



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

### AGENDA ITEM 17

#### *Elections (concluded) (E/L.1371)*

#### *Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme*

1. The PRESIDENT announced that there were two candidates, Ethiopia and Nigeria, for the last two seats to be filled on the Governing Council of UNDP for a period of three years from 1 January 1972.

*The two candidates were elected by acclamation.*

### AGENDA ITEM 18

#### **Consideration of the provisional agenda and list of documents for the fifty-first session (E/L.1384, E/L.1385)**

2. Mr. AHMED (Secretary of the Council) drew attention to the note by the Secretary-General (E/L.1385) which contained the lists of the items to be considered at the fifty-first and the resumed fifty-first sessions. The lists were based on the 1971 programme considered by the Council at its 1735th meeting on 12 January 1971 and incorporated the changes which the Council had made in the programme at that meeting.

3. As indicated in paragraph 2 of the note, it was suggested that two additional items should be included in the list of items for consideration at the resumed fifty-first session: the report of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination on its tenth session and the World Food Programme (pledging target for 1973/1974).

4. In paragraph 3 it was suggested that item 4 in the provisional list of items for consideration at the resumed fifty-first session should be amended. Apart from those changes, the provisional agenda was in conformity with the decision taken by the Council in January 1971. In addition, items 10 (a) and (b) and 17 would remain on the agenda or would be deleted, depending on the decision taken by the Council at the current session. With regard to the question of the establishment of a world tourist organization, the Secretary-General had been requested, in accordance with the decision taken by the Council at its 1769th meeting, to report before the fifty-first session.

5. Referring to the documents for the fifty-first session (E/L.1384), he said that the report relating to item 2 of the provisional agenda could not be issued on 24 May because

all the necessary data could not be collected in time and because it would require lengthy consultations.

6. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) suggested that consideration of the question of the establishment of a United Nations transport economics and technology documentation centre, which had been postponed indefinitely (see 1760th meeting), should be included as an additional item in the agenda for the fifty-first session.

7. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that he was opposed to the Pakistan representative's suggestion because he considered it premature to resume consideration of the item only six weeks after deciding to postpone it indefinitely and because the agenda for the fifty-first session was already heavy enough.

8. He wished to make a few comments concerning document E/L.1385. It seemed to him that the question of the World Food Programme item 8 (f) was already included in the agenda for the resumed fifty-first session (item 7). Furthermore, item 3 (a) of the agenda for the fifty-first session was related to item 17, and the Council would normally take it up when it had completed its consideration of item 16. Item 5 (d) concerning budget policy and management could be dealt with by the Council without it even being mentioned in the agenda. Also, item 7 (d) could be combined with item 10 (d). Those amendments should make it possible to lighten the agenda for the fifty-first session.

9. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) asked whether the Council would have the UNDP Governing Council's recommendations on the question of natural resources when it considered item 8 (a) at the fifty-first session.

10. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) said that his delegation would prefer item 7 (d) to be kept as a separate item of the agenda for the fifty-first session; if items 7 (d) and 10 (d) were merged, the importance of an integrated approach to the question of industrial development would not be brought out.

11. His delegation supported the Pakistan representative's suggestion that consideration of the question of the establishment of a transport economics and technology documentation centre should be taken up at the fifty-first session.

12. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) said that it would be preferable to include that question in the agenda for the fifty-second session and not in that for the fifty-first, which, as had been pointed out, was already very heavy.

13. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) said that at its next session the Council would have before it many



subjects grouped together, and therefore in effect twice as many items as it had for the fiftieth session. The view expressed by the Sudanese representative therefore seemed to him to be perfectly justified.

14. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that the provisional agenda for the fifty-first session was acceptable to his delegation, although it was rather heavy. The Council might experience great difficulty in completing its consideration of very important items in four weeks. It might perhaps be useful to stress, in the general debate, items 2 and 3 of the provisional agenda.

15. Furthermore, his delegation regretted that the agenda for the resumed fifty-first session was also overburdened. The question of the establishment of an international university, the report of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination and the item concerning the World Food Programme should not appear in the provisional list of agenda items for the resumed session. His delegation noted with regret that the relevant documentation would not be ready in time.

16. With regard to the question of the establishment of a United Nations transport economics and technology documentation centre, his delegation hoped that the Pakistan representative would be persuaded by the arguments of the Sudanese representative. It was preferable for the item to be postponed until the fifty-second session.

17. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation was prepared to accept the provisional agenda for the fifty-first session. However, he endorsed the views of the Sudanese representative on the inclusion in the agenda of the fifty-first session, which was already extremely heavy, of an additional item concerning the establishment of a United Nations transport economics and technology documentation centre. His delegation therefore appealed to the Pakistan representative to agree that the item should be carried over to the fifty-second session.

18. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) said that he accepted, with reservations, the proposal made by the representative of Sudan.

19. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objections, he would take it that the Council had decided to include that item in the provisional agenda for the fifty-second session.

*It was so decided.*

20. Mr. AHMED (Secretary of the Council) explained to the representative of Greece that item 5 (d) had been included in the provisional agenda of the Council at its organizational meetings. The Council could decide at its fifty-first session whether it wished to consider the item in detail or deal with it briefly.

21. With respect to the question put by the representative of New Zealand (see para. 9 above), he said that the Council was to consider the report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme under item 8 (a) and that the Governing Council of UNDP had most probably included its comments on natural resources in that report.

22. He also explained to the representative of France, that the Council had decided at its organizational meetings to include the establishment of an international university in the agenda for the resumed fifty-first session basically because of the time factor involved. In resolution 2691 (XXV) the General Assembly had authorized the Secretary-General to establish a group of experts to help him in his consultations and studies. The Executive Board of UNESCO was to consider the recommendations and conclusions of the group of experts, but its next session would not be held until the autumn of 1971. Consequently, the Council could not consider the question of establishing an international university before the resumed fifty-first session.

23. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objections, he would take it that the provisional agenda for the fifty-first session of the Council (E/L.1385) had been provisionally adopted, with the amendments made, and subject to decisions which could still be taken at the meeting.

*It was so decided.*

## AGENDA ITEM 16

### Measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council (concluded)\* (E/4986 and Add.1-9, E/L.1382, E/L.1408 and Rev.1, E/L.1421 and Rev.1, E/L.1422, E/L.1423, E/(L)/CRP.I)

24. Mr. MARAMIS (Indonesia) reported on the outcome of the consultations held in the Working Group, of which he had been Chairman, on draft resolution E/L.1408, submitted by Greece and New Zealand. Subject to certain amendments to the first, third and fourth paragraphs, the members of the Working Group had been able to agree on the preamble as a whole. Similarly, with regard to the operative paragraphs, part I of the draft had been accepted with one amendment to paragraph 2 (c). Changes had been made in several paragraphs in part II and part III. However, the members of the Working Group had not been able to agree on paragraph 4 of part III; some wanted to delete the paragraph and others wanted to retain it. The sponsors had not been able to accept the amendments proposed by the representative of Brazil. Moreover, the sponsors of the amendments contained in document E/L.1421 had revised their amendments to the original draft resolution. Their revised draft had appeared as document E/L.1421/Rev.1, with 12 co-sponsors.

25. The Working Group had not considered draft resolution E/L.1382, submitted by the USSR, and had referred it to the plenary meeting.

26. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) asked if the representative of the USSR would agree to have his text (E/L.1382) considered after the revised draft resolution (E/L.1408/Rev.1) despite the fact that the latter had been submitted later; the text submitted by Greece and New Zealand was more controversial and had already been the subject of much consultation and negotiation.

\* Resumed from the 1768th meeting.



27. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he thought the two texts were complementary and could perhaps be discussed together. However, if one was to be given priority, he agreed that the draft submitted by Greece and New Zealand should be considered first.

28. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that the revised draft submitted jointly by his delegation and that of New Zealand (E/L.1408/Rev.1) incorporated many amendments made to the original draft. For example, the third preambular paragraph had been amended so that it reproduced the text of paragraph 83 of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade (General Assembly resolution 2626 (XXV)) in order to accommodate the representative of Brazil. Similarly, in the last preambular paragraph, the sponsors had agreed to replace the words "are required" by the words "need to be studied", in order to show their willingness to co-operate.

29. As a compromise, the sponsors had agreed to specify that the session to be held in the third quarter of the calendar year would also be devoted to "a debate on the implementation of the International Development Strategy",—and not to the implementation itself—"with a view to assisting the General Assembly in the over-all appraisal" Similarly, in paragraph 1 of part II, the words "the consideration of important substantive issues . . . where this is appropriate" had been added to satisfy some representatives. As suggested by the Secretariat, and in conformity with established practice, paragraph 2 of part II stated that the High Commissioner for Refugees could also request that his report be the subject of a debate. In accordance with a suggestion made by the representative of the United Kingdom, the sponsors had agreed to replace, in paragraph 3 of part II, the words "of the Commission on Human Rights and the Commission on the Status of Women" by the words "of all its functional commissions and subsidiary bodies" and to add the words "as far as possible". For the same reason, mention of subsidiary bodies had been added in two places in paragraph 3 of part III. It had also been specified in the same paragraph that the reports of those bodies should contain a résumé of the discussions. The sponsors had thus demonstrated their understanding and had tried as far as possible to accept the amendments which had been proposed.

