


ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL
Fifty-second Session
OFFICIAL RECORDS
*Monday, 15 May 1972,
at 10.50 a.m.*
NEW YORK

President: Mr. Károly SZARKA (Hungary).

Statement by the President

1. The PRESIDENT reopened the fifty-second session of the Council by saying that the tasks that lay before it were important and that, in some cases, far-reaching decisions would have to be made. It was not proper for him, as President, to dwell on any particular item on the agenda and he was convinced that the members of the Council and of the sessional committees were well able to determine the priorities for the Council's future work. He urged members to concentrate on the progressive elements of each item and thus try to accelerate further development on every question. He was sure that, as the body responsible under the Charter for co-ordinating the Organization's economic and social activities, the Council would become the centre of decision-making and co-ordination, at the highest possible level, of economic and social work and develop the techniques for taking the most effective measures and making recommendations to the General Assembly. He was hopeful that the current session would be another step towards attaining those objectives. If all delegations joined together in their efforts and succeeded in reaching constructive, effective and sound agreement on ways of improving the Council's work, the efficiency of all economic and social activities would certainly be enhanced. The members of the Council had shown a remarkable spirit of co-operation during the 1971 sessions and, as President, he would encourage that spirit. The provisional agenda for the session indicated that delegations should direct their full attention to essential questions; only thus could the Council complete its work by the end of the session.

2. He welcomed the additional members of the sessional committees and was confident that they would make a distinguished contribution towards enabling the Council to discharge its responsibilities with greater efficiency and effectiveness. He had discussed with his colleagues of the Bureau the desirability of electing vice-chairmen of the sessional committees to assist the Vice-Presidents of the Council in conducting the work of those committees. Previously, the only officer of the sessional committees had been the Chairman — one of the Vice-Presidents of the Council — who had shouldered a heavy burden in conducting the meetings without any possibility of relief. With the enlargement of the sessional committees and the decision that they should consider all substantive items, the burden would increase substantially. The Bureau had agreed that the election of vice-chairmen would greatly assist the Chairmen of the committees and lighten their burden. It was accordingly

proposed that the sessional committees should be invited at their first meetings to elect their respective vice-chairmen in accordance with rule 26 of the Council's rules of procedure which provided that each committee should elect its own officers except as provided in rule 20 or where otherwise decided by the Council. Rule 20 dealt with the election of the President and Vice-Presidents of the Council and stipulated that "each of the Vice-Presidents shall be chairman of one of the sessional committees". In electing the vice-chairmen it would, in the opinion of the Bureau, be proper for the sessional committees to take into account the needs of equitable geographical distribution as well as the desirability of associating the additional members of the sessional committees in the conduct of the committee's work.

3. He said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council agreed that the sessional committees should each be invited at their first meetings to elect a vice-chairman in accordance with rule 26 of the Council's rules of procedure.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 1

Adoption of the agenda (E/5091/Rev.1 and Add.1, E/L.1489)

4. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the provisional agenda for the fifty-second session and the annotations thereto (E/5091/Rev.1 and Add.1). Members also had before them a request from the representatives of Burundi and Egypt for the inclusion of a supplementary item (E/L.1489) in the agenda. He suggested that the Council should deal first with the proposed supplementary item entitled "Assistance in relief, rehabilitation and resettlement of Sudanese refugees". Unless he heard objections, he would take it that the Council agreed to the inclusion of the proposed supplementary item in the agenda, as item 16.

It was so decided.

5. Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring to the provisional agenda, said that, in accordance with the position it had adopted at its previous sessions, his delegation wished to propose the deletion of item 6 (a). The question of the establishment of a United Nations transport economics and technology documentation centre was not one of the most important matters before the Council and discussion of it would divert attention from more essential items. There had been no new developments since the Council had decided, at its fiftieth session, not to take any decision on the

substance of the draft resolutions which had then been before it.¹ Although the item had been on its agenda for several years, the Council had never been able to take a decision on it. Furthermore, his delegation had often noticed that no documentation was circulated on the subject. In the circumstances, the Council should delete the item.

6. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) said that he could not subscribe to the USSR proposal. The interests of the developing and the developed countries in the matter were not the same. He proposed, therefore, that the item should be maintained without prejudice to any results that might be achieved. It was true that no decision had yet been reached in the matter, but that did not rule out the possibility of ultimate agreement.

7. Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stressed that the item should be deleted from the provisional agenda. There had been no new developments in the matter since the previous session of the Council. Members should try to understand his delegations's position. Nevertheless, if there was no support for his proposal, his delegation would not press it or insist on a formal vote on it.

8. Mr. FRAZÃO (Brazil) said that, although he appreciated the USSR representative's arguments, he was inclined to agree with the Tunisian delegation that the item should be maintained. As a result of a discussion on the matter, the interests of the developing countries might be better understood.

9. Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, if the majority so wished, the item would obviously be maintained although note should be taken of his delegation's reservations. Nevertheless, as no material had been submitted on the subject and in order not to waste time on an item on which there had been no new development, it might be advisable to postpone discussion of it until the fifty-third session.

10. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) suggested that it would be unwise to create a precedent by postponing discussion of the item. Given the interests of the developing countries in the matter, the item should be retained on the agenda of the current session.

11. The PRESIDENT said that, since the USSR delegation would not press for deletion of the item or postponement of its discussion, he took it that the item would be maintained on the agenda of the fifty-second session.

It was so decided.

12. Mr. WANG (China) welcomed the representatives of the Member States newly elected to the sessional committees. It was a pleasure for his delegation to attend a regular session of the Council for the first time and to be able to work with all members.

13. Basically, his delegation endorsed the provisional agenda for the session and supported the proposal made by Burundi and Egypt for the inclusion in the agenda of an item on the relief of Sudanese refugees. Nevertheless, some comments on item 6 (b) were called for. As was well known, at its twenty-sixth session the General Assembly had decided by resolution 2758 (XXVI) of 25 October 1971 "to restore all its rights to the People's Republic of China and to recognize the representatives of its Government as the only legitimate representatives of China to the United Nations, and to expel forthwith the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek from the place they unlawfully occupy at the United Nations and in all the organizations related to it". In his note of 12 January 1972 to the Secretary-General, the Permanent Representative of China to the United Nations had further elaborated on the stand of the Chinese Government in that connexion. Most of the specialized agencies had already expelled the unlawful representatives of the Chiang Kai-shek clique, but the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization (IMCO) had not yet done so. His delegation maintained that it would not be in conformity with the General Assembly resolution for the United Nations and IMCO jointly to sponsor the Conference on International Container Traffic until the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek had been expelled from IMCO. Therefore, his delegation deemed it necessary for the Council to urge IMCO to expel forthwith those representatives. Only when that had been done would it be possible for the Council to hold a fruitful discussion on the item. His delegation considered that those organizations of the United Nations system which had not yet expelled the representatives of the Chiang Kai-shek clique should take measures to expel them forthwith in earnest and complete compliance with General Assembly resolution 2758 (XXVI).

14. The PRESIDENT suggested that it would be more appropriate to discuss the question under the organization of work than under the item "Adoption of the agenda".

15. Mr. WANG (China) disagreed that the matter concerned the organization of work; it was a matter of principle. The representatives of the Chiang Kai-shek clique had not yet been expelled from IMCO which was, therefore, acting in contravention of the decision taken by the General Assembly in resolution 2758 (XXVI). The Council should make it clear that it would have nothing to do with IMCO until that organization had expelled those representatives.

