



ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

FIFTY-FIRST SESSION

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Friday, 30 July 1971

at 3.20 p.m.

PALAIS DES NATIONS, GENEVA

CONTENTS

Page

Agenda items 17, 10 (b) and 3 (a): Measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council (continued)	
Science and technology: (b) Future institutional arrangements for science and technology (concluded)	
Second United Nations Development Decade: review and appraisal of the objectives and policies of the International Development Strategy:	
(a) System of over-all appraisal of progress in implementing the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade: report of the Economic Committee (continued)	227

President: Mr. DRISS (Tunisia)

AGENDA ITEMS 17, 10 (b) AND 3 (a)

Measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council (continued) (E/4986 and Add.1-9, E/L.1382, E/L.1408/Rev.2, E/L.1435, E/L.1451 (part A); E/L.1458)

Science and technology

(b) Future institutional arrangements for science and technology (concluded) (E/4954, E/4989, chap. VII; E/5012 (part I), chap. I, section B; E/L.1400, E/L.1420 and Add.1, E/L.1451 (part B) and E/L.1451/Add.1, E/L.1458, E/L.1459)

Second United Nations Development Decade: review and appraisal of objectives and policies of the International Development Strategy

(a) System of over-all appraisal of progress in implementing the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade: report of the Economic Committee (continued) (E/5029, annex; E/5059, E/L.1451 (part C) and E/L.1451/Add.1, E/L.1454-1458)

1. Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that it was inappropriate to imply, as the USSR representative had done, that some members of the Council were resorting to purely mechanical procedures to impose their wishes on the rest of the Council. His delegation had the right to join with other delegations in proposing measures, in accordance with its obligations under the Charter and its aims as a member of the Council. It had the right to carry out its Government's instructions

to participate in the Council's deliberations in whatever manner it considered appropriate.

2. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that in the vote on the draft resolution submitted by the Congo (Democratic Republic of), Ghana, Haiti, Indonesia, Italy, Jamaica, Kenya, Lebanon, Madagascar, Malaysia, Niger, Norway, Sudan, Tunisia, and the United States of America (E/L.1451), his delegation would oppose part A, but would support parts B and C, although it did not consider some of the wording in those two parts entirely satisfactory and would prefer some changes to be made. If the draft resolution was adopted, he hoped that the General Assembly would not be faced with a definitive proposal but that further negotiation would be possible with a view to eliminating the provisions which, to his delegation, seemed objectionable.

3. He hoped that the sponsors had carefully considered the possibility of an eventual *rapprochement* with the delegations which, although not in a position to support the present draft, had not condemned it outright. That did not mean that his delegation was in favour of the Greek draft resolution (E/L.1458), proposing that the entire issue should be deferred to the Council's resumed fifty-first session. It was not prepared to regard the present situation on the issue as static, but assumed that it would change in the next few months, especially with further consideration in the General Assembly and at the Council's future sessions. The Greek proposal was too categorical in requiring the Council to defer action on all the draft resolutions and amendments under agenda items 17, 10 (b) and 3 (a); it would have no results to show for its efforts to find a solution. Moreover, the proposal was not purely procedural, since it touched indirectly on the substance of the issues. The Council's resumed fifty-first session also seemed unsuitable for such a discussion, because it would be short and would be held during the General Assembly. In effect, the issue would therefore be referred indirectly to the General Assembly. It was undesirable for the Council to deal with such important issues while the General Assembly was in session, for it would undoubtedly be influenced by pressures from the Assembly. If it was to retain its independence, it should not be exposed to such risks. The possibility of conflict between the Council and the General Assembly, which had been invoked in support of deferment, was less important than the conflict developing within the Council and the risk of widening the rift by deferring consideration of the points at issue.

4. It was also difficult to accept the argument that a decision on an issue before the Council should be deferred until a group of countries, i.e. the Group of 77, had held its Ministerial Meeting, outside the Organization, and expressed its views on that issue. Although it was normal that groups of countries should have some influence on the

deliberations of such international organizations as UNCTAD, it should not be permitted in the case of the Council or the General Assembly, where it would introduce an element of pressure and distortion which was not in conformity with the spirit of the Charter. He did not, therefore, support the draft resolution submitted by Greece. He had heard the arguments for both sides many times and was convinced that everything had been said on the issues involved. He therefore urged the Council to take action in the matter without further delay.

5. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) agreed with the USSR representative that it was in everyone's interest to make the Council a powerful and united body capable of discharging its functions under the Charter. The Greek draft resolution had been submitted for that purpose. He shared the French representative's view that draft resolution E/L.1451, especially part A, included some provisions which were undesirable. He agreed that the issue should not be referred without a decision to the General Assembly, and had therefore proposed that its consideration should be deferred to the Council's resumed fifty-first session. The proposal provided for the deferment of the consideration of all the draft resolutions submitted under items 17, 10 (b) and 3 (a) because it concerned the whole of draft resolution E/L.1451. The Council could still be a single, united body if it could end its debate in a spirit of conciliation and defer the three controversial issues to the resumed fifty-first session for a final attempt to reach agreement. His proposal was intended, through a decision which would not be contested in the General Assembly, to prevent a rift in the Council. The adoption of draft resolution E/L.1451 would widen that rift and might induce the permanent members of the Security Council to harden their position on those issues. It was pointless for the Council to adopt a decision which might well be reversed by the General Assembly.

6. The many objections and doubts expressed concerning draft resolution E/L.1451 had remained unanswered. His delegation, too, had doubts about it but had not taken sides. His proposal referred specifically to the matter dealt with in part A of the draft resolution since that was the most controversial and weakest component of the "package". Greece would not agree to sacrifice efficiency to political expediency, but the issue was a political one and should perhaps be decided by the entire United Nations membership if it became clear that the Council was irrevocably divided on it. One third of the developing countries, one third of the Council's members and three out of the four permanent members of the Security Council represented in the Economic and Social Council were opposed to the enlargement of the Council, as proposed in draft resolution E/L.1451.

7. His delegation had been asked by the representative of Tunisia to withdraw its proposal in a spirit of co-operation. Such a withdrawal would amount to a denial of the moral principle underlying it: that of conciliation. It might nevertheless be willing to consider document E/L.1458 as a declaration by the Greek delegation and not as a draft resolution. It would perhaps be better if, instead of putting draft resolution E/L.1451 to the vote, the President

announced that that draft resolution had the support of the majority of the Council but was opposed by a strong minority, and invited the Council to make a statement to that effect. The General Assembly would in any case have before it the Council's report on its debate, the summary records of the relevant meetings and the President's statement when it took up the issues in question. The Council could then adjourn its fifty-first session on a less discordant note and negotiations on those issues could continue.

8. The PRESIDENT said that he was not empowered to adopt such a procedure. He had complied with rule 52 of the rules of procedure, which now required him to put the draft resolutions to the vote. Under rule 66 the Greek draft resolution should be put to the vote first. He therefore invited the Council to vote on draft resolution E/L.1458.

At the request of the representative of Peru, the vote was taken by roll-call.

Uruguay, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Brazil, Ceylon, Greece, Hungary, Peru, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Against: United States of America, France, Ghana, Haiti, Indonesia, Italy, Jamaica, Kenya, Lebanon, Madagascar, Malaysia, Niger, Norway, New Zealand, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Sudan, Tunisia.

Abstaining: Pakistan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Draft resolution E/L.1458 was rejected by 17 votes to 8, with 2 abstentions.

9. The PRESIDENT announced that New Zealand had added its name to the list of sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1451. He invited the Council to consider the amendments to part C of that draft resolution proposed by Brazil, Ceylon, Uruguay and Yugoslavia (E/L.1454) and by Yugoslavia (E/L.1455), and the amendments to part B submitted by Brazil, Uruguay and Yugoslavia (E/L.1459).

10. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) said that, after careful consideration, the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1451 had been unable to accept any of the proposed amendments. He hoped that, in view of the difficulties which had arisen over the draft resolution, the sponsors of the amendments would withdraw their proposals, as their views were reported in the summary records.

11. Mr. MOJSOV (Yugoslavia) said that it was clear from the statement of the representative of Sudan that the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1451 were not prepared to compromise, but intended to press for adoption of the text in its present form. If the sponsors had made the slightest concession to the sponsors of the amendments in a spirit of conciliation, he would have supported the Sudanese representative's appeal for the withdrawal of the amendments. In the circumstances that appeal had no moral force.

12. He failed to see why the sponsors of the draft resolution had refused to accept the amendment proposed

in document E/L.1455, to the effect that the Council's decision in paragraph 1 of part C of the draft resolution would be subject to the final decision of the General Assembly. No one could deny that, by virtue of the Charter, all the Council's decisions were subject to the General Assembly's authority. The amendment did not conflict with the views held by the sponsors and was merely intended to avoid a confrontation between the Council and the General Assembly.

13. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) said that, in referring to the Council's functions under the Charter, paragraph 1 of part C of the draft resolution implicitly acknowledged its powers under Article 68 of the Charter and the General Assembly's authority under Article 60. An explicit reference to the General Assembly's authority would therefore be redundant. That was why the sponsors had been unable to accept the amendment.

14. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the amendments to part C of draft resolution E/L.1451 in document E/L.1454.

15. Mr. MOJSOV (Yugoslavia) requested that separate votes should be taken on the amendment to the preamble, on the first amendment to the operative part, and on the second amendment to the operative part.

