



ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL
Forty-sixth Session
OFFICIAL RECORDS

Friday, 6 June 1969,
 at 3.15 p.m.



CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 9:</i> <i>The role of the co-operative movement in economic and social development (concluded)</i>	1
<i>Agenda item 22:</i> <i>Consideration of the provisional agenda for the forty-seventh session</i>	2
<i>Agenda items 11 and 13:</i> <i>Report of the Commission on Human Rights Advisory services in the field of human rights Report of the Social Committee.</i>	4
<i>Agenda item 4:</i> <i>Development of natural resources:</i> <i>(a) Water desalination;</i> <i>(b) Non-agricultural resources;</i> <i>(c) Survey programme</i> <i>Report of the Economic Committee</i>	7
<i>Agenda item 7:</i> <i>Questions relating to science and technology:</i> <i>(a) Report of the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development;</i> <i>(b) Investigation, development and rational utilization of the natural resources of developing countries</i> <i>Report of the Economic Committee</i>	7
<i>Agenda item 8:</i> <i>Arrangements for the transfer of operative technology to developing countries</i> <i>Report of the Economic Committee</i>	8
<i>Agenda item 3:</i> <i>Tax treaties between developed and developing countries</i> <i>Report of the Economic Committee</i>	8
<i>Agenda item 6:</i> <i>Land reform</i> <i>Report of the Economic Committee</i>	9
<i>Closure of the session</i>	9

President: Mr. Raymond SCHEYVEN (Belgium).

AGENDA ITEM 9

The role of the co-operative movement in economic and social development (concluded)* (E/L.648, E/L.1256, E/L.1259)

1. The CHAIRMAN announced that the United Republic of Tanzania and Kuwait had become co-sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1259.

*Resumed from the 1599th meeting.

2. Mr. CHRISTIANSEN (Norway) said that Norway attached considerable importance to the role of the co-operative movement in economic and social development and regretted that the draft resolution did not have more co-sponsors.

3. He proposed that the word "Member" should be inserted before the word "States" in operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution in order to bring the wording in line with operative paragraph 2 of General Assembly resolution 2459 (XXIII) on the same subject.

4. With regard to operative paragraph 5, he felt that the Secretary-General should not be asked to submit the report to the Council at its forty-eighth session and to the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth session. An effort should be made to reduce the number of reports requested of the Secretary-General. It would be more appropriate to request him to submit a report on the implementation of operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution; the Council should assess the contribution of the co-operative movement as an integral part of the work on the Second United Nations Development Decade.

5. Mr. BRADLEY (Argentina) said that he had no objection to the present wording of operative paragraph 3. However, he shared the views of the representative of Norway with regard to operative paragraph 5.

6. Mr. SKATARETIKO (Yugoslavia) announced that Yugoslavia also wished to co-sponsor the draft resolution.

7. Mr. ROUAMBA (Upper Volta) proposed that the meeting should be suspended to allow the sponsors to discuss the changes suggested by the representative of Norway.

It was so decided.

The meeting was suspended at 3.40 p.m. and resumed at 3.55 p.m.

8. Mr. ROUAMBA (Upper Volta) said that the sponsors had decided to insert the following phrase before the words "with a view to" in operative paragraph 1: "and to make an assessment of the contribution which can be made by this movement in the achievement of the goals and objectives of the Second Development Decade".

9. The sponsors could not accept the amendment to operative paragraph 3 proposed by the representative of Norway.

10. They had agreed on the following revised text of operative paragraph 5:

"Requests the Secretary-General to prepare, in co-operation with the interested organizations and bodies in the United Nations system and International Co-operative Alliance, a report to put into effect

the provisions of operative paragraph 1, taking into account the time-table which has been approved for the formulation of the international development strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade.

11. Mr. HALL (Jamaica) proposed that the words "the co-operative movement" should be replaced by "this movement" after the words "which can be made by" in the revised text of operative paragraph 1.

It was so decided.

12. Mr. MARTIN WITKOWSKI (France) proposed, for stylistic reasons, that the words "the contribution" should be replaced by "this contribution" after the words "with a view to ensuring that" in the revised text of operative paragraph 1.

It was so decided.

13. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) felt that operative paragraph 5 was inconsistent with operative paragraph 1. Operative paragraph 5 requested the Secretary-General to take action which the Council itself would be taking under operative paragraph 1.

14. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) pointed out that under operative paragraph 5 the Secretary-General would not be working alone; he would have the co-operation of all States and bodies involved in the preparation of the strategy for the Second Decade.

15. With regard to operative paragraph 3, he explained that the sponsors could not agree that only Member States should be invited to share their experience with the developing countries, since that would limit the number of countries to which the developing countries could apply for assistance. Developing countries which turned to non-Member States would be deprived of the moral support of a United Nations resolution.

16. Mr. MARTIN WITKOWSKI (France), supported by Mr. DECASTIAUX (Belgium), recalling the Norwegian representative's statement at the beginning of the meeting, reintroduced the proposal that the word "Member" should be inserted before "States" in operative paragraph 3.

The amendment to operative paragraph 3 was adopted by 11 votes to 7, with 7 abstentions.

17. Mr. KASSUM (Secretary of the Council) suggested that the United Kingdom representative's objection to operative paragraph 5 might be met by revising a portion of the paragraph to read "a report which would assist in putting into effect the provisions of operative paragraph 1". Thus, the Secretary-General's report would help the Council to carry out its own mandate.

It was so decided.

Draft resolution E/L.1259 as a whole, as amended, was adopted unanimously.

18. Mr. DUBEY (India), explaining his vote, said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution on the understanding that the report to be prepared by the Secretary-General would clearly set forth specific measures to be taken by developed and developing countries. It was too late at the present stage to assess the role of the co-operative movement in purely theoretical terms without seeking to identify specific goals

and objectives. Furthermore, it should be borne in mind that the resolution would entail considerable expenditure of local currency.

19. He hoped that his comments would be reflected in the Council's report.

20. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had supported the draft resolution, although it had reservations similar to those expressed by the representative of India. Preparations for the Second United Nations Development Decade, including work on the co-operative movement, should be carried out by the Preparatory Committee for the Second Decade.

21. Since the amendment to operative paragraph 3 had been adopted, his delegation interpreted the word "Governments" in operative paragraph 4 as referring to the Governments of Member States.

22. Mr. BLAU (United States of America) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, despite its belief that a further report was not necessary. It hoped that the report would be brief. Since a statement of financial implications had not been submitted, he assumed that the relevant costs would be met from existing resources. He endorsed the United Kingdom representative's comments with regard to operative paragraph 4.

23. Mr. DECASTIAUX (Belgium) and Mr. GALLARDO MORENO (Mexico) also endorsed the United Kingdom representative's interpretation of operative paragraph 4.

AGENDA ITEM 22

Consideration of the provisional agenda for the forty-seventh session (E/L.1246 and Corr.1 and 2 and Add.1, E/1252, E/L.1258)

24. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to comment on the provisional agenda (E/L.1246 and Corr.1 and 2 and Add.1) and proposed organization of work E/L.1252) of its forty-seventh session. In the light of the decision taken at the previous meeting, the provisional agenda should also include an item on the situation with regard to infringements of trade union rights in the Portuguese colonies of Africa. If the Council adopted a recommendation of the Economic Committee concerning future institutional arrangements in the field of science and technology, it would have still another item to add to the provisional agenda.

25. Mr. ZAKHAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring to document E/L.1246/Corr.2, noted that it was proposed to reword item 20 to read "Reorganization of the work of the Council and calendar of conferences and meetings for 1970 and 1971". He felt that the word "reorganization" implied a radical change, whereas the discussion had focused on ways of improving the organization of work. He proposed that the item be entitled "Measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council and calendar of conferences and meetings for 1970 and 1971".

It was so decided.

26. Mr. BLAU (United States of America) observed that there was a growing tendency to include, as items or sub-items on the agenda, matters on which the Council was not required to take any action. For

example, sub-items (a) and (c) under provisional item 5, Financing of economic development of the developing countries, involved annual reports of an informational character... which were consistently behind schedule; they should be included among the documentation for the main item. He hoped that the Secretariat would take that comment into account in reviewing the whole agenda.

27. Under the present item 21, his delegation had proposed (1596th meeting) a reorganization of the calendar of meetings for discussion at the forty-seventh session. In particular, it had proposed that many of the items of substance which could not be completed at the forty-seventh session should be taken up in the early part of the following year, and not at the resumed session, in order not to encroach on the work of the Committees of the General Assembly.