16. Mr. KITTANI (Assistant Secretary-General for Inter-Agency Affairs) said that, in considering proposed item 6 (b), the Council might wish to take the following information into account. The first meeting of any IMCO organ since the adoption of General Assembly resolution 2758 (XXVI) would take place the following week when the IMCO Council was to meet and when the question of implementing that resolution would be brought to its attention. The document on the organization of the work of the fifty-second session (E/L.1487/Rev.1) showed that item 6 was scheduled for

¹ E/L.1397 and E/L.1401.

discussion during the second week of the session by which time it was hoped that the results of IMCO's consideration of the matter would be available.

17. Mr. WANG (China) said that he accepted the explanation of the Assistant Secretary-General for Inter-Agency Affairs.

18. Mr. DE CHALVRON (France) said that, in paragraph 7 of his note on the World Plan of Action (E/5101), the Secretary-General had stated that in accordance with Council resolution 1638 (LI) of 30 July 1971, *World Plan of Action for the Application of Science and Technology to Development* had been circulated to Governments of all Member States for their comments and views. Very few replies, the Secretary-General had added, had been received at the time the note had been written, on 1 March 1972. His delegation wished to make it clear that the French Government was among those which had not replied to the Secretary-General's request for reasons totally independent of its wishes. The Secretary-General had sent the English version of the report to the French Government. He would not emphasize the gravity of such a breach of the rules on the equality of working languages. He was obliged to point out, however, that the action of the Secretariat had placed the French authorities concerned in a situation of obvious inferiority vis-à-vis authorities in English-speaking countries, since the French version had appeared only four months after the original had been issued. Indeed, requests for additional mimeographed copies of the Plan in French had been to practically no avail since the supplies available to the Secretariat were totally inadequate in relation to the magnitude of the distribution which should have been contemplated. In the long run it was the cause of the Plan itself which would suffer as a result of the delay. The action of the French services which naturally intended to play a major part in promoting the Plan had been impeded and slowed up as a result of the facts he had just mentioned. In expressing the hope that those facts would be carefully investigated, his delegation requested that its statement should be included *in extenso* in the record of the meeting and in the report of the Council on the session.

19. The PRESIDENT said that, as requested, the comments of the French representative would be included in the record of the meeting and the report of the session.

20. He suggested that the Council should adopt the agenda as set forth in document E/5091/Rev.1 with the addition of the supplementary item proposed by the delegations of Burundi and Egypt in document E/L.1489.

It was so decided.

Organization of work (E/L.1487/Rev.1)

21. The PRESIDENT drew attention to his note on the subject (E/L.1487/Rev.1). In preparing the proposals for the organization of work, the primary consideration had been to ensure the most productive use of the time available to the Council and its sessional committees. Another consideration had been to avoid deliberations on items which might be related to the work of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) until the conclusion of the third session of the conference at Santiago, Chile. The proposals before the Council should be regarded as tentative and subject to change during the course of the session in the light of the progress of the work.

22. The representative of the Philippines had requested permission to make a statement under rule 75 of the rules of procedure. If there was no objection, he would call upon him to speak.

It was so decided.

23. Mr. VERCELES (Observer for the Philippines) wondered to what extent the members of the sessional committees could participate in the work of the Council in plenary meetings. In his delegation's view, their status should be more than that of observers.

24. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that there had been a precedent when the Council's membership had been enlarged from 18 to 27 and that the Council might be guided by what had been done then.

25. Mr. AHMED (Secretary of the Council) said that, at the Council's thirty-seventh session, the additional members had been asked to take places at the Council table and invited to participate fully in debates in plenary meetings although they had been unable to vote or sponsor proposals. When one of them wished to support a proposal, the fact was indicated in the text concerned or in the record of the meeting in question.

26. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council agreed to follow the precedent set at the thirty-seventh session.

It was so decided.

27. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council agreed to the arrangements suggested in document E/L.1487/Rev.1.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 12

Non-governmental organizations (E/5094, E/5098)

28. The PRESIDENT invited the Chairman of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations to introduce the Committee's report on its session held from 17 to 21 January 1972 (E/5098).

