


**ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL**

*Fifty-second Session*  
OFFICIAL RECORDS

*Friday, 7 January 1972,  
at 11 a.m.*

NEW YORK

*President: Mr. Károly SZARKA (Hungary).*

*Organization of work*

1. The PRESIDENT said that, after consultations with the newly elected Vice-Presidents of the Council, he wished to suggest that Mr. Frazão should serve as Chairman of the Economic Committee, Miss Lim as Chairman of the Social Committee, and Mr. Scott as Chairman of the Co-ordination Committee. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Council agreed to that suggestion.

*It was so decided.*

**AGENDA ITEM 10**

**Basic programme of work of the Council in 1972 and consideration of the provisional agenda for the fifty-second session (concluded) (E/L.1469 and Corr.1, E/L.1474, E/L.1475; ESA/ECOSOC/LII/CRP.1)**

2. The PRESIDENT said that, without prejudice to any other decisions which the Council might wish to take on the item, he would like to suggest that the Economic Committee should begin its work at the fifty-second session a few days after the commencement of the meetings on 15 May. He was making that suggestion because most members of the Council appeared to have reacted favourably to it after it had initially been made by the representative of Japan. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Council agreed to the suggestion.

*It was so decided.*

3. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) asked precisely how many days after the reopening of the fifty-second session the Economic Committee would begin its work.

4. The PRESIDENT replied that the exact timing of the meetings of the Economic Committee could be decided at the start of the meetings of the fifty-second session.

5. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) repeated the proposal he had made at the previous meeting for closure of the debate on the provisional agenda for the fifty-second session. The Council would be wasting time if it continued to discuss the provisional agenda, which would in any case be reviewed when the session reopened. He proposed that the Council should approve the provisional agenda for the fifty-second session (see E/L.1469 and Corr.1), subject to any modifications which might be made during the session.

6. Mr. DENOT MEDEIROS (Brazil) recalled that proposals regarding the allocation of items for the fifty-second session (see E/L.1474) had also been made at the previous meeting. He assumed the Council would discuss those proposals further at the organizational meetings.

7. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that when the session reopened the Council would be fully entitled to adopt, change or reject the provisional agenda approved at the organizational meetings. He suggested that each item of the provisional agenda should be considered separately.

8. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) felt it would be useless to take a separate decision on each item, as the discussion would be repeated at the reopening of the fifty-second session. He withdrew all his proposals on the matter.

9. Mr. MAHMASSANI (Lebanon) felt that decisions on the provisional agenda should be deferred until the reopening of the session.

10. Mr. AKWEI (Ghana) said that if the Council could not agree on the provisional agenda at the organizational meetings, there was little likelihood that it could agree on it at the actual session. He supported the Greek representative's views concerning the need for a detailed examination of the provisional agenda at the present stage, which might facilitate the Council's work when the session reopened in May.

11. Mr. ZAGORIN (United States of America) said he was prepared to approve the draft programme of work and the provisional agenda for the fifty-second session as prepared by the Secretariat (E/L.1469 and Corr.1).

12. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that at the previous meeting he had proposed that consideration of two items on the agenda of the fifty-second session, item 3 (d) and item 6 (a), should be deferred to the resumed fifty-third session. Agenda item 10 (b) could be deleted from the agenda of the fifty-second session, as it was to be considered at the fifty-third session in any case.

13. Mr. ZAGORIN (United States of America) said that he would oppose any proposal to defer consideration of agenda item 3 (d) to the resumed fifty-third session. The Plenipotentiary Conference to Amend the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, was scheduled to be held in March 1972 and there would be plenty of time for a report on the Conference to be issued before the fifty-second session proper. Regarding agenda item 6 (a), he felt no useful purpose would be served by reversing the

earlier decision of the Council for inclusion of that item in the agenda of the fifty-second session.

14. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that the Council appeared to be talking about two different questions, approval of the provisional agenda for the fifty-second session, and organization of work for that session. Regarding the first question, it was imperative to approve a provisional agenda so that Governments could prepare for discussion of the items approved. He was willing to adopt the draft programme contained in document E/L.1469 and Corr.1, which might be modified by the Secretariat on the basis of new developments. For instance, the report on housing, building and planning under item 2 might be considered at the fifty-fourth session and agenda item 5 (b) might be considered at the fifty-third session. Agenda item 3 (d) specifically mentioned "possible" follow-up action. The Council at its fifty-second session might decide to postpone the item until a later time, particularly if follow-up action was not possible, for one reason or another.

