



ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

FIFTY-THIRD SESSION

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Friday, 28 July 1972
at 3.40 p.m.

PALAIS DES NATIONS, GENEVA

President: Mr. SZARKA (Hungary)

AGENDA ITEM 5

**Permanent sovereignty over natural resources
of developing countries**

REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC COMMITTEE (E/5205)

1. The PRESIDENT said that the Economic Committee had adopted the draft decision in paragraph 4 of its report (E/5205) unanimously. He proposed that the Council should adopt the draft.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 6

**United Nations/IMCO Conference
on International Container Traffic**

REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC COMMITTEE (E/5206)

2. Mrs. MITTELBERGER (Observer for Austria) said that the report of the Economic Committee (E/5206, para. 6) should state that Austria had also joined the sponsors of draft resolution E/AC.6/L.482.

3. The PRESIDENT said that the Secretariat would take note of the matter.

4. In paragraph 13 of its report, the Economic Committee recommended that the Council should adopt a draft resolution which the Committee had itself adopted by 26 votes to 10, with 5 abstentions.

5. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) pointed out that abstention was not the same as opposition.

6. Mr. NESTERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he wished to ask, as he had done in the Economic Committee, for a separate vote on the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution.

7. The paragraph referred to a decision based on what was known as the "Vienna formula", according to which the countries invited to a conference, symposium, seminar or other meeting convened by the United Nations were restricted to those belonging to the United Nations, the specialized agencies or the International Atomic Energy Agency. The Soviet Union categorically rejected that formula, which resulted in arbitrary discrimination based

on unfounded political prejudices and took away from the truly international character which, by definition, all activities of the United Nations should have. The Soviet delegation would therefore vote against the second preambular paragraph.

8. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) said that in the Economic Committee his delegation had abstained on the suggestion that the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution should be deleted. In the Council it would vote against that suggestion.

9. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution.

The second preambular paragraph was adopted by 14 votes to 4, with 4 abstentions.

10. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the draft resolution as a whole (E/5206, para. 13).

*At the request of the representative of Ceylon, the vote was taken by roll-call.**Finland, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

In favour: Ghana, Kenya, Lebanon, Malaysia, New Zealand, Peru, Tunisia, United States of America, Bolivia, Brazil, Burundi, Ceylon, Chile, China.

Against: Finland, France, Italy, Japan, United Kingdom.*Abstaining:* Greece, Hungary, Niger, Poland, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.*The draft resolution was adopted by 14 votes to 5, with 5 abstentions.*

AGENDA ITEM 19

Elections (E/5150/Add.1 and Corr.1, E/L.1504, E/L.1505)*Committee on Science and Technology for Development*

11. The PRESIDENT said that, in accordance with the Secretary-General's note (E/L.1504), the Council had to elect 18 members of the Committee on Science and Technology for Development for a period of three years.

12. Mr. AHMED (Secretary of the Council) said that there were 5 vacancies for African States, but no candidates; 7 vacancies for Asian States, and 3 candidates — Ceylon, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen and the Philippines; one vacancy for the Latin American States and one candidate — Colombia; 5 vacancies for western

European and other States and 4 candidates – Canada, the Netherlands, New Zealand and Spain.

The candidate countries were elected members of the Committee by acclamation.

13. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) regretted the fact that no country had submitted its candidate for the vacancies for African States.

14. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) said that the terms of reference of the Committee on Science and Technology for Development had only recently been adopted. Some countries did not yet know what obligations they would be undertaking in becoming members of the Committee. A wider appeal for candidatures should be made.

Commission on Narcotics Drugs

15. The PRESIDENT announced that the Council had to elect 14 members of the Committee on Narcotic Drugs, according to the criteria referred to in paragraph 2 of the Secretary-General's note (E/L.1505).

16. Mr. AHMED (Secretary of the Council) said that, since Venezuela had withdrawn its candidature, 13 countries were candidates for the 14 vacancies: Australia, Egypt, the Federal Republic of Germany, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Mexico, Morocco, Pakistan, Romania, Sweden and Thailand.

17. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) said that, if no other Latin American country was a candidate, Chile would stand in place of Venezuela.

18. Mr. FRAZÃO (Brazil), Mr. VELEZ (Peru), Mr. OLMEDO (Bolivia) and Mr. NESTERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) supported the candidature of Chile.

The 14 candidate countries were elected members of the Commission by acclamation.

19. The PRESIDENT said that, in accordance with paragraph 4 of the Secretary-General's note (E/L.1505), the 7 countries which were to serve for three years were to be drawn by lot; the remaining 7 would serve for only one year.

The following countries were chosen by lot to serve for three years: Federal Republic of Germany, Hungary, India, Kenya, Pakistan, Sweden and Thailand.

The following countries were thus chosen to serve for one year: Australia, Chile, Egypt, Indonesia, Mexico, Morocco and Romania.

Statistical Committee, Committee on Natural Resources, Committee on Review and Appraisal

20. The PRESIDENT said that there was a vacancy (for an Asian State) on the Statistical Committee, 2 vacancies

(for western European and other States) on the Committee on Natural Resources, and 11 vacancies (6 for African States and 5 for Asian States) on the Committee on Review and Appraisal.

21. Mr. AHMED (Secretary of the Council) said that only two countries were candidates for the vacancies for Asian States on the Committee on Review and Appraisal: Malaysia and the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen.

Malaysia and the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen were elected members of the Committee on Review and Appraisal by acclamation.

22. The PRESIDENT said that at its resumed fifty-third session the Committee would have to elect members to the seats still vacant on its subsidiary bodies.

AGENDA ITEM 7

Regional co-operation (*concluded*)*

REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC COMMITTEE (E/5207)

23. The PRESIDENT said that the Economic Committee had adopted the draft decision in paragraph 4 of its report (E/5207) by consensus.

24. He proposed that the Council should adopt the draft decision without a vote.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 18

Calendar of conferences

REPORT OF THE CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE (E/5200)

25. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) said that he opposed the Co-ordination Committee's decision recommending that the Council should dispense with summary records at the meetings of the Sub-Commission on the Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities (E/5200, para. 4 (e)).

26. The Sub-Commission was one of the most effective of the Council's subsidiary bodies, but the bodies to which it was subordinate treated it with scant respect: some of the reports and studies prepared by the Sub-Commission at the Council's instructions had still not been considered by the Commission on Human Rights.

27. The Sub-Commission consisted of eminent experts, who in many cases occupied senior positions in their countries and voluntarily gave up some of their time in order to take part in the struggle against racial discrimination. It had therefore been a mistake to decide that the

* Resumed from the 1830th meeting.

Sub-Commission should meet in New York in winter and it was to be hoped that the Co-ordination Committee's decision that the Sub-Commission should meet in Geneva in August 1973 would not now be arbitrarily changed.

28. The Co-ordination Committee was wrong, however, to wish to dispense with summary records at the Sub-Commission's meetings: the special rapporteurs who were responsible for drafting the studies on discrimination requested of the Sub-Commission could not perform their task if they did not have the summary records. In preparing certain conventions and declarations, such as the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial discrimination, it was also necessary to consult the summary records.

29. He asked the Council to reverse the Co-ordination Committee's decision.

30. Mr. SEKYIAMAH (Ghana) said that he fully supported the views of the Chilean representative.

31. The Co-ordination Committee's decision bordered on arbitrariness. It would have been more logical to refer the question to the Commission on Human Rights, to which the Sub-Commission was directly subordinate. In any event, the elimination of summary records would be undesirable because the Sub-Commission did not take its decisions by consensus: the divergent views expressed in it were brought out properly in the summary records, but not in a general report. In addition, the Sub-Commission was about to start some very important work on information received concerning infringements of human rights; it could not do it without summary records. The Ghanaian delegation hoped that the countries which wanted summary records to be dispensed with were not motivated by the fear of complaints against themselves.