29. Mr. SEKYIAMA (Ghana) said that at its January session the Committee had considered a number of applications for consultative status and had taken action as indicated in its report. It had devoted the greater part of its time to consideration of the work assigned to it under Council resolutions 1580 (L) of 20 May 1971 and 1651 (LI) of 29 October 1971, on which it was to report to the Council at its fifty-fourth session. The Committee had shown a keen awareness of the importance of those two resolutions, whose proper implementation should go a long way towards eliciting the maximum possible benefit from the resources and potential of non-governmental organizations. Its immediate concern during its last session had been to formulate an acceptable procedure for obtaining the information it needed to discharge its mandate. As could be seen from paragraphs 10 to 13 of the report, the Committee had had a detailed and sometimes spirited discussion on the procedure to be followed. Two views had emerged. One had been that the basic information should be obtained by means of a questionnaire addressed to all non-governmental organizations. The second had been that the information should be obtained by means of interviews and discussions with the headquarters personnel of the non-governmental organizations, namely, with officials who were permanently and professionally involved with the work of those organizations. Although it had found considerable merit in both approaches, the Committee had been concerned at their financial implications. The consensus that had emerged had been to combine the two procedures, ensuring that the final form they took imposed no financial burdens. It had thus agreed on the two short questionnaires reproduced in its report. Its questions had had to be short in order to eliminate financial and administrative burdens on both the United Nations and the non-governmental organizations. Since it had been clear that there would have been financial implications if the Secretariat had had to process the answers to the questionnaires or even to circulate them to members of the Committee, it had been agreed that the replies would be retained in their original forms, to be consulted by representatives. The Secretary of the Committee was, however, to present an oral summary of the replies to the Committee.

30. That procedure involved no financial implications but it did not completely respond to the need for a frank and in-depth study on the basis of which realistic recommendations could be made. The Committee had therefore decided to supplement the questionnaires by discussions with representatives of non-governmental organizations, but in a manner which would not involve any expenditure by the United Nations. The Committee would avail itself of its normal meetings and of the Council's meetings to continue its discussion with representatives of non-governmental organizations, most of which were expected to be represented at Geneva at the forthcoming meeting of the Conference of Non-Governmental Organizations. It was hoped that members of the Committee who would be at Geneva in the normal course of business would hold further discussions with the headquarters personnel of the organization, and that should assist them in formulating their views in relation to the Committee's mandate under the

two resolutions he had referred to. In view of the importance of such consultations, he appealed to delegations to make it possible for members of the Committee to be present at the following session. In order to obtain additional information on the subject, the Secretary of the Committee had been requested to seek further information from the non-governmental organizations concerning the two questionnaires in the course of his normal duties abroad and to present an oral report to the Committee at its Geneva session. He hoped that the Council realized the financial constraints within which the Committee's preliminary work had had to be carried out. Within those limitations, the Committee could be considered to have adopted the most practical way of pursuing its work.

31. The Committee's debates at its previous session had been conducted with the active participation of the non-governmental organizations represented at its meetings. The Committee had found their participation helpful and productive even though most of the representatives in question had not had the mandate to commit their organizations or to delve very deeply into the matter. The Committee hoped to pursue that joint examination of the subject during the Council's fifty-third session with the higher officials of the organizations and was gratified to note that the twelfth triennial meeting of the Conference of Non-Governmental Organizations would focus attention on Council resolutions 1580 (L) and 1651 (LI). That should be extremely helpful for the joint discussions. The Committee had no desire to make of its work an academic exercise detached from realities and leading to recommendations which could not be implemented either by the Council or non-governmental organizations. That was why it felt it necessary to study the issues frankly and openly. The International Development Strategy and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples should be tackled boldly but realistically. In the case of the Declaration the Committee would work very closely with the Special Committee on the Situation, with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration, with which it was already in contact.

32. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to take up chapter II, section A, of the report.