28. Mr. KASSUM (Secretary of the Council) assured the representative of the United States that his comments would be taken into account, possibly in the annotations to the agenda. Indeed, all the proposals made for improving the organization of the work of the Council would be taken into consideration when the Co-ordination Committee discussed the Council's future work under item 20 of the provisional agenda for the forty-seventh session.

29. He wished to point out that certain items had to be dealt with at the resumed session because they had to be brought before the General Assembly at its twenty-fourth session. The Council might wish at that time to decide which items it had to consider at the resumed session and which items could be deferred until a "resumed resumed session".

30. Mr. BLAU (United States of America) agreed that some action had to be taken during the resumed session. He hoped, however, that there would be no question of a "resumed resumed session" but that there could be an early first session for 1970 in which the election of officers etc. could take place.

31. Mr. GALLARDO MORENO (Mexico), noting the proposal that the Co-ordination Committee should discuss the development of tourism (item 17) in the first week of the session (see E/L.1252), reminded the Council that there had been an inter-governmental meeting at Sofia, Bulgaria, on that subject and that it might take some time for documentation to become available. He proposed that the item should be dealt with by the Council in plenary meeting and preferably at the end of the second or during the third week of the session.

32. Mr. GELEV (Bulgaria) supported the view of the representative of Mexico. His delegation felt that the item should be discussed in plenary, and should not be taken up until the third week of the session.

33. Mr. BLAU (United States of America) said that, despite the importance of the item, his delegation felt that it was preferable for the sessional committees to deal with problems which required detailed action by the Council. There might first be a general debate in plenary, after which the item might be referred to the Co-ordination Committee.

34. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) agreed that it was a fallacy to assume that important subjects had neces-

sarily to be debated in plenary. There could well be a general debate in plenary first, but the details of the three sub-items of item 17 could best be dealt with in a committee.

35. Mr. HAQUE (Pakistan) supported the view of the representative of Mexico that the item should be considered later in the session. While the arguments of the United States and the United Kingdom representative were cogent, it should also be borne in mind that the Co-ordination Committee would have a heavy burden of work, and it might after all be found desirable to debate the item in plenary.

36. Mr. GELEV (Bulgaria) said that he saw no point in having a general debate in the plenary and then referring the item to a committee. After a general debate in plenary, a resolution should be prepared by means of informal consultations and submitted to the plenary for final action.

37. Mr. KASSUM (Secretary of the Council) suggested that, as all the Committees as well as the plenary would have a heavy agenda, the item might be split up, with the co-ordination aspect being dealt with by the Co-ordination Committee and the other aspects being divided between the Economic Committee and the plenary. The Secretariat might draft a proposal to that effect.

38. Mr. GALLARDO MORENO (Mexico) doubted that time would be saved by dividing the item and distributing it among committees. It should be dealt with as a whole either by the plenary or by the Economic Committee.

39. Mr. BLAU (United States of America) proposed it should be left to the forty-seventh session to decide whether, after plenary discussion, action under the item should be discussed in plenary or referred to the appropriate committee.

It was so decided.

40. Mr. ROUAMBA (Upper Volta), referring to item 2 of the provisional agenda, "General discussion of international economic and social policy", noted that the list of related reports given in the note by the Secretary-General on documentation (E/L.1258) appeared to contain only economic reports; he wondered whether the social aspects had been omitted deliberately in accordance with the view that the summer session of the Council should deal exclusively with economic matters, while the spring session should deal with social matters.

41. Mr. KASSUM (Secretary of the Council) pointed out that the Report on the World Social Situation only appeared once every two years. However, the Council had approved draft resolution V, recommended in the report of the Social Committee (see E/4681 and corr.1, para.10), and it would be taken into consideration in the discussion on the Second United Nations Development Decade.

42. The PRESIDENT inquired in that connexion whether the Council approved paragraph 3 of document E/L.1252 and agreed to focus its attention, in particular during the general discussion on international economic and social policy, on preparations for the Second United Nations Development Decade.

It was so decided.

43. The PRESIDENT inquired whether the Council was prepared to adopt the provisional agenda for the forty-seventh session, as amended, together with the provisional organization of work proposed in document E/L.1252.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEMS 11 AND 13

Report of the Commission on Human Rights (E/4621, E/4621/Add.1 and Corr.1, E/4621 (Summary), E/L.1254)

Advisory services in the field of human rights (E/4637)

REPORT OF THE SOCIAL COMMITTEE (E/4693 AND CORR.1)

44. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the recommendations of the Social Committee contained in paragraph 31 of its report (E/4693 and Corr.1).