32. The Co-ordination Committee had not given thorough consideration to the question. It would therefore be perfectly justified for the Council to reverse its decision.

33. Mr. WILDER (Observer for Canada) said that the Canadian delegation had abstained during the vote in the Co-ordination Committee, but was ready to recognize that doing away with summary records at meetings of the Sub-Commission was a mistake and to reconsider its decision accordingly.

34. The Council would be entirely justified, from a legal standpoint, in going back on a decision by one of its sessional committees. It would, however, be the first time that the Council, which still had only 27 members, had reversed a decision by one of its committees, which now had 54 members. That dangerous precedent would create a division between the 27 "full" members of the Council and the 27 other members, which would, so to say, then be only "second class" members. It would be preferable that the decision should be revoked, at the earliest possible opportunity, by those who had taken it.

35. The Canadian delegation would readily support the suggestion by Ghana that in the meantime the question should be referred to the Commission on Human Rights.

36. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) asked what would be the financial implications of dispensing with summary records at meetings of the Sub-Commission.

37. Mr. AHMED (Secretary of the Council) said that the 1973 Geneva meeting of the Sub-Commission and its Working Group would involve additional expenses of \$44,800 (E/L.1491/Add.1, para. 2) and that dispensing with summary records would save \$36,200 of that amount; the additional expenses for other services would, therefore, amount to \$8,600.

38. Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya) associated himself with the statements by the representatives of Chile and Ghana. The Co-ordination Committee's decision should be reconsidered and reversed forthwith. Any activities which helped to do away with racism were important, and the Sub-Commission should not be deprived of its facilities. Much attention was being given at the present time to the preservation of the physical environment, but pollution of the social environment was just as serious; it gave rise to monstrosities such as *apartheid*.

39. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) recognized that the Canadian representative's arguments had some weight, but considered that an exception should be made in the present case: if the Council reversed the decision of the Co-ordination Committee, it would be understood that the Committee had not heard the arguments put forward in the Council and had taken a decision in haste.

40. The only argument which could really be put forward for dispensing with summary records was the saving of some \$36,000. Unfortunately, to make such a saving would reduce the effectiveness of one of the main activities of the United Nations. That would be particularly regrettable because the activity in question had not always been given due recognition. At one stage the Sub-Commission on the Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities would have been dissolved but for one vote. Yet, the Sub-Commission did useful work and the documentation on which the General Assembly relied in that sphere was largely the fruit of its labours. It already had quite enough obstacles to face without an attempt to deprive it of its facilities.

41. The Chilean delegation would therefore press the request it had made, believing it to be more important than a marginal administrative decision.

42. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) said that in the Co-ordination Committee his delegation had voted against the proposal to dispense with summary records, which had in fact been adopted by only 14 favourable votes out of 54 members. The Council had the right to override the decisions of its sessional committees.

43. The Sub-Commission had delicate problems to deal with; in order to do so it needed summary records. To abolish summary records would be a politically motivated act and thus quite unacceptable.

44. Turning to another question, he said that one month was not enough for the 1973 spring session of the Council.

The Council would have to consider a great many topics; it must therefore meet for a longer time, even if that was to the detriment of other bodies.

45. The PRESIDENT pointed out that the proposed duration of the spring session was five working weeks.

46. Mr. AMERASINGHE (Ceylon) said that the number of members a body had was less important than its status. The Council had the status of a body established under the Charter; the Co-ordination Committee, even expanded, did not. It was true that the expansion of the membership of the Council's sessional committees had been a somewhat dubious decision; in a way, the Council had been expanded without due authorization under the Charter. Nevertheless, the Council must preserve its rights vis-à-vis all its subsidiary bodies.

47. Mr. WANG Jun-sheng (China) said that the comments of the representatives of Chile, Ghana, Kenya, Tunisia and Ceylon showed how important the Sub-Commission's summary records were. China was sympathetic to their arguments; although it had abstained in the Co-ordination Committee it would vote in favour of keeping the summary records.