33. Mr. EVDOKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted with satisfaction that the Committee had recommended that consultative status should be granted to a number of broadly representative non-governmental organizations in which socialist countries participated and which dealt with urgent matters and could contribute to the Council's work. It was important to grant consultative status to a number of organizations in which developing countries were represented. That would be more equitable from the geographical point of view and would lead to an improvement of the work of non-governmental organizations in the Council. So far the non-governmental organizations in consultative status with the Council had been predominantly Western or pro-Western and had, as a rule, reflected the interest of the capitalist world. Unfortunately, some organizations which had been given consultative status violated the provisions of Council resolution 1296 (XLIV)

of 23 May 1968 and engaged in slander against the socialist countries and some developing countries which were Members of the United Nations. Such organizations expressed the interests of the ruling classes in their countries and could not make a constructive contribution to the Council's work. Category II status was sometimes granted to organizations representing one group or one capitalist country, in violation of the basic criteria of resolution 1296 (XLIV). Some members of the Committee did their utmost to help organizations which did not meet the criteria of resolution 1296 (XLIV) to gain recognition and blocked positive decisions concerning certain non-governmental organizations in which the socialist countries participated. That had happened at the Committee's last session when a number of Western countries had voted against the granting of consultative status to the International Federation of Resistance Movements. That was unjust since the Federation fully merited consultative status.

34. In considering applications, his delegation had always taken a position of principle and had strictly complied with resolution 1296 (XLIV). It also considered that organizations which used their consultative status for purposes contrary to the Charter and resolution 1296 (XLIV) should be deprived of that status. In that connexion, he drew attention to paragraph 36 (b) of the resolution. His delegation would later raise the question of withdrawing consultative status from certain organizations in the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations.

35. Mr. DE LATAILLADE (France) said that his delegation agreed to the recommendations made in section A except for that relating to the maintenance of the International Federation of Landscape Architects on the Roster. At a time when the problems of the environment were of particular importance, his delegation felt that the Federation should be placed in category II.

36. Mr. SEKYIAMAHA (Ghana) said that, since the applications for reclassification had been very carefully considered by the Committee, in principle his delegation was against any proposals to reverse the Committee's carefully considered conclusions. However, in view of the special circumstances mentioned by the French representative, his delegation would not object to the proposal in question.

37. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council agreed to the French representative's proposal.

It was so decided.

38. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council approved the recommendations contained in section A, as amended by the French representative's proposal.

It was so decided.

39. The PRESIDENT invited the members of the Council to comment on chapter II, section B, of the report.

40. Mr. CZARKOWSKI (Poland) said that, as an observer in the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, he had pointed out that the International Federation of Resistance Movements played an important role, particularly in Europe, in many fields related to the work of the Council. It had carried out very constructive work in his region during the post-war period. He therefore supported the proposal to place the Federation in category II.

41. Mr. FRAZÃO (Brazil) said that his delegation was not against including the Population Council on the Roster. However, when it joined the Roster it would be appropriate to ask the Population Council to follow a more balanced policy. To date, its activities only took into account one aspect of the population problem, namely, excessive population growth which might hinder economic and social development. That approach was not applicable to all developing countries. Economic development was the most important factor for the developing countries and many of them needed a larger population to expand their labour force, increase demand. Those aspects should be taken into consideration by the Population Council when it acquired consultative status. He would elaborate on his remarks further during discussion on item 4 (Population).

42. Mr. DE LATAILLADE (France) pointed out that in the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations his delegation would have favoured recommending the Federation for the Respect of Man and Humanity for category II, had it received the documentation in time. That Federation's aim was to combat racism and it should therefore be placed in category II instead of the Roster.

43. Although the International Association Against Painful Experiments on Animals had asked to be placed in category II, the Committee had recommended that it be placed on the Roster. In his delegation's view, the work of that Association was significant and he therefore asked that it be placed in category II.

