



ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Fifty-second Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Thursday, 6 January 1972,
at 11 a.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Károly SZARKA (Hungary).

Tribute to the memory of Mr. Hichem Ayoub (concluded)

1. Mr. GUEVARA ARZE (Bolivia), Mr. OGISO (Japan) and Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) expressed their deepest sympathy to the Tunisian delegation on the occasion of the death of Mr. Hichem Ayoub.

2. Mr. FIGUEROA (Chile) recalled that at its previous meeting many members had paid tributes to the memory of Mr. Ayoub. In view of the exceptional circumstances, he proposed that those tributes should be recorded verbatim.

3. The PRESIDENT said that if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council approved the proposal made by the representative of Chile, and its financial implications.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 1

**Election of the President and Vice-Presidents for 1972
(concluded)**

4. The PRESIDENT said that the Council should elect the three Vice-Presidents for 1972, which it had not been able to do at the preceding meeting.

5. Mr. GUEVARA ARZE (Bolivia) nominated Mr. S.A. Frazão (Brazil) as one of the three Vice-Presidents.

6. Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) and Mr. ILONIEMI (Finland) supported the nomination.

Mr. Frazão (Brazil) was elected Vice-President by acclamation.

7. Mr. OGISO (Japan) nominated Miss P. G. Lim (Malaysia) as Vice-President.

8. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) supported the nomination.

Miss Lim (Malaysia) was elected Vice-President by acclamation.

9. Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) nominated Mr. J. V. Scott (New Zealand) as Vice-President.

¹ Statements made in tribute to the memory of Mr. Ayoub were issued in mimeographed form.

10. Mr. OGISO (Japan) supported the nomination.

Mr. Scott (New Zealand) was elected Vice-President by acclamation.

11. The PRESIDENT, after recalling rule 20, paragraph 2, of the rules of procedure, said that he would inform the Council of his recommendations regarding the chairmanship of each of the sessional committees, following consultations with the officers just elected. He hoped to be able to do so before the end of the current series of meetings.

Statement by the representative of China

12. Mr. AN (China) expressed his delegation's appreciation to those countries which had struggled for the restoration of all the legitimate rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations and those which had supported China's participation in the Economic and Social Council.

13. Spectacular changes had occurred during the past year in the international arena and the United Nations. Small and medium-sized countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America were becoming more united, had intensified their struggle for the defence of their national independence and sovereignty against foreign aggression and were playing an ever more inspiring role in the United Nations. It had become increasingly difficult for one or two super-Powers to control United Nations affairs as they had done in the past. A certain semi-super-Power which was criminally subjecting a sovereign country to subversion, aggression and dismemberment under the pretext of furthering the causes of peace, humanity and non-alignment had been severely condemned by overwhelming majorities in the Security Council and the United Nations and had been discredited and isolated. Although the forces of imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism were making every effort to stave off defeat, they could not obstruct the great historical trend of the times: countries wanted independence, nations wanted liberation, and the people wanted revolution.

14. Countries must be equal, no matter what their size. The affairs of a country were the concern of its own people; world affairs were the concern of all countries, and matters of interest to the United Nations must be the concern of all Member States. The Chinese Government had consistently supported medium-sized, small and other countries in their struggle to defend their equal status in international relations and to frustrate the super-Powers' attempts to control and bully other nations. It would unswervingly support the third world and all countries which upheld justice in a common

struggle to defend the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of all countries, develop independent national economies and economic co-operation based on equality and mutual benefit, safeguard international security and promote human progress.

15. Although the role it could play in the United Nations was limited, China was willing to do its best. His delegation was ready to work with other representatives in the Economic and Social Council and, in principle, endorsed the agenda for the current series of meetings.

16. Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that in its first statement to the Council a certain delegation was again bringing forward the concept of one or two so-called super-Powers, whose policies it intended to resist strenuously. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of the USSR in his statement to the General Assembly during the general debate (1942nd plenary meeting) had stressed that the Soviet Union supported the full sovereign equality of all States. The delegation in question, in its statement to the Council, had shown a desire to create disharmony in the work of the Council and among the Members of the United Nations in general. The Soviet Union, in assessing the role and contribution of various States, used only one criterion, that of class. Some of the great Powers were in favour of strengthening peace and co-operation in the social and other fields, while others were opposed to that aim. No delegation should assume the role of protector of the developing countries, which in recent years had become stronger and certainly did not need any patrons. His delegation, in its work in the Economic and Social Council, would always be guided by the principle of the equality of all States.

AGENDA ITEM 2

Adoption of the agenda (E/5084)

17. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection he would take it that the Council wished to adopt the provisional agenda for the organizational meetings, in document E/5084.

It was so decided.

Organization of work

18. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should consider the remaining items on the agenda in the order in which they were listed in document E/5084, with the exception of items 4, 5 and 7, since consultations were still in progress concerning the nominations in question.

It was so decided.

19. Mr. AHMED (Secretary of the Council), referring to agenda item 8, suggested that, since the Secretariat had just been informed of certain changes concerning the

persons listed in document E/5078 and Add.1-3, the Council should defer consideration of the item until a later stage.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 3

Application of Bhutan for membership in the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East (E/L.1465/Add.1)

20. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the note of the Secretary-General (E/L.1465/Add.1) submitted to the resumed fifty-first session, which contained the application of Bhutan for membership in the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East. Paragraph 3 of the terms of reference of the Commission provided that any State in the area which became a Member of the United Nations would be admitted as a member of the Commission.² The action to be taken by the Council was introduced in the annotation to item 3 of the provisional agenda (E/5084). If there was no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to amend the terms of reference of the Commission to provide for the participation of Bhutan as a full member in the Commission's work and he suggested that it should adopt the following draft resolution in conformity with past practice:

"The Economic and Social Council,

"Noting the communication from the Permanent Representative of Bhutan to the United Nations dated 26 November 1971, with respect to the admission of Bhutan to full membership in the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East,

"Amends paragraphs 2 and 3 of the terms of reference of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East by the insertion of 'Bhutan' after 'Afghanistan' in paragraph 2 and after 'Australia' in paragraph 3."

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 6

Appointment of two members of the Committee on Crime Prevention and Control (E/5089)

21. Mr. MAHMASSANI (Lebanon) said that his delegation would prefer a vote by secret ballot on the experts in question, in accordance with rule 67 of the rules of procedure.

22. The PRESIDENT said that it was the normal practice not to take a vote on such appointments. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Council agreed to the appointment as members of the Committee on Crime Prevention and Control, for a period of three years beginning on 1 January 1972, the candidates nominated by the Secretary-General (E/5089).

It was so decided.

² See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Fifty-first Session, Supplement No. 2*, annex III.

AGENDA ITEM 9

Actions arising out of decisions of the General Assembly at its twenty-sixth session (E/L.1468 and Corr.1 and Add.1-2)

23. The PRESIDENT noted that document E/L.1468 was divided into three parts: section A dealt with decisions of the General Assembly that appeared to require action by the Council at the current organizational meeting; section B listed decisions of the Assembly that affected the programme of work for 1972; section C listed some decisions of the Assembly that would affect the Council's work in future years. He suggested that the Council should first consider section A paragraph by paragraph.

Section A of document E/L.1468

Paragraph 1

24. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that, although he agreed that the Council should transmit General Assembly resolution 2768 (XXVI) of 18 November 1971 to the Committee for Development Planning, he thought it would be inappropriate for the Council to ask the Committee to take action on the resolution. The Council should simply ask the Committee to give further consideration to the question of the identification of the least developed among the developing countries and to make suggestions. The Council was giving the Committee, not complete freedom of action, but merely an opportunity to make additional suggestions concerning possible modifications in the list of the least developed countries. That fact should be reflected in any decision taken by the Council.

25. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) agreed with the French representative's interpretation of the action recommended by the Secretary-General and suggested that the word "action" at the end of the paragraph should be replaced by the word "consideration".

26. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) supported the suggestion made by the French representative.

27. Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) said that he failed to understand the import of the French representative's suggestion. The Second Committee had agreed on a list of the least developed countries, but at the same time a number of delegations had urged that new criteria for determining such countries should be devised. General Assembly resolution 2768 (XXVI) had subsequently provided an opportunity not only for modifying the list of such countries but also for devising more appropriate criteria.

28. Mr. AKWEI (Ghana) supported the observations made by the representative of Madagascar. He did not see how the Council could change the provisions of a resolution which had already been adopted by the General Assembly. As the representative of Madagascar had recalled, certain delegations considered that there should be a continuing review of the list of the least

developed countries. The Council was now called upon to ask the Committee for Development Planning to undertake precisely such a review.

29. Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya) said that many delegations had for some time been dissatisfied with the criteria applied in identifying the least developed countries. They had therefore proposed that the Committee for Development Planning should continue to consider the question with a view to determining more acceptable criteria and modifying the list as necessary. Hence, the action recommended by the Secretary-General seemed appropriate.

30. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) said that, since the Committee for Development Planning would report to the Council in any case, there would appear to be no difficulty. The Council was merely transmitting to the Committee the request of the General Assembly; the Committee would then transmit the results of its consideration of the question back to the Council. The French representative's interpretation of the Secretary-General's recommendation thus seemed perfectly acceptable to his delegation.

31. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that it was not his delegation's intention to attempt to amend the provisions of General Assembly resolution 2768 (XXVI). The difficulty for his delegation stemmed from the fact that the French text of the Secretary-General's recommendation might be interpreted as calling for a delegation of authority to the Committee. That was not his delegation's interpretation of the recommendation. The Committee should merely make appropriate recommendations to the Council at a subsequent stage.

32. Mr. AKWEI (Ghana) said that if the French delegation's interpretation of the recommendation was reflected in the summary record of the current meeting he thought there should be no difficulty. The Committee for Development Planning would certainly not assume any responsibilities which had not been entrusted to it.

33. Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) said that in the opinion of his delegation, the action recommended by the Secretary-General did not entail the delegation of any powers to the Committee for Development Planning. It simply meant that the Committee should continue the review of criteria now being used, as provided in General Assembly resolution 2768 (XXVI).

34. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) observed that a misunderstanding might have arisen from the fact that the paragraph under consideration was the only one in which the words "for action" were used in the Secretary-General's recommendation. The Committee would undoubtedly review the criteria now being used and would report back to the Council.

35. Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya) said that the word "action" should not cause any difficulty because the action required of the Committee was clearly defined in General Assembly resolution 2768 (XXVI).

36. The PRESIDENT said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Council endorsed the action recommended by the Secretary-General on the understanding that the summary record of the Council's deliberations on the question would be transmitted to the Committee for Development Planning in order to clarify the Council's decision.

It was so decided.

Paragraph 2

37. The PRESIDENT said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Council endorsed the action recommended by the Secretary-General in paragraph 2.

It was so decided.

Paragraph 3

38. The PRESIDENT said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Council took note of the paragraph.

It was so decided.

Paragraphs 4 to 8

39. The PRESIDENT said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Council endorsed the action recommended by the Secretary-General in paragraphs 4 to 8.

It was so decided.

Paragraph 9 (a)

40. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that although his delegation supported the action recommended by the Secretary-General, it considered that the Council and, in particular, the Co-ordination Committee should be given an opportunity to consider the question of the publications and documentation of the United Nations. At a later stage, therefore, his delegation would propose that the question should be included in the Council's provisional agenda for 1972 and, in particular, its provisional agenda for the fifty-third session.

41. The PRESIDENT said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Council endorsed the action recommended by the Secretary-General in paragraph 9 (a).

It was so decided.

Paragraph 9 (b)

42. Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had no objection to the action recommended by the Secretary-General. It nevertheless proposed that the recommendation should be adopted on the understanding that it would apply also to the proceedings of the new Committee on Science and Technology and Committee on Review and Appraisal.

43. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) asked whether adoption of the Soviet proposal would mean that the two Committees referred to by the Soviet representative would not have summary records.

