



ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Fifty-second Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Thursday, 1 June 1972,
at 3.30 p.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Károly SZARKA (Hungary).

AGENDA ITEM 16

**Assistance in relief, rehabilitation and resettlement of
Sudanese refugees**

REPORT OF THE SOCIAL COMMITTEE (E/5162)

1. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the report of the Social Committee on item 16 (E/5162). In paragraph 5 the Social Committee recommended a draft resolution for adoption by the Council which the Committee had adopted by consensus. He invited the Council to vote on the draft resolution.

The draft resolution was adopted without objection.

2. Mr. EL-SHEIKH (Observer for the Sudan), speaking on behalf of the delegation and Government of the Sudan, said he wished to thank the members of the Council for adopting the draft resolution. He felt sure that such an attitude would encourage the people of the world to renew their faith in the work of the Organization.

AGENDA ITEM 10

Capital punishment

REPORT OF THE SOCIAL COMMITTEE (E/5163)

3. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the report of the Social Committee on item 10 (E/5163). In paragraph 5, the Committee recommended a draft resolution for adoption by the Council which the Committee had adopted by consensus. He then invited the Council to vote on the draft resolution.

The draft resolution was adopted without objection.

AGENDA ITEM 3

Narcotic drugs:

- (a) Report of the International Narcotics Control Board;
- (b) Report of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs;
- (c) Concerted United Nations action against drug abuse and activities of the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control;
- (d) United Nations Conference to consider amendments to the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1953;
- (e) Youth and dependence-producing drugs

REPORT OF THE SOCIAL COMMITTEE (E/5165)

4. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the report of the Social Committee on item 3 (E/5165). In paragraph 30 the Social Committee recommended nine draft resolutions for adoption by the Council.

5. He said that the Social Committee had adopted by consensus draft resolution I, on the abuse of drugs. He invited the Council to vote on draft resolution I.

Draft resolution I was adopted without objection.

6. The PRESIDENT said that the Social Committee had adopted draft resolution II, on the Convention on Psychotropic Substances, by 41 votes to none, with 1 abstention. He invited the Council to vote on draft resolution II.

Draft resolution II was adopted by 21 votes to none.

7. The PRESIDENT said that the Social Committee had adopted draft resolution III, on the abuse of cannabis and multiple drug abuse, by 41 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

8. Mr. VALTASAARI (Finland), supported by Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand), requested a separate vote on the words "the most severe" in operative paragraph 2.

9. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) said that, if operative paragraph 2 was voted on separately, he would abstain, since the words in question were inconsistent with his Government's position on capital punishment.

The words "the most severe" in operative paragraph 2 were retained by 14 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.

Draft resolution III as a whole was adopted by 22 votes to none.

10. The PRESIDENT said that the Social Committee had adopted draft resolution IV, on the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Illicit Traffic in the Near and Middle East, by consensus.

11. Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested a vote on draft resolution IV.

12. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on draft resolution IV.

Draft resolution IV was adopted by 19 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

13. The PRESIDENT said that the Social Committee had adopted draft resolution V, on the report of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, by consensus. He invited the Council to vote on draft resolution V.

Draft resolution V was adopted without objection.

14. The PRESIDENT said that the Social Committee had adopted draft resolution VI, on the report of the International Narcotics Control Board, by 41 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

15. Mr. COUTO (Brazil) said that the draft lacked an important element and proposed the insertion of the word "consumption" in operative paragraph 2 after the words "illicit production". By adopting his amendment, the Council would be acting in accordance with the letter and the spirit of the Single Convention of 1961 as well as the Convention on Psychotropic Substances of 1971. The amendment would be in line with both the second preambular paragraph of draft resolution VI and the second preambular paragraph of draft resolution VIII. He had been informed by the sponsors that they would have no difficulty in accepting his amendment.

16. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the Brazilian amendment and on the draft resolution as a whole.

The Brazilian amendment was adopted by 22 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Draft resolution VI, as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 22 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

17. The PRESIDENT said that the Committee had adopted draft resolution VII, on the enlargement of the membership of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, by 35 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

18. Mr. NATHON (Hungary) requested a separate vote on the word "world-wide" in the second preambular paragraph.

19. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the word "world-wide" in the second preambular paragraph and on the draft resolution as a whole.

