

U.S. GOVERNMENT  
PRINTING OFFICE  
1971  
UNDACT-111



**ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL**  
**OFFICIAL RECORDS**

**FIFTIETH SESSION**

**Volume II**

**26 April-21 May 1971**

**UNITED NATIONS**  
**New York, 1973**

## INTRODUCTORY NOTE

The *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council* consist of the summary records of the plenary meetings (incorporating corrections requested by delegations and any necessary editorial modifications), annexes and supplements.

A check list of documents pertaining to the agenda of the session appears on page xvii.

\*

\* \*

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

---

## ABBREVIATIONS

ACAST	Advisory Committee for the Application of Science and Technology to Development
ACC	Administrative Committee on Co-ordination
CPC	Committee on Programme and Co-ordination
ECA	Economic Commission for Africa
ECAFE	Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East
ECE	Economic Commission for Europe
ECLA	Economic Commission for Latin America
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
IAEA	International Atomic Energy Agency
IBRD	International Bank for Reconstruction and Development
ICAO	International Civil Aviation Organization
ICC	International Computing Centre
ILO	International Labour Organisation
IMCO	Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization
IMF	International Monetary Fund
MPS	System of Material Product Balances
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
SNA	System of National Accounts
TCM	International Combined Transport of Goods
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNESOB	United Nations Economic and Social Office at Beirut
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
UNITAR	United Nations Institute for Training and Research
UNRWA	United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East
WFP	World Food Programme
WHO	World Health Organization
WIPO	World Intellectual Property Organization
WMO	World Meteorological Organization



# CONTENTS

	Page		Page
List of delegations .....	vii	1742nd meeting	
Agenda .....	xvi	<i>Wednesday, 28 April 1971, at 10.55 a.m.</i>	
Check list of documents .....	xvii	AGENDA ITEM 19:	
1738th meeting		Accession of the Republic of Korea to the Con-	15
<i>Monday, 26 April 1971, at 11 a.m.</i>		vention on Road Traffic of 19 September 1949	
STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT .....	1	1743rd meeting	
TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF MR. FRANCOIS		<i>Wednesday, 28 April 1971, at 3.20 p.m.</i>	
DUVALIER, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC		AGENDA ITEM 16:	
OF HAITI .....	1	Measures to improve the organization of the work	
AGENDA ITEM 1:		of the Council ( <i>continued</i> ) .....	17
Adoption of the agenda .....	1	1744th meeting	
ORGANIZATION OF WORK .....	2	<i>Friday, 30 April 1971, at 11.15 a.m.</i>	
AGENDA ITEM 16:		AGENDA ITEM 7:	
Measures to improve the organization of the work		Report of the Statistical Commission ( <i>continued</i> )	23
of the Council .....	3	REQUEST FOR INCLUSION OF A SUPPLE-	
1739th meeting		MENTARY ITEM IN THE AGENDA .....	23
<i>Monday, 26 April 1971, at 3.20 p.m.</i>		1745th meeting	
AGENDA ITEM 16:		<i>Friday, 30 April 1971, at 3.10 p.m.</i>	
Measures to improve the organization of the work		AGENDA ITEM 16:	
of the Council ( <i>continued</i> ) .....	5	Measures to improve the organization of the work	
1740th meeting		of the Council ( <i>continued</i> ) .....	25
<i>Tuesday, 27 April 1971, at 10.50 a.m.</i>		1746th meeting	
AGENDA ITEM 7:		<i>Monday, 3 May 1971, at 11 a.m.</i>	
Report of the Statistical Commission .....	9	AGENDA ITEM 7:	
1741st meeting		Report of the Statistical Commission ( <i>continued</i> )	29
<i>Tuesday, 27 April 1971, at 3.20 p.m.</i>		1747th meeting	
AGENDA ITEM 7:		<i>Monday, 3 May 1971, at 3.00 p.m.</i>	
Report of the Statistical Commission ( <i>continued</i> )	11	AGENDA ITEM 20:	
AGENDA ITEM 9:		Emergency assistance to Palestine refugees .....	33
Transport development:		AGENDA ITEM 9:	
(a) Establishment of a United Nations transport		Transport development ( <i>continued</i> ):	
centre .....	12	(b) Preparation for the United Nations/IMCO	
		Conference on International Container Traffic .	35

	Page
AGENDA ITEM 7:	
Report of the Statistical Commission ( <i>concluded</i> )	38
<b>1748th meeting</b>	
<i>Tuesday, 4 May 1971, at 10.40 a.m.</i>	
AGENDA ITEM 9:	
Transport development ( <i>continued</i> ):	
(b) Preparation for the United Nations/IMCO Conference on International Container Traffic ( <i>continued</i> )	39
AGENDA ITEM 10:	
Public administration and development	39
<b>1749th meeting</b>	
<i>Tuesday, 4 May 1971, at 3.20 p.m.</i>	
AGENDA ITEM 10:	
Public administration and development ( <i>continued</i> )	45
AGENDA ITEM 9:	
Transport development ( <i>continued</i> ):	
(b) Preparation for the United Nations/IMCO Conference on International Container Traffic ( <i>continued</i> )	48
<b>1750th meeting</b>	
<i>Wednesday, 5 May 1971, at 10.50 a.m.</i>	
AGENDA ITEM 10:	
Public administration and development ( <i>continued</i> )	51
OTHER MATTERS	52
<b>1751st meeting</b>	
<i>Wednesday, 5 May 1971, at 3.15 p.m.</i>	
AGENDA ITEM 9:	
Transport development ( <i>continued</i> ):	
(b) Preparation for the United Nations/IMCO Conference on International Container Traffic ( <i>continued</i> )	55
(a) Establishment of a United Nations transport centre ( <i>continued</i> )	58
<b>1752nd meeting</b>	
<i>Thursday, 6 May 1971, at 10.50 a.m.</i>	
AGENDA ITEM 9:	
Transport development ( <i>continued</i> ):	
(a) Establishment of a United Nations transport centre ( <i>continued</i> )	61
AGENDA ITEM 11:	
Science and technology:	
(a) Future institutional arrangements for science and technology	63

<b>1753rd meeting</b>	
<i>Thursday, 6 May 1971, at 3.10 p.m.</i>	
AGENDA ITEM 11:	
Science and technology ( <i>continued</i> ):	
(a) Future institutional arrangements for science and technology ( <i>continued</i> );	
(b) Application of computer technology to development	65
AGENDA ITEM 10:	
Public administration and development ( <i>concluded</i> )	68
<b>1754th meeting</b>	
<i>Friday, 7 May 1971, at 10.50 a.m.</i>	
AGENDA ITEM 11:	
Science and technology ( <i>continued</i> ):	
(a) Future institutional arrangements for science and technology ( <i>continued</i> )	71
<b>1755th meeting</b>	
<i>Friday, 7 May 1971, at 3.10 p.m.</i>	
AGENDA ITEM 11:	
Science and technology ( <i>continued</i> ):	
(b) Application of computer technology to development ( <i>continued</i> )	77
AGENDA ITEM 9:	
Transport development ( <i>continued</i> ):	
(b) Preparation for the United Nations/IMCO Conference on International Container Traffic ( <i>continued</i> )	81
<b>1756th meeting</b>	
<i>Monday, 10 May 1971, at 10.20 a.m.</i>	
AGENDA ITEM 11:	
Science and technology ( <i>continued</i> ):	
(a) Future institutional arrangements for science and technology ( <i>continued</i> )	85
(b) Application of computer technology to development ( <i>continued</i> )	88
AGENDA ITEM 3:	
Outflow of trained personnel from developing to developed countries	89
<b>1757th meeting</b>	
<i>Monday, 10 May 1971, at 3.10 p.m.</i>	
AGENDA ITEM 9:	
Transport development ( <i>continued</i> ):	
(a) Establishment of a United Nations transport centre ( <i>continued</i> );	
(b) Preparation for a United Nations/IMCO Conference on International Container Traffic ( <i>continued</i> )	93



	Page		Page
<b>1758th meeting</b>		<b>1763rd meeting</b>	
<i>Tuesday, 11 May 1971, at 3.10 p.m.</i>		<i>Friday, 14 May 1971, at 10.45 a.m.</i>	
AGENDA ITEM 8:		AGENDA ITEM 3:	
Natural resources:		Outflow of trained personnel from developing to	
(a) Report of the Committee on Natural Resources	97	developed countries ( <i>continued</i> )	125
(b) International co-operation in cartography	101	AGENDA ITEM 11:	
ORGANIZATION OF WORK	101	Science and technology ( <i>continued</i> ):	
		(b) Application of computer technology to	
		development ( <i>concluded</i> )	127
<b>1759th meeting</b>		<b>1764th meeting</b>	
<i>Wednesday, 12 May 1971, at 10.45 a.m.</i>		<i>Monday, 17 May 1971, at 10.50 a.m.</i>	
AGENDA ITEM 3:		AGENDA ITEM 8:	
Outflow of trained personnel from developing to		Natural resources ( <i>continued</i> ):	
developed countries ( <i>continued</i> )	103	(a) Report of the Committee on Natural Resources	
AGENDA ITEM 9:		( <i>continued</i> )	129
Transport development ( <i>continued</i> ):		<b>1765th meeting</b>	
(a) Establishment of a United Nations transport		<i>Monday, 17 May 1971, at 3.20 p.m.</i>	
centre ( <i>continued</i> )	107	AGENDA ITEM 16:	
<b>1760th meeting</b>		Measures to improve the organization of the work	
<i>Wednesday, 12 May 1971, at 3.15 p.m.</i>		of the Council ( <i>continued</i> )	135
AGENDA ITEM 9:		AGENDA ITEM 3:	
Transport development ( <i>concluded</i> ):		Outflow of trained personnel from developing to	
(a) Establishment of a United Nations transport		developed countries ( <i>continued</i> )	138
centre ( <i>concluded</i> )	109	<b>1766th meeting</b>	
(b) Preparation for the United Nations/IMCO		<i>Tuesday, 18 May 1971, at 10.45 a.m.</i>	
Conference on International Container Traffic		AGENDA ITEM 8:	
( <i>concluded</i> )	110	Natural resources ( <i>concluded</i> ):	
AGENDA ITEM 3:		(a) Report of the Committee on Natural Resources	
Outflow of trained personnel from developing to		( <i>concluded</i> )	141
developed countries ( <i>continued</i> )	111	AGENDA ITEM 11:	
ORGANIZATION OF WORK	112	Science and technology ( <i>continued</i> ):	
<b>1761st meeting</b>		(a) Future institutional arrangements for science	
<i>Thursday, 13 May 1971, at 10.50 a.m.</i>		and technology ( <i>continued</i> )	144
AGENDA ITEM 16:		<b>1767th meeting</b>	
Measures to improve the organization of the work		<i>Tuesday, 18 May 1971, at 3.20 p.m.</i>	
of the Council ( <i>continued</i> )	115	AGENDA ITEM 11:	
<b>1762nd meeting</b>		Science and technology ( <i>continued</i> ):	
<i>Thursday, 13 May 1971, at 3.10 p.m.</i>		(a) Future institutional arrangements for science	
AGENDA ITEM 8:		and technology ( <i>continued</i> )	147
Natural resources ( <i>continued</i> ):		AGENDA ITEM 14:	
(a) Report of the Committee on Natural Resources		Report of the Committee for Programme and	
( <i>continued</i> )	119	Co-ordination	150
(b) International co-operation in cartography			
( <i>concluded</i> )	122		

	<i>Page</i>		<i>Page</i>
AGENDA ITEM 3:		AGENDA ITEM 6:	
Outflow of trained personnel from developing to developed countries ( <i>continued</i> ) . . . . .	150	Narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances:	
<b>1768th meeting</b>		(a) United Nations Conference for the Adoption of a Protocol on Psychotropic Substances;	
<i>Wednesday, 19 May 1971, at 3.10 p.m.</i>		(b) Report of the International Narcotics Control Board;	
AGENDA ITEM 3:		(c) Proposal to convene a plenipotentiary con- ference to amend the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961	
Outflow of trained personnel from developing to developed countries ( <i>concluded</i> ) . . . . .	151	Report of the Social Committee ( <i>concluded</i> ) . . .	162
AGENDA ITEM 16:		ORGANIZATION OF WORK . . . . .	162
Measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council ( <i>continued</i> ) . . . . .	151		
<b>1769th meeting</b>		<b>1771st meeting</b>	
<i>Thursday, 20 May 1971, at 10.50 a.m.</i>		<i>Friday, 21 May 1971, at 10.10 a.m.</i>	
AGENDA ITEM 4:		AGENDA ITEM 17:	
Capital punishment		Elections ( <i>continued</i> ) . . . . .	163
Report of the Social Committee . . . . .	157	AGENDA ITEM 2:	
AGENDA ITEM 13:		Social development	
Development of information media		Report of the Social Committee . . . . .	163
Report of the Social Committee . . . . .	157	AGENDA ITEM 5:	
AGENDA ITEM 6:		Human rights:	
Narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances:		(a) Report of the Commission on Human Rights;	
(a) United Nations Conference for the Adoption of a Protocol on Psychotropic Substances;		(b) Allegations regarding infringements of trade union rights	
(b) Report of the International Narcotics Control Board;		Report of the Social Committee . . . . .	164
(c) Proposal to convene a plenipotentiary conference to amend the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961			
Report of the Social Committee . . . . .	157	<b>1772nd (closing) meeting</b>	
AGENDA ITEM 12:		<i>Friday, 21 May 1971, at 4.15 p.m.</i>	
Relations with intergovernmental organizations:		AGENDA ITEM 17:	
(a) Relations with non-United Nations inter- governmental organizations in the economic and social field;		Elections ( <i>concluded</i> ) . . . . .	167
(b) Co-operation and relations between the United Nations and the World Tourism Organization		AGENDA ITEM 18:	
Report of the Social Committee . . . . .	158	Consideration of the provisional agenda and list of documents for the fifty-first session . . . . .	167
AGENDA ITEM 15:		AGENDA ITEM 16:	
Non-governmental organizations		Measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council ( <i>concluded</i> ) . . . . .	168
Report of the Social Committee . . . . .	158	AGENDA ITEM 11:	
<b>1770th meeting</b>		Science and technology ( <i>concluded</i> ):	
<i>Thursday, 20 May 1971, at 3.35 p.m.</i>		(a) Future institutional arrangements for science and technology ( <i>concluded</i> ) . . . . .	170
AGENDA ITEM 17:		CLOSURE OF THE SESSION . . . . .	170
Elections . . . . .	161		

## LIST OF DELEGATIONS

### Members of the Council

#### BRAZIL

##### *Representative*

H.E. Mr. João Augusto de Araújo Castro, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, Permanent Representative to the United Nations

##### *Alternates*

Mr. Celso Antônio de Souza e Silva, Minister Plenipotentiary, Deputy Permanent Representative to the United Nations

Mr. Bernardo de Azevedo Brito, First Secretary of Embassy, Permanent Mission

Miss Laura Maria Malcher de Macedo, First Secretary of Embassy, Permanent Mission

Mr. Ronaldo Mota Sardenberg, Second Secretary of Embassy, Permanent Mission

Mr. José Arthur Denot Medeiros, Second Secretary of Embassy, Permanent Mission

Mr. Claudio Cesar de Avellar, Second Secretary of Embassy, Permanent Mission

#### CEYLON

##### *Representative*

H.E. Mr. H. S. Amerasinghe, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, Permanent Representative to the United Nations

##### *Alternates*

Mr. Y. Yogasundram, Counsellor, Deputy Permanent Representative to the United Nations

Mr. K. K. Breckenridge, First Secretary, Permanent Mission

Mr. D. S. de Silva, Third Secretary, Permanent Mission

#### CONGO (DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF)

##### *Représentant*

S.E. M. T. Idzumbuir, ambassadeur extraordinaire et plénipotentiaire, représentant permanent auprès de l'Organisation des Nations Unies

##### *Suppléants*

M. Bernard Louya, premier secrétaire, mission permanente

Mlle Philomène Makolo, premier secrétaire, mission permanente

M. Alfred Bomele, deuxième secrétaire, mission permanente

#### FRANCE

##### *Représentant*

M. Georges Gorse, député

##### *Suppléant*

M. Maurice Viaud, ministre conseiller, mission permanente

##### *Conseillers*

M. Jean-Dominique Paolini, conseiller d'ambassade, mission permanente

M. Louis Gros, administrateur civil, chargé de mission auprès du Directeur de la Coopération au Ministère de l'éducation nationale

M. Michel Le Diraison, conseiller des affaires étrangères

M. Bernard Prague, attaché commercial, mission permanente

Mlle Nicole Courson, attaché, mission permanente

#### GHANA

##### *Representative*

H.E. Mr. R. M. Akwei, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, Permanent Representative to the United Nations

##### *Alternates*

Mr. G. C. N. Cudjoe, Minister Counsellor, Deputy Permanent Representative to the United Nations

Mr. J. L. M. Amissah, Assistant Director, Economic Relations Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

##### *Advisers*

Mr. Emmanuel Sam, Counsellor, Permanent Mission

Mr. E. K. Sekyiamah, First Secretary, Permanent Mission

#### GREECE

##### *Representative*

H.E. Mr. Dimitri S. Bitsios, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, Permanent Representative to the United Nations

##### *Alternates*

H.E. Mr. Costa P. Caranicas, Ambassador, Economic Affairs

H.E. Mr. John Apostolides, Minister Plenipotentiary

Mr. Stephane G. Stathatos, Counsellor of Embassy, Deputy Permanent Representative to the United Nations

Mrs. Erica-Irene A. Daes, Barrister of the Supreme Court



*Advisers*

Mr. Alexander P. Philon, Second Secretary of Embassy,  
Permanent Mission  
Mr. Alcibiades Carokis, Second Secretary of Embassy,  
Permanent Mission

## HAITI

*Représentant*

S.E. M. Marcel Charles Antoine, ambassadeur extra-  
ordinaire et plénipotentiaire, représentant permanent  
auprès de l'Organisation des Nations Unies

*Suppléants*

S.E. M. Raoul Siclait, ambassadeur, représentant per-  
manent adjoint auprès de l'Organisation des Nations  
Unies  
M. Curdy B. Mehu, ministre conseiller, mission per-  
manente  
M. Alexandre Verret, premier secrétaire, mission perma-  
nente  
M. Jean-Claude Antoine, attaché, mission permanente

## HUNGARY

*Representative*

H.E. Mr. Károly Szarka, Ambassador Extraordinary and  
Plenipotentiary Permanent Representative to the  
United Nations

*Alternates*

H.E. Mr. János Pataki, Ambassador Extraordinary and  
Plenipotentiary, Deputy Head of the Department of  
International Organizations, Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
Mr. József Tardos, Counsellor, Deputy Permanent Repre-  
sentative to the United Nations  
Mr. Gyula Budai, First Secretary, Permanent Mission

*Advisers*

Mr. István Halasz, First Secretary, Ministry of Foreign  
Affairs  
Mr. Géza Selmei, First Secretary, Permanent Mission  
Mr. István Nathon, Third Secretary, Permanent Mission  
(Secretary of the Delegation)

## INDONESIA

*Representative*

H.E. Mr. J. B. P. Maramis, Ambassador, Deputy Perma-  
nent Representative to the United Nations

*Alternates*

Mr. Toman Hutagalung, Counsellor, Permanent Mission  
Mr. Abdoelkobir Sasradipura, Counsellor, Permanent  
Mission

*Advisers*

Mr. Ngurah K. Sumantera, Third Secretary, Permanent  
Mission  
Miss Kustijah Prodjolalito, Third Secretary, Permanent  
Mission

## ITALY

*Representative\**

H.E. Mr. Piero Vinci, Ambassador Extraordinary and  
Plenipotentiary, Permanent Representative to the  
United Nations

*Alternates*

Mr. Giovanni Migliulo, Minister Counsellor, Permanent  
Mission  
Miss Maria A. Cao-Pinna, Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
Mr. Alessandro Quaroni, Counsellor, Permanent Mission  
Mr. Ramiro Ruggiero, Counsellor, Permanent Mission  
Mr. Joseph Nitti, Counsellor, Permanent Mission  
Mr. Agostino Mathis, First Secretary, Permanent Mission  
Mr. Giovanni Scolamiero, Adviser for Economic and  
Social Affairs, Permanent Mission

## JAMAICA

*Representative*

H.E. Mr. Keith Johnson, Ambassador Extraordinary and  
Plenipotentiary, Permanent Representative to the  
United Nations

*Alternates*

Mr. Probyn Marsh, Counsellor, Deputy Permanent Repre-  
sentative to the United Nations  
Mr. H. N. Bonnick, Counsellor, Permanent Mission  
Mr. H. Dale Anderson, First Secretary, Permanent Mission  
Mr. Dennis I. Francis, Second Secretary, Permanent  
Mission

## KENYA

*Representative*

H.E. Mr. Joseph Odera-Jowi, Ambassador Extraordinary  
and Plenipotentiary, Permanent Representative to the  
United Nations

*Alternates*

Mr. Japhet Gideon Kiti, Counsellor, Permanent Mission  
Mr. Peter Joseph Ndung'u, First Secretary, Permanent  
Mission  
Mr. Donald Wacieni Kaniaru, Second Secretary, Perma-  
nent Mission

## LEBANON

*Representative*

H.E. Mr. Edouard Ghorra, Ambassador Extraordinary and  
Plenipotentiary, Permanent Representative to the  
United Nations

*Alternates*

Mr. Yahya Mahmassani, Second Secretary, Permanent  
Mission  
Mr. Samir Mobarak, Attaché of Embassy, Permanent  
Mission

\* At the organizational meetings of the fiftieth session, Mr. Mario  
Franzi served as representative.

## MADAGASCAR

*Représentant*

S.E. M. Blaise, Rabetafika, ambassadeur extraordinaire et plénipotentiaire, représentant permanent auprès de l'Organisation des Nations Unies

*Suppléant*

M. Moïse Rakotosihanaka, premier secrétaire d'ambassade, mission permanente

*Conseillers*

M. Daniel Randrianarison, attaché, mission permanente  
M. Jean-de-Dieu Antoni, attaché, mission permanente

## MALAYSIA

*Representative*

H.E. Mr. H. M. A. Zakaria, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, Permanent Representative to the United Nations

*Alternates*

Mr. Yusof Ariff, Deputy Permanent Representative to the United Nations  
Mr. Ismail Budin, Counsellor, Permanent Mission  
Mr. Mohd. Hashim bin Taib, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission

## NEW ZEALAND

*Representative*

H.E. Mr. J. V. Scott, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, Permanent Representative to the United Nations

*Alternates*

Mr. F. A. Small, Deputy Permanent Representative to the United Nations  
Mr. R. J. Gates, First Secretary, Permanent Mission  
Miss P. J. Williams, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission  
Mr. P. W. Bennet, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission

## NIGER

*Représentant*

S.E. M. George Condat, ambassadeur extraordinaire et plénipotentiaire, représentant permanent auprès de l'Organisation des Nations Unies

*Suppléants*

S.E. M. Jean Poisson, ambassadeur à Bruxelles  
M. Soumana Ouseini, premier secrétaire, mission permanente  
M. Mariko Keletigui, Ministère de l'économie rurale

*Conseiller*

M. Oumarou Youssoufou, premier secrétaire, ambassade à Washington

## NORWAY

*Representative\**

H.E. Mr. Edvard Hambro, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, Permanent Representative to the United Nations

*Alternates*

Mr. Knut Hedemann, Director-General, Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
Mr. Jan Arvesen, Counsellor of Embassy, Permanent Mission

*Advisers*

Mr. Per Tresselt, First Secretary of Embassy, Permanent Mission  
Mr. Ola Dørum, First Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
Mr. Sverre Refshal, First Secretary of Embassy, Permanent Mission  
Mr. Bjørnar Utheim, First Secretary of Embassy, Permanent Mission

*Special Advisers*

Mr. Mogens Knud Isaksen, Counsellor of Embassy, Permanent Mission of Denmark  
Mr. Uggi Engel, Counsellor of Embassy, Permanent Mission of Denmark  
Mr. Gert Øvervad, Second Secretary of Embassy, Permanent Mission of Denmark  
Mr. Jaako Iloniemi, Counsellor of Embassy, Permanent Mission of Finland  
Mr. Arto Tanner, First Secretary of Embassy, Permanent Mission of Finland  
Mr. Garth Castrén, Second Secretary of Embassy, Permanent Mission of Finland  
Mr. Hannes Jónsson, Counsellor of Embassy, Deputy Permanent Representative of Iceland to the United Nations  
Mr. Olof Martin Skoglund, First Secretary of Embassy, Permanent Mission of Sweden  
Mrs. Madeleine Strøje-Wilkens, Second Secretary of Embassy, Permanent Mission of Sweden

## PAKISTAN

*Representative*

H.E. Mr. Agha Shahi, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, Permanent Representative to the United Nations

*Alternate*

Mr. Sayid A. Karim, Deputy Permanent Representative to the United Nations

*Advisers*

Mr. A. R. Bashir, Economic Minister, Embassy, Washington, D.C.  
Mr. Hayat Mehdi, Counsellor, Permanent Mission  
Mr. Munir Akram, Third Secretary, Permanent Mission  
Mr. Mohammad Farooq, Third Secretary, Permanent Mission

\* At the organizational meetings of the fiftieth session, Mr. Knut Hedemann served as representative.



## PERU

*Representante*

S.E. Sr. Jorge Pablo Fernandini, Embajador, Asesor Económico y Director de la División de Organismos Internacionales del Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores

*Suplentes*

Sr. Oswaldo de Rivero, Primer Secretario, Misión Permanente  
Sr. Julián Torres, Segundo Secretario, Misión Permanente  
Sr. Cord Dammert, Tercer Secretario, Misión Permanente

## SUDAN

*Representative\**

H.E. Mr. Mansour Khalid, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, Permanent Representative to the United Nations

*Alternates*

Mr. Kamal Mustafa, Minister Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, Deputy Permanent Representative to the United Nations  
Mr. Salih Mohamed Osman, First Secretary, Permanent Mission  
Mr. Omer El Sheikh, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission

## TUNISIA

*Représentant*

H.E. M. Rachid Driss, ambassadeur extraordinaire et plénipotentiaire, représentant permanent auprès de l'Organisation des Nations Unies

*Suppléants*

M. Ali Chtioui, conseiller d'ambassade, mission permanente  
M. Mohamed L. Fayache, premier secrétaire d'ambassade, mission permanente  
M. Mohamed Fourati, premier secrétaire d'ambassade, mission permanente  
M. Hichem Ayoub, deuxième secrétaire d'ambassade, mission permanente  
M. Kamel Belkhiria, deuxième secrétaire d'ambassade, mission permanente

## UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

*Representative*

H.E. Mr. A. V. Zakharov, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, Deputy Permanent Representative to the United Nations

*Alternate*

Mr. N. K. Tarasov, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, Deputy Permanent Representative to the United Nations

\* At the organizational meetings of the fiftieth session, H.E. Mr. Fakhreddine Mohamed served as representative.

*Advisers*

Mr. G. P. Lisov, Senior Counsellor, Permanent Mission  
Mr. Y. M. Rybakov, Counsellor, Permanent Mission  
Mr. V. I. Kiryushin, Counsellor, Permanent Mission  
Mr. N. I. Yevdokeyev, Counsellor, Permanent Mission  
Mr. N. I. Filimonov, First Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
Mr. G. A. Smirnov, First Secretary, Permanent Mission

*Experts*

Mr. V. N. Fedorov, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission  
Mr. V. K. Romantsev, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission  
Mr. N. C. Tkatch, Expert, State Committee on Science and Technology, Council of Ministers

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN  
AND NORTHERN IRELAND*Representative\*\**

Mr. D. J. McCarthy, Minister, Economic and Social Affairs, Permanent Mission

*Alternates*

Mr. M. E. Allen, Minister, Economic and Social Affairs, Permanent Mission  
Mr. D. F. Milton, First Secretary, Permanent Mission  
Miss T. A. H. Solesby, First Secretary, Permanent Mission

*Advisers*

Miss S. Darling, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission  
Miss H. B. Reid, Third Secretary, Permanent Mission  
Mr. P. B. Hall, Third Secretary, Permanent Mission

## UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

*Representative\*\*\**

H.E. Mr. George Bush, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, Permanent Representative to the United Nations

*Alternates*

H.E. Mr. Seymour Maxwell Finger, Ambassador, Senior Adviser to the Permanent Representative  
Mr. Robert Wilson Kitchen, Jr., Counsellor, Economic and Social Affairs, Permanent Mission

*Special Advisers*

Mrs. Rita E. Hauser, Representative on the Commission on Human Rights, Permanent Mission  
Mrs. Jean Picker, Representative on the Commission for Social Development, Permanent Mission

*Advisers*

Mr. Robert E. Allen, Office of International Administration, Department of State  
Mr. Paxton T. Dunn, Adviser, Economic and Social Affairs, Permanent Mission  
Miss Betty C. Gough, Office for Multilateral Development Programmes, Department of State

\*\* At the organizational meetings of the fiftieth session, H.E. Sir Colin Crowe, Permanent Representative to the United Nations, served as representative.

\*\*\* At the organizational meetings of the fiftieth session, H.E. Mr. Glenn A. Olds served as representative.



Mr. John W. Koehring, Adviser, Economic and Social Affairs, Permanent Mission  
 Mr. Alphonse F. La Porta, Office for Multilateral Development Programmes, Department of State  
 Mr. Harry K. Lennon, Adviser, Economic and Social Affairs, Permanent Mission  
 Mrs. Johanna W. Martin, Office of International Administration, Department of State  
 Mr. James A. Rose, Family Health Care Institute, Bladensburg, Maryland  
 Mr. Elliott C. Rothenberg, Adviser, Economic and Social Affairs, Permanent Mission  
 Mr. Arthur M. Stillman, Adviser, Economic and Social Affairs, Permanent Mission  
 Mr. Ronald A. Webb, Office of Maritime Affairs, Bureau of Economic Affairs, Department of State

## URUGUAY

*Representante*

S.E. Sr. Augusto Legnani, Embajador Extraordinario y Plenipotenciario, Representante Permanente ante las Naciones Unidas

*Suplentes*

S.E. Sr. Carlos Giamb Bruno, Embajador, Director del Departamento de Organismos Internacionales del Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores  
 Sr. Alberto D. Fajardo, Consejero, Misión Permanente  
 Sra. Ana A. Fasanella de Gamou, Primer Secretario, Misión Permanente  
 Srta. Graziella Dubra, Agregado, Misión Permanente

## YUGOSLAVIA

*Representative*

H.E. Mr. Lazar Mojsov, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, Permanent Representative to the United Nations

*Alternate*

Mr. Ante Skataretiko, Counsellor, Permanent Mission

*Advisers*

Mr. Naste Čalovski, First Secretary, Permanent Mission  
 Mr. Stipan Orčić, Attaché, Permanent Mission

## Members of the United Nations represented by observers

## AUSTRALIA

Mr. L. L. Joseph, Counsellor, Permanent Mission  
 Mr. R. W. Butler, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission

## AUSTRIA

Mr. Wolfgang Wolte, Counsellor, Acting Permanent Representative to the United Nations  
 Mr. Gregor Woschnagg, Secretary of Legation, Permanent Mission  
 Mrs. Edda Weiss, Secretary of Legation, Permanent Mission

## BARBADOS

Mr. C. E. Marshall, First Secretary, Permanent Mission  
 Mr. E. G. ...ester, First Secretary, Permanent Mission  
 Miss A. O. Mellowes, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission

## BELGIUM

M. Daniel Massonet, ministre conseiller (pour les affaires économiques), mission permanente  
 M. Raymond Schrijvers, attaché d'ambassade (pour les questions économiques)  
 M. Paul Roux, conseiller d'ambassade (pour les questions sociales)

## BULGARIA

Mr. Stefan Todorov, First Secretary, Permanent Mission

## CANADA

M. D. C. Reece, ministre, représentant permanent adjoint auprès de l'Organisation des Nations Unies  
 M. C. O. Spencer, conseiller, mission permanente  
 Mlle Hélène Gendron, troisième secrétaire, mission permanente  
 Mme Gertrude Keough, commissaire aux droits de l'homme, Ministère du travail  
 M. J. C. Sherlock, directeur de la Division des droits de l'homme, Ministère du travail  
 M. Trevor M. Berry, secrétaire exécutif, Commission des droits de l'homme  
 M. Benoît Dufour, assistant greffier de l'Assemblée nationale de Québec

## CHILE

S.E. Sr. Humberto Díaz-Casanueva, Embajador Extraordinario y Plenipotenciario, Representante Permanente ante las Naciones Unidas  
 Sr. Uldaricio Figueroa, Primer Secretario, Misión Permanente

## CHINA

Mr. Sheldon S. D. Cheng, Adviser, Permanent Mission  
 Mr. Tseng Yen-san, Third Secretary, Permanent Mission

## COLOMBIA

Mr. Martín Pinzón, Ministro Consejero, Misión Permanente

## COSTA RICA

S.E. Sr. José Luis Molina, Embajador Extraordinario y Plenipotenciario, Representante Permanente ante las Naciones Unidas

## DENMARK

Mr. Mogens Knud Isaksen, Counsellor of Embassy, Permanent Mission  
Mr. Uggi Engel, Counsellor of Embassy, Permanent Mission  
Mr. Gert Øvervad, Secretary of Embassy, Permanent Mission

## ECUADOR

Sr. Horacio Sevilla-Borja, Representante Alterno, Misión Permanente  
Sr. Eduardo Fausto Cabezas, Segundo Secretario, Misión Permanente

## FINLAND

Mr. Jaako Iloniemi, Counsellor of Embassy, Permanent Mission  
Mr. Matti Kahiluoto, Counsellor of Embassy, Permanent Mission  
Mr. Arto Tanner, Secretary of Embassy, Permanent Mission  
Mr. Garth Castrén, Secretary of Embassy, Permanent Mission

## INDIA

H.E. Mr. S. Sen, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, Permanent Representative to the United Nations  
Mr. N. P. Jain, Minister, Deputy Permanent Representative to the United Nations  
Mr. A. S. Mani, First Secretary, Permanent Mission  
Mr. A. N. Abhyankar, First Secretary, Permanent Mission  
Mr. R. Gupta, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission  
Mr. R. N. Bose, Permanent Mission

## IRAQ

Mr. Adnan Raouf, Minister Plenipotentiary, Deputy Permanent Representative to the United Nations  
Mr. Wissam Al-Zahawie, Minister Plenipotentiary, Permanent Mission

## ISRAEL

Mr. Jacob Barmore, Minister Plenipotentiary, Permanent Mission  
Mr. Reuven Hillel, Counsellor, Permanent Mission

## JAPAN

H.E. Mr. Motoo Ogiso, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, Acting Permanent Representative to the United Nations  
Mr. Tadayuki Nonoyama, First Secretary, Permanent Mission  
Mr. Tadashi Ikeda, Deputy Head, Economic Affairs Division, United Nations Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
Mr. Yasuya Hamamoto, First Secretary, Permanent Mission

## JORDAN

Mr. Khalil I. Othman, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission

## LIBYA

Mr. Ramadan Usta Omar, First Secretary, Permanent Mission  
Mr. Ibrahim Suleiman, First Secretary, Permanent Mission

## MEXICO

Sr. Santiago Meyer Picón, Segundo Secretario, Misión Permanente

## NETHERLANDS

Mr. Charles Rutten, Minister Plenipotentiary, Permanent Mission  
Mr. Gerben Ringnald, First Secretary, Permanent Mission  
Mr. A. Peter van Walsum, First Secretary, Permanent Mission

## PHILIPPINES

Mr. Leandro I. Verceles, First Secretary, Permanent Mission

## POLAND

Mr. Leszek Kasprzyk, Minister Plenipotentiary, Deputy Permanent Representative to the United Nations  
Mr. Zbigniew Dabrowski, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission  
Mr. Edward Sabik, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission

## ROMANIA

S.E. M. Gheorghe Diaconescu, ambassadeur extraordinaire et plénipotentiaire, représentant permanent auprès de l'Organisation des Nations Unies  
M. Nitza Constantin, deuxième secrétaire, mission permanente

## SPAIN

Sr. Alvaro Fernández-Villaverde, Segundo Secretario de Embajada, Misión Permanente

## TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO

Mr. Babooram Rambissoon, First Secretary, Permanent Mission

Mrs. Annette Auguste, First Secretary, Permanent Mission

## TURKEY

H.E. Mr. Nuri Eren, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, Deputy Permanent Representative to the United Nations

Mr. Behiç Hazar, Counsellor, Permanent Mission

Mr. Erkut Onart, First Secretary, Permanent Mission

Mr. Sevinç Dalyanoğlu, First Secretary, Permanent Mission

## UKRAINIAN SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLIC

Mr. M. Z. Getmanets, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, Deputy Permanent Representative to the United Nations

Mr. A. K. Yeremenko, First Secretary, Permanent Mission

Mr. A. M. Ovsyuk, Attaché, Permanent Mission

## UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Mr. Mokhless M. Gobba, Counsellor, Permanent Mission

Mr. Amre M. Moussa, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission

Mr. Ali M. Sadek, Third Secretary, Permanent Mission

## VENEZUELA

Sr. Pedro Emilio Coll, Primer Secretario, Misión Permanente

Sr. Eduardo Soto, Segundo Secretario, Misión Permanente

Sr. Héctor Griffin, Tercer Secretario, Misión Permanente

## Specialized agencies

## INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANISATION

Mr. C. M. von Stedingk, Director, Liaison Office with the United Nations, New York

Mr. M. Teferra, Deputy Director, Liaison Office with the United Nations, New York

Mr. W. J. Knight, Liaison Office with the United Nations, New York

Mr. J. Mateos Cicero, Liaison Office with the United Nations, New York

Mr. V. Chivers, Liaison Office with the United Nations, New York

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION  
OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. Donald W. Woodward, Director, Liaison Office with the United Nations, New York

Mr. Morris A. Greene, Assistant Director, Liaison Office with the United Nations, New York

Mr. M. Garvey Laurent, Liaison Officer, Liaison Office with the United Nations, New York

Mr. Alain Vidal-Naquet, Liaison Officer, Liaison Office with the United Nations, New York

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC  
AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

Mr. Alfonso de Silva, Director, Bureau of Relations with the United Nations, New York

Mr. Julian Behrstock, Director, Office of Free Flow of Information and International Exchanges

Miss Lorna McPhee, Deputy Director, Bureau of Relations with the United Nations, New York

Mr. André Varchaver, Deputy Director, Bureau of Relations with the United Nations, New York

Mr. Victor Nikolsky, Senior Liaison Officer, Bureau of Relations with the United Nations, New York

## WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

Dr. R. L. Coigney, Director, Liaison Office with the United Nations, New York

Dr. R. M. Malan, Medical Liaison Officer

Mrs. S. Meagher, Liaison Officer

Mrs. Vera Kalm, Liaison Officer

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION  
AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Ernesto Franco-Holguín,\* Special Representative for the United Nations Organizations

## INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

Mr. Gordon Williams, Special Representative to the United Nations

## INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION

Mr. G. Gamacchio, External Relations Officer

\* At the organizational meetings of the fiftieth session, Mr. Federico Consolo served as representative.



## WORLD METEOROLOGICAL ORGANIZATION

Mr. L. Harmantas  
Mr. N. Johnson

\* \* \*

## INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY

Mr. Lev Issaev, Representative of the Director-General to  
the United Nations  
Mr. Robert Najjar, Deputy Director, Liaison Office

## Other intergovernmental organizations represented by observers

## WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION

Mr. Harben, Counsellor

## Non-governmental organizations

## CATEGORY I

*International Chamber of Commerce*

Mrs. Simone Beetham

*International Confederation of Free Trade Unions*

Miss Beatrice von Roemer

*International Co-operative Alliance*

Mr. Leslie Woodcock

*International Council of Women*

Mrs. Mary Craig Schuller  
Mrs. Louise Mumm  
Mrs. Alice DeWitt Stetten

*International Union of Local Authorities*

Mr. Charles S. Ascher

*World Federation of Trade Unions*

Mr. Brian A. Barton

## CATEGORY II

*Bahá'í International Community*

Mr. Victor de Araujo  
Mrs. Annamarie Honnold

*Caritas Internationalis*

Dr. Louis Longarzo

*Eastern Regional Organization for Public Administration*

Mr. Charles S. Ascher

*Inter-American Planning Society*

Mr. Charles S. Ascher

*International Catholic Child Bureau*

Miss Margaret M. Bedard

*International Committee for the Red Cross*

Mr. A. Dominique Micheli  
Mr. Louis Jaquinet

*International Council on Jewish Social  
and Welfare Services*

Mr. Eugene Hevesi

*International Federation for Housing and Planning*

Mr. Charles S. Ascher

*International Information Centre for Local Credit*

Mr. Charles S. Ascher

*International Institute of Administrative Sciences*

Mr. Charles S. Ascher

*International Federation of Business  
and Professional Women*

Mrs. Esther W. Hymer

*International Movement for Fraternal Union  
among Races and Peoples*

Miss Eileen Schaeffler  
Mrs. Joy Garland

*International Organization of Supreme Audit Institutions*

Mr. Charles S. Ascher

*Pan-Pacific and South-East Asia Women's Association*

Mrs. Jetta Gordon

*Woman's Christian Temperance Union*

Mrs. Philip S. Reed

*World Alliance of Young Men's Christian Associations*

Mr. J. Edward Sproul

*World Union of Catholic Women's Organizations*

Miss Catherine Schaefer

Miss Jean Gartlan

Miss Alba Zizzamia

*World Young Women's Christian Association*

Mrs. Margaret Forsyth

*ROSTER**International Hotel Association*

Mr. Pierre M. Rhonheimer

**AGENDA FOR THE MEETINGS OF THE FIFTIETH SESSION  
HELD FROM 26 APRIL to 21 MAY 1971**

adopted by the Council at its 1738th meeting on 26 April 1971

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. Social development.
3. Outflow of trained personnel from developing to developed countries.
4. Capital punishment.
5. Human rights:
  - (a) Report of the Commission on Human Rights;
  - (b) Allegations regarding infringements of trade union rights.
6. Narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances:
  - (a) United Nations Conference for the Adoption of a Protocol on Psychotropic Substances;
  - (b) Report of the International Narcotics Control Board;
  - (c) Proposal to convene a plenipotentiary conference to amend the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961.
7. Report of the Statistical Commission.
8. Natural resources:
  - (a) Report of the Committee on Natural Resources;
  - (b) International co-operation in cartography.
9. Transport development:
  - (a) Establishment of a United Nations transport centre;
  - (b) Preparation for the United Nations/IMCO Conference on International Container Traffic.
10. Public administration and development.
11. Science and technology:
  - (a) Future institutional arrangements for science and technology;
  - (b) Application of computer technology to development.
12. Relations with intergovernmental organizations:
  - (a) Relations with non-United Nations intergovernmental organizations in the economic and social field;
  - (b) Co-operation and relations between the United Nations and the World Tourism Organization.
13. Development of information media.
14. Report of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination.
15. Non-governmental organizations.
16. Measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council.
17. Elections.
18. Consideration of the provisional agenda and list of documents for the fifty-first session.
19. Accession of the Republic of Korea to the Convention on Road Traffic of 19 September 1949.
20. Emergency assistance to Palestine refugees.\*

---

\* At its 1744th meeting, on 30 April 1971, the Council decided to include this additional item on its agenda.

## CHECK LIST OF DOCUMENTS

*Note.* Listed below are the documents pertaining to the fiftieth session of the Council. The relevant agenda item is given for each document. An asterisk after the agenda item indicates that the document is published in the corresponding fascicle of the *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Fiftieth Session, Annexes*.

