



## CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 12:	
Questions relating to science and technology	
Report of the Co-ordination Committee . . . . .	179
Agenda item 4:	
Review and reappraisal of the Council's role and functions (resumed from the 1431st meeting and concluded)	
Report of the Co-ordination Committee . . . . .	180

*President* : Mr. T. BOUATTURA (Algeria)

*Present* :

Representatives of the following States: Algeria, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Dahomey, Ecuador, France, Gabon, Greece, India, Iran, Iraq, Morocco, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Sierra Leone, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Venezuela.

Observers for the following Member States: Austria, Bulgaria, China, Denmark, Israel, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Nigeria, Norway, Tunisia, Turkey, Yugoslavia.

Observers for the following non-member States: Federal Republic of Germany, Holy See, Switzerland.

Representatives of the following specialized agencies: International Labour Organisation, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, International Monetary Fund, World Health Organization.

The representative of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

## AGENDA ITEM 12

Questions relating to science and technology  
(E/4178 and Add.1, E/4222)

REPORT OF THE CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE (E/4260)

1. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the Co-ordination Committee's report on agenda item 12 (E/4260), and to vote on the draft resolution in paragraph 10 and on the recommendation in paragraph 9 of that report.

2. Mr. SHATSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation was in favour of adopting the draft resolution recommended by the Co-ordination Committee.

3. With reference, however, to paragraph 7 of the Committee's report, his delegation believed that the members of the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development should include specialists who were employed in scientific or government agencies in the developing countries and whose daily work brought them into contact with the scientific needs of those countries. It was also necessary to bear in mind that the position of some members of the Advisory Committee might change with the passage of time and that a periodical change in the Committee's membership would have a favourable effect on its work. In that connexion, his delegation supported the statement made by the representative of Iraq at the 1442nd meeting of the Council.

4. Mr. VIAUD (France) said he endorsed the statement in paragraph 7 of the report. Only experts chosen by the Secretary-General in their own individual capacities and not as representatives of Governments, and whose nomination had been subsequently approved by the Council, should take part in the work of the Advisory Committee. If, as a result of unforeseen circumstances, a member was unable to attend a session, it should be possible, as an exceptional arrangement, for him to be replaced, but his replacement should also be an expert.

5. He had no objection to the recommendation in paragraph 9 of the report. With regard to operative paragraph 7 of the draft resolution, as his delegation had indicated in the Co-ordination Committee (309th meeting), French technical co-operation programmes were no longer unilateral and were now negotiated through technical co-operation agreements. The recommendation in that operative paragraph would thus be meaningful only if the developing countries with which France had such agreements drew his Government's attention to their needs in the field of science and technology and to the relative importance which they attached to them. France would endeavour to meet those needs in so far as possible, bearing in mind the structure of the technical co-operation agreements. It could, however, implement the recommendation only if it reached an understanding with the countries benefiting from its assistance, after joint discussion of the form which that assistance should take.

6. Mr. BLAU (United States of America) said he regarded the draft resolution and the report itself as an important advance in regard to the application of science and technology to development.

7. His delegation concurred in the view expressed in paragraph 7 of the report. It firmly believed that the expert character of the Advisory Committee should be

preserved, which was possible only if experts, and not political representatives of Governments, participated in its work. He was pleased that the representatives of Iraq and the Soviet Union agreed with the view expressed by his delegation earlier that it was desirable to change the composition of the Committee from time to time by introducing a system of rotation.

*The draft resolution in paragraph 10 of the Co-ordination Committee's report was adopted unanimously.*

*The recommendation in paragraph 9 of the Co-ordination Committee's report was approved unanimously.*

#### AGENDA ITEM 4

#### Review and reappraisal of the Council's role and functions (resumed from the 1431st meeting and concluded)

##### REPORT OF THE CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE (E/4265; E/L.1142, E/L.1143)

8. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the Co-ordination Committee's report on agenda item 4 (E/4265); he drew attention to the draft resolution in paragraph 5 of the report and to the amendments to that draft resolution: the amendment submitted by the United Kingdom (E/L.1142), to include the Commission on Narcotic Drugs among the exceptions mentioned in operative paragraph 2, and the amendment submitted by Greece, Iraq and Philippines (E/L.1143), to include the Commission on the Status of Women among the exceptions.