The amendment to the preamble of draft resolution E/L.1451, part C was rejected by 16 votes to 8, with 3 abstentions.

At the request of the representative of Brazil, the vote on the first amendment to the operative part of draft resolution E/L.1451, part C was taken by roll-call.

Malaysia, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Peru, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Brazil, Ceylon.

Against: Malaysia, Niger, Norway, New Zealand, Congo (Democratic Republic of), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Sudan, Tunisia, United States of America, Ghana, Indonesia, Italy, Jamaica, Kenya, Lebanon, Madagascar.

Abstaining: Pakistan, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, France, Greece, Haiti, Hungary.

The first amendment to the operative part of draft resolution E/L.1451, part C was rejected by 16 votes to 5, with 6 abstentions.

At the request of the representative of Brazil, the vote on the second amendment to the operative part of draft resolution E/L.1451, part C was taken by roll-call.

Italy, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Peru, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Brazil, Ceylon.

Against: Italy, Jamaica, Kenya, Lebanon, Madagascar, Malaysia, Niger, Norway, New Zealand, Congo (Democratic Republic of), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Sudan, Tunisia, United States of America, France, Ghana, Indonesia.

Abstaining: Pakistan, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Greece, Haiti, Hungary.

The second amendment to the operative part of draft resolution E/L.1451, part C was rejected by 17 votes to 5, with 5 abstentions.

16. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the Yugoslav amendment (E/L.1455) to part C of draft resolution E/L.1451.

At the request of the representative of Yugoslavia, the vote was taken by roll-call.

Peru, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Peru, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Brazil, Ceylon.

Against: Congo (Democratic Republic of), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Sudan, Tunisia, United States of America, France, Ghana, Greece, Indonesia, Italy, Jamaica, Kenya, Lebanon, Madagascar, Malaysia, Niger, Norway, New Zealand.

Abstaining: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Haiti, Hungary, Pakistan.

The Yugoslav amendment (E/L.1455) was rejected by 18 votes to 5, with 4 abstentions.

17. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the amendments submitted by Brazil, Uruguay and Yugoslavia (E/L.1459) to part B of draft resolution E/L.1451.

At the request of the representative of Brazil, the vote on the first amendment was taken by roll-call.

Yugoslavia, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Yugoslavia, Brazil, Ceylon, Peru, Uruguay.

Against: United States of America, France, Ghana, Indonesia, Italy, Jamaica, Kenya, Lebanon, Madagascar, Malaysia, Niger, Norway, New Zealand, Pakistan, Congo (Democratic Republic of), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Sudan, Tunisia.

Abstaining: Greece, Haiti, Hungary, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The first amendment to draft resolution E/L.1451, part B was rejected by 18 votes to 5, with 4 abstentions.

At the request of the representative of Brazil, the vote on the second amendment was taken by roll-call.

Peru, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Peru, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Brazil, Ceylon.

Against: Congo (Democratic Republic of), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Sudan, Tunisia, United States of America, France, Ghana, Indonesia, Italy, Jamaica, Kenya, Lebanon, Madagascar, Malaysia, Niger, Norway, New Zealand, Pakistan.

Abstaining: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Greece, Haiti, Hungary.

The second amendment to draft resolution E/L.1451, part B was rejected by 18 votes to 5, with 4 abstentions.

18. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on draft resolution E/L.1451.

19. Mr. MOJISOV (Yugoslavia) requested a separate vote on each part of the draft resolution.

At the request of the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the vote on part A was taken by roll-call.

The Democratic Republic of the Congo, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Congo (Democratic Republic of), Sudan, Tunisia, United States of America, Ghana, Haiti, Indonesia, Italy, Jamaica, Kenya, Lebanon, Madagascar, Malaysia, Niger, Norway, New Zealand, Pakistan.

Against: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Brazil, Ceylon, France, Greece, Hungary, Peru.

Abstaining: None.

Part A of draft resolution E/L.1451 was adopted by 17 votes to 10.

At the request of the representatives of Brazil and Yugoslavia, the vote on part B was taken by roll-call.

The Democratic Republic of the Congo, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Congo (Democratic Republic of), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Sudan, Tunisia, United States of America, France, Ghana, Haiti, Indonesia, Italy, Jamaica, Kenya, Lebanon, Madagascar, Malaysia, Niger, Norway, New Zealand, Pakistan.

Against: Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Brazil, Ceylon, Peru.

Abstaining: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Greece, Hungary.

Part B of draft resolution E/L.1451 was adopted by 19 votes to 5, with 3 abstentions.

At the request of the representatives of Brazil and Yugoslavia, the vote on part C was taken by roll-call.