### Organizational meetings held from 11 to 13 January 1971

<i>Document No.</i>	<i>Title or description</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Observations and references</i>
E/4934 and Add.1-3	Confirmation of members of the functional Commissions of the Council: note by the Secretary-General	4	For the list of members, see <i>Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Fiftieth Session, Supplement No. 1</i> , pp. 29 and 30
E/4937	Provisional agenda for the organizational meetings of the fiftieth session of the Council: note by the Secretary-General	2	Mimeographed. For the agenda, see <i>Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Fiftieth Session</i> , vol. I, p. iv
E/L.1359	Election of seven members to the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination: note by the Secretary-General	3	For the list of members, see <i>Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Fiftieth Session, Supplement No. 1</i> , p. 28
E/L.1365	Election of four members of the United Nations/FAO Intergovernmental Committee of the World Food Programme: note by the Secretary-General	3	<i>Ibid.</i> , p. 28
E/L.1366 and Add.1	Note by the Secretary-General	6	Mimeographed
E/L.1367 and Corr.1-2	Work of the Council in 1971: draft programme prepared by the Secretary-General	7	Ditto
E/L.1368	Documentation for the fiftieth session: note by the Secretary-General	7	Ditto
E/L.1369	Note by the President of the Council dated 31 December 1970	5	Ditto
E/L.1370	Organization of the work of the fiftieth session: note by the Secretary-General	7	Ditto

### Meetings held from 26 April to 21 May 1971

E/4798	Report of the Executive Director of the United Nations Institute for Training and Research	3	Mimeographed
E/4800	<i>The application of computer technology for development</i>	11 (a)	United Nations publication, Sales No.: E.71.II.A.1
E/4800 (Summary)	Summary of the report on the application of computer technology for development	11 (a)	Final offset
E/4820 and Corr.1, E/4820/Add.1 and Corr.1	Report of the Secretary-General	3	Mimeographed
E/4820 (Summary)	Summary of the report of the Secretary-General	3	Ditto
E/4861 and Corr.1	Statements proposing arrangements for implementing General Assembly resolution 2529 (XXIV) concerning the conversion of the International Union of Official Travel Organizations into an organization of an intergovernmental character: report of the Secretary-General	12	Final offset
E/4938	Report of the Statistical Commission on its sixteenth session (5-15 October 1970)	7	<i>Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Fiftieth Session, Supplement No. 2</i>

<i>Document No.</i>	<i>Title or description</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Observations and references</i>
E/4943	Sixth United Nations Regional Cartographic Conference for Asia and the Far East: report of the Secretary-General	8 (b)	Mimeographed
E/4943/Add.1	Administrative and financial implications of the proposals contained in paragraphs 11 (e) and 22 (a) of document E/4943: note by the Secretary-General	8 (b)	Ditto
E/4944 and Add.1	Provisional agenda for the fiftieth session: note by the Secretary-General	1	Mimeographed. For the agenda, see p. xvi above
E/4945	Report of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations	15	Final offset
E/4946	Note by the Secretary-General	17	Mimeographed
E/4947 and Corr.1	Note by the Secretary-General	4	Final offset
E/4948 and Corr.1	Progress report by the Executive Director of the United Nations Institute for Training and Research	3	Mimeographed
E/4949	Report of the Commission on Human Rights on its twenty-seventh session (22 February-26 March 1971)	5 (a)	<i>Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Fiftieth Session, Supplement No. 4</i>
E/4949 (Summary)	Summary of the report of the Commission on Human Rights on its twenty-seventh session	5 (a)	Mimeographed
E/4949/Add.1	Addendum to the report of the Commission on Human Rights: financial implications of resolutions adopted by the Commission at its twenty-seventh session	5 (a)	Ditto
E/4950	Public administration in the Second United Nations Development Decade: report of the Secretary-General	10	Final offset
E/4950/Add.1	Note by the Secretary-General circulating the report of the Second Meeting of Experts on the United Nations Programme in Public Administration	10	Mimeographed. For the report, see <i>Public Administration in the Second United Nations Development Decade</i> (United Nations publication, Sales No.: E.71.II.H.3)
E/4953	Report on trade union rights in southern Africa, submitted in accordance with Economic and Social Council resolution 1412 (XLVI), by the <i>Ad Hoc</i> Group of Experts established under resolution 2 (XXIII) of the Commission on Human Rights	5 (b)	Mimeographed
E/4955	Note by the Secretary-General	12 (b)	Final offset
E/4956	Report of the Secretary-General on publicity given to the report of the <i>Ad Hoc</i> Working Group of Experts	5 (b)	Mimeographed
E/4958	Book development in the service of education: report by the UNESCO secretariat	13	Final offset
E/4959	Note by the Secretary-General	11 (a)	Final offset
E/4961	Report of the Secretary-General	12 (a)	Final offset
E/4963	Note by the Secretary-General	9 (b)	Mimeographed
E/4964	Report of the Secretary-General	9 (a)	Ditto
E/4964/Add.1	Comments of the International Civil Aviation Organization	9 (a)	Ditto
E/4964/Add.2	Administrative and financial implications of the proposals contained in document E/4964: note by the Secretary-General	9 (a)	Ditto
E/4964/Add.3	Note by the Secretary-General	9 (a)	Ditto
E/4964/Add.4	Extract from the report of the Economic Commission for Europe to the Economic and Social Council	9 (a)	Mimeographed. For the text, see <i>Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Fifty-first Session, Supplement No. 3</i> (E/5001), paras. 193 and 194
E/4965	Summary of the report of the International Narcotics Control Board on its work in 1970	6	Mimeographed. For the report, see E/INCB/9
E/4966	Note by the Secretary-General circulating the text of the Final Act of the United Nations Conference for the Adoption of a Protocol on Psychotropic Substances (E/CONF.58/5) and the text of the Convention on Psychotropic Substances (E/CONF.58/6)	6 (a)	Mimeographed



<i>Document No.</i>	<i>Title or description</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Observations and references</i>
E/4968 and Add.1	Election of nine members of the Committee on Housing, Building and Planning: note by the Secretary-General	17	For the list of members, see <i>Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Fiftieth Session, Supplement No. 1</i> , p. 30
E/4969	Report of the Committee on Natural Resources on its first session (22 February-10 March 1971)	8 (a)	<i>Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Fiftieth Session, Supplement No. 6</i>
E/4971	Letter dated 18 March 1971 from the representative of the United States of America addressed to the Secretary-General	6 (c)	Mimeographed
E/4971/Add.1	Memorandum of the United States of America respecting its proposed amendments to the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961	6 (c)	Ditto
E/4972	Note by the Secretary-General	19	Ditto
E/4984	Report of the Commission for Social Development on its twenty-second session (1-22 March 1971)	2	<i>Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Fiftieth Session, Supplement No. 3</i>
E/4984 (Summary)	Summary of the report of the Commission for Social Development	2	Mimeographed
E/4984/Add.1	Statement of administrative and financial implications of resolutions adopted by the Commission at its twenty-second session: note by the Secretary-General	2	Mimeographed
E/4985	Letter dated 26 March 1971 from the representative of the United States of America addressed to the Secretary-General	6 (c)	Ditto
E/4986 and Add.1-9	Note by the Secretary-General circulating the views and proposals of Governments	16	Ditto
E/4987	Report of the Social Committee	13*	
E/4989	Report of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination on its eighth session (22 March-8 April 1971)	14	<i>Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Fiftieth Session, Supplement No. 5</i>
E/4993	Report of the Social Committee	4*	
E/4995	Supplementary items proposed for inclusion in the provisional agenda for the fiftieth session: note by the Secretary-General	1	Mimeographed
E/5005	Note by the Secretary-General circulating a Summary of the 1970 <i>Report on the World Social Situation</i>	2	Mimeographed. The full text will be issued as a United Nations publication
E/5008	Applications for hearings: report of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations	2, 5	Mimeographed
E/5021	Report of the Social Committee	15*	
E/5023	Report of the Social Committee	12*	
E/5025	Report of the Social Committee	6*	
E/5029	Report of the Social Committee	2*	
E/5032	Report of the Social Committee	5*	
E/AC.7/L.578	Italy, Norway, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Uruguay: draft resolution	4	For the text, see E/4993, para. 4
E/AC.7/L.579	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: amendments to draft resolution E/AC.7/L.578	4	<i>Ibid.</i> , para. 5
E/AC.7/L.580	Brazil, Pakistan and Sudan: draft resolution	15	Replaced by E/AC.7/L.580/Rev.1
E/AC.7/L.580/Rev.1	Brazil, Ghana, Pakistan and Sudan: revised draft resolution	15	Mimeographed. See E/5021, para. 14
E/AC.7/L.581	Lebanon, Madagascar, Pakistan, Sudan and Tunisia: draft resolution	13	For the text, see E/4987, para. 4
E/AC.7/L.582	India:† amendment to draft resolution E/AC.7/L.581	13	<i>Ibid.</i> , para. 5

† In accordance with rule 75 of the rules of procedure.

<i>Document No.</i>	<i>Title or description</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Observations and references</i>
E/AC.7/L.583	New Zealand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America: draft resolution	6 (a)	Replaced by E/AC.7/L.583/Rev.1
E/AC.7/L.583/Rev.1	New Zealand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America: revised draft resolution	6 (a)	Mimeographed. See E/5025, paras. 4 to 7
E/AC.7/L.584	Greece, United States of America and Uruguay: draft resolution	6 (c)	Replaced by E/AC.7/L.584/Rev.1
E/AC.7/L.584/Add.1	Administrative and financial implications of draft resolution E/AC.7/L.584: note by the Secretary-General	6 (c)	Mimeographed
E/AC.7/L.584/Rev.1	Greece, Indonesia, New Zealand, Norway, United States of America	6 (c)	Same text as resolution 1577 (L)
E/AC.7/L.585	India,† Indonesia, Sudan and Yugoslavia: proposal for decision by the Council	12 (b)	Replaced by E/AC.7/L.585/Rev.1
E/AC.7/L.585/Rev.1	India,† Indonesia, Sudan and Yugoslavia: revised proposal for decision by the Council	12 (b)	For the text, see E/5023, para. 9
E/AC.7/L.586	United States of America: amendment to draft resolution III submitted by the Commission for Social Development (E/4984, chap. X)	2	For the text, see E/5029, para. 6
E/AC.7/L.587	United States of America: amendment to draft resolution I submitted by the Commission for Social Development (E/4984, chap. X)	2	<i>Ibid.</i> , para. 4
E/AC.7/L.588/Rev.1	United States of America: revised amendments to draft resolution II submitted by the Commission for Social Development (E/4984, chap. X)	2	<i>Ibid.</i> , para. 5
E/AC.7/L.589	Greece: amendments to draft declaration on the rights of mentally retarded persons submitted by the Commission for Social Development (E/4984, chap. XI)	2	<i>Ibid.</i> , para. 14
E/AC.7/L.590	France and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland: draft resolution	2	Mimeographed. See E/5029, para. 14
E/AC.7/L.591	Brazil and Pakistan: amendments to draft resolution II submitted by the Commission for Social Development (E/4984, chap. X)	2	For the text, see E/5029, para. 5
E/AC.7/L.592	Pakistan: draft resolution	2	<i>Ibid.</i> , E/5029, appendix
E/AC.7/L.593	Norway: amendments to draft resolution II submitted by the Commission for Social Development (E/4984, chap. X)	2	<i>Ibid.</i> , E/5029, para. 5
E/AC.7/L.594	France, Italy and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland: draft text	2	<i>Ibid.</i> , E/5029, appendix
E/AC.7/L.595	Proposal by the Chairman	2	<i>Ibid.</i> , E/5029, para. 19, draft decision I
E/AC.7/L.596	Italy, Pakistan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Uruguay: draft resolution	5 (a)	Replaced by E/AC.7/L.596/Rev.1
E/AC.7/L.596/Rev.1	Italy, Pakistan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Uruguay: revised draft resolution	5 (a)	Same text as resolution 1596 (L)
E/AC.7/L.597	France, Madagascar, Tunisia and Uruguay: draft resolution	5 (a)	<i>Ibid.</i> , resolution 1597 (L)
E/AC.7/L.598	Ghana, Indonesia, Jamaica, Kenya, Malaysia, Sudan and Yugoslavia: draft resolution	5 (b)	See E/5032, para. 29 to 33
E/AC.7/L.599	Greece and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland: amendment to draft resolution VII submitted by the Commission on Human Rights (E/4949, chap. XX)	5 (a)	<i>Ibid.</i> , para. 21
E/AC.7/L.600	Brazil: amendments to draft resolution III submitted by the Commission on Human Rights (E/4949, chap. XX)	5 (a)	<i>Ibid.</i> , para. 10
E/AC.7/L.601	France and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland: draft resolution	5 (a)	Mimeographed. See E/5032, para. 34
E/AC.7/L.602	New Zealand: amendment to draft resolution E/AC.7/L.598	5 (b)	For the text, see E/5032, para. 29
E/CN.4/1049	Working documents of the twenty-seventh session of the Commission on Human Rights	5	Mimeographed
E/INCB/9	<i>Report of the International Narcotics Control Board on its work in 1970</i>	6 (b)	United Nations publication, Sales No.: E.71.XI.2

† In accordance with rule 75 of the rules of procedure.

Document No.	Title or description	Agenda item	Observations and references
E/INCB/10	<i>Estimated world requirements of narcotic drugs and estimates of world production of opium in 1971</i>	6	United Nations publication, Sales No.: E.71.XI.1
E/INCB/11	<i>Statistics on narcotic drugs for 1969 furnished by Governments in accordance with the International Treaties and maximum level of opium stocks</i>	6	United Nations publication, Sales No.: E.71.XI.7
E/L.1371	Election of twelve members of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme: note by the Secretary-General	17	For the list of members, see <i>Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Fiftieth Session, Supplement No. 1</i> , p. 31
E/L.1372	Note by the Secretary-General calling the Council's attention to a draft resolution submitted by the Statistical Commission (E/4938, chap. XV)	7	Mimeographed. Draft resolution adopted as amended. See 1744th meeting and resolution 1564 (L)
E/L.1373	Election of ten members of the Executive Board of the United Nations Children's Fund: note by the Secretary-General	17	For the list of members, see <i>Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Fiftieth Session, Supplement No. 1</i> , p. 31
E/L.1374	Election of four members of the United Nations/FAO Intergovernmental Committee of the World Food Programme: note by the Secretary-General	17	<i>Ibid.</i> , p. 29
E/L.1375 and Corr.1	Election of seven members to the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination: note by the Secretary-General	17	<i>Ibid.</i> , p. 28
E/L.1377	Organization of the work of the fiftieth session: note by the President of the Council	1	Mimeographed
E/L.1378	Letter dated 31 March 1971 from the representative of Austria addressed to the Secretary-General	4	Ditto
E/L.1379	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: draft resolution	3	Replaced by E/L.1379/Rev.1
E/L.1379/Rev.1	France, Hungary, Madagascar, Tunisia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Yugoslavia: revised draft resolution	3	Replaced by E/L.1412
E/L.1379/Rev.1/Add.1	Administrative and financial implications of draft resolution E/L.1379/Rev.1: note by the Secretary-General	3	Mimeographed
E/L.1380	Note by the Secretariat containing extracts from the report of the UNCTAD Committee on Shipping on its fifth session	9 (b)	Ditto
E/L.1381	Note by the Secretariat circulating a decision taken by the UNCTAD Committee on Shipping at its fifth session	9 (a)	Ditto
E/L.1382	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: draft resolution	16	Ditto
E/L.1383	New Zealand: draft resolution	19	Adopted at the 1742nd meeting. See resolution 1563 (L)
E/L.1384	Consideration of the provisional agenda and list of documents for the fifty-first session: note by the Secretary-General	18	Mimeographed
E/L.1385	Consideration of the provisional agenda for the fifty-first session: note by the Secretary-General	18	Ditto
E/L.1386	Brazil, Pakistan, Sudan and Yugoslavia: amendments to the draft resolution submitted by the Statistical Commission (E/4938, chap. XV)	7	Mimeographed. See 1744th meeting and resolution 1564 (L)
E/L.1387	Ghana and Norway: draft resolution	20	Adopted as amended. See 1747th meeting and resolution 1565 (L)
E/L.1388	Note by the Secretariat, circulating a cable from the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization	9 (b)	Mimeographed
E/L.1389	Hungary, Pakistan, Tunisia and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: draft resolution	7	Replaced by E/L.1389/Rev.1
E/L.1389/Rev.1	Hungary, Lebanon, Pakistan, Sudan, Tunisia, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: revised draft resolution	7	Adopted as amended. See 1747th meeting and resolution 1566 (L)
E/L.1390	Letter dated 30 April 1971 from the representative of Portugal addressed to the Secretary-General	5 (b)	Mimeographed
E/L.1391	Brazil and India:† draft resolution	9 (b)	Replaced by E/L.1391/Rev.1

† In accordance with rule 75 of the rules of procedure.



<i>Document No.</i>	<i>Title or description</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Observations and references</i>
E/L.1391/Rev.1	Brazil, Chile† and India:† revised draft resolution	9 (b)	Replaced by E/L.1391/Rev.2
E/L.1391/Rev.1/Add.1	Administrative and financial implications of draft resolution E/L.1391/Rev.1: note by the Secretary-General	9 (b)	Mimeographed
E/L.1391/Rev.2	Brazil, Chile,† India,† New Zealand and the United States of America: revised draft resolution	9 (b)	Adopted at the 1757th meeting. See resolution 1568 (L)
E/L.1392	Kenya, Sudan and Yugoslavia: draft resolution	10	Replaced by E/L.1392/Rev.1
E/L.1392/Rev.1	Kenya, Pakistan, Sudan, Tunisia and Yugoslavia: revised draft resolution	10	Adopted as amended. See 1753rd meeting and resolution 1567 (L)
E/L.1393	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland: amendments to draft resolution E/L.1391	9 (b)	Replaced by E/L.1393/Rev.1
E/L.1393/Rev.1	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland: amendments to draft resolution E/L.1391/Rev.2	9 (b)	Mimeographed
E/L.1394	Brazil, Ghana and Yugoslavia: draft decision	9 (b)	Ditto
E/L.1395	Note by the Secretary-General	5 (a)	Ditto
E/L.1396	Letter dated 5 May 1971 from the Chairman-Rapporteur of the <i>Ad Hoc</i> Working Group of Experts established under resolution 2 (XXIII) of the Commission on Human Rights addressed to the President of the Economic and Social Council	5 (b)	Mimeographed
E/L.1397	United States of America: draft resolution	9 (a)	At the 1760th meeting, the Council decided not to take any action on the draft
E/L.1398	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: amendment to draft resolution E/L.1391/Rev.2	9 (b)	Mimeographed
E/L.1399	Letter dated 6 April 1971 from the representative of Kenya addressed to the Secretary-General	8 (a)	Ditto
E/L.1400	Brazil, Kenya, Sudan and Yugoslavia: draft resolution	11 (a)	Ditto
E/L.1401	Brazil, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Kenya, Sudan, Tunisia and Yugoslavia: draft resolution	9 (a)	At the 1760th meeting, the Council decided not to take any action on the draft
E/L.1402	France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America: draft resolution	9 (b)	Adopted as orally revised. See 1760th meeting and resolution 1567 (L)
E/L.1405	Hungary, Sudan, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Yugoslavia: draft decision	9 (b)	Withdrawn at the 1760th meeting
E/L.1406	Indonesia, Malaysia and New Zealand: draft resolution	8 (b)	Adopted as orally revised. See 1760th meeting and resolution 1570 (L)
E/L.1407	United States of America: draft resolution	11 (a)	Mimeographed
E/L.1407/Add.1	Administrative and financial implications of draft resolution E/L.1407: note by the Secretary-General	11 (a)	Mimeographed
E/L.1408	Greece and New Zealand: draft resolution	16	Replaced by E/L.1408/Rev.1
E/L.1408/Rev.1	Greece and New Zealand: revised draft resolution	16	Mimeographed
E/L.1409	Uruguay: draft resolution	3	Replaced by E/L.1412
E/L.1410	France, Lebanon, Madagascar, Norway, Tunisia and Yugoslavia: draft resolution	11 (b)	Adopted as orally amended. See 1763rd meeting and resolution 1571 (L)
E/L.1411	Congo (Democratic Republic of), Jamaica, Kenya, Pakistan, Sudan and Yugoslavia: draft resolution	8 (a)	Adopted as amended. See 1766th meeting and resolution 1572 (L)
E/L.1411/Add.1	Administrative and financial implications of draft resolution E/L.1411: note by the Secretary-General	8 (a)	Mimeographed
E/L.1412	Draft resolution prepared by the Working Group	3	Replaced by E/L.1412/Rev.1
E/L.1412/Rev.1	Revised draft resolution prepared by the Working Group	3	Adopted by consensus at the 1768th meeting. See resolution 1573 (L)

† In accordance with rule 75 of the rules of procedure.

<i>Document No.</i>	<i>Title or description</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Observations and references</i>
E/L.1413	Brazil and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: amendments to draft resolution E/L.1411	8 (a)	Mimeographed
E/L.1414	New Zealand: amendments to draft resolution E/L.1411 in document E/L.1411	8 (a)	Ditto
E/L.1415	United States of America: amendment to draft resolution E/L.1411	8 (a)	Ditto
E/L.1416	Sudan: amendments to draft resolution E/L.1412	3	Ditto
E/L.1417	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: amendment to draft resolution E/L.1412	3	Ditto
E/L.1418	Brazil, Haiti, Jamaica and Kenya: amendments to draft resolution E/L.1412	3	Ditto
E/L.1420	France: draft resolution	11 (a)	Ditto
E/L.1420/Add.1	Administrative and financial implications of draft resolution E/L.1420: note by the Secretary-General	11 (a)	Ditto
E/L.1421	Congo (Democratic Republic of), Ghana, Indonesia, Italy, Kenya, Lebanon, Madagascar, Pakistan, Sudan and Tunisia: amendments to the draft resolution E/L.1408 in document E/L.1408	16	Mimeographed
E/L.1421/Rev.1	Congo (Democratic Republic of), Ghana, Indonesia, Italy, Kenya, Lebanon, Madagascar, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Sudan and Tunisia: revised amendments	16	Ditto
E/L.1422	Brazil: amendments to draft resolution E/L.1408	16	Ditto
E/(L)/CRP.1	Note by the Secretary-General	16	Ditto
E/RES/1563 (L)- E/RES/1599 (L)	Resolutions adopted by the Economic and Social Council at its fiftieth session		See <i>Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Fiftieth Session, Supplement No. 1</i> , resolutions 1563 (L)-1599 (L)



## ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Fiftieth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Monday, 26 April 1971,  
at 11 a.m.

NEW YORK

*President: Mr. Rachid DRISS (Tunisia).**Statement by the President*

1. The PRESIDENT paid a tribute to Mr. Maramis, President of the forty-ninth session, whose able leadership had ensured the session's success. The fiftieth session was essentially social in character and only the Social Committee would be meeting along with the plenary Council; however, it should never be forgotten that the social and economic fields were interconnected and represented two faces of the same reality.

2. At the start of the session one could not but call to mind the obstacles which still kept the organs of the United Nations from discharging their duties efficiently. The Council should reaffirm its specially important role. To that end all must join hands, rise to the level of the community of men and promote international economic and social co-operation as called for in Article 55 and the whole of Chapter IX of the Charter. Nations large and small must assert their political will and, while the Economic and Social Council could not be expected to be more than the sum of the wills expressed by its twenty-seven member States, the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade (General Assembly resolution 2626 (XX)) could help the Council to gain its true role. The Council could become a genuine forum for deliberation and co-ordination if its twenty-seven members wished that to happen. It was therefore fitting to urge the representatives of all Governments to see to it that the fifty-first session of the Council, to be held at Geneva, gave new impetus to economic and social co-operation. Despite difficulties, the Council must find within the constructive character of its work the strength to persevere.

*Tribute to the memory of Mr. François Duvalier,  
President of the Republic of Haiti*

3. The PRESIDENT asked the Haitian delegation to convey to its Government and to the family of the deceased the condolences of the members of the Council, who wished at the same time to express their sympathy and hopes for prosperity and happiness to the Haitian people.

4. Mr. ANTOINE (Haiti) thanked the President and the Council, on behalf of the Haitian people, for the statement just made in connexion with the death of President Duvalier. Despite the incomprehension of certain privileged Haitian circles and the world press, President Duvalier, who had carried out a great social revolution and fought for the moral and material advancement of his country, belonged to history. The nickname "Papa Doc" given him by the

rural people of Haiti had reflected the Haitian people's veneration for him. Privileged individuals and the world press had tried to make him out a dictator, but their cynicism was merely an outgrowth of a pitiful state of infantilism. With no economic help from the more prosperous peoples, President Duvalier had brought discipline and order to the country and had combated the elements of nature, the Pharisees and the prophets of doom. The hatred of his political adversaries and the foreign press had only added to his stature. Fighting for the freedom of the third world, martyred by the incomprehension of his unrelenting adversaries, he had given his life for Haiti. The Haitian people had looked upon him as a father and not as a dictator. Despite the persistent efforts of his enemies, the people would continue to pay grateful homage to his memory.

## AGENDA ITEM 1

**Adoption of the agenda (E/4944 and Add.1,  
E/4971 and Add.1, E/4972, E/4985, E/4995)**

5. The PRESIDENT invited comments on the provisional agenda, which had been considered on 12 January 1971 (1735th meeting) and had been issued as document E/4944.

6. He drew the attention of members of the Council to a note by the Secretary-General (E/4995), which set forth a list of supplementary items proposed for inclusion in the provisional agenda in accordance with rule 13 of the rules of procedure. He suggested that consideration be given first to the list of supplementary items:

- (i) United Nations Conference for the Adoption of a Protocol on Psychotropic Substances: item proposed by the Secretary-General (E/4944/Add.1);
- (ii) Proposal to convene a Plenipotentiary Conference to amend the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961: item proposed by the United States of America (E/4985);
- (iii) Accession of the Republic of Korea to the Convention on Road Traffic of 19 September 1949: item proposed by the Secretary-General (E/4972).

7. In paragraphs 2 and 3 of his note (E/4995) the Secretary-General suggested that items (i) and (ii) should be included as subitems (a) and (c) respectively of agenda item 6, which should be amended to read "Narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances", and that item (iii) should be included as a separate item.

8. Mr. ZAKHAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the provisional agenda prepared by the Secretariat (E/4944) contained eighteen items relating to important



areas of international co-operation such as social development, human rights, natural resources, transport development and science and technology, and also questions of importance for the Council's own activities, such as measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council and the report of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (CPC).

9. He wished to refer to the Soviet Union's position of principle on the development of international co-operation. Quite recently, the Twenty-fourth Congress of the Communist Party of the USSR had adopted a programme of action for peace and international co-operation and the freedom and independence of peoples. The programme stated that the Soviet Union was prepared to strengthen in all areas its co-operative relations with interested States on a basis of mutual benefit. The Soviet Union was prepared to co-operate with other countries in finding answers in the fields of environmental protection, utilization of natural resources, including electric power, development of transport and telecommunications, prevention and eradication of the most serious and widespread diseases, utilization of space, the sea and oceans and related research.

10. In addition, specific targets had been fixed in the sphere of external economic relations. Durable relations were to be developed in trade, science and technology with the developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, on a basis of mutual benefit and with the purpose of strengthening those countries' economic independence. Relations of that kind were also to be strengthened with those developed capitalist countries which expressed readiness to enhance their co-operation with the Soviet Union.

11. His delegation was prepared to make a positive contribution to the Council's work aimed at developing international co-operation in the economic, social, scientific and technological areas. It accordingly supported the provisional agenda in document E/4944.

12. His delegation wished, however, to draw attention to the note by the Secretary-General (E/4972), in which it was proposed "in accordance with past practice" to include in the agenda of the fiftieth session an item on the accession of the "Republic of Korea" to the Convention on Road Traffic signed at Geneva in 1949. His delegation was in disagreement with so-called "past practice". It would be quite illegal to discuss the proposed item. The South Korean régime could make no claim whatsoever to speak for Korea. Including the question in the agenda would only make it more difficult to give constructive consideration to the important questions of international co-operation. His delegation was against including the item in the agenda and would vote against the proposal for its inclusion.

13. Mr. SZARKA (Hungary) said that his delegation supported the proposed agenda but could not agree to the inclusion of an item on the accession of the "Republic of Korea" to the 1949 Convention on Road Traffic. The Seoul authorities could not enter into international commitments on behalf of Korea.

14. The PRESIDENT asked whether the USSR representative was insisting on a vote on the question.

15. Mr. ZAKHAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he was.

16. Mr. SKATARETIKO (Yugoslavia) supported the Soviet proposal and said that his delegation would also vote against the inclusion of the item in the agenda.

17. Mr. BUSH (United States of America) said he was surprised by the objections raised by the Soviet representative. The fact was that since 1950, the General Assembly had repeatedly considered the question of Korea, often on the proposal of the socialist countries. He therefore hoped that the Soviet representative would reconsider his proposal to take a vote on the inclusion of the item.

18. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that although the Council's rules of procedure had been observed, the request for the inclusion of supplementary items in the agenda had been circulated rather late and his Government had not had time to consider it closely.

19. A distinction should be made between the inclusion of an item in the agenda and the consideration of the substance of the item. His delegation was reluctant to commit itself in a procedural vote and would in any case reserve its position with regard to the substance of the item.

20. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) shared the view expressed by previous speakers that the Soviet representative should reconsider his proposal to take a vote on the item. He was prepared to support fully the Secretary-General's proposal to include the item in the agenda, particularly since there were precedents for such action. If the Council decided to put it to a vote, his delegation would vote for inclusion of the item.

21. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the inclusion of the following item in the provisional agenda: "Accession of the Republic of Korea to the Convention on Road Traffic of 19 September 1949", the three items proposed in document E/4995 and the provisional agenda as a whole.

*The item was included in the provisional agenda by a vote of 18 to 5, with 4 abstentions.*

*The three items proposed for inclusion in the agenda in document E/4995 were included.*

*The provisional agenda, as a whole, as amended, was adopted.*

### *Organization of work*

22. Mr. VIAUD (France) requested that the Council should defer consideration of item 3 of the agenda (Outflow of trained personnel from developing to developed countries), which it was to take up in plenary that week, until the beginning of the third week of its session or the end of the second week following item 10 (Public administration and development). Some of the studies necessary for consideration of the problem had not yet been made available to the French delegation and it needed more time for a more careful examination of the resolution submitted by the USSR.

23. Mr. DE ARAUJO CASTRO (Brazil) said that he had no objection to the French proposal but would like to complement it by suggesting that item 10 should be taken up in the first week instead of item 3.

24. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) pointed out that according to the note by the President (E/L.1377) the report of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (item 14) was to be considered in the fourth week. However, since that report should facilitate consideration of item 8 (Natural resources) and item 9 (Transport development), the Council might be well-advised to examine the comments of CPC before taking up those items.

25. Mr. AHMED (Secretary of the Council) drew attention to the annotations to the provisional agenda (E/4944). As indicated in the document, by the time the Council came to consider item 14, all that would be left of the CPC report would be those aspects which had not already been directly considered in the Council in connexion with other agenda items. The CPC report was to be issued the next day.

26. If the French proposal was adopted, the Council would try to complete consideration of item 11 (Science and technology) by the end of the second week and could then take up item 3 at the beginning of the third week.

27. The Brazilian proposal to take up item 10 instead of item 3, although feasible, would create a few difficulties. The Secretary-General's report on public administration in the Second United Nations Development Decade (E/4950) and other related documents could not be issued in all the languages until the beginning of the following week.

28. The first part of item 9, dealing with the establishment of a United Nations transport centre, could be taken up the first week and the second part at a later stage once the relevant information had been received from the Trade and Development Board.

29. Mr. DE ARAUJO CASTRO (Brazil) said he would not press his proposal.

30. The PRESIDENT said that the Council appeared to be in general agreement that item 3 would not be taken up until the beginning of the third week of work.

*It was so decided.*

31. The PRESIDENT said that the item proposed by the Secretary-General for inclusion in the agenda, "Accession of the Republic of Korea to the Convention on Road Traffic of 19 September 1949", could be taken up after item 9.

*It was so decided.*

32. The PRESIDENT pointed out that the proposals concerning the organization of the work of the session (E/L.1377) were tentative and subject to change if the work of the Council or its Social Committee made it necessary. If there was no objection, he would take it that for the time being the Council agreed with the arrangements proposed in document E/L.1377 as he had amended them.

*It was so decided.*

## AGENDA ITEM 16

### Measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council (E/4986 and Add.1-3)

33. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider item 16 of the agenda. The Secretary-General had invited Governments of Member States to communicate their views on the question and had reproduced the replies received in document E/4986 and Add.1-3. The President suggested that the meeting should be devoted to a preliminary exchange of views and that the Council should revert to the question towards the end of the session. He asked those representatives who wished to speak to give their names to the Council Secretary.

34. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) asked how the President thought the Council could deal with the question of measures to improve the organization of its work.

35. The PRESIDENT said that it was for the Council to determine how it wished to deal with item 16. He personally felt that the first thing to do was to consider the substance of the replies from Governments, then try to formulate proposals or even resolutions on the question.

36. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) said that a date should be set for the submission of specific proposals. It would be a good idea at that point to establish a working group to consider those proposals since the Council was taking up the question with a view to adopting a resolution on it.

37. Mr. DE ARAUJO CASTRO (Brazil) said that although very few positive results had been achieved so far it was encouraging that Member States still clung to the hope of making the Economic and Social Council an efficient tool for the implementation of the objectives set forth in Chapter IX of the Charter. A cold analysis of the facts must be made if anything was to be accomplished.

38. The achievements of the United Nations in the realm of economic and social development had been far from encouraging. The international community had failed to provide the impetus which could ensure a pace of development compatible with the aspirations of the great majority of the peoples of the developing countries. In its twenty-five years of existence the Economic and Social Council had failed to grasp the tragic dimensions of the problems of underdevelopment. Subjects of vital importance to the less privileged countries were treated academically, and the Council had become little more than a channel through which information supplied by experts was mechanically transmitted to the General Assembly.

39. As far as the United Nations system in general was concerned, the lack of effective co-ordination by the Council could not be more obvious. That inertia might, however, have been a blessing in disguise, since it had led to the establishment of various subsidiary organizations which constituted the present United Nations system. Despite statements to the contrary, those organizations played a useful role, as a result of their diversity and relative vitality.

40. It was hard to see how measures to strengthen the role of the Council could be envisaged when an effort was being



made to establish an arbitrary and fixed ceiling on budgets, as if development needs had suddenly become static. Furthermore the Council's functions as a policy-making body could not be enhanced so long as it followed a policy of evading commitments and imposing controls, such as population control and environmental control. Moreover, it seemed that efforts to reorganize the Council were to a large extent provoked by the desire to counteract the natural preference of developing countries for larger and more politicized bodies in which they had a better chance of having their claims satisfied.

41. The considerations he had mentioned indicated that the possibilities of improving and strengthening the work of the Council were very limited. The remedy might lie in finding ways and means of measuring the participation of more Member States so as to inspire greater confidence in the Council's work and provide broader political support for its decisions and recommendations. Effective policy-making called for adequate representation of all prevailing views. Note should also be taken of the greatly enlarged membership of the United Nations and of the much greater range in opinions and interests, as compared with 1945.

42. Significant improvements could certainly be achieved in the area of the Council's responsibilities as the "governing body" which directed United Nations activities pertaining to economic, social and related matters. The defects and deficiencies in that area could hardly be attributed solely to the limits imposed on budgets. For example, the quality of programmes could be considerably improved, particularly by a clearer definition of priorities. If co-ordination proved to be almost impossible on a system-wide basis, there was no reason why the same should be true of the United Nations itself. The draft programmes and general blueprints for future activities prepared by the functional commissions and standing committees of the Council naturally concentrated on purely technical aspects. With the assistance of the CPC the Council should undertake a much more serious examination of those drafts and blueprints.

43. The Council's current procedure was to review very superficially, or simply to take note of, the reports of the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and the programmes of the various units of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs, the regional economic commissions and the United Nations Economic and Social Office at Beirut (UNESOB). As far as the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) were concerned, it was obvious that the General Assembly alone had the political leverage necessary to review the work of those bodies, but that did not apply to programmes prepared at the technical level for

the different sectors of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs. The Council should define the priorities and a more integrated picture should emerge, not only on a sectoral basis, but also from a cross-sectional, interdisciplinary approach. There should also be a more rational integration of planning at the global and regional levels. Very often proposals made at Headquarters seemed to ignore measures being carried out at the regional level by the regional economic commissions, and vice versa.

44. Improving the Council involved political and, to some extent, technical issues. For the time being, little could be done with respect to the political issues, but there was no reason why an attempt should not be made to improve the technical performance of the Council, for example, by insisting on comprehensive and clear reports, a more rational calendar of meetings and perhaps some modifications in budget presentation. The idea of programme-budgeting, recently presented as a panacea for all the evils besetting the United Nations, could be effective but might involve too great an increase in the Secretariat staff required.

45. Apart from organizational and procedural changes, members of the Council should concentrate on the programming aspects which fell within the Council's competence. Even when trying to improve its own work, the Council should proceed on the basis of priorities.

46. It was high time to transform the Council into an effective instrument as part of the international machinery for development. It should be remembered, however, that the so-called "reactivation" of the Council should not upset the constitutional balance of the United Nations by interfering with the normal development of UNCTAD, UNIDO and UNDP, or by altering in any way the basic relationship which had developed between the Council and the General Assembly. Maximum power was vested in the Assembly and any reform that might immobilize the most representative body of the United Nations and change its economic and social role into that of a mere rubber-stamp for the Council's recommendations should be rejected. He did not believe that the failures of the United Nations and of the Council in particular could be attributed to excessive participation in decision-making by Member States. Improving the Council should not result in the curtailment of the functions of the Second and Third Committees of the General Assembly, which should maintain its powers and prerogatives so that it could continue to defend the interests of medium and small nations. The Council should nevertheless be reactivated and its work should be made more effective and meaningful. The Council should at last emerge from its current state of inertia.

*The meeting rose at 12.25 p.m.*



## ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Fiftieth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

1739th meeting

Monday, 26 April 1971,  
at 3.20 p.m.

NEW YORK

*President: Mr. Rachid DRISS (Tunisia).*

## AGENDA ITEM 16

**Measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council (continued) (E/4986 and Add.1-3)**

1. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) said that although the response to the Secretary-General's communication sent to Governments of Member States pursuant to the decision taken at the 1737th meeting on 13 January 1971 had so far been limited, he hoped that the action initiated in January would enable the Council to make substantive progress at its current session.

2. In its reply to the Secretary-General's communication (see E/4986), his delegation had echoed the widely held view that there were two basic categories of reform: short-term reforms of a procedural or technical nature, which should not create any political difficulties, and far-reaching long-term reforms, which could be expected to give rise to controversy and conflicts of interests. In its opinion, the Council at its current session should concern itself with smaller reforms which would set the tone for dispassionate consideration of the more important problems, such as the future composition of the Council on the solution of which success in making the Council more meaningful and effective in the discharge of its functions would depend.

3. Immediate improvements could be made with regard to documentation, the programme of meetings and the Council's agenda, including the establishment of the necessary priorities. He therefore suggested that the Council should request the Secretariat to compile a list of possible measures to be taken in those areas for consideration during the third week of the session. The list should be compiled in co-operation with interested delegations and should take into account the relevant comments made by Governments in their official replies to the Secretary-General's communication. The list, which would be prepared along the lines of the analysis of Government views prepared for the Special Committee on the Rationalization of the Procedures and Organization of the General Assembly, might also include suggestions by the Secretary-General himself. When available, the document might be studied by an informal open-ended working group in which non-Council members having a contribution to make could participate. The group would then prepare an appropriate draft for consideration and adoption by the Council during the current session. His delegation would be fully prepared to play its part in the work of such a group. In any case, the Council should agree as soon as possible on whatever procedure it was going to adopt and should avoid unneces-

sary procedural debate if the momentum that had been generated was to result in real improvement in its work.

4. Mr. MOJSOV (Yugoslavia) said that his Government had submitted to the Secretary-General views<sup>1</sup> on the topic under consideration, together with certain specific proposals which it hoped would contribute to improving the organization of the Council's work.

5. His delegation felt that the policy-making role of the Council should be strengthened. The Council should, in particular, identify the major problems of development, indicate new policy directions and recommend appropriate ways and means of meeting the challenges of the development process. It should also serve as a medium for influencing Governments to exercise their political will to solve pressing problems and to give new impetus to development. Revitalized, the Council could take more initiative in dealing with economic and social problems and thus improve the prospects for success in attaining the goals of the Second United Nations Development Decade. To that end, it should be so composed and organized as to be capable of laying down policy guidelines for its subsidiary organs and other bodies engaged in making recommendations for action.

6. His delegation noted a tendency among certain developed countries to underestimate the Council's role as a policy-making body and to overemphasize its co-ordinating function. That tendency was very clearly exemplified in paragraph 2 of the United Kingdom's reply (see E/4986). It would appear that most of the developed countries wanted the Council to contribute to the further stagnation of the United Nations system by freezing the resources of the regular budget and using its influence to limit voluntary contributions at the very time when assistance was urgently needed if the Second Development Decade was to be a success. Indeed, some of the developed countries even seemed to consider that the only role the Council should play in the review and the appraisal of the progress of the Decade was that of supervision.

7. In his delegation's view, one of the main reasons for the unsatisfactory performance of the Council was the inadequate representation of the membership of the United Nations, especially the smaller developed and the developing countries, in the Council itself and in its subsidiary bodies. In order to remedy that defect, the number of members of some of the subsidiary bodies should be increased.

8. The two issues which he had mentioned, both of them of a political nature, could be solved, many difficulties which contributed to the Council's inefficiency would be

<sup>1</sup> Subsequently circulated as document E/4986/Add.4.



eliminated and the Council would find it easier to cope with the technical aspects of its work.

9. His Government would like to make a number of suggestions. The Council should continue its present practice of holding two regular sessions a year, together with a brief organizational session at the beginning of the year. It should place greater emphasis on social items during the spring session and on economic items during the summer session, and should continue its present practice of concentrating on major policy matters at the summer session. It should maintain its three sessional committees, but most of the items on its agenda should be allocated to the Economic and Social Committees, which, in order to be able to cope with their increased workload, should hold intersessional meetings to deal with specific issues when necessary. No substantive items should be referred at the outset to the Co-ordination Committee; only specific subjects raising questions of co-ordination should be submitted to it at appropriate times, and its terms of reference in dealing with such subjects should be clearly and precisely defined. Such a procedure would reduce the burden of work of the Co-ordination Committee and enable it to take over much of the work now performed by the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination. The Co-ordination Committee should also meet intersessionally as often as necessary in order to assist the Council in programming and co-ordination. The Council's documentation should be relevant to the subject-matter under consideration and should contain recommendations for action. Reports should consist of two parts: a resumé of the discussion and specific recommendations.

10. In his delegation's view, the problems of the Council could not be solved in a purely technical and mechanical way. The Council could never function as a policy-making body unless Governments were ready to undertake the political commitments necessary for the implementation of the objectives of the Charter, and thus create conditions in which the Council could discharge its functions. His delegation was prepared at the present session to agree to certain specific measures, both political and technical, which would ensure a continued improvement of the way in which the Council handled its work.

11. Mr. BUSH (United States of America) said that his Government wanted the Economic and Social Council to be a hard-driving, forward-looking body in which the industrialized countries and the less developed countries could work with each other, instead of against each other, to improve the lot of people everywhere. The President of the United States took great interest in the problem of establishing effective international machinery for improving economic and social conditions throughout the world, particularly in the less developed countries.

12. However, it was generally recognized that the Council fell short of those expectations at the present time and, in fact, was in deep trouble. It issued too many documents, held too many meetings, postponed too many decisions. It failed to lead, and all countries, particularly the developing ones, suffered as a result. In short, the Council was undergoing a crisis of confidence. The question was how confidence in the Council could be restored. In his opinion, that could not be done by tinkering with procedures; on

the contrary, its members must take stock of the Council's place within the United Nations system and make sure that the opportunities that it afforded were exploited to the maximum.

13. The Council was subordinate to the General Assembly, which set policies and expressed the "political will" of the United Nations. It was the Assembly which had the final word on all important issues, including economic and social ones. It was the Assembly which had the power of the purse in approving the operating programmes of the United Nations. The founders of the United Nations had assigned to the Council certain specific functions not in order to derogate from the rights and responsibilities of the Assembly, but to relieve the latter of the detailed consideration of such highly complex matters as specific work programmes in the economic, social and related fields and the co-ordination of the activities of the specialized agencies and other United Nations bodies. Those were the central functions of the Council and they were essentially non-political. They required attention to technical detail in the programming and execution of agreed policies, involved complicated interrelationships between the various parts of the United Nations system, and were concerned with the day-to-day operation of the system. No intergovernmental forum of 127 or more members could do that kind of job; even smaller bodies found the task extremely difficult. The Council could not and should not compete with the Assembly; what it could do was to examine difficult technical issues and thus help the Assembly to act on them intelligently. That was an important policy-formulating role. It could also make sure that the will of the Assembly was carried out by co-ordinating and supervising the social and economic activities of the United Nations and the specialized agencies.

14. There were two main complaints about the work of the Council: first, that not enough member countries participated in its work and, secondly, that it failed to come to grips with the main issues of the day. Something could be done about both.

15. It was sometimes charged that the Council was not representative of the United Nations as a whole; his delegation could not agree. Its twenty-seven members were drawn from all geographical regions and represented a realistic ratio between less developed and industrialized countries. The seventeen less developed countries had a clear majority; the facts belied the assertion that the Council was a rich man's club. However, while the Council was representative of the membership of the United Nations, it could be argued that it did not allow enough countries to participate in its work. His delegation therefore felt that it would be desirable to increase the participation of delegations in the economic and social organs of the United Nations. There were two ways of doing so. One would be to increase the membership of the Council by twelve or fifteen, but that would require a change in the Charter, a process which might take several years. The other would be to assign some of the more important new issues to subsidiary committees of the Council which would be expanded to include delegations that were not members of the Council. That could be done immediately.

16. The two most immediate issues which the Council must tackle were the establishment of machinery for the

review and appraisal of the Second Development Decade and the establishment of future institutional arrangements for science and technology. Those two subjects could be dealt with in the manner he had indicated; if the Council followed that course it would immediately begin to move forward in its work. Other subjects which also urgently required the Council's attention, such as uncontrolled population growth and the degradation of the environment, could in the future be dealt with in the same way. Looking further into the future, changes in the structure of the United Nations system could be anticipated, which would make it more effective in coping with the enormous demands of an increasingly internationalized development effort. If such a course were adopted, the Council would be enabled to play a more important role, the general Membership of the United Nations would develop a greater sense of participation in its work and the General Assembly would be better served. Moreover, all that could be done immediately.

17. His delegation, which was submitting its proposals in more detail in an official document,<sup>2</sup> had often been asked whether the United States was interested in the United Nations only as a mechanism for promoting economic and social development. The answer was that the United States wanted the United Nations to be a viable political body; however, if the Organization could succeed in promoting economic and social development it could eliminate many of the causes of political friction. Accordingly, his Government supported the political role of the United Nations but placed particular emphasis on its economic and social role.

18. Mr. ZAKHAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that his delegation had given a detailed explanation of its position of principle on the item under consideration at the 1734th meeting on 12 January and had outlined its general approach to it at the previous meeting.

19. His country's efforts to promote peace and international co-operation included taking full advantage of the possibilities offered by the United Nations, as Mr. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, had stated at the Twenty-fourth Congress. His delegation felt that at present, inadequate use was being made of the possibilities of the Economic and Social Council in promoting fruitful international co-operation in the economic and social fields. The role of the Council in the United Nations system was defined in Chapters IX and X of the Charter, particularly in Article 60, which stated that responsibility for the discharge of the functions of the Organization was vested in the General Assembly and, under the authority of the General Assembly, in the Economic and Social Council. The Soviet Union believed that the Council could be more effective in promoting the economic and social progress of the peoples. It was therefore gratified to see that the replies of Governments (E/4986 and Add.1-3) to the Secretary-General's letter envisaged a leading role for the Council in the economic and social activities of the United Nations. The Soviet Union had consistently advocated strengthening the Council, enhancing its role and authority, and making its activities more effective.

20. It was generally accepted that the role of the Council, as one of the main organs of the United Nations, required strengthening. A number of measures had been proposed to that effect, measures which, he felt, could be divided into two categories: those aimed at the rationalization and improvement of existing procedures and those aimed at structural changes necessitating a revision of the Charter. His delegation could support the first category but not the second. The question of the better organization of the work of the Council required very careful study and his delegation, for its part, was prepared to continue the consultations begun among the members of the Council at the forty-ninth session.