48. Mr. NESTERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the success of the struggle against racial oppression depended not on publications but on the extent to which countries participated in it, both in word and in deed. Opinions might vary as to the value of documentation and the USSR did not wish to take a set position on the matter.

49. He agreed with the representative of Ceylon that the Council had the right to reverse the decisions of its subsidiary bodies. One of the reasons which could lead it to do so was a careful examination of opposing arguments. After hearing the arguments that had been put forward, the Soviet delegation, which had voted in the Co-ordination Committee to dispense with summary records, would abstain if the Council decided to take a vote on the matter.

50. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) endorsed the view of the representatives of Chile, Ghana and Kenya concerning the useful work of the Sub-Commission. However, despite the efforts of the United Kingdom and other delegations, including Chile, the Commission on Human Rights did not pay heed to the work of the Sub-Commission, although it was made up of reasonable, capable and independent members – who were not government puppets – and submitted detailed and well-prepared reports to the Commission on Human Rights. That was the real problem, much more than the question of keeping or dropping summary records. Certain delegations which were insistently demanding that summary records should be kept were the very ones that were responsible for that attitude towards the Sub-Commission on the part of the Commission on Human Rights.

51. In the Co-ordination Committee it had been the USSR which had requested that the Sub-Commission

should dispense with summary records. The United Kingdom had long favoured that step, in the belief that the Sub-Commission submitted good reports which should suffice for the Commission. He was not saying that the Co-ordination Committee had taken the right decision but the \$36,200 which that decision would save could be used for better purposes than to produce documents: for example, to feed 2,000 hungry Bengalis for one year.

52. Mr. TERENCE (Burundi) said that the value of summary records was that they took a comprehensive approach which was more true to life than the analytical approach of reports. Human rights, moreover, was not the field to economize in – quite the contrary. The Sub-Commission should therefore continue to have summary records.

53. He asked the Soviet delegation to vote for the delegation of sub-paragraph 4 (e) of the report of the Co-ordination Committee since the Government of the USSR had always come out in favour of human rights and insisted that United Nations funds should be put to good use.

54. Mr. NESTERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed the closure of the debate under article 53 of the rules of procedure.

The motion was adopted by 13 votes to 1 with 8 abstentions.

55. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the recommendation of the Co-ordination Committee that the Council should “decide that the Sub-Commission on the Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities dispense with summary records” (E/5200, para. 4 (e)).

The recommendation was rejected by 12 votes to 6, with 6 abstentions.

56. Mr. NOGUEIRA BATISTA (Brazil), speaking in explanation of his vote, said that his country had been prepared to reconsider the position which it had taken in the Co-ordination Committee. However, it had also taken into account the question of the relationship between the Council and its sessional committees. That question might arise often and involve great loss of time. In the present case, the Council could have avoided an awkward situation by referring the recommendation in sub-paragraph (e) back to the Co-ordination Committee, since it could not be said, even by invoking the Charter, that 27 countries had greater powers than 54. Brazil would therefore have preferred the Co-ordination Committee to re-examine its decision: that would have caused a delay of only one session. The reason why Brazil favoured that solution was not that it underestimated the importance attached to the protection of human rights; its principles in that respect were well known and were above suspicion.

57. Miss BELL (United States of America) said that in her delegation's view the summary records of the Sub-Commission could have been dispensed with. However, the

Council had the right to reverse decisions of its subsidiary bodies.

58. Mr. SMOQUINA (Italy) explained that his delegation had voted in favour of sub-paragraph (e), but that its vote did not imply a judgement on the importance of the Sub-Commission's work. Italy was always ready to support the Sub-Commission, but, like the United Kingdom delegation, it believed that the money which could have been saved might have been better used elsewhere.

59. The Co-ordination Committee had adopted recommendation (e) in regrettable circumstances: 17 of its members had been absent when the vote was taken, and if they had been present the Council would probably not have had to override the recommendation.

60. The United Nations could clearly not be put back on a firm footing by a saving of \$36,000. But the cumulative effect of such savings was the way for the Organization to improve its financial situation, since it was difficult to see how millions of dollars could be saved at a time.