Haiti, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Haiti, Indonesia, Italy, Jamaica, Kenya, Lebanon, Madagascar, Malaysia, Niger, Norway, New Zealand, Congo (Democratic Republic of), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Sudan, Tunisia, United States of America, France, Ghana.

Against: Peru, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Brazil, Ceylon.

Abstaining: Hungary, Pakistan, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Greece.

Part C of draft resolution E/L.1451 was adopted by 18 votes to 5, with 4 abstentions.

At the request of the representative of Brazil, the vote on draft resolution E/L.1451 as a whole was taken by roll-call.

Norway, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Norway, New Zealand, Pakistan, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Sudan, Tunisia, United States of America, Ghana, Haiti, Indonesia, Italy, Jamaica, Kenya, Lebanon, Madagascar, Malaysia, Niger.

Against: Peru, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Brazil, Ceylon, Hungary.

Abstaining: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, France, Greece.

Draft resolution E/L.1451 as a whole was adopted by 17 votes to 7, with 3 abstentions.

20. Mr. MOJISOV (Yugoslavia), speaking in explanation of vote, said that in principle his delegation supported the enlargement of the Council and its sessional committees, as was evidenced by the fact that it had been a sponsor of the amendments (E/L.1431) to draft resolution E/L.1408/Rev.2. Two factors had, however, compelled it to vote against part A of the resolution just adopted. Firstly, it considered that the question of enlarging the Council and its sessional committees should have been the subject of a separate resolution. Secondly, it could not support the inclusion, in paragraph 1, of the words "in accordance with the present geographical distribution of seats in the Council", since the present geographical distribution did not meet the wishes of the developing countries for real representation in the Council; in addition, those words could be prejudicial to the eventual seating of the People's Republic of China, once that country had been admitted to membership of the United Nations.

21. Yugoslavia had voted against draft resolution E/L.1451 as a whole for reasons which had been fully explained in the debate.

22. Mr. de AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) said that although his delegation was strongly in favour of enlarging the Council it had been obliged to vote against part A of the resolution because the measures suggested for such an enlargement had basic defects of a juridical, constitutional and even political nature. With regard to part B, only a General Assembly body could make a practical and effective contribution: a new Economic and Social Council organ might simply duplicate the work of the UNCTAD Intergovernmental Group on Transfer of Technology. His country's position was reflected in the draft resolution (E/L.1400) originally submitted by his own and three other delegations at the Council's fiftieth session, and in the amendment submitted at the present session in document E/L.1459. The present wording of part B represented a basic departure from that position and his delegation had accordingly voted against it. With regard to part C, the International Development Strategy was the creation of the General Assembly, which should therefore be the first to express its views on the matter. Moreover, his delegation interpreted paragraph 4 of General Assembly resolution 2641 (XXV) to mean that no action should be taken until a final decision was reached by the Assembly. Lastly, his delegation had never been approached by any of the

sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1451 for consultations or for an informal exchange of views.

23. Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the resolution because his country, as a developing country, felt that an enlarged and more representative Economic and Social Council was needed, that establishment of a Council committee on the application of science and technology to development was overdue and that any delay in establishing a review and appraisal committee would defeat the goals of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade. It had been suggested that the Council's decision would be reversed in the General Assembly. The developing countries, however, would not agree to any further postponement of those questions and would continue in the General Assembly their action to make United Nations bodies more representative. Only thus could they make their voices heard more effectively.

24. Mr. WIELAND ALZAMORA (Peru) stated that his delegation had voted against part A of the resolution, which was not only weak but had legal lacunae which might lead to serious consequences. Moreover, in the matter of geographical distribution the text did not accord with the draft resolution co-sponsored by his delegation (E/L.1431), which had sought to enlarge the Economic and Social Council separately, on its own merits. His delegation had also voted against parts B and C because it felt that the establishment of committees of the kind envisaged was a matter for the General Assembly.

25. Mr. PATHMARAJAH (Ceylon) said that his delegation had adduced detailed arguments to show the drafting weakness and conceptual vagueness of passages of part A of the resolution on which parts B and C depended. It had misgivings concerning the phrasing used to refer to the early enlargement of the Council, the equity or inequity of the present geographical distribution of seats in the Council, the legality and propriety of having sessional committees larger than the parent body, the creation of two different classes of economic and social membership, the indivisibility and injustice of electing twenty-seven new members of sessional committees at the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly, and the prevention of sixteen members from participating in the activities of the Council and its sessional committees. As no satisfactory answers to those points had been given, his delegation had been unable to support part A. It had also voted against parts B and C as, in view of the important conferences to be held shortly, more time was needed to consider those matters.

26. Mr. NAIK (Pakistan) said that his delegation wholeheartedly supported the decisions and recommendations in part A of the resolution and did not share the fears expressed by the Yugoslav representative. There were twelve seats for the African and Asian States, and it was the current practice to regard permanent members as representatives of their regional groups. That practice would apply to the People's Republic of China, which would therefore

not be excluded from its rightful place as a permanent member of the Council.