15. No decision could be taken on organization of work three months in advance. The organization of work was in any case dependent on adoption of the definitive agenda. He therefore suggested that the Council should "take note" rather than "approve" the organization of work outlined in document E/L.1474.

16. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) agreed with the representative of France regarding the action to be taken on the provisional agenda. With reference to the organization of work, it was helpful for delegations to know in advance whether committees such as the Economic Committee would meet, and what specific agenda items would be allocated to each. That would facilitate the discussion and adoption of the agenda at the beginning of the fifty-second session. He was prepared to accept the draft programme (E/L.1469 and Corr.1) but the question of the organization of work (E/L.1474) needed to be clarified somewhat.

17. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) said he was ready to accept the programme of work contained in document ESA/ECOSOC/LII/CRP.1, with no further changes. Regarding the allocation of items, he agreed with the French and Lebanese representatives that the question should be postponed until the beginning of the fifty-second session. At that time the Council would have a clearer idea of the scope of the work to be done on each item and on the reports which would be submitted by the bodies meeting before the opening of the session.

18. Mr. MAHMASSANI (Lebanon) said that he shared the view of the representative of New Zealand. He agreed with the representative of France that the Council should take note of the provisional agenda, which could subsequently be modified at the beginning of the fifty-second session.

19. Mr. HEMANS (United Kingdom) said that his delegation approved the basic programme of work of the Council in 1972 contained in document ESA/ECOSOC/LII/CRP.1, but thought that the

provisional agenda for the fifty-second session was greatly overloaded. He wished to reserve the right to propose the postponement of consideration of certain items when the fifty-second session began.

*The basic programme of work of the Council in 1972, as revised by the Secretariat in document ESA/ECOSOC/LII/CRP.1, was adopted.*

20. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should approve the provisional agenda for the fifty-second session.

*It was so decided.*

21. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that if the members of the Council merely took note of the organization of work of the fifty-second session outlined in document E/L.1474, as suggested by the representative of France, they would only be postponing difficulties until the session began. If the Council was not going to discuss the organization of work now, the Secretariat should not have been requested to produce a paper on the matter.

22. The PRESIDENT pointed out that document E/L.1474 outlined a "tentative arrangement of business for the fifty-second session" and should be taken in that spirit.

23. Mr. ZAGORIN (United States of America) expressed agreement with the suggestion made by the representative of France. If the members of the Council could not come to some agreement now, it would be a waste of time for them to continue the discussion, since the situation would probably change and they would undoubtedly have a better understanding of what was needed at the beginning of the fifty-second session. He therefore thought that the Council should merely take note of the organization of work of the session and deal with it more definitively when the session opened.

24. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) reserved the right to revert to the decision to convene the Economic Committee at the reopening of the fifty-second session, since he considered it premature.

25. Mr. DENOT MEDEIROS (Brazil) said that he agreed with the representative of the United States. He proposed that the Council should take note of the tentative organization of work of the fifty-second session proposed by the Secretary-General (E/L.1474, para. 5) and of the various proposals put forward during the organizational meetings in the light of the Council's decision to convene the Economic Committee a few days after the reopening of the fifty-second session in May.

26. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece), noting that all decisions taken at the organizational meetings were provisional, said that his delegation would join with that of Tunisia in an attempt to prevent the convening of the Economic Committee at the beginning of the fifty-second session. With regard to the organization of work, he would prefer to have more meetings of the plenary to

examine some of the items referred to the Economic Committee.

27. Mr. ILONIEMI (Finland) said that a firm decision should be taken as to when agenda items were to be discussed, since many of the smaller delegations, including his own, had a limited number of experts they could assign to meetings.

28. Mr. ZAGORIN (United States of America) supported the Brazilian representative's proposal. If the representative of Greece had misgivings, he should be reassured by the fact that the Council could reverse at the reopening of the fifty-second session any decisions taken during the organizational meetings. One thing that could not be altered, however, was paragraph 4 of Economic and Social Council resolution 1621 A (LI). Although the plenary had been able to deal with economic matters in the past, there were now 27 additional members of the Council and the decision to convene the Economic Committee at the fifty-second session was therefore a wise one.

29. Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya) shared the views expressed by the representative of Finland and asked what the purpose of the organizational meetings was if all the decisions taken were provisional.

30. Mr. MAHMASSANI (Lebanon) asked the President to make a ruling on the decision to convene the Economic Committee at the fifty-second session.