21. His delegation had often drawn attention to the existing deficiencies in the work of the Council and had proposed measures to remedy them. One of the most serious of those deficiencies was that the Council was not fully discharging its functions under the Charter as the main United Nations organ responsible for co-ordinating activities in the economic, social, scientific and technical fields. Its agenda was overburdened with minor matters which could be successfully dealt with by subsidiary organs. In fact, its effectiveness could be greatly enhanced by the establishment of a sessional committee on science and technology. At the same time, the Council should be kept better informed of the practical steps which the Secretariat was taking to give effect to its decisions.

22. At its forty-ninth session the Council had adopted, on the proposal of the USSR delegation, resolution 1547 (XLIX), strict compliance with which would enable the Council to discharge its functions and at the same time would remove from the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (ACC) the extraordinary and unauthorized functions which it had assumed and which were the exclusive prerogative of intergovernmental organs, thus enhancing the Council's authority. He hoped that the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination, which was to study the question of ACC, would submit appropriate recommendations to the Council at its fifty-first session.

23. Despite its deficiencies, the Council could, because of its great experience, solve many complex social and economic problems and thus lighten the burden of the General Assembly. It was important as both a co-ordinating and a legislative body and for that reason his delegation was surprised that no high-ranking officials of the Secretariat were attending its meetings on so important a subject.

24. His delegation was submitting for the Council's consideration a draft resolution for adoption by the General Assembly.<sup>3</sup> It was designed to enhance the prestige and co-ordinating role of the Council and increase its effectiveness in the practical fields with which it was concerned.

25. Mr. QUARONI (Italy) said that his delegation, as had been clear in the informal meetings during the resumed forty-ninth session in December and the organizational meetings of the fiftieth session in January, attached considerable importance to reforming the working methods of the Council. With regard to the organization of work at

<sup>2</sup> Subsequently circulated as document E/4986/Add.5.

<sup>3</sup> Subsequently circulated as document E/L.1382.

the present stage, he suggested that a summary of all replies, both official and informal, should be prepared, preferably by the Secretariat, so as to facilitate the Council's work.

26. Mr. HEDEMANN (Norway) supported the New Zealand delegation's suggestion that the Secretariat should compile a list of proposals for improving the work of the Council to be submitted to an open-ended working group in preparation for consideration by the Council later in the session. His delegation would be prepared to take part in such a working group. Furthermore, the New Zealand proposals seemed to be fully compatible with others made during the meeting.

27. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that, while he was not against the establishment of a working group, he considered that more than one day was needed for the preliminary debate. Although it was superfluous for members to comment on the replies of their own Governments, they should be given an opportunity to give their views on the position of other delegations. Furthermore, it would be premature to decide on any definite course of action at that juncture. The Soviet Union had already submitted a draft resolution and certain delegations had made thought-provoking statements. Members therefore needed time to reflect and work out their positions.

28. The PRESIDENT pointed out that members would have ample opportunity to formulate their views before the Council reverted to the item during the third and fourth weeks of the session.

29. It was essential for the Council to take a decision on the item during the current session. He therefore urged delegations to submit in writing as early as possible any formal or informal proposals which they might wish to make.

30. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that he thought the suggestions before the Council were extremely interesting. There was already considerable divergence of views. For example, the delegation of Yugoslavia, in contrast to the United States delegation, considered that the Economic and Social Council was not merely a technical organ but had political functions and should therefore examine the questions submitted to it in greater depth. The Yugoslav representative had advocated certain structural reforms, whereas the representatives of the USSR and New Zealand would prefer to begin by tackling short-term problems. His own delegation felt that the Council should proceed as soon as possible to consider specific problems, beginning with short-term ones. An *ad hoc* group might be established to do the preparatory work and hear the views of States not members of the Council, which had positive contributions to make.

31. He shared the USSR representative's regret that, when the Council was considering an item which was of the greatest importance for the Department of Economic and Social Affairs, the Secretariat was not well represented; in particular, he would have liked the Under-Secretary-General to be present.

32. Mr. AKWEI (Ghana) considered that a summary of proposals and suggestions should be prepared as soon as possible since it might help to avoid unduly protracted debates. With a schematic picture of long-term and short-term proposals relating to such matters as procedure, programming, and possible institutional machinery for science and technology before it, the Council could easily identify areas of possible consensus. Furthermore, for the sake of efficiency members should be urged to submit their proposals, point by point, in writing to the Secretariat and to dispense with lengthy explanatory statements.

*The meeting rose at 4.45 p.m.*





## ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Fiftieth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Tuesday, 27 April 1971,  
at 10.50 a.m.

NEW YORK

*President: Mr. Rachid DRISS (Tunisia).*

## AGENDA ITEM 7

**Report of the Statistical Commission (E/4938, E/4989,  
chap. VI, sect. A; E/L.1372)**

1. The PRESIDENT drew the attention of the members of the Council to section A, chapter VI, of the report of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (E/4989), which dealt with the report of the Statistical Commission.

2. Mr. LOFTUS (Director, Statistical Office) recalled that the report of the Statistical Commission on its sixteenth session (E/4938) had been considered by the CPC during its general review of United Nations programmes in the economic and social fields. In the interests of conciseness certain activities of the Commission and the Statistical Office were discussed somewhat cursorily in the report. For example, the international statistical strategies and the high-priority programmes for the next five years were not described in great detail. The Commission's work covered five basic areas: first, in the field of social statistics, an attempt was being made to establish an integral system corresponding to the System of National Accounts (SNA) in the field of economic statistics. Secondly, development statistics were defined to enable the developing countries to formulate their plans for the Second United Nations Development Decade by helping them to establish their own statistical systems. About 100 experts were engaged in helping countries to devise national systems, and three institutes, situated in Rabat, Tokyo and Kampala, were providing training for experts at the national level. Two additional institutes were being set up at Yaoundé and Dar es Salaam. One of the tasks of the Statistical Office was to combine the statistics prepared by various international agencies in specialized fields into a single system with a view to facilitating access by the developing countries to the data they needed. Thirdly, in the area of electronic computing techniques most countries were confronted with the problem of a shortage of qualified personnel. Measures were being taken to remedy that situation with the help of UNDP. Fourthly, the United Nations statistical staff were trying to improve international co-ordination with a view to devising a fully integrated system which would meet the needs of both the developing and the developed countries. Lastly, the Statistical Office was enabling all countries to gain access to the statistical data they needed in order to assess their position in the world economy.

3. The report of the Commission made no mention of the fact that the Statistical Office was planning to establish an electronic data bank which would make it possible to compare the statistics of various developing countries so as

to identify trends in economic development. Such a bank would be very useful during the Second United Nations Development Decade.

4. The programme of work for the next five years was described in chapter X of the Commission's report. Chapter XIV contained twelve resolutions adopted by the Commission, and chapter XV contained a draft resolution to be considered by the Economic and Social Council.

5. Mr. MARSH (Jamaica) noted that the Conference of European Statisticians was working on environmental statistics, a new field in which it was probably difficult to make comparisons. As the Statistical Office was collaborating in that project, he would like to know its views on the subject.

6. Mr. LOFTUS (Director, Statistical Office) replied that environmental statistics were closely connected with social statistics. The Statistical Office was collaborating with the Conference of European Statisticians in the preparatory stages of the project by asking countries to provide information on their priorities in that field. The information obtained would be made available to the Conference.

7. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Commission seemed to have accomplished some highly satisfactory work at its sixteenth session. It had contributed to the development of international statistical services, particularly by attempting to rationalize the collection and presentation of data within the United Nations system. His delegation supported the decisions taken by the Commission and welcomed the results obtained.

8. It was encouraging to see that the Commission's work, as described in the report (E/4938), was fully consonant with the relevant General Assembly and Economic and Social Council resolutions. There had been cases in which other Secretariat departments had allowed considerations or proposals which bore little relation to the directives issued by the competent bodies to appear in documents prepared on behalf of the Secretary-General.

9. The results of the Commission's session and in particular the contents of its report showed that the Statistical Office, the Commission and the statistical offices of all the United Nations agencies were making a considerable effort to deal with the very important problem of statistical analysis in the economic and social fields. A high standard of economic and social statistical analysis was an essential factor for determining the measures to be taken at the international and national levels to ensure the economic and social development of all countries. One tangible result obtained was the preparation of statistical indicators of the distribution of national income and of social progress,

which would be of great assistance in future United Nations activities.

10. The statistical activities of the United Nations organs and specialized agencies were increasing rapidly every year. However, that rapid growth was accompanied by overlapping and duplication. The Statistical Commission and the Statistical Office were attempting to remedy those defects in the system. Chapter IV of the report gave some idea of the measures already taken in that connexion and of those planned for the future. The Statistical Commission had made a positive effort in that direction. However, his delegation felt that the Council itself should take a decision aimed at supporting those practical measures and strengthening the Commission's authority. In that decision, the Council could draw attention to the need to give the Commission a greater role in the co-ordination of United Nations statistical activities. It might also propose that the statistical programmes of the United Nations and the specialized agencies should not be carried out until they had been examined by the Commission. Lastly, the Council should request the Commission to promote the development of a unified system of data collection. Such a decision would help to rationalize the statistical activities of United Nations bodies. The Soviet delegation was ready to co-operate constructively with other delegations interested in drawing up a draft resolution on that question.

11. It would also be useful if the Statistical Office and the Statistical Commission could co-operate more actively with various international statistical institutes outside the United Nations system.

12. The activities of the proposed International Computing Centre were defined very broadly in chapter IV of the Commission's report. It must be acknowledged, however, that a final decision had yet to be taken on establishing the centre and it was too early at the present stage to define its activities and functions.

13. In the draft resolution appearing in chapter XV, and also in other chapters of the report, there were various provisions that could affect technical assistance. He believed that in all spheres, including statistics, United Nations technical assistance must be channelled through UNDP. It was essential to bear that principle in mind when preparing documentation.

14. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom), commenting on paragraph 118 of the report (E/4938), which indicated the reasons why the Commission preferred to hold its next session in February 1972 instead of the autumn of 1972, said that his delegation considered that those reasons were valid. An interval of over two years between the sessions would make it difficult to maintain continuity in the work of the Commission. It had been said that the volume of work of the Statistical Office was steadily growing, and if the Commission's proposal were adopted it would expand still further. However, that would be the case as long as the Commission existed. He thought that it would be advisable for the Council to endorse the Commission's proposal and for the Statistical Office to take due account of it pending a final decision.

15. Mr. TARDOS (Hungary) said that chapter II of the report gave an interesting account of developments in

national accounting. In Hungary, the Central Statistical Office was greatly concerned with that question and in 1968 an improved system of national accounting had been introduced. His delegation was pleased that the Statistical Commission had recommended circulating a description of the System of Material Product Balances (MPS). A definition of the links between MPS and the System of National Accounts (SNA) could provide the basis for an integrated system and permit comparisons within a country or between different countries. The Commission had recommended that data, in current and constant prices, on aggregates in respect of the production, supply and disposition of goods and services should also be gathered and published in terms of the SNA from countries using the MPS and in terms of the MPS from countries using the SNA and that that should be done more than once every five years. His delegation supported the proposal that there should be separate statistics for distribution services and for other services. It was important to clarify terminology and specify indicators relevant to the various services available to the public. The Statistical Office should review the classification established, without however changing the basic structure of the systems.

16. Analysing external trade statistics by mode of transport (see E/4938, para. 99) was a costly method which entailed the risk of error. The appropriate data should be related to transport rather than to external trade statistics.

17. With regard to the draft resolution in chapter XV of the report, he thought that it would be wrong to underestimate the importance of improving vital statistics for developing countries; however, the United Nations limited resources would no doubt be better utilized if they were expended in assessing the progress achieved over the past decade. His delegation hoped that the financial implications of the vital statistics project would not be excessive and that it could accordingly vote in favour of it. It would also like to know the financial implications of the 34 *ad hoc* projects of high priority listed in paragraph 115 of the report, and the number of projects of low priority. It would be preferable to concentrate on a few projects of high priority.

18. Mr. SKATARETIKO (Yugoslavia) said he would like to know why the preambular part of the draft resolution in chapter XV of the report, the purpose of which was to facilitate attainment of the objectives of the Second United Nations Development Decade, referred to General Assembly resolution 1710 (XVI), which had been adopted in 1961.

19. Mr. LOFTUS (Director, Statistical Office) said the resolution had been mentioned because it stressed statistical requirements, which had not been so strongly emphasized in the resolution dealing with the Second Development Decade. It was only after the Committee for Development Planning had studied the question in detail that emphasis had been placed on the very real need for an effort in the statistical field, as many plans and programmes had previously been prepared without sufficient account being taken of the necessary data. The Statistical Commission, being aware of that state of affairs, had consequently stressed the need for preparing essential basic statistics.

*The meeting rose at 11.55 a.m.*





## ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Fiftieth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

1741st meeting

Tuesday, 27 April 1971,  
at 3.20 p.m.

NEW YORK

*President:* Mr. Rachid DRISS (Tunisia).

## AGENDA ITEM 7

**Report of the Statistical Commission (*continued*)  
(E/4938, E/4989, chap. VI, sect. A; E/L.1372)**

1. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should take note of the report of the Statistical Commission (E/4938) and adopt the draft resolution contained in chapter XV.

2. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) pointed out, with regard to the draft resolution, that in the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (CPC) the developing countries had suggested that assistance in the field of statistics should be given in particular to the developing countries. Consideration of the draft resolution should therefore be postponed until delegations were ready to submit specific amendments to that effect.

3. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation was engaged in consultations with a view to submitting a draft resolution designed to increase the co-ordinating role of the Statistical Commission.

4. Mr. ORČIĆ (Yugoslavia) pointed out that the draft resolution referred only to the First United Nations Development Decade. His delegation would be prepared to vote for the draft resolution if a reference to General Assembly resolution 2626 (XXV), relating to the Second Development Decade, were inserted in the second preambular paragraph.

5. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that the Council might take note of the report with satisfaction as it was excellent and illuminating. Consideration of the draft resolution should be deferred to a later stage.

6. Mr. LOFTUS (Director, Statistical Office) said that he had noted the comments made on the draft resolution in the Council and in CPC. For the most part they were in line with the views of the Statistical Commission. He therefore suggested that the second preambular paragraph should be deleted in its entirety as it was not up to date; the word "further" would then be deleted from the third preambular paragraph. In order better to reflect the intentions of the Statistical Commission, operative paragraph 2 might be amended to read in part "... to give assistance to developing countries in the implementation ...".

7. Mr. ORČIĆ (Yugoslavia) said that he welcomed the report of the Statistical Commission which contained a concise and factual account of the problems in the field of

statistics. In addition, it put forward specific proposals which deserved full consideration by the Council.

8. Since, in the context of the Second United Nations Development Decade, the United Nations was called upon to solve the question of the establishment of machinery for the review and appraisal of the goals of the Second Development Decade, high priority should be accorded to the recommendations contained in chapter IV of the report. The adoption of an integrated statistical system was a prerequisite for a successful and effective review and appraisal of the goals of the Second Decade. The urgency of such a co-ordinated approach became even more apparent from the observations contained in paragraph 58 of the report. The report aptly elaborated the need to adopt major statistical policies on economic growth, full employment, income distribution, educational opportunities, social and economic disparities, and so forth. In that connexion, his delegation was in full agreement with the ideas expressed by the Statistical Commission in paragraph 70 of the report.

9. In conclusion, subject to the insertion of a reference to General Assembly resolution 2626 (XXV), his delegation would support the draft resolution contained in chapter XV since its adoption would pave the way for a successful co-operative approach in the highly important area of vital statistics.

10. Mr. FAROOQ (Pakistan) said that the report of the Statistical Commission was most commendable. His delegation had no hesitation in approving the work programme, together with the modest financial implications of the decisions taken by the Commission during its sixteenth session (E/4938, annex II), since that would help to bring about better co-ordination at the international level and improved methodology at the national level.

11. With regard to the date and place of the Commission's seventeenth session, if the Commission's request to meet in New York in February 1972 were granted, exceptional treatment in the arrangement of sessions might become the rule. His delegation would therefore prefer that the matter should be settled in accordance with the general principles of General Assembly resolution 2609 (XXIV) on the pattern of conferences.

12. His delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution on the principles and recommendations for a vital statistics system (E/4938, chapter XV). In that connexion, he drew attention to paragraph 102 of the report, and stressed that developing countries endeavouring to establish a system of vital statistics should be warned beforehand of the problems that might arise.

13. The Council's work had been greatly facilitated by the fact that the Statistical Commission had avoided a rigid



application of rule 39 of the rules of procedure of the functional commissions and had referred only one of the sixteen resolutions which it had adopted to the Council. The Council was clearly required to approve the draft resolution in chapter XV since it superseded Council resolution 1307 (XLIV) of 31 May 1968.

14. Turning to the work programme, he said that his delegation welcomed the emphasis to be given in the international statistical programmes for 1971-1975 to the particular needs of the developing countries, including the furnishing of technical assistance in the development of national statistical services. His delegation also supported the initiative to update the *Handbook of Statistical Organization*<sup>1</sup> and the proposal to hold an international seminar on statistical organization.

15. His delegation had noted with interest the view expressed in paragraph 76 of the report that the new International Computing Centre (ICC) should examine ways of providing special facilities for the developing countries in relation to the supply of data, access to its data bank, computer work and training. It also looked forward to seeing the flow of data between international organizations and Member States facilitated and increased.

16. In conclusion, he paid tribute to the realistic and expert work of the Statistical Commission as well as the excellent services rendered by the Statistical Office.

17. Mr. GATES (New Zealand) said that his delegation could have accepted the original draft resolution submitted by the Commission, but would like to have time to consider the revised version suggested by the Director of the Statistical Office.

18. In view of the vital importance of accurate national statistics to the success of the Second United Nations Development Decade, particularly in the areas of population and demography, housing and building, the production of and trade in key commodities, the Council should ensure that sufficient stress was placed on the need for data availability and the improvement of statistical services. That being so, his delegation fully endorsed the request for the publication of the "Principles and recommendations for a vital statistics system", as called for in operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution submitted for the Council's consideration. To his knowledge, the work of demographic experts in the developing countries in Asia were seriously hampered by the lack of an adequate system for recording births, deaths and marriages. It would therefore be most apposite, as recommended by the Commission, to prepare simplified versions of statistical systems for use in situations where a full system would be too costly.

19. The PRESIDENT said that, if there was no objection, he would assume that the Council was in favour of adopting the following decision:

*"The Economic and Social Council,*

*"(a) Takes note with satisfaction of the report of the Statistical Commission on its sixteenth session (E/4938);*

*"(b) Endorses the work programme contained therein."*

*It was so decided.*

20. He said that the draft resolution, with the amendments suggested by the Director of the Statistical Office, together with any other draft resolutions submitted by delegations, would be considered in detail by the Council at a later stage.

## AGENDA ITEM 9

### Transport development:

*(a) Establishment of a United Nations transport centre (E/4964 and Add.1 and 2, E/4989, chap. VIII; E/L.1381)*

21. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) urged that, before it took any decision on the matter, the Council should have at its disposal a revised version of the proposed terms of reference of a United Nations transport economics and technology documentation centre together with the related financial implications, as was suggested in the report of CPC on its eighth session (see E/4989, para. 87).

22. Mr. GUPTA (Observer for India), speaking at the invitation of the President, said that his delegation could not endorse the Secretary-General's report (E/4964), since little account had been taken of the views expressed at the Council's forty-eighth session or of the discussion in the eighth session of CPC. It would be recalled that opinions in CPC had been divided; while many members had felt that the proposed centre was unnecessary, others had given their support to the idea, on condition that the proposed terms of reference were revised to confine the centre's work to land and intermodal transport, so as to avoid duplication with other activities within the United Nations system. His delegation took particular exception, in the light of paragraphs 83 and 88 of CPC's report (E/4989), to the excessively general way in which the functions and terms of reference of the proposed centre were still described by the Secretary-General. Such phrases as "transportation in its entirety", "transport technology", "over-all transport policy", "over-all transport planning" and "an integrated development of transport in its entirety" in paragraphs 9, 10, 11 and 12, respectively, of his report were strangely at odds with the consensus of opinion of delegations.

23. Mr. TARDOS (Hungary) said that his delegation was opposed to the establishment of a United Nations transport economics and technology documentation centre on the grounds that it would lead to considerable overlapping or that the centre would take over functions of documentation that other bodies, such as the International Union of Railways, had been discharging with success for a long time. As the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) stated in paragraph 5 of document E/4964/Add.1, the problem as regards air transport was not a shortage of documentation but one of selection. His delegation fully concurred in the opinion of ICAO that the centre, if established, could add little if anything to the information available and, indeed, would give rise to duplication and confusion.

<sup>1</sup> United Nations publication, Sales No.: 54.XVII.7.



24. Another cogent argument against the establishment of the centre was the financial situation of the United Nations. There could be no doubt that the Organization could expend the sum proposed for the centre on more worthy projects. The figure of \$660,400 which had been quoted in the statement on the administrative and financial implications of the centre (see E/4964/Add.2) was, in any case, a modest underestimate because it did not include the cost of microfilming and the use of computer services. Moreover, the return—fifty pages of newsletter four times a year—would hardly be worth the expense involved.

25. His delegation regarded the United Nations/IMCO Conference on International Container Traffic, to be held at Geneva in 1972, as both timely and useful. A comprehensive convention regulating the questions of safety requirements and customs formalities in respect of container traffic could only promote the development of international transport.

26. It should be stressed, however, that the Conference would be able to perform effectively only if it had a universal character; an invitation should therefore be sent to the German Democratic Republic. It was deplorable to have to raise, time and time again, the question that had been definitively decided by history. His delegation had pointed out for years in various United Nations forums that the situation was untenable. The obstruction of the participation of the German Democratic Republic was contrary to the principles of international law and alien to the objectives of the United Nations. At the same time, by debarring that country from membership and from the Conference in question, the Council was depriving itself of the co-operation of a country which, by reason of its central geographical location, its industrial potential and its technological and scientific prowess, was an indispensable partner in international transport.

27. Mr. LENNON (United States of America) said that his delegation doubted the wisdom of establishing a United Nations transport economics and technology documentation centre, especially since, according to the report of CPC (E/4989), even those delegations which favoured the establishment of the centre could not support the proposal before the Council in its present form (E/4964).

28. The Centre would undoubtedly duplicate the work of other bodies. According to its proposed terms of reference, the centre would organize on an *ad hoc* basis, teams and task forces of experts to carry out surveys and studies (see E/4964, para. 16), but that was a function of other United Nations bodies. According to paragraph 14(c), it would also analyse and evaluate the information it received on transport matters in order to extract from it information helpful in solving transport development problems, particularly for developing countries and regions, and in accordance with paragraph 14(g), it would arrange advanced training for personnel from developing countries designated to serve in high-level transport planning, administration or management posts; but those were functions that could be carried out within the existing structure of the United Nations. Since the proposal did not seem to be based on a careful analysis of all aspects of the situation, his delegation doubted whether, even if the criticisms made by

the Indian representative were met, the text could be improved sufficiently to make it acceptable.

29. He therefore suggested that the Council should take note of the views expressed by CPC and let the matter rest at that point for the time being.

30. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) welcomed the fact that observers were taking part in the present meeting in view of the comments made in connexion with a previous item about the participation of more Member States in the work of the Economic and Social Council.

31. His delegation supported the valid procedural objections raised by the delegations of Brazil and India. The Council must give due weight to the views and suggestions of CPC. Accordingly, his delegation agreed that the Secretariat should be requested to revise the draft terms of reference of the centre, but would not necessarily commit itself to supporting the revised text.

32. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation found it somewhat difficult to speak on the question of the proposed United Nations transport economics and technology documentation centre without referring to the second part of the agenda item dealing with preparation for the United Nations/IMCO Conference, as it was not yet clear how container shipping would affect all kinds of transport.

33. His country attached great importance to the question of transport, which, as Mr. Brezhnev, the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party had said, it regarded as an important field of international co-operation. All types of transport were now highly developed; transport questions transcended national boundaries and became intra-continental and inter-continental in scope; and the improvement of transport was an important and effective means of development. However, despite the importance it attached to that rapidly changing field, his delegation had serious misgivings about the establishment of the proposed centre. In the first place, many bodies were already operating in the field of transport, such as ICAO, the specialized agency which had been given responsibility for air transport; UNCTAD, which, though new, was playing an increasingly effective role in sea transport; the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization (IMCO), which was making a significant contribution to international co-operation in the use of the oceans and the development of shipping; and such other international organizations as the International Union of Railways and the International Road Federation, which had already acquired great experience and promoted the adoption of many agreements and conventions. Secondly, the establishment in the United Nations of the proposed centre would deprive the new body of any possibility of doing effective work. It would in essence be only a small cog doing little practical work in the machinery of the United Nations, the only big thing about it being its name. All practical work in the field would continue to be done by the national, non-governmental and intergovernmental authorities.

34. The original ambitious proposal made by the Secretariat at the Council's forty-eighth session had envisaged the establishment of a body which would serve as a focal point



for the work of the different organs concerned with land transport. The present proposal for a documentation centre, which would spend some \$660,400 a year to produce a mere 200 pages of documentation, was a severe disappointment. The original idea had vision and scope and should be reconsidered by the Council at the proper time and under the proper circumstances. Meanwhile, his delegation felt that the Council should not decide to establish the centre as now proposed; that did not mean that it would not support the establishment by the Secretariat of a group to study transport trends, the activities of intergovernmental organs in the field in question, and existing conventions and agreements on transport and, on the basis of its findings, to propose an institution which would not be a mere research group but an expression of the will of the Members of the United Nations to co-ordinate all activities and harmonize international co-operation in the sphere of transport. That would be a large and important body and a true transport centre.

35. Mr. SKATARETIKO (Yugoslavia) recalled that CPC, which had been established to assist the Economic and Social Council, had stated in paragraph 87 of its report that several members had insisted that the Council should be presented with revised terms of reference for the Centre. The Council could not ignore that fact. Furthermore, the subject was by no means new and statements were being repeated from year to year. To avoid further duplication, the Council should support the recommendation of CPC so that it might consider the question of the establishment of a transport centre more meaningfully.

36. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) considered that it was somewhat embarrassing for the Secretariat to be requested to produce new terms of reference for the centre, as it had already stated its position clearly in document E/4964.

37. Since several members were against the establishment of the centre because of its questionable usefulness, excessive cost and possible duplication, while others would support it if its sphere of competence were more modest, the Council should forthwith request the Secretariat to confirm its readiness to submit revised terms of reference. It might also submit an explanatory statement relating to the functions of the Transport Division indicating whether, with more staff and an enlarged sphere of competence, the Division could effectively discharge its functions without requiring the assistance of such a centre.

38. If the Secretariat could not produce revised terms of reference for the centre, those members of the Council who supported the centre might prepare, for consideration by the Council, a draft resolution revising the centre's terms of reference and making its sphere of competence more modest. Alternatively, the Council could take note of the report of the Secretary-General (E/4964) and defer further consideration of the question until a future session.

39. The PRESIDENT said that there appeared to be a consensus that the Council needed to have at its disposal the revised terms of reference before considering the substance of the question.

40. If there were no objections, he would take it that the Council wished to request the Secretary-General to make available revised terms of reference and related financial implications in the light of the discussions in the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination.

*It was so decided.*

*The meeting rose at 4.55 p.m.*





## ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Fiftieth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Wednesday, 28 April 1971,  
at 10.55 a.m.

NEW YORK

*President: Mr. Rachid DRISS (Tunisia).*

## AGENDA ITEM 19

**Accession of the Republic of Korea to the Convention on Road Traffic of 19 September 1949 (E/4972, E/L.1383)**

1. The PRESIDENT pointed out that the members of the Council had received document E/4972 in which the Secretary-General drew their attention to the communication from the Government of the Republic of Korea dated 16 February 1971, expressing the Government's wish to accede to the Convention on Road Traffic opened for signature at Geneva on 19 September 1949.

2. The delegation of New Zealand had submitted a draft resolution on the subject (E/L.1383).

3. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) read out the draft resolution submitted by his delegation. The adoption of the draft resolution by the Council would have the effect of acceding to the request of the Government of the Republic of Korea set out in the note by the Secretary-General (E/4972) since the Council would in fact be declaring, in the operative paragraph, that the Republic of Korea could become a party to the Convention on Road Traffic of 19 September 1949.

4. He drew attention of members of the Council to article 27, paragraph 3, of the Convention on Road Traffic, which was reproduced in document E/4972. It was clear from that text that, in addition to the States mentioned in article 27, paragraph 1, any other State which the Economic and Social Council might by resolution declare eligible could accede to the Convention.

5. It appeared that despite the views of an essentially political nature which had been expressed during the consideration of the provisional agenda, there was no reason why the Council should not take the necessary measures to declare that the Republic of Korea met the conditions required for accession to the Convention. On two previous occasions the Council had taken similar measures by acceding to the requests submitted in the case of partitioned States, namely, the request of the German Federal Republic in 1951 (resolution 348 A (XII)) and that of the State of Viet-Nam in 1953 (resolution 506 (XVI)). In those two cases, the Council, by a large majority, had agreed that the States in question should become parties to the Convention.

6. His delegation therefore hoped that the draft resolution it had submitted would receive the widest possible support from members of the Council.

7. Mr. TARDOS (Hungary) recalled that he had been firmly opposed to the inclusion of the item in question in the agenda. He read out article 27, paragraph 3, of the Convention, and pointed out that it was impossible for the Council to declare that the Republic of Korea could accede to the Convention since the authorities in the southern part of Korea could not claim to represent the Korean people. He thought that the request was of a political rather than a technical nature. His delegation would therefore vote against the proposal that the Council should declare the Republic of Korea eligible to accede to the Convention.

8. Mr. ZAKHAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he, too, had voted against the inclusion of the item in the agenda and that in his view the Secretary-General's note (E/4972) was not admissible. The régime in Seoul did not have the right to assume international obligations on behalf of the Korean people and the decision by the Council would constitute a violation of international law. Accordingly, his delegation would vote resolutely against a decision which was in such conflict with the law.

9. Mr. ANTOINE (Haiti) pointed out that the Committee was considering a draft resolution and not the agenda. Since the Republic of Korea had always been allowed to send an Observer to the United Nations and since the question of accession to a road traffic convention was a routine question, his delegation supported the draft resolution (E/L.1383).

10. Mr. FINGER (United States of America) supported the draft resolution submitted by the New Zealand delegation. There were many precedents for the procedure suggested in the draft. In 1951, in resolution 348 (XII), the Council had recognized that the Governments of the German Federal Republic and the Principality of Monaco could accede to the Convention. In 1953, the representative of France, supported by the United States among others, had submitted a draft resolution which had been adopted (resolution 506 (XVI)) and which had followed the same procedure with regard to the State of Viet-Nam. By objecting to the application of that procedure, the Hungarian and Soviet delegations were running counter to the opinion of the General Assembly which, in December 1948, had recognized that the Government of the Republic of Korea was the only lawful Government in Korea (resolution 195 (III)) and which had affirmed elsewhere that Korea met the conditions required for membership in the United Nations; such membership had been blocked by a veto by one permanent member in the Security Council. The draft resolution submitted by New Zealand was, however, of an economic nature and there was no need to engage in a political debate.

11. Mr. ORČIĆ (Yugoslavia) indicated that his delegation, which at the 1738th meeting had voted against the

inclusion in the agenda of the item relating to the accession of the Republic of Korea, would vote against the draft resolution.

12. Mr. ZAKHAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), replying to the representative of the United States, observed that South Korea continued to be occupied by a foreign army which usurped the United Nations flag to conceal its activities. The discussion which had taken place during the current meeting showed once again that a United Nations organ was being used to give a semblance of respectability to a puppet régime. He confirmed that he would vote against the draft resolution.

13. Mr. FINGER (United States of America) recalled that at the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly the Soviet delegation had advanced the same point of view and that it had been rejected by the First Committee by an overwhelming majority.

14. Mr. ARIFF (Malaysia) supported the draft resolution. He thought that there was no political question involved and that the desire of the Korean Government to conduct the affairs of its country within the framework of the United Nations deserved nothing but praise.

15. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that in the view of his delegation the question at issue was that of accession to a convention of an essentially technical nature, and on conditions set out in the Convention itself in the passages relating to the conditions for the accession of various countries. The Council should therefore confine itself to consideration of the technical aspect of the problem since it had nothing to do with the political aspects. His delegation was ready to lend its support to the draft resolution submitted by New Zealand but, in its view, the operative paragraph, in which the Council was called upon to declare that the Republic of Korea was eligible to accede to the Convention on Road Traffic signified that its eligibility depended on its fulfilling the conditions set out in chapter VII of the Convention. Even if a clarification to that effect was not included in the body of the draft resolution, the point should be borne in mind.

16. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) said that his delegation, which had opposed the inclusion of the item in the agenda, was also opposed in general to the United Nations commitment

in Korea. He thought that the draft resolution was of a political nature and that it was yet another manifestation of the desire to perpetuate the Organization's commitment in Korea, which did not promote the realization of the purposes of the Charter. While realizing that the draft resolution would probably be adopted, his delegation maintained its opposition and hoped that the United Nations would at a future stage adopt a more constructive approach to the problem of Korea.

17. Mr. DE SOTO (Peru) associated himself with the remarks of the representatives of France and Malaysia, who thought that the draft resolution should be considered as divorced from any political considerations. He shared the view of the French delegation that any State could be authorized to sign the Convention, with the consent of the Economic and Social Council, on the conditions set out in chapter VII of the Convention. It was in that spirit that his delegation would vote in favour of the text submitted by New Zealand.

18. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand), replying to the representatives of France and Peru, observed that the draft resolution which he had submitted followed exactly the text of the Convention itself. It was drafted in the same terms in which the Economic and Social Council had, in resolution 348 (XII), authorized the German Federal Republic and the Principality of Monaco to accede to the Convention.

19. Mr. VIAUD (France) suggested that the French text of the draft resolution should be redrafted to reflect the spirit of the provisions of article 27 of the Convention.

20. The PRESIDENT said that that observation would be taken into account.

21. Mr. DE SOTO (Peru) asked that the Spanish text should also be redrafted, if necessary.

22. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the draft resolution (E/L.1383).

*The draft resolution was adopted by 16 votes to 5, with 4 abstentions.*

*The meeting rose at 11.40 a.m.*





## ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Fiftieth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Wednesday, 28 April 1971,  
at 3.20 p.m.

NEW YORK

*President: Mr. Rachid DRISS (Tunisia).*

## AGENDA ITEM 16

**Measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council (continued)\* (E/4986 and Add.1-4, E/L.1382)**

1. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that the difficulties which the Council had been facing for many years were due mainly to the considerable growth of the economic activities of the United Nations system caused by the accession to independence of many territories and by increasing awareness of the problem of under-development as it affected a large part of mankind. The changes which those developments necessitated had been opposed by the industrialized countries, as could be seen from their initial unwillingness to agree to the convening of a conference on trade and development. At the same time the developing countries, in their impatience, had tended to by-pass the conservative stronghold which the Council constituted in their eyes. The result had been a progressive weakening of the Council and a proliferation of new organs detrimental to the efficiency of the Organization as a whole.

2. The problem of the need to improve the methods and organization of the Council was still unsolved because of the mutual distrust of the industrialized and developing countries. He could not agree with the representative of Brazil (see 1738th meeting) that the efforts to revive the Council were largely designed to counter the natural preference of developing countries for larger and more politically oriented organs in which their demands were more likely to be met. His own delegations' desire to give new life to the Council arose from a deep conviction that the General Assembly might be weakened if its work was not carefully prepared by an organ which had the Assembly's confidence and enjoyed the necessary prestige among the agencies of the United Nations system.

3. If the Council was to regain its rightful place, it was essential to overcome the mistrust with which the proposals of the different groups were still being received. Only then could the Council agree on practical measures which would enable it to be the focal point for the formulation and harmonization of policies designed to accelerate the economic and social progress of the third world.

4. It was unfair to say that the Council had done nothing for the developing countries. After establishing the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance and the Special Fund it had merged them in the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). It had established the Economic Commission for Africa and the Economic and Social

Office at Beirut. It had encouraged the activities of the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) and had contributed to the launching of the Second United Nations Development Decade. Lastly, it had authorized the Secretary-General to convene high-level expert groups such as the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development. The difficulty lay in the fact that the Council tended to lose control of the machinery which it set up to deal with problems as they arose and found itself reduced to holding academic debates on the reports of its subsidiary organs, as in the case, most notably, of UNDP and UNICEF. The autonomy of UNCTAD and UNIDO had accelerated that process. In his view, the remedy did not lie in expanding the membership of the Council, which would involve the delicate task of amending the Charter. The role of the Council, which was fundamentally of a political nature, consisted in identifying the main economic and social problems facing the international community at meetings attended, preferably, by ministers or other high-ranking officials, and recommending to the Governments concerned and the organs of the United Nations the policies to be pursued. Hence the revival of the Council depended on the political will of its members to co-operate in all the tasks entrusted to it. He did not agree with the representative of Brazil that the desired political will would be created by increasing the number of participants, but he fully concurred in the view that the main obstacle which the Council faced was the conflict between the interests of the industrialized world and those of the less developed countries. That obstacle would be overcome more easily if the economic and social policy-makers met regularly in the Council in order to give the necessary impetus to the competent organs of the United Nations. Such meetings would be particularly useful in connexion with the appraisal of the Second Development Decade.

5. The Council had not been as successful as had been hoped in co-ordinating the activities of the specialized agencies and the principal organs of the United Nations. In the case of the Second Development Decade, for example, it did not have the authority to force the organizations of the United Nations system to adopt the complementary measures required for the success of the programmes undertaken. The developed countries attributed the Council's impotence to increases in the budget and bad organization, while the developing countries put the blame on budgetary restrictions, but no attempt had been made to agree on priorities. With the assistance of the subsidiary bodies, and of CPC in particular, the Council should be able to identify areas warranting priority and recommend increases in resources for the most useful activities while calling for reductions in the resources devoted to secondary activities. If the Council could establish priorities and impose on the specialized agencies the discipline required for the execution of joint programmes it would recover the

\* Resumed from the 1739th meeting.



prestige without which its co-ordinating function would degenerate into a mere administrative exercise. His delegation was not categorically opposed to a reasonable increase in the budget, but considered that when proposals for the adoption or expansion of programmes were being studied thought should be given to the possibility of reducing less important activities. With regard to the Second Development Decade, France would approve the establishment of more substantial administrative support provided the developing countries acknowledged that the success of the Decade would largely depend on a reduction in the secondary programmes of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade (General Assembly resolution 2626 (XXV)).

6. Thus, the two basic elements of reform were the holding of frequent high-level meetings in order to enhance the authority of the recommendations submitted to the General Assembly and the fixing of priorities as a means of providing more dynamic guidance for the activities of the United Nations and its specialized agencies. As his Government had stated in its memorandum (see E/4986/Add.3), a distinction could then be made between the organization of work and reorganization of the Council's structures. His delegation agreed with the President of the forty-ninth session of the Council that members should not underestimate the value of practical steps relating to the organization of meetings, the preparation of documents, the periodicity of sessions and the staggering of certain items. The Council might take useful decisions on those matters.

7. With regard to structural reform, it would be pointless at the present time to enlarge the Council itself. At the technical level, however, more States might profitably be involved in the preparation of certain items if the committees reporting to the Council were enlarged. Similarly, the membership of CPC might be increased to twenty-seven. With regard to the application of science and technology to development, an intergovernmental organ should be established which could do the preparatory work that the Council was not able to undertake. Such committees or commissions should have the benefit of the preliminary views of groups of experts such as the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development.

8. His delegation was prepared to co-operate fully in the work of the Council or in any working group. The success of any reforms adopted would depend largely on the spirit in which they were applied. If the Council was to play a vital role within the United Nations and serve the interests of the third world, it was essential that members should at all times show the political will to promote the economic and social development of the developing countries.

9. Mr. LOUYA (Democratic Republic of the Congo) said that despite the reforms introduced since 1965, the Council was not yet in a position to discharge effectively the tasks assigned to it by the Charter. Serious problems, for which the Council was not entirely responsible, continued to exist in the fields of co-ordination and development. The Council's defects were mainly due to the establishment of a great number of organs over the past twenty years, the multiplicity of their tasks and the absence of any effective

machinery for the integration and collective appraisal of their activities.

10. The results achieved by the United Nations in the economic and social fields were followed closely throughout the world. It was clear that the effectiveness of the United Nations system in promoting development was largely dependent on the efficiency of the Economic and Social Council which formulated the relevant policy guidelines. His delegation therefore supported the proposal of the New Zealand representative (1739th meeting) to establish a working group which would consider in depth the item under discussion, analyse the views submitted by Governments and thus help to identify the reforms which were needed, particularly with regard to improvements in co-ordination.

11. His delegation had no objection in principle to the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union (E/L.1382), but it did not think that the Council should take a decision on it at the current session since, before taking such a step, it should await the recommendations and proposals of the working group.

12. Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya) said that, like other developing countries, Kenya had a vital stake in the work of the Council. It felt that, in consonance with the spirit of the Charter, the work of the Council should be viewed in the light of the demands made upon it by the millions of human beings who still lacked the basic requisites of economic and social development. It should be related to the challenge laid down in the International Development Strategy adopted by the General Assembly, and measures to improve the organization of the Council's work should be undertaken from that standpoint alone.

13. If the goals of the Development Decade were to be achieved, the Council could not confine itself to forwarding documents produced by the Secretariat to the General Assembly without specific policy directives and recommendations for implementation. It could not disregard its primary role as a policy-making body in the field of economic and social development and it should demonstrate its dynamism by taking initiatives in that field. In order to play its role as the main intergovernmental co-ordinating body on policy matters as defined in Chapter X of the Charter it should establish priorities and evolve the appropriate policy measures for their implementation. It should not waste time on detailed discussion of the numerous reports from the specialized agencies, and it should make sure that overlapping was avoided.

14. If the Council was to be able to wield full authority and gain the necessary support of Governments, its working documents should be issued at least six weeks before the opening of its sessions. His delegation would be in favour of a system which would ensure that documents were forwarded to members sufficiently early so that the discussion of items would not have to be postponed because delegations had not had time to read them. In addition, documents should spell out clearly the action required and its financial implications so that the Council could consider it realistically.

15. The Council could fulfil its basic mission only if it served all countries, developed and developing. His delega-



tion supported the suggestions for increasing the Council's membership, in the belief that to do so would strengthen it and give greater authority to its decisions.

16. The PRESIDENT urged members intending to submit draft resolutions to do so as soon as possible so that a working group composed of the sponsors of such drafts could be set up with a view to reaching a consensus during the session. In addition, the Secretariat should prepare a reference paper containing an analysis of the main ideas and suggestions put forward for consideration by the Council during the third week of the session.

17. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) supported the President's suggestions but wished to point out that the Secretariat had a vital role to play in improving the work of the Council. He would welcome a position statement by the Secretariat.

18. Mr. DE SEYNES (Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs) said that he had been unable to listen to earlier statements in the Council's debate because he had been required to attend ACC.

19. The question of the composition of the Council was closely linked with a more vital problem: the political balance within United Nations organs. Some delegations were of the opinion that a membership of twenty-seven was not the optimum number for the Council because it did not provide the most dynamic balance. In that connexion, it should be remembered that the Council was functioning in a state of osmosis with the General Assembly and the equilibrium which was being sustained was highly satisfactory and dynamic. He could recall no instance of the Council taking a position substantially different from that subsequently taken by the Assembly, either before or after the membership had been raised to twenty-seven; the Council had always recognized that it could function effectively only if it reflected the position of the General Assembly.

20. He had been surprised that the representative of France, in speaking of the past role of the Council, had not referred to the Council's decision leading to the establishment of UNCTAD. The resolution, if he remembered correctly, had been elaborated by the Council at its thirty-fourth session in 1962 and had been adopted by the General Assembly at its sixteenth session. The Council had at that time been composed of only eighteen members.

21. One inherent source of weakness for the Economic and Social Council was to be found in the nature of the functions which were now ascribed to it or advocated for it. The functions which were within the classical traditions of multilateral diplomacy, those relating to trade, international payments and capital transfers, as well as the supervision of programmes of practical action, were now exercised elsewhere either *de jure* or *de facto*. UNCTAD had within its jurisdiction the negotiation of concrete agreement on trade and finance, and the Economic and Social Council had, for all practical purposes, abdicated its responsibility to control the United Nations Development Programme. It was quite revealing that the thorough reform of the programme, on the basis of the Jackson Report,<sup>1</sup>

had not been undertaken by the Economic and Social Council in spite of the impact which UNDP activities had on the whole of the United Nations system. That was both a symptom and a cause of the weakness of the Council. The situation had therefore been reached where the operationally significant functions were vested *de jure* or *de facto* in other organs.

22. It remained for the Council to discharge functions which were vital but rather vague and ill-defined and which under any set of circumstances would be extremely difficult to perform: (a) the formulation of general policies; (b) the co-ordination of programmes of the United Nations system; and (c) the control of the programme of work of the United Nations proper. In performing (a) the Council always ran the risk of confining itself to generalities without much impact; (b) was extremely difficult as the Council had neither juridical authority over the programmes of the agencies nor the power of the purse to influence them; (c) was handicapped by a method of programme and budget which did not permit the effective relation of one to the other.

23. Nevertheless, the Economic and Social Council had a unique chance to overcome those handicaps if it was given the principal responsibility, under the General Assembly, for the delicate functions relating to the Second Development Decade. It seemed that the Council was the proper place for that as the General Assembly was too large for an exercise which had many technical aspects and as the Strategy represented a synthesis of numerous elements which were dealt with in different agencies directly related to the Council. The Economic and Social Council was the natural focal point for ensuring the coherence of the Strategy, in view of its institutional relationship with all the various agencies or organizations of the system. If the chance was missed, then it was probable that the Council would persist in its dynamic insufficiency for years to come, even if its membership was increased.