27. Mr. CHTOUROU (Tunisia), speaking as a sponsor of draft resolution E/L.1471, said that it was difficult to see how an enlargement of the Economic and Social Council could impede the admission of a country to membership of that body; on the contrary, it would facilitate the admission of new members.

28. Referring to the Brazilian representative's allegation that there had been no consultations, he said that throughout the first two weeks of the session there had been negotiations among the Group of 77 on parts A and B of draft resolution E/L.1451. Only later, when it had proved impossible to reach agreement within the Group, had negotiations been conducted with other countries, leading to the submission of the text just adopted by the Council.

29. Mr. KASSATKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the reasons which had prompted his delegation to vote against part A and to abstain on parts B and C had been explained in detail by the head of his delegation at the 1797th meeting; no further comment was required.

30. Mr. PATAKI (Hungary) said that the Council had not had a proper opportunity to discuss the important questions covered in the resolution and that his delegation could not share in the responsibility for the hasty decision which the Council had just taken. There had been no real exchange of views on the text. The Council had been faced with a position in which the majority had not wished to take into account the views of a substantial minority. The Economic and Social Council had an important role to play in the United Nations system and his country would do its best to ensure that the Council fulfilled the functions and powers vested in it by the Charter.

31. Mr. LOUYA (Democratic Republic of the Congo) stated that his delegation's wholehearted support for the resolution just adopted reflected the stand which his country had adopted with regard to the International Development Strategy. It was essential that more countries, particularly developing countries, should be given a greater opportunity in the development efforts.

32. Mr. ANTOINE (Haiti) said that various members had been given an opportunity to express their views on the resolution and that much light had been shed on the subject. His delegation had, in full knowledge of the facts, voted in favour of the resolution, which could to some extent give satisfaction to all. There was already some measures of agreement and he hoped that all the views expressed would be brought into harmony in the General Assembly.

33. Mr. THAJEB (Indonesia) said that his delegation, which had been a sponsor of draft resolution E/L.1451, regretted that some delegations had been unable to support the draft resolution. The debate had been most beneficial. Although his delegation had adopted a definite stand on the

issues involved, that did not mean that it was unmindful of the other opinions expressed in the Council. No group of countries had wished to impose its views on others. The decision was neither a victory nor a defeat for any group of members. Although there were differences of opinion on the means to be employed, the Council was surely united with regard to the objectives to be sought. His delegation hoped that the draft resolution would serve as a basis for further discussions with a view to reaching agreement before the General Assembly took a decision.

34. Mr. ARIFF (Malaysia) said that, in voting in favour of the resolution, his delegation had been confident that its action would not jeopardize or reduce the role of UNCTAD or in any way interfere with the forthcoming third session of the Conference or with the Ministerial Meeting of the Group of 77 to be held in Lima.

35. Mr. ZAGORIN (United States of America) said that his delegation was not fully satisfied with the wording of paragraph 1 of part B of the resolution, for it considered that the functions of the Standing Committee should not be limited to the application of science and technology to development but should help co-ordinate and focus on activities dealing with applications of science and technology generally. That did not mean, however, that the Committee should deal with matters such as the sea-bed or the human environment, which had been or might be assigned to other United Nations bodies. His delegation's support for the resolution as now worded was without prejudice to the further effort which it intended to make at the appropriate time to obtain agreement on the scope of the Committee's functions, which would not be too narrow.

36. In its opinion, the terms of reference of the Committee should be to advise the Council and make recommendations as appropriate on scientific and technological matters of importance to the United Nations system in the economic and social sphere, with particular reference to the following:

“(a) Keeping under review progress in the application of science and technology and the transfer of technology and proposing to the Council practical measures for such applications and transfer for the benefit of the developing countries, especially the least developed among them;

“(b) Reviewing, promoting and making recommendations concerning scientific exchanges of both personnel and information among nations, recognizing the importance of facilitating such exchange between developed and developing nations, between nations with different economic systems, and between nations of generally the same level of development;

“(c) Forecasting future development in science and technology and, as far as possible, assessing their social implications;

“(d) Recommending priorities for international action in the field of science and technology, with due regard to the International Development Strategy, the World Plan of Action for the Application of Science and Technology to Development, and the ongoing programmes of the

specialized agencies and IAEA as endorsed by their respective governing bodies;

“(e) Considering the environmental implications of the foregoing;

“(f) Reviewing, in close co-operation with responsible co-ordinating bodies within the United Nations system, the science and technology programmes of the United Nations and related agencies and proposing measures for their improvement, including the establishment of priorities among them and the elimination of duplication;

“(g) Studying and proposing changes in organization or other arrangements which would advance the application of science and technology, particularly in the developing nations;

“(h) Considering specific questions referred to it by the Council and receiving requests from all sources on matters which might be proposed for consideration by the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development; and

“(i) Considering specific recommendations developed by the Advisory Committee on its own initiative.”

