

34. He said that draft resolution I had been adopted by the Co-ordination Committee without objection, and if he heard none in the Council, he would take it that it too wished to do so.

*Draft resolution I was adopted without objection.*<sup>6</sup>

35. The PRESIDENT said that draft resolution II had also been adopted by the Co-ordination Committee without objection; he would take it that the Council wished to follow suit.

*Draft resolution II was adopted without objection.*<sup>7</sup>

<sup>6</sup> Council resolution 1742 (LIV).

<sup>7</sup> Council resolution 1743 (LIV).

36. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested that in paragraph 3 (e) the words "*a takje*" should be replaced by the word "*i*". As it stood, the text placed the Spanish, Russian and Chinese languages in an inferior position.

37. The PRESIDENT said that the Secretariat would make the necessary correction to the text.

38. If he heard no objections, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt draft resolution III.

*Draft resolution III was adopted without abstention.*<sup>8</sup>

*The meeting rose at 12.05 p.m.*

<sup>8</sup> Council resolution 1744 (LIV).

## 1855th meeting

Wednesday, 16 May 1973, at 10.50 a.m.

President: Mr. Sergio A. FRAZÃO (Brazil).

E/SR.1855

### AGENDA ITEM 13

#### Capital punishment

##### REPORT OF THE SOCIAL COMMITTEE (E/5298)

1. The PRESIDENT drew attention to paragraph 17 of the Social Committee's report (E/5298), which contained a draft resolution recommended for adoption by the Council.

2. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution in the Social Committee but now intended to vote for it. Although the legal system in Chile did provide for capital punishment, the relevant legislation was more than 100 years old and had not been applied in recent years. His delegation could support the draft resolution, since it did not call for the abolition of capital punishment and it expressly stated that the main objective to be pursued was that of progressively restricting the number of offences for which capital punishment might be imposed with a view to the desirability of abolishing such punishment. His delegation particularly endorsed the expression of concern in paragraph 4 at the use of harsher methods of execution, a concern which was entirely in keeping with his country's respect for the dignity of human life.

3. The PRESIDENT said that a vote had been requested on the draft resolution.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 12 abstentions.*<sup>1</sup>

### AGENDA ITEM 17

#### Social development:

- (a) Report of the Commission for Social Development;
- (b) Promotion of the co-operative movement during the Second United Nations Development Decade

##### REPORT OF THE SOCIAL COMMITTEE (E/5328)

4. The PRESIDENT noted that paragraph 24 of the Social Committee's Report (E/5328) contained seven

<sup>1</sup> Council resolution 1745 (LIV).

draft resolutions and five draft decisions recommended for adoption by the Council. He then put draft resolution I to the vote.

*Draft resolution I was adopted by 24 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*<sup>2</sup>

5. Mr. EVDOKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had voted for draft resolution I as a whole in the Social Committee for the reasons it had explained in that Committee. His delegation understood the reference to "obligations" in the eleventh preambular paragraph as meaning only obligations assumed by States pursuant to agreements concluded by them. No obligations could be imposed upon a State by virtue of an agreement to which it was not a party.

6. Mr. COUTO (Brazil) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution I in the Social Committee but had cast an affirmative vote on the present occasion as proof of its identification with the broad purposes of the draft resolution. His delegation had abstained initially because of imperfections in the draft resolution which could be attributed to the attempt to combine, in a single text, two different drafts conceived from different points of view.

7. The causes of and the remedies for the problems raised in the draft resolution were not adequately identified, and the notion of "social development" was presented as if measures to improve social conditions could be envisaged in the abstract, without regard for the general framework of development policies.

8. The text was imprecise with respect to the role of national and international efforts in the social development process. National efforts seemed to be ignored, and international efforts were presented in formulations that were far too vague to have the required impact. Moreover, national and international efforts were not related to each other in a mutually supportive manner.

9. The specific wording of the text was also unsatisfactory, in particular the idea of a "working force" conceived of as being separate from the population as a whole. In theory, Brazil regarded its working force as being every man, woman and child in the popula-

<sup>2</sup> Council resolution 1746 (LIV).

tion. Because the resolution was biased in its approach to social development, it had the effect of prejudging situations that should be viewed in the context of national priorities and national decisions.

10. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution I, although it shared to some extent the concern expressed by the representative of Brazil with regard to the unsatisfactory wording of certain ideas. It particularly endorsed the recommendation in paragraph 4 that appropriate measures should be taken at all levels to ensure more active participation by the entire population, including the working force, in the production, preparation and execution of economic and social development policies and programmes. He understood the expression "working force" to mean the majority of the population in most developing countries, which had marginal productive roles and were relatively disadvantaged compared with a favoured minority employed in the modern sector of the economy. The draft resolution rightly emphasized the need to involve the majority of the population in social progress and development.

11. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on draft resolution II.

*Draft resolution II was adopted by 25 votes to none, with 1 abstention.<sup>3</sup>*

12. Mr. WANG Jun-sheng (China) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution II because it needed to study further the implications of certain of its provisions. He stressed that circumstances differed in each country and that every country should decide its own approach to social and economic development.

13. The PRESIDENT noted that draft resolution III had been unanimously adopted by the Social Committee. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Council also wished to adopt it unanimously.

*Draft resolution III was adopted unanimously.<sup>4</sup>*

14. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on draft resolution IV.

*Draft resolution IV was adopted unanimously.<sup>5</sup>*

15. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on draft resolution V.

*Draft resolution V was adopted by 19 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.<sup>6</sup>*

16. The PRESIDENT noted that draft resolution VI had been unanimously adopted by the Social Committee. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Council also wished to adopt it unanimously.

*Draft resolution VI was adopted unanimously.<sup>7</sup>*

17. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on draft resolution VII.

*Draft resolution VII was adopted by 22 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.<sup>8</sup>*

18. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on draft decisions A, B, C, D and E, which had been adopted without objection by the Social Committee.

*Draft decisions A, B, C, D and E were adopted without objection.*

<sup>3</sup> Council resolution 1747 (LIV).

<sup>4</sup> Council resolution 1748 (LIV).

<sup>5</sup> Council resolution 1749 (LIV).

<sup>6</sup> Council resolution 1750 (LIV).

<sup>7</sup> Council resolution 1751 (LIV).

<sup>8</sup> Council resolution 1752 (LIV).

### AGENDA ITEM 3

#### Special measures in favour of the least developed among the developing countries

REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC COMMITTEE (E/5327)

19. The PRESIDENT drew attention to paragraph 15 of the report (E/5327), containing two draft resolutions which the Economic Committee had adopted by consensus and recommended for adoption by the Council.

*Draft resolutions I and II were adopted by consensus.<sup>9</sup>*

### AGENDA ITEM 4

#### Special measures related to the particular needs of the land-locked developing countries

REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC COMMITTEE (E/5326)

20. The PRESIDENT drew attention to paragraph 13 of the Economic Committee's report (E/5326), containing a draft resolution recommended for adoption by the Council, and invited the Council to vote on it.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 21 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.<sup>10</sup>*

21. Mr. VOLOSHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution on the understanding that, if a special fund were established to subsidize the additional transport costs of the land-locked developing countries, it would be financed exclusively from voluntary contributions.

22. Mr. KARHILO (Finland) said that, although his delegation fully recognized the problems of the land-locked developing countries and the need to adopt special measures to assist them, it had abstained in the vote because of its well-known opposition to the proliferation of special funds within the United Nations system. In particular, his delegation did not approve of the wording of paragraph 1, which implied that the Economic and Social Council was endorsing the establishment of a special fund to subsidize the additional transport costs of the land-locked developing countries.