Recommendation (a)

Recommendation (a) was adopted unanimously.

Recommendation (b)

45. Mr. BLAU (United States of America) proposed that recommendation (b) (i) to (iv) be deferred until the forty-seventh session. He felt that it would be inconsistent to take action on that recommendation, since it was related to the other suggestions discussed under agenda item 21 concerning institutional arrangements in general, which had been referred to the summer session.

46. Mr. SCHREIBER (Director, Division of Human Rights) stated that the suggestions discussed under agenda item 21 and contained in document E/L.1249 prepared by the Secretariat, were essentially issues to be considered by the Council. As regards sessions of the Commission on Human Rights and of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, there was no suggestion by the Secretary-General that those organs should meet on a biennial basis.

47. Mr. DUBEY (India) considered that, as human rights were dealt with principally at the present session, it was logical for the Council to take a decision. If it was decided to defer a decision, it should be deferred until the resumed session and not until the summer session.

48. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan) considered that the recommendation was purely procedural and a decision should not be deferred until the forty-seventh session.

49. Mr. ROUAMBA (Upper Volta) said that his delegation favoured deferring action on recommendation (b) until the forty-seventh session, since it was related to the whole question of the co-ordination of meetings of United Nations bodies. The members of African delegations often had to attend several commissions, and felt that it was important for the whole calendar of commission meetings to be rationalized. The question of the maintenance of summary records also required further consideration.

50. Mr. DEJAMMET (France) agreed that the objections raised would enable the Council to review the whole position at the next session.

51. Mr. BLAU (United States of America) stressed that he had had no intention of suggesting a change in the periodicity of meetings of the Commission on Human Rights. He agreed with the representative of Upper Volta that the Council should look into the question of meetings of commissions as a whole, and not consider each commission in isolation.

52. Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, in his view, consideration of recommendation (b) should not be deferred until the forty-seventh session because that would mean reopening the debate on the report of the Commission on Human Rights at that session, which already had a very heavy agenda. It would be advisable to specify that the provisions of paragraph (i) of recommendation (b) applied only to the 1970 and 1971 sessions of the Commission; the question of the periodicity and duration of subsequent sessions could be discussed by the Commission and the Council at a later date. With regard to paragraph (ii), the discussion in the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities and in the Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities and in the Commission on Human Rights had shown that those bodies did not intend that the Sub-Commission should meet more than once a year; furthermore, he himself considered that the duration of the Sub-Commission's sessions should not exceed three weeks. The last part of paragraph (ii) should therefore be amended to read "should meet once a year for not more than three weeks". With regard to paragraph (iii), he inquired whether the Sub-Commission had ever considered the possibility of dispensing with summary records. If it had not yet taken a decision on that question, it should be invited to do so at its next session.

53. Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (United Republic of Tanzania) said he was prepared to support the United States proposal, provided that when recommendation (b) was taken up at the forty-seventh session, the United States did not intend to propose that the Commission on Human Rights and the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities should meet biennially and dispense with summary records.

54. Mr. BLAU (United States of America) assured the Tanzanian representative that his delegation had no intention of proposing that the Commission and the Sub-Commission should meet less frequently than every year. However, he could not give the Tanzanian representative the assurance he had requested with regard to the matter of summary records. With regard to the USSR representative's comments he considered that they illustrated the difficulty of reaching a decision at the current session.

55. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the United States proposal that consideration of recommendation (b) should be deferred until the forty-seventh session.

The United States proposal was adopted by 11 votes to 9, with 5 abstentions.

Recommendation (c)

Recommendation (c) was adopted unanimously.

Recommendation (d)

56. Mr. DUBEY (India) observed that his delegation, which had voted for resolution 5 (XXV) in the Commission on Human Rights (see E/4621, chap. XVIII), felt that the Special Rapporteur was carrying out his important task with great efficiency. However, the Special Rapporteur had so far been unable to begin work on the part of his original mandate relating to a survey of the policies and practices of racial discrimination in the African Territories under Portuguese domination. Furthermore, the Commission on Human Rights, at its twenty-fifth session, had extended the Special Rapporteur's mandate to cover a study of the question of apartheid from the point of view of international penal law. His delegation felt that since the Special Rapporteur had made such a good beginning, he should be allowed to complete his work, and it therefore proposed that the Council should disregard recommendation (d) of paragraph 31 of the report of the Social Committee (E/4693 and Corr.1) and decide that resolution 5 (XXV) of the Commission on Human Rights should be implemented as proposed by the Commission.