24. More difficult tasks even than the Development Strategy would confront the United Nations system during the 1970s, which also because of their multidisciplinary nature should be vested in the Economic and Social Council, under the General Assembly. Those were the subject matters arising from the development of technology which would require the co-ordination of numerous elements and a measure of planning and forecasting, for which the Council would also appear to be the natural focal point under the authority of the General Assembly. When dealing with such matters, including environment, the same degree of convergence of interests between groups of countries as postulated for the Development Strategy might not be found. Priorities might have to be defined and arbitrations exercised in cases of conflicts of interests. There was in certain quarters a resistance to dealing with those problems within the United Nations system, but it should be realized that if they were not dealt with within the United Nations system, they would be dealt with elsewhere without the concurrence, support and influence of a large part of humanity which could be affected by the decisions made. In respect of those new subjects, involving action with a real operational significance, a strong Economic and Social Council would appear to be a great asset.

<sup>1</sup> A Study of the Capacity of the United Nations Development System (United Nations publication, Sales No.: E.70.I.10).



25. The role of the Secretariat in respect of the present functions of the Economic and Social Council was essentially that of providing the Council with the information and analysis which it needed to discharge its responsibilities. It was quite possible that the role was not adequately exercised, and that the Council required a different type of document in order to pass judgement in fields increasingly complex. The matter should be the subject of careful scrutiny and of a dialogue between the Governments and the Secretariat. The objective here was to provide the Economic and Social Council with the material which it needed to formulate a global judgement on problems, some of which had a planetary character. Studies and reports, of course, should retain their professional rigour, but they might be presented in a way which would be more useful to decision-makers in the Governments.

26. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that he agreed with the French representative and the Under-Secretary-General that the Council's problem lay in its inability to control the activities of the organs established under its auspices. Nevertheless, it must face up to its important task of co-ordinating the work of those bodies with that of the specialized agencies. The Council was at a disadvantage in that the range of its concerns was very broad, and it was clearly difficult for the Secretariat to produce good documentation defining the essence of each problem. In addition, there were the questions of political balance and the need to satisfy as many Governments as possible. It was true that the developing countries had never responded to the Council as they had to UNCTAD, despite the fact that, as the French representative had pointed out, the Council had done much for them in the past and that it had launched the initiative by which UNCTAD had been established. His delegation did not oppose the idea of enlarging the membership of the Council, even though that might require an amendment to the Charter, but it would prefer to see an expansion of the Economic Committee. If that were agreed to, it would be necessary to appoint experts to enable the Secretariat to facilitate the Committee's work.

27. The Council appeared to be agreed that a working group, in which non-members of the Council could participate, should do some preparatory work on the item under discussion. It would, however, in his opinion, need to have before it an analytical summary of the views expressed in the Council, prepared by the Secretariat. He wondered whether the working group would be authorized to discuss the USSR delegation's resolution and any others that might be submitted.

28. The PRESIDENT suggested that it would be advisable for the group to be a formal working group and thus to have the full range of conference services. It might consist of or include the sponsors of draft resolutions.

29. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that, when he had spoken of the past history of the Council, he had hesitated to credit the latter with setting up UNCTAD because it had dragged its feet for two or three years before taking any decision on that matter and, by so doing, had failed to measure up to the expectations of the developing countries.

30. He agreed with the President that the working group should be formal. The Soviet Union should be commended

for submitting a draft resolution (E/L.1382), even though it perhaps did not cover all the views expressed in the debate, and other delegations should be encouraged to submit draft resolutions as a basis for discussion. It would be advisable to wait until such draft resolutions were handed to the Secretariat before the working group was established. If the procedure he was suggesting found favour, a decision would have to be taken on the items to be covered by the draft resolutions. In any event, the sponsors should take into account the views expressed in the debate and endeavour to produce texts acceptable to the Council as a whole if anything was to be achieved at the current session.

31. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) said that the Secretary-General's views on measures to improve the organization of the Council's work would be most welcome. A wealth of material on the subject already existed and he agreed with the suggestion that material of an unofficial nature should also be considered. He was confident that the Secretariat would be able to identify some areas on which the Council could reach a consensus and he hoped that it could produce material in time for consideration by a working group. He agreed with the representatives of France and Greece that a working group should do the spade-work, leaving the Council to make the final pronouncements. It was essential for the Council to achieve progress on certain procedural and technical matters in which reform was long overdue. The working group need not await the submission of additional draft resolutions provided it had a summary of suggestions on the short-term measures contemplated. With regard to the Soviet Union's draft resolution, he was of the opinion that it should be deferred until the following session on the grounds that it did not reflect the widespread feeling among members that the Council should take early action. He wondered whether the President would designate the members of the working group and whether it would be open to non-members of the Council. He hoped that the working group could meet as soon as the Secretariat had compiled a basic working document. A time-limit should be set so that the Council could take a decision on its recommendations during the latter part of the session.

32. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) supported the proposal for the establishment of a working group, which he felt should begin its deliberations the following week on the basis of a working paper prepared by the Secretariat. He was doubtful whether the working group would be able to submit to the Council at its present session a draft resolution containing specific recommendations, but it might be able to reach a consensus on some particular points. He suggested that the President or the working group should contact the Chairman of the Special Committee on the Rationalization of the Procedures and Organization of the General Assembly to ascertain what views had been expressed in that Committee and whether they might be helpful to the Council in its own work.

33. The PRESIDENT said that he would act on the Sudanese representative's suggestion, for the two bodies in question would inevitably have an interest in each other's work.

34. He invited the members of the Council to express their views on the advisability of requesting the Secretariat to prepare an analytical summary of the views and proposals



made and on the desirability of establishing a working group.

35. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he could see no reason for haste in the establishment of a working group, which would, he felt, only tie the Council's hands and to some extent circumvent it. The working group would be too small and technical a body to deal with the great bulk of material already available on the subject: the conclusions to which the President of the forty-ninth session of the Council had come after his unofficial consultations in December 1970, the Council's discussion of the subject in January 1971, the replies of Governments (E/4986 and Add.I-4), and the exchange of views at the present session. In addition, there was his delegation's draft resolution (E/L.1382), which was concerned only with some first steps which could be taken on specific aspects of the Council's work. Other draft resolutions might also be submitted. Thus the Council had both the time and the material it needed to take a decision on the matter itself.

36. He supported the proposal to request the Secretariat to prepare an analysis of the proposals made but hoped that the Secretary-General, as head of one of the principal organs of the United Nations, would also express his views on the subject and make any recommendations he felt appropriate. If the Secretary-General was unable to submit such a document during the current session, his delegation would agree to postpone consideration of the matter to the next session.

37. Mr. ANTOINE (Haiti) also felt that the Council should be in no hurry to establish a working group at its current session, since only a few Governments had replied to the Secretary-General's request for their views. He would endorse a request to the Secretariat to prepare an analytical summary, but felt that the Secretariat might be in a better position to express its view on the subject at the next session. Accordingly, he felt that consideration of the matter should be postponed to that session and, in the meantime, the Secretariat could co-ordinate all the views expressed by Governments in a single document on the basis of which the Council could adopt a draft resolution containing its final decision.

38. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) agreed with the representatives of the USSR and Haiti that the Council might indeed dispense with the establishment of a working group, which would be an exceptional procedure, and leave time to ascertain for itself the views of more non-members, particularly in the form of statements by their observers in the Council.

39. He would suggest that delegations contemplating the submission of draft resolutions should confine them to immediate problems.

40. Mr. JAIN (Observer for India), speaking at the invitation of the President, said that his delegation favoured the establishment of a working group because the group could consider all the proposals made and crystallize the points on which consensus might conceivably be reached during the current session, and because it would obviate the necessity for lengthy discussions. His delegation, which took a keen interest in the subject and had already

submitted some suggestions on it, would like to become a member of the working group. He also supported the proposed request to the Secretariat.

41. Mr. TARDOS (Hungary) doubted whether any consensus could be reached until the views of all other members and non-members had been heard; only then could the points of possible agreement emerge. Instead of establishing a working group, the members of the Council might simply hold informal consultations.

42. Mr. FINGER (United States of America) saw no reason for delaying the establishment of a working group. In such a body statements were briefer, work progressed more quickly and non-members could take part. If the Council had to wait for the written views of all other members—or even a majority of them—before it could set up the working group, it might find itself waiting indefinitely. It was rare for more than a fraction of Governments to reply in such instances. Any action it took at the current session would in no sense be definitive and would be subject to continuing review. He could see no reason why the working group should not discuss, *inter alia*, the USSR draft resolution, which tied in well with the work of the Special Committee on the Rationalization of the Procedures and Organization of the General Assembly and proposed a logical distribution of work between the Council and the Assembly, in accordance with Chapters IX and X of the Charter. He doubted, however, whether there was a necessary pre-condition for the submission of other draft resolutions. He therefore suggested that the President should consult the members to ascertain whether there was agreement on the objectives and composition of the working group. The preparation of a working document by the Secretariat would be very helpful.

43. Mr. HEDEMANN (Norway) supported both the early establishment of a working group and the preparation of an analytical summary by the Secretariat.

44. Mr. AKWEI (Ghana) supported the proposal to request the Secretariat to prepare an analytical summary of the proposals made and the proposal to establish a working group, which could even be a committee of the whole and should be open to all Members of the United Nations. He could see no need to lay down any specific terms of reference for it. Clearly, the working group would never receive all the views of all Member States; it should merely be asked to take account of any views submitted at any time. Proposals need not be submitted in the form of a draft resolution, nor need the working group submit a draft resolution as the final result of its work, particularly one in the form of a draft resolution for adoption by the General Assembly, as many matters could be decided by the Council on its own authority. The working group should study but not necessarily decide on the USSR draft resolution at the present session.

45. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) said that the Council had now reverted to the point it had reached at its forty-ninth session in July 1970. Enough informal consultations had been held; it was time for the Council itself to deal with the question. There was no reason why it could not do so: it had the time, the text of the replies by

Governments and the summary records of its meetings. Instead of establishing a working group it should now go beyond the stage of expression of views and, at the end of its current session, decide at least certain minor matters, such as the calendar of meetings and documentation. He was in favour of asking the Secretariat for an analytical summary, which Governments should study, together with the replies of other Governments; they should then come to the next session prepared to take decisions on major points.

46. Mr. SPENCER (Observer for Canada), speaking at the invitation of the President, indicated that the views of his

delegation coincided with those expressed by the Observer for India.

47. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should postpone a decision on the question of the working group for the time being and should decide to request the Secretariat to prepare an analytical summary of the comments made on the item under discussion.

*It was so decided.*

*The meeting rose at 6.5 p.m.*





## ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Fiftieth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Friday, 30 April 1971,  
at 11.15 a.m.

NEW YORK

*President: Mr. Rachid DRISS (Tunisia).*

## AGENDA ITEM 7

**Report of the Statistical Commission (continued)\*  
(E/4938, E/4989, chap. VI, sect. A; E/L.1372, E/L.1386)**

1. The PRESIDENT drew the Council's attention to the draft resolution entitled "Principles and recommendations for a vital statistics system" contained in chapter XV of the report of the Commission (E/4938) and invited the representative of Pakistan to introduce the amendments contained in document E/L.1386.

2. Mr. FAROOQ (Pakistan) read out the amendments submitted by the delegations of Brazil, Pakistan, Sudan and Yugoslavia. Those amendments took into account the interests of the developing countries which would have to establish or strengthen their own statistical services, as appropriate.

3. Mr. FILIMONOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had no objection in principle to the adoption of the amendments introduced by the Pakistan representative. With regard to the new text of the second preambular paragraph, his delegation was not opposed to mention being made there of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade (General Assembly resolution 2626 (XXV)), but it would base its own position on the joint statement of the socialist countries on the second decade of development and social progress.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, if the word "Governments" was replaced by the words "developing countries" in operative paragraph 2, it should be remembered that the Statistical Commission, composed of specialists, wanted a unified method valid for all countries to be evolved. The application of the norms in question should be universal.

4. Mr. FAROOQ (Pakistan) thanked the USSR representative and pointed out that the developing countries were also the least developed in the field of statistics. Attention should therefore be drawn to their needs, and uniformity at the international level could be achieved only when the necessary work had been done at the national level.

5. The PRESIDENT said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Council unanimously adopted the draft resolution, as modified by the amendments contained in document E/L.1386.

*It was so decided.*

\* Resumed from the 1741st meeting.

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fifth Session, Annexes, agenda item 42, document A/8074.*

6. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) pointed out that the Statistical Commission had expressed the wish to hold its next session in February 1972.

7. The PRESIDENT said that the matter, which concerned the calendar of meetings, would be considered at the fifty-first session at Geneva.

8. He also pointed out that the debate on the agenda item was not yet concluded, since the USSR delegation was preparing another draft resolution.

*Request for inclusion of a supplementary  
item in the agenda*

9. Mr. AKWEI (Ghana), invoking rule 13 of the Council's rules of procedure, asked for the inclusion in the agenda of an additional item entitled "Emergency assistance to Palestine refugees". The General Assembly had recognized the deplorable conditions in which 1.5 million Palestine refugees lived. The report of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East<sup>2</sup> stated that the Agency had had a budget deficit for the previous two years and had been obliged to reduce its services. The deficit for the current year amounted to \$6.5 million. The Working Group on the financing of the Agency, established in pursuance of General Assembly resolution 2656 (XXV), had spared no effort to gather the necessary funds. Contributions had been promised, but they would merely make it possible to reduce the deficit, not to eliminate it. The question had not been included in the Council's provisional agenda because the Working Group had hoped that the appeals made to Governments would be heeded and that it would be possible to eliminate the deficit. As those hopes had been disappointed, it was important that the Council should urgently consider the question, which was of a humanitarian nature. His delegation was ready to submit a draft resolution on the subject.

10. The PRESIDENT said that a revision of the agenda was involved and that rule 17 of the rules of procedure should be applied.

11. Mr. HEDEMANN (Norway) supported the Ghanaian representative's request and said that the Council should, without delay, declare itself in favour of an increase in the aid which the specialized agencies provided to the Agency. If the specialized agencies were to include such an urgent item in their agenda in good time, it was essential that the Council should take a decision on the subject during the current session. His delegation was willing to join the Ghanaian delegation in submitting a draft resolution.

12. The PRESIDENT said that, in the absence of any objection, he would take it that the item was included in the agenda.

*It was so decided.**The meeting rose at 11.45 a.m.*<sup>2</sup> *Ibid., Twenty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 13.*





## ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Fiftieth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Friday, 30 April 1971,  
at 3.10 p.m.

NEW YORK

*President: Mr. Rachid DRISS (Tunisia).*

## AGENDA ITEM 16

**Measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council (continued)\* (E/4986 and Add.1-5, E/L.1382)**

1. Mr. KHALID (Sudan) noted that ten years of deliberations on ways and means of improving the work of the Economic and Social Council had achieved very few positive results. Clearly the Council was becoming more and more ineffectual in superintending the economic and social activities of the United Nations in accordance with Chapter IX of the Charter. Through either devolution or default it had spawned myriads of subsidiary bodies; although some of them had done important work, the last ten years had been a story of wasteful duplication. It was all very well to talk about working methods, selective agendas, synchronized calendars, rationalized documentation and penurious budgets, but the real problem was political: the Council neither reflected world realities nor had a broad geographical basis. Because of its lack of authority, it was incapable of performing either its policy-making or its co-ordinating function. There were other bodies which enjoyed a greater degree of sovereignty and were more representative than the Council.

2. His delegation did not share the view that the Council, however it might be enlarged, could genuinely reflect the geo-political realities of the present-day world. It was not possible to strengthen United Nations organs without taking account of the structure of existing power relationships. Compromises will be achieved only when the political and economic realities and interests of the developing countries were taken into account. The experience of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development was a case in point. His delegation would, however, support any effort to reapportion responsibilities more rationally between the major organs in such a way as to lessen friction and put an end to duplication.

3. There was also a need for a review of the Council's co-ordinating function. Admittedly, co-ordination within a system as geographically divided and functionally disparate as that of the United Nations was not easy. It was time the Council made a survey of all the bodies that had been set up to deal with the question so that it could decide on a rational division of labour among them, distinguishing carefully between the political and the functional and between administration and policy-making. A proper evaluation of the work of the specialized agencies, however, could be made only by the General Assembly, which alone had the machinery, the power and the political leverage to do so.

\* Resumed from the 1743rd meeting.

4. Within a dynamic system, many institutions inevitably became redundant and lost their *raison d'être*; accordingly, delegations should review the composition, functions and effectiveness of, and even the need for, the Economic and Social Council, which had been aptly described as the fifth wheel in the United Nations system.

5. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had little to add to the statement of his Government's views in document E/4986. It would be prepared to take part in the activities of the working group if one was set up. Such a group might, however, find it difficult to reconcile views concerning the role of the Council. For example, the representative of the Sudan seemed to take an unfavourable view of the increase in the number of specialized agencies and other bodies within the United Nations system and the consequent reduction of the powers of the Council. His own delegation felt that what that situation required was a strengthening of the co-ordinating role of the Council because, although its relative powers might have been changed as a result of those developments, its duties under the Charter had not. Various representatives also seemed to resent the fact that the specialized agencies, having greater financial resources and a broader geographical base than the Council, were so free to do as they wished. But they had the executive functions. It was when that situation led to extravagance, duplication and waste that the Council's function to correct was relevant. If the Council could keep that area under review it would be achieving its major purpose. In his view, therefore, the Council should in future concentrate on dealing with problems before it rather than spend time talking about what its role should be.

6. Mr. TARDOS (Hungary) said that his delegation, which attached great importance to improving the work of the Council, would endorse any measure which might enable it to promote economic and social progress more effectively.

7. Under the Charter, the Council had been given the key role in the development of international economic and social co-operation, but the discussion confirmed that it had not entirely fulfilled that function. His delegation felt that the Council's work could not be improved merely by one resolution; that had to be done step by step, through both short-term and long-term measures. Problems had first to be identified; then it would be a relatively easy task to decide on how the solutions should be implemented. That seemed to be the approach contemplated in operative paragraphs 2 and 5 of the USSR draft resolution (E/L.1382).

8. Some short-term steps could be taken immediately. First, the six-week rule regarding the issuance of documents should be strictly observed. Secondly, documentation should be kept at a level commensurate with the working



requirements of the Council and uniform rules for the editing of documents should be applied. Thirdly, a more rational and workable calendar of conferences should be prepared and the Council should enforce the resolutions adopted by the Assembly concerning the frequency of meetings of the Council's subsidiary bodies. Fourthly, the Council should so distribute its yearly workload as not to impede the work of the Second Committee. Specifically, the Council's resumed summer session should be held after the Second Committee had completed its work. Fifthly, the working relationship between the Assembly and the Council should be reviewed. Lastly, the Council's work programme should be adapted to the new responsibilities it would have under the Second Development Decade. To meet the challenge of the Decade, the Council would have to reconsider its priorities, reformulate its pattern of debates and evaluate the relative importance of the items on its agenda. Those elements of a short-term programme could be realized in the near future.

9. The long-term programme required much lengthier and more careful consideration, since many different and often conflicting proposals would have to be analysed in terms of their advantages and disadvantages. One of the most controversial problems was the question of institutional change. In his delegation's view, the Council could not arbitrarily enlarge either itself or any of its sessional committees, as that right was reserved by the Charter to the General Assembly. He had therefore been surprised when one Government, which had often in the past upheld the strict application of the Charter, had suggested transferring the rights of the Assembly to the Council. Perhaps the least controversial proposals for institutional change concerned the handling of questions dealing with science and technology. However, before establishing a sessional committee for the purpose the Council should make an over-all review of the present institutional arrangements in order to avoid duplication. The discussion of that problem should not be influenced by narrow interests or short-term considerations.

10. Another element of the long-term plan should be solution of the problem of programming, i.e. the establishment of priorities and programme budgeting upon which the effective functioning of the Council and its subsidiary organs depended. The existing system prevented the Assembly from exercising its budgetary authority and the present undemocratic situation, in which the majority view concerning the most effective use of available financial resources could be thwarted by the narrow interests of small bodies, had to be corrected.

11. Mr. AKWEI (Ghana) said that the paucity of replies from Governments to the Secretary-General's questionnaire was no reason to delay the work of the Council. First, in the light of past experience the poor response was to have been expected. Secondly, the Council had been considering measures to improve the organization of its work for almost two years, formally and informally, and there was a wealth of ideas and documentation available that could form the basis of a genuine discussion, something which would be more useful than the presentation of formal statements. It was not necessary to take a formal decision to extend the time limit for the submission of replies by Governments: the Council should simply agree not to exclude from consideration any views submitted by a Government before

the matter was finally disposed of. It should decide to complete its consideration of the matter at its fifty-first session and agree on the recommendations it wished to make to the General Assembly at its twenty-sixth session. To continue to discuss the subject indefinitely would only be a waste of time. It should be given an analysis and classification of all the ideas submitted so far on measures to improve the organization of its work so that conclusions might be reached in a working group, preferably of the whole.

12. Turning to the substantive aspects of the question under consideration, he said it should be borne in mind that although the Council was a principal organ of the United Nations it was subordinate to the General Assembly. Its function was to act as the chief organ in the co-ordination, execution, supervision and implementation of policy decisions, programmes and activities and in the formulation of policy recommendations. Its efforts to carry out that function had been characterized by duplication, lengthy inconclusive debates, competition with other bodies, and a feeling of non-involvement on the part of States which were not included among its members. He intended to examine the cause of some of those problems and offer specific suggestions for their short-term or long-term solution. With reference to short-term proposals, he observed that in attempting to carry out its co-ordinating functions the Council was hampered by the duplication of effort on the part of organs and committees with competing terms of reference, resulting in an excessive number of meetings, unnecessary administrative expense and lack of a sense of direction. Co-ordination was in the hands of three separate bodies: the Council's own sessional Co-ordination Committee, CPC and ACC. His delegation felt that ACC had not succeeded in co-ordinating the programmes and activities of the organs and institutions comprising the United Nations economic and social system. Its meetings were in the nature of a mere exchange of information as to what each specialized agency proposed to do, without bringing the agencies under the guiding and co-ordinating influence of the Council itself. In short, ACC was not sufficiently under the control of the Council, and, in fact, often confronted the Council with *faits accomplis*. If ACC was to serve a useful purpose, it must work within clearly defined terms of reference laid down by the Council in the light of policy objectives determined by the latter under the guidance of the General Assembly. In so doing, ACC would become an executing arm of the Council.

13. Secondly, the roles of CPC and the Co-ordination Committee called for reform. CPC often went beyond its co-ordinating role to discuss substantive and budgetary measures, thus duplicating debates which had already taken place in the specialized agencies and were likely to take place in the Co-ordination Committee and in the Council itself. Either the Co-ordination Committee should be abolished and CPC retained with its role strictly limited to co-ordination, or CPC should be abolished and its functions assigned to the Co-ordination Committee, which would then meet more frequently, preferably between Council sessions throughout the entire year. If the Co-ordination Committee was abolished and CPC retained, it would be desirable to enlarge the latter's membership so that it would be the same size as the Council. That would make it possible for the Economic and Social Committees of the



Council to discuss not only the substantive aspects of questions but also their co-ordination on the basis of information furnished by CPC. Their work should thus be facilitated, for it was evident from the experience of CPC that it was often difficult to separate the co-ordination aspects of certain questions from their substantive aspects. Furthermore, some improvement was needed in the Council's co-ordination of policy formulation. The Council had not yet taken on a key role in co-ordinating the policies of the specialized agencies with those of the United Nations. Even with the institutional and constitutional limitations which existed at present, some useful steps could be adopted. As the co-ordinating authority of the United Nations economic and social system, the Council should be given an opportunity to examine the plans and policy objectives of all the specialized agencies before their adoption to ensure that they took the Council's recommendations into consideration. In considering the plans and policies of the specialized agencies, the Council should relate them to the policies and objectives of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade (General Assembly resolution 2626 (XXV)).

14. The proposals he had just made would, to some extent, reduce the Council's present volume of work. Eliminating the present duplication between the Co-ordination Committee and CPC would bring about an automatic reduction in the amount of documentation and would also save time and effort. If the Council's sessional committees worked intersessionally throughout the year, much detailed technical work would be lifted off the shoulders of the Council itself. In addition, the Council should seek to encourage more real discussion and consider whether it was always necessary to begin consideration of an item with a general debate; in his opinion, the general debate was essential only in exceptional cases. Furthermore, the Council should not attempt to consider in great technical detail questions involving highly specialized bodies. It should concentrate on broad policies, programmes and objectives and their co-ordination.

15. Reform was also possible in the presentation, timing and length of documentation. Documents on items under consideration by the Council should consist of a first part giving a description of developments to date and a second part setting forth recommendations and indicating the various decisions possible and the consequences of each decision. Where no decision was required, that should also be clearly stated. If some bodies were not in a position to adhere to such a format, the Department of Economic and Social Affairs should be able to analyse the reports they submitted and put those analyses before the Council. The function of the Department with regard to the Council should be to process and distil reports for the Council to decide upon and to prepare position papers on the future plans of the Council at its request. In fulfilling that function, the Department should be able to call on the secretariats of all the specialized agencies. In short, the Council should be organized along the lines of a board of business executives or a cabinet or central committee, which had no time for general debate or consideration of details but made policy, gave directions and guided action. The Council should insist on observance of the six-week rule for the submission of documents which should be

made available early enough to enable delegations to forward them to their Governments for study and instructions. Observance of that rule would mean that the calendar of meetings of subsidiary bodies of the Council and the specialized agencies might have to be modified. The Council should dispense with resumed sessions altogether, especially when they coincided with sessions of the General Assembly. The Council should not hesitate to ask the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD), the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and their affiliates to revise their calendars of meetings to fit in with its schedule. With those modifications, there was no reason why it should not suffice for the Council to meet in January, April and July, according to its present calendar of meetings.

16. His delegation supported the suggestion for greater involvement of more Members of the United Nations in the work of the Council. That could be brought about by enlarging the membership of the Council's sessional committees to enable non-Council Members to participate in their work. It would be wrong, however, for the Council to have a smaller membership than its subsidiary bodies, and for that reason, it might consider enlarging its own membership.

17. Turning to the fundamental, long-term problems that faced the Council, he expressed the view that it could never expect to control or even to co-ordinate the policies and programmes of the specialized agencies unless it also exercised control over their budgets. The fact that each agency was controlled by its own membership, which in some cases was greater than that of the General Assembly, could produce strange anomalies, and there had even been occasions on which delegations to agency conferences had taken positions that differed from the positions taken by their Governments' own delegations to the General Assembly. At present, there were at least fourteen centres of policy formulation in the economic and social field, and it would be extremely difficult for the Council to exercise any effective control or co-ordination unless the constitutions of the specialized agencies and the basic agreements governing their relations with the Council and the General Assembly were amended in such a way as to make them more subordinate to the global will as expressed in the Assembly. The inefficiency of the international development system was demonstrated by the fact that so much effort had to be expended on co-ordination. In his view, an institution should be largely self-co-ordinating, and the entire economic and social system of the United Nations needed to be re-examined with that object in view.

18. Neither the effective functioning of the Council nor its authority had been improved by the establishment by the General Assembly of subsidiary economic bodies such as UNCTAD, UNIDO and UNDP, whose links with the Council were somewhat nebulous. It was probable that such bodies would not have been established if the Council had at the time taken the appropriate action in response to the legitimate pressures exerted by the developing countries. The Council's functions might be improved, however, if the General Assembly were to delegate more authority to it, without prejudice, of course, to its own ultimate constitutional authority. He believed that, if more policy-making authority was delegated to the Council, there should also be

a modest increase in its membership, so that it would be more representative of the membership of the General Assembly. He did not think there was any need to establish new subsidiary bodies, because the various new topics that were coming to the fore in United Nations discussions, such as the environment and science and technology, could be dealt with adequately and, indeed, much more economically by the Council if it organized its work in a businesslike manner. He was not against a redefinition of the Council's functions or a strengthening of its secretariat to cope with new responsibilities. In any event, the functioning of the Council called for thorough reappraisal, and the various courses of action he had recommended would need to be carefully considered. Perhaps, therefore, a working group might be set up to undertake a study of the basic issues that now faced the Council as well as its long-term future.

19. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan) felt that the Council's functions in its field of competence as well as its technical performance could unquestionably be improved and that a number of good ideas for improvement had been submitted by Governments to the Special Committee on the Rationalization of the Procedures and Organization of the General Assembly. He tended to agree with the statement on the subject made by the United States representative: the Council was indeed suffering from a crisis of confidence, and although there were no doubt many minor or procedural changes that could be made, further erosion of the Council's position could not be prevented unless dynamic action were taken. His delegation therefore favoured enlargement of the Council's membership, which would have beneficial psychological and political effects. The fact that there were at present only twenty-seven members made it difficult, because of the principle of rotation, for developing countries to gain the necessary experience and thus improve the quality of their contributions. In comparison with the governing bodies of UNCTAD and UNIDO, the Council's membership was very small. That

was bound to be a matter of concern to many of the 100-odd developing countries which were eager to participate in plans for economic and social development. It was also important that greater authority should be given to the Council, and he therefore fully supported operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union (E/1382). In conclusion, he urged the permanent members to consider the advantages in terms of renewed confidence that would be gained by an immediate enlargement of the Council's membership.

20. After a discussion on the possibility of establishing a working group, in which Mr. GATES (New Zealand), Mr. VIAUD (France), Mr. AKWEI (Ghana), Mr. ANTOINE (Haiti), Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar), Mr. KITCHEN (United States of America), Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil), Mr. QUARONI (Italy), Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom), Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon), Mr. OSMAN (Sudan), Mr. AYOUB (Tunisia), Mr. SKATARETIKO (Yugoslavia) and Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) took part, the PRESIDENT suggested that, as soon as the Secretariat had prepared an analytical summary of the replies from Governments, he should hold consultations with the officers of the Council, the regional groups, and, if necessary, the entire membership of the Council, with a view to preparing a list of priority topics for discussion when the Council resumed consideration of the item in the third week of its session. He assured the Council that his consultations would complement rather than duplicate the work being undertaken by the Secretariat on the same subject, and said it should be understood that his suggestion was entirely without prejudice to the right of any member of the Council to develop and submit its own ideas, suggestions or draft resolutions in the meantime.

*The President's suggestion was adopted.*

*The meeting rose at 6.5 p.m.*





## ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Fiftieth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

1746th meeting

Monday, 3 May 1971,  
at 11 a.m.

NEW YORK

*President: Mr. Rachid DRISS (Tunisia).*

## AGENDA ITEM 7

**Report of the Statistical Commission (continued)\***  
(E/4938, E/4989, chap. VI, sect. A; E/L.1372, E/L.1389)

1. Mr. ANTOINE (Haiti) said it was regrettable that the meetings began so late, in view of the importance of the matters under consideration.

2. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the draft resolution which had been circulated (E/L.1389) and which was also co-sponsored by the delegations of Hungary, Pakistan and Tunisia incorporated the comments and suggestions made by various delegations and by the Secretariat in the course of informal consultations.

3. The preamble of the draft resolution drew the Council's attention to four basic considerations which brought out the extraordinarily significant role played by the Statistical Commission in the field of statistical analysis. First, reliable and complete statistical data were becoming increasingly important for socio-economic analysis aimed at monitoring progress achieved under the Second United Nations Development Decade. Secondly, the activities of United Nations bodies were undergoing considerable expansion, and the Council could not neglect that field without failing in its task. Thirdly, it was necessary to take account of the growing importance of the co-ordination of statistical activities, which should lead to the establishment of an integrated system for the organizations of the United Nations system. Fourthly, it was important to stress the necessity to avoid any parallelism and duplication that would impede the development of a statistical system.

4. In operative paragraph 1, the sponsors had intended to recall briefly the central role which the Statistical Commission should play under its terms of reference. The Commission's attention was drawn in operative paragraph 2 to the need to strengthen its co-ordinating role and in operative paragraph 3 to the need to take positive action to develop an integrated system for the collection, data processing and dissemination of international statistics. In paragraph 4 the sponsors had wanted to draw the Council's attention to the fact that the Commission and the Statistical Office should introduce into their field of activity the new technologies that were available and should co-ordinate their use. Operative paragraph 5 was a request to the specialized agencies and the various United Nations bodies to co-operate fully with the Statistical Commission. Lastly, the Secretary-General was requested to undertake

concerted action to assist the developing countries in strengthening their statistical systems.

5. The adoption of the text he had just introduced would render it possible to improve the statistical system of the United Nations and to make a significant contribution to monitoring the results achieved during the Second Development Decade.

6. Mr. FAROOQ (Pakistan) said that his delegation, which was a sponsor of the draft, fully endorsed the comments made by the representative of the Soviet Union. He was particularly pleased at the emphasis on the need to study the goals of the Commission's work, taking into account the objectives of the Second Development Decade. The improvement and organization of national statistical systems was extremely important to the developing countries, and it should be emphasized that co-ordination at the international level was possible only if each country instituted co-ordination at the national level. For that reason, he was glad that the special needs of the developing countries had been stressed at several points in the text of the draft resolution submitted for the Council's approval.

7. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon) stated that his delegation supported the draft resolution, which, as the representatives of the USSR and Pakistan had pointed out, highlighted some extremely important matters. His delegation would like to become a sponsor.

8. He noted that the United Nations Economic and Social Office in Beirut had, no doubt inadvertently, been omitted from operative paragraph 5.

9. Mr. PRAGUE (France) said that his delegation was greatly interested in the problem of co-ordination in the statistical field, since statistical activities were essential to the success of the Second Development Decade. The draft resolution (E/L.1389) was, on the whole, in conformity with the views of his delegation, which nevertheless wished to make a few comments on points of form or of detail.

10. It was not customary for the Council to reaffirm its own resolutions by quoting them at considerable length, as it was proposed to do in operative paragraph 1. It would appear sufficient to recall Council resolution 8 (II) of 21 June 1946 in the preamble. The beginning of operative paragraph 2 should perhaps be changed for reasons of form; it would be better to say that the Commission should assign priority in its work programme to its work in the co-ordination of activities of United Nations organs and agencies in the statistical field.

11. One important idea which appeared in the Commission's report had not been taken up in the draft resolution, namely, that no co-ordination at the international level was

\* Resumed from the 1744th meeting.

possible so long as co-ordination was not achieved at the national level. Member States might therefore be invited, in an additional paragraph, to seek more effective co-ordination at the national level in the statistical field.

12. In operative paragraph 4, it would perhaps be more appropriate to state that the Council “welcomed” the interest of the Commission in matters related to the use of computers. It might also be advisable to refer specifically in that paragraph to the International Computing Centre.

13. His delegation welcomed the initiative taken by the sponsors of the draft resolution and would vote for the text as a whole.

14. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) said that he supported the text of the draft resolution (E/L.1389) but proposed the addition of a seventh operative paragraph, reading as follows:

*“Requests the Secretary-General to submit to the fifty-second session of the Council, through the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination, a report on the existing technical assistance of the United Nations system of organizations to the developing countries as well as on the steps envisaged to assist those countries to improve their statistical services with a view to meet the new requirements of the Second United Nations Development Decade”.*

15. Mr. SKATARETIKO (Yugoslavia) agreed with the representative of France that there was no need to quote the Council resolution 8 (II) in operative paragraph 1. He also agreed that the text of operative paragraph 2 was not entirely clear.

16. He suggested that the words “realization of the objectives” in operative paragraph 3 should be replaced by the phrase “review and appraisal of both objectives and policy measures”. That wording would be more in line with the first preambular paragraph.

17. Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) said that, on the whole, he supported the substance of the draft resolution introduced by the Soviet representative. However, he agreed with the representative of France that it would be better to transfer operative paragraph 1 to the preamble. The Sudanese amendment would be a useful addition to the draft, since the need to assist the developing countries in strengthening their national statistical systems had already been pointed out in operative paragraphs 3 and 6. The proposed paragraph would make it clear how such assistance might be furnished.

18. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) stressed the importance which his delegation attached to the question of improving current methods of co-ordination. He would like, however, to point out some repetitions in the proposed text, but with regard to operative paragraph 1, in which the sponsors had considered it necessary to reproduce part of the Statistical Commission's terms of reference, he recognized that there were so many United Nations resolutions, reports and other documents that it was sometimes almost indispensable to repeat certain information.

19. He agreed with the representative of Yugoslavia that operative paragraph 2 was rather vague. On the other hand, the idea which the representative of Yugoslavia wished to convey in operative paragraph 3 was, in fact, already contained in the text.

20. He wondered whether it was really necessary to ask the Secretariat to prepare yet another report, as proposed by the representative of the Sudan, especially since the information he sought had already been provided by the Commission in its report (E/4938).

21. Mr. NDUNG’U (Kenya) stressed the importance of operative paragraph 3. The Yugoslav amendment did not seem to improve the text in any way. His delegation agreed with the representative of France that there was no need to quote the text of Council resolution 8 (II) word for word in paragraph 1; it would be enough to make a reference to it. The co-ordination of statistical work was referred to in operative paragraph 1 (b), paragraph 2 and paragraph 5; such repetition could be avoided. It would be desirable to delete the last part of operative paragraph 5, so that it would end with the words “to carry out these tasks”.

22. Mr. LENNON (United States of America) commended the sponsors of the draft resolution for their valuable initiative. With regard to operative paragraph 2, he wondered how a subsidiary organ would be able to carry out the task of co-ordination. He hoped that the Secretariat would clarify that point and also provide some information on the practical implications of the draft resolution.

23. Mr. AYOUB (Tunisia) thanked the USSR delegation for having taken account of the observations of his delegation, which was now a sponsor of the draft resolution. Some representatives had expressed the view that it was perhaps unnecessary to repeat the provisions of Council resolution 8 (II) in operative paragraph 1. However, he felt that it would be useful, on the threshold of the Second United Nations Development Decade, to remind Governments of the main functions of the Statistical Commission, with particular reference to the development of national statistics and to improving their comparability.

24. With regard to operative paragraph 2, it had been noted that different agencies utilized different concepts in making quantitative appraisals of the results of the Second Development Decade. The Statistical Commission should have something to say concerning the way in which progress during the Decade was to be reviewed and monitored.

25. The word “including” in operative paragraph 3 of the English text seemed less apt than the words “*et notamment*” in the French text. His delegation had no objection to the amendment proposed by the representative of Yugoslavia.

26. It also had no objection in principle to the Sudanese representative's proposal that a seventh operative paragraph should be added to the draft resolution, but a satisfactory wording would have to be devised.

27. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) asked whether the use of the word “fully” in operative paragraph 5 meant that the



work done so far had not been satisfactory. Paragraph 64 of the Commission's report (E/4938) stated the Commission's view that the working group established under Council resolution 1306 (XLIV) of 31 May 1968 should be continued. His delegation would like to ask the Secretariat whether representatives of UNCTAD and UNIDO took part in the meetings of that working group and whether it would be possible for the working group to follow up the request made by the representative of the Sudan in his amendment.

28. Mr. KENESSEY (Statistical Office) said that, as he saw it, operative paragraph 5 did not indicate any dissatisfaction with the co-operation between the agencies in question and the Statistical Commission. It might be desirable to replace the word "Requests" by "Invites". The working group could take up the question referred to in operative paragraph 5 at its next series of meetings, which would be held at Geneva from 10 to 12 June. A representative of UNCTAD regularly attended the meetings of the working group. UNIDO had not yet sent a representative, but might be able to do so.

29. Whether operative paragraph 1 should remain where it was or be transferred to the preamble was only a question for form. It was perhaps desirable to quote Council resolution 8 (II), since it was an old resolution.

30. It might be unnecessary in operative paragraph 2 to request the Statistical Committee to consider its work in the co-ordination of activities as being of importance, because the Commission already attached the greatest importance to co-ordination. However, the words "to assign it priority" seemed more justifiable.

31. His feeling was that the changes proposed in operative paragraph 3 were as acceptable as the original text itself.

32. The French representative could perhaps explain his second amendment to operative paragraph 4.

33. It seemed perfectly possible to insert the name of the United Nations Economic and Social Office in Beirut (UNESOB) after the regional economic commissions in operative paragraph 5. With regard to the operative paragraph 7 proposed by the Sudan, the rules applied in matters relating to co-operation with the specialized agencies should be kept in mind. Lastly, in reply to the comments of the United States representative, he said that the Statistical Commission was fully aware of what it could achieve in co-ordination matters, as paragraph 52 (a) of its report (E/4938) clearly indicated.

34. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) said that the new paragraph he had proposed for inclusion in the draft was not incompatible with the rules followed in matters relating to co-operation with the specialized agencies. The Secretary-General would obviously consult those agencies before he submitted his report.

35. Mr. PRAGUE (France) stated that his delegation had not introduced a specific and formal amendment to operative paragraph 4 as it had wished, first of all, to know whether the sponsors were prepared to agree to its suggestion. The second part of operative paragraph 4 was

somewhat vague, and it should be clarified by an explicit reference to the International Computing Centre (ICC).

36. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) inquired whether the sponsors would agree to transfer the content of operative paragraph 1 to the preambular part.

37. Mr. FAROOQ (Pakistan) felt that it would be better not to make any amendments to operative paragraph 1, where it was useful to have the text of Council resolution 8 (II) readily available.

38. His delegation would have no particular difficulty in accepting the amendment to operative paragraph 3 submitted by the Yugoslav delegation. The text could be improved by specifically mentioning ICC, by including UNESOB in operative paragraph 5, and by inserting, slightly amended, the text of the operative paragraph 7 proposed by the Sudan.

39. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the sponsors of the draft resolution intended to take account of the views expressed by previous speakers. However, before stating their position specifically, he wished to point out that it had not been their intention to mention all the activities of the Statistical Commission, but to consider in particular ways of making its activities more fruitful, in the light of their increasing complexity. The draft resolution should be viewed from that angle and attention should be focused on a specific aim, namely, the improvement of the statistical services and the co-ordination of the statistical work of the United Nations and its specialized agencies.

40. He supported the Lebanese representative's proposal to refer specifically to UNESOB in operative paragraph 5. The name of the Office should appear after those of UNCTAD and UNIDO.

41. The French and other delegations had expressed some doubts on the advisability of including operative paragraph 1 in its present form in the draft. Council resolution 8 (II) establishing the Statistical Commission, which had been adopted in 1946, was extremely detailed, and the sponsors of the draft resolution had not quoted it *in extenso*. Nevertheless, they had wished to select from it a number of important points which were relevant to the current needs of the Commission. The provisions quoted had been retained because they constituted a kind of summary of the 1946 resolution and stressed the Commission's co-ordinating role.

42. With regard to the French delegation's suggestion concerning operative paragraph 2, the Commission needed to focus all possible attention on co-ordinating activities. The sponsors of the draft resolution had not wished to impose a form of words, but rather to meet an actual situation.

43. In reply to the Kenyan representative's comment, he pointed out that operative paragraphs 2 and 5 were not repetitious. In operative paragraph 5, the specialized agencies, the regional economic commissions, UNCTAD and UNIDO were requested to co-operate fully with the Statistical Commission in the work of co-ordination con-

templated in operative paragraph 2. The difference between the two paragraphs was fundamental enough to warrant the retention of operative paragraph 5.

44. The Yugoslav delegation felt that operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, which emphasized the achievement of goals, should stress other aspects, and had referred in particular to the first preambular paragraph which mentioned socio-economic analysis. The analysis of results obtained in the economic and social fields should be used only for the realization of the objectives of the Second United Nations Development Decade; it was not therefore an end in itself, and if the draft resolution was amended in that respect, its impact would be weakened.

45. His delegation felt that the amendments proposed by France to operative paragraph 4 were unnecessary. It was a fact, which had been recognized in that paragraph, that the Statistical Commission was concerned with matters related to the use of computers, and it was therefore requested to consider that field from the point of view of co-ordination. The positive objectives would fall within the competence of ICC, but it was not intended to stress that aspect of the matter in operative paragraph 4.

46. He had not had time to consult the co-sponsors of the draft resolution on the Sudanese proposal to add an operative paragraph 7 requesting a new report on technical assistance. However, his delegation agreed with the representative of Greece that the Statistical Commission's report already contained much data on that subject. If the representative of the Sudan insisted on the preparation of a new report, it should be drafted by eminent specialists and submitted to the Statistical Commission which was more familiar than any other body with the situation in that field. However, at all events, that document would fall within the Commission's general activities and there was no need to make a special request for it in the draft resolution.

47. If the members of the Council saw fit to adopt the draft resolution, they would be making a valuable contribution to the activities of the Statistical Commission.

48. The PRESIDENT thought that the co-sponsors of the draft resolution might consult with the other delegations on a new text.

49. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) pointed out that the report of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination had emphasized the need for a study such as that requested in the Sudanese amendment. His delegation felt that its amendment would improve the draft resolution but did not want to create difficulties for the co-sponsors. If they maintained their views, his delegation might submit another draft resolution.

50. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he well understood the desire of the other delegations to see some of their views reflected in the draft resolution. Consequently, he did not rule out the possibility, if the Council so desired, of adding a paragraph to draft resolution E/L.1389 and asked the Secretary of the Council if the report requested would have financial implications. The Sudanese proposal showed that delegation's spirit of co-operation and he would consider any other resolution it might submit in the same spirit.

51. The PRESIDENT stated that the preparation of a report such as that requested by the Sudan would have no financial implications.

52. Mr. SKATARETIKO (Yugoslavia) observed that other co-sponsors had readily accepted his amendment to operative paragraph 3. Yugoslavia's intention was not to weaken the draft resolution but, on the contrary, to emphasize the requirements of reviewing and appraising economic and social progress, particularly in the context of the policy measures and objectives of the Second Development Decade, taking into account the needs of the developing countries.

*The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.*





## ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Fiftieth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Monday, 3 May 1971,  
at 3.00 p.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Rachid DRISS (Tunisia).

## AGENDA ITEM 20

## Emergency assistance to Palestine refugees (E/L.1387)

1. Mr. AKWEI (Ghana) said that before introducing the draft resolution in document E/L.1387 he would like to indicate a few small changes in the text. The last words of operative paragraph 1 should be changed from "to the extent of \$2 million" to "up to \$2 million". The last words of operative paragraph 2 should be changed from "to the extent of \$1 million from each of them" to "to the maximum extent possible". The words "particularly of paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 2672 B (XXV)" should be added at the end of operative paragraph 4, and the word "possible" in operative paragraph 5 should be replaced by the word "appropriate".