23. Mr. DUMAS (France) said that, despite its sympathy for the problems of the land-locked developing countries, his delegation had abstained in the vote because it felt that paragraph 1 prejudged the question of establishing a special fund. The Council should not make any recommendation which might be interpreted as advocating the establishment of the fund without previously having made a careful study of the transport difficulties confronting the land-locked countries and having determined that a special fund was, in fact, the best means of overcoming those difficulties. At the present stage it would be better to study the question of the transport problems of land-locked countries in the regional economic commissions, under whose auspices consultations could be held with a view to co-ordinating the policies of the land-locked countries and the neighbouring transit States. Such a dialogue would facilitate increased trade between land-locked and other States and stimulate co-operation between land-locked and transit States in joint projects of mutual benefit.

24. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because

<sup>9</sup> Council resolutions 1753 (LIV) and 1754 (LIV).

<sup>10</sup> Council resolution 1755 (LIV).

it supported further efforts to seek international solutions to the problems of countries which were particularly disadvantaged as a result of their geographical location. His delegation viewed the question of special measures in favour of the land-locked developing countries in a wider context of special measures for countries which suffered economic disadvantages because of their location, for example, developing island countries. His delegation's support for the draft resolution, however, should not be interpreted as acceptance of an obligation to contribute to a special fund for the land-locked developing countries, if that should be the outcome of the study envisaged in the draft resolution.

25. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) said that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution because it supported the establishment of a fund to help the land-locked developing countries overcome their transport problems. He had noted with interest the point raised by the representative of France concerning the desirability of consultations between land-locked and transit countries and joint efforts to solve their mutual problems. His country had had successful experience with such an approach and believed that that method could be of great value to Asian and African countries.

26. Mr. ZAGORIN (United States of America) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution as an indication of its concern for the problems faced by the land-locked developing countries. Like others, however, his delegation had reservations as to the desirability of establishing yet another special fund. His delegation had been able to support the draft resolution because of the provision in paragraph 2 that the Secretary-General would bring forth in his study all possible alternatives that might result from his consultations.

## AGENDA ITEM 20

### Study on regional structures

#### REPORT OF THE CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE (E/5338)

27. The PRESIDENT drew attention to paragraph 10 of the report of the Co-ordination Committee (E/5338), containing two draft resolutions recommended for adoption by the Council. Since draft resolution I had been adopted by the Committee without a vote, he would take it, if there was no objection, that the Council also wished to adopt it without a vote.

*Draft resolution I was adopted without objection.*<sup>11</sup>

28. Mr. MAHMASSANI (Lebanon) said that his delegation had supported the draft resolution on the understanding that the study envisaged would not in any way jeopardize the establishment of further regional economic commissions.

29. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft resolution II, on which a vote had been taken in the Co-ordination Committee.

30. Mr. FACK (Netherlands) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution II in the Committee because it was opposed to an amendment submitted by the Brazilian delegation inserting the phrase "and under the authority and supervision of the legislative bodies of the regional economic commissions concerned" in paragraph 1. While it fully understood the concern of the Brazilian delegation that the authority and policy-making role of the regional economic

commissions should in no way be affected by intersecretariat meetings designed to improve co-operation and co-ordination at the regional level, his delegation felt that the Brazilian amendment would create considerable legal and practical difficulties for the Secretary-General in the organization of such meetings. Nevertheless, his delegation would be prepared to accept the draft resolution by consensus, if that was the wish of the Council, particularly in view of the fact that paragraph 2 gave the Council an opportunity to review the effectiveness of intersecretariat meetings at a later stage. If, however, the draft resolution were to be put to a vote, his delegation would abstain.

31. Mr. MACKENZIE (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had no difficulty with the substance of the draft resolution; however, he suggested that the word "legislative" in paragraph 1 should be replaced by "intergovernmental".

32. Mr. MEDEIROS (Brazil) said that the amendment his delegation had proposed to paragraph 1, which had been accepted by the Committee, was essential to preserve the authority and independence of the regional economic commissions. He had no objection, however, to the slight change suggested by the representative of the United Kingdom, if that was acceptable to the Council.

33. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) felt that it might indeed be appropriate to clarify the scope and spirit of the phrase that had been inserted in the draft resolution on the proposal of the Brazilian delegation. His own understanding was that intersecretariat co-ordination between the various regional bodies responsible for development was indispensable and that such co-ordination should in no sense reduce or affect the authority of the intergovernmental bodies to decide the programmes to be carried out by the respective agencies, and particularly by the regional economic commissions. Paragraph 1 of the draft resolution did not mean that a decision by the intergovernmental body concerned was required in order for the intersecretariat meetings to take place; otherwise, co-ordination among the executive secretaries of the regional economic commissions would be almost impossible to achieve, since some commissions met only biennially. However, there should be a continuing flow of information from the executive secretaries to Governments, so that the latter could consider and orient the meetings called for in paragraph 1 of the draft resolution under consideration.

34. On the basis of that interpretation, his delegation would endorse the draft resolution, as amended in paragraph 1 by the representative of the United Kingdom.

35. Mr. VOLOSHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that in both the Co-ordination Committee and in the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (CPC), his delegation had been among those to express fears that intersecretariat meetings with the participation of representatives of the specialized agencies under the chairmanship of the executive secretaries of the regional economic commissions might to some extent encroach on the rights of the intergovernmental bodies.

36. The Brazilian amendment, which had been adopted by the Co-ordination Committee, had in fact made it possible for his own delegation to support the draft resolution. Accordingly, it would support the present text, which the representative of Brazil had agreed to amend in accordance with the proposal of the United Kingdom representative.

<sup>11</sup> Council resolution 1756 (LIV).

37. Mr. ZAGORIN (United States of America) observed that, if a regional economic commission met every two years, "supervision" was not a type of activity it could feasibly undertake. He was of the opinion that the term "authority" in paragraph 1 was sufficient and therefore proposed that the words "and supervision" should be deleted.

38. Mr. MEDEIROS (Brazil) said he failed to understand the semantic difficulties experienced by the United States representative. It was true that his own delegation had originally proposed the insertion of the phrase in question, but the latter had been adopted by the Co-ordination Committee. However, he would have no objection to the deletion of the words "and supervision", on the understanding that the term "authority" included the task of supervision and/or guidance.

39. Mr. VERCELES (Philippines) said that, in the view of his delegation, retention of the words "and supervision" would create practical difficulties in the implementation of the provisions of the resolution. Consequently, he was gratified to note that the representative of Brazil agreed to their deletion.

40. Mr. FACK (Netherlands) said that the text, even as improved by the deletion of the words "and supervision", might create legal and practical difficulties for the Secretary-General. However, if the interpretation placed on paragraph 1 by the representative of Chile was acceptable to the Council, his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution, although it would much prefer to have the text adopted by consensus.

41. The PRESIDENT said, that if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt draft resolution II by consensus.

*Draft resolution II was adopted by consensus.<sup>12</sup>*

42. Dr. COIGNEY (World Health Organization (WHO)) said that, as early as 1962, the Executive Board of WHO had requested the Director-General to study co-ordination at the level of the regional economic commissions. In its resolution EB31.R49, the Executive Board had declared that, bearing in mind the constitutional responsibilities of WHO in the field of health, its willingness to assist, and the economic advantages that would accrue from early participation of health experts in the planning and execution of development programmes, the Director-General should continue the co-operation described in the study in question. WHO's regional arrangements were stipulated in the WHO Constitution; the pertinent articles had been implemented since 1948 and after the first World Health Assembly had delineated six geographical areas which still constituted the basic regional structures of the agency.

43. In conformity with the Constitution, each region consisted of a regional intergovernmental committee and a regional office. The functions of the former included the formulation of policies governing matters of an exclusively regional character, such as co-operation with regional bodies of the United Nations and other specialized agencies having interests in common with WHO.

44. In the western hemisphere the situation was somewhat more complex, since the WHO regional office was the Panamerican Health Organization (PAHO), which was also an organ of the Organization of American States and had its own constitution and its own budget.

45. He wished to assure the Council that WHO was ready to continue to take part in efforts to improve regional co-operation, bearing in mind its constitutional position; that position would be reflected in its contribution to the study now requested of the Secretary-General.

## AGENDA ITEM 21

### Tourism

#### REPORT OF THE CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE (E/5337)

46. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the Co-ordination Committee's report on tourism (E/5337). If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt the draft resolution contained in paragraph 9 of the report without objection.