57. Mr. ROUAMBA (Upper Volta) said he opposed the Indian proposal because he felt that the Commission should consider the two alternatives suggested by the Social Committee in recommendation (d).

58. Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he, too, was opposed to the Indian proposal. The Commission should consider the two alternatives mentioned by the Social Committee and should also consider a third possibility, namely, that of appointing a different Special Rapporteur. In his view, the logical solution would be to entrust the existing mandate of the Special Rapporteur to the Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts which had been re-appointed under resolution 21 (XXV) of the Commission on Human Rights (see E/4621, chap. XVIII) which was already working on other aspects of the apartheid question. It would be helpful if the Secretariat could indicate what savings would result if the mandate was transferred to the Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts.

59. Mr. SCHREIBER (Director, Division of Human Rights) replying to the question put by the USSR representative, said that there would definitely be some savings, but the exact amount would depend on a number of factors, for example, whether the Ad Hoc Working Group would have to extend its sessions to do the additional work, and whether the Group would need the consultant services requested by the Special Rapporteur.

60. Mr. BILGE (Turkey) inquired whether the Special Rapporteur would be able to complete his work in one year.

61. Mr. SCHREIBER (Director, Division of Human Rights) said that only the Special Rapporteur could answer that question accurately, but he personally felt that in view of the vast scope of the Special Rapporteur's mandate, more than one year would be needed to complete the work.

62. Mr. HAQUE (Pakistan) inquired what savings would result if the Special Rapporteur's mandate were abolished altogether.

63. Mr. SCHREIBER (Director, Division of Human Rights) said that the total savings would be \$1,200: \$19,000 for 1969 and \$2,100 for 1970.

64. Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (United Republic of Tanzania) and Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that they did not understand why the savings that would result from the abolition of the mandate were so small; according to document E/4621/Add.1, the financial implications of resolution 5 (XXV) of the Commission on Human Rights amounted to \$27,100 for 1969 and \$146,100 for 1970.

65. Mr. SCHREIBER (Director, Division of Human Rights) explained that the figures cited by the representatives of the United Republic of Tanzania and the Soviet Union covered the financial implications of the resolution as a whole, and not just those of the provisions relating to the Special Rapporteur. The financial implications for 1969 included \$8,000 for the publication of parts of the Special Rapporteur's most recent report, which would presumably be published even if the Special Rapporteur's mandate were discontinued in the future. Similarly, the financial implications for 1970 included \$144,000 for the establishment and operation of a unit of the United Nations Radio in Africa, which would not be affected by a decision to abolish the mandate. The savings resulting from abolition of the mandate would thus be \$21,200 as he had originally indicated.

66. Mr. DUBEY (India) withdrew his proposal.

Recommendation (d) was adopted unanimously.

Recommendations (e), (f) and (g)

Recommendations (e), (f) and (g) were adopted unanimously.

Recommendation (h)

67. Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that draft recommendation (h) in paragraph 31 overlapped with paragraph 30 of document E/4693.

68. Mr. KASSUM (Secretary of the Council) suggested that the Council should vote on recommendation (h) only.

Recommendation (h) was adopted unanimously.

69. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft resolutions I to XII recommended by the Social Committee in paragraph 32 of its report (E/4693 and Corr.1).

Draft Resolution I

Draft resolution I was adopted unanimously.

Draft Resolution II

70. Mr. BERRO (Uruguay) said that, although his delegation supported the objectives of operative paragraphs 3, 4, 5 and 10 of draft resolution II and repudiated colonialism, apartheid and racism as it had always done, it believed that those paragraphs related to matters which were within the exclusive competence

of the Security Council under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter, in particular Articles 39, 40 and 41. Every United Nations body had a duty to operate within its own field of competence and should not infringe on that of other bodies. On legal, not political, grounds, therefore, his delegation requested a separate vote on operative paragraphs 3, 4, 5 and 10.

71. Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that while his delegation supported draft resolution II as a whole, it had reservations concerning operative paragraphs 11, 12 and 13, for reasons which his delegation had explained in the Social Committee. He therefore requested a separate vote on those paragraphs.