37. He requested that the foregoing list should be duly recorded in the Council's report.

38. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to proceed to a vote on the draft resolution submitted by the USSR (E/L.1382).

39. Mr. MOJSOV (Yugoslavia), supported by Mr. PATH-MARAJAH (Ceylon), said that it would be difficult to vote on draft resolution E/L.1382 because there had been no opportunity to discuss it in detail.

40. Mr. NAIK (Pakistan) said that his delegation had had time to consider the various provisions of draft resolution E/L.1382 in detail and would have to vote against it, since the recommendations in it were far-reaching and would restrict the final authority of the General Assembly to deal with certain questions. He urged the USSR representative not to press his draft resolution to a vote; perhaps he might agree to its being transmitted, with the Council's report, to the General Assembly for further negotiation.

41. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) urged the USSR representative not to press his draft resolution to a vote at that stage. If necessary, it could be considered by the General Assembly or at the resumed fifty-first session of the Council.

42. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that if the draft resolution was put to the vote his delegation would abstain.

43. Mr. KASSATKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that in the course of the discussion on agenda item 17 his delegation had had the impression that draft resolution E/L.1382 did in fact reflect the wishes of the Council; his delegation's only intention in submitting it had been to help the General Assembly to carry out its work more efficiently in accordance with the Charter. Now, however, various delegations had raised difficulties with

regard to the draft resolution; the representative of Pakistan in particular had adopted an unduly rigid position on the subject.

44. His delegation had already explained its reasons for submitting the draft resolution and nobody had disputed them. Moreover, the draft resolution was dated 26 April 1971 and the ideas put forward in it had been expressed at the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly. Any further delay in discussing the draft resolution and voting on it would therefore be unjustified.

45. The PRESIDENT confirmed that a decision had to be taken on all the draft resolutions submitted and that draft resolution E/L.1382 had been before the Council for a long time.

46. Mr. de AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) said that, although the ideas in draft resolution E/L.1382 had been informally circulated at the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly, they were far-reaching and needed substantial negotiation. The draft resolution as it stood might unduly restrict the work of the Second Committee of the General Assembly. There had been no negotiation on it and his delegation would be obliged to vote against it.

47. Mr. THAJEB (Indonesia) recalled that the representative of Lebanon had proposed some amendments to the operative paragraphs of the USSR draft resolution (see 1796th meeting, para. 60), but so far there had been no reaction on the part of the USSR representative to those amendments. He therefore requested the USSR representative to state his delegation's opinion on the amendments.

48. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that his delegation had had time to study the USSR draft resolution and would vote in favour of it. He thought, however, that certain parts of the draft resolution, in particular paragraph 4, might be somewhat out of date. The Economic Committee of the Economic and Social Council had already begun to take measures of the kind proposed in paragraph 4. His delegation thought that the first three operative paragraphs were appropriate and would be helpful to the General Assembly in the exercise of its functions.

49. Mr. NAIK (Pakistan), replying to the comments of the USSR representative, said that that representative had stated that the Pakistan delegation had adopted a rigid position on the subject of the draft resolution. He wished to assure the USSR representative that that was not the case. Pakistan would be prepared to confer with the USSR on the various measures that the draft resolution recommended that the Council should undertake, and on the ways in which decisions should be taken in future.

50. It was apparent, however, that there had been no opportunity to consult the USSR representative on the draft resolution. That representative had stated that no arguments had been adduced against the draft resolution, but that was merely because there had been no time. He therefore wished to explain his delegation's difficulties with regard to the draft resolution.

51. Under paragraph 1, any new economic, social, scientific or technical questions appearing on the agenda of the General Assembly would be considered first by the Economic and Social Council. His delegation might be able to agree to that in the case of economic and social questions, but it thought that some scientific and technical questions did not fall within the scope of the Economic and Social Council. It agreed that the Council should have a larger and more predominant role in regard to economic and social matters than it had had hitherto, but it did not wish to restrict the scope of other bodies -- UNCTAD, for example which were competent to deal with certain questions. His delegation therefore found it difficult to endorse paragraph 1, which ran counter to the terms of reference of the Council and to the interests of the Members of the United Nations. If there could be negotiations with the USSR delegation on that paragraph, it might be possible to find a formula to which Pakistan could agree.

52. With regard to paragraph 2, his delegation thought that the Economic and Social Council was not perhaps in the best position to submit such a list to the General Assembly. It could not, for example, deal with scientific and technical matters. There were other bodies which were competent in their various fields. His delegation did not think that such a wide-ranging recommendation could be endorsed by the Council without taking into account the competence and jurisdictional problems involved.