9. Mr. LOPEZ (Philippines), introducing the three-Power amendment on behalf of the sponsors, explained that, for procedural reasons, it had not been voted on by the Co-ordination Committee. The Commission on the Status of Women, whose valuable work was evident from its reports, had just embarked on a long-term programme of studies and action for the advancement of women and needed annual sessions if that programme was to be carried out. Moreover, he thought it discriminatory for the Social Committee to recommend that the Commission on Human Rights should continue to meet annually and that the length of its sessions should be increased from four to six weeks (see E/4261, draft resolution I), while the Co-ordination Committee recommended that the Commission on the Status of Women should meet only biennially. There was too much discrimination against women as it was. A decision by the Council that the Commission on the Status of Women should meet only biennially might be interpreted to mean that it now attached less importance to the advancement of women. Lastly, the fact that there were more women than men in the world should not be overlooked.

10. Mr. FERNANDINI (Peru) said that his delegation supported the three-Power amendment.

11. Mr. JAFERI (Iran) said that he would vote for the three-Power amendment and also for the United Kingdom

amendment. The work done by the Commission on Narcotic Drugs was of great importance and the problems with which it dealt called for urgent attention.

12. Mr. VIAUD (France) observed that the draft resolution which the Co-ordination Committee had submitted to the Council was the result of extremely complex negotiations. The compromise which had been reached in respect to operative paragraph 2 was obviously open to criticism but had nevertheless gained the support of fifteen members of the Committee against seven. It was understandable that some representatives should have doubts about the wisdom of reducing the number of sessions of most of the functional commissions and of the Committee on Housing, Building and Planning at a time when their work programmes were steadily expanding. However, the General Assembly had given the question the most careful consideration before recommending a reduction in the frequency of meetings of the Council's subsidiary organs. The present number of meetings placed an intolerable burden on Governments and on the Secretariat. Less frequent meetings would be more productive, as everyone concerned would have more time to prepare for them.

13. The draft resolution provided for two exceptions to the general principle that meetings should be biennial. The sponsors had originally wished to limit the exceptions to the Commission on Human Rights but, in view of the fact that the Social Commission had now become the Commission on Social Development and intended in future to concentrate on linking social progress with economic development, they had agreed to make it an exception too. If the Commission on the Status of Women and the Commission on Narcotic Drugs were added to the list, it would make nonsense of the draft resolution. There would be no question of biennial meetings being the general rule. He hoped the Council would endorse the Committee's decision.

14. Sir Keith UNWIN (United Kingdom), introducing the United Kingdom amendment, said that he found himself in a difficult position. His delegation had voted for the draft resolution which the Co-ordination Committee had recommended for adoption by the Council and had opposed proposals to make exceptions to the general principle of biennial meetings. Yet he was himself now proposing an exception, namely, that the Commission on Narcotic Drugs should continue to meet annually. He had been unable to submit the amendment to the Co-ordination Committee for procedural reasons.

15. It had been argued that there was no legal requirement that the Commission on Narcotic Drugs should meet annually, but there were many practical reasons why that Commission, whose functions were somewhat different from those of the other functional commissions, should continue to do so.

16. The Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs contained provisions calling for annual reports. Under article 15 of that Convention, the International Narcotics Control Board was required to prepare an annual report on its work and such additional reports as it considered neces-

sary for submission to the Council through the Commission, which might make such comments as it saw fit. If the reports came to the Council without comments, the latter would be entitled to complain, as it would if they were held up for two years. Article 18 provided, *inter alia*, that the Parties to the Single Convention should furnish to the Secretary-General an annual report on the working of the Convention within each of their territories. If such reports were required of or submitted by States which were members of the Commission and had acceded to the Convention, they should be considered annually.

17. Article 3 of the Single Convention empowered the Commission to place new drugs under control on the recommendation of WHO. In the past, urgent action had sometimes been necessary on a WHO recommendation and in December 1965 the Commission had adopted resolution 1 (XX) laying down a special procedure for postal voting when a Commission session would not take place within three months of such a recommendation being made. That procedure, which was unsatisfactory and should be avoided whenever possible, would have to be frequently used if annual sessions were to be replaced by biennial sessions.

18. For those reasons, although he subscribed in general to the principle of biennial meetings for the Council's subsidiary bodies, he believed that the Commission on Narcotic Drugs should continue to meet annually.

19. With regard to the three-Power amendment, although the representative of the Philippines had made some telling points, he thought that, if the Council decided that the Commission on Human Rights should continue to meet annually and that its sessions should be longer, it would have taken into account all the points raised by the Philippine representative. Women served on the Commission on Human Rights, which dealt with their rights and also with discrimination.