72. Mr. BILGE (Turkey) also requested a separate vote on operative paragraph 8 of the draft resolution.

Operative paragraph 3 was adopted by 25 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Operative paragraph 4 was adopted by 25 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Operative paragraph 5 was adopted by 23 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 8 was adopted by 17 votes to 1, with 8 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 10 was adopted by 16 votes to 6, with 4 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 11 was adopted by 18 votes to 4, with 4 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 12 was adopted by 18 votes to 2, with 6 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 13 was adopted by 18 votes to 2, with 6 abstentions.

Draft resolution II, as a whole, was adopted by 18 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.

Draft Resolution III

Draft resolution III was adopted by 16 votes to 2, with 6 abstentions.

73. Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution III because it attached great importance to the consideration by the Council of the question of the punishment of war criminals and of persons who had committed crimes against humanity. The Soviet people had paid a high price for victory against fascism: 20 million Soviet citizens had perished in the struggle. The Soviet Union complied strictly with all its obligations in bringing criminals to justice and took an active part in all United Nations activities directed towards that end. Together with other countries, the Soviet Union had supported the initiative taken by the Polish delegation which had resulted in the adoption by the United Nations of the Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity,^{1/} and had been one of the first States to ratify the Convention.

74. In connexion with the adoption of draft resolution III by the Council, his delegation wished to draw

^{1/} For the text of the Convention, see the annex to General Assembly resolution 2391 (XXIII) of 26 November 1968.

attention to the results of the International Conference on Questions Relating to the Prosecution of Nazi war Criminals, held in Moscow from 25 to 29 March 1969, which had stressed the need to intensify the struggle against Nazi war criminals and had called on all Governments to become parties to the Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity. The resolution adopted at that Conference was reproduced in document E/L.1254.

75. The dangerous political situation in the Federal Republic of Germany was a matter of concern to people throughout the world. Former Nazis were mobilizing their forces, the revanchists were seeking to void the results of the Second World War and Nazi war criminals were being rehabilitated and employed in the government administration. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany had recently been forced to take some measures to comply with the provisions of the Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity, but, under the pretext of adopting a different approach to the question, it had taken steps which were in effect designed to legitimize the activities of Nazi criminals and protect them from punishment. In the German Democratic Republic, on the other hand, all Nazi war criminals had been duly punished and the Constitution was in strict accordance with the provisions of the most important United Nations conventions on human rights. In March 1969, the German Democratic Republic had expressed its readiness to accede to the Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity. His delegation hoped that the resolution which had just been adopted by the Council would help to ensure retribution for Nazi war criminals.

Draft Resolution IV

Draft resolution IV was adopted unanimously.

Draft Resolution V

76. Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Republics), speaking in explanation of vote, said that draft resolution V, like draft resolutions VI and VII, concerned the appointment of a new Special Rapporteur. There were already a considerable number of reports which the Commission on Human Rights and the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities had not yet had time to consider and, at a modest estimate, they would need at least four years to consider the reports that had accumulated. In addition, two further studies were recommended in draft resolutions VI and VII. There was no need for the study recommended in draft resolution V to be undertaken until the Sub-Commission had considered many other items on their agenda. Draft resolution V was therefore inopportune and his delegation would vote against it.

Draft resolution V was adopted by 22 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

77. Mr. BERRO (Uruguay) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution V on the understanding that it was concerned with the protection of a right which was as fundamental as those referred to in other draft resolutions.

78. Mrs. GAVRILOVA (Bulgaria) said that her delegation had voted against the draft resolution not because it did not share the general concern to protect the rights of minorities, but because the mandate of the Special Rapporteur was not clear and it seemed unnecessary to appoint a Special Rapporteur to carry out the proposed study; the Sub-Commission could carry out that task itself.

79. Mr. EL HUSSEIN (Sudan) said that his delegation agreed with the representative of Bulgaria that the mandate of the Special Rapporteur was not clear. For that reason, his delegation had abstained in the vote.

Draft Resolution VI

Draft resolution VI was adopted unanimously.

Draft Resolution VII

Draft resolution VII was adopted by 22 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

Draft Resolution VIII

Draft resolution VIII was adopted by 23 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Draft Resolution IX

Draft resolution IX was adopted unanimously.

Draft Resolution X

80. Mr. EL HUSSEIN (Sudan) suggested that the reference to resolution 5 (XXV) of the Commission on Human Rights in operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution X should be deleted in view of the decision taken earlier in the meeting regarding recommendation (d). He was not however, proposing a formal amendment.

