



**ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL**

*Fiftieth Session*  
OFFICIAL RECORDS

Thursday, 20 May 1971,  
at 10.50 a.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Rachid DRISS (Tunisia).

**AGENDA ITEM 4**

**Capital punishment**

REPORT OF THE SOCIAL COMMITTEE  
(E/4993 and Corr.1)

✓ 1. The PRESIDENT drew attention to a draft resolution, the adoption of which was recommended by the Social Committee in paragraph 9 of its report (E/4993 and Corr.1).

*The draft resolution was adopted by 14 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.*

2. Mr. ANTOINE (Haiti) said that, since Haitian law provided for the death penalty, his delegation had abstained from voting. He would, however, bring the resolution to his Government's attention.

3. Mr. DAMMERT (Peru) said that his delegation, while appreciating the humanitarian motives of a resolution which sought to extend maximum protection to the right to life in the spirit of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, had abstained from voting because the particular circumstances of Peru required that its legislation prescribing the death penalty for a small number of specific criminal offences should be maintained intact for the time being.

4. Mr. STILLMAN (United States of America) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on the resolution because, first, the imposition of the death penalty in the United States was complicated by the existence of separate federal and state systems of justice; secondly, several cases concerning the constitutionality of the death penalty were pending before the Supreme Court; and, thirdly, a task force of the Department of Justice was examining the question of abolition of the death penalty in federal offences.

**AGENDA ITEM 13**

**Development of information media**

REPORT OF THE SOCIAL COMMITTEE (E/4987)

5. The PRESIDENT drew attention to a draft resolution, the adoption of which was recommended by the Social Committee in paragraph 10 of its report (E/4987).

6. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested separate votes on operative paragraphs 2 and 3 of the draft resolution.

*Operative paragraph 2 was adopted by 19 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

*Operative paragraph 3 was adopted by 22 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

*The draft resolution as a whole was adopted unanimously.*

7. Mrs. BOIVINEAU (France) recalled that her delegation had requested a separate vote on operative paragraph 4 in the Social Committee because it had felt that it would be premature for the Council to take a decision on a matter that would be discussed in July 1971 at the Conferences to revise the Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works and the Universal Copyright Convention. It had not, however, felt that it was necessary to repeat that request.

8. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, although his delegation considered that the draft resolution went beyond the scope of the agenda item and of the UNESCO report (E/4958), and indeed beyond the Council's own terms of reference, it had voted for the draft resolution as a whole because it supported UNESCO's programme for 1972; in fact, the USSR had been one of its original sponsors. His delegation had requested separate votes, and had abstained from voting on operative paragraph 2 because the USSR was a party neither to the Berne Convention nor to the Universal Copyright Convention and on operative paragraph 3 because the USSR did not participate in the work of the UNESCO International Copyright Information Centre.

**AGENDA ITEM 6**

**Narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances:**

- (a) United Nations Conference for the Adoption of a Protocol on Psychotropic Substances;
- (b) Report of the International Narcotics Control Board;
- (c) Proposal to convene a plenipotentiary conference to amend the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1954

REPORT OF THE SOCIAL COMMITTEE (E/5025)

9. The PRESIDENT drew attention to three draft resolutions, the adoption of which was recommended by the Social Committee in paragraph 13 of its report (E/5025).

10. Mr. YEVDOKYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested a separate vote on operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution I.

11. Mr. LE DIRAISON (France) requested a separate vote on the words "these comments would be fully taken into account by the Conference" in operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution II.

*Operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution I was adopted by 20 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions.*

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

*The words "these comments would be fully taken into account by the Conference" in operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution II were adopted by 16 votes to 3, with 7 abstentions.*

*Draft resolution II as a whole was adopted by 24 votes to 2.*

12. Mr. EREN (Observer for Turkey), speaking at the invitation of the President, said that he wished to inform the Council of some recent measures taken by the Turkish Government with respect to the regulations and control of opium growing and marketing in Turkey. In order to bring under more effective control the growing and smuggling of opium, his Government had restricted the area of cultivation to a single region in central Anatolia far from border areas. In the current month it had adopted new regulations to streamline its machinery and methods for supervising and controlling the cultivation of the opium poppy. Under the new regulations, joint field commissions, composed of representatives of the government ministries concerned and the police, had been set up at the district level to ensure, through spot inspections, that no illicit planting was taking place within their respective jurisdictions, that crop estimates were made more accurately and realistically and that deliveries closely corresponded to the estimates. A new bill on the licensing of opium cultivation, which provided for a strict licensing system and severe penalties for violations, was now before the Grand National Assembly. A few days previously, the Council of Ministers had decreed a 66 per cent increase in price at which the State purchased opium in order to discourage illegal marketing.

13. In addition to the measures taken with respect to poppy cultivation, the police and security forces responsible for combating drug offences had been reorganized; special task forces had been set up, a central police drugs bureau had been established, and both the police and the gendarmerie had been specially trained and given up-to-date equipment, including aircraft.

14. His Government continued to believe that, if the fight against drug abuse was to be effective, there must be concerted action on the national and international levels at all three stages, namely, production, trafficking and demand. He wished to assure the Council of Turkey's continued co-operation in all three areas.

15. Mr. YEVDOKYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had voted against operative

paragraph 3 of draft resolution I because it was wrong for the United Nations to accept the functions assigned by the Convention of Psychotropic Substances (E/4966) before it had entered into force. It had also voted against draft resolution II, because it was undesirable to amend the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, until the provisions of article 47 had been carried out.

16. Mr. LE DIRAISON (France) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on the last part of operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution II because it believed that it was premature to review the question of psychotropic substances. Although it agreed in principle with the convening of a conference of plenipotentiaries, it did not wish the conference or its participants to be bound to certain positions in advance.

*Draft resolution III was adopted unanimously.*

## AGENDA ITEM 12

### Relations with intergovernmental organizations:

- (a) Relations with non-United Nations intergovernmental organizations in the economic and social field;
- (b) Co-operation and relations between the United Nations and the World Tourism Organization

### REPORT OF THE SOCIAL COMMITTEE (E/5023)

17. The PRESIDENT drew attention to recommendations made by the Social Committee in paragraphs 8 and 9 of its report (E/5023).

*The recommendation in paragraph 8 of the report was adopted without objection.*

18. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that in the Social Committee his delegation had not opposed the proposal set out in paragraph 9 of the report because there had been no indication in the Russian text of documents E/AC.7/L.585 and E/AC.7/L.585/Rev.1 that the observer for India was among the sponsors. He did not believe that rule 75 of the rules of procedure authorized non-members of the Council to co-sponsor draft decisions. He requested that the Soviet position should be fully reflected in the Council's report.

*The recommendation in paragraph 9 of the report was adopted without objection.*

## AGENDA ITEM 15

### Non-governmental Organizations

### REPORT OF THE SOCIAL COMMITTEE (E/5021)

19. The PRESIDENT drew attention to two draft resolutions the adoption of which was recommended by the Social Committee in paragraph 20 of its report (E/5021) and to the recommendations made by the Committee in paragraphs 21 to 23 of the report.

*Draft resolution I was adopted by 24 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

*Draft resolution II was adopted unanimously.*

*The recommendations in paragraphs 21 to 23 of the report were adopted without objection.*

20. Mr. YEVDOKHEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that in the Social Committee his delegation had asked for separate votes on certain non-governmental organizations. He requested that its views should be reflected in the Council's report by the inclusion of the following paragraph:

“The Soviet delegation believed that the Council should recommend that the Council Committee on Non-Govern-

mental Organizations should, in accordance with its resolution 1296 (XLIV), deprive of consultative status those non-governmental organizations, such as the World Jewish Congress and the Women's International Zionist Organization, which had taken part in anti-Soviet meetings held at Brussels in February 1971, and that the Committee should submit its conclusions and recommendations to the Council at its fifty-second session.”

21. The PRESIDENT said that a paragraph along the lines proposed by the Soviet delegation would be included in the Council's report.

*The meeting rose at 12.5 p.m.*