The word "world-wide" was retained by 12 votes to 3, with 5 abstentions.

Draft resolution VII, as a whole, was adopted by 17 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

20. The PRESIDENT said that the Committee had adopted draft resolution VIII, on concerted United Nations action against drug abuse and activities of the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control, by 35 votes to 5, with 3 abstentions. He invited the Council to vote on the draft resolution.

Draft resolution VIII was adopted by 18 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions.

21. The PRESIDENT said that the Social Committee had adopted draft resolution IX, on the United Nations Conference to consider Amendments to the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, by 33 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.

22. Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested a separate vote on operative paragraph 1.

23. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on operative paragraph 1 and on the draft resolution as a whole.

Paragraph 1 was adopted by 19 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

Draft resolution IX, as a whole, was adopted by 19 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

AGENDA ITEM 9

Social development:

- (a) **Implementation of the International Development Strategy and the role of the Commission for Social Development;**
- (b) **National experience in achieving far-reaching social and economic changes for purposes of social progress;**
- (c) **Promotion of the co-operative movement during the Second United Nations Development Decade**

REPORT OF THE SOCIAL COMMITTEE (E/5172)

24. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the report of the Social Committee on item 9 (E/5172). In paragraph 21, the Committee recommended three draft resolutions for adoption by the Council. He said that the Committee had adopted draft resolution I, on the implementation of the International Development Strategy and the role of the Commission for Social Development, by 36 votes to none, with 8 abstentions. He invited the Council to vote on the draft resolution.

Draft resolution I was adopted by 19 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

25. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote, because it felt that a decision on the matter was premature. The draft resolution should have gone first to the Co-ordination Committee for consideration.

26. The PRESIDENT said that the Social Committee had adopted draft resolution II, on national experience in achieving far-reaching social and economic change for purposes of social progress, by 35 votes to none, with 5 abstentions. He invited the Council to vote on the draft resolution.

Draft resolution II was adopted by 18 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

27. The PRESIDENT said that the Social Committee had adopted draft resolution III, on the promotion of the co-operative movement during the Second United

Nations Development Decade, by consensus. He invited the Council to vote on the draft resolution.

Draft resolution III was adopted without objection.

AGENDA ITEM 2

Housing, building and planning

REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC COMMITTEE (E/5174)

28. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to turn its attention to the report of the Economic Committee on item 2 (E/5174). In paragraph 13, the Committee recommended three draft resolutions for adoption by the Council. He pointed out that corrections should be made in paragraphs 5, 6 and 13 of document E/5174, and requested the Secretary of the Council to read out the corrections.

29. Mr. OLIVER (Deputy Secretary of the Council) said that, in the fourth line of paragraph 5 of the English text of the report, the figure "2" should be replaced by the figure "1". The words "for a significant improvement of slums and squatter settlements." should be added at the end of paragraph 6 after the words "the following measures". The same correction should be made in operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution II.

30. The PRESIDENT said that the Social Committee had adopted draft resolution I, on development planning advisory services, by consensus. He invited the Council to vote on the draft resolution.

Draft resolution I was adopted without objection.

31. The PRESIDENT said that the Social Committee had adopted draft resolution II, on rehabilitation of transitional urban settlements, by consensus. He invited the Council to vote on the draft resolution.

Draft resolution II, as corrected, was adopted without objection.

32. The PRESIDENT said that the Economic Committee had adopted draft resolution III, on the training of skilled manpower in the field of housing, building and planning, by consensus. He invited the Council to vote on the draft resolution.

Draft resolution III was adopted without objection.

33. The PRESIDENT pointed out that in paragraph 14 the Economic Committee recommended that the Council should take note of the report of the Committee on Housing, Building and Planning on its seventh session (E/5086). If there were no objections, he would take it that the Council approved that recommendation.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 14

Elections (*continued*)

34. The PRESIDENT suggested that, if candidates were available, the Council should complete the elections which it had begun at its 1815th meeting when it had decided to defer the election of members of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs pending a decision regarding the enlargement of the Commission. If it was not possible to complete the elections, he suggested that the Council should defer the item until the following meeting.

35. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) wished to know whether consultations were being held concerning the elections and whether it was expected that a consensus would emerge by the following meeting. If not, the Council might well proceed to the elections immediately.

36. The PRESIDENT said that it was his understanding that at the present stage there were fewer candidates than places available. He hoped that the requisite number would be put forward by the next meeting.

37. Mr. STILLMAN (United States of America) recalled that his delegation had proposed that the elections for the Commission on Narcotic Drugs should be deferred until the fifty-third session of the Council.

38. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) said that, if the Commission on Narcotic Drugs was not scheduled to meet until 1973, the elections could be postponed until the fifty-third or resumed fifty-third session.

39. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) suggested that, in the absence of candidates and provided that the bodies concerned were not scheduled to convene before the fifty-third session of the Council, the elections should be postponed.

40. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) said that the Greek suggestion was logical but dangerous. While he was ready to agree to the postponement of the election of members of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs to the fifty-third session, he did not think that postponement should be made a principle. Governments needed to know if they were to be members of the relevant bodies in good time in order to prepare for the work.

41. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) said that in the case of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs there would be no problem in deferring the elections until the fifty-third session. Furthermore, he recalled that the Council had only just adopted a resolution calling for the enlargement of the Commission. Officially, that resolution had not been brought to the attention of his Government. With regard to the suggestion made by the representative of Greece, he had no objection as long as due consideration was given to the time factor.

42. Mr. STILLMAN (United States of America) formally proposed that the election of members of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs should be postponed until the fifty-third session.

43. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the proposal.

The proposal was adopted by 15 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

44. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should postpone the election of members of other bodies until the following meeting and appealed to members to assist him in completing the remaining elections at that time.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 15

Consideration of the provisional agenda for the fifty-third session (E/L.1488 and Corr.1, E/L.1494, E/L.1495)

45. The PRESIDENT drew attention to a note by the Secretary-General (E/L.1488 and Corr.1) which contained the provisional annotated agenda for the fifty-third session and the resumed fifty-third session of the Council and a note by the Secretary-General (E/L.1494) concerning the status of documentation for the fifty-third session. A revision of the text of paragraph 9 of document E/L.1495 on the organization of work, which he had prepared in consultation with the Bureau, would be circulated in due course as E/L.1495/Amend.1.

46. Should the Council endorse the Economic Committee's recommendation concerning item 11 of the agenda of the current session, subitem 13 (a) of the provisional agenda for the Council's fifty-third session would have to be replaced by a new subitem entitled "Terms of reference of the Committee on Science and Technology".

47. The Bureau recognized that the schedule of meetings for the fifty-third session was heavy but trusted that, with the co-operation of all delegations, it would be possible to dispose of the agenda in the four-week period available. The suggested order of consideration of items took into account the availability of documentation, and in particular the reports of the Committee on Review and Appraisal, the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the Industrial Development Board and the Committee on Shipping of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.

48. With regard to the order of consideration, the Bureau suggested that items for which the reports of the Secretary-General would not be available until shortly before the opening of the session should be placed near the end of the session. It was therefore suggested that item 9 (c) (Study on regional structures) should be taken up by the Co-ordination Committee in the last week of the session and that item 22, concerning documentation, should be taken up by that Committee in the second week, immediately after item 21. It was also suggested that it should take up item 17 (Tourism) in the last week of the session and that the Economic Committee should consider item 6 at the end of the session.

49. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) said that under item 21 (d), which it had been suggested should be left until the last week of the fifty-third session, members would have to consider the co-ordinating role of the Council.