61. Miss LIM (Malaysia) said that her delegation, which had not participated in the vote, would have abstained if it had been present.

62. At its spring session the Council had adopted resolution 1695 (LII) on the question of slavery in pursuance of a proposal by the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities. That proposal had been pending for years, because the Commission on Human Rights had been absorbed in innumerable political problems and had not been able to consider the Sub-Commission's report on the question. That was unfortunately the fate of most of the Sub-Commission's reports. At that time, the attitude of the Commission on Human Rights towards the Sub-Commission had been criticized and it was then that several delegations had proposed the resolution on slavery.

63. As the Sub-Commission already had difficulty in getting the Commission's attention, one might well ask what would happen if it was also deprived of summary records. The Sub-Commission itself was in fact in the best position to state whether it needed summary records or not.

64. The Economic and Social Council nonetheless had the right to reverse decisions of the Co-ordination Committee.

65. Mr. NESTERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) denied the validity of the Brazilian representative's argument concerning the Council's rights: the Council was fully entitled to override decisions of its sessional committees.

66. Mr. TERENCE (Burundi) said that, while it was certainly necessary to make economies in order to put the finances of the United Nations on a healthy footing, too many savings should not be made in a sphere as important as human rights; in that sphere, the cost of preparing summary records was amply justified.

67. Mr. WILDER (Observer for Canada) observed that he had fully recognized the Council's right to change a decision by one of its sessional committees. However, the Council had never yet done so, and the decision which it had just taken might constitute an unfortunate precedent. If the debate had not been closed, the Canadian delegation would have withdrawn its objections on condition that it was clearly understood and stated in writing that the rejection of a decision taken by a sessional committee must be considered as exceptional.

68. M. DRISS (Tunisia) said that, on the contrary, the Council's right to confirm or reverse a decision taken by one of its sessional committees was the rule and not the exception.

69. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to approve the report of the Co-ordination Committee (E/5200) as a whole.

70. Following a discussion in which Mr. NESTERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) and Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) took part, the PRESIDENT suggested that sub-paragraph 4 (f) of the report should be put to the vote separately.

It was so decided.

Sub-paragraph 4 (f) was adopted by 8 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

71. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the report of the Co-ordination Committee (E/5200) as a whole, as amended.

The report, as amended, was adopted.

AGENDA ITEM 4

Development planning and projections: report of the Committee for Development Planning

REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC COMMITTEE (E/5204)

72. The PRESIDENT said that the Economic Committee had recommended that the Council should adopt the two draft resolutions contained in paragraph 15 of its report (E/5204).

73. If there was no objection, he would take it that draft resolution I, entitled "Identification of the least developed among the developing countries", was adopted by the Council.

It was so decided.

74. Mr. AHMED (Secretary of the Council) said that there were three corrections to be made in draft resolution II. In the last phrase of the eighth preambular paragraph, the word "including" should be replaced by the words "and which would include", as suggested by the Brazilian delegation. In the ninth preambular paragraph, the words "including appropriate suitable adjustment policies" should be replaced by the words "including the adoption

where appropriate of suitable adjustment assistance policies”, i.e. the same wording as in operative paragraph 5. In operative paragraph 10, the words “ILO-related publications” should be replaced by the words “related ILO publications”.

75. The PRESIDENT said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that draft resolution II (The elimination of mass poverty and unemployment through the adoption of national development strategies and the International Development Strategy), as amended, was adopted by the Council.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 16

Co-ordination

- (a) Reports of the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency
- (b) Reports of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination and of the Joint Meetings of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination and the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination
- (c) Reports of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination
- (d) Review of the Council's co-ordinating machinery

REPORT OF THE CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE (E/5198)

76. The PRESIDENT said that the Co-ordination Committee had recommended that the Council should adopt the three draft resolutions and the two draft decisions contained in paragraph 13 of its report (E/5198).