2. The draft resolution was non-controversial and humanitarian. It was addressed solely to the need for funds to enable the Palestine refugees to enjoy the minimum amenities of human existence. It did not deal with the political aspects of the Palestine question. The United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) was experiencing deep financial difficulties and had a deficit of \$6.5 million for 1971. If that deficit was not liquidated, the only alternative would be to reduce its services drastically. The Working Group referred to in the third preambular paragraph had established contact with officials of the host countries and of neighbouring States in a position to offer assistance and had approached organizations in the United Nations family. He was sure that the Council would wish to welcome the positive response of the World Food Programme (WFP), the International Labour Organisation (ILO), the World Health Organization (WHO) and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), as referred to in operative paragraphs 1, 2 and 3. However, the measures envisaged in those paragraphs had not yet been carried out, which explained the necessity for operative paragraph 4. The main thrust of the resolution came in operative paragraphs 5 and 6, which requested the specialized agencies, non-governmental organizations and other United Nations bodies to respond to the challenge presented by the plight of the Palestine refugees.

3. Mr. HEDEMANN (Norway) said that the importance Norway attached to the subject of the draft resolution under consideration, of which his delegation was co-sponsor, had been reflected in a communiqué issued at the conclusion of the last meeting of the Nordic Ministers for Foreign Affairs urging Governments and organizations to increase their contributions to UNRWA without delay so that it could continue its humanitarian work without

reducing its activities. The Members of the United Nations had a collective responsibility to help the refugees. His Government had responded to the appeals made in the General Assembly resolutions referred to in the preamble to the draft resolution by announcing an extraordinary contribution of \$140,000 to UNRWA, in addition to which it had increased its regular contribution for 1971 by 100 per cent. The Norwegian Council for Refugees, a private organization, was also doubling its contribution to UNRWA in 1971. Thus the Norwegian contributions pledged to UNRWA for 1971 totalled approximately \$500,000. The main purpose of the draft resolution was to secure maximum assistance to UNRWA and the Palestine refugees from the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations family.

4. Mr. STATHATOS (Greece) welcomed the initiative taken by the delegations of Ghana and Norway in submitting draft resolution E/L.1387. His Government had always taken an active interest in the fate of the Palestine refugees and desired to contribute to the efforts to alleviate their plight. By adopting the draft resolution, the Council would be drawing the attention of the membership of the United Nations and its specialized agencies to the humanitarian aspects of the Palestine question and more particularly to the serious financial crisis which jeopardized the activities of UNRWA. The international community had the duty to ensure that UNRWA was provided with the financial means to continue its life-saving operation. The deficit which UNRWA faced was particularly alarming since it endangered the Agency's educational and vocational activities. Furthermore, the Commissioner-General of UNRWA had warned that a further reduction in the relief programme would have an adverse effect on the nutrition of children now living in emergency conditions. The Council would be failing in its duty if it did not take action to alleviate the sufferings of the Palestine refugees, who, through no fault of their own, were dependent on international solidarity for their existence.

5. His delegation would support the draft resolution under consideration, but felt that it should include an appeal to non-contributing countries for assistance to UNRWA. It might be argued that such an appeal was implicit in operative paragraph 4, which expressed the hope for an early implementation of General Assembly resolution 2672 B (XXV); however, his delegation thought that it would be preferable to insert an additional operative paragraph in which such an appeal would be specifically made.

6. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) said that his delegation was grateful to the delegations of Ghana and Norway for submitting the draft resolution. He associated himself with the remarks made by the representative of Greece concerning the need for an additional operative paragraph



appealing for assistance to UNRWA from non-contributing Member States. He was glad to note that the positive steps taken by the Director-General of UNESCO had already yielded results and suggested that the words “and the encouraging results obtained so far” should be added at the end of operative paragraph 3. He had doubts about the change in operative paragraph 5 indicated by the representative of Ghana, since all assistance was appropriate assistance. It would be better to retain the word “possible” and to insert the word “appropriate” before the words “ways and means”.

7. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that his Government had shown the greatest interest in the problem of the Palestine refugees ever since its inception in 1948 and had participated in the humanitarian work done by UNRWA. Up to 1970, its total contributions had amounted to about \$16 million. In 1970, it had contributed a total of \$1 million, \$800,000 of which was in the form of an extraordinary contribution. It was certainly desirable to ensure the financial soundness of UNRWA, and the normal way to do so would be for contributing countries to increase their contributions and for non-contributing countries to start contributing. However, in the absence of voluntary contributions it would be necessary to have recourse to indirect financial assistance. Of course, the only way to put an end to the sufferings of the refugees once and for all was to find a lasting solution to the Middle East problem, but in the meantime the United Nations should do all it could to enable UNRWA to reduce its deficit and continue its humanitarian efforts. It was in that spirit that the Council should consider the draft resolution before it, which should receive unanimous support. His delegation would vote in favour of it. However, it had no objections to the amendment suggested by the representative of the Sudan.

8. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon) said that his delegation welcomed draft resolution E/L.1387 and supported the additions suggested by the representative of the Sudan. It was grateful for the positive steps taken by the Director-General of UNESCO and hoped that his appeal would result in increased contributions from Governments. He paid a tribute to the Chairman of the Working Group, who had spared no effort to promote the objectives of General Assembly resolution 2728 (XXV), and to the Secretary-General, who had made several appeals for the implementation of the provisions of that resolution. His delegation appreciated the efforts of a number of Governments, especially the large contributors, which had increased their contributions to UNRWA, and it was glad that others had joined the list of Member States assisting UNRWA in its humanitarian task.

9. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) recalled that his Government had been a major contributor to UNRWA since its inception, had voted for General Assembly resolutions 2656 (XXV) and 2672 B (XXV) and was represented on the Working Group, to whose efforts and those of its Chairman it wished to pay a tribute. He supported the draft resolution with the changes mentioned by Ghana and those suggested by the Sudan. However, he felt that a few other minor changes would make the text more accurate. At the end of operative paragraph 4 the words “in accordance with constitutional procedures” should be added; the word “all” in operative paragraph 5 might be

deleted as some specialized agencies were not concerned; and the words “to continue” should be inserted after the words “the non-governmental organizations concerned” in operative paragraph 5.

10. Mr. AYOUB (Tunisia), Mr. QUARONI (Italy), Mr. SUMANTERA (Indonesia), Mr. TAIB (Malaysia), Mr. LOUYA (Democratic Republic of the Congo) and Mr. LEGNANI (Uruguay) supported the draft resolution, with the proposed amendments.

11. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) recalled that his Government had contributed substantially to UNRWA but felt that the main burden of relief should be borne by the States which were responsible for the eviction of the refugees from their homeland. The problem required a long-term solution based on the cessation of the aggressive actions which had caused it. The draft resolution was appropriate not only because of the present strain on UNRWA's finances but also because of the responsibility of the Economic and Social Council to carry out its obligations with regard to the situation in the Middle East. He would therefore support the draft resolution with the Sudanese amendments.

12. Mr. YOGASUNDRAM (Ceylon) supported the draft resolution and the Sudanese amendments to operative paragraphs 3 and 5. He hoped that the present crisis would not cause a further reduction in the services that UNRWA provided to the refugees, for that might have serious political repercussions. He trusted that the change in operative paragraph 1 indicated by the Ghanaian representative did not imply a reduction in the help of WFP; it was to be hoped that the aid target mentioned in the original version would be achieved.

13. He asked the UNESCO representative for information on the results of the action taken by the Director-General of that organization.

14. Mr. BUSH (United States of America), recalling that his Government had long supported UNRWA, said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution.

15. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) supported the draft resolution with all the proposed changes and said that he would like to pay a tribute to the brisk and effective way the Working Group had gone about its business in bringing to the attention of Member States the tragic and human problems of the Palestine refugees and the critical state of the finances of UNRWA.

16. He noted that New Zealand had consistently supported the Agency for 20 years and was one of the major contributors to it. Nevertheless, the needs of the Agency were great and urgent and he therefore supported fully the efforts made to increase the contributions of member Governments, agencies and others to enable the work of UNRWA to be continued at its present level.

17. Mr. ORČIĆ (Yugoslavia), Mr. DE SOTO (Peru), Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil), Mr. NDUNG'U (Kenya), Mr. MARCH (Jamaica) and Mr. ANTOINE (Haiti) supported the draft resolution.

18. Mr. ZAKHAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the



draft resolution as a whole because it appreciated the need to render assistance to the Arab peoples, victims of the aggression by Israel, the troops of which continued to occupy a part of the territories of the Arab States.

19. At the same time, his delegation would request a separate vote on operative paragraphs 2, 5 and 6 and would abstain in the vote on those paragraphs. In that connexion, it wished to make its position clear and to stress that the USSR had rendered and was continuing to render important bilateral assistance to the Arab peoples, victims of the Israeli aggression. The USSR would continue to give support to its Arab friends and to provide them comprehensive assistance on a bilateral basis.

20. Mr. VARCHAVER (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) said that on 1 January 1971 the Director-General of UNESCO had launched an appeal for voluntary financial assistance to the joint UNRWA/UNESCO educational effort, on the basis of decisions taken by the Executive Board at its eighty-fourth and eighty-fifth sessions in 1970. To enhance the appeal, the Director-General had invited the Permanent Representative of Sudan to the United Nations to visit a number of countries in order to obtain additional contributions from Governments and from non-governmental and private organizations, an invitation which had been accepted. The response to the appeal had been encouraging and more was expected as a result of the visits still to be made by the Sudanese representative and the spontaneous response of a number of Member States. So far, cash contributions totalling \$778,635 had been pledged or received from Abu Dhabi, Bahrain, Denmark, Dubai, Kuwait, Libya, Norway, Qatar and Switzerland. In addition, the Governments of Iran, Iraq, Lebanon and Sweden had promised financial contributions of as yet unspecified amounts. Still other Governments had expressed their willingness to review their position on contributions. Lastly, various non-governmental and private organizations in Finland, Italy, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom had pledged substantial contributions in kind, ranging from the services of experts to the supply of timber and educational materials. The Director-General wished to express his gratitude for the generosity of many Governments and organizations and for the devoted efforts of his special envoy. He also wished to express the hope that countries and organizations which had not yet done so would soon join in supporting the joint educational efforts of UNRWA and UNESCO.

21. Mr. AKWEI (Ghana) said that the sponsors of the draft resolution (E/L.1387) accepted the Sudanese and United Kingdom amendments. Although they would have preferred the Greek suggestion to be withdrawn because the point he had raised was already covered by the second preambular paragraph, they had agreed to insert the words "particularly of paragraph 3 of resolution 2672 B (XXV)" after the words "above-mentioned decision" in operative paragraph 4.

22. They hoped that the USSR representative would not press his request for a separate vote on individual paragraphs of a resolution of the nature of the one before the Committee, since that would tend to diminish its impact.

23. Mr. ZAKHAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation wanted to express by

means of a vote its reservations on the three operative paragraphs in question.

24. The PRESIDENT put to the vote operative paragraphs 2, 5 and 6 of the draft resolution (E/L.1387), as amended.

*The paragraphs were adopted by 24 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

25. The PRESIDENT invited the Committee to vote on draft resolution E/L.1387 as a whole, as amended.

*The draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was adopted unanimously.*

## AGENDA ITEM 9

### Transport development (continued):

#### (b) Preparation for the United Nations/IMCO Conference on International Container Traffic (E/4963, E/L.1380, E/L.1388)

26. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) observed that transport had always been a creative and dynamic sector, and one of its most significant features was the development of containerization. Although that development was still at a relatively early stage, it was vital that action should be taken by the international community to regulate practices and procedures. His Government therefore warmly supported the Council's decision, taken at its resumed forty-eighth session, that a United Nations/IMCO Container Conference should be convened. Steps should be taken to ensure that the developing countries were not left out of containerization development. Their share of world shipping tonnage in 1969 had been only 7.6 per cent, although they had accounted for 64.7 per cent of all cargoes loaded and 18.1 per cent of all cargoes unloaded. Since containerization and container traffic were capital-intensive, there was a danger that they might be negative factors in the establishment of an equitable share for the developing countries in shipping and other modes of transport. He therefore advocated that technical and financial assistance should be provided to enable the developing countries to participate in new developments such as containerization and the "LASH" system of specially designed barge-carrying vessels.

27. While noting that there had been fruitful co-operation between different United Nations bodies at the secretariat level and that progress had been made on a number of items of the agenda for the Conference he expressed concern that, with the exception of the Economic Commission for Europe (ECE), regional economic commissions had played virtually no part in the preparatory process; now that the United Nations had a Membership of 127 States, a truly universal approach, rather than a solely European one, was called for.

28. He believed that it would be advisable to set up a United Nations/IMCO intergovernmental preparatory committee which would undertake to, *inter alia*, define the scope of the Conference. He noted in that connexion that one of the topics of the Conference was entitled "Legal problems concerning in particular the liability of combined



transport operators and related questions" (see E/4963, para. 2 (c)) and that under that topic a draft Convention on the International Combined Transport of Goods (TCM) had been circulated. That document was in no way relevant to containerization and indeed made no reference to containers or container traffic. The general objective of the draft Convention was to provide regulatory control over all intermodal or combined transport operations, which had been carried on long before the advent of containers. It provided for control to be exercised by the combined transport operator, who would be able to make decisions affecting in various degrees such matters as cargo routing, the competitive position of transport companies and national economies, preferential arrangements for shipping and labour conditions at points of trans-shipment, all of which has serious economic implications. His delegation felt that no international convention on combined transport should be based on concepts that might bring about a situation in which all unitized cargoes would depend entirely on services supplied by a few countries. Although the draft Convention would not be compulsory, it would inevitably have far-reaching effects in the long term. It was not surprising, therefore, that the UNCTAD Committee on Shipping had in its resolution 17 (V) recommended that the Economic and Social Council should be invited to consider undertaking a study of the economic implications, in particular for developing countries, of the proposed TCM Convention. Some kind of regulation of intermodal or combined transport operation was possible and desirable, but the developing countries could not be rushed into arrangements that were contrary to their economic interests and benefited a small group of countries only. Although attention should be given to the legal and other problems posed by intermodal or combined transport operations, such problems went beyond the question of international container traffic and should not be taken up at the Conference. In any event, there would not be time to do so.

29. In support of his delegation's view that the draft Convention lay outside the scope of the Conference, he pointed out that the combined transport operator would act and the combined transport document would be issued even if unitization through containers or other means did not take place. Intermodal or combined transport operations represented a current practice, the characteristics, requirements and legal problems of which were by no means confined to the domain of containerization or any other form of unitization. Moreover, the specific terms of reference of the Conference—as a conference on international container traffic—had been duly respected when other items had been discussed. To include consideration of the draft Convention in the agenda of the Conference would be to seek to secure over-all control of transport operations by a back-door approach. That was a good example of a matter over which the Council should exercise policy control.

30. His delegation supported the study called for by the UNCTAD Committee on Shipping and would in due course, together with other delegations, submit a draft resolution on the question.

31. Mr. HEDEMANN (Norway) said that it had been obvious for many years that there was a need for unified rules governing both the liability for goods that were moved

by combined transport and the legal character of the relevant documentation. After describing the work carried out on the draft TCM Convention since 1957 by the International Institute for the Unification of Private Law, and the International Maritime Committee, he expressed his delegation's satisfaction that the Council had at its forty-eighth session decided to take up the matter as part of the agenda for the Container Conference. On that subject, he had to disagree with the view of the Brazilian representative. On the other hand, he fully agreed that the Council should act on the recommendation made by the UNCTAD Committee on Shipping and undertake a study on the economic implications, in particular for developing countries, of the proposed Convention. His delegation believed that such a study would show that the Convention would be more favourable to cargo owners than the existing law applicable to combined transport and that the negotiable combined transport document dealt with in the Convention would prove to be a most useful instrument for furthering international trade. It was important that the study should be available well in advance of the Conference and he therefore suggested that November 1971 should be set as the time-limit for its completion. At the latest, the study should be circulated by the end of January 1972, when, according to the time-table proposed by the Secretary-General in his note (see E/4963, para. 6), the consolidated draft Convention, proposals and recommendations would be circulated to Governments and the organizations concerned.

32. Mr. WEBB (United States of America) referred to the great impact that the container revolution had had on international transport and to its major role in the development of a new transport concept—intermodalism. He noted that the container revolution had resulted mainly from the efforts of the private sector and said that, in the view of the United States, the role of Governments in that area should be mainly one of encouraging and facilitating the process. It regarded the development as a desirable one because containerization led to increased world trade by reducing or preventing increases in the costs of transport. Since the private sector had already been reasonably successful in its efforts, it would be unfortunate if Governments took action which had the effect of stifling innovation or distorting the benefits to be derived from containerization. If anything, Governments had lagged behind in establishing the necessary administrative and legal framework for container movement. However, there was a good record of international co-operation in the matter, and he cited the Customs Convention on Containers as an example.

33. It was natural that container traffic has so far developed mainly among the highly developed countries, but the time had come to make the existing intergovernmental framework universal in scope, and the Container Conference would provide an opportunity to do so. His delegation hoped that as many of the developing countries as possible would participate in the Conference, so that the resulting agreements and conventions would be widely accepted and thus bring economic benefits to all. The proposed date and duration of the Conference and the Secretariat's proposal (see E/4963, para. 7) with respect to invitations were acceptable to his Government. He expressed the view, however, that as a matter of protocol the



invitations should come from the Secretaries-General of the United Nations and IMCO, as co-sponsors of the Conference. Observers should be limited to those organizations having consultative status or special working arrangements with the specialized agencies.

34. Although he was aware that certain aspects of the Conference had been discussed at a number of meetings of such bodies as IMCO and ECE, he felt that the time had come for Governments to take a collective look at the arrangements and to reach whatever decisions were necessary to ensure that adequate preparations were made. There were a number of matters on which the Secretariat would need guidance, such as the priority to be given to the various topics, and it was also essential to reach early agreement on a provisional agenda. He therefore proposed that the Secretariat should address a circular letter to Governments, based on the Council's discussions, requesting their views on a number of points. September 1971 might be set as the time-limit for replies, which could then be communicated to Member States in the following two months. He also proposed that the Council should set up a small intergovernmental preparatory committee, representing both the United Nations and IMCO, that would consider the replies at, say, the beginning of January 1972. The committee could prepare guidelines for the Conference and work out a provisional agenda. It might also reconvene before the opening of the Conference to assist in final preparations. Because of the time factor, the Council should take a decision on his proposals at the current session.

35. With regard to the study recommended by the UNCTAD Committee on Shipping, his Government's support was qualified by the belief that such a study should be directed to very specific ends, such as the development of certain types of information that would permit Governments to evaluate better the TCM Convention and its possible consequences. His delegation had prepared and would make available to other delegations an informal paper on suitable items that could be taken up. In that connexion, his delegation felt that the range of possible conflicting interests in the TCM Convention was better defined along industry sector lines than along national lines. As an example, it considered that shipper interests in the TCM Convention shared a common position regardless of their country of domicile. He hoped that the proposed economic study would be completed as expeditiously as possible and that it would be undertaken by an outside consultant or consulting firm with specific terms of reference provided by the Council. Because of the complexity of the Convention, the study would involve three overlapping areas: international intermodal transport operations, especially containerization; transport insurance, including both liability insurance of the carriers and cargo insurance of the shipper or consignee; and the legal structure provided by the existing international transport liability conventions, namely The Hague Rules, 1921, and the Convention for the Unification of Certain Rules regarding International Transport, with Additional Protocol, signed at Warsaw, October 12, 1929.<sup>1</sup> When completed, the study should be sent not only to Governments but also to the secretariats of the organizations concerned, as well as to the regional economic commissions.

<sup>1</sup> League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. CXXXVII (1933), No. 3145.

36. Mr. JAIN (Observer for India), addressing the Council under rule 75 of the rules of procedure, stressed the importance for India and other developing countries of the United Nations/IMCO Container Conference. In particular, he endorsed the comments made by the Brazilian representative on the subject of the TCM Convention and agreed that there should first be a full study of the economic implications which the Convention would have for the developing countries. Consultations with all Member Governments as well as with the regional economic commissions would be most valuable and might establish whether a country-wide or an industry-wide problem was involved.

37. He also agreed with the United States proposal for a preparatory committee, pointing out that if Governments were asked in advance for their views on the agenda items for the Conference, it would prevent substantive items that had not been properly considered from arising unexpectedly.

38. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the development of containerization was making it possible to establish a more effective international system of transport. All countries would benefit from the development of that new system, and the United Nations/IMCO Container Conference would, by bringing together all the transport organizations and other organizations with an interest in the matter, create an opportunity for solving the various technical and legal problems that had arisen in that connexion. As a system of intracontinental and intercontinental freight movement, containerization had three main advantages. It provided the most rapid means of transport of goods between countries, it resulted in substantial reductions in cost, and it facilitated the better organization of the labour involved in the transportation of goods. At the international level, it would bring about a reduction in the manpower required for customs inspection and other customs procedures. For those reasons, his Government favoured the introduction of the container system in as many countries as possible. Such a system would be particularly advantageous to the developing countries. His delegation was keenly interested in the preparations for the United Nations/IMCO Container Conference and intended to take an active part in formulating a system to promote containerization in all parts of the world. As many countries as possible should participate in that process, and it was incomprehensible that certain delegations wished to omit a country as important as the German Democratic Republic from the Conference.

39. His Government was confident that the Conference would lead to the introduction of a world containerization system on a single basis. A uniform system of containerization, such as the one to be introduced in his own country, would help in solving five major transport problems: First, it would facilitate the passage of containers between countries. Secondly, it would permit more rapid loading and unloading operations, making use of up-to-date techniques and thereby reducing the manpower required. Thirdly, it would promote the more effective utilization of technological improvements in transport facilities. Fourthly, it would increase the safety of personnel involved in freight transport and help in the preservation of goods. Finally, it would accelerate and simplify commercial,



customs, health and other procedures by standardizing the paperwork involved.

40. His delegation thought the Conference should consider four main questions: the draft convention on the combined transport contract; the draft convention on safe intermodal transport of containers; the draft of a revised customs convention relating to containers; and the standardization of containers for international air, sea and land transport.

41. His delegation would be willing to consider other questions as well, such as those relating to preservation and insurance against damage in the transport of plants and other agricultural produce, which were of particular concern to the developing countries. The Economic Commission for Europe would be able to formulate recommendations on such questions, which would make the Conference more constructive and likely to produce positive results.

42. He hoped that the Conference would hasten the day when all types of transport would serve the true purpose of development to the advantage of all peoples and not just that of profit-making corporations. In conclusion, he pointed out that the introduction of an international container system would create the conditions necessary for the establishment of an international transport centre.

43. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had no objection to the inclusion of the topic indicated in paragraph 2 (e) of document E/4963, but felt it should not be a separate item as it would inevitably arise in connexion with the discussion of the safety and customs conventions. The topic referred to in paragraph 2 (g) likewise need not constitute a separate item; indeed, it might even be undesirable to decide on any particular pattern of documentation. He doubted whether special container manifests would be acceptable to various Government customs authorities, including the United Kingdom's. He also had reservations with regard to topic (f), as it was difficult to see at the present time whether separate identification would prove necessary to customs authorities. Otherwise, he found the general preparation for the Conference to be proceeding satisfactorily.

44. He disagreed with the Brazilian representative's implication that the preparation of the Conference was being rushed by the shipping countries to the detriment of the developing countries and that the Conference in general would be disadvantageous to the latter. The developing countries were well represented in UNCTAD and had

participated in the preparatory work done by IMCO. He could understand Brazil's doubts about the appropriateness of discussing at the Conference a convention which went beyond the original technical purpose of the Conference, but he felt that the development of containers and the need for the Conference had made questions related to the Convention more urgent and its discussion at the Conference would therefore be quite in order.

45. His delegation supported the UNCTAD proposal for further study and felt that the Council's best course would be to agree to the study and ask for its submission as soon as possible.

46. The United Kingdom representative doubted the need for the establishment of the small intergovernmental study group proposed by the United States representative, as he feared arguments about its composition. The scope of the work of the group, if established, should be carefully defined: it should merely prepare for the Conference and should not redraft documents.

## AGENDA ITEM 7

### Report of the Statistical Commission (*concluded*) (E/4938, E/4989, chap. VI, sect. A; E/L.1372, E/L.1389/Rev.1)

47. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), introducing a revised version (E/L.1389/Rev.1) of the draft resolution, said that the sponsors had made every effort to take account of the many views expressed on their original draft; in particular, they had rearranged the order of paragraphs to accommodate those views. They had included an idea suggested by the French representative in operative paragraph 4 and an idea suggested by the Sudanese representative in operative paragraph 7.

48. Mr. PRAGUE (France) proposed the inclusion of the word "national" before the words "statistical matters" in operative paragraph 4.

49. The sponsors having accepted the amendment proposed by France, the PRESIDENT put draft resolution E/L.1389/Rev.1 to the vote.

*The draft resolution, as orally amended, was adopted unanimously.*

*The meeting rose at 6.5 p.m.*





## ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Fiftieth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Tuesday, 4 May 1971,  
at 10.40 a.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Rachid DRISS (Tunisia).

## AGENDA ITEM 9

Transport development (*continued*):(b) Preparation for the United Nations/IMCO Conference on International Container Traffic (*continued*)  
(E/4963, E/L.1380, E/L.1388, E/L.1391)

1. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) said that the Council should begin by considering the note by the Secretary-General (E/4963), which described the measures already taken for the preparation of the Conference. The Council had approved the organization of the Conference but since there were as yet no detailed directives on the subject consultations were now taking place. Pakistan, which had supported the decision to hold the Conference, was concerned over the limited character of those consultations in which few regional bodies and few African and Asian countries were able to participate. His delegation, having received the documentation on the Conference only the week before, had not had time to examine it in detail, particularly since Pakistan lacked specialists on containerization. His delegation therefore approved the United States representative's proposal that the Council should have a memorandum distributed on the documentation concerning IMCO's preparations and should set up a preparatory group to study both that documentation and the agenda for the Conference.

2. With reference to the question raised by the representative of Brazil, i.e. the TCM Convention, he said that his delegation approved of resolution 17 (V) of the UNCTAD Committee on Shipping recommending that the Economic and Social Council should be invited to consider undertaking a study on the economic implications of the TCM Convention, in particular for developing countries, but it had doubts concerning the way in which that study should be carried out. The United States representative had suggested that it should be done by a group of consultants, while his delegation thought that it should be undertaken by the UNCTAD Committee on Shipping.

3. His delegation was not opposed to the Brazilian draft resolution (E/L.1391), but it reserved the right to discuss it after it had been introduced.

## AGENDA ITEM 10

Public administration and development  
(E/4950 and Add.1, E/4989, chap. VI, sect. B)

4. The PRESIDENT noted that the Council had before it the report of the Secretary-General on public administration

in the Second United Nations Development Decade (E/4950). That report had been examined by the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination at its eighth session and the Committee's views and recommendations appeared in paragraphs 47 to 59 of its report (E/4989).

5. He also informed the members of the Council that the report of Second Meeting of the Group of Experts on the United Nations programme in Public Administration, which had met from 18 to 26 January 1971, had been circulated under cover of a note by the Secretary-General (E/4950/Add.1).<sup>1</sup>

6. Mr. WU (Director, Public Administration Division) noted that the United Nations public administration programme differed from most other important programmes in that no committee or commission had the task of examining it and the Secretary-General had to rely on meetings of experts to review the programme, the results of which were considered by CPC and the Economic and Social Council. He then drew attention of the members of the Council to the report of the Second Meeting of Experts on the United Nations programme in Public Administration, particularly annexes II, III and IV. The report reviewed the progress achieved under the United Nations programme in public administration since the First Meeting of Experts in January 1967.<sup>2</sup> In accordance with the Council's instructions, emphasis in the programme had been placed on training, which had long been one of the priority areas. Progress had been made with regard to various other aspects of the management of public administration services, and the Division had, in particular, helped the developing countries to work out methods of improving their performance. In addition, the Division had given increasing attention to other aspects of administration in fields where multidisciplinary activities were called for: administration of urbanization, administrative aspects of the environment, family planning, and so forth. The public administration programme consisted of two parts: technical co-operation to developing countries; and the programme of the Division at Headquarters.

7. The programme directly for countries was intended to help them improve their administrative capacities. The Division's efforts were directed in particular toward projects of developing countries which were related to the over-all development of the countries. Officials at the entrance and intermediate levels and senior officials had to be trained. The projects carried out since 1967 required much more attention from the Headquarters staff than had been the case of the earlier projects with their more sophisticated objectives. While the Public Administration

<sup>1</sup> Public Administration in the Second United Nations Development Decade (United Nations publication, Sales No.: E.71.II.H.3).

<sup>2</sup> For the report, see document E/4296-ST/TAO/M/38.



Division was primarily concerned with the general aspects of public administration, the specialized agencies were responsible for the organization and administration of specific development functions in their spheres of competence. For example, the ILO was concerned with labour administration and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) with agricultural administration. The Economic Commission for Africa (ECA), the Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA) and the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East (ECAFE) each set up a public administration unit responsible for carrying out programmes in that field. Under Council resolution 1199 (XLII), UNDP (Special Fund) was the main source for the financing of a large number of projects.

8. The second part of the programme, namely, the programme of the Division at Headquarters, had two aspects: to supervise the country projects executed in the field, and to carry out research, comparative studies, seminars, etc. in the field of public administration. Public administration was a comparatively new field of activity which was in the process of development, and on many subjects there were no manuals or other authoritative works to which the Division could refer. For illustrations, that part of the programme included advanced training for senior officials of the public service in the developing countries, training of trainers, major administrative reforms and the improvement of urban administration.

9. The programme was based on the requests of Governments and did not go beyond their needs as stated by them.

10. In conclusion, he stressed that the Division had become more efficient and that its activities were now directed toward more useful projects and more immediate needs.

11. Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya) outlined the provisions of the draft resolution<sup>3</sup> which he felt that the Council should adopt on public information during the Second United Nations Development Decade. The adoption of that text would be the logical outcome of the various measures taken by the Secretary-General and the United Nations bodies concerned in pursuance of Council resolution 1199 (XLII) and General Assembly resolution 2561 (XXIV). He recalled that, in accordance with those resolutions, the Secretary-General had prepared, in close collaboration with the specialized agencies and non-governmental organizations concerned, a report on the proposed objectives and programmes in public administration for the Second Development Decade, and had convened the Second Meeting of Experts on the United Nations Programme in Public Administration to consider those proposals, which are contained in annex II of its report. The proposals and recommendations of the experts had subsequently been considered by the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination at its eighth session.

12. The important role of public administration in the framework of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade (General Assembly resolution 2626 (XXV)) for accelerating economic and social development could not be over-empha-

sized. The General Assembly, in paragraph 78 of the Strategy, had asked the developing countries to "pay special attention to the orientation and organization of their public administration at all levels for both the effective formulation and implementation of their development plans". He, as the representative of a developing country, was fully aware of the urgent need to improve public administration and of the fact that many countries would require a real "administrative revolution" to achieve the radical changes they sought in the Second Development Decade. His delegation fully concurred with the Secretary-General's view that the challenge to public administration arose from three facts: that Governments had a central role in promoting economic and social development, that administrative capability needed to be strengthened at all levels of government and that public administration had to adapt itself to changes if it was to be an effective instrument for progress.

13. While the initiative and most of the effort had to come from the developing countries themselves, the United Nations and the specialized agencies still had a useful role to play in helping countries to develop their public administration systems. Indeed, multilateral assistance was often preferable to bilateral assistance because of its ability to draw upon the experience of countries having different systems.

14. In the operative part of the draft resolution the attention of Member States would be drawn to the importance of measures to increase administrative capability: such measures should form an integral part of development plans at all levels. Elsewhere in the draft the Council would note with appreciation the co-operation and co-ordination prevailing among all the departments and bodies concerned. In another operative paragraph the Council would recommend that the Secretary-General's proposals for public administration for the Second Decade should be taken into account by the governing bodies of all United Nations organizations and interested non-governmental organizations concerned when they were programming activities in that field. The Council would also approve the work programme for the Public Administrative Division for 1971-1975, subject to the comments made on it by the Meeting of Experts and the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination. The Council would also recommend that the third Meeting of Experts should be held in 1975, an arrangement which would enable the experts not only to review the United Nations public administration programme but also to contribute to the mid-term review of progress in implementing the administrative aspects of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade. In the concluding paragraph, the Council would transmit the recommendations of the Meeting of Experts to the General Assembly at its twenty-sixth session.

15. He cited as an example of the effectiveness of the United Nations programme a Special Fund project being carried out in East Africa for the development of local railway transport and harbour enterprises. The way in which the project was being managed proved beyond dispute that the United Nations and similar organizations were unique in their ability to help the developing countries in the field of public administration because of the diversity of experience on which they could draw.

<sup>3</sup> Subsequently circulated as draft resolution E/L.1392.



16. He suggested that, since a second draft resolution was to be introduced on the same subject, the sponsors should endeavour to prepare a single draft resolution.

17. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that in recent years the international community had come to recognize that the public administration work of the United Nations was one of its most important activities. Public administration was extremely important in solving the problems of economic and social development, and was essential in securing rapid development, which was particularly vital for developing countries.

18. The experience of the socialist countries demonstrated the vital role of public administration in the elimination of economic backwardness, in industrialization, and in accelerating the pace of economic growth. At the Twenty-fourth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mr. Kosygin, Chairman of the Council of Ministers had, in announcing the guidelines for the new five-year plan, emphasized the measures to improve public administration and asserted that the degree to which the administrative structure could be improved would largely determine the country's progress.

19. It was for such reasons that the Soviet Union was co-operating, under bilateral agreements, with many developing countries with a view to transferring to them a body of knowledge on public administration. Those agreements covered practical projects, for example, those dealing with improving the management system of enterprises established under technical assistance from the Soviet Union and the training of national officials in various sectors of the administration. Soviet Union experts also visited countries to help them to build up their systems of public administration.

20. The Soviet Union also participated in international programmes. Its experts had attended seminars organized by the United Nations, and one USSR expert had participated in drawing up the Division's work programme.

21. His delegation supported the work programme and would co-operate fully with the Division. It was especially interested in the parts of the programme which dealt with the management of the public sector, the organization of national economic planning and the establishment of national systems of management training.

22. The report before the Council rightly pointed out that the subject of administration should be tackled at several levels—local, national and international. Similarly, the subject had to be dealt with as it affected the individual sectors of the national economy (such as industry, agriculture and science), each of which had its own characteristics and required a separate solution.

23. In view of the genuine scientific and technical revolution which was currently taking place, the improvement of public administration was not an operation which could be performed once and for all. On the contrary, it was a continuous process of improvement. The Division should accordingly bear in mind the need for constantly perfecting its current and future planning methods.

24. Of special importance in the Division's programme were the comparative studies which should be prepared in the form of educational texts or handbooks. In any event, the activities of the international agencies were of concern not only to the developing countries, but to all Member States of the United Nations.

25. There seemed to be a vital need to co-ordinate the programmes undertaken by the various specialized agencies. A number of constructive measures had been taken to that end over the past few years and specific examples could be given of such co-ordination efforts. One such example was provided by the co-operation between the Public Administration Division and UNESCO regarding the African Training and Research Centre in Administration for Development, and the Joint United Nations/ILO project for the training of specialists in transport administration. However, there were still cases of duplication and overlapping which resulted in a waste of time and resources. For example, UNESCO's programme made provision for a symposium in 1972 on modern management methods in public administration, although the United Nations Secretariat had already organized an interregional seminar on that question in 1970.

26. A number of agencies had set up special bodies with a view to co-ordinating their various programmes. The Division should follow that example and set up a board composed of the heads of departments concerned.

27. With regard to the work programme which the Public Administration Division planned to carry out in the period 1971-1975, his delegation had no substantive comments to make. However, it noted that the programme provided for a study of corruption in the public administrations of developing countries. No doubt there were defects in the workings of various public administrations but in general it could be seen that such shortcomings had to do with the question of national sovereignty. What the developing countries needed was not revelations concerning their administrations, but assistance and support.

28. It was also hard to see the need, in the proposed programme, for a study of the special administrative problems involved in extending services to nomads. The question was of interest only to a very small number of countries and was distinctly national in character. The limited resources of the United Nations should be spent on studies presenting a wider interest.

29. The Soviet Union would continue to intensify its efforts within the United Nations to ensure co-operation towards development in the field of public administration. However, it was hard to understand why the Secretariat should show such discrimination against the USSR and the other socialist countries. The attention of the members of the Council and of the Director of the Public Administration Division should be drawn to the fact that data prepared by the Division were not published in Russian and that the seminars on public administration did not employ Russian as a working language. Experts from the socialist countries, who had gained considerable experience in public administration, were not to be found among the large number of experts sent to the developing countries with funds from the United Nations budget. It would be



interesting to know the reasons for that discrimination. The Secretariat should take those factors into consideration and remove the obstacles preventing participation by Soviet experts.

30. Mr. MOJSOV (Yugoslavia) said that his delegation had followed the work of the Public Administration Division with keen interest and was happy to note the results achieved. Yugoslavia had actively supported the realization of the Division's work programme from the outset, and Yugoslav experts had participated in the symposia organized by the Division. In 1969 Yugoslavia had acted as host to a symposium on public enterprise management improvement. Some Yugoslav experts had joined the teams of experts formed under the Special Fund project for public administration. Yugoslavia would continue to assist in the implementation of the work programme of the Public Administration Division.

31. During the period under review, inherited administrative systems and outlooks had continued to exercise a negative influence on the economic and social development of the developing countries. Those countries wished to modernize their public administration and therefore looked to the United Nations and to various developed countries for technical assistance in that sector. The modernization of the national public administration and the improvement of its administrative capacity were highly important in the present phase of development. The work programme proposed for the Second United Nations Development Decade was in line with the basic principles of the United Nations and suited to the needs of the developing countries. The programme, which had been discussed at length in January by experts from developed and developing countries, reflected recommendations that were designed to increase the effectiveness of administration in the developing countries.

32. It should be emphasized that the Public Administration Division of the United Nations and the sections that dealt with public administration in the regional economic commissions needed to have an adequate number of competent experts. Activities under the work programme had steadily grown and expanded. At the same time, the needs for expert assistance in the developing countries had become more sophisticated. The need to recruit experts had thus become more pressing. Recruitment was not always an easy task, but it was to be hoped that specialists could be recruited in time to prevent a delay in the execution of projects. Every effort must be made to ensure that the experts recruited had the necessary technical skills and extensive legal experience. In the interests of the rational utilization of investments and the avoidance of duplication, organizations within the United Nations system should co-ordinate their public administration activities with those of the Public Administration Division. The Division had considerable experience that could be of benefit to the developing countries. The Yugoslav delegation was ready to endorse the proposed work programme of the Division for the period 1971-1975.

33. Mr. MOBARAK (Lebanon) thanked the Director of the Public Administration Division for his statement. The Lebanese delegation supported the United Nations programme in the field of public administration. It must be

realized that public administration had an important role to play in the process of economic and social development. That role would become increasingly prominent and public administration would have a special responsibility in the effective formulation and implementation of national development plans. The Second Meeting of Experts in public administration had ended on 26 January 1971. In the report transmitted to the Secretary-General the experts had noted that in the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade (resolution 2626 (XXV)), the General Assembly had asked the developing countries to pay special attention to the orientation and organization of their public administration at all levels for both the effective formulation and implementation of their development plans. The experts had also noted that the Secretary-General's report on objectives and programmes took the International Development Strategy as the frame of reference and called attention to the urgent need for the improvement of public administration in order to enable the developing countries to achieve the economic and social targets set by the General Assembly. The experts had also considered that many developing countries would need an administrative revolution to bring about necessary changes in the economic and social fields during the Second Decade. The extent to which Governments performed their tasks in the promotion of economic and social development would depend largely on the rate of progress in developing administrative capability at all Government levels and in the main areas of development. Public administration must adjust to that trend if it wished to be an effective instrument of development. Experience gained during the First United Nations Development Decade showed the importance of public administration to the success or failure of national efforts towards economic and social development. Administrative weaknesses or shortcomings had often been the main causes of the slow rate of progress in that field.

34. The diversity of administrative systems and of the situations in which they functioned meant that the priority problems which public administration would have to solve during the 1970s would often differ considerably from country to country. There were, however, certain traits common to a number of countries, and common elements of a solution to various administrative problems which have to be found.

35. The influence on public administration structures and efficiency and on national development were as varied as they were numerous. Ways had to be found of identifying those influences and of channelling them towards the economic and social objectives set by national authorities. It was evident that the methods followed differed considerably from one country to another and that certain administrative methods were preferable to others. Public administration must adapt itself to the pressing requirements of economic and social change. In their conclusions, the experts had expressed the hope that, when it considered their report, the Council would emphasize the strategic role of public administration in accelerating the pace of development. The Secretary-General had found the comments and recommendations of the Meeting of Experts to be most useful. The Lebanese delegation considered that the organizations in the United Nations system should collaborate



with each other at the Headquarters level, with the regional commissions at the regional level and with the UNDP resident directors at the country level, in order to help Governments improve the administration of major development activities and programmes. It also supported the proposal that UNDP give sympathetic consideration to requests of Governments for assistance in increasing their administrative capability for development. One could not but welcome the views expressed by the experts on programme content, research and comparative studies, interregional seminars and publications. It was encouraging to note that the number of requests for technical co-operation in public administration had steadily risen during the 1960s and was likely to increase further during the 1970s. Means for increasing the resources available for technical co-operation in public administration needed to be closely studied, as such an increase was necessary in view of the central role of public administration in national development efforts. In confronting an ever-changing situation, public administration must adapt itself constantly to new requirements if it was not to check the economic and social process of national development. His delegation supported the views of the representative of Kenya and also the draft resolution which he proposed to submit.

36. Mr. PATAKI (Hungary) said that his delegation had studied with interest the report of the Secretary-General (E/4950) and the report of the Second Meeting of Experts on the United Nations programme in Public Administration. The role of public administration and of Governments was highly important for development. Efficient public administration made a significant contribution to economic, technical and social progress, as the great successes of the socialist countries in those areas clearly proved. Their experience should serve as a guide in the

implementation of the programme outlined in the documents before the Council. The Secretary-General's report was a valuable contribution to the attainment of goals of the Second United Nations Development Decade. His delegation welcomed the integrated manner in which the objectives and programmes for the 1971-1975 period had been presented, and urged that United Nations Headquarters, the specialized agencies and the regional commissions co-operate efficiently so as to avoid any overlapping. The programme should be action-oriented and priorities should be set on that basis. That was especially important in view of the fact that at present many of the project descriptions did not make clear the magnitude of the effort needed to carry them out. The titles of the projects did not always reflect their real importance. The value and real usefulness of the programme would depend on the extent to which it could satisfy the real needs of improving public administration in the developing countries.

37. The Secretary-General's report contained proposals to expand the staff of the Public Administration Division. His delegation was not convinced that the implementation of the programme required a significant expansion either of the Public Administration Division at Headquarters or in the regional commissions. An examination of the programme proposed for 1971-1975 showed that a considerable number of the projects could be carried out with the help of various non-governmental organizations. The Division was already co-operating with interested scientific institutions. An increase in staff could be avoided if such co-operation were to be broadened under the programme proposed for the 1971-1975 period.

*The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.*





## ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Fiftieth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Tuesday, 4 May 1971,  
at 3.20 p.m.

NEW YORK

*President: Mr. Rachid DRISS (Tunisia).*

## AGENDA ITEM 10

**Public administration and development (continued)**  
(E/4950 and Add.1, E/4989, chap. VI, sect. B; E/L.1392)

1. Mr. PRAGUE (France) said that his delegation was generally satisfied with the report of the Second Meeting of Experts on the United Nations Programme in Public Administration circulated under cover of a note by the Secretary-General (E/4950/Add.1). However, it felt that the work programme proposed for the Public Administration Division in the period 1971-1975 placed excessive emphasis on certain problems at the expense of others. For instance, the problems of smaller States had been referred to three times and land-locked States had received extra attention, although there was no reason why they should have special problems of public administration. On the other hand, the question of evaluating the Second United Nations Development Decade had been given no priority. He agreed that the problems of the least developed of the developing countries should receive top priority.

2. He also felt that, although there had been unofficial contacts between the Public Administration Division and corresponding units in the specialized agencies, insufficient attention had been paid to the question of co-ordination. The United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR), for instance, was engaged in work that was often identical with that of the Public Administration Division, and there was a possibility that it would eventually become a competitor. Further details might usefully be given with regard to the distribution of tasks.

3. Turning to budgetary matters, he expressed the view that the Group of Experts was not qualified to make recommendations with financial implications, since it did not have over-all knowledge of the various issues involved. Although his delegation was not adamantly opposed to an increase in either the budget or the manning table, it considered that any such increase should be viewed with extreme caution and that UNDP was the appropriate body to provide additional finance for public administration training.

4. He strongly recommended that UNDP's resident directors for country programmes should be assisted by personnel administration experts. Furthermore, such experts should be members of multidisciplinary planning teams, since their role determined the success or failure of plans.

5. Mr. FAROOQ (Pakistan) said that his delegation attached particular importance to the work programme proposed for 1971-1975 in the field of public adminis-

tration because the date of its completion would coincide with the mid-point of the Second Development Decade. Like other developing countries, Pakistan was well aware of the contribution that administrators could make to accelerating economic and social development. It also knew that, if administrators were to meet the new challenges created by economic and social change, they would have to familiarize themselves with recent scientific and technological progress. Pakistan had, with the help of friendly countries and international co-operation, established institutions such as the Civil Services Academy of Pakistan and the National Institute for Public Administration to train new civil servants and to give refresher courses and advanced training as necessary. Although it regarded such programmes as a national responsibility, it believed that the United Nations should continue to play a significant role in the sector, because it was in a unique position to draw upon the experiences of countries in various regions with different administrative systems.

6. He agreed with the delegation of the Soviet Union (1748th meeting) that a study of measures to promote high ethical standards in public administration, as called for in project A.3 (c) of the proposed work programme, would be of little practical value to Member Governments. The Soviet Union had also referred to the danger of duplication and overlapping, but that should not arise if the established practice of holding prior consultations was followed, so that the work programmes of different bodies were properly dovetailed before taking their final form.