50. All members of the Economic Committee were worried about their own performance at the fifty-second session. The problem was much wider than the illustrative but limited point mentioned in the provisional annotated list for the agenda for the fifty-third session: the interrelation of the sessional meetings of the Co-ordination Committee and the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (CPC). Most delegations had been present at an informal meeting convened by the Permanent Representative of the United States at which general concern about the state of the Council's work had clearly emerged. Delegations had also received certain papers which his delegation had circulated prior to that meeting. Views varied widely, particularly after the experience of the fifty-second session, but most delegations agreed that the problems were real. The addition of the Committee on Natural Resources, the Committee on Review and Appraisal and, it was to be hoped, the Committee on Science and Technology to the Economic and Social Council system had led to increasing congestion of the time-table, increasing quantities of documentation, and increasing demands on delegations and their Governments. The requirements which those Committees had been set up to meet were important and relevant to the proper pursuit of the International Development Strategy. The Council had not, however, considered whether the functions of established subordinate bodies had or could be taken over wholly or in part by the new Committees. The Council should consider that possibility in the context of item 21. Increased overlapping and duplication did not serve the purposes of the Strategy.

51. Again, there was the self-evident problem of documentation, and attention should be paid to the Secretary-General's note (E/L.1494). In accordance with section III of Council resolution 1623 (II) of 30 July 1971, the Secretariat was doing its best to cut down the length and improve the format and content of papers, but it could not control the number of papers to be issued. The Council, as the legislative body, was calling for more and more papers by the Secretariat, rapporteurs or *ad hoc* groups as the number of subordinate bodies grew.

52. The increase in the number of subsidiary bodies and in the volume of documentation was creating a situation in which the Council could not do its work properly. Meetings were so frequent that Governments did not have time to consider the relevant papers before a given meeting took place. Thereafter, the report of the meeting in question was not available in time for the next meeting in the sequence which the Council had established. One current example was the reports of CPC in relation to the fifty-second and fifty-third sessions of the Council. CPC was supposed to prepare and co-ordinate for the Council. The calendar was, however, so congested that the Committee had concluded its last meeting on the Friday before the fifty-second session of the Council opened. The report of CPC had been received at the end of the

first week by delegations and later by Governments. That did not prepare the Council for its session. Further, CPC was to meet immediately after the fifty-second session in order to co-ordinate for the fifty-third session, but even if CPC's report was available soon after its meeting, it would not be available six weeks before the fifty-third session as was required, but at best two or three. Then delegations would be involved in the UNDP Governing Council and would scarcely be able to read the report. Delegations also expected at that time to be involved in the initial meetings of the Committee on Science and Technology and the Committee on Review and Appraisal and the Joint Meeting of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination and the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination. The fifty-third session of the Council, with its massive agenda, followed immediately thereafter, and there might not be time to consider subitem 21 (d) if it was deferred until the last week of the session.

53. It was not certain that Governments would have received all the necessary papers in good time for the fifty-third session of the Council or that delegations would have been able to exchange views with their Governments and be fully prepared to play their part in ensuring that the Council fulfilled its tasks as the Charter intended. At the end of the fifty-third session, who would be able to say that proper consideration had been given to everything on the agenda? If they were honest, members would have to admit that they had subconsciously become more concerned with appearing to complete the agenda than in dealing properly with what was on it. Although his judgements might be sweeping, most delegations would agree that they were pertinent.

54. It was no use blaming the Secretariat for the late distribution of documentation. The Council could not work properly unless it gave the Secretariat time to prepare its side of the work and members should exercise discipline in their demands for papers. Conversely, the Secretariat's effort was largely in vain if the Council did not have time to consider a paper when it was produced, which called for discipline concerning the calendar and the pattern of meetings for the bodies within the Council system.

55. Some delegations, including that of Brazil, felt that the Council should avoid further structural reforms and should continue with its work. Instinctively his delegation would like to agree. It had not enjoyed the wrangling over the "package deal" at the fifty-first session. It was not impressed by the results as seen in the elections and other proceedings at the fifty-second session and was reminded of the arguments put forward by the representative of Greece at the fifty-first session concerning the dangers of hasty contrivance. The fifty-second session had, however, shown that the Council should look at its structures and methods of work. The representative of Brazil himself, as Chairman of the Economic Committee, had pointed out during the sixth working day that the Council had lost over five hours. He had not blamed unnecessary or lengthy speeches. He had blamed the inveterate habit of arriving late for every meeting and had suggested that there should be longer sessions and night meetings.