*The draft resolution was adopted without objection.<sup>13</sup>*

47. Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had supported the draft resolution on the understanding that paragraph 3 of the text did not prejudice his country's position regarding ratification of the statutes of the World Tourism Organization.

48. The PRESIDENT said that he would take it that the Council wished to adopt, without objection, the draft decision contained in paragraph 10 of the report (E/5337).

*The draft decision was adopted without objection.*

49. Mr. ZAGORIN (United States of America) said that his delegation had refrained from taking part in the Council's action on the draft decision in question because it did not believe that it was appropriate for the Council to guide non-governmental organizations as suggested in the text.

50. Mr. MEDEIROS (Brazil) said that, if there had been a vote on the draft decision, his delegation would have been obliged to abstain.

51. Mr. WANG Jun-sheng (China) said that his delegation had fully endorsed the draft decision recommended by the Co-ordination Committee because it believed that it was wholly consonant with the spirit of General Assembly resolution 2758 (XXVI).

#### *Increase in the seating capacity of the Economic and Social Council Chamber (E/5308)*

52. The PRESIDENT observed that the Secretary-General, in his note (E/5308), had submitted a plan for alterations to the Council Chamber which raised a number of questions: for example, the design of the new Chamber, which did not reflect the dignity and importance of the Council; the location of the various groups of representatives; the fact that some delegations would have seating for only one adviser; and the few seats provided for observers. In view of the significance of the matters discussed by the Council, a large number of representatives of States that were not members of the Council followed its debates very closely and they should be adequately accommodated. Yet another point was that the accommodation in the suite of offices and the conference room adjoining the Council Chamber was completely inadequate, even at the present time, and would be even more inadequate when the Council came to be enlarged. Accordingly, the

<sup>12</sup> Council resolution 1757 (LIV).

<sup>13</sup> Council resolution 1758 (LIV).

suite should be refurbished so as to serve fully the purpose for which it was built.

53. Mr. VAN NAME (Buildings Management Service, Office of General Services) said that, following the Council's decision to increase its membership, the Secretary-General had considered the question of the cost of accommodating an enlarged Council. At the time, it had been estimated at \$85,000. However, no decision had been taken as to whether the Chamber should be altered. The plan now contained in the note by the Secretary-General (E/5308) was designed to improve the lines of sight from the seating position of the president. Minimum changes, and maximum use of existing furniture, had been made to that end, so as to reduce the cost, which was now estimated at \$100,000.

54. The Chamber was essentially the same as when it had been originally designed in 1949. The only basic difference was in the seating arrangements for the members of the Council. Places for more members had been set at the existing tables—the result being that, whereas formerly all delegations had two adviser seats, some would now have only one. No changes had been made in the places allocated for observers and the location of the various groups of representatives remained the same.

55. The Secretariat had made no proposal for changes in the suite of offices adjoining the Chamber because it had never been called upon to do so. If requested, it would of course explore requirements and make any necessary alterations.

56. Mr. FACK (Netherlands) said he could not conceal his delegation's disappointment with the unsatisfactory plan contained in document E/5308. Even allowing for the 24 seats on the sides of the Chamber, it would not be possible for all delegations to have two adviser seats. In other words, if the plan was put into effect, the future situation would be worse than it was in Conference Room 3, in which the Council was currently meeting. He fully concurred with the President's view that the facilities were not adequate from the standpoint of the dignity and importance of the Council and, in addition, from the standpoint of efficiency. For purposes of comparison, it should be remembered that the Security Council Chamber provided seating for more than two advisers for each delegation.

57. Moreover, while the Council certainly wanted proper and adequate press coverage, it was somewhat exaggerated, to say the least, to provide 100 press seats. In that regard, it would be useful to ascertain from the United Nations Correspondents' Association its opinion on essential seating arrangements for the press.

58. Lastly, it would be useful for the officers of the Council, together with a small number of representatives, to form a group and discuss matters with the Secretary-General with a view to improving the present plan.

59. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) said that he fully shared the views of the President and the representative of the Netherlands. The plan did not bespeak a clear understanding of the need to maintain the prestige and dignity of the Council, nor would it enable delegations to work efficiently.

60. When he himself had been President of the Economic and Social Council, he had faced a similar problem at Geneva and had been compelled to obtain an allocation of \$50,000 from the Fifth Committee in

order to overcome the difficulties. It was apparent that certain administrative circles in the United Nations had failed to make a true evaluation of the importance of the work of the Council and of its prestige. The Council Chamber had been planned when the entire membership of the United Nations was less than half what it was now. It was not possible to make temporary changes any longer; the time had come for adequate permanent arrangements.

61. He wished to endorse the proposal of the Netherlands representative regarding establishment of a group to consult with the Secretary-General and seek a long-term solution. The Council could not continue to meet in rooms which had been designed for other bodies and other purposes. Lastly, he was grateful to the President for his endeavours and for placing the matter before the Council.

62. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) said that an entirely new and fundamentally different plan was required. Not only should each delegation be provided with seats for at least two advisers, but the horseshoe seating arrangement should be reversed so as to enable the President to see each representative. Indeed, it might even be possible to alter the layout so that no one would be facing the window and, consequently, there would be less need for artificial lighting. Furthermore, in the course of its proceedings, the Council was required to engage in a considerable amount of voting. With an enlarged Council, there would be even more need for a voting machine to be installed in the Chamber. It was also perfectly true, as the Netherlands representative had pointed out, that considerably fewer than 100 press seats were needed. In the final analysis, it was the Council that would decide the question of costs and he endorsed the proposal to establish a small group to discuss the subject with the Secretary-General.

63. Mr. ZAGORIN (United States of America) said that he agreed with the points made by previous speakers. The further consideration of plans to increase the seating capacity of the Economic and Social Council Chamber should take into account not only the dignity of the Council but also its functional needs. He therefore supported the President's suggestion that a contact group should be established to consult with the Secretary-General and members of the Secretariat, so that those who would ultimately formulate the plans would be aware of those needs. He agreed that voting machinery should be installed in the Council Chamber and that fewer seats should be allocated to members of the press. The principle of equity should be observed with regard to the seating arrangements and each delegation should have a minimum of two seats for advisers. The proposed plan was too limited in concept; although his delegation appreciated the Secretariat's desire to keep costs down, the preparations and planning for increasing the seating capacity of the Council Chamber must take into account the constitutional change that would take place in the Council when it was expanded. The plans should be somewhat bolder, in keeping with the drive to rationalize and revitalize the Council's work.

64. Mr. MACKENZIE (United Kingdom) said that he agreed with the President that the question should be re-examined and he endorsed the other points raised by speakers regarding equity in seating arrangements, installation of voting machinery and allocation of seats to the press, the public and delegates. He suggested the possibility of reconstructing the Chamber in such a

way that it could be used during the General Assembly by the Second Committee, since there was a severe shortage of conference rooms during the Assembly.

65. Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) endorsed the statements of previous speakers and pointed out that there appeared to be space in the Chamber to seat some 700 or 800 persons. There should therefore be no difficulty in providing seating arrangements for 54 delegations, with three advisers each, since only 216 seats would be required in all. He agreed with the representative of the United Kingdom that efforts should be made to reconstruct the chamber in such a way that it could accommodate 140 delegations for General Assembly meetings. He suggested that, since Denmark had donated the Economic and Social Council Chamber originally, the Danish delegation should participate in the contact group suggested by the President.

66. Mr. SADDLER (Chief, Economic, Social and Human Rights Section, Office of Financial Services) said that he was sure the Secretary-General would be very happy to hear the views of the Council on the matter under consideration. Indeed, had he heard those views earlier, they could have been reflected in the plan. The wishes of members would undoubtedly influence the Governments which would be providing the funds to carry out the required alterations. In drawing up the plan, the Secretary-General had borne in mind the financial situation of the United Nations and the positions of Governments respecting that situation. A number of options had been considered, the cost of which ranged from \$100,000 to \$700,000, with the highest figure representing the cost of a complete restructuring of the Council Chamber. The Secretary-General would be happy to discuss the plan for increased seating capacity with the group appointed by the Council.