81. Mr. SCHREIBER (Director, Division of Human Rights) said that the only expenditure outstanding in 1969 under resolution 5 (XXV) of the Commission on Human Rights related to the publication of the report of the Special Rapporteur on apartheid. The remaining expenditure under resolution 5 (XXV) of the Commission on Human Rights related to the publication of the report of the Special Rapporteur on apartheid. The remaining expenditure under resolution 5 (XXV) of the Commission would be incurred in 1970. The Council might therefore consider that there was no urgency and the decision might be left to the twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly. In his own view, therefore, there would be no difficulty if the Council so wished, in deleting the reference to the resolution, as the representative of the Sudan had suggested.

82. Mr. ROUAMBA (Upper Volta) formally proposed the deletion of the reference to resolution 5 (XXV) of the Commission on Human Rights in operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution X recommended by the Social Committee (E/4693 and Corr.1, para. 32), since it related to a part of the programme which had already been deferred until the forty-seventh session.

The amendment proposed by the Upper Volta was adopted by 21 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

83. Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested a separate vote on operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution X for reasons which his delegation had explained in the Social Committee.

Operative paragraph 2 was adopted by 13 votes to 4, with 9 abstentions.

Draft resolution X, as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 16 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.

Draft Resolution XI

Draft resolution XI was adopted by 22 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

Draft Resolution XII

Draft resolution XII was adopted unanimously.

84. Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation wished to stress the special significance of resolution 16 (XXV) of the Commission on Human Rights (see E/4621, chap. XVIII) concerning the centenary of Lenin's birth. He hoped that the symposium to be organized by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) on that occasion would be successful and would help to stress the great contribution made by Lenin to the cause of economic and social progress for mankind as a whole.

AGENDA ITEM 4

Development of natural resources (E/4625 and Corr.1, E/4634, E/4636 and Add.1):

- (a) Water desalination;
- (b) Non-agricultural resources;
- (c) Survey programme*

REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC COMMITTEE (E/4692)

85. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the draft resolution contained in paragraph 13 of the report of the Economic Committee (E/4692).

86. Mr. ZAKHAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested a separate vote on operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution.

87. Mr. BERRO (Uruguay) requested a separate vote on operative paragraph 5, for reasons which his delegation had stated in the Economic Committee.

Operative paragraph 2 was adopted by 16 votes to 5, with 3 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 5 was adopted by 13 votes to 7, with 4 abstentions.

88. Mr. BERRO (Uruguay) and Mr. PLEHN MEJIA (Mexico), speaking in explanation of vote, referred to the statements made by their delegations in explanation of vote at the 483rd meeting of the Economic Committee.

The draft resolution, as a whole, was adopted by 19 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions.

AGENDA ITEM 7

Questions relating to science and technology (E/4608 and Add.1 and 2, E/4611 and Add.1 and 2, E/4644):

- (a) Report of the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development;
- (b) Investigation, development and rational utilization of the natural resources of developing countries

REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC COMMITTEE (E/4694)

*In the absence of documentation, sub-item (c) had not been considered by the Economic Committee.

89. The PRESIDENT drew attention to draft resolutions I and II contained in paragraph 14 of the report of the Economic Committee (E/4694).

Draft Resolution I

90. Mr. ZAKHAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested a separate vote on the words "or members of the specialized agencies" in operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution I.

The Council decided, by 20 votes to 3, with 1 abstention, to retain the words "or members of the specialized agencies" in operative paragraph 1.

Draft resolution I, as a whole, was adopted unanimously.

Draft Resolution II

Draft resolution II was adopted unanimously.

91. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the decision of the Economic Committee referred to in paragraph 13 of its report (*ibid.*), concerning the symposium to be organized by UNESCO on the occasion of the centenary of Lenin's birth.

AGENDA ITEM 8

Arrangements for the transfer of operative technology to developing countries (E/4633, E/4633/Add.1 and Corr.1)

REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC COMMITTEE (E/4699)

92. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the draft resolution contained in paragraph 7 of the report of the Economic Committee (E/4699).

93. Mr. YUNUS (Pakistan) said that the Economic Committee's report in effect recommended that the Council should postpone consideration of the question of arrangements for the transfer of operative technology to developing countries to its forty-seventh session. Intensive consultations had been held in an effort to determine whether, while postponing consideration of the item, some agreed principles could be formulated regarding the relative competence of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly in that field. No such principles had been included in the draft resolution because most delegations preferred to postpone the whole issue in order not to prejudice the outcome of the Council's future deliberations. His delegation wished, however, to state the principles which, in its view, had emerged during the current session.