56. His delegation had agreed with that conclusion. On the other hand, representatives sometimes had to arrive late in order to do their work properly and their lateness, exasperating as it was, was not at the root of the Council's current difficulties. The cause was the length of the agenda, which was, in turn, due to the multiplicity of subordinate bodies which produced more and more reports. The workload was steadily increasing and there were no signs that the increase would stop. His delegation, like that of Brazil, would much rather forge ahead with the Council's work than talk about its structure, but it could not escape the conclusion that the Council could not do its work unless it first rationalized its structure and approach.

57. His delegation in no way intended to restrict the Council's work using rationalization to eliminate any fields of activity. The proper time for presenting views on the merits of a particular activity was during the debate on the activity itself. Furthermore, his delegation did not want to raise the controversial question as to whether the Council's function was one of policy or co-ordination. Its function was essentially both. On the other hand, since the Council came under the General Assembly, which discussed policy at length but was not equipped for co-ordination work, the Council, through a natural division of labour, should devote particular attention to co-ordination. At present it was failing to carry out that co-ordinating role.

58. Because there would be such severe time pressure at the fifty-third session, some preparation for the session might be worth attempting. Ideas on that subject had been circulating for months, and those on which there was a degree of consensus could perhaps be brought together. He proposed that an informal working group should be set up, under the President, to examine the various ideas that had been suggested and to see whether specific proposals could be drawn up for consideration at the fifty-third session. The working group, it was to be hoped, could meet several times between 5 and 19 June, as any later dates would be impracticable. Perhaps it would be helpful if the group included the whole Bureau of the present Council, and also Mr. Driss, the representative of Tunisia and Mr. Caranicas, the representative of Greece, both of whom had earned a special position by their past efforts in the field. It also might include representatives of the remaining regional groups, i.e. Africa and Eastern Europe. He hoped that all permanent members of the Security Council would also take part. Beyond that, the group might be open to any delegation which wished to attend and had ideas to contribute. The group should be informal, so as to give representatives a free hand, but the members of the Bureau should be explicitly authorized to take part and arrangements should be made for a meeting place and for interpretation.

59. Mr. FRAZÃO (Brazil) said he agreed totally with most of what the United Kingdom representative had said. One point of disagreement was that he could see no reason why the permanent members of the Security Council should by right sit on all committees.

60. The most recent session of the Economic Committee had left its members with a deep sense of frustration. They had worked hard to reach decisions on every item but had not succeeded because the agenda was overcrowded. Perhaps the effects of expanded membership had not been anticipated. On the other hand, he had been impressed by the active and positive contributions made by the new members.

61. He was glad that the United Kingdom representative had not raised the question of the Council's aims or of whether the Council was a political or co-ordinating body. The many issues before it reflected the expanding interests of international society, and the Council would be abdicating its responsibilities if it specialized in certain fields. It had to be both a political and co-ordinating body if it was to live up to the expectations of the Charter.

62. The Council must realize that it could no longer meet only twice a year for a total of seven weeks. If it continued to do so, it would be forced to avoid its responsibilities by transferring work to still more subordinate bodies. Unless the Council stated candidly that it did not have enough time, decisions would continue to be deferred and the same speeches would be made every time an item came up for consideration.

63. If the Council had more time it could work out useful compromises on important issues. For example, great progress had been made during a year of consultations in bringing together divergent positions on the International Development Strategy. He did not see how the Economic Committee, with only four weeks available for its forthcoming session at Geneva, could possibly make progress on all the items on its agenda. If that Committee had had even one week more of meetings during the current session, it might not have been obliged to defer consideration of two or three items.

64. The Economic and Social Council, together with the Security Council, should be one of the pillars of the United Nations. However, unless members showed the will to develop new methods of work, the former would become a bureaucratic body, and no one would pay attention to it.

65. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) said that the multiplicity of agenda items which had plagued the Council since its expansion amounted to a real pollution problem. Every July there was a parade of agency heads and staff members to Geneva. A new form of tourism had developed, benefiting medium-level and lower-level staff members. That situation must stop. The Council must meet its responsibilities by approaching its work with a new spirit and must cease engaging in discussion for discussion's sake. The volume of work was, of course, an even greater problem for the smaller delegations than for the larger ones.