67. The PRESIDENT agreed with the representative of the Office of Financial Services that the current debate could have been avoided had the members of the Council been consulted earlier. The Council would obviously bear in mind the financial implications of any future plan, but there were other considerations which should be taken into account, as he had stated earlier. He suggested that the Council should take a decision on the matter at one of its forthcoming meetings; meanwhile, he would consult delegations regarding their views.

### AGENDA ITEM 30

#### Consideration of the provisional agenda for, and duration of, the fifty-fifth session (E/L.1544, E/L.1545, E/L.1548 and Add.1)

68. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) said that the provisional agenda for the fifty-fifth and resumed fifty-fifth sessions, contained in document E/L.1544, were based on the programme for 1973 approved by the Council at one of its organizational meetings (1850th meeting), on 10 January 1973. The list of items also took into account the decision by the Council to postpone until its fifty-fifth session consideration of the item entitled "Work programme and budget for 1974-1975 and the medium-term plan for 1974-1977 relating to economic, social and human rights activities". It did not take into account any action which the Council had taken or might still take during the fifty-fourth session. The Secretariat would submit suggestions on how the decisions taken at the current

session could be reflected in the agenda for the fifty-fifth session. He pointed out a typographical error in paragraph 15 of the English version of document E/L.1544: UNDP should be replaced by UNEP.

69. Mr. DUMAS (France) said that he shared the President's concern to maintain the effectiveness of the Council and update its work. The same concern for effectiveness had led his delegation to state, during discussion in the Co-ordination Committee on the rationalization of the Council's work, that the Council should focus attention on a few major issues, such as items 3, 4 and 15, which would undoubtedly give rise to important discussions. However, the provisional agenda in document E/L.1544 contained 21 other items, and he wondered whether the Council was not over-estimating its working capacity. Although his delegation would like to support the President's efforts to ensure that the Council fulfilled its important task, it should be borne in mind that delegations and Secretariat officials would need some respite after the summer session to prepare for the General Assembly. He therefore hoped that any decision to extend the fifty-fifth session until 10 August 1973 would be considered tentative, in other words, to be acted on only if, after consultations, it proved impossible to organize the Council's work in any other way. It should not create a precedent.

70. The PRESIDENT said that the officers of the Council had decided to extend the summer session in order to facilitate the rationalization of the Council's future work.

71. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) said that the provisional agenda for the fifty-fifth session marked the end of a phase in the Council's work. There were many items which would have to be completed so that in 1974 the Council could concentrate on major issues, in accordance with the new resolutions on the rationalization of its work, and assume its primary responsibility in the field of international economic and social co-operation. He was confident that the President would organize the Council's work in such a way as to shorten discussions on certain items. There were several items on which the General Assembly had requested that a report be submitted to the Council for comments. However, he wondered whether it was necessary for the Council to discuss those reports and whether they could not be submitted directly to the General Assembly for a final decision. In his delegation's view, the Council could further rationalize its work by discussing the items on UNDP and the United Nations Capital Development Fund concurrently. He was certain that the preparatory work done by the officers of the Council and the Secretariat would lighten the agenda for the fifty-fifth session, and he supported the proposal to extend the summer session in order to clear the way for more substantive work in the future.

72. The question of multinational corporations had not been included in the provisional agenda and he formally proposed that it should be. The situation with regard to such corporations was evolving rapidly; the study group proposed had not yet been established and the matter required urgent attention. He noted that, under item 4, the concept of collective economic security had been incorporated in the review and appraisal of the Second United Nations Development Decade in an effort to reduce the number of items on the agenda, but it might give the impression that the concept of collective economic security was related only to the

International Development Strategy whereas it was actually much wider in scope. Perhaps the Secretariat could arrange the agenda in such a way that collective economic security was not specifically linked to the International Development Strategy, since it was an item of major importance. He formally proposed that the Director-General of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) should be included in the list of persons referred to in Economic and Social Council resolution 1724 (LIII), who should participate in the discussion of the item on international economic and social policy at the beginning of the Council's summer session. It would be useful to the Council to have direct information from GATT, particularly in view of the forthcoming multilateral trade negotiations in which both the developed and the developing countries were to take part.