44. Mr. AKWEI (Ghana) requested information concerning the status of the two new Committees.

45. Mr. AHMED (Secretary of the Council) said that at the resumed fifty-first session the Secretary-General had submitted a note to the Council stating that no special provision for summary records had been made in Council resolutions 1621 B (I.I) and 1621 C (I.I) of 30 July 1971, in which the two new Committees had been established. He had then outlined the financial implications of summary records for the two Committees. The Council had subsequently decided by vote that the two Committees should have summary records (see 1808th meeting).

46. Mr. AKWEI (Ghana) said that in the circumstances the Soviet proposal was invalid unless the Soviet delegation wanted to reopen consideration of the question of summary records for the two new Committees.

47. Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, since the Secretary-General had suggested that the Council should decide that summary records should not be provided for a newly established subsidiary body, his delegation was proposing that such a decision should be extended to the two new Committees. In making that proposal, it was fully aware that the question had been considered at the resumed fifty-first session. However, since the General Assembly had decided that records should not be provided for newly established subsidiary bodies unless specifically authorized in the enabling resolution, that decision should be extended to the two new Committees established by the Council.

48. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that the Council should take a decision on the Soviet proposal. His delegation had consistently maintained that summary records should not be provided for subsidiary bodies. It therefore agreed that the two new Committees should not have summary records and supported the Soviet proposal.

49. Mr. AKWEI (Ghana) pointed out that the Soviet proposal had the effect of calling into question the original Council resolution establishing the two new Committees. His delegation might at a later stage be in a position to support the Soviet proposal but he suggested that no action should be taken on it at the present time.

50. Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya) said that his delegation's position was similar to that of the Ghanaian delegation. The Council had specifically decided that the two new Committees should have summary records. Some representatives had maintained that in view of the importance of the two Committees their Governments would find their records useful. His delegation had not changed its position on the question and supported the Ghanaian representative's suggestion that for the time being no action should be taken.

51. Mr. VIAUD (France) supported that suggestion. The action recommended by the Secretary-General was consistent with views which had frequently been expressed by his delegation, i.e. that excessive documentation and inessential publications should be eliminated. However, the question whether a decision of the General Assembly should be applied to the vast network of the Council's subsidiary bodies should not be decided in a purely procedural discussion. The Secretary-General's recommendation should therefore be transmitted to the Co-ordination Committee in order that the Committee might in turn make recommendations on whether the decision of the General Assembly should be applied to the two new bodies in question. The Council might then be in a position to take an appropriate decision at the fifty-third session.

52. Miss LIM (Malaysia) said that the wording of the Secretary-General's recommendation gave rise to confusion since it appeared to refer to the records of all newly established subsidiary bodies of the Council. At its 1808th meeting, however, the Council had decided by a large majority that the two new Committees should in fact have summary records. The only way in which the Secretary-General's recommendation and the Council's decision could be reconciled was to read the Secretary-General's recommendation as applying to all newly established subsidiary bodies except the Committee on Science and Technology and the Committee on Review and Appraisal.

53. Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that since there was insufficient time to consider which bodies should have summary records, it would be preferable to adopt the French proposal.

54. Mr. ZAGORIN (United States of America) inquired as to the dates on which decisions concerning verbatim and summary records had been taken by the Council and the Assembly respectively. Those dates would have an important bearing on the Malaysian representative's interpretation of paragraph 9 (b), which seemed logical. He supported the course of action suggested by the French representative, but felt that a decision should be taken at the fifty-second rather than the fifty-third session of the Council, because the Committee on Science and Technology and the Committee on Review and Appraisal would be meeting before the fifty-third session. An earlier decision was therefore advisable.

55. Mr. FIGUEROA (Chile) said that his delegation wished to have an opportunity to hold consultations on the matter, which was a delicate one. He suggested that the Council might postpone its decision on the question until the following day.

56. Mr. AKWEI (Ghana) said that the purpose of his suggestion had become somewhat distorted in the discussion. What he had had in mind was that the recommendation made by the Secretary-General should be adopted by the Council, subject to further consideration in relation to the Committee on Science and Technology and the Committee on Review and Appraisal.

57. Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) suggested that the recommendation of the Secretary-General should be adopted, with the reservation that the Council's decision with regard to the Committee on Science and Technology and the Committee on Review and Appraisal should remain valid. He had no objection to the proposal by the representative of France that the Co-ordination Committee should review the matter but the Co-ordination Committee should take account of the decision which had previously been taken by the Economic and Social Council.

58. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) proposed that the Council should vote to reconfirm the decision it had taken at its 1808th meeting regarding summary records for the Committee on Science and Technology and the Committee on Review and Appraisal.

59. Mr. ILONIEMI (Finland) said there was no need to reconfirm the Council's decision. The two Committees were to have summary records of their meetings, as had been decided by the Council. If the review and appraisal of the Second United Nations Development Decade was to be of value to all Members of the United Nations, an adequate documentation was required.

60. Mr. SOUZA E SILVA (Brazil) felt there was no need for the Council to reconfirm the decision it had already taken, by a large majority, on the question of summary records. He agreed with the representative of Finland regarding the need for adequate documentation in connexion with the two very important subsidiary bodies in question.

61. Mr. MAHMASSANI (Lebanon) supported the views expressed by the representatives of Finland and Brazil.

62. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) pointed out that there was no precedent for reconfirming a decision which had already been taken. He hoped however that the majority of the Council's members would decide there was no need for summary records, if the matter was put to the vote. It was regrettable that, despite all appeals for economy and for a reduction in paper work, it was always decided that committees should have summary records. He thought the majority would probably agree with the French representative's proposal that the Co-ordination Committee should make a recommendation on the matter.

63. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) said it might be a good thing to create a precedent which would help to solve problems. The argument of economy was always propounded when matters concerning developing countries were being discussed.

64. Mr. AKWEI (Ghana) formally proposed that the recommendation made by the Secretary-General in paragraph 9 (b) should be adopted, without prejudice to decisions taken concerning already existing subsidiary bodies.

65. Mr. ILONIEMI (Finland) pointed out that the Committee on Science and Technology and the Committee on Review and Appraisal would be meeting in the

summer of 1972; a decision regarding the type of records they were to have should be taken before those meetings were held.

66. Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya) supported the Tunisian representative's proposal that the decision of the Council should be reconfirmed.

67. Mr. AKWEI (Ghana) said that there was no need for such a reconfirmation. Those who did not wish the subsidiary bodies to have summary records could take the initiative in seeking to reverse the Council's decision on the matter, which was a binding one until such time as the decision was changed.

68. Mr. GUEVARA ARZE (Bolivia) suggested, in order to dispel the confusion which appeared to exist, that the words "This recommendation shall not apply to the decision taken by the Council on 20 December 1971" should be added to the recommendation contained in section A, paragraph 9 (b) of document E/L.1468. Such a formulation would imply a reconfirmation of the Council's decision of 20 December 1971.

69. Mr. FIGUEROA (Chile) supported the proposal of the Bolivian representative.

70. The PRESIDENT, in reply to the question asked by Mr. ZAGORIN (United States of America), said that

General Assembly resolution 2836 (XXVI) had been adopted on 17 December 1971.

71. Mr. ZAGORIN (United States of America) noted that the General Assembly resolution in question had invited the Economic and Social Council and other bodies to adopt decisions containing provisions similar to those in paragraph 10 (b) of General Assembly resolution 2538 (XXIV) of 11 December 1969, according to which summary records should not be provided for a newly established subsidiary body, unless they were specifically authorized in the enabling resolution. The enabling resolution which had established the Committee on Science and Technology and the Committee on Review and Appraisal (Council resolutions 1621 B (LI) and 1621 C (LI)) had not provided for summary records. Therefore the decision to provide summary records for those two Committees, which the Council had taken at its 1808th meeting, on 20 December 1971 — four days after the adoption of Assembly resolution 2836 (XXVI) — created an ambiguity which should be clarified in one way or another by the Council.

72. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) said that the addition to section A, paragraph 9 (b) of document E/L.1468 suggested by the representative of Bolivia was quite satisfactory. It would constitute a reconfirmation of the Council's decision and would avoid confusion.

The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.