66. He requested the Bureau to submit a shorter draft agenda. It might be limited to the following items: adoption of the agenda, general debate, implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), report of the Joint Inspection Unit, co-ordination, documentation,

science and technology, the Second United Nations Development Decade and elections.

67. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) recalled that his delegation had opposed the "package deal" in 1971, as it had felt it would worsen the trend towards a greater number of bodies with increased memberships. The situation, which had been appalling before, had become almost a nightmare. He was glad that the representatives of the United Kingdom, Brazil and Tunisia had brought the problem to light, and his delegation would like to consider their proposals seriously. The Tunisian representative had proposed a kind of surgery, and his proposal should be considered carefully, perhaps the following day, although he suspected that it was a palliative and not a solution to the fundamental problem. As to the Brazilian representative's comments on the contribution of the new members of the Council, there had never been more than 44 members present during votes, in the Council, that proved that 10 members either did not have enough representatives to send to the meetings or were no longer interested in attending once they had been granted a seat.

68. While his delegation had no solutions to offer, it felt that the idea of an open-ended working group was excellent. That would at least enable the Council to go to Geneva with a full awareness of the problem.

69. Most of the documents listed in document E/L.1494 would be published late, often because the Committee involved was meeting just before the Council session. That showed that there were too many committees. Co-ordination was therefore the major problem facing the fifty-third session and, if it was not solved, all the Council's work would be in jeopardy. Furthermore, co-ordination could not possibly be dealt with adequately if it was left until the end of the session. He personally was not optimistic about efforts to review the role of the Council and its subordinate bodies, as he had found that international bodies did not tend to disband even if they had ceased to perform a useful function. But the matter was none the less urgent.

70. Perhaps the permanent members of the Security Council should give guidance to the Economic and Social Council. His delegation granted them no primacy, but recognized that their opinion carried weight and should be heard.

71. Mr. KITCHEN (United States of America) said that his delegation had devoted considerable time and thought to the dilemma facing the Council. The problem was twofold: on the one hand, there was the external crisis of confidence in the value and effectiveness of the Council's work and, on the other hand, the internal crisis of organization. Externally, the Council had been criticized as a body which was doing less and less about more and more and which, apparently, sooner or later would be doing nothing about everything. Internally, the Council's work was hampered by repetitious debate; the arguments first advanced in the subsidiary bodies were heard again in the Council, yet again in the Second Committee of the General Assembly and finally in the plenary Assembly. Something had to be done to correct

that disgraceful situation if the Council was to survive both physically and intellectually. He hoped that serious consideration would be given to refining the Council's agenda and, in particular, that the Council when it met in July would give priority consideration to item 21 (d) (Review of the Council's co-ordinating machinery) of its provisional agenda. Careful consideration should also be given to the United Kingdom proposal to convene an informal working group in June. No effort should be spared to restore the credibility of the Council and to improve the effectiveness of its work.

72. Mr. FRAZÃO (Brazil) agreed that it was a matter of the utmost urgency to refine the Council's agenda for its fifty-third session. He would not, however, perform such radical surgery on the agenda as had been suggested by the representative of Tunisia. He welcomed the United Kingdom proposal to convene an informal working group in order to study the Council's organization of work before the fifty-third session and hoped that the group would produce concrete results.

73. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) said that, in his opinion, the "package deal" referred to earlier by the representative of Greece had produced excellent results: the enlargement of the membership of the sessional committees had in no way impeded the Council's work. It was clear, however, that a radical change in working methods was needed if the Council was to make greater headway on the many important issues brought before it. Although he did not wish to put forward a formal proposal, he felt that the best way to make more rapid progress would be to do some judicious pruning of the Council's agenda, many items on which could be postponed for five or ten years while priority attention was given to more essential matters.

74. The work of the Council could also progress more rapidly if speakers endeavoured to keep their remarks as brief as possible. Lengthy discourses on problems which were well understood by everyone were quite unnecessary, the more so since delegations often had very explicit instructions from their Governments on particular matters and would scarcely be swayed by the eloquence of speakers advocating other positions.