44. The work of the Panafrican Institute for Development should be a priority for developing countries. He therefore proposed that it should be placed in category II.

45. Mr. BUDAI (Hungary) said that his delegation had already stated in the Committee that the International Federation of Resistance Movements was doing extremely important work in the field of human rights. It was a rare international organization in that its membership comprised people from Eastern and Western Europe. It was fighting against nazism and other racial ideologies and he therefore supported the proposal to place it in category II.

46. He could find no justification for altering the status of any other non-governmental organizations.

47. Mr. MOUSSA (Observer for Egypt) said that there was a certain imbalance in the Committee's recommendations. He wondered, for example, whether it was logical that the International Federation of Beekeeper's

Associations should be placed in category II while the International Federation of Resistance Movements was placed only on the Roster.

48. Paragraph 3 of Council resolution 1651 (LI) instructed the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations to study how non-governmental organizations in consultative status with the Council assisted in the achievement of the objectives of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and other relevant resolutions of the General Assembly. The work of the International Federation of Resistance Movements was such as to merit it being placed in category II.

49. Mr. DE LATAILLADE (France) said that his delegation was not against inclusion of the International Federation of Beekeeper's Associations in category II, but possibly it might be sufficient to keep it on the Roster.

50. Miss REID (United Kingdom) supported the proposal by the representative of France to place the Federation for the Respect of Man and Humanity in category II. She reminded members that the case of the International Federation of Resistance Movements had been discussed at length in the Committee and it had been decided to place it on the Roster in view of the fact that its membership was limited to Europe alone. It had applied for consultative status in the 1950s and had been rejected. Since then no information had been received which might justify a reversal of that decision.

51. If the proposal to place the International Federation of Resistance Movements in category II was maintained, she would request a vote on the question.

52. Mr. STATHATOS (Greece) also pointed out that the case of the International Federation of Resistance Movements had been fully debated in the Council in 1955. At that time the organization's request for category II status had been rejected and, as nothing new had transpired since, he could see no reason to change its status. It was not the title of a Non-Governmental Organization that qualified it for a particular category but the role it performed. It would be time-consuming to start a new discussion on the activities of that organization, since the matter had already been fully debated.

53. Mr. EVDOKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation supported the proposal made by the representative of Poland to place the International Federation of Resistance Movements in category II. The purposes of that organization had already been noted in the Council. Any criticism concerning the activities or restricted membership of the organization must be politically motivated because there were many organizations with consultative status which represented only a single country and yet the Western States had raised no objection.

54. The reasons why the request of the International Federation had been refused in 1955 was because of the effects of the cold war. In fact the organization fully conformed to the criteria for inclusion in category II under Council resolution 1296 (XLIV).

55. Mr. CZARKOWSKI (Poland) said that his delegation was reluctant to agree to change any of the proposals and recommendations made by any United Nations organ including the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations. However, it was prompted to do so in the present case because the report on the International Federation of Resistance Movements showed that the decision to reject it in 1955 had been taken by 5 votes to 4 with 2 abstentions. It was evident that the Committee had been divided on the issue and the decision had been taken by a minority of the members. It was therefore relevant to bring it before the Council for further discussion. He again stressed the imbalance in the list of non-governmental organizations included in categories I and II.

56. If the Council accepted the International Federation for category II status, it would comply with recent changes in the United Nations. It was true that the decision of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations was politically motivated and had been taken, in part, because that organization supported resistance movements in Africa. That was precisely why it should be placed in category II.

57. Mrs. GAVRILOVA (Observer for Bulgaria) said that it was regrettable that the Council should refuse the International Federation of Resistance Movements category II consultative status. The organization was closely related to the United Nations which, as all members were aware, had been founded as a result of the allied nation's fight against nazism. The reasons for its rejection were purely political. It was hardly a valid argument to say that the organization had been rejected in 1955. The representative of the USSR had explained that it had been rejected for category II status as a result of the cold war. There was no longer any reason to exclude an organization which had every right to participate in the work of the Council and it would be ridiculous to do so.