77. Miss LIM (Malaysia) pointed out that, in paragraph 12 of the report, it was necessary to delete the reference to document E/AC.24/WG/9, which had been submitted by her delegation to the Working Group, because it had been withdrawn.

78. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft resolution I, concerning reports of the ACC, the specialized agencies and IAEA.

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.

79. The PRESIDENT drew attention to draft resolution II (Review of United Nations and specialized agencies and IAEA activities), which the Co-ordination Committee had adopted by 29 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

80. Mr. NESTERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested that draft resolution II should be put to the vote.

Draft resolution II was adopted by 20 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

81. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft resolution III, concerning the establishment of a working group on rationalization, and said that the Committee had adopted the text unanimously.

82. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) said that if draft resolution III had been put to the vote, his delegation would have voted against operative paragraph 2 because it was of the opinion that the task in question should have been entrusted to the Co-ordination Committee.

Draft resolution III was adopted unanimously.

83. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) stressed the urgency of the problems which would have to be tackled by the Working Group just established. For the past year, much had been said about modifying the structure of the Council and many studies had been made, but no real decision had been taken and no positive results had been achieved.

84. At the fifty-first session in 1971, the delegations of France, the USSR and the United Kingdom had been accused of being cautious and conservative when they had expressed doubts about the enlargement of the membership of the Council. The problem which had just arisen at the present meeting with regard to the constitutionality of the committees made up of 54 members showed that those doubts had not been unfounded.

85. In addition, the calendar of meetings which had been adopted was going to raise some very difficult problems of organization and documentation for the Secretariat and would involve considerable costs.

86. His delegation therefore fervently hoped that the Working Group which had just been established would be able to make specific recommendations to the Council at its fifty-fourth session, and that the Council would be able to adopt them. The Council would then be able to deal properly with the problems it was responsible for.

87. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) informed the Council that the New Zealand Government had approved the amendment to the Charter enlarging the membership of the Council to 54. The instrument ratifying the amendment had been deposited on 19 July 1972.

88. The PRESIDENT drew the attention of the Council to draft decision I, concerning improvement of the Council's methods of work.

Draft decision I was adopted unanimously.

89. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft decision II (Form of presentation of the United Nations budget).

Draft decision II was adopted unanimously.

90. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should take note of the report of the CPC on its twelfth session (E/5186) and of the report on the joint meetings of the CPC and the ACC (E/5188).

It was so decided.

*Financial implications of actions taken by the Council
at its fifty-third session (E/5208)*

91. The PRESIDENT proposed that the Council take note of the report of the Secretary-General on the financial implications of actions taken by the Council at its fifty-third session (E/5208).

It was so decided.

*Credentials of representatives to the fifty-third session
of the Council*

92. The PRESIDENT informed the Council that, in accordance with rule 19 of the rules of procedure, he and the Vice-Presidents had examined the credentials of the representatives to the Council and its sessional committees, and had found them to be in order.

The Council took note of the President's statement.

AGENDA ITEM 2

**General discussion of international economic
and social policy (concluded)**

**EXPLOITATION OF LABOUR THROUGH ILLICIT AND
CLANDESTINE TRAFFICKING: DRAFT RESOL-
UTION SUBMITTED BY THE WORKING GROUP
(concluded) (E/L.1514)**

93. Mr. MUÑOZ LEDO (Observer for Mexico), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said that at the previous meeting the representative of Greece had made a reference to Mexican migrant workers during the debate on the draft resolution concerning the exploitation of labour (E/L.1514). Although his delegation had preferred not to reply to that statement immediately, in order not to divert the Council's attention from the facts described by the representative of Kenya, it nevertheless felt that it was necessary to clarify the matter.

94. At present, large numbers of Mexican workers left the country because of the combined effects of the labour shortage in the United States of America and the growth of population in Mexico. From 1951 to 1964, various agreements between the two countries had governed the admission of those workers to the United States and their protection in that country. Since 1964, large numbers of Mexican workers had continued to flock to the United States. In 1971, more than 300,000 had entered illegally and had been sent back. Many others had settled illegally in the United States, breaking both Mexican and United States regulations.