30. Members of the Working Group had, however, not all agreed on paragraph 4 of part III for political reasons which the sponsors considered inappropriate in the Economic and Social Council. He had proposed, as a solution to the problem, a formula which would have reaffirmed the rule that functional commissions and subsidiary bodies should meet biennially and retained the present exceptions to that rule. His text read:

*"Considers that the exceptions to the rule that the functional commissions meet biennially should be confined to those commissions presently exempted"*.

He said he did not understand why his solution had not been accepted, unless it was because some representatives wished the exemptions to be retained, without expressly saying so.

31. The Working Group had not agreed on part IV of the draft resolution, although it was so vague as to commit no one. Rather than accept the amendments submitted to part IV (E/L.1421/Rev.1), he would prefer to delete it altogether and have only the first three parts put to the vote.

32. The PRESIDENT asked whether, in view of the extreme complexity of the matter under consideration, the Council preferred to postpone its consideration until the fifty-first session or to extend the current session for a few days.

33. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) observed that the Council would be taking a useful step if it simply voted on the first three parts of the draft resolution.

34. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) said that the twelve delegations were withdrawing the revised text of their amendments (E/L.1421/Rev.1). In the event that the matter was postponed until the fifty-first session, document E/L.1421 would still be valid.

35. If, however, the Council decided to vote on draft resolution E/L.1408/Rev.1 at the current session, the twelve delegations had certain amendments to propose. In the last preambular paragraph, they wished to delete the words "longer-term measures, including". In the same paragraph, the words "need to be studied in order" should be replaced by "are required". It should also be made clear in part IV that consideration was to be given to the possibility of enlarging the membership and modifying the terms of reference and the pattern of meetings not only of the Council's committees but of the Council itself. Lastly, speaking on behalf of his own delegation, he requested the deletion of paragraph 4 of part III.

36. Mr. VIAUD (France) recalled that draft resolution E/L.1420, which had been introduced by his delegation, had not been formally submitted for consideration by the Council. Since it pertained to item 11(a), which was related to item 16 of the agenda of the current session, and bearing in mind that the Council might decide to postpone consideration of item 16 until its fifty-first session, his delegation wished to know whether its draft was officially regarded as having been introduced. If so, it would automatically be considered at the fifty-first session.

37. With regard to item 16, it would be preferable to take no decision at the present time rather than extend the session. In any event, it would not be possible to speak of a failure on the part of the Council, for it had in fact made progress on that item. Delegations had shown a great deal of good will on a delicate matter which the Council had perhaps not been sufficiently prepared to consider. The only partial solution that could be adopted in the time remaining before the end of the session would be to approve the first three parts of the draft resolution submitted by Greece and New Zealand (E/L.1408/Rev.1) and take no decision on part IV. The Council would thus be taking a decision on a procedural matter and not on one of substance. If that approach gave rise to objections, however, it would be best to adopt the solution suggested by the President, namely to postpone consideration of the matter until the fifty-first session.

38. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) said that the revised draft resolution (E/L.1408/Rev.1) was an improvement on the previous text in many respects. His delegation was also grateful to the sponsors of the revised amendments contained in document E/L.1421/Rev.1 for the spirit of understanding they had shown. However, the question was a very complex one and had political aspects. Since the system of appraising the progress made in implementing the International Development Strategy for the Second Development Decade and future institutional arrangements for science and technology were on the provisional agenda for the fifty-first session, it would be wiser to give Governments more time to consider the question of measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council.

39. Therefore, invoking rule 50 of the rules of procedure of the Council, his delegation proposed that the debate on the question under consideration should be postponed until the fifty-first session.

40. Mr. FINGER (United States of America) supported the Brazilian representative's proposal.

41. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that his delegation was opposed to the Brazilian representative's proposal. The Council could take a decision now on the procedural matters. His delegation and that of New Zealand were withdrawing part IV of draft resolution E/L.1408/Rev.1.

42. The PRESIDENT read out rule 50 of the rules of procedure and invited members of the Council to vote on the proposal made by the representative of Brazil.

*It was decided, by 12 votes to 6, with 6 abstentions, that consideration of item 16 and of the proposals before the Council should be postponed until the fifty-first session.*

#### AGENDA ITEM 11

##### **Science and technology (concluded):**

**(a) Future institutional arrangements for science and technology (concluded)\* (E/4959, E/4989, chap. VII; E/L.1400, E/L.1407 and Add.1, E/L.1420 and Add.1)**

43. Mr. SKATARETIKO (Yugoslavia) supported by Mr. FINGER (United States of America) proposed that consideration of the item in question should be postponed until the next session.

44. Mr. VIAUD (France) also supported the proposal and requested that it should be put to the vote.

*It was decided, by 17 votes to none, with 7 abstentions, that consideration of item 11 (a) should be postponed until the fifty-first session.*

##### *Closure of the session*

45. The President declared the fiftieth session of the Economic and Social Council closed.

*The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.*

\* Resumed from the 1767th meeting.