73. The PRESIDENT explained that the decision that collective economic security should be considered in connexion with review and appraisal of the Second United Nations Development Decade had been adopted by the Council by consensus.

74. Mr. ROVIRA (Spain) shared the concern expressed by the representative of France regarding the difficulty of discussing in depth all the items on the provisional agenda for the fifty-fifth session. He felt that the agenda could be further rationalized and suggested that the President could consult the Chairmen of the Economic, Social and Co-ordination Committees to that end. He drew attention to rule 51 of the rules of procedure which stated that the Council could limit the time allowed to each speaker and the number of times each member could speak on any question. Since the rationalization of the Council's work was important to all delegations, he suggested that it might be wise to invoke rule 51, with a view to reducing the length of the session. Moreover, if the Council could work on Saturday mornings, the length of the session could be reduced.

75. The PRESIDENT said that the officers of the Council had already met to discuss the possibility of

lightening the agenda for the summer session. In theory, it appeared to be possible, but in the final analysis it had been extremely difficult to delete any items. He would be reluctant to enforce rule 51 of the rules of procedure because he considered that all members had a sovereign right to express their views in the way in which they thought fit. However, any voluntary curtailment of the length of statements and the number of statements would naturally be appreciated.

76. Mr. SINGH (Malaysia) said that his delegation could not agree to the extension of the session until 10 August because its commitments were already considerably over-extended in view of its limited staff and the very heavy schedule of meetings. In his delegation's view, the main objective should be to utilize the time available appropriately. He pointed out that, during the general debate, meetings had had to be postponed or adjourned for lack of speakers. The situation would probably be the same in the summer session even if it was extended. Moreover, the provisional agenda could have been more selective and could have concentrated on the most vital items.

77. Mr. ZAGORIN (United States of America) asked whether the recommendations and decisions made at meetings of the regional economic commissions regarding the admission of members or associate members would be included in the agenda for the summer session.

78. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) said that those recommendations and decisions would be considered under item 9, on regional co-operation.

79. Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he supported the Chilean proposal to include an item on multinational corporations in the agenda for the fifty-fifth session.

80. The PRESIDENT said that in view of the lateness of the hour, he would put the two Chilean proposals to the vote at a later meeting. He suggested that the Council should defer until Friday, 18 May 1973, any decision on the provisional agenda for, and duration of, the fifty-fifth session.

*The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.*

## 1856th meeting

Thursday, 17 May 1973, at 3.40 p.m.

President: Mr. Sergio A. FRAZÃO (Brazil).

E/SR.1856

### AGENDA ITEM 26

Elections (E/5233, E/5234 and Corr.1 and Add.1 and 2, E/5235 and Corr.1, E/5278, E/L.1526-1528, E/L.1529 and Corr.1, E/L.1537, E/L.1538, E/L.1539 and Add.1 and 2, E/L.1546)

#### ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE APPLICATION OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY TO DEVELOPMENT

1. The PRESIDENT drew the Council's attention to the note by the Secretary-General (E/5278), in which he had submitted the name of Mr. Bruce H. Billings, of the United States of America, for appointment in his personal capacity to the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development to fill the unexpired term of Mr. J. G. Harrar, who had

resigned. Mr. Billings would serve until 31 December 1974.

2. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to elect Mr. Billings.

*It was so decided.*

3. The PRESIDENT then drew attention to the note by the Secretary-General concerning the election of members of the functional commissions of the Council (E/L.1526), which indicated the number of seats to be filled in each commission as well as the number of seats allocated to each group of States. He suggested that the elections should be held in the order in which the Commissions were listed in the document.

4. To expedite the work, he suggested that Mr. Fleming (Argentina), Miss Gendron (Canada), Mr. Ya-