95. Because of that situation, the President of Mexico and the President of the United States had considered the economic, social and political aspects of the matter, and had agreed that the two Governments concerned should study the problem immediately in order to find a mutually satisfactory solution. A joint commission had been established for that purpose.

96. Although the problem of Mexican workers employed illegally in the United States did indeed exist, no comparison could be made between that problem and certain facts which the Council had condemned in adopting the draft resolution on the exploitation of labour through illicit and clandestine trafficking.

Adjournment of the session

97. The PRESIDENT, summing up the work of the Council, said that the activities of the organizations of the United Nations system could not be separated from the international political and economic situation and in particular from recent developments which made it possible to hope for an end to the era of conflicts and confrontations in which the world had lived for so long.

98. It was being recognized once again that there was a close connexion between the international political climate and economic and social progress. Thus, the improvement in the political atmosphere would certainly be followed by accelerated economic and social development throughout the world.

99. As had been stated by the Secretary-General at the opening of the session (1819th meeting), the decision taken by the General Assembly in resolution 2880 (XXVI), calling for the evolution of a system of collective economic security, was further proof of the recognition that increasingly closer relations had been established between all countries and that development problems which in the past might have been only of local or regional interest now concerned the entire world and should be dealt with by the international community as a whole. It was to be hoped that the Economic and Social Council would give careful consideration to that idea.

100. The economic picture had not been without its own hopeful signs. The rate of economic expansion in the developed market-economy countries in 1971, although still substantially short of the average recorded in the 1960s, had gathered momentum, and further expansion was to be expected. The countries with centrally planned economies had continued to record fairly high rates of growth, which their current plans should make it possible to maintain. The developing countries had also maintained a relatively high rate of growth and had been less susceptible to external vicissitudes than in the past.

101. In the world economy, the major event of the year had been the international monetary crisis, which marked the beginning of a new era for the international monetary system. It was to be hoped that the reform of that system would not be delayed and that it would reflect the realities of the world economy.

102. The economic and social progress of the developing countries was, of course, one of the main concerns of the world community. Although those countries seemed to have achieved satisfactory over-all results, there were considerable differences from one country to another, and many of them were still lagging far behind. In formulating programmes of action, the organizations of the United

Nations system could not afford to gloss over those disparities, a fact which had led to decisions on the least developed among the developing countries. Indeed, the decisions taken at the fifty-third session of the Council would lead to a strengthening of international action in favour of the least developed countries.

103. In addition to other important tasks, the Council would have to monitor the economic and social progress made during the Second United Nations Development Decade. It had taken important steps to prepare itself for that task. Thus, the Committee on Review and Appraisal stood ready to carry out the necessary work at the intergovernmental level, and the Committee for Development Planning had organized its programme of work in such a way as to make its technical knowledge and the experience acquired by its independent experts available in time for the intergovernmental deliberations in 1973. The periodic review and appraisal of the progress made would mark the beginning of a new phase in international co-operation. In order to ensure its success, Governments and international organizations would have to do their utmost to discharge their responsibilities.

104. The review and appraisal procedures were intended to make the necessary periodic adjustments in the International Development Strategy in the light of changing circumstances. In the report on its eighth session (E/5126), the Committee for Development Planning had very clearly brought out the fact that, despite significant economic and social improvements in recent years, mass poverty continued to be one of the characteristics of the developing countries, where unemployment had often assumed serious proportions. It would be necessary to analyse the provisions of the International Development Strategy in order to ensure that the goals and objectives which had been established were in harmony with real needs.

105. The search for solutions to mankind's economic and social ailments must continue. The success achieved might fall short of expectations, but that should not lead to passivity. It was the duty of the Council to probe into unfolding developments and to point the way to new areas of action. That the Council was mindful of that duty was shown by the unanimous adoption of resolution 1721 (LIII) on multinational corporations, requesting the Secretary-General to appoint a group of experts to study the role and the impact of those corporations on the development process and to submit appropriate recommendations.