94. First, in his report (E/4633), the Secretary-General had expressed the view that none of the existing inter-governmental bodies dealing with problems of science and technology was exclusively geared to the particular issue of the transfer of operative technology (*ibid.*, para. 38) and had recognized the justified concern of UNCTAD with the question (*ibid.*, para. 39). That recognition was of the utmost importance in view of the fact that the Secretary-General's report had been prepared in pursuance of Council resolution 1361 (XLV) of 2 August 1968.

95. Secondly, in paragraph 67 of his report, the Secretary-General recognized UNCTAD's competence

to take appropriate action on institutional arrangements within its own framework in order to facilitate the transfer of operative technology to developing countries. Recognition of those two principles should be reflected fully in the institutional arrangements for dealing with matters pertaining to science and technology.

96. Thirdly, in his report, the Secretary-General had referred to resolution 48 (VII) of the Trade and Development Board of 21 September 1968, which had been before the Council for the first time (see E/4633, annex). That resolution was not mentioned in the draft resolution recommended by the Economic Committee in its report (see E/4699, para. 7), and the Council should therefore revert to it when considering the item at its forty-seventh session.

97. Fourthly, it had become clear that the transfer of operative technology to developing countries was part of the larger issue of the application of science and technology to development. While UNCTAD undeniably had a role to play in the former, the over-all co-ordinating and legislative responsibility of the Council and the General Assembly with regard to the latter must also be recognized, and there was no reason why that should give rise to any jurisdictional problems. As to whether the inter-governmental machinery pertaining to the larger issue of science and technology should be created in the context of the Council or the General Assembly, his delegation felt that there were weighty considerations on both sides and that the Council should revert to the matter at its forty-seventh session.

98. Finally, on the question of the future arrangements for the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development, his delegation, like others, felt that the Advisory Committee had made an outstanding contribution to the general recognition of the role of science and technology in the development process and believed that it would be an asset to any inter-governmental machinery that might eventually be established.

99. He pointed out that the Trade and Development Board had decided to take final action in respect of its resolution 48 (VII) by 30 September 1969 and, since the next session of the Trade and Development Board was scheduled to be held in September 1969, he hoped that the item would be given due priority and that the Council's views on the matter would be finalized at its forty-seventh session.

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 3

Tax treaties between developed and developing countries (E/4614 and Corr.1, E/4630 and Add.1)

REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC COMMITTEE (E/4697 AND ADD.1)

100. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the draft resolution contained in the report of the Economic Committee (E/4697 and Add.1, para.10).

The draft resolution was adopted by 21 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

101. Mr. ZAKHAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), explaining his vote, said that he had abstained, not because he opposed the substance of the draft resolution, but because the question of tax treaties did not concern countries with centrally planned economies.


102. Mr. MARTIN WITKOWSKI (France), explaining his vote, recalled that his delegation had abstained in the vote on Council resolution 1273 (XLIII) of 4 August 1967, which had established the Ad Hoc Group of Experts on Tax Treaties between Developed and Developing Countries, because it had felt that the tasks entrusted to the Group should not be carried out by experts acting in an individual capacity. At the current session, it would have preferred the Council to set a definite time-limit for the completion of the work of the Ad Hoc Group, or to replace that group by a group of government experts. Furthermore, his delegation found the wording of the sixth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution unsatisfactory. For all those reasons he had abstained in the vote.

AGENDA ITEM 6

Land reform (E/4617 and Corr.] and 2, E/L.1256)
REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC COMMITTEE (E/4700)

103. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the decision contained in the Economic Committee's report E/4700, para. 8).

104. Mr. DUBEY (India) proposed that the words "the International Labour Organization" should be inserted after the words "the United Nations".

The Indian proposal was adopted unanimously. 

105. Mr. ZAKHAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested a separate vote on the words "the financial aspects of land reform and".

The words "the financial aspects of land reform and" were retained by 20 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Paragraph 8, as a whole, as amended, was adopted unanimously.

106. Mr. ZAKHAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), explaining his vote, said he had abstained because he did not consider it advisable for the Secretary-General's sixth report on progress in land reform to place special emphasis on the financial aspects of land reform.

Closure of the session

107. After the customary exchange of courtesies, the PRESIDENT declared the 46th session of the Council closed.

The meeting rose at 8.35 p.m.