7. It appeared from chapter IV of the experts' report that despite limited resources the Secretariat had responded energetically to the problems and requests of the developing countries and that the 1966-1970 work programme had provided a solid foundation for launching new and strengthened programmes during the Second Development Decade. The statement that collaborative relationships had been forged with other units of the United Nations and the specialized agencies was most welcome. Having noted various other areas in which progress had been made during the period under review and having expressed his delegation's satisfaction with a number of the items contained in the new work programme, he drew the Council's attention to the fact that the programme had increased to the point where there was no longer adequate staff to perform the work properly. It was important that qualified staff should be recruited to enable the new programme to be properly implemented. In that connexion, he noted that according to paragraph 66 (a), financial restraints had prevented the Secretary-General from carrying out some of the recommendations of the First Meeting of Experts and that inflation had reduced the real value of funds. His delegation would therefore like to know which recommendations had been left aside and what the percentage reduction in the real value of funds had been. It would



also like to know whether the recommendations not previously implemented had been incorporated in the new work programme.

8. With regard to the statement in paragraph 66 (*b*) that only \$3.5 million of the \$5 million approved for the technical co-operation programme in public administration had been used, he requested details concerning the external obstacles that had contributed to that situation and asked what could be done by the Council to remove them. The main fact that appeared to have emerged was that the Public Administration Division had been handicapped by lack of funds; he urged the Council to meet the Division's staff requirement so that there would be no repetition of cases of recommendations not being implemented.

9. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) said that his delegation agreed with the concept that progress in the field of public administration was a crucial factor for development and felt that the reference made by the Second Meeting of Experts to the need for an "administrative revolution" was most appropriate. Assistance in the public administration sector was to a large extent assistance in self-help and planning, which would have a vital bearing on the outcome of the Second Development Decade, and United Nations assistance to the developing countries in that sector was accordingly of great importance. The proposed work programme for 1971-1975 rightly included a wide range of projects and an indication of priorities. It was certainly important to ensure that the major projects with the greatest implications for the development process that had already been selected for priority consideration should be given concentrated attention during the next two years. In that connexion, he agreed with the USSR representative concerning the study called for under project A.3. (*c*).

10. Noting that the Secretary-General would take account of the observations and recommendations of the Meeting of Experts in his formulation of the entire work programme in the economic and social field, he stressed the need for effective co-ordination in drafting final work programmes, including those of Secretariat bodies, since the concept of public administration could not always be dissociated from substantive sectors in which governmental action developed. For instance, transport administration and urban administration would require co-ordination with the Resources and Transport Division and the Centre for Housing, Building and Planning, respectively.

11. Mr. GATES (New Zealand) said that of the recommendations of the Meeting of Experts set out in paragraph 33 of the Secretary-General's report (E/4950), his delegation was ready to endorse those in subparagraphs (*a*), (*d*), (*e*) and (*g*) without reservation; it would also support recommendations (*b*), (*c*) and (*f*) subject to the comments made by CPC in paragraphs 55 and 56 of its report (E/4989).

12. The Council should emphasize the strategic role of public administration in accelerating the pace of economic and social development. The value to any country of a well-organized, well-trained, highly motivated and incorruptible civil service was inestimable. On it depended law and order, leadership in planning social and economic development, the possibility of capital formation through taxation,

borrowing and attraction of overseas aid, and the conditions which stimulated initiatives from the private sector. Priority should be given to the importance of national machinery for public administration, and particularly to training in specific functions as opposed to general education. The trend of resistance to institutional change should be overcome at the national and international levels. That could best be done by strengthening the Public Administration Division; an increase of staff was justified if it enabled the Division to keep abreast of operations in the field and to give support to consultants. It was also important to provide adequate follow-up of field studies, reports and recommendations by experts.

13. While individual countries had different problems, there were a few common factors basic to the efficient operation of all public administration systems. For instance, before suggesting how a public administration system might be improved, the following questions should be asked: Was the machinery of government, for example, the grouping of functions, logical? Were there appropriate central organs of inspection stimulation, and criticism and internal mechanism for change? Did personnel policies and practices enable those with the greatest merit to reach the top? Did officers know what their jobs were, and were they held accountable for the results of their actions? Was there proper liaison between the departments of the administration and the political executive?

14. Turning to the proposed work programme of the Public Administration Division, he said that projects A.2 (*c*) and (*d*), on the support of public administration units in the regional economic commissions and UNESOB and the evaluation and follow-up of technical assistance projects, were of special importance. Project A.3. (*c*), on measures to promote high ethical standards in public administration, would also have merit provided it included realistic studies on such matters as inspection, organization and management teams, and training. On the other hand, project A.4. (*c*), on the development of a public information retrieval system or clearing-house, could have little effect other than that of producing more documentation, while the reference in project B.1 to qualitative and quantitative indices suggested an academic approach and implied a degree of sophistication in administrative structures that was rarely obtained. Project D.2. was highly worth while because job description and classification and inspection and evaluation of performance were very important tasks. With regard to project E.3., he observed that training officers should themselves be adequately trained.

15. Turning to the activities of the Public Administration Division (E/4950, para. 23), he said that his delegation was in general agreement with the activities outlined in subparagraphs (*e*) to (*j*). He had, however, some observations to make on the activities outlined in subparagraphs (*a*) to (*c*). Research and comparative studies were of the greatest value when directed to the problems of a specific country or countries. Interregional seminars were useful only when they provided opportunities for officials to compare notes on well-defined subjects. Information services and retrieval were of doubtful merit if they merely added to the volume of paper; as CPC had said, such services should be viewed in the context of the wider effort of the United Nations



family of organizations to develop an information and retrieval system.

16. His delegation fully agreed with the Secretary-General that there should be adequate funds for travel from Headquarters to the field (E/4950, para. 27).

17. Mr. MARSH (Jamaica) said that training in public administration was needed at all levels but that programmes should be carefully planned if they were to be beneficial. Another area which merited attention was the role of scientists in public administration; liaison between the administrative branches and the scientific units of government was often hampered by difficulties of communication and lack of comparable standards, and the developing countries would welcome guidance in that area. The role of the United Nations in public administration training could well be focused on the proposed international university, if it were set up; such an arrangement would have the advantages of economy and co-ordination.

18. Mr. WU (Director, Public Administration Division) thanked the Kenyan delegation for its initiative with respect to the draft resolution on the United Nations public administration programme which was now before the Council (E/L.1392). He also wished to express his appreciation of the encouraging remarks and general support given to the programme by many of the delegations present. The Division welcomed the constructive suggestions and directives put forward on the item under consideration. In particular it had noted the emphasis placed on the following areas: the importance of public administration work to the Second United Nations Development Decade; the desirability of instituting administrative reforms on a long-term and continuing basis; the need for administrative planning to support economic and social development; the desirability of improving the performance of public enterprises; the necessity of adapting public administration systems to rapidly changing environments; the importance of the integrated approach and of action-oriented programmes; the need for self-help; and the importance of training.

19. Some of the comments made called for clarification or an elaboration of certain projects in the Division's work programme. The purpose of project A.3(c) on studies of measures to promote high ethical standards in public administration was not to expose corruption, but to study successful experiences in establishing high ethical standards in government within a single agency or on a government-wide basis. However, since CPC had questioned the wisdom for the United Nations to carry out the study directly, it was now intended to ask the International Institute of Administrative Sciences to undertake a preliminary study and perhaps include it as a major topic in the agenda of its future world congress. That would require minimum involvement on the part of the United Nations.

20. In connexion with project F.3.(b), on the special administrative problems involved in extending services to nomads, he pointed out that the proposal for that study had originated some years earlier in ACC. As questions were also raised in CPC, the secretariat would welcome the Council's guidance in that matter. The project, marked with an asterisk, was one which could be undertaken only with an increase of staff.

21. Objections had been raised to project B.1., on appraising administrative capability for development, on the ground that the studies would be too academic. Nevertheless, in view of the many requests by countries for an effective evaluation of their administrative systems and suggestions for improvements, the Public Administrative Division was eager to work out a set of guidelines to appraise administrative capability for development. The few thousand dollars that that would cost would be well spent.

22. The representative of Pakistan had asked why the Division had implemented only \$3.5 million of the \$5 million approved for the technical co-operation programme in public administration for 1970. The main reason was shortage of staff. The fact that only 70 per cent of the programme was being implemented was regrettable, but there was little the Division could do to remedy the situation unless it had more staff. Another obstacle to effective programme implementation was slowness in recruitment, which usually took nine or ten months.

23. The representatives of the USSR, France and Pakistan had stressed the need for effective co-ordination, a matter to which the Secretary-General attached the greatest importance. The Division's efforts in that field were summarized in paragraphs 153 to 158 of annex II of the report of the meeting of experts. The ACC had found its activities in that respect satisfactory and felt that co-ordination should be informational rather than structural. In addition, the Division was following the Hungarian representative's suggestion that full use should be made of non-governmental organizations and was doing its best to comply with the Jamaican representative's advice to maintain close links with national training and educational institutions. It was also co-operating closely with UNITAR and contributing to some of its studies.

24. He assured the USSR representative that the Division was not guilty of discrimination against any country but was, on the contrary, making every effort to draw as fully as possible upon the experience of countries with differing political, social, economic and administrative systems. Its staff of fifteen Professional posts now included at least two officers each from Africa, Asia, Latin America, North America, Eastern Europe and Western Europe; and a considerable number of countries—including Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the Netherlands, Trinidad and Tobago, the United Kingdom, the USSR, the United States and Yugoslavia—had served as host countries to the interregional seminars and other interregional projects of the Division, providing not only conference and other host facilities but also making significant substantive contributions in the form of technical papers and discussion leaders. The Division was also making comparative studies of the experience gained in public administration in various countries, especially the Eastern European countries. In addition, it was doing its best to broaden the basis of participation in country programmes. In 1959, for example, experts had come from only twenty countries, but that figure had risen to thirty-four by 1969. However, the real problem with regard to the country programmes was language, as the recipient countries insisted on the language that was most useful to them. He had made an agreement with the Technical Assistance Recruitment Service that the



name of any qualified candidate proposed by a Government would be forwarded to the requesting Government. That was, he thought, all the Secretariat could do, but he was willing to discuss with the USSR representative ways and means of increasing the participation of as yet under-represented countries. He had hoped to publish documents and studies in all the official languages and Arabic but no funds were available for that purpose and sometimes documents had to be issued in only one language. The question of the budget was, of course, a matter for the legislative bodies to decide on the basis of the priorities established by the United Nations. The Division had been in a crisis situation for some time and was doing everything it could under the present circumstances of financial stringency.

## AGENDA ITEM 9

### Transport development (*continued*):

#### (b) Preparation for the United Nations/IMCO Conference on International Container Traffic (*continued*) (E/4963; E/L.1380, E/L.1388, E/L.1391)

25. The PRESIDENT said that the Council would have to take decisions on paragraphs 7 and 8 of the note by the Secretary-General (E/4963).

26. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) stressed his delegation's positive approach towards both the Conference on International Container Traffic and the legal problems concerning intermodal transport operations; it felt that the Conference deserved full support and the more general problem of possible international action on combined transport operations required careful consideration. Nevertheless, the proposed draft Convention on the International Combined Transport of Goods (TCM) went beyond the original technical purposes of the Conference and he could not help wondering whether those purposes had been changed and, if so, by whom—certainly not the Council.

27. Introducing the draft resolution submitted by his delegation and that of India (E/L.1391), which he believed reflected the general sentiments of the developing countries, he said that it attempted to clarify a number of conceptual questions of particular relevance to the preparation of the Conference and took account of the justifiable concern expressed by the UNCTAD Committee on Shipping in its resolution 17 (V) regarding the proposed Convention. The preambular part was generally factual in nature and was intended to clarify the conceptual framework of the Conference. Operative paragraph 1 was intended to prevent the Conference from becoming a world transport conference through the sudden introduction of extraneous matters into its agenda. Operative paragraph 2 laid down a principle which should be the very *raison d'être* of the Conference, at least from the point of view of the developing countries. Operative paragraph 3 called for the preparation of the study recommended by the UNCTAD Committee on Shipping. It should not be a bureaucratic study and for that reason the paragraph called for the assistance of qualified experts. At the same time, it should not be purely academic; consequently, it was felt that consideration should first be given to questions which Member States felt required clarification. The doubts and the specific misgivings of many Governments on the subject of

the draft TCM Conference should be made known before the study was begun. Logically, once the study was made it should be referred back to the UNCTAD Committee on Shipping as the competent intergovernmental body. The fact that that Committee would be reconvened only after the Conference was immaterial, since the TCM Convention did not fall within the much narrower scope of the Conference but required separate and distinct treatment. To ensure such treatment and influence future action, the Committee on Shipping should comment and make recommendations on the study. Operative paragraph 5 reflected a pragmatic approach: the Council could decide whether the draft TCM Convention was ready for international consideration only after the completion of the process envisaged in operative paragraphs 3 and 4. If it was not the intention of the shipping countries to rush the developing countries on that point, then operative paragraph 5 should pose no difficulties.

28. Mr. HEDEMANN (Norway) reiterated his delegation's reservations with regard to the proposal implicit in the draft resolution submitted by Brazil and India that the draft TCM Convention should not be discussed at the Conference; it felt that the misgivings of the developing countries that the Convention might be inimical to their interests were unfounded. The fact was that the increasing use of containers and the expansion of international trade made uniform regulations regarding the combined transport of goods urgent enough to warrant discussion at the Conference. A careful study of the draft Convention would show that, far from being harmful to the developing countries, it would be to their advantage. However, he agreed that the study of the economic implications of the Convention should be carried out before the Council took a final decision on the Conference. The Council should agree on a date for the completion of the study that would be well in advance of the Conference. In the preparation of the study, he hoped that all parties would have ample opportunity to express their views. He doubted the need for the intergovernmental preparatory group proposed by the United States representative (1747th meeting), but if such a group was established the representatives of all interested Governments should be able to take part in its work.

29. Mr. FIGUEROA (Observer for Chile), speaking at the invitation of the President, said that his country had no objection to the proposed Conference but hoped that the interests and present structure of the transport industries in the developing countries would be duly taken into account. On the other hand, it had serious misgivings with regard to the preparatory work so far done on the draft TCM Convention, which failed to give due consideration to the present shipping situation in the developing countries. In that connexion, it fully shared the views expressed by the representatives of Brazil and India in the Council and supported the draft resolution which they had submitted, of which it would like to become a sponsor. Only when the study called for in operative paragraph 3 of that text had been completed should the Council take a decision on the desirability of convening a Conference. His delegation wished to make it quite clear that it was not necessarily opposed to the Convention, which it might even favour at the proper time, that is to say, after its effect on the transport structures of the developing countries and their



adaptability to the new form of transport had been thoroughly studied by the Council and by UNCTAD.

30. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) recalled that in its resolution 17 (V), the UNCTAD Committee on Shipping, later supported by the Legal Committee of IMCO, had recommended that the Economic and Social Council be invited to consider undertaking a study on the economic implications of the proposed TCM Convention. Although the Committee on Shipping had not felt competent to undertake the study itself, under the draft resolution introduced by Brazil (E/L.1391) it would be called upon to give further consideration to the matter once the study was undertaken. Furthermore, the representative of Brazil had argued that the draft Convention did not fall within the framework of the Conference on International Container Traffic as envisaged by the Economic and Social Council and that it was therefore unnecessary to adhere to the time schedule proposed by UNCTAD and IMCO for consideration of that text. In the view of his delegation, the pace of development of container traffic would unquestionably give rise to many problems, including legal ones. If the results of the study on the draft TCM Convention were not available for the Conference, many difficulties would arise due to the lack of information on the implications of those legal questions. The results of the proposed study should be made available by mid-1972 so that representatives to the Conference could have at their disposal certain guidelines which would help them resolve their differences of opinion regarding the draft Convention.

✓ 31. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece), supported by Mr. ANTOINE (Haiti) and Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking on a point of order relating to draft resolution E/L.1391, said that while he welcomed the participation of observers in the general debate, he was not sure that it was in order, under rule 75 of the Council's rules of procedure, for observers to sponsor draft resolutions.

32. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) recalled that, at the forty-ninth session, the Council had without objection allowed the observer for Malta to introduce a draft resolution. A member of the Council had subsequently requested that it should be put to the vote. Hence the Council already had a precedent.

33. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should authorize him to consult the Legal Department for a ruling on whether observers had the right to sponsor draft resolutions under rule 75 of the rules of procedure.

*It was so agreed.*

34. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that in the view of his delegation the Conference should concentrate on four major topics, i.e. the draft TCM Convention, the draft conventions covering the safe intermodal transport of containers and customs, and the question of the standardization of containers for international intermodal transport. Of those, the draft TCM Convention was perhaps the most important, but if any of the four issues were excluded from consideration at the Conference it would be impossible to mobilize efforts satisfactorily for the development of an effective world-wide intercontinental transport system. However, operative paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of the draft resolution (E/L.1391) introduced by Brazil would, in their present form, tend to postpone unduly the preparation of the proposed study. The study could easily be prepared in time for the Conference, and international experts could be consulted in order to ensure that the content of the draft TCM Convention was thoroughly understood. Furthermore, as the agenda for the Conference made clear, the Convention was still in the draft stage and throughout the Conference all delegations would be free to submit any amendments they wished in order to clarify any doubts regarding its advantages for the developing countries. The draft resolution (E/L.1391) should be amended in the light of those observations.

35. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil), replying to questions raised during the meeting, said that his delegation firmly believed that the developing countries must pay heed to the development of container traffic. Unfortunately the draft TCM Convention contained no specific provision relating to container transport. In that respect, it was somewhat out of date. Work on the draft Convention should therefore run parallel to that on the question of containers, which had added a new dimension to intermodal transport operations. Furthermore, the role of containerization in intermodal transport should be reflected in the TCM Convention.

36. He welcomed the United States suggestion to establish an intergovernmental group to review the agenda for the Conference. The sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1391 would make every effort to accommodate the views of that delegation but insisted that in the preparations for the Conference a clear distinction should be made between international combined transport and container transport.

*The meeting rose at 5.55 p.m.*





## ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Fiftieth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

1750th meeting

Wednesday, 5 May 1971,  
at 10.50 a.m.

NEW YORK

*President: Mr. Rachid DRISS (Tunisia).*

## AGENDA ITEM 10

**Public administration and development (continued)**  
(E/4959, E/4986, chap. VI, sect. B; E/L.1392)

1. Mr. NDUNG'U (Kenya) said that he would announce some changes to be made in the draft resolution introduced by his delegation (E/L.1392). The words "and other organizations in the United Nations system" in the fourth preambular paragraph was to be deleted and the words "are" and "their" replaced by "is" and "its". The phrase "constituting a basis" in operative paragraph 2 should be replaced by "constituting the basis", and the phrase "shall have the necessary staff... administration" in operative paragraph 5 should be replaced by the words "shall have the necessary staff to implement fully their work programmes". His delegation hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted unanimously.

2. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) said that his delegation supported the draft resolution; it had reservations, however, about operative paragraphs 2, 3 and 5. Since the staff and resources of the units dealing with public administration programmes at Headquarters and in the regions were limited, priorities would have to be determined. That part of the recommendations of the Second Meeting of Experts which was quoted in paragraph 33 (f) of the Secretary-General's report (E/4950) should not be put into effect until the Secretariat had revised the programme in the way recommended in paragraph 33 (c).

3. Mr. AYOUB (Tunisia) said that his delegation attached great importance to questions of public administration. He was gratified by the quality of the report of the Second Meeting of Experts and by the fact that the sponsors of the draft resolution had explicitly mentioned the Secretary-General's summary of that report (E/4950). The guidelines and recommendations of the Meeting of Experts would help developing countries to improve their public administration. The Public Administration Division was also to be commended on its work. His delegation supported draft resolution E/L.1392. It was pleased to note that CPC had agreed (see E/4989, para. 54) with the Experts' recommendation that public administration experts should be included in the interdisciplinary planning advisory teams of the United Nations.

4. In view of the fact that the draft resolution stated that the Council approved the work programme of the Public Administration Division, the request in operative paragraph 5 that the Division should be given the necessary staff to implement the projects contained in that programme

seemed logical. Of the major projects directed at improving public administration structures, his delegation considered projects A.2 (c) (Substantive support of the Division for public administration units in the regional economic commissions and UNESOB) and A.7 (b) (Contribution to mid-term review of progress in implementing administrative aspects of the International Development Strategy) to be deserving of mention.

5. Mr. PRAGUE (France) said that the sponsors' proposal was consistent with the thinking of his delegation, which would support the draft resolution. However, the wording of the draft could probably be made clearer in two instances.

6. Greater attention should be paid to public administration in country programming. As public administration had such a great influence on the success or failure of national economic and social development work, the United Nations interdisciplinary planning advisory teams should include public administration experts and the resident directors should make more use of them. The sponsors should take that recommendation into account in the draft resolution.

7. His delegation had been surprised to find that the Meeting of Experts had not been able to appraise the Secretary-General's proposals in the light of the work programme of the other agencies, all of which properly dealt with public administration matters. It was his delegation's hope that, in order to avoid duplication, the Meeting of Experts, to be held in 1975, would have before it not only the Secretary-General's proposals on the work programme of the Division, but also the work programmes of the other agencies concerned. For that reason it was proposing that operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution should be amended by adding after the words "public administration programme" the phrase "taking due account of the work of other United Nations bodies in this field".

8. Mr. LENNON (United States of America) supported the amendment proposed by the French representative and the comments of the United Kingdom representative on the order of priorities. His delegation was prepared to support the draft resolution, but would like operative paragraph 5 to be amended in such a way as to make it consistent with paragraph 58 of the report of CPC (E/4989). To do that, the words "taking into account the findings of the manpower utilization survey," should be added after "Requests the Secretary-General". There should be an indication, for every United Nations programme, of the degree of priority that was assigned to it. It was to be hoped that the Division would classify its activities by order of priority and periodically review that order, altering it, if necessary, as circumstances changed. His delegation whole-

heartedly supported the entire programme of the Division, but trusted that the sponsors' addition of the word "fully" in operative paragraph 5 would not be taken to mean that any review of the order of priorities was excluded.

9. Mr. FAROOQ (Pakistan) thanked the sponsors of the draft resolution for taking account of his delegation's comments; he supported the French amendment.

10. It should be borne in mind that if the United States amendment was adopted, the resulting provision should not adversely affect the required expansion of the activities of the United Nations system, a point made by the CPC in paragraph 25 of its report.

11. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, before making its decision, the Council should have before it the final text of the draft resolution, including the revisions announced by the Kenyan delegation. The adoption of the draft resolution would help to improve United Nations public administration activities. His delegation was prepared to support the useful amendment proposed by France to operative paragraph 4.

12. Operative paragraph 5 of the draft was an improvement on the version introduced orally by the Kenyan representative at the 1748th meeting. Nevertheless, the fact that the revised text made no reference to the conclusions of the Meeting of Experts had not altered the general thrust of the draft resolution. The Secretary-General was still requested, in operative paragraph 5, to ensure that the Public Administration Division and the public administration units of the regional economic commissions and of UNESOB had the necessary staff. The Meeting of Experts had had the current and future programmes of public administration work in mind when it had expressed the hope that the staff of the public administration units at Headquarters and in the regions would be strengthened; its recommendation was in no way binding, however, and the opinion it had expressed had been and still was subject to review.

13. Moreover, the Meeting of Experts had not had before it all the public administration programmes of the agencies of the United Nations system. If that had been the case, the experts would have concluded that there was duplication and that if that duplication could be eliminated, there would be no need for staff increases. The Meeting of Experts had not sought the opinion of any intergovernmental organ, a procedure which was incorrect and could well lead to wrong decisions. The sponsors would therefore be well advised to accept the amendment proposed by the United States delegation.

14. His delegation asked the sponsors to consider making the following amendment to operative paragraph 5: to add, after the words "to ensure", the words "by staff redistribution within the present over-all manning table".

15. Mr. SKATARETIKO (Yugoslavia) said that his delegation could not decide on the proposed amendments without consulting the other sponsors and having the revised text available.

16. He pointed out that the recommendations in paragraph 58 of the CPC report (E/4989), on which the United

States amendment was based, would not necessarily have a salutary effect on the work of the United Nations system. The purpose of operative paragraph 5 might well be to overcome the staff shortage in the Public Administration Division at Headquarters and the public administration units of the regional economic commissions and UNESOB, but it was none the less clear that a resolution alone was not going to dispose of the difficult problem of shortage of staff. He hoped that the delegations which had submitted amendments would co-operate in finding an acceptable solution.

17. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objections, he would take it that the Council had decided to defer a decision until the representative of Kenya has submitted the revised text in writing and the sponsors and other delegations concerned had had consultations.

*It was so decided.*

#### *Other matters*

18. The PRESIDENT invited the Director of the General Legal Division to speak on the question of whether observers had the right to sponsor draft resolutions under rule 75 of the rules of procedure, which had been raised at the 1749th meeting.

19. Mr. SLOAN (Director, General Legal Division), speaking on behalf of the Legal Counsel, said that the question was whether a Member State of the United Nations which was not a member of the Economic and Social Council and which had been invited under Article 69 of the Charter and rule 75 of the Council's rules of procedure to participate in the deliberations of the Council on a matter of particular concern to that Member could be one of the sponsors of a draft resolution submitted on the matter.

✓20. Article 69 of the Charter did not define the meaning of participation, except to provide that the non-member of the Council was not entitled to vote. Rule 75, however, provided, *inter alia*, that any Member thus invited might submit proposals which might be put to the vote by request of any member of the Council. It was therefore clear that a Member of the United Nations which was not a member of the Council and was participating in accordance with an invitation under rule 75 might itself submit a draft resolution. Since the non-member of the Council might itself submit a draft resolution, it was the opinion of the Office of Legal Affairs that it might join in co-sponsoring a draft resolution submitted by a member or members of the Council, provided, of course, that the other sponsors so agreed.

21. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he was in some doubt about the grounds for the opinion given by the representative of the Office of Legal Affairs. Did it mean that a Member State which was not a member of the Council could in any circumstances whatsoever join in co-sponsoring a draft resolution or even submit a draft resolution itself?

22. Mr. SLOAN (Director, General Legal Division) said that rule 75 of the rules of procedure answered that question explicitly; the word "proposal" in that rule



covered draft resolutions and substantive amendments or motions, as rules 56 and 57 of the rules of procedure indicated. In the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, in fact, draft resolutions were described only by the word "proposals".

23. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that the effect of the new interpretation of rule 75 which the representative of the Office of Legal Affairs had just given was to increase the membership of the Economic and Social Council, which was the sole prerogative of the Security Council and the General Assembly. A Member of the United Nations which was invited to participate in the Council's deliberations and co-sponsored a draft resolution became, for all practical purposes, a member of the Council. The representative of Brazil had said at the 1749th meeting that at the forty-ninth session Malta, which had not then been a member of the Council, had submitted a draft resolution which had later been adopted. That event should not, however, be considered to have created a precedent, since that would in practice mean accepting an increase in the membership of the Council.

24. Mr. SLOAN (Director, General Legal Division) explained that he had not said that the situation would in effect increase the membership of the Council. Rule 75 of the Council's rules of procedure stipulated the circumstances in which the Council could invite a Member of the United Nations to participate in its deliberations.

25. Mr. AKWEI (Ghana) said that he did not agree with the representative of Greece that the Director's interpretation of rule 75 of the Council's rules of procedure was a new one. In his view, the word "proposals" was clearly synonymous, in practice, with draft resolutions. The fact that a Member of the United Nations which was not a member of the Council could submit proposals on a specific matter did not mean that it was deemed to be a member of the Council.

26. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation was inclined to agree with the reservations expressed by the Greek representative on the entirely new interpretation which the representative of the Office of Legal Affairs had given of rule 75 of the rules of procedure.

27. Rule 56 of the rules of procedure of the Council distinguished clearly between draft resolutions and substantive amendments or motions. In his delegation's view, rule 75 could be interpreted only as meaning that a Member State could submit proposals, but not amendments or draft resolutions.

28. Mr. ANTOINE (Haiti) said he welcomed the explanations given by the Office of Legal Affairs.

29. In the specific case of the draft resolution on the preparation for the Conference on International Container Traffic (E/L.1391), it was proper that any Member State which could accede to the proposed Convention should be able to give its views on the subject. Furthermore, the rules of procedure of the Security Council provided an interesting precedent: when a Member State was called on to plead its cause before the Council, it could not itself submit a draft resolution but had to call upon another Member State to do so.

30. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) said that he found rule 75 of the rules of procedure of the Economic and Social Council perfectly clear. The word "proposals" could mean amendments, draft resolutions or substantive proposals. If no one disputed the right of an "invited" Member State, to submit proposals or draft resolutions, that Member State obviously also had the right to co-sponsor a draft resolution. Some might fear the Council would have to deal with many proposals from States not members of the Council, but his delegation would greatly welcome such a development.

31. Mr. AYOUB (Tunisia) said the Council was sovereign within its terms of reference under the Charter and within the limits of its rules of procedure. Rule 75 of the rules of procedure seemed to him to mean that once the Council had invited a State Member of the United Nations which was not a member of the Council to participate in its deliberations, that State did not have the right to vote but it could submit proposals. It could, therefore, with even more justification, co-sponsor a proposal submitted by a member State of the Council.

32. The PRESIDENT said that, at the stage which the discussion had reached, it would not be advisable to embark on a long legal debate. He accordingly suggested the compromise solution of adding a foot-note to draft resolution E/L.1391 stating that the delegations of India and Chile supported the draft resolution. The delegations concerned would not then be listed as co-sponsors but their position would be placed on record.

33. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) pointed out that a question of principle was involved. Whatever decision was taken, he would consider the delegations of India and Chile, together with his own, to be sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1391.

34. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that no one was trying to detract from the extremely important institution of observers. Rule 75 of the Council's rules of procedure entitled them to participate in deliberations on matters of concern to them. Under the same rule, they were permitted to submit proposals which might be put to the vote by request of any member of the Council. Nevertheless, his delegation firmly believed that the rights of observers went no further than that and that only members of the Council could request that a proposal should be put to the vote. In the case in point, the rules of procedure should be strictly observed.

35. Mr. AKWEI (Ghana) said that he was tempted to accept a compromise solution but that, in his opinion, the one suggested by the President would not be in accordance with the rules of procedure; to record the fact that an observer supported a proposal would amount to giving him a vote. The rules of procedure stated very clearly that observers should not have the right to vote. Therefore, should the President's solution be accepted, his delegation would like the summary record to state that, in its opinion, the delegations of Brazil, India and Chile were all co-sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1391.

36. Mr. AYOUB (Tunisia) said he was in favour of abiding by the letter of the rules of procedure. The Council should



first take a decision with regard to the participation of an observer in the debate on a matter which the Council considered to be of particular concern to that country. Only on that condition was a Member of the United Nations which was not a member of the Council entitled to enjoy the right conferred by article 75. Once the Council decided to invite observers to participate in the deliberations on a matter, it should act in accordance with rule 75 of the rules of procedure and give them all the rights provided for in that rule.

37. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that the President's proposal was entirely appropriate in that it made it possible not to settle the issue immediately. The issue was certainly an extremely important one, but before taking a decision on it, the Council should be familiar with all its aspects and ramifications.

38. In his view, it would be dangerous to give too broad an interpretation to rule 75 of the rules of procedure. If, for example, the delegations of India and Chile, which were not members of the Council, had been the only ones wishing to submit draft resolution E/L.1391, would the Council have invited them to take a seat at the Council table, to introduce their draft resolution formally and to accept or reject amendments? To do so would amount to increasing the membership of the Council, an action which could only be taken by the Security Council and the General Assembly.

39. The PRESIDENT said that to take account of the objections raised by the representative of Ghana, draft resolution E/L.1391 might have a foot-note stating that Chile and India had expressed the desire to be co-sponsors. If that were done, a decision on the substantive issue could be avoided.

40. Mr. FAROOQ (Pakistan) said that before the Council took a decision the Secretariat might provide it with a document on all the aspects of the matter. Members should not lightly commit themselves, since any decision, even the one suggested by the President, would create a precedent.

41. Mr. VIAUD (France) agreed with the President that it would be best to defer prolonged discussion on a legal question of the type under consideration. The Council might revert to it when it took up the item on measures to improve the organization of its work.

42. It might be dangerous to adhere too strictly to the rules of procedure. For example, rule 75 provided that the Council should invite any Member of the United Nations which was not a member of the Council to participate in its deliberations on any matter which the Council considered was of particular concern to that Member. There might be difficulties in requiring the Council to decide whether a specific question was of particular concern to a given Member. On the other hand, too loose an interpretation would only create disorder and confusion. A practical solution should therefore be sought which would take account of the fact that since States not members of the Council had not the right to vote their participation should be limited. His delegation supported the President's suggestion.

43. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) said that if the Council accepted the President's suggestion, it would in effect be exercising discrimination against two Members of the United Nations which wished to be co-sponsors of a draft resolution. He proposed that the Council should decide by vote whether Chile and India were to be permitted to sponsor draft resolution E/L.1391.

44. Mr. ANTOINE (Haiti) pointed out that what the Council was required to do at the moment was to act on a draft resolution submitted to it and not to settle a legal question. Unlike the representative of Brazil, he did not think the Council should take in haste a decision which would create a precedent. He therefore asked the representative of Brazil to give delegations time to think about the matter or to let the Council defer consideration of it until the item on measures to improve the organization of work came up for discussion.

45. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) asked the representative of Brazil to withdraw his proposal. His own delegation was prepared to accept the President's suggestion. In any event, the Secretariat might, as had been suggested, prepare a document dealing with all the aspects of the question.

46. Mr. FAROOQ (Pakistan) and Mr. LENNON (United States of America) asked the representative of Brazil to withdraw his proposal.

47. Mr. SKATARETIKO (Yugoslavia) said that he thought the issue was very clear and that it was obvious that the delegations of India and Chile could be listed as co-sponsors of a draft resolution. If consideration of the question was postponed or a special study requested, the Council might become involved in an endless discussion.

48. Mr. TARDOS (Hungary) moved the adjournment of the debate on the item under discussion under rule 50 of the Council's rules of procedure.

49. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) supported that motion. He urged the Secretariat to continue to be guided by the interpretation that had always been given to rule 75 and to accept only draft resolutions submitted by members of the Council.

✓ 50. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) said he opposed the Hungarian motion on the grounds that the only effect of adjourning of the debate would be to prolong unnecessarily the discussion of the item on the preparation for the Conference.

*The motion to adjourn the debate was adopted by 19 votes to 3, with 1 abstention.*

51. The PRESIDENT said that two non-governmental organizations had requested a hearing on agenda items 2 and 5. If there were no objections, he would assume that their requests (E/5008) were accepted.

*It was so decided.*

*The meeting rose at 1 p.m.*





## ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Fiftieth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Wednesday, 5 May 1971,  
at 3.15 p.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Rachid DRISS (Tunisia).

## AGENDA ITEM 9

Transport development (*continued*):(b) Preparation for the United Nations/IMCO Conference on International Container Traffic (*continued*)\*  
(E/4963, E/L.1380, E/L.1388, E/L.1391/Rev.1, E/L.1393, E/L.1394)

1. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) introduced document E/L.1393, containing amendments by his delegation to draft resolution E/L.1391. The principal change was the provision in the amendments that the results of the proposed study on the economic implications of the draft TCM Convention should be available in time for the Conference on International Container Traffic, whose agenda would include the field covered by the Convention. The first amendment in effect acknowledged the excellent preparatory work done by the Secretariat. The second was being submitted because his delegation felt that the original wording of the third preambular paragraph was too categorical. A simple indication of the question to be covered by the Conference was more appropriate. The third amendment took account of the need to refer to the fact that the Legal Committee of IMCO, a specialist body representative of both developing and developed nations, had taken note of resolution 17 (V) of the UNCTAD Committee on Shipping and had suggested a time-limit for the completion of the contemplated study. Under the fourth amendment the Council would confirm its approval of the timing and duration of the Conference. With regard to the fifth amendment, the word "Notes" seemed more appropriate than "Stresses". The phrase "should have its scope limited" was unjustifiably exclusive. The phrase "concentrate on" would indicate that the primary purpose of the Conference would be to consider questions relating to container transport. The phrase "should not comprehend" in the draft resolution as it stood would imply that the Conference could not discuss questions which it might wish or even be compelled to consider. The sixth amendment would make the paragraph to which it related more balanced. Although the developing countries might, indeed, have certain difficulties in the field of containerization, the Conference could not be guided exclusively by the interests of any one group of countries. The seventh amendment put the proper stress on the role of IMCO in a conference in which UNCTAD and IMCO had a joint interest. The eighth amendment would introduce the most important substantive change. The effect of the original paragraph 4 in the context of the draft resolution as a whole would be to postpone review by the Committee on Shipping of the

proposed study until 1973, since that Committee was not scheduled to meet in 1972. If, therefore, it was agreed that the Committee on Shipping should review the study, the latter would not be available for the Conference. The implication would be that questions relevant to both the Conference and the draft TCM Convention would not be ripe for international consideration in 1972. The ninth amendment had been drawn up in the interests of brevity. Furthermore, unless the study was available in good time the Conference would not be able to consider the whole field of intermodal transport. Although it was true, as the representative of Brazil had said, that containers were not mentioned in the TCM Convention, the development of containers had indubitably facilitated intermodal transport and the two questions were therefore interrelated.

2. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) said that he had found merit in the United States delegation's suggestion (1747th meeting) to institute a process of intergovernmental consultations with a view to drawing up the agenda for the Conference, and it was therefore being incorporated in a revised text of draft resolution E/L.1391/Rev.1. The fourth preambular paragraph of the revised draft recognized the desirability of more precise definition of the scope and objectives of the Conference. The new operative paragraphs 3 and 4 indicated how the intergovernmental consultations were to proceed. The first stage would be to ascertain the views of Governments regarding the priorities for the Conference, while the second would be to review Government replies and prepare proposals for a specific provisional agenda.

3. With three exceptions, the United Kingdom amendments in document E/L.1393 were totally unacceptable because they were based on the principle of the inclusion of the draft TCM Convention in the agenda for the Conference. The only amendments that could be accepted were the first, the fourth and the second part of the eighth. With regard to the proposed revision of the third preambular paragraph, it was felt that the present wording better reflected the status of the agenda and was less categorical. The time-limit imposed in the third amendment would make it impossible to undertake the serious in-depth and comprehensive study which the developing countries considered essential.

4. With regard to operative paragraph 1, his delegation considered that it was necessary to stress the limited scope of the Conference because attempts were being made to introduce extraneous matters into the agenda. It was essential to state quite categorically the scope of the Conference if it was not to become a world transport conference. The amendment to operative paragraph 2 would completely change the original concept that the guiding principle was the need to promote development to safeguard the interests of the developing countries. With

\* Resumed from the 1749th meeting.



regard to operative paragraph 3, the present formulation was more in line with the juridical structure of the United Nations system than the amended text would be. IMCO was placed in a separate category because it was a specialized agency. The eighth amendment would delete all reference to the Committee on Shipping despite its specific competence in the matter and would imply that the draft TCM Convention was to be considered at the Conference. With regard to the ninth amendment, he could not accept any device aimed at including the draft TCM Convention in the agenda for the Conference, which would ultimately detract from the quality of the proposed study and of the consideration of the question by the appropriate intergovernmental bodies. The problems of combined transport were not new. The points of embarkation and final destination of goods were seldom located at ports and, while every effort should be made to improve the present situation, the Conference could not be used as a pretext to induce countries to agree to arrangements which required the most careful consideration. In short, the majority of the amendments in document E/L.1393 were unacceptable because of the difference between the position of the United Kingdom as one of the major shipping Powers and that of the developing and other countries for which maintenance of the *status quo* in the transport industry was intolerable.

5. Mr. AYOUB (Tunisia) said that his delegation fully supported the convening of a Conference on International Container Traffic. However, it did not consider that the technical gap between the developed and developing countries was any reason to exclude the latter from the preliminary discussions on the TCM Convention, which would have an extremely important impact on all forms of transport. ECE should be joined by the other regional economic commissions in the preparation of the draft and the forthcoming IMCO meetings should be better publicized among the Governments of the developing countries. His delegation would wish to associate itself with all developments in the field of international transport, a vital sector for the economies of the third world, in order to draw maximum benefits from them.

6. The only disagreement on the proposed study on the economic implications of the TCM Convention requested by the UNCTAD Committee on Shipping related to timing. The draft resolution introduced by Brazil would exclude consideration of the draft TCM Convention from the agenda for the Conference. Since the development of container transport would unquestionably have repercussions on intermodal transport and vice versa, his delegation felt that the Conference should consider some of the legal principles on which the Convention might be based as well as the legal aspects of container transport. It did not wish to take a position at the present stage on the specific question of whether the Convention should be included in the agenda for the Conference, although it tended to favour the view expressed by Brazil.

7. With regard to the general organization of the Conference, he suggested that the Secretariat might well arrange for regional seminars on the various topics that would be dealt with, as in the case of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment to be held at Stockholm in 1972, so that specialists from the third world could prepare

themselves for the discussions at the Conference on International Container Traffic itself.

8. In conclusion, he expressed his delegation's total agreement with the United States suggestion concerning the establishment of an intergovernmental preparatory committee.

9. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) stressed that his delegation's position on the question of whether the draft TCM Convention should be taken up at the Conference was an impartial one. He fully recognized the anxieties felt by the developing countries with regard to the draft Convention and had therefore supported the proposal for a study of its economic implications. However, he also felt that since the draft Convention raised so many relevant problems it would be unsound to take a lightly-considered decision at the present stage that would have the irrevocable effect of excluding discussion of the Convention from the agenda for the Conference.

10. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) restated his delegation's conviction that, because of the need to consider many different topics and to reflect the views of all countries, the proposed study would take a considerable period of time; under no circumstances could it be rushed. When completed, it should be submitted to the UNCTAD Committee on Shipping, the only intergovernmental body that had already taken up the question of the economic implications of the TCM Convention and had, in fact, recommended the study. If containerization was going to present new problems for intermodal transport those problems would surely emerge during the Conference and could, if necessary, be related to the TCM Convention at a later stage. He maintained his view that the draft Convention was an inappropriate item for the agenda for the Conference and would conflict with national legislation which protected the shipping interests of the developing countries, whose share of world tonnage was still unfortunately minute.

11. Mr. PRAGUE (France) said that since the representative of Brazil, in commenting on the proposed amendments to the draft resolution sponsored by him, had accepted the United States proposal to establish an intergovernmental preparatory committee to plan the Conference and draw up its agenda, he did not think the Council should take a decision on the agenda at the current session. While not wishing to prejudge the question of whether the TCM Convention was an appropriate item for the agenda, his delegation felt that it would be wrong to preclude discussion of it by adopting a resolution that would have the effect of preventing the study of its economic implications from being available when the Conference opened. The Secretariat might indicate whether it would be possible to complete the study by that time.

12. Turning to operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution he said it would be illogical for an international conference on containers to take as its sole guiding principle the need to promote the development and interests of one group of States. His delegation could accept the paragraph if it were amended to read, for example, "as one of its main considerations". Otherwise it would be obliged to request a separate vote on the paragraph.



13. Mr. TARDOS (Hungary) said that, as a representative of a land-locked country, he would make no substantive comment on the appropriateness of the TCM Convention for inclusion in the agenda for the Container Conference. However, he welcomed the proposal for a study of its economic implications, which would also benefit land-locked countries whose goods had to be shipped by other nations. Eighteen months should be a sufficiently long period to enable any important economic implications of the Convention to be made clear. He had perused the background documentation concerning the draft TCM Convention and wondered why Brazil, whose representative was now expressing strong views on the subject, had not entered reservations when the Convention was being discussed.

14. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) felt that any delegation had a right to assume that certain items would be included in the agenda for the Conference without prejudice to the final agenda as adopted by the Conference itself. The USSR delegation, for its part, regarded the TCM Convention as one of the four main areas of discussion, but since the Conference was still eighteen months away the best thing seemed to be to allow the agenda to evolve of itself in the course of discussions between the agencies concerned. Since operative paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of the revised draft resolution would result in the study being completed too late to enable the draft Convention to be discussed at the Conference, his delegation supported the amendments proposed by the United Kingdom in document E/L.1393, which did not deny the need for the study and envisaged an active role for all the agencies concerned.

15. He asked the Brazilian representative to consider the real advantages that would accrue from the adoption of the TCM Convention. It would undoubtedly reduce transport costs, expedite deliveries and have beneficial effects in terms of the preservation and security of cargoes. His delegation believed that all countries would gain from the Convention and agreed with the comments made by the representative of Hungary. It was true that for a country with, say, a large merchant fleet, the initial capital costs involved in containerization were likely to be relatively high. However, such costs would be borne by the private sector in the developed countries and the economic advantages would benefit all countries, particularly the developing ones.

16. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) said that the UNCTAD Committee on Shipping would not have recommended that the Council should undertake a study on the economic implications of the proposed TCM Convention had it not felt that the latter might be detrimental to the interests of some countries. His own Government had not been the only one to adopt a cautious approach in the Committee; other developing countries had supported its views, as the final sentence of paragraph 69 of the extracts from the Committee's report (E/L.1380) testified. In his view, the study should be an in-depth analysis of technical economic problems and should not be prepared in a hurry.

17. The new operative paragraph 4 in document E/L.1391/Rev.1, which had been added to the original text at the request of the United States delegation, did not mean

that the sponsors had changed their attitude to the TCM Convention. The task of the intergovernmental group, as he saw it, would be to review the replies of Governments and define more clearly the topics to be considered by the Conference, so that the Council could give a more enlightened opinion on the subject.

18. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that there seemed to be agreement on all points but one, and that was the time-limit for completion of the study. The reluctance of the Brazilian representative to agree to a suitable date was in conflict with the position set forth in the fifth preambular paragraph of resolution 17 (V) of the UNCTAD Committee on Shipping, which stated that "such a study should, if possible, be completed in good time for the convening of the ... conference proposed for 1972". That resolution, it would be recalled, had been adopted unanimously by the Committee. Furthermore, the IMCO Legal Committee in a cable to the Council (E/L.1388), suggested that any study on the economic implications of the TCM Convention should be distributed by November 1971, if possible. Those were the views of two authoritative organs and the Council should take them into account.

19. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) said that regardless of the arguments advanced in favour of completing the proposed study by an early date, too strict a time-limit would be bound to affect its quality and scope; what was needed was a far-reaching analysis of the economic implications of the TCM Convention which should be of interest to both developed and developing countries, not just a hurried and superficial compilation of views without lasting value. Resolution 17 (V) of the UNCTAD Committee on Shipping had been adopted on the basis of a consensus reached after vigorous debate. His country had maintained at the time, and still maintained, that the legal and other problems posed by combined transport operations lay outside the scope of the conference convened to discuss containerization.