106. At the present session, the Council had taken another decision of vital importance in establishing, by resolution 1715 (LIII), the terms of reference of the Committee on Science and Technology for Development. The spirit of compromise in which the agreement had been reached was an indication of the co-operation which the Council could inspire. The broad scope of the terms of reference of the new Committee should ensure that it could "assist the Council in the definition of guidelines in the field of science and technology for development in the interests of all mankind and particularly of the peoples of the developing countries".

107. The activities of the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development (ACASTD) and those of the Committee on Science and Technology for Development should complement each other. One of the most important contributions made by ACASTD had been the World Plan of Action for the Application of Science and Technology to Development, which had been discussed by the Council, but which should be one of the major items for discussion by the Committee on Science and Technology for Development, the competent body to deal with the proposals of ACASTD. It was particularly necessary to ensure that the Plan would be well integrated into the Strategy for the Second Development Decade.

108. The Council had noted with interest that UNDP had entered into a new phase defined by the Consensus adopted in June 1970,¹ and that the plans submitted by 35 countries as part of the country programming exercise had been approved. UNDP should play a role in implementing the special measures in favour of the least developed among the developing countries, and the Council, in resolution 1710 (LIII), had requested it to give priority to the revision of the criteria to be followed in calculating indicative planning figures in order to enable those countries to receive an equitable share of the Programme's resources. By the same resolution, the Council had supported the decision of the UNDP Governing Council to prepare a study on the feasibility of using the United Nations Capital Development Fund first and foremost for the least developed countries. It hoped to be able to consider the results of that study and the UNDP Governing Council's decisions on it in time to forward them to the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly.

109. The Council had continued its efforts to rationalize its methods of work, agenda, documentation and structure so that it could more effectively carry out the functions entrusted to it by the Charter of the United Nations. On the basis of the results of the formal and informal discussions held in New York during and after its fifty-second session, it had adopted concrete measures which should lay the foundation for a series of limited but potentially useful improvements.

110. The Council had also established a working group to deal with the rationalization of its work, which was composed of all members of the Council and its sessional committees interested in the matter. Several interesting and constructive proposals had already been put forward. They would be submitted to the working group for consideration, and it was to be hoped that others would be submitted in time for consideration at the working group's meeting in January 1973. The issues were complex and opinions differed, but there was broad agreement on the goals to be achieved and the foundation had been laid for prompt and effective reform.

111. In short, the Council had done some useful work at its fifty-third session, and, with a few exceptions, had been able to settle the questions submitted to it, including some

¹ General Assembly resolution 2688 (XXV), annex.

urgent matters which had arisen during the course of the session. Only a few less important items had had to be deferred to the following session.

112. The strengthening of the role of the Council, which was a basic factor in the implementation of the International Development Strategy, could only be done in accordance with the spirit of the United Nations Charter. Full compliance with the principle of universality would greatly improve its work and that of the United Nations system as a whole.

113. In conclusion, he thanked the members of the Council and the Vice-Presidents, and all the members of the Secretariat, whose assistance had ensured the success of the Council's work.

114. Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya) once again regretted the fact that there was a lack of will in the Council when it was necessary to take a decision. Its methods of work and documentation should be rationalized and, unless it had sufficient authority to take decisions on all the important

questions before it, the Council could not hope to achieve substantial results.

115. In addition, it was clear that, both in terms of will and in their approach to problems, there was a gap between the developed and the developing countries members of the Council. That gap was contrary to the spirit of the Charter and must be bridged. Better understanding of each other's point of view was necessary if tension was to be reduced and useless debates avoided, and the first thing to be done was to strengthen the moral authority of the Council. That was the responsibility of its members. His delegation hoped that, through the efforts of all its members, the enlarged Council would be able to accomplish what it had not yet been able to accomplish.

116. After the customary exchange of compliments, the PRESIDENT declared the fifty-third session of the Economic and Social Council adjourned.

The meeting rose at 7.15 p.m.