53. With regard to paragraph 3, it had been pointed out in earlier discussions that the final decision on all questions rested with the General Assembly. Hence the Council could not make a recommendation such as that proposed in that paragraph. The Council could make recommendations on certain matters to the General Assembly for its policy decisions, but the final decision lay with the General Assembly, not with the Council.

54. He hoped that, in view of those difficulties, the USSR would agree to submit its draft resolution to the General Assembly at its twenty-sixth session, at which time the Pakistan delegation would be prepared to discuss its problems concerning the draft resolution with the USSR delegation.

55. Mr. KASSATKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that the draft resolution proposed by his delegation was not a new subject for discussion. He could not understand why the Pakistan delegation had doubts, particularly with regard to paragraphs 1, 2 and 3. Perhaps an explanation of the position of the USSR delegation would help to dispel those doubts.

56. With regard to the first three operative paragraphs, it might be that the translation could lead to different interpretations. He assured the representative of Pakistan that in Russian the phrase translated into English as "deems it advisable" was less strong than the wording suggested by the representative of Lebanon and that it implied that the Economic and Social Council was bound by Article 60 of the United Nations Charter. Paragraph 1 did not mean that the General Assembly could not include any item it wished on its agenda; it simply meant that the General Assembly would waste less time by making use of the competence of

the Economic and Social Council to consider various economic, social, scientific or technical questions.

57. With regard to paragraph 2, his delegation understood that some questions might require immediate discussion in the General Assembly, but if the Economic and Social Council had a specific approach to a question he saw no reason why it could not recommend consideration of that question. The representative of Pakistan had said that the Council should not consider scientific and technical matters. If that were so, he would like to know what had been the purpose of the decision to establish the Standing Committee on Science and Technology. He pointed out that the USSR delegation had not voted against the establishment of that Committee, but had abstained on the basis of the discussions on draft resolution E/L.1451.

58. With regard to paragraph 3, he pointed out that the agenda of the Council included items on which the Council had to decide on the basis of the reports of its subsidiary bodies. If there could be no decisions on those reports, it was hard to see what the purpose of those subsidiary bodies was. If the Economic and Social Council could make no decisions, it would mean that the General Assembly would be obliged to remain in permanent session.

59. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand), speaking on a point of order, objected that a new general debate was beginning on an item that had already been discussed. He thought that the USSR draft resolution should be put to the vote.

60. The PRESIDENT said that if there were no objections, the Council would proceed to vote on draft resolution E/L.1382.

Draft resolution E/L.1382 was adopted by 8 votes to 4, with 15 abstentions.

61. Mr. CHTOUROU (Tunisia) said that his delegation had been prepared to examine the contents of the USSR draft resolution on condition that the Council's membership was enlarged.

62. Mr. de AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) regretted that it had been impossible to negotiate on the USSR draft resolution, according to the normal procedure.

63. Mr. PIACITELLI (Italy) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the resolution because paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 reinforced the resolution already adopted by the Council. In addition, paragraph 4 included an invitation to the Council to improve the organization of its work.

64. Mr. NAIK (Pakistan) said that his delegation could not take the resolution, which had been adopted by only eight votes, very seriously and would not endorse it. It would raise the question of the resolution in the General Assembly.

65. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) said that his delegation had voted against the USSR draft resolution because it was procedurally incorrect. The tenor of the draft resolution was incompatible with draft resolution E/L.1451, that had

just been adopted by the Council and with another draft resolution that was about to be discussed.

66. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the revised draft resolution submitted by Greece and New Zealand (E/L.1408/Rev.2) and the amendments to it submitted by Brazil (E/L.1422) and by Brazil, Ghana, Jamaica, Lebanon, Pakistan, Peru, Tunisia, and Yugoslavia (E/L.1431). He called upon the representative of Brazil to introduce the amendments in document E/L.1422.

67. Mr. de AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) said that the first two amendments in document E/L.1422 had already been taken into account by the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1408/Rev.2. He would like to have the opinion of the representatives of Greece and New Zealand on the third amendment, which referred to the subject of observers.

68. In view of the adoption of draft resolution E/L.1451, there was no longer any need to vote on the amendments in document E/L.1431.

69. Mr. KASSATKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether he was right in thinking that the words "subsidiary bodies" in paragraph 3 of part III of draft resolution E/L.1408/Rev.2, did not include the regional economic commissions, since those bodies adopted resolutions which were not submitted to the Council for approval. If those words did not apply to the regional economic commissions, his delegation would have no difficulty in voting in favour of the draft resolution.

70. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) said that although his delegation had not had an opportunity to consult the delegation of Greece on that question, he believed that it was the intention of the sponsors that the paragraph in question should refer to the reports of the functional commissions and the subsidiary bodies of the Council which reported to it. The sponsors were proposing that those reports should contain a concise summary of recommendations and a statement of issues requiring action by the Council; the resolutions referred to in the second half of the paragraph were those requiring action by the Council. The interpretation of the representative of the USSR therefore coincided with that of the sponsors of the draft resolution.

71. With regard to the third amendment proposed by Brazil (E/L.1422), the sponsors would be willing to accept paragraph 1 but would be reluctant to accept paragraph 2 in view of the division of opinion at the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly, for they were anxious that the draft resolution should be supported by the greatest possible majority.

72. Mr. KASSATKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the functions mentioned in sub-paragraph (c) of the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution should include a review of the economic situation, to be submitted every two years.

73. The PRESIDENT asked whether the Brazilian delegation could agree to withdraw paragraph 2 of its third amendment.

74. Mr. de AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) said that that paragraph elaborated on an established procedure. Nevertheless, as his delegation did not want such an important issue to be considered hastily, it would not press for the acceptance of the paragraph.

75. His delegation hoped, however, that the Council would be able to study the matter more fully at its next session, for it thought that the participation of observers would provide an effective means of improving the work of the Council.

76. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the draft resolution submitted by Greece and New Zealand (E/L.1408/Rev.2) as amended by the addition of paragraph 1 of the third Brazilian amendment (E/L.1422).

Draft resolution E/L.1408/Rev.2, as amended, was adopted by 26 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

77. Mr. KASSATKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), supported by Mr. MOJSOV (Yugoslavia), said that he would like it to be recorded that it was the Council's understanding that the second half of paragraph 3 of part III of the resolution referred only to resolutions submitted for subsequent adoption by the Council, in view of the fact that a number of its subsidiary bodies adopted resolutions on which the Council was not requested to take a decision.

78. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the draft resolution submitted by Brazil, France, Tunisia and Uruguay (E/L.1435).

79. Mr. VIAUD (France) recalled that in an earlier statement he had made on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution, he had said that the draft resolution was not meant to be prejudicial to other languages. The sponsors had accordingly decided to add the words "without prejudice to the other languages" at the end of paragraph 1.

80. The PRESIDENT put draft resolution E/L.1435 to the vote.

Draft resolution E/L.1435, as amended, was adopted unanimously.

81. Mr. KASSATKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation reserved the right to propose the introduction of Russian as a working language in the General Assembly and in the Security Council.

82. In reply to a question by the PRESIDENT, Mr. de AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) said that his delegation's draft resolution (E/L.1400) was automatically withdrawn, since it was contradictory to part B of resolution E/L.1451. Nevertheless, it still represented the position of his delegation, which would endeavour to reverse the decision of the Council on all three parts of the package resolution when it came before the General Assembly.

83. The PRESIDENT asked the French representative whether his delegation wished to withdraw draft resolution E/L.1420.

84. Mr. VIAUD (France) replied that his delegation did not wish a vote to be taken on the draft resolution at the present session, as draft resolution E/L.1451, adopted at that meeting, covered the subject more concisely. It reserved the right to re-submit the draft resolution at the Council's resumed fifty-first session should any new element arise in the discussion which might make it appropriate.

85. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that he had no objection to the re-submission of draft resolution E/L.1420 at a later session of the Council but would prefer it to be the fifty-second session, as the resumed fifty-first session would be too short to allow of full discussion of such an important matter.

86. Mr. CHTOUROU (Tunisia) appealed to the French representative not to press his point, since there would be no time to study matters of substance at the resumed fifty-first session and its agenda did not include an item on science and technology. In the light of paragraph 3 of part B of draft resolution E/L.1451, which requested the Secretary-General to submit reports to the Council at its fifty-second session on the possible terms of reference of the Standing Committee created under paragraph 1, it would be preferable for the French draft resolution to be re-submitted at the fifty-second session.

87. Mr. VIAUD (France) pointed out that the mandate of the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development expired at the end of 1971. If it was intended to discuss the appointment of members of the Advisory Committee with effect from January 1972, the matter must necessarily be on the agenda of the resumed fifty-first session.

88. Mr. de SEYNES (Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs) said that, if the question was discussed at the Council's resumed fifty-first session, it would only be with a view to appointing certain members of the Advisory Committee. Amendments to the draft agenda required a decision by the Council, but the matter could easily be added to the existing item on the appointment of members of the Committee for Development Planning and of the Committee on Crime Prevention and Control.

89. The PRESIDENT said that, in the absence of any objection, he would take it that the Council wished to add an item on the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development to the agenda of its resumed fifty-first session.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 7.15 p.m.