20. If the Council were to decide that the Commission on Narcotic Drugs should meet biennially, that would imply that the United Nations was losing interest in the vitally important questions of narcotic drug addiction, illicit production and the traffic in natural and synthetic narcotic drugs. New synthetic drugs were constantly being produced and often had addiction-producing effects. The procedure laid down in the Single Convention would have to be followed if any headway was to be made in the fight against narcotic drug addiction.

21. Mr. PARRY (Canada) said that the intention of the sponsors of the original draft resolution submitted to the Co-ordination Committee (E/AC.24/L.293), which had included his own delegation, had been to establish the principle that the Council's functional commissions should meet biennially. They had agreed to exceptions in the case of the Commission on Human Rights and the Commission on Social Development, but had felt that no further concessions could or should be made.

22. It would be remembered that, in 1964, the Secretary-General had recommended to the Council that, as a general rule, functional commissions should meet biennially. In his report to the Council under agenda item 4

at the current session, the Secretary-General had recalled the proposals he had made at that time and, after stating that experience since 1964 had only strengthened his belief in their soundness, had strongly recommended the Council to reconsider the possibility of deciding that as a general rule functional commissions and other subsidiary bodies should meet biennially (E/4216, paras. 16 and 17). The Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions had endorsed the Secretary-General's recommendations (E/2432, para. 50), and the sponsors had gone as far as they felt was possible in meeting the Secretary-General's views. The proposals in part B of the draft resolution also represented the maximum possible response to the appeal made by the General Assembly in its resolution 2116 (XX).

23. While it was true that, under the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, the International Narcotics Control Board was required to prepare annual reports as part of the information to be supplied to the Secretary-General, no provision of the Convention called for an annual review of those reports. The Commission on Narcotic Drugs had met annually as a matter of policy, but there was no legal requirement for it to do so. The last clause of operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution provided the necessary safeguard; if the Commission on Narcotic Drugs believed an additional session was required in the year between its regular sessions, it could make a recommendation to that effect to the Council, and it would then be for the Council to take a decision on the matter.

24. The sponsors considered it extremely important to establish the principle of biennial meetings for the functional commissions and to set an example to other United Nations bodies. They believed that biennial meetings, far from causing a loss in efficiency, would make the work of the commissions and the Council itself more effective; they would enable delegations, and particularly the small ones, to function more efficiently and would lighten the burden of the Secretariat, so that it, too could do its work better.

25. He regretted that he would have to oppose the two amendments, not because his delegation had any reservations about the work of the bodies concerned, but because of the importance it attached to the principle at stake and to reducing to a minimum the number of exceptions.

26. Mr. MARTINEZ COBO (Ecuador) said that his delegation supported both the amendments before the Council.

27. Mr. BLAU (United States of America) said that his delegation also warmly supported both amendments. The work programme of the Commission on the Status of Women was of such magnitude as to require annual meetings. The procedural reasons adduced by the United Kingdom representative provided a sound basis for annual meetings of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs. Had any proposal been made that the Committee on Housing, Building and Planning should meet annually, it would also have received his delegation's support. That Committee's work on housing was just beginning to take shape, and

his delegation would have preferred to defer a decision that it should meet biennially until its work was more solidly established.

28. Mr. LUKOSE (India) said that while his delegation found it difficult to withhold its support for the three-Power amendment, it agreed that the Council must set an example to other United Nations bodies; and if the Council wished to establish a principle, it should not weaken that principle by making too many exceptions. The Commission on Narcotic Drugs admittedly differed in character from the other functional commissions, but despite the validity of the technical reasons given by the United Kingdom representative for including it among the exceptions, his delegation thought it would be unwise to do so at that stage. As the Canadian representative had said, the final clause of operative paragraph 2 provided machinery which would enable additional meetings to be held if required for technical reasons.

29. Mr. RIVERO (Venezuela) said he was not entirely satisfied with the drafting of the fifth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, which appeared inconsistent with the later provisions regarding exceptions to the general rule of biennial meetings.

30. His delegation supported the three-Power amendment.

31. Mr. VIAUD (France), speaking on a point of order, said that if the two amendments were adopted, the text of the draft resolution would contain a number of anomalies. For example, the provision contained in operative paragraph 3 was justified if the functional commissions were to meet biennially, but was much less so if almost all the functional commissions were to be excepted from that rule. He would like to know whether amendments could be submitted to operative paragraph 3 if the two amendments now before the Council were adopted. Rule 56 of the rules of procedure would have to be waived to enable amendments to be introduced orally.