58. The membership of the International Federation was far from limited. In her country alone the national branch had 72,000 members. She did not think that the decision of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations was correct and therefore supported those who were in favour of putting the question before the Council again.

59. Mr. STATHATOS (Greece) said that he wished to make it clear that as his country had been a victim of nazism it took a sympathetic view of requests for granting consultative status to organizations genuinely involved in the struggle against nazism. However, he took exception to those speakers who had said that the decision of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations had been politically motivated and was ridiculous. He requested that the record concerning the rejection of the request for category II status by the International Federation of Resistance Movements should be read out.

60. Mr. ROOSEVELT (Chief, Section of Non-Governmental Organizations of the Economic and Social Council Secretariat) read out paragraph 8 of draft

resolution A recommended for adoption by the Council in the report of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations,³ which stated that the Committee “Decides not to request the Secretary-General to place the Fédération internationale des résistants on the register of non-governmental organizations referred to in paragraph 17 of Council resolution 288 B (X)”.

61. Mrs. KINYANJUI (Kenya) said that her delegation had no objection to placing the International Federation in category II. However, she would like to see its activities extended to the developing countries and particularly to Africa where resistance movements were active. At present its activities were restricted to countries of West and East Europe.

62. Mr. EVDOKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations had not heard representatives of the International Federation and he did not therefore have the necessary information to judge the scope of its activities. However, it had members in African countries, particularly in the Portuguese colonies where it was supporting resistance movements.

63. Mr. BUDAI (Hungary) said that his delegation considered the opposition to the placing of the International Federation in category II irrelevant. The political atmosphere had changed since 1955 when it had first been rejected. His delegation also considered it superfluous to argue that the membership of the organization was limited. There were many organizations in categories I and II and on the Roster with more limited memberships. He therefore supported the proposal made by the representative of Poland.

64. Mr. EVDOKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out, for the information of those delegations which were opposed to placing the Federation in category II, that in the USSR the entire population took part in its activities. His country had lost 20 million people during the Second World War. It was therefore opposed to nazism and supported the work of the International Federation.

65. Mr. GETMANETS (Observer for the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) expressed surprise that an organization whose establishment had taken place under similar conditions to that of the United Nations itself and which was so active against nazism should be refused consultative status. Many organizations whose contributions to peace and security were by no means comparable to that of the International Federation had been granted consultative status. It was incorrect to say

that the organization was not representative or that its activities were confined to Europe. It had branches in many countries in which it was fighting nazism. He therefore wished to associate himself with the just demand that the organization be placed in category II.

66. The PRESIDENT invited the members of the Council to vote on the Polish proposal to place the International Federation of Resistance Movements in category II.

The proposal was adopted by 12 votes to 4, with 7 abstentions.

67. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council had adopted the proposal made by the representative of France to place the Federation for the Respect of Man and Humanity, the International Association Against Painful Experiments on Animals and the Panafrican Institute for Development in category II.

It was so decided.

68. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council approved the recommendations in chapter II, section B, of the report.

It was so decided.

69. Mr. WANG (China) explained that his delegation had not taken part in the vote, because it was the first time it had participated in the work of the Council. It would have to study certain issues in greater detail and therefore reserved its position on such issues.

70. The PRESIDENT said that chapters I, III and IV of the report were organizational in nature. If no delegation had any comments, he suggested that the Council should take note of them.

It was so decided.

71. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the report of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations was adopted as a whole.

It was so decided.

72. The PRESIDENT drew the attention of the Council to the note by the Secretary-General entitled “Action by the Secretary-General to place non-governmental organizations on the Roster” (E/5094) and suggested that it should take note of the document.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.

³ See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Nineteenth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 22, document E/2694 and Corr.1.