meet with difficulties if it proceeded on the basis of the compromise proposal in its present form. He believed that the Council, at its fiftieth session, should engage in a substantive discussion of measures to improve its work, for otherwise action might be postponed indefinitely. Some preparatory work would therefore be needed and a group should be set up to carry it out. If it was also felt that the group should prepare the questionnaire, then the group would have to report to a formal meeting of the Council. In that case the Pakistan representative's suggestion not to hold an informal meeting would not apply. Finally, the group should study the existing materials and suggestions received from Member States and submit the background material to the Council at its fiftieth session.

*The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.*



President: Mr. R. DRISS (Tunisia).

#### AGENDA ITEM 4

##### Confirmation of members of functional commissions of the Council (E/4934 and Add.1-3)

1. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should confirm the members of the functional commissions listed in the note by the Secretary-General (E/4934 and Add.1-3).

*It was so decided.*

#### AGENDA ITEM 3

##### Elections (E/L.1359, E/L.1365)

2. The PRESIDENT observed that the Council was to elect the thirteen members of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, seven members of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination and four members of the United Nations/FAO Intergovernmental Committee of the World Food Programme. The Secretariat had indicated that for each election the number of candidates for the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, seven for CPC and four for the United Nations/FAO Intergovernmental Committee.

3. Mr. AHMED (Secretary of the Council) read out the list of candidates for the three bodies:

*United Nations/FAO Intergovernmental Committee of the World Food Programme:* Australia, Kenya, Peru, and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

*Committee for Programme and Co-ordination:* Colombia, France, Nigeria, Sudan, Trinidad and Tobago, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and United States of America.

*Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations:* France, Ghana, Hungary, Indonesia, Jamaica, Kenya, Norway, Pakistan, Sudan, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Uruguay.

4. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Member States on the list which the Secretary of the Council had just read out should be declared elected without a vote.

*It was so decided.*

#### AGENDA ITEM 5

##### Measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council (concluded) (E/L.1369)

5. Mr. MARAMIS (Indonesia) recalled that his delegation had submitted at the preceding meeting a compromise proposal. His delegation felt that the proposal could be supported unanimously by the Council. If that was not the case, it would not press for a decision on the matter.

6. The PRESIDENT suggested that the members of the Council should adopt the following decision:

*“The Economic and Social Council,*

*“Having considered the note by the outgoing President (E/L.1367),*

*“Decides to request the Secretary-General:*

*“(a) to transmit to the Governments of States Members of the United Nations the records of its discussions of the question of measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council during the organizational meetings of the fiftieth session, together with the note by the outgoing President;*

*“(b) to invite the Governments of Member States to communicate their views and proposals, if any, on this matter in time for their circulation to the Council for consideration at its fiftieth session.”*

*The proposal was accepted without objection.*

7. Mr. AHMED (Secretary of the Council) said that, in view of the decision just taken, the members of the Council were urged to submit their corrections to the records of the meetings as quickly as possible.

8. The PRESIDENT, on behalf of the Council, thanked Mrs. Herman, Assistant Secretary of the Council, who would soon leave the Secretariat, for the services she had rendered the Economic and Social Council during the past twenty-five years. Mrs. Herman should be congratulated on the role she played in the organization of the Council's sessions and in the preparation of its documentation. He also wished to thank Mr. Sakhreddine, representative of the Sudan, Mr. Franzi, representative of Italy and Mr. Olds, representative of the United States of America, who would soon leave the Council, for their co-operation, and to wish them every possible success in their future work.

*The meeting rose at 3.40 p.m.*



---

**HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS**

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

**COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES**

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre librairie ou adressez-vous à: Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

**КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ**

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

**COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS**

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

---