20. Mr. PRAGUE (France) agreed with the representative of Brazil that the study was an important one and should not be hurried. He asked the Secretariat to give the Council some idea how long it would take to prepare the study along the lines contemplated by the Brazilian delegation.

21. Mr. LASTOVKA (Chief, Transport Section, Resources and Transport Division) said that the study would require intensive work and co-operation if it was to be comprehensive and well balanced. The Secretariat would do its utmost to comply with any decision the Council took but would much prefer the date of completion to be March 1972 rather than January.

✓ 22. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) observed that his delegation had serious doubts concerning the admissibility of the draft decision (E/L.1394), submitted by Brazil, Ghana and Yugoslavia, accepting Chile and India as co-sponsors of the draft resolution introduced by Brazil, and asked what action was proposed with regard to it.

23. The PRESIDENT said that the matter would be discussed by the officers of the Council and would be brought up in due course, if necessary.



**(a) Establishment of a United Nations transport centre (continued)\* (E/4964 and Add.1-3, E/4989, chap. VIII; E/L.1381)**

24. Mr. LASTOVKA (Chief, Transport Section, Resources and Transport Division) observed that the Council had before it an addendum (E/4964/Add.3) to the Secretary-General's report, which contained a reformulated text relating to the proposed centre's role and basic functions. The revised text had been prepared in response to a suggestion put forward by CPC in its report on its eighth session (see E/4989, para. 87) and formally endorsed by the Council at its 1741st meeting. It would be noted that UNCTAD and IMCO would be consulted on the maritime shipping aspects of combined transportation and ICAO on the air transport aspects. Moreover, to avoid duplication, extensive consultations would take place with the regional economic commissions and UNESOB. It would be observed, in particular, that field operations, research programmes and training functions would be excluded from the centre's tasks. The centre would co-ordinate its long-term programme of work with the transport-related work being done within the United Nations system, thus ensuring that there would be no interference or duplication. Estimates of the staff required (see E/4964/Add.3, annex II) had been reduced by three Professional and two General Service posts, and the total cost of the centre was now estimated at \$557,000 instead of \$660,400.

25. Mr. TARDOS (Hungary) pointed out that ten General Service posts were included in the estimates in the reformulated report and not nine as had been suggested by the previous speaker. There also seemed to be a discrepancy in the estimated costs of the translation of documentation, which was now \$5,000, whereas before it had been \$15,000.

26. Mr. PRAGUE (France) observed that only the comments of ICAO (E/4964/Add.1) and a brief note by UNCTAD (E/L.1381) were before the Council, despite the fact that the Secretary-General had stated in his report (see E/4964, para. 3) that suggestions and comments on the proposed centre had also been invited from the regional economic commissions, UNIDO, UNDP and the specialized agencies. He asked why, if those organizations had submitted comments, they had not been circulated.

27. Mr. LASTOVKA (Chief, Transport Section, Resources and Transport Division) said that the Secretary-General's report (E/4964) had indeed been circulated to all of those organizations in early January and their observations had been received and taken into consideration by the Secretariat. However, only ICAO and UNCTAD had submitted their comments directly to the Council.

28. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) said that he welcomed the reformulated report of the Secretary-General (E/4964/Add.3) and that his delegation was entirely satisfied with the newly proposed basic functions of the centre. He was especially pleased that those functions had now been confined to inland and combined transport and did not entail research or field work. He agreed with the Secretary-General that some institutional arrangements for

better transport documentation in the sphere of technology and economics were needed (see E/4964/Add.3, annex I, para. 5). Since the Council had before it a satisfactory document, members should be given sufficient time in which to frame draft resolutions on the subject.

29. Mr. GUPTA (Observer for India), speaking at the invitation of the President, said that he fully endorsed the views of the Brazilian representative. The revised text took full account of the views expressed in the Council and CPC during the past two years. His delegation intended to submit a draft resolution on the subject.

30. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) observed that two important international bodies, ICAO and the UNCTAD Committee on Shipping, had cast doubt on the value of the proposal to establish a United Nations transport economics and documentation centre; both the comments of ICAO and the decision of the Committee on Shipping reflected general satisfaction with present procedures and a concern to avoid the duplication, confusion and unnecessary cost that might ensue from the creation of a new facility. Similar misgivings had been expressed by a number of delegations in both CPC and the Council.

31. While his delegation understood those misgivings, it felt that, on balance, there was merit in the proposal to establish an international transport centre along the lines indicated in paragraphs 6 to 12 of document E/4964/Add.3. The prime function of the centre would be to store and disseminate information on technological progress in transport, and its revised terms of reference would effectively limit its work to land and intermodal transport. As a country that was particularly dependent on trade and transport, New Zealand realized the importance of the full dissemination of the latest technological developments to countries in a similar position. It also realized the difficulty, particularly for the developing countries, of meeting the capital costs necessary to turn technological innovations to good use. Furthermore, it appreciated the need to know both the benefits of particular transport systems and the alternatives available. In the developing countries, the development of the transportation infrastructure had to be co-ordinated with the provision of economic and social assistance to enable those countries to adjust to improved transportation systems. A useful role in that respect could be played by the proposed centre, which should try to ensure better co-ordination of effort not only among the various agencies responsible for transport development but also between such agencies and the institutions providing economic and social assistance.

32. Accordingly, his delegation favoured the establishment of the centre but made its support contingent on the Council's endorsement of terms of reference for the centre closely patterned on those laid down in document E/4964/Add.3, particularly in paragraph 11 regarding the centre's non-involvement in field operations or research programmes. His delegation welcomed the revised financial implications of the centre and wondered how long it would take before the centre could fully utilize the amount of \$557,900. He would reserve his delegation's position on the cost factor, as the matter would be discussed again in the Fifth Committee in connexion with the actual appropriation of funds.

\* Resumed from the 1741st meeting.



33. Mr. LENNON (United States of America) wondered how the Secretariat planned to evaluate the work of the centre at the end of two years.

34. Mr. SADDLER (Office of the Controller) drew attention to two mistakes in the statement of financial implications in annex II of document E/4964/Add.3: in paragraph 1 (a) the entry "7 G-3/4" should read "6 G-3/4" and in paragraph 1 (j) the amount should read "15,000" rather than "5,000". Depending on the speed of recruitment, the Secretariat thought that it would take the centre three years to reach full operating strength.

35. Mr. TARDOS (Hungary) pointed out that the correction to paragraph 1 (a) entailed a correction to paragraph 14.

36. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) wondered what the prospects were for contributions by private sources to the centre.

37. Mr. LASTOVKA (Chief, Transport Section, Resources and Transport Division) observed that the director of the centre, if and when it was established, would undoubtedly report on its activities to CPC and the Council and would discuss with Governments and other international organizations ways and means of improving its services. The Secretariat had already developed a co-operative relationship with some of the international organizations in the field, such as the International Union of Railways and the International Road Federation, which would, it was sure, provide it with the results of most of their research.

38. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) wondered whether there was any need for the submission of a draft resolution on the subject.

39. The present discussion brought into focus many of the Council's larger problems. For example, during the debate on item 16 (Measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council) many delegations had stressed the need for the Council to play a greater role in policy-making and co-ordination, both of which were involved in the present discussion. Recalling the statement by the Director of the Public Administration Division that despite the urgency and priority of public administration the work of his Division was severely handicapped for lack of funds, he said it would be unfortunate for the Council at the same time to agree to the expenditure of more than half a million dollars on a project the need for which had been seriously questioned by the Council itself at its forty-eighth session and by the international organizations most closely concerned which had been asked for their views. There was nothing in the current report (E/4964/Add.3) that con-

vinced his delegation that the centre would provide services not already being provided by other agencies or by the Resources and Transport Division itself. There was clearly no demand for its services by the major international organizations in the field: ICAO was actively opposed; IMCO was non-committal; and the UNCTAD Committee on Shipping preferred the existing arrangements, which it considered adequate and comprehensive. The crux of the argument in favour of the centre was that its establishment would strengthen the organizations operating in the field of transport; but those organizations themselves disclaimed any need for such strengthening.

40. In the circumstances, therefore, his delegation could not support the establishment of the centre. The Council must set priorities to ensure that scarce staff and funds were used to best advantage. It should accord priority to more deserving projects and should not proceed with the establishment of the centre at the present time.

41. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the documentation submitted by the Secretariat on the matter and the replies of the international organizations concerned with transport would not justify an affirmative resolution. Surely, in comparison with the initial idea for the establishment of a centre to co-ordinate all types of transport, the present proposal for the establishment of a centre which would be concerned only with land and intermodal transport operations and would consist of only eight Professional staff members yet would cost almost \$600,000 a year was ludicrous, especially since many existing bodies were already widely disseminating the information on transport development which they had gathered. The Council should adopt a resolution stating that there was no justification for the establishment of such a centre.

42. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) fully supported the statements made by the representatives of the United Kingdom and the USSR. His delegation, too, was opposed to the establishment of the centre and was considering the submission of a draft resolution proposing that the question should be deferred either to a later session or *sine die*.

43. The Council's prestige could and should be enhanced by the adoption of sound decisions giving to various proposals and their financial implications the proper priority. There were many other questions of greater urgency than the establishment of the centre which deserved higher priority.

*The meeting rose at 6.5 p.m.*





## ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Fiftieth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Thursday, 6 May 1971,  
at 10.50 a.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Rachid DRISS (Tunisia).

## AGENDA ITEM 9

Transport development (*continued*):(a) Establishment of a United Nations transport centre (*continued*) (E/4964 and Add.1-3, E/4989, chap. VII; E/L.1381)

1. Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya) said that the question of the establishment of a United Nations transport economics centre was extremely important. Economic and social development depended on an adequate transport system. In particular, the system must provide fast and economical services that were responsive to the needs of a developing economy.

2. In Kenya, as in other African countries, the transport system had been established by a colonial régime with the object of exploiting the country's mineral and agricultural resources to support the industries in the metropolitan country. Railways and roads had been built without the slightest consideration for the economic and social interests of the African people. Furthermore, the African colonies had been exploited separately, no links being established between the different colonial empires, while the colonial régimes had not developed any transport system at all in Africa's many land-locked countries. As a result, the independent African States must currently try to rationalize transport systems within each country and to link the various countries.

3. In an evaluation of the need for a United Nations transport economics centre, account must be taken of those problems which were peculiar to Africa and which seriously handicapped development. Other difficulties arose from the lack of financial resources. The high costs incurred by the African countries in the establishment of their transport systems were due not so much to increases in mileage of railway tracks or roads as to the high cost of equipment and machinery imported at great expense from developed countries, as well as to such factors as inefficient construction techniques and the high cost of repairs. Because of the lack of skilled personnel, the developing countries had to recruit expatriate advisers and accept inequitable contracts with foreign construction companies.

4. It was clear that the developing countries needed the assistance of the United Nations in eliminating the handicaps which were impeding the development of their transport systems and in making a rational choice between the various modes of transport in the light of national development objectives.

5. His delegation fully supported the idea of a centre with the role and functions outlined in the Secretary-General's report (E/4964). They could, however, be extended to include studies of some of the problems facing developing countries, to which he had just referred. For example, the centre should study interregional transport requirements of the African States, prepare model contracts for road construction and its financing and make a technical examination of the railway network of the African countries in order to determine their long-term and short-term requirements.

6. Mr. FINGER (United States of America) stressed that too hasty a decision should not be taken. The Council should first be very sure that the proposed centre should definitely represent the best possible use of the Organization's limited resources. Experience showed that the decision to establish a new body was almost irrevocable. It was true, as the representative of Kenya had emphasized, that transport was a key factor in development and that the developing countries had a particular need for assistance. But it should be stressed that considerable efforts were already being made in that field and that the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, for example, had already made very substantial loans to finance transport projects. In view of the Organization's very limited resources, it should be ascertained whether the proposed centre should be established or whether there might not be a better alternative, such as development of the transport activities of the regional economic commissions. At all events, the Council should study the question in greater detail before taking a decision; he suggested that consideration of the question should be deferred to the next session.

7. Mr. PRAGUE (France) said that his delegation did not favour the establishment of the proposed centre and hoped that the majority of the Council would reject the proposal, or at least that the decision would be deferred.

8. Contrary to what was stated in paragraph 3 of document E/4964, the Secretary-General's report seemed to have taken insufficient account of the comments and suggestions of the regional economic commissions and of various United Nations bodies. The Secretary-General had recently revised his proposals (see E/4964/Add.3) and submitted new draft terms of reference for the centre that were less ambitious than the original proposal. That change had not, however, been matched by a proportionate reduction in the estimated costs, which remained extremely high. It would certainly appear that the usefulness of the centre, whose terms of reference were quite vague, would not warrant the expenditure.

9. He hoped that the Council would defer its decision on a question which was in fact not of top priority.



10. Mr. TARDOS (Hungary) recalled that, at its February 1971 session, the Inland Transport Committee of ECE had considered the question of the establishment of a United Nations transport economics and technology documentation centre. That Committee had decided that the Economic and Social Council should ascertain the views of the regional economic commissions before taking a decision and that it had insufficient information on the proposed centre to give an authoritative opinion. In general, the replies received from the various United Nations bodies were not very encouraging.

11. Although it had been stated (see E/4964/Add.3, annex I, para. 6) that the centre would pay particular attention to transport problems which were not covered by any other United Nations body, there was a great risk that it might duplicate many of the activities of certain international non-governmental organizations. Furthermore, the proposed reduction in staff seemed small compared with the reduction in the amount of work to be assigned to the centre. For all those reasons his delegation could not support the establishment of the transport documentation centre.

12. Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) felt that the question should first be considered by the regional economic commissions. The replies received from the United Nations bodies were generally rather unenthusiastic and it would be inadvisable to go against the views of those bodies. Consequently, although his delegation had very much hoped that an arrangement would be evolved for assisting the developing countries, it considered that no decision should be taken until more favourable reactions had been expressed. It therefore suggested that the decision should be deferred so that the question might be considered in greater detail.

13. Mr. HEDEMANN (Norway) said that he was well aware of the special interest of developing countries in that matter but that the arguments advanced thus far had not convinced his delegation that the establishment of a centre would be the best solution. It would be preferable to defer the question until a subsequent session.

14. Mr. FRANCO-HOLGUIN (International Bank for Reconstruction and Development) recalled that the representative of the Bank had indicated at the forty-eighth session of the Council (1682nd meeting) that better transport planning and use of the resources available to transport agencies could be achieved. In particular, project preparation could be improved with better data and methods and a wider consideration of new technologies.

15. There should be greater communication of knowledge and experience, because projects costs were increasing as traffic growth necessitated the use of higher levels of technology. Research into various aspects of the transport sector was being undertaken at various levels, in universities, research institutes and elsewhere, but there was no clear over-all view. The result was not only duplication of effort, but also that a project might be needlessly delayed while research was being undertaken which had already been carried out.

16. Good transport planning and efficient transport operations required a large supply of highly qualified people;

they would benefit if they had access to information which they currently lacked because of ignorance of its existence, language differences or limited distribution arrangements.

17. The proposed centre, acting in co-operation with agencies concerned, would therefore fill a gap in transport technology by providing easily accessible knowledge on transportation research.

18. Mr. BARNEA (Director, Resources and Transport Division) said that the Secretary-General's proposals were in fact rather modest, considering the amount of investment in transport and the fact that mistakes in that area were becoming increasingly expensive. Transport was developing much more rapidly in developed than in developing countries. The Council therefore had a part to play in helping the developing countries in that field. It was of course the Council which should decide whether the establishment of a centre was the best solution to the question.

19. Mr. LOUYA (Democratic Republic of the Congo) thanked the Secretary-General for his report, which was both clear and concise. The Congolese delegation was generally opposed to the proliferation of United Nations bodies, but was in favour of the establishment of a United Nations transport economics and technology documentation centre. The aim should be to help developing countries to establish national transportation services and to strengthen those which already existed. Success would depend on the analysis and evaluation methods used, which should be selected in consultation with national and international transport bodies. It was stated in the report (see E/4964/Add.3, annex I, para. 8) that the centre would review and analyse studies on the economic aspects of transportation. He wondered what form those analyses would take and how the centre would intervene to assist interested governments.

20. It was also proposed in paragraph 14 that the centre should have eight senior posts. The Congolese delegation was convinced of the need to limit expenditure and did not feel that the immediate or future activities of the centre would warrant so many high-level posts.

21. Mr. FINGER (United States of America) expressed surprise that the World Bank, if it believed that significant savings would result from a better dissemination of information on new transport technology, had not itself taken the necessary action. The Bank could use the services of experts and was in an unrivalled position to collect and disseminate such information. Moreover, it had a surplus available from earnings, while the United Nations had a serious deficit. The Bank might have good reasons for not providing that kind of service itself, but had not mentioned any. If the Bank had been in the habit of making wide use, for instance, of the studies and research results published by UNDP, its attitude might appear more convincing.

22. The representative of IBRD had emphasized the establishment of a central information library, while the Director of the Resources and Transport Division had stressed the idea of new research. Those two points of view would have to be reconciled, particularly as the representative of the Congo had underlined the need to help



developing countries to establish their own transport services.

23. His delegation felt that the Council was not yet ready to take a decision on the establishment of the new body.

24. Mr. AKWEI (Ghana) noted that the arguments advanced so far showed a certain scepticism about the proposed transport centre. Ghana had undertaken a vast transport development programme as part of its general development plan. If appropriate plans were to be drawn up, the research results and indispensable technical data should be made available. Yet centres already existed for the dissemination of such information and the proposed centre might be just another library. Transport experts always managed to acquire the necessary information and the establishment of the centre might lead to duplication and needless expenditure. In addition, the centre might be a purely administrative body and give no practical assistance in the field. It was envisaged that when established the centre would prepare, within its functions and terms of reference, its long-term programme of work (see E/4964/Add.3, annex I, para. 15). The Ghanaian delegation would not wish to be instrumental in setting up a body which did not already have a clear idea of its long-term work programme. It was not opposed to the establishment of such a centre in the future, if more thorough study dispelled the doubts, but thought it would be premature to take a decision at the current session.

25. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) agreed with the representative of Ghana and said that the United States representative's remarks about IBRD were very cogent. The Bank would derive no special advantage from the establishment of a United Nations transport economics and technology documentation centre. It had all the resources needed to study transport projects and had already made an important contribution to the financing of those projects in many developing countries, whose transport needs were well known. The solution to their problem lay not in the establishment of a documentation centre, but in a more rational preparation of national programmes and in assistance from the specialized agencies and regional economic commissions which were familiar with the special needs of each region. The Greek delegation would prefer the question to be postponed *sine die*, but would accept the majority view.

26. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) felt that the transport activities of the regional economic commissions should be expanded. At the moment, ECLA had only very limited resources for such activities. Research and data collection and dissemination should be undertaken on a world-wide basis. Even if developing countries had free access to research results, it was not always easy for them to adapt the information obtained to their own needs. For that reason, a documentation centre seemed to be needed. At the eleventh session of the UNDP Governing Council, it had been seen that most transport projects had been given to IBRD for execution, which proved there was a gap in that respect in the United Nations system. United Nations world-wide and regional services should be strengthened so as to support the projects in the field. Yet it was the developing countries which should say whether the proposed documentation centre fulfilled their needs.

27. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan) stated that various delegations had held informal consultations to prepare proposals with lesser financial implications than those described in annex II of document E/4964/Add.3. They had not had time to finalize those proposals. It would therefore be desirable to suspend the discussion until the following week, so that consultations could be held among all delegations—those of developed as well as developing countries.

28. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) thought it might be advisable to close the debate on the item. The Council could consider the draft resolutions and take a decision on them during the following week.

29. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) supported the proposal made by the representative of Pakistan.

30. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan) said he agreed with the views expressed by the representative of Greece.

31. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objections, the general debate on the item would be considered to be closed, and the Council would take up the draft resolutions the following week.

*It was so decided.*

## AGENDA ITEM 11

### Science and technology:

#### (a) Future institutional arrangements for science and technology (E/4959, E/4989, chap. VII)

32. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the note by the Secretary-General (E/4959), which referred, *inter alia*, to resolution 74 (X) of the Trade and Development Board. The Council also had before it the report of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination on its eighth session (E/4989, chapter VII).

33. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that the establishment of intergovernmental machinery for the application of science and technology to development was much more complex than the establishment of a United Nations centre for transport economics and technology documentation. His Government based its position on the need to reinforce and co-ordinate the current activities of the United Nations in that sphere, as science and technology played an exceptionally important part in the solution of existing and social problems.

34. The Twenty-fourth Congress of the Communist Party of the USSR had decided that the application of science and technology to development should be an essential element in the external economic policy of the Soviet Union. It had also been decided that the USSR should increase its participation in the economic and technical development of developing countries by such means as bilateral arrangements. His Government considered that if activities in that sector were to be strengthened and co-ordinated, the United Nations must now take stock of its activities and introduce some order into them; con-



siderable efforts were being made, but they often entailed duplication. As a specific proposal the Soviet delegation would suggest that the first essential task should be to define the problems in that field and establish very strict priorities, that is, decide on the basic objectives to be attained. For example, extremely favourable conditions should be created to enable the countries concerned to obtain as much assistance as possible and thus accelerate their development. Another important element in the process of reorganization would be to determine which organs and agencies in the United Nations system were primarily responsible for solving those problems. The next stage would be to establish a system of co-ordination for the United Nations and its specialized agencies so as to introduce some order and achieve greater efficiency. But which organ or agency should be responsible for introducing the necessary order? The Soviet delegation thought it would be logical to entrust the task to the specialized agencies concerned and to the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development since they had eminent specialists who could prepare specific proposals for consideration by the Council.

35. The establishment of intergovernmental machinery would meet a real need, and various solutions had been suggested; the Soviet delegation was ready to co-operate whole-heartedly towards achieving that end.

36. The establishment of a standing intergovernmental committee of the Council or the General Assembly would have two drawbacks. Such a committee would be a subsidiary organ. Science and technology were an integral part of economic and social development, and it would be illogical for the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council to set activities connected with science and technology apart from other activities, thus relegating them to a secondary position. Furthermore it would not be desirable to decide at that stage to set up a standing intergovernmental committee, since suggestions concerning the form such machinery should take had not yet been crystallized.

37. The Soviet delegation would accordingly support the establishment of a sessional committee of the Council, which would have the same status as CPC, and the Social Committee and the Economic Committee of the Council. The establishment of such a committee would not rule out the possibility of setting up a standing committee at some future date.

38. The Soviet delegation was also in favour of maintaining the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development, since the Council would need advice from a committee of experts in any case, and such advice would be even more necessary if it was decided that a sessional committee should be instituted.

39. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan) said the complexity of the question explained the fact that no majority view had emerged during the last few sessions of the Council concerning the nature of the proposed intergovernmental machinery.

40. The Economic and Social Council was a principal organ of the United Nations, but its authority had diminished over the years for various reasons. It would be difficult to adopt the suggestion made by the representative of the Soviet Union unless the greatest possible number of members could be represented in the proposed sessional committee.

41. A number of reasons militated in favour of the establishment of a standing committee of the General Assembly, since science and technology concerned all Member States without exception, as did the question of the environment which had first been raised in the General Assembly. Moreover, it would not be encroaching on the authority of the Council to entrust consideration of the question to an organ of the General Assembly. He did not consider that to establish a standing committee of the Economic and Social Council would be a satisfactory solution, although it would perhaps be preferable to setting up a sessional committee. It would of course be normal for the Council to play the main role in that sphere, as laid down in the Charter, but it should be borne in mind that because of its limited membership the Council was not the most appropriate body to consider a matter that concerned all Member States.

42. He hoped that a consensus would emerge on the question, taking account of the legitimate aspirations of developing countries. It was too early to assess the question of the terms of reference of the new committee, but it was already clear that its field of activities should not be too broad. The difficulties that had arisen over questions of jurisdiction in the case of peaceful uses of the sea-bed and the ocean floor should serve as a warning in that connexion.

*The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.*





## ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Fiftieth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Thursday, 6 May 1971,  
at 3.10 p.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Rachid DRISS (Tunisia).

## AGENDA ITEM 11

Science and technology (*continued*):

- (a) Future institutional arrangements for science and technology (*continued*) (E/4959, E/4989, chap. VII);  
 (b) Application of computer technology to development (E/4800 and E/4800/Summary)

1. Mr. AKWEI (Ghana) said that the inconclusiveness of the document submitted by the Secretariat on the agenda item on future institutional arrangements for science and technology (E/4959) was perhaps not surprising, as the question was a difficult one. Bodies such as UNCTAD and specialized agencies such as WHO, FAO, WMO and IAEA each had their own arrangements for co-operation in science and technology and their own fields of specialization. As the USSR representative had said (1752nd meeting), the activities of the United Nations system in the field of science and technology were characterized by a lack of order and duplication. However, that lack of order could not be overcome merely by the establishment of new institutional machinery. What was needed was clear policy guidance from the Economic and Social Council; that would result in greater economy through the use of existing resources and expertise and would also re-establish the Council's authority with respect to co-ordination in economic and social matters. In that connexion, he had been surprised to hear some delegations which strongly opposed proliferation of United Nations bodies in other fields of activity express support for the establishment of new institutional machinery to deal with questions of science and technology.

2. He fully agreed with the USSR representative's contention that the time had come to bring order into the situation, first, by identifying common problems, secondly, by establishing priorities and facilitating the exchange of information and co-operation on scientific and technical matters, thirdly, by specifying which organs should have primary responsibility in matters of co-ordination, and, fourthly, by instituting a clear-cut system of co-ordination. With regard to the last point, it was possible that the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment to be held in 1972 would recommend the establishment of a body to co-ordinate activities relating to the human environment; if the Council set up such a body, however, it might well be faced with requests for the establishment of similar bodies to do the same for activities related to population and other problems certain aspects of which related to the work of different parts of the United Nations system.

3. His delegation was opposed to the establishment of a new institution. Consistent with the position it had taken

on agenda item 16 (Measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council) it felt that the Council itself should establish and co-ordinate policies on questions of science and technology. It could best do so by professionalizing the Department of Economic and Social Affairs so that it could not only conduct consultations with the specialized agencies on matters within their technical expertise but also—through the appointment of special consultants—prepare the background documents on which the Council could base its policy decisions. If the Secretariat could be so strengthened as to be able to prepare, for the Council's approval, policy guidelines on specific questions such as transport or on specific aspects of science and technology related to development, then it would be easier to ensure co-operation with the specialized agencies. The Council might, for example, instruct ACC to consider specific areas where co-ordination was necessary and possible and to report to it thereon through CPC.

4. The suggestion had been made that ACC should report to the Council through a new standing committee on science and technology or to a new body to be established under the authority of the General Assembly. His delegation could not but view with alarm the placing of any new body dealing with economic and social affairs under the authority of the Assembly, for that would inevitably make it far more difficult for the Council to carry out its already difficult function of co-ordination and would further reduce its authority. If any new institutional machinery was to be set up in the field of science and technology it should be placed under the authority of the Council. The USSR representative's argument in favour of the establishment of a new body to co-ordinate not only the economic and social aspects of science and technology but the political aspects as well was, he felt, untenable; it was true that some questions of science and technology had political aspects but those were clearly problems beyond the Council's mandate.

5. However, without establishing any new body, the Council could, once the Department had been professionalized and was performing the services expected of it, give its own Economic Committee responsibility for considering questions of science and technology related to development and entrust to its Social Committee responsibility for such questions as they affected social life. In that connexion, he said that his delegation would be opposed to the continuation of the Council's Co-ordination Committee if CPC was to be retained. The Council had a very broad mandate in respect of social questions; it could, on the recommendation of its Social Committee, suggest ways and means of achieving its over-all social objectives, such as promoting tolerance, equality and human dignity and eliminating *apartheid* and racial discrimination. It would surely be within the Council's terms of reference to consider how science and technology could contribute to



the attainment of such objectives. For example, the Social Committee and the Council might consider how satellites could be used to disseminate ideas of racial equality and human dignity, particularly in the Republic of South Africa. Surely the Council could recommend such a policy and refer it to the appropriate specialized agency for execution.

6. Obviously it was difficult to lay down clear and sound policy guidelines on matters on which scientists themselves were in disagreement. A case in point was the Supersonic Transport, or SST, recently debated and rejected in the United States Senate. The SST was undeniably a threat by science and technology to the environment and its effects were highly debatable; yet a number of countries were proceeding with its construction. Smoking and the permissible level of radio-activity in the human body were also matters of heated debate amongst scientists. In such fields, the Council might play an invaluable role by establishing scientific standards acceptable to all States based on expert technical recommendations. In regard specially to the SST, it might request ICAO to make a thorough study of the problem and recommend proposed international standards which the Council could adopt and undertake to apply throughout the United Nations system.

7. His delegation disagreed with the recommendation in paragraph 2 of the Secretary-General's note (E/4959) that the Council on the expiry of the present term of the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development at the end of 1971, should create a sessional committee on science and technology. He doubted whether a strong case could be made for the establishment of a new sessional committee on science and technology or indeed for any other type of new machinery under the authority of either the Council or the Assembly. What was necessary was for the Council to rationalize its own work, giving priority and the necessary time and thought to the scientific and technical matters on its agenda.

8. Mr. LOUYA (Democratic Republic of the Congo) observed it was unfortunate that the authors of the Charter had not foreseen the future importance of science and technology, which were now recognized to be the pillars of development. Technology was not, of course, an end in itself but rather a means of stimulating balanced economic and social development and promoting the development of the human and natural resources of the developing countries which wanted their peoples to benefit from the scientific revolution. The transfer of science and technology depended on training and on the exchange of scientific knowledge among countries and research institutions. It was therefore to be regretted that there was no institutional machinery in the United Nations designed specifically to meet that need. His delegation favoured either the establishment of a new intergovernmental body or the transformation of the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development into a sessional committee responsible for the formulation of policy, the establishment of priorities, the mobilization of public opinion and the dissemination of information. The interest in the proposal shown by the developed countries at a time when economic assistance to the developing countries seemed to be stagnating was encouraging. The new body

should have a specific responsibility to assist the developing countries, which had to overcome with great rapidity the lag separating them from the developed countries and which felt that science and technology held the key to their success. International co-operation with regard to scientific and technology development was necessary but was contingent on the initiative and determination of the developed countries. In his view, the time had come to attack the problems involved in the application of science and technology to the developed and developing countries alike in a systematic and concerted way.

9. Mr. TAIB (Malaysia) said that his Government attached great importance to the role of science and technology in promoting the development of the developing countries. It had therefore recently established a Ministry of Science and Technology to co-ordinate activities and to ensure the maximum utilization of science and technology in Malaysia's development efforts.

10. With regard to the question of future institutional arrangements for science and technology, his delegation was pleased to note that the need for intergovernmental machinery had been emphasized. However, there was some divergence of views concerning the form such machinery should take; his delegation would be in favour of a standing committee of the General Assembly. The significant problems which had arisen and the progress of technology in recent years called for a multidisciplinary and multisectoral approach to the problem. A standing committee of the General Assembly would be best suited to meet those new challenges. Furthermore, the terms of reference of the committee must be clearly defined in order to ensure its effectiveness.

11. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) said that the enormous impact of new scientific and technological discoveries amply justified collective action by the international community in that field. Such action should be planned both at the sectoral level and on a global scale. At the sectoral level, the specialized agencies should be responsible for promoting the wider application of new scientific and technological advancements in their respective fields of competence. The desirability of a global approach was dictated by the increasingly interdisciplinary character of science and technology, the need for comprehensive planning and the fact that the developing countries had many common problems which called for common solutions.

12. United Nations activities would fall within the global category. The role of UNCTAD, under the guidance of the intergovernmental group set up by resolution 74 (X) of the Trade and Development Board, was already clearly defined with regard to the transfer of operative technology. His delegation endorsed the hope expressed by CPC in paragraph 80 of its report (E/4989) that the intergovernmental group would soon be in a position to start its substantive work, since the transfer of operative technology deserved the highest priority. The United Nations itself had the responsibility for providing an interdisciplinary link within the system. It should assist the international community and in particular the developing countries in planning the application of science and technology to development. In that regard, the Advisory Committee on the Application of



Science and Technology to Development had done pioneer work of great impact. That expert body had, however, recognized the need for intergovernmental guidance and follow-up. No consensus had been reached by CPC at its eighth session regarding a final recommendation on the exact place of the new body within the structure of the United Nations, although the majority of members had favoured the idea that it should take the form of a standing committee of the General Assembly. While United Nations activities in that sector related primarily to the application of science and technology to development, there were many problems involved which went far beyond purely technical or economic considerations. The limitations encountered so far in the application of science and technology were undeniably political in nature. Planning, because of its far-reaching impact on policies and on basic national and international options, was clearly a political task. Such factors justified the preference for a standing committee at the level of the General Assembly. A standing committee of the Economic and Social Council would not have the requisite political leverage and would suffer from the limitations inherent in the Council itself. The same applied to a sessional committee of the Council. At the level of the Council, the important thing was simply to ensure that sufficient time was allotted in the plenary or in the sessional committees to the question of science and technology and that representatives to those meetings had the expertise required.

13. The preference of his delegation was for a standing committee of the General Assembly responsible for all problems of science and technology not at present specifically entrusted to other intersessional organs of the General Assembly or to the specialized agencies. It would concentrate on the planning aspects of scientific and technological development. Its reports might be submitted to the Assembly through the Council so that the latter could act on those points of direct interest to it. Final action would, however, be taken by the Assembly. If such arrangements were adopted, the terms of reference of the Advisory Committee would have to be amended in order to transform it into an advisory body of the standing committee. The Advisory Committee might then constitute panels with specific sectoral expertise, following a general blueprint established at the governmental level.

14. Mr. MARSH (Jamaica) said that in the field of science and technology the gap between the developed and the developing countries was widening and that all efforts to enhance the role of the United Nations in that field had come to naught, apparently because of an inertia factor. A new organ should be created only if it could be endowed with the political leverage required to initiate the process of transferring technology to the developing countries. Any proposal on the subject must have the support of those who possessed the scientific and technological knowledge which the developing countries wanted to acquire. At present the transfer of technology at the bilateral level was limited. Attitudes therefore needed changing and channels of communication must be opened.

15. Within the United Nations, UNIDO had a distinct role to play. UNCTAD's efforts thus far had been abortive, although the UNCTAD/GATT International Trade Centre was continuing its activities. The representative of Ghana

had ably identified the contribution to be made by the specialized agencies. However, a central co-ordinating mechanism was needed within the United Nations system in order to avoid duplication and keep costs to the minimum. Even with such new machinery, the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development, with its multidisciplinary expertise, should be retained.

16. The PRESIDENT said that, as he saw it, there was a consensus regarding the acceptance of the principle of an intergovernmental organ dealing with science and technology. However, it was not yet clear what its mandate would be nor under what organ of the United Nations it would be established.

17. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that the consensus seemed to be that the proposed body should deal exclusively with the application of science and technology to development. It should be made quite clear that other scientific questions, such as those relating to the sea-bed and outer space, which were dealt with by other organs of the United Nations, did not fall within the competence of the Council. The proposed new machinery would deal with those questions which now came within the terms of reference of the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development.

18. The PRESIDENT said that the first stage was to gain acceptance in principle of the proposed intergovernmental body. Its mandate would be discussed at a later stage.

19. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece), supported by Mr. NDUNG'U (Kenya), said he did not think that a true consensus could emerge until all delegations had spoken.

20. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) said that he was not sure what type of body was required. A statement by the Director of the Office for Science and Technology on the points raised by the representative of Jamaica, particularly with regard to the inertia factor which the latter had mentioned, might help the Council to develop its ideas more clearly.

21. In his view, science could be divided into various categories. First, there was pure science, which was already international in nature. The international community of pure scientists had instituted a free exchange of views and information. There were also frontier areas of pure science where discoveries might be applied in the future to development. In that regard, he was not sure how an international organ could tackle the growing problem of the exchange of applied technology. New scientific discoveries were applied by government or private enterprises because the directors of those enterprises thought that they would be of use to society in their countries. The developing countries wanted the assurance that their interests in any new developments would be safeguarded and that they would have access to such development if they were applicable to their own societies. However, he thought that such access should be ensured either by bilateral arrangements or through the various specialized agencies rather than by the establishment of a new body. His delegation was disturbed by the proliferation of agencies and considered that new scientific developments could be dealt



with adequately either by the international scientific community, the Economic and Social Council, the General Assembly or the existing technical organs of the United Nations.

22. Mr. GRESFORD (Director for Science and Technology), introducing the Secretary-General's report on the application of computer technology for development (E/4800 and E/4800/Summary), said that the report had been prepared in an order that would facilitate a coherent study of the subject-matter. The order was somewhat different in the summary, the chapter headings of which he drew to the Council's attention. During the preparation of the report, computer technology had been looked at as a whole for the first time and the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) had already taken action for the protection of computer programmes.

23. In reply to questions asked by Mr. MARSH (Jamaica) and Mr. FAROOQ (Pakistan), respectively, Mr. GRESFORD (Director for Science and Technology) expressed doubt as to whether a representative of the International Computation Centre at Rome would be present during the Council's debates and said that the establishment of an international advisory board on computer technology for development would have financial implications: at the initial stage they would be modest, but they could not be estimated properly until the Council had expressed its views on the subject.

24. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that his delegation, which had long been a party to initiatives in the field of science and technology, was preparing a draft resolution on the subject together with other delegations. He hoped that consultations would ensue.

### AGENDA ITEM 10

#### Public administration and development (*concluded*)\* (E/4950 and Add.1, E/4989, chap. VI, sect. B; E/L.1392/Rev.1)

25. Mr. NDUNG'U (Kenya) introduced a revised text (E/L.1392/Rev.1) of the draft resolution which incorporated amendments proposed by the delegations of France and the United States. The word "fully" should be inserted after the word "implement" in operative paragraph 5.

26. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan), speaking as one of the sponsors of the draft resolution, said that the words "administrative aspects" in operative paragraph 4 should be replaced by "relevant provisions", in pursuance of a suggestion made by the United Kingdom.

27. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) expressed his deep regret that the sponsors had not accepted his delegation's proposal to use the words "through a redistribution within the limits of the present manning table" after the words "necessary staff" at the end of operative paragraph 5. It was unfortunate that the sponsors had preferred to make obscure references to paragraphs 25 and 58 of the report of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (E/4989). Paragraph 58 of

that report dealt with the question of a staff increase in a most cautious matter and referred to the fact that some members had disagreed with the idea. It was in sharp contrast to the Soviet delegation's proposal, the aim of which was to strengthen the Public Administration Division by using clear, simple language.

28. He hoped that a further effort would be made to amend operative paragraph 5, since otherwise his delegation would have to vote against it and abstain on the draft resolution as a whole.

29. Mr. NDUNG'U (Kenya) said that the sponsors had been unable to accept the USSR amendment because the concept of redistribution was different from that of an increase.

30. Mr. ORCIC (Yugoslavia) stressed that the sponsors had drafted operative paragraph 5 most carefully, so as to leave the decision for or against an increase of staff entirely open.

31. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that, if Kenya interpreted the wording of operative paragraph 5 as implying that there would be an increase in staff in any event, his delegation would have to withdraw its support, because it had agreed to staff increases for certain priority areas of the Secretariat on the strict understanding that ruthless reductions would be made in others.

32. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) said that, like the Soviet Government, his Government had serious reservations about increasing the staff of the Secretariat in view of the United Nations financial situation, and the refusal of the sponsors to incorporate the Soviet amendment had created difficulties for his delegation, difficulties which were increased by the addition of the word "fully" in operative paragraph 5.

33. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said he shared the views of the Soviet Union, France and the United Kingdom with respect to operative paragraph 5 and suggested that it should be deleted. That action would not affect the substance of the resolution, since the sponsors had made it clear in operative paragraph 3 that their endorsement of the Public Administration Division's work programme was subject to the views of CPC and hence to the findings of the manpower utilization survey.

34. Mr. LENNON (United States of America) said that the best possible use should be made of existing staff resources and that he shared the Soviet Union's view that the only logical way of implementing that policy was to reallocate staff. Like the United Kingdom representative, he regretted that the word "fully" had been added in the final operative paragraph.

35. Mr. AYOUB (Tunisia) observed that the sponsors had taken every care in drafting operative paragraph 5 and had expressly referred to "the necessary staff" to implement the work programme rather than to an increase in staff. They had not incorporated the Soviet amendment because they felt that it was not right to hold back the public administration work programme should a redistribution of staff prove unfeasible. All delegations were agreed on the prime importance to be accorded to that programme and he

\* Resumed from the 1750th meeting.



could not see why the inclusion of operative paragraph 5 was regarded as a stumbling-block.

36. Mr. FAROOQ (Pakistan) drew attention to operative paragraph 3, which alluded indirectly to paragraph 58 of CPC's report (E/4989). When taking action to strengthen the Public Administration Division, the Secretary-General would have before him the recommendations of CPC and the Council as well as the findings of the manpower utilization survey, and it would be for him to do as he saw fit. The primary intention of the sponsors in drafting operative paragraph 5 had been to ensure that the public administration programme would be carried out.

37. Mr. GATES (New Zealand) said that he was satisfied with the explanations of the sponsors and could vote in favour of the draft resolution.

38. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he could not agree that the sponsor's explanation was satisfactory. Judging from what they had said, operative paragraph 5 was superfluous and the logical course would be to delete it.

39. Mr. FAROOQ (Pakistan) said he was categorically opposed to deleting operative paragraph 5. It might, however, be better to rearrange the order and to have operative paragraph 5 precede operative paragraph 4.

40. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) suggested in a spirit of compromise that the phrase "within the manpower resources of the Secretariat" should be added at the end of operative paragraph 5.

41. Mr. AYOUB (Tunisia) said that the sponsors were anxious not to preclude any action that might be necessary to implement the work programme.

42. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that, although in the light of their explanations, the sponsors' intention was abundantly clear to him, he wondered whether it would be as clear to the Secretary-General. Paragraph 58 of CPC's report stated that there had been a divergence of views within CPC as to whether any expansion of staff should be authorized. While any rigid solution was undesirable, it was essential to find a clear-cut formula that would enable the Public Administration Division to implement its work programme and, at the same time, remind the Secretary-General of the need for economy. It would therefore be better to postpone the vote on the draft resolution in order to allow the sponsors to find a unanimously acceptable wording.

43. The PRESIDENT suggested that a preferable procedure would be to vote forthwith on the draft resolution and to include in the Council's report and summary record of the meeting a reservation to which the Secretary-General's attention would be drawn. The reservation would read as follows:

"The adoption of operative paragraph 5 does not necessarily mean an automatic increase in staff and does not rule out the possibilities offered by a careful redistribution of personnel."

44. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he supported the French suggestion that the sponsors should reformulate operative paragraph 5 to reflect either his own delegation's amendment or the Greek representative's suggestion, both of which stressed the need for economy. If that suggestion was opposed, his delegation must insist that a separate vote be taken on operative paragraph 5.

45. Mr. VIAUD (France), supported by Mr. LENNON (United States of America), said that the wording of the reservation suggested by the President seemed entirely satisfactory and, taking into account the sponsors' explanations and the reservation, he would be able to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

46. The PRESIDENT invited the Committee to vote first on operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution E/L.1392/Rev.1, on which a separate vote had been requested by the representative of the Soviet Union, and then on the draft resolution as a whole.

*Operative paragraph 5 was adopted by 20 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions.*

*The draft resolution as a whole, as orally amended, was adopted by 22 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

47. The PRESIDENT said that if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council agreed to his suggestion that the reservation on operative paragraph 5 which he had indicated earlier should be recorded in the Council's report and the summary record.

*It was so decided.*

*The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.*





## ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Fiftieth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Friday, 7 May 1971,  
at 10.50 a.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Rachid DRISS (Tunisia).

## AGENDA ITEM 11

## Science and technology (continued):

## (a) Future institutional arrangements for science and technology (continued) (E/4959, E/4989, chap. VII)

1. Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya) observed that it was universally recognized that science and technology exercised a profound influence both on the tempo of economic development and on the content and quality of social change.

2. In agriculture, for instance, science and technology could be utilized to increase productivity and to effect savings through the use of simpler and less costly techniques. Industrial development was even more dependent on scientific techniques because increased productivity and cost reduction were closely related to their use. A faster pace of industrialization, due in particular to cost reduction, fostered the expansion of public enterprise and helped to raise the standard of living.

3. The application of science and technology to transport, which was a major factor in economic and social development, made it possible, as in the case of manufacturing industries, to save on labour and capital and thus to stimulate economic development and overcome poverty and underdevelopment.

4. Moreover, it was now possible to make greater use of natural resources, and the developing countries, in particular, must develop their capacity to do so. The mining of some mineral resources could now be contemplated because of the spectacular progress achieved. Similarly, the development of hydrology was already benefiting and would continue to benefit agriculture, a process which would help to improve the living conditions of millions of men and women in many developing countries. Furthermore, advances in medical science, which had led to the eradication of a number of diseases previously regarded as incurable, had an important bearing on economic development.

5. The recent advent of the computer and the revolutionary progress made in communications had profoundly affected virtually all areas of endeavour. The United Nations had already recognized not only the need for improving and co-ordinating its activities in science and technology, but also the desirability of establishing inter-governmental machinery for that purpose. His delegation believed that the time had come for the Council to decide what type of institutional arrangement could best help the

countries concerned to derive greater benefits from scientific and technological progress. It favoured the establishment of a standing committee of the General Assembly, whose terms of reference should be clearly defined and whose reports should be channelled to the General Assembly through the Economic and Social Council. The Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development should be retained in order to give the new committee technical backing. The terms of reference of the committee should include assistance to the developing countries in formulating policies in the field of science and technology in the light of their level of industrial, social, scientific and technological development and of the relationships which existed or were envisaged with their neighbours and with other countries. In view of the particular interest which the developing countries took in the application of science and technology to development, the new committee should, if it was to be successful, take due account of local social and cultural conditions. The problems of adapting equipment, in particular, must be given very careful consideration. Changes should not only be made in size or scale but should be adapted to local conditions, the needs of the probable users and even the market. That did not mean supplying second-rate tools, but the creation of new and better equipment and the improvement of what already existed.