75. Mr. AKRAM (Observer for Pakistan) said that what was really wrong with the Council was that there were too many speeches and not enough action. The problems facing the world were growing apace and new ones were arising daily, but the Council appeared to be unable to take any concrete decisions on many of the problems brought before it.

76. The work of the Council could be divided into three broad categories. First, there was the specialized consideration of particular problems, which the Council assigned to its specialized subsidiary bodies. Their work, although it might have an impact on matters of general policy, was preponderantly at the technical level. Secondly, there was the question of over-all policy, which was the province of the Council itself. Thirdly, there was co-ordination, for which the Council bore ultimate responsibility. The Council had not been able to decide on a co-ordinated over-all policy for economic and social

development in the past because it had lacked a framework by which to judge the effectiveness of its work. That framework was now provided in the International Development Strategy, and the Council could henceforth direct its efforts towards achieving the goals of the Strategy. In that effort it would be substantially assisted by the Committee for Review and Appraisal. Many policy decisions could be made in that Committee, and it was to be hoped that there would be relatively few issues left to be resolved by the Council, which could therefore address itself with greater energy to the important task of co-ordination. In that way the heavy burden of the Council's agenda would gradually be lightened without the need for any form of radical surgery.

77. In conclusion, he supported the idea of setting up an informal working group, as suggested by the United Kingdom representative.

78. Miss LIM (Malaysia) welcomed the United Kingdom proposal to convene an informal working group during the intersessional period and expressed the hope that the group would come up with some concrete suggestions as to how the Council might more effectively deal with the items on its agenda and avoid duplication of debates.

79. It should be pointed out that the fundamental functions of the Council under the Charter were to act as a governing body co-ordinating the activities of the United Nations system of organization in the economic and social fields and to serve as a forum for the discussion of issues pertaining to international economic and social policies. In that connexion, it had been very instructive for her delegation to study Council resolutions 1621 (LI), 1622 (LI) and 1623 (LI) of 30 July 1971, which, *inter alia*, recalled the Council's basic functions. It was clear from those resolutions that the Council was not intended to be a forum for debate; it was to be hoped that all members would exercise self-restraint and keep their statements brief and to the point. That would certainly assist the Council in dealing with its agenda more effectively and expeditiously.

80. Mr. CAVAGLIERI (Italy) felt strongly that the Council should fulfil the role assigned to it by the Charter. He had elaborated on that point and the shortcomings he saw in the Council's work at the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly. If the Council's working methods were not reviewed and brought up to date, it would no longer be adequate for its role, and that would mean a serious erosion of the Charter.

81. Mr. ABHYANKAR (Observer for India) said that he too was concerned about the problem of duplication of debates in the subsidiary bodies of the Council and in the Council itself, but a more fundamental problem was the Council's failure to act on matters submitted to it by its subsidiary bodies. Another deplorable trend was the passing of meaningless resolutions in which the Council simply "took note" of various important reports and documents without recommending further action.

82. Mr. GOBBA (Observer for Egypt) supported the idea of setting up an informal working group which

would meet in the intersessional period and seek a solution to the problems facing the Council. He shared the feelings of frustration with the Council's work expressed by many speakers and felt that there was certainly room for improvement in the Council's organization of work. As an example, he recalled that a recent meeting of the Economic Committee had been almost entirely taken up with voting on a single draft resolution because there had not been sufficient time for informal consultations which could have resulted in an agreed text. He was optimistic that progress could be made towards improving the Council's organization of work in the atmosphere of the proposed working group.

83. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) said that he was gratified at the sympathetic response to his delegation's proposal to set up a working group. During

the debate which had just taken place a number of interesting ideas had been put forward which deserved serious consideration. In particular, he agreed with the representatives of Brazil and Tunisia that the Council's first priority should be to set its agenda right. He felt, however, that further consideration of those ideas might well be postponed until the next meeting since, if drastic changes were to be made in the agenda, delegations would need to have time to reflect carefully on which items should be retained and which dispensed with.

84. The PRESIDENT suggested that the meeting should be adjourned so as to give delegations time to consult each other concerning the many important proposals made during the meeting.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.