31. Mr. AKWEI (Ghana) pointed out that, since a decision had already been taken on the convening of the Economic Committee, many speakers had been out of order in discussing the positions that their delegations would take in the future. His delegation agreed with that decision and with the proposal made by the representative of Brazil. The debate on the convening of the Economic Committee should be closed and the Council should respect the decision taken, subject to the proposal made by the representative of Brazil, which made allowances for future changes.

32. The PRESIDENT said that a decision had been taken, but that did not prevent representatives from expressing their opposing views, although they could do so again at the fifty-second session.

33. Mr. VIAUD (France) agreed with the representative of Ghana. He also shared the view of the Finnish representative that the Council should know what was to be discussed at the fifty-second session. His delegation was not opposed to the decision to convene the Economic Committee at the fifty-second session, but recognized that it might put considerable pressure upon the small delegations. The decision should therefore not be regarded as creating a precedent. His delegation agreed with the proposal made by the representative of Brazil.

34. Mr. HEMANS (United Kingdom), formally proposed the closure of the debate on the organization of work of the fifty-second session, in view of the substantial measure of agreement on the proposal made by the representative of Brazil.

*It was so decided.*

*The proposal made by the representative of Brazil concerning the organization of work of the fifty-second session was adopted.*

35. Mr. AN (China) said that his delegation agreed in principle to the basic programme of work of the Council for 1972. However, since he did not as yet have a clear understanding of the work of the Council or the background involved in decisions on its agenda, he would study the agenda and state his delegations's position later in the fifty-second session.

#### AGENDA ITEM 4

##### **Appointment of members of the advisory committee on the application of science and technology to development (E/5088 and Add.1-2)**

36. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the note by the Secretary-General (E/5088 and Add.1 and 2) which contained the names of 22 individual experts nominated by the Secretary-General for appointment to the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development. It would be noted from paragraph 5 of document E/5088 that the Secretary-General intended to nominate experts from Chile, China, India and Spain for appointment, in their personal capacities, as members of the Advisory Committee after the necessary consultations had been completed. The Secretary-General had concluded his consultations concerning the experts from Chile and Spain, whose names would be found in documents E/5088/Add.1 and E/5088/Add.2 respectively.

37. Since the Advisory Committee was due to meet early in April, the Secretary-General wished to suggest that he should be authorized to appoint the remaining two individual experts as members on an interim basis and to present their names to the Council at the earliest opportunity. That practice had, in fact, been followed in the past with regard to appointments to both the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development and the Committee for Development Planning.

38. Mr. MAHMASSANI (Lebanon) said that his delegation was surprised to see included in the list contained in document E/5088 a nominee from a country whose Government had violated the Charter of the United Nations by committing acts of aggression against Arab States. He was referring to Mr. Alexander Keynan of Israel. His delegation strongly opposed the nomination of Mr. Keynan and hoped that the actions of the Governments concerned would be taken into account when the criteria for inclusion in the list of nominees were established.

39. Mr. AN (China) whole-heartedly supported the observations made by the Lebanese representative. Consideration should have been given to the fact that the nominee concerned came from a country which had committed aggression against Arab nations.

40. His delegation wished to thank the Council and the Secretariat for the confidence which they had displayed in it by asking it to nominate an expert for appointment to the Advisory Committee. However, since its experience in questions relating to the Council was somewhat limited, it was unable to respond to the invitation at the present time. It would give a firm answer once appropriate consultations had been held.

41. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) associated his delegation with the observations made by that of Lebanon concerning the nomination of Mr. Keynan. His delegation's position on the question was based on purely political considerations and was not prompted by racial discrimination.

42. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the list of nominees drawn up by the Secretariat was arbitrary and inadmissible in that it constituted a violation of the rights of the socialist countries of Eastern Europe: whereas in the past four experts from Eastern European countries had been members of the Advisory Committee, only three such experts were included in the list now submitted by the Secretary-General. The Secretariat should exercise greater care in selecting candidates for membership of bodies composed of governmental experts, such as the Advisory Committee. His delegation therefore reserved the right to raise the question of the proper composition of the Advisory Committee at the fifty-second session of the Council with a view to restoring the lawful rights of the socialist countries of Eastern Europe.

43. The PRESIDENT said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Council, while taking note of the reservations and observations expressed by some members, wished to appoint as members of the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development, for a period of three years beginning on 1 January 1972, the 22 nominees proposed by the Secretary-General (E/5088 and Add.1 and 2), and authorized the Secretary-General to appoint the remaining two members on an interim basis.