6. The proper co-ordination of the planning and implementation of a national policy for science and technology was a very difficult task which the States concerned might perhaps consider entrusting to a national body specifically created for that purpose; that body would have to determine what national activities could be undertaken with local resources and what activities were contingent on imported technology. The body might also have to establish an information centre on the most recent scientific and technological developments. The question of its relationship to other bodies, particularly the specialized agencies, universities, research organizations, etc., should also be decided. The important thing was that the nature of such relationships should be made very explicit and practical.

7. In conclusion, he expressed the hope that the suggestions he made would be taken into account when the Council discussed the terms of reference of the proposed intergovernmental machinery. Some operational relationship would have to exist between research and training institutes, universities, private research and development organizations, government research agencies and the organizations of the United Nations system. Other considerations, such as the type of education best suited to the policy adopted in the field of science and technology, should also be taken into account. In that respect, the United Nations system could provide effective help to the developing countries. The work currently being done by UNESCO and the Office for Science and Technology was to

be commended. The task of formulating and implementing a policy for science and technology and of co-ordinating and integrating it in national development plans was of course a very difficult one, but the challenge had to be faced and overcome if the countries concerned were to survive in the technological era.

8. Mr. VIAUD (France) noted that the item on institutional arrangements for science and technology had been on the Council's agenda for almost three years. It was based on Council resolution 1454 (XLVII) of 8 August 1969 and was still very relevant to the debate because it contained two main points that should be kept in mind. First of all, the Council, in that resolution, recognized the need for the establishment of an intergovernmental machinery in the field of the application of science and technology to development, and considered that the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development was competent to take any action, including appropriate institutional arrangements within its framework, in connexion with those aspects of the transfer of operative technology that fell within its jurisdiction. Furthermore, in that resolution the Council had also decided to extend the term of the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development until the end of 1971 and to enlarge the membership of the Committee from 18 to 24. Later, in its resolution 1544 (XLIV) of 30 July 1970, the Council had reiterated that there was a need for the reinforcement and co-ordination of activities in the field in question, but recognized that so far no consensus or majority opinion had emerged on how best to meet the need for such reinforcement and co-ordination. Those facts explained why the Council found itself in the present situation. Nevertheless, some progress had been made: UNCTAD had decided to set up an intergovernmental group on the transfer of technology, which would hold its first session in June 1971. Moreover, the increase in the membership of the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development from 18 to 24 was a step forward; the Committee could therefore base its work on a broader range of ideas and scientific and technical knowledge and would undoubtedly become more dynamic. The work of the Committee on Peaceful Uses of the Sea-bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction and the Preparatory Committee for the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment was beyond the Council's purview as they did not report to the Council. The time had come for the Council to shake itself free of the inertia which had blocked action on that question for almost two years.

9. With reference to the comments of the representative of Pakistan (1752nd meeting), who considered that a sessional committee of the Council would only be acceptable if its membership was enlarged, he felt that, although the premise of the argument was logical, namely that it would make sense to establish an enlarged body, there was a surprising element of sophistry in the conclusion that the body in question should not report to the Council on the ground that the Council was not sufficiently representative. He expressed surprise that under one agenda item some members were advocating that the role of the Council should be strengthened while under another, they were recommending that it should be stripped of some of its functions. The need to find a logical formula within the

framework of the Council's functions under the Charter was obvious.

10. His delegation believed that in the first instance it was important to avoid taking a decision that, even indirectly, would cast doubt upon the Council's competence with regard to the application of science and technology to development, in which it had co-ordinating functions that no one could reasonably challenge. Secondly, scientific and technological questions should be thoroughly examined in the Council, and that was not possible at present because there was no body competent to do so. None of the existing solutions were satisfactory. If, as a result of a lack of the appropriate institutional machinery, problems that the Council should deal with were referred to the Economic Committee, the latter would be unable to carry out its responsibilities and would be even less effective than it was at present.

11. The establishment of a sessional committee of the Council would compensate for those drawbacks. It was true that the interest shown by a number of countries in the application of science and technology to development might justify the establishment of a body with a larger membership than that of the Council. Moreover, a strengthened membership in numerical and qualitative terms would also be advantageous considering the diversity and scope of the problems to be dealt with. His Government would be quite willing to examine the possibility of making institutional arrangements for adding other members to the 27 members of the Council as a concession to those who argued that broader representation was the best guarantee of a body's efficiency. The main thing would be that the new body should report to the Council so that the Council could compare its report with those of other bodies (UNIDO, UNCTAD, the specialized agencies) and submit to the General Assembly proposals that could be discussed by the Assembly with full knowledge of the facts.

12. His delegation was of the opinion that the establishment of a General Assembly committee under Article 22 of the Charter would be a poor solution because it would have the effect of weakening the Council's role. Nor would it be a good solution for the General Assembly itself, because the latter would not have a body capable of passing judgement on specialized activities. It was clear that the decisions and recommendations addressed to Member States in the field of scientific and technical co-operation should come from the General Assembly itself, but it was still necessary for its decisions to be guided and prepared by a specialized body. The purpose in such a delegation of authority was precisely to enable the General Assembly to go straight to the most important problems.

13. Notwithstanding the various difficulties, his delegation was confident that the Council could reach a decision and establish a body with terms of reference sufficiently precise to enable it to fulfil the desired objective.

14. Mr. SELMECI (Hungary) said that the importance of the question before the Council had been repeatedly emphasized by a number of United Nations bodies and affirmed in a number of resolutions. The fact that the question of the institutional arrangements for science and technology had been on the Council's agenda since its



forty-sixth session was an indication of its controversial nature. Perhaps the time was not ripe for a decision on the question. Perhaps, too, it should be considered at the same time as the item dealing with measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council.

15. Thus far, members appeared to agree on only one aspect of the problem: that the proposed institutional machinery should be an intergovernmental body. Although none of the proposals before the Council was fully satisfactory to his delegation, the proposal made by the USSR representative at the 1752nd meeting to establish a sessional committee of the Economic and Social Council had the fewest drawbacks. The fact was that under the Charter, the Council had responsibility for co-ordination in the economic and social fields, and matters relating to science and technology were closely related to those fields. It was, of course, the General Assembly that decided the over-all objectives and policies to be followed by all members of the United Nations system, and the body to be set up would naturally comply with the Assembly's guidelines. However, it would report to the Economic and Social Council.

16. Mr. SPENCER (Observer for Canada), speaking under rule 75 of the rules of procedure, said that although he had no specific recommendations with regard to the nature of any body, he wished to make a few comments.

17. Unlike agriculture or industry, for example, science and technology was not a separate sector of development and all United Nations organizations were inevitably concerned with some aspects of the question. Secondly, the technological revolution that was now taking place was basic to global development, particularly in the developing countries. Thirdly, accelerating developments in science and technology were changing the very structure of society with accelerating effects, including in the field of human rights. For those reasons, therefore, the Economic and Social Council, whose principal responsibilities were co-ordination, economic and social development, forward planning and human rights questions, was the organ best qualified to deal with problems of science and technology, as they arose in the context of the United Nations.

18. Any decision that might be taken on the establishment of a body to deal with science and technology should take into account current discussion not only of the measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council but also of the preparations for the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment. It should be borne in mind, however, that although questions of the environment were related to, they should not be equated with, questions of science and technology.

19. Any institutional arrangements to be devised should be linked to the Economic and Social Council and not the General Assembly. In the first place, the issues to be faced by the Committee fell completely within the terms of reference of the Council. Then, the advocates of a standing committee of the General Assembly had stressed that the new body should have broad terms of reference; if so, they would encroach upon those of the committees dealing with the sea-bed and outer space. Moreover, the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology

to Development had recommended that the Council should create an intergovernmental committee on science and technology; the Advisory Committee was a subsidiary body of the Council and it would therefore be much simpler if the proposed committee were also a Council committee, which would make working relations between the two bodies easier. In any event, the future role of the Advisory Committee should be considered carefully.

20. Another argument advanced in favour of a General Assembly committee was that it could have more members than the Economic and Social Council. However, there was no reason why a sessional or intersessional committee of the Council with more than 27 members could not be set up. There were precedents in both cases. Finally, the question of the non-representational nature of the Council was exercising many Governments, but that question was being considered in connexion with measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council, and the Council should not be by-passed through assuming in advance that the exercise would fail.

21. Mr. YOGASUNDRAM (Ceylon) said that, since the members of the Council seemed to be in general agreement on the need for new machinery to deal with questions relating to science and technology, there was no reason to defer a decision on that subject. Although his delegation had no firm preference between a General Assembly committee or a Council committee, it would tend to favour the latter solution. In that regard, it should be pointed out that the question could not be divorced from the question of measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council. Whatever happened, the establishment of a new body should not be used as a pretext for dissolving the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development or excessively weakening its terms of reference.

22. Mr. KITCHEN (United States of America) said that the Council was duty-bound to organize itself so that it could help all mankind to benefit from the advantages of science and technology. There was still a great divergence in the views of members of the Council. Some felt that UNCTAD's role should be enhanced, others thought that a standing committee of the General Assembly should be set up, and still others, including his delegation, favoured the establishment of a sessional committee of the Economic and Social Council. There was no denying the competence of UNCTAD or the important role played by the specialized agencies. The point, however, was to equip the Council itself to assume the tasks entrusted to it under the Charter. He agreed with the Brazilian representative that some questions relating to science and technology were inextricably linked with political considerations falling within the competence of the General Assembly. His delegation was therefore proposing a solution in which it had tried to take account of all those considerations.

23. His delegation proposed the establishment of a standing committee on science and technology, subordinate to the Council and composed of prominent Government representatives experienced in the subject of science and technology, who could number more than 27. The committee would meet once a year and consider a broad range of questions. It would be assisted by panels of experts who

would advise it on questions within their specialties. The committee members would be selected in their personal capacity on the basis of their qualifications and in such a way as to take account of the principle of equitable geographical distribution. That arrangement would make available the specialized talent, and the intergovernmental nature of the standing committee would ensure the support of Governments.

24. In a background paper it had distributed to members of the Council, his delegation had described alternatives to that proposal, in the hope of initiating an interesting and dynamic exchange of views.

25. Mr. SKATARETIKO (Yugoslavia) recalled that the Council had already given detailed consideration, during its forty-seventh and forty-ninth sessions, to the question of future institutional arrangements for science and technology. The discussion had been based on reports such as the one in document E/4845 and on proposals of intergovernmental organizations and expert bodies, such as the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development. The members of the Council had also had the opportunity to examine the issue in the light of a possible reorganization of the General Assembly or strengthening of the role of the Council in the economic and social fields. Various speakers had proposed the establishment of a committee which would be a sessional, intersessional or standing committee of the Council or the General Assembly. Their arguments were based on the opinions of experts or political viewpoints which varied according to the country or group of countries concerned. However, everyone recognized the importance of the role of science and technology in development. The problem was not whether to establish machinery or what type of machinery to establish, but what would be its purpose—in other words, what services it would render to the world community, especially the developing countries. Although considerable attention had been given to that problem, no answers had yet been found to the basic questions concerning the terms of reference, membership and level of the organ, its relationship with the advisory bodies in the field of science and technology, the specialized agencies and other intergovernmental bodies in that field, its method of work and reporting procedure or its staffing.

26. If the Council wished to take a definite decision quickly, it should establish an *ad hoc* working group consisting of 15 to 25 representatives of States Members of the United Nations. Such an intergovernmental working group would immediately begin to prepare detailed recommendations on the establishment of an intergovernmental body and its terms of reference, so that it would be able to report to the Council at its fifty-first session on the progress made. The Council would then be able to take action-oriented decisions at its fifty-first session. His delegation appealed to representatives to make an effort to work in a constructive manner and set aside particular national interests.

27. Mr. MOBARAK (Lebanon) stressed the importance that most delegations had always attached to the question under consideration. Apparently, many of them favoured the creation of an intergovernmental body. That body could be given the task of over-all co-ordination. Although

sectoral tasks fell within the competence of the specialized agencies, over-all co-ordination was necessary so that account would be taken of the role of science and technology in all sectors of economic development and of their influence on the growth of national income. Each country should carefully study the range of options available to it in the application of science and technology to development. It would seem important to establish an intergovernmental body which could deal with the problems not being studied by the specialized agencies or the other specialized bodies of the United Nations. In resolution 1454 (XLVII), the Council had already recognized the need for the reinforcement and co-ordination of present and contemplated activities, including the desirability of the establishment of an intergovernmental machinery in the field of the application of science and technology to development. It should therefore take a decision as soon as possible on that question and define in detail the terms of reference, membership and reporting procedure of the body to be established.

28. Mr. SUMANTERA (Indonesia) said that his delegation attached great importance to science and technology and to the human aspects of the problem. It reaffirmed that it was in favour of the establishment of an intergovernmental committee which would be a subsidiary organ of the General Assembly.

29. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) said he was glad that the French delegation had recognized the General Assembly's competence to take decisions of principle in matters of economic and social development. Similarly, in connexion with measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council, the United Kingdom representative had recognized that it was for the General Assembly to take policy decisions. The representative of France, however, had said that questions relating to science and technology should not be assigned to the Economic Committee or the Social Committee of the Economic and Social Council. In that case, it would be necessary to create sessional committees not only to deal with questions relating to science and technology, but also in the field of human rights or in other fields, such as transport and population; that would lead to a proliferation of sessional committees.

30. His delegation would like to know when the question would be considered in substance so that experts could be made available in good time. It was in favour of the creation of an intergovernmental committee which would be a subsidiary organ of the General Assembly and which would submit its reports to the Assembly through the Council; the latter could then take decisions on questions within its competence. The Council should without delay recommend to the General Assembly the creation of such a standing committee of the Assembly. After the Assembly had taken a decision, the Council, at its resumed fifty-first session, could consider the question of revising the terms of reference of the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development. His delegation had no fixed position regarding the terms of reference of the organ to be created. But it was essential that the Council should take a decision without delay.

31. Mr. GROS (France) noted the impatience shown by some delegations. It was important at the current stage to



point out that initially the intention had been to include the item on the agenda of the fifty-first session. Some Governments could accordingly consider that they needed a little more time to reflect on it. The representative of Brazil had just said that if the French delegation's reasoning was followed, sessional committees of the Council would also have to be created with competence in matters relating to human rights, transport, population, etc. The difference, however, lay in the fact that there were already intergovernmental functional commissions which dealt with those matters whereas there was none in the field of science and technology.

32. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) pointed out that now that it was at the beginning of the Second Development Decade the United Nations should face up to the challenge represented by the current technological revolution. The developing countries should without delay derive the maximum profit from technological advances with a view to accelerating their economic development. It might be that in the near future one of the main advantages offered by the United Nations would prove to be its capacity to create intergovernmental agencies or organs to promote international co-operation in that area. In view of the fact that science and technology altered even the data relating to time and space, Governments should face up to the problems which were outside their national jurisdiction, such as the environment or the exploitation of the sea-bed and ocean floor. It was not surprising that the United Nations was concerned to introduce order in those sectors, by ensuring that the advantages of technology were shared and distributed equitably. Although the Organization had developed a great deal since its creation, the purposes of the Charter still met the hopes of Member States in the economic, social and cultural fields. The scope of the Organization's activities had expanded because new technologies made improved international co-operation essential, but it had also been narrowed because of the limitations which impeded collective action by the United Nations for peace. Nowhere in the Charter could the words "science and technology" be found, yet the tasks which faced the Organization in that field, and which had not even been dreamed of at San Francisco, would perhaps in the future prove to be the most important.

33. It had been said that in order to settle the question under consideration, a new General Assembly committee on science, natural resources and the environment should be created to replace the Special Political Committee. The Secretary-General had even spoken of a "committee of the future".

34. The representative of France had quite appropriately pointed out that the question had been under consideration for a long time and his explanation concerning the statement by the representative of Pakistan could not fail to meet with approval. In fact, it was a contradiction to wish to improve the organization of the work of the Council and strengthen its authority while stating that the Council was not sufficiently representative. His own delegation did not believe that the Council was undergoing a crisis of confidence. Increasing the number of its members would not result in a strengthening of its authority. The Security Council was the political organ of the United Nations: it was not, however, because it had a limited membership that it was unable to solve the problems submitted to it. The same applied to the Economic and Social Council. The creation of a standing committee of the General Assembly would have a number of disadvantages. If all aspects of the various solutions were taken into account, it would perhaps be recognized that it was better to create a sessional committee of the Council, a committee with an expanded membership. Observers should play a greater role in such a committee than that currently provided for in rule 75 of the Council's rules of procedure. His delegation reserved the right to modify its position if a large majority came out in favour of solutions (a), (b) or (c) suggested in the report of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (see E/4989, para. 79). It was, in fact, important that a decision should be taken by a large majority.

35. The PRESIDENT, noting with interest that several members of the Council wished a decision to be taken by consensus or by a fairly large majority, invited delegations to formulate specific proposals.

36. He declared closed the list of speakers wishing to participate in the general debate on the item.

*The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.*





## ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Fiftieth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Friday, 7 May 1971,  
at 3.10 p.m.

NEW YORK

*President: Mr. Rachid DRISS (Tunisia).*

## AGENDA ITEM 11

**Science and technology (continued):****(b) Application of computer technology to development (continued)\* (E/4800 and E/4800/Summary)**

1. Mr. HARBEN (World Intellectual Property Organization), speaking at the invitation of the President, said that at their meeting in September 1970, the Conference and General Assembly of WIPO had welcomed the recommendation in paragraph 201 of the report on the application of computer technology for development (E/4800) and had decided that work should start on the study as soon as possible. It had been agreed that it was essential to define the scope of the study and to see how the results of work already done along those lines would be utilized before a full-scale meeting of governmental experts could be convened. For that purpose the Director-General of WIPO had invited ten Governments to nominate experts to serve on an advisory group. The Group had met in March 1971 and its report, which would be considered by the appropriate intergovernmental bodies of WIPO in September 1971, had already been communicated to the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

2. The Advisory Group had reached unanimous agreement on a number of points in connexion with the proposed study, of which the two most important were the following: first, a committee of governmental experts should not be convened until thorough documentation had been prepared giving an indication of the economic evidence of the need for legal protection and information about the state of the relevant laws in the member countries; secondly, the proposed study should concentrate on the desirable ingredients of any system of legal protection rather than follow rigidly the lines of established legal concepts for the protection of other inventions or works.

3. Discussions were currently taking place with a view to associating the Office for Science and Technology with the preparatory work, particularly with regard to the economic aspects which were outside WIPO's competence. The results of the preparatory work would automatically be transmitted to the Secretary-General of the United Nations for any follow-up action which he might be required to take. If the preparatory work was to be done thoroughly, as had been recommended, it was unlikely that a committee of governmental experts could be convened before the latter half of 1972.

4. The requests for technical assistance currently being addressed to WIPO by the developing countries contained a

substantial element relating to the application of computer technology. WIPO hoped that the potentialities of world-wide intergovernmental technical organizations which were outside the United Nations system would be taken into account in the establishment of any future institutional machinery in that area.

5. Mr. GROS (France), noting that the Secretary-General's report was the result of an initiative taken by a number of delegations including his own, said that the authors of the report should be congratulated on their conscientious fulfilment of their task. Through no fault of theirs, but because of the nature of the work, the report was uneven. Abundant information had been provided by the developed countries but there was insufficient data for a comprehensive description of computer installations in the developing countries. The report should therefore be regarded as a first step to be followed up by a second, supplementary report in which attention should be focused particularly on the current role played by computers in the developing countries.

6. Turning to the individual sections of the report, he noted that chapter V gave an account of the history of the International Computation Centre at Rome, including the considerations which had prompted a change in the objectives of the Centre converting it into an intergovernmental bureau for information processing rather than computation. There was also a useful commentary in the same chapter on private sector contributions.

7. The proposal in chapter VI to establish an international advisory board of computer technology for development was, however, causing his delegation some serious misgivings. He hoped that it was not the Secretary-General's intention that the Council should take a stand in favour of the proposed board before its terms of reference were established. Any urgent tasks could be carried out by existing machinery such as the Office for Science and Technology, which could set up a special section to deal with problems relating to the developed and developing countries. In view of the need for reflection, his delegation would adamantly oppose any move to establish a new body at the present time. It had noted that WHO also had reservations concerning the board and had requested that if such a board were to be established the terms of reference should make it clear that the co-ordination activities would apply only to the United Nations itself and not to the specialized agencies.

8. Chapter VII contained some very useful advice. For instance, if circumstances did not allow for a national computer centre, access to a good regional facility was a satisfactory stopgap and infinitely more advisable than renting obsolete equipment. It was clear that developing countries should, whenever possible, acquire third-genera-

\* Resumed from the 1753rd meeting.



tion computers because of their increased reliability and decreased operating costs.

9. Chapter VIII, on computers and employment, was of great importance, particularly to countries faced with chronic unemployment. As the authors observed, the possible effect of computers and computer capability on real or imagined employment opportunities was a matter worthy of serious consideration. At present, there was insufficient data on that point and in particular whether developing countries should have labour-intensive industries or should install computers which were intended as a labour-saving device.

10. The question of patents and copyrights (chap. IX) entailed many delicate and intricate problems. It was, however, too early to establish any legal machinery to solve them.

11. His delegation was of the opinion that the Secretariat could establish an inventory of the problems facing the international community and should submit a supplementary report to the Council at its fifty-third session in 1972. Such a report should contain more ample data on the use of computers in the developing countries and should address itself to the effects of computer usage on employment. He asked the Director of the Office for Science and Technology whether the Secretariat could reasonably be expected to undertake that task.

12. Mr. DIACONESCU (Romania) said that computer science was one of the great achievements of modern civilization, ranking beside the use of atomic energy, the exploration of outer space and the exploitation of the sea-bed.

13. The question of electronic computers, the report in document E/4800 showed, would require new United Nations machinery. He was convinced that the United Nations system would be able to promote effective international co-operation in the interests of all countries, particularly the developing ones. He found the recommendations in paragraph 29 highly relevant and considered that the technical assistance offered by UNDP could play a particularly important role. Assistance was needed most urgently in such areas as teaching and training, the exchange of technical information, advice on the goals to be included in a broad national policy and the expertise required to apply computer technology. He fully endorsed the conclusion in paragraph 36 that concerted action for the transfer of computer technology to developing countries was of top priority. His Government, having learned from experience that the development of science and technology must take place within the context of a national plan, believed that in the case of computer technology too it was essential to establish national centres, to train specialists at all levels and to develop satisfactory materials and techniques. Romania was accordingly making a sustained effort to develop a national computing system. It has realized that the enterprise entailed not only acquiring modern equipment but also gaining experience and comparing notes with other countries, conducting studies and appraising the special computing requirements peculiar to the Romanian economy.

14. The Secretary-General's report gave a clear picture of the scope and nature of the activities conducted by the United Nations system and by some professional organizations. Of outstanding importance was the recommendation to establish an international advisory board on computer technology for development (paras. 148-157). That proposal deserved favourable consideration if it was truly desired to place international co-operation on a permanent and scientific basis.

15. His Government would do everything in its power to intensify international co-operation in the use of computer technology as an instrument for development.

16. Mr. LA PORTA (United States of America) said that his delegation considered computers to be of great significance because of their potential effect on economic and social development. The report submitted by the Secretary-General (E/4800) provided an excellent point of departure for future discussions, to which the Secretariat should contribute its expertise. The report only lightly touched on a number of questions of major importance in computer investment decisions; such complex issues as employment, foreign currency, manpower and technological infrastructure in relation to those decisions required clarification. The conclusions of the report unfortunately did not include a strong recommendation calling for the development of indigenous capabilities in the developing countries so that wise decisions on the acquisition and use of computers could be made. The developing countries must also establish an institutional framework for decision-making that would enable them to make technical and economic judgements within the context of their own priorities and resources.

17. His delegation supported conclusion I and recommendation 1 in paragraph 29 of the report. It recognized the difficulty of establishing truly multinational regional centres in the developing countries but felt that the effort should be made in selected regions where national facilities would not be adequate for some time. It also subscribed to recommendations 2, 3 and 4 and approved the statements relating to education and training made by the Working Group on Computer Technology for Development of the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development (E/4800, annex II, para. 18 (a) and (c)). The report recognized the need to train not only computer experts but also managers, decision-makers and the general public. Despite the disadvantages of training specialists abroad, noted in paragraphs 60 and 61 of chapter II of the report, his delegation believed that the developing countries would have to continue for the foreseeable future to send their nationals abroad for training until they could establish adequate educational facilities at the national or regional level. However, an increasing proportion of such training should be carried out in the developing countries themselves.

18. With regard to paragraph 146, concerning assistance by international professional organizations, his delegation felt that some organizations in the private sector might also, in addition to the activities mentioned in subparagraphs (a) to (f), provide assistance and advice to developing countries in their planning and educational programmes. The International Federation for Information Processing would, in



particular, be receptive to such a request; accordingly, the Secretary-General might request the governing body of the Federation to consider the matter at its next conference which was scheduled for August 1971, and might draw that conference to the attention of Member States.

19. His delegation agreed with the general purport of conclusion II in paragraph 29 but felt that the extent and character of the broad national policy advocated depended on the country's level of development. Many developing countries could not be expected to formulate a realistic policy without outside assistance, and the United Nations might consider what assistance its different agencies could provide. Recommendation 6 would be a sound one only if the plan to which it referred was consistent with national development priorities. Whether UNDP increased its assistance in that field would depend largely upon the priority which the developing countries accorded to computer technology in their development plans. Although the United States did not disagree with the two recommendations made under conclusion II, it questioned whether they would be feasible if they were not carefully considered within the context of development priorities.

20. With regard to recommendation 7, under conclusion III, his delegation believed that it might be premature to establish a new institution for the application of computer technology to development. The functions of the advisory board proposed might well be performed by existing bodies in the United Nations system, including the new Advisory Board of the International Computing Centre, UNESCO and UNDP.

21. In that connexion, the Statistical Commission and the individual information systems of such United Nations agencies as IAEA also had a role to play. UNIDO could explore such topics as the use of computers at the enterprise level in the developing countries and its effect on employment, training and social and economic development; it might also consider how it correlated the work of international, regional and national technical and trade organizations with respect to computers with that being done by the developing countries and how computer technology could be adapted and made more directly relevant to the needs of those countries.

22. Before the Council took any decision, the question of establishing an advisory board should be considered by CPC. Whatever body might be given responsibility in the field should be closely linked to the international computing community, as suggested in paragraphs 151 and 152. The regional economic commissions should consider the suggestion made in paragraph 157 for the establishment of regional counterparts to a central advisory body.

23. His delegation also supported recommendations 8, 9, 10 and 11 in paragraph 29. With regard to recommendation 9, it had supported "twinning" relationships initiated by individual organizations and felt that other "twinning" relationships, particularly between universities and research institutions, might be encouraged. In view of the importance of establishing standards for the sake of compatibility and with a view to the possible exchange of experience and data, his delegation thought that the attention of all developing countries embarking on the use of computer

technology should be drawn to recommendation 11 and that they should be encouraged to implement, wherever possible, existing standards and recommendations related to information processing, particularly those promulgated by the International Organization for Standardization.

24. His delegation fully concurred with conclusion IV. Countries with substantial computer experience acknowledged the validity of paragraph 30 (a) but were aware that sometimes computerization retarded progress. That paragraph, together with paragraph 30 (b) to (f), deserved careful consideration by the developing countries.

25. Mr. GATES (New Zealand) observed that the important problem of the application of computer technology to development did not lend itself to easy solutions. Although the computer's full potential had yet to be realized, it was already clear that it was among the most important of the many technological innovations which were creating changes unparalleled in human history. At the same time, there was the danger that its development would bring disproportionate economic benefits to the developed countries. It was that danger which the United Nations had attempted to deal with in document E/4800. Generally speaking, his delegation was sympathetic to the conclusions and recommendations in that report but it took a cautious approach because it felt that computer technology must not be regarded as a panacea for the problems of development. Even in the most developed countries many organizations had in their enthusiasm been led to make unprofitable investments. That danger was all the greater in the less developed countries, where administrative and managerial skills were thinly stretched and where computers were less likely to be properly utilized. Considering the multitude of problems attending most major attempts at regional economic co-operation, the prospects for success in the particular field of computers seemed bleak.

26. His delegation supported conclusion I, which it interpreted as placing greater emphasis on education aimed at the judicious application of computer technology to development than on education in the computer skills themselves. With regard to recommendation 1, his delegation felt that, since it was clearly beyond the financial and administrative capacity of many nations to undertake a wholesale upgrading of their computer technology, a global centre would be impractical and what was needed was regional co-operation. However, it foresaw difficulty in reaching agreement on the number and type of regional centres because of the problems created by disparate stages of technological development, including basic administrative and managerial skills, in countries at varying stages of development. His delegation would counsel against blanket courses for representatives from all countries of a region. It would even go so far as to stress the need to discourage some countries from actively seeking to assimilate computer technology which they were ill-equipped to handle. Hence the importance of the classification and transitional models referred to in paragraphs 159 and 169; indeed, his delegation would be in favour of even more detailed schemata if it appeared that more detail could be handled properly. Consideration should also be given to coupling computer training courses in any regional institution with a "pre-computer" course which would not only give instruction in basic administrative and organizational skills, but



would also emphasize the need for each country to apply computer technology to its own circumstances. The report should place greater emphasis on those problems in order to work out a basic approach to the whole subject.

27. The reservations his delegation had expressed on recommendation 1 applied equally to recommendations 2 and 3 on education and training. While sympathetic to the recommendations, his delegation was dubious about the ultimate benefit of educating students in a new science in an alien environment without adapting each student's course to the practical requirements of his own country. Such adaptation might well be beyond the capacity of that country's resources. In paragraphs 60 to 62, the report gave adequate coverage to that problem and the related problem of the "brain drain" but both would be very difficult to solve in practice.

28. While there could be no argument about the need for disseminating knowledge on computer technology, stressed in recommendations 4 and 10, there could be different opinions on the best methods of doing so. The usefulness of professional organizations in that respect could be over-rated, since such organizations did not generally possess a body of consolidated knowledge or the secretariat necessary for its transfer. Some progress might, however, eventually be achieved with international co-operation.

29. Recommendation 7 for the establishment of an international advisory board had merit provided the financial implications, which had yet to be ascertained, were acceptable. If such a board was to be set up, the question of its functions, form and membership would have to be settled. In his view, qualifications for board membership should include not only knowledge of computers but also familiarity with the problems of particular regions, since advice based on a sound appreciation of both the problems common to a region and the problems peculiar to individual countries within the region would be immeasurably more valuable than expert advice emanating from a centralized body with no such regional knowledge. His delegation therefore endorsed the suggestion in paragraph 157 for cross-representation between the central and regional boards. Other functions of the central board might include the development of computer awareness in the developing countries in order to promote a realistic appreciation of the limitations and dangers of computerization, as well as its benefits. The board should ascertain in detail the needs of the developing countries for computer education and training and act as a clearing-house for computer information. It should take account of existing organizations that could be adapted to perform a regional or subregional function.

30. Effective supervision and control should be exercised over the board's activities. In that connexion, the report proposed the traditional system of annual reporting by the board to the Secretary-General and to the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly. Although that was a function the Council should fulfil, it was difficult to feel confident that it could do so without drastic changes in its methods of work. If such changes were not possible, the radical alternative of establishing a channel through the UNDP Governing Council might perhaps be envisaged.

31. The success of the "twinning" practice advocated in recommendation 9 had in the past depended on the degree of personal involvement in each venture and "computer twinning" would probably function in a similar way. "Twinning" could be one of the most cost-effective methods of passing on the benefits of computer technology because it minimized political, administrative and financial problems. His delegation therefore supported the idea.

32. Enhancing the compatibility of computer hardware and software, as advocated in recommendation 11, was perhaps more important in the long run for the application of computers to development than any other single measure, and was at the same time of the utmost importance to the development of computer technology itself. His delegation had been surprised that the report made little mention of computer-language difficulties. The idea of a universal code of computer languages for various functions fell very properly within the domain of the United Nations.

33. Undoubtedly the United Nations in general and the Council in particular could play a useful role in the application of computer technology to development. However, the subject needed to be kept strictly in perspective, as it was only one of a wide range of technological instruments for economic development. Computerization was expensive and bad judgement costly. The laymen who had to make decisions on computers would have to have available to them thorough and reliable cost-benefit analyses.

34. In his delegation's view, such issues as the best means of teaching computer courses and of disseminating information (paras. 66 to 69), the generation argument (paras. 99 and 100) and the question of financing were among a host of issues that required expert examination by a body such as UNESCO, in conjunction with the proposed board and international professional organizations. Consideration should also be given to carrying out a regional survey which would analyse in depth each country's relative stage of computer technology, its particular technological problems and any special governmental organizational structures that would determine what type of computer development would be most relevant to its needs. A follow-up survey should be made once the initial institutional structure for computer technology had been decided upon.

35. In principle, New Zealand was fully prepared to associate its bilateral aid programme with multilateral activities in the application of computer technology to development.

36. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said the great importance which his Government attached to international co-operation in the use of computers for economic development was indicated by the fact that it had often made some of its highest officials available for service as Chairmen or members of various bodies and expert groups in the United Nations system concerned with international co-operation in science and technology, particularly in the field of computers.

37. His delegation found the report before the Council (E/4800) to be highly satisfactory and felt that the *Ad Hoc*



Panel of Experts which had prepared it had dealt comprehensively with the subject of the use of computers in solving problems of economic development and the specific characteristics and difficulties of their use in developing countries, and had made helpful recommendations aimed at overcoming existing difficulties as rapidly as possible.

38. In his delegation's view, the most important sphere of application of computer technology was that of material production, for the primary immediate goal of the developing countries was to raise their gross national product and national income. Only thereafter should attention be turned to the application of computer technology to such fields as statistics, planning and financial operations on a national scale.

39. Naturally, solutions would vary from one country to another and the specific steps which each country took would depend on its own social and economic circumstances and natural conditions. Whatever those differences might be, however, the solution of the problems of computer use would in all cases depend on training. His delegation believed that national computer centres should be established by the State, which would make it possible for those centres to be used later for the centralized training of personnel.

40. The United Nations family, including its system of computing centres, had a positive role to play in co-ordinating work connected with computers; the work of the computing centres, however, should be more practical; they should, in particular, provide information, advisory services and training.

41. His delegation hoped that the report would serve as a starting-point for further activity by the United Nations in solving international problems related to the application of computer technology to development.

42. Mr. MOBARAK (Lebanon) said that the Secretary-General's excellent report concerning the application of computer technology to accelerate the development process had helped members to form a better idea of the needs and problems of the developing countries and highlighted the need for the United Nations to increase co-operation in the field of computers. The replies received from Governments to the Secretary-General's letter (see E/4800, annex IV) showed that two thirds of the countries concerned did not use computers and that 12 were just beginning to use them. The use of computers by the public authorities was aimed primarily at the automation of certain operations relating to economic development. However, existing facilities were not fully used and the simple techniques employed were not necessarily the most effective. Training opportunities were inadequate. The available information tended to indicate that computer technology in the industrialized countries had led to structural changes in the labour market but had not produced appreciable unemployment. It was impossible fully to assess the situation in the developing countries because of insufficient reliable information.

43. It was for each country to define its own policy concerning centralization and the role of computer technology in the national system. The efficient use of computers presupposed the existence of experienced per-

sonnel at all levels, reliable systems of information and the development of allied disciplines such as management science, statistics and operational research. In that connexion, the effects of the "brain drain" should be borne in mind.

44. During the Second United Nations Development Decade the developing countries should make full use of the appropriate techniques in order to intensify their development. The role played by computer technology in determining the rate of development of the developing countries would be of the greatest importance in the 1970s.

45. Another factor which should be borne in mind was the effect of computers in areas with high unemployment rates. The United Nations could do much to encourage international co-operation in the field of computer technology, particularly with regard to the preparation of studies to determine the relationship between the use of computer technology and the level of employment in developing countries.

46. Any final decision concerning the use of computers for development should be based on consideration of all factors relating to the needs of the developing countries. He noted in that connexion the importance of their being able to obtain third-generation computers rather than hiring obsolescent second-generation facilities.

## AGENDA ITEM 9

### Transport development (*continued*):

(b) Preparation for the United Nations/IMCO Conference on International Container Traffic (*continued*)\* (E/4963, E/L.1380, E/L.1388, E/L.1391/Rev.1 and Add.1, E/L.1393, E/L.1394)

47. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) introduced the revised draft resolution (E/L.1391/Rev.1).

48. Mr. KOEHRING (United States of America) said that in order to gain the widest possible support for the draft resolution, he had held consultations with a view to suggesting amendments to operative paragraphs 3, 8 and 9. Although it could not be denied that all economic and social activities should ultimately contribute to development, the emphasis in operative paragraph 3 was misplaced since the principal purpose of the Conference was the development of containerization. Furthermore, all countries wished to ensure that their interests would be protected. He therefore suggested that operative paragraph 3 should be amended to read "... should have as its guiding principle the development and facilitation of container traffic on a global basis while safeguarding the interests of the developing countries".

49. The procedure envisaged in operative paragraphs 8 and 9 was too rigid. The relevant organs of the United Nations should have an opportunity to review the study on the proposed TCM Convention in order to determine whether it was ready for international consideration. Those paragraphs should therefore be combined in a single new operative paragraph which would read:

\* Resumed from the 1751st meeting.



"8. *Invites* the Committee on Shipping of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, the regional economic commissions, the United Nations Economic and Social Office at Beirut and the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization to review the matter in the light of the results of the study in order to consider whether the draft Convention on the International Combined Transport of Goods or alternative proposals are ready for international consideration."

50. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) said that the United States amendment to operative paragraph 3 made the text much clearer. The proposed new paragraph would provide for a broader review of the study and would therefore ensure that all relevant aspects were taken into account when specific proposals were prepared for the regulation of intermodal transport. He was therefore pleased to accept those amendments.

51. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) said that the new draft (E/L.1391/Rev.1) as amended by the representative of the United States covered some of the points raised in the United Kingdom amendments (E/L.1393). He would therefore withdraw his sixth and ninth amendments. In view of the explanations given by Brazil at the 1751st meeting, he would also withdraw his seventh amendment.

52. The revised text did not, however, overcome the difficulty of the timing of the study, which had prompted the third and eighth United Kingdom amendments. His delegation considered that it was important that the study should be available for the Conference, as recommended by the Legal Committee of IMCO and the UNCTAD Committee on Shipping. His amendment did not specify a time-limit but indicated that the study should be completed as soon as possible and in any case in good time for the Conference. He would therefore be compelled to press those amendments.

53. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the draft TCM Convention was expected to be a substantive issue in the Conference and its exclusion would cause considerable difficulties for those organs responsible for ensuring the orderly preparation and conduct of the Conference. Both the UNCTAD Committee on Shipping and the Legal Committee of IMCO had recommended that the study should be prepared well in advance of the opening of the Conference. The sponsors of the draft resolution should pay heed to the authoritative view of those two widely representative intergovernmental organs.

54. The difficulty would have been overcome if, in the final preambular paragraph, the sponsors had reproduced the relevant part of resolution 17 (V) of the UNCTAD Committee on Shipping in its entirety. However, since the draft resolution gave no indication of the time-limit for the preparation of the study, he proposed that operative paragraph 6 should be amended to read:

"... such study to be conducted:

"(a) with the assistance of experts, after ascertaining the views of Governments of Member States on those aspects and questions which in their view required clarification, and

"(b) on condition that this study does not entail the exclusion from the future agenda of the United Nations/IMCO Conference of the question of the proposed TCM Convention."

55. Mr. SPENCER (Observer for Canada), speaking at the invitation of the President, said that his delegation would have no difficulty with draft resolution E/L.1391/Rev.1 as orally amended by the United States delegation, and considered that further study of the economic implications of the TCM Convention would contribute to the success of the Conference.

56. Mr. PRAGUE (France) said that although at that stage he was not in a position to express a definitive opinion on draft resolution E/L.1391/Rev.1, as orally amended, it would appear that the procedure envisaged for the preparation of the study was excessively cumbersome. As could be seen from the statement of administrative and financial implications (E/L.1391/Rev.1/Add.1), the Secretary-General envisaged the convening of an intersecretariat group for the preparation of the study. For his part, he could see no valid reason why so many bodies should be involved in its preparation if they were to have an opportunity to review it when it was completed. Furthermore, the draft resolution in its present form did not include the Economic and Social Council itself in the list of reviewing bodies.

57. The essential factor was that the study should be prepared in time for the Conference to take it into consideration if it so wished. The Council might take note in its report of the statement by the Secretariat that the study could be prepared by March 1972. That statement, along with operative paragraph 7 of the draft resolution, would remove the doubts of the United Kingdom representative and would assure Member States that the study could be considered during the Conference, if it was thought necessary.

58. Mr. GATES (New Zealand) said that his delegation understood the misgiving felt by Brazil with regard to the TCM Convention and fully agreed that a thorough and properly considered study of its economic implications should be undertaken. The Convention would have consequences for all countries, not just the developing countries. Overseas trade made a larger proportionate contribution to the economy of New Zealand than to that of any other member of the Council, and it therefore utilized a great deal of shipping and transport services. Consequently, any convention that affected relations between shippers and transport operators would receive the closest attention from his Government. His delegation could not agree that an international transport conference should have as its guiding principle the promotion of the development of the developing countries, and it therefore welcomed the United States amendment to operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution. The interests of the developing countries were, however, of vital importance in that context and would be borne in mind during the Conference. Even if the TCM Convention were not discussed by the Conference—and it was possible that its inclusion in the agenda would interfere with the orderly consideration of other very important matters—his delegation felt that the Conference would render an extremely valuable service to the international



community if it did no more than complete consideration of the two other draft conventions it would have before it. He doubted whether the TCM Convention would be ready for consideration by November 1972, and could not therefore support the United Kingdom amendment concerning the time schedule. However, he did not rule out the possibility that the Convention might in fact be ready for consideration. The draft resolution in its present form accurately reflected the views of his delegation, which would be happy to be included in the list of sponsors.

59. With regard to participation at the Conference, his delegation agreed with the formula contained in paragraphs 7 and 8 of the Secretary-General's note (E/4963). The United Nations Conference on Road Traffic, held in 1968, was an appropriate precedent, and it was logical that observer status should be accorded to the organizations that had consultative status or special working arrangements with IMCO.

60. Mr. AYOUB (Tunisia) said that his delegation did not consider that the TCM Convention should necessarily be included in the agenda for the Container Conference. It therefore favoured the amended Brazilian draft resolution (E/L.1391/Rev.1) but could not support the United Kingdom amendment dealing with the time schedule for completion of the study.

61. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) restated his delegation's hope that matters that were common to the TCM Convention and to containerization would be discussed at the Conference. He fully agreed with the French delegation that the procedure outlined in operative paragraph 6 of the draft resolution was cumbersome and costly, and said he would have preferred a simple request to the Secretary-General to have a study prepared. The time factor was most important, and his delegation was anxious that, when the misgivings of the developing countries had been clarified, the Conference should consider the TCM Convention.

62. Mr. HEDEMANN (Norway) said that the procedure proposed in draft resolution E/L.1391/Rev.1 would make it unlikely that the TCM Convention could be discussed at the Conference. His delegation therefore could not support the draft unless the sponsors accepted an amendment along the lines of those submitted by the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union. In any event, he agreed with the French delegation that the Council should have an opportunity to examine the text of the study before making a final decision.

63. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) said with regard to the Soviet Union's amendment and the remaining amendments of the United Kingdom that a careful study of the

implications of the TCM Convention could not be produced in a hurry. The process of completing the study would inevitably be lengthy, since experts could not begin the task until Governments had given details of their misgivings. The Convention contained a number of elements that would affect domestic legislation, relations between shippers and carriers, and national transport networks. Clearly, a study of those elements could not be rushed. The sponsors were therefore unable to accept either the Soviet Union's amendment or those of the United Kingdom. With regard to the French delegation's criticism of the procedure for the study, he said that the reason why no reference had been made to the Economic and Social Council was that the Council would automatically be in a position to consider the study if it so wished.

64. Mr. SADDLER (Office of the Controller) introduced the Secretary-General's statement (E/L.1391/Rev.1/Add.1) of the administrative and financial implications of the Brazilian draft resolution. He informed the Council that the convening of an intersecretariat group as outlined in paragraph 4 of the statement had been considered the most suitable way in which to implement the terms of the draft resolution. Qualified staff within the Secretariat would be used as much as possible in order to keep expenditure to a minimum.

65. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) characterized as extravagant the proposals contained in document E/L.1391/Rev.1/Add.1. The Brazilian draft resolution did not call for an intersecretariat group, and in any event the necessary co-ordination could be effected by means of correspondence and questionnaires. The estimated expenditure of \$61,300 would do nothing for development and should be allocated to a more valuable purpose.

66. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) informed the Council that the joint IMCO/ECE committee was expected to approve the revised draft of the TCM Convention in June 1971. By mid-July the new document would be available to all members of IMCO or ECE and it was inconceivable that when 127 nations had studied the document, any problematical questions should remain undisclosed. The criticism of the time schedule proposed by his delegation was therefore unjustified, and a less cumbersome procedure than that requested in the Brazilian draft would be not only more practical but also more economical.

67. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) moved the adjournment of the meeting under rule 54 of the rules of procedure.

*The motion was adopted by 14 votes to 6, with 4 abstentions.*

*The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.*





## ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Fiftieth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Monday, 10 May 1971,  
at 10.20 a.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Rachid DRISS (Tunisia).

## AGENDA ITEM 11

## Science and technology (continued):

## (a) Future institutional arrangements for science and technology (continued)\* (E/4959, E/4989, chap. VII)

1. Mr. AVESEN (Norway) noted that the Economic and Social Council appeared to be on the verge of reaching general agreement on the need for an intergovernmental body to deal with science and technology and on the proposition that its membership should be larger than that of the Council itself. His delegation believed that the new body should be a standing committee on the Council rather than an organ that would report directly to the General Assembly, because the Council had a special responsibility for co-ordination activities, because science and technology had a crucial role in the Second United Nations Development Decade and finally because a sessional committee with the same composition as the Council would not satisfy the legitimate wishes of the developing countries for greater representation.

2. With regard to the terms of reference of the new body, it was important to prevent overlapping and duplication. At the same time science and technology