32. The PRESIDENT said that he proposed to put to the vote the amendments submitted to the draft resolution recommended by the Co-ordination Committee. In the absence of any objection, he would then allow the introduction of any drafting amendments which might be deemed necessary to adjust the text to the new situation.

*It was so agreed.*

33. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the amendment submitted by the United Kingdom (E/L.1142).

*The amendment was rejected by 12 votes to 6, with 5 abstentions.*

34. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the amendment submitted by Greece, Iraq and Philippines (E/L.1143).

*The amendment was adopted by 12 votes to 11, with 2 abstentions.*

35. Sir Keith UNWIN (United Kingdom) suggested that the Council's work might be speeded up if the Secretariat were left to introduce the necessary amendments consequential upon the decisions just taken.

36. Mr. KITTANI (Secretary of the Council) suggested that operative paragraph 3 might be amended by replacing the word "commissions" by the words "Commission on Narcotic Drugs", since that was the only body whose members' terms of office would be affected by the Council's decisions.

37. Mr. VIAUD (France) proposed that, in order to meet the Venezuelan representative's point, the phrase "and taking account of the necessary exceptions to this rule" should be added to the fifth preambular paragraph.

38. Mr. ZOLLNER (Dahomey) said he had no objection to that amendment.

39. With regard to the change suggested in operative paragraph 3, the Co-ordination Committee had discussed the question of extending the terms of office of the members of all the functional commissions, not only of those which would meet biennially; that was why the words "as a consequence", which had been included in the earlier versions of the joint draft resolution submitted to that Committee (E/AC.24/L.293 and Rev.1 and 2) had been omitted from the version ultimately adopted (E/AC.24/L.293/Rev.3). The drafting change suggested by the Secretary of the Council was not therefore a purely consequential amendment.

40. Mr. VIAUD (France) endorsed the United Kingdom representative's suggestion that the question of consequential amendments might be left to the Secretariat. He was prepared to accept the Secretary's suggestion with regard to operative paragraph 3.

41. Mr. KITTANI (Secretary of the Council) said that, in order to implement the resolution, the Secretariat must be quite certain whether the Council's intention was to extend the terms of office of the members of all the functional commissions, or only of those which were to meet biennially.

42. Mr. LOPEZ (Philippines) proposed that the words "meeting biennially" should be inserted after the word "commissions" in operative paragraph 3.

43. Mr. VIAUD (France) and Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) supported that proposal, which they believed reflected the unanimous view of the Council.

44. Mr. ZOLLNER (Dahomey) observed that the amendment introduced a substantive, not a consequential, change into the paragraph.

45. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that delegations had been quite certain of the meaning of operative paragraph 3 when they had adopted it in the Co-ordination Committee. The sponsors of the draft resolution and the Secretariat had explained that it would be desirable to extend the terms of office of the members of all the functional commissions and of the Committee on Housing, Building and Planning to four years. The Philippine amendment amounted to a reversal of that position; it should accordingly be discussed and voted on as a new proposal.

46. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the amendment to the fifth preambular paragraph proposed by the French representative.

*The amendment was adopted unanimously.*

47. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the amendment to operative paragraph 3 proposed by the Philippine representative.

48. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Philippine amendment was contrary to the spirit of the discussions in the Co-ordination Committee and to the decision taken in that body. The arguments for and against extending the terms of office of the members of all the functional commissions had been discussed at length, and the view that the effectiveness of those bodies would be increased by such an extension had seemed to prevail; yet an attempt was now being made to impose the minority view on the Council. His delegation reserved the right to raise the question again at a later date if the Philippine amendment was adopted.

49. Mr. LOPEZ (Philippines) said he had proposed his amendment under the impression that the sponsors of the draft resolution submitted to the Co-ordination Committee had intended operative paragraph 3 to refer to the

extension of the terms of office of members of commissions meeting biennially. The USSR representative's contrary interpretation of that paragraph, however, placed him in a quandary. It was true that a four-year term of office was better adapted to the decision taken by the Council at its 1422nd meeting—resolution 1147 (XLI)—to increase the membership of three functional commissions to thirty-two: a four-year term would facilitate the annual replacement of eight members of the commissions. He therefore withdrew his amendment.

50. After a procedural discussion during which Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) re-submitted the amendment that the Philippine representative had withdrawn, the PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on that proposal, i.e., to include the words "meeting biennially" after the word "commissions" in operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution.

*The amendment was adopted by 8 votes to 7, with 8 abstentions.*

51. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the draft resolution in paragraph 5 of the Co-ordination Committee's report (E/4265), as amended.

*The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted unanimously.*

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.