*It was so decided.*

#### AGENDA ITEM 5

##### Appointment of members of the Committee for Development Planning (E/5087)

44. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the note by the Secretary-General (E/5087) which contained the names of 22 individual experts nominated by the Secretary-General for appointment to the Committee for Development Planning.

45. Mr. DE SEYNIS (Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs) announced that the Secretary-General had that morning received the name of a nominee — V. M. Kirichenko, Deputy Director of Scientific and Economic Research of GOSPLAN — from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. His name should therefore be added to the list of nominees contained in document E/5087.

46. Mr. AN (China) said that his delegation's position with regard to the appointment of a Chinese expert to the Committee for Development Planning was the same as that which it had expressed in connexion with the preceding item.

47. The PRESIDENT noted that, in accordance with paragraph 3 of document E/5087, the Secretary-General intended to nominate an expert from China for appointment, in a personal capacity, as a member of the Committee for Development Planning after the necessary consultations had been completed. Since the Committee was due to meet in April, the Secretary-General wished to suggest that he should be authorized to appoint that expert as a member on an interim basis and to present his name to the Council at the earliest opportunity.

48. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to appoint as members of the Committee for Development Planning, for a period of three years, beginning on 1 January 1972, the 22 nominees proposed by the Secretary-General as well as Mr. Kirichenko, whose nomination had been announced at the current meeting, and to authorize the Secretary-General to appoint the remaining member on an interim basis.

*It was so decided.*

#### AGENDA ITEM 8

##### Confirmation of members of functional commissions of the Council (E/5078 and Add.1-4)

49. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the note by the Secretary-General (E/5078 and Add.1-4) containing the names of the representatives which the Council was asked to confirm.

50. Mr. MAHMASSANI (Lebanon) announced that Mr. El-Zein whose name was included in the list of members of the Commission on Human Rights in document E/5078, would no longer be the Lebanese representative in the Commission. His delegation would communicate the name of the new Lebanese representative to the Secretariat as soon as possible.

51. Mr. HEMANS (United Kingdom) announced that Mr. Fair would no longer be the United Kingdom representative in the Commission for Social Development. His delegation would communicate the name of the new representative to the Secretariat as soon as possible.

52. Mr. AHMED (Secretary of the Council) pointed out that, since the Council was required to confirm members of the functional commissions in their individual capacities, it would be called on to confirm the Lebanese and United Kingdom representatives at a later stage.

53. The PRESIDENT said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Council confirmed the representatives listed in documents E/5078 and Add.1-4.

*It was so decided.*

**AGENDA ITEM 7****Elections**

54. Mr. HEMANS (United Kingdom) noted that it had proved difficult to find Member States willing to serve on the Council's Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations. In that connexion, the Council might wish to recall that in resolution 1580 (L) of 20 May 1971 it had requested the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations to examine the contributions to development already made or being planned by non-governmental organizations in consultative status active primarily in the field of economic and social development. It had further requested the Committee to submit to it at its fifty-fourth session recommendations on improving non-governmental organizations' contribution towards the implementation of the International Development Strategy.

55. The item relating to resolution 1580 (L) was perhaps the most important on the Committee's provisional agenda and the resolution might well be the most important resolution relating to the non-governmental organizations since the United Nations had established consultative status. The Committee might wish to use the opportunity afforded by resolution 1580 (L) to determine why a truly meaningful and productive relationship had not been developed between the Council and the non-governmental organizations.

Major non-governmental organizations had long made it plain that they found the relationship as difficult and, at times, unrewarding as the Council did.

56. There were several good reasons why a productive relationship was particularly desirable at the present time. First, Article 71 of the Charter entrusted to the Council the responsibility of making suitable arrangements for consultation with non-governmental organizations. Secondly, both the Council and the General Assembly had recognized the fact that the mobilization of public opinion and the creation of political will in favour of the International Development Strategy was a prime requisite for accomplishing the goals of the Second United Nations Development Decade, and the Council had recognized the non-governmental organizations as a means of creating that political will. Thirdly, the latest figures of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, indicated that \$840 million was transferred annually from developed to developing countries through non-governmental organizations. Those reasons should suffice to remind the Council of the importance of the work of the Committee. His delegation therefore urged those delegations which had considered applying for membership in the Committee to take them into account in order that there might be a complete list of candidates.

*The meeting rose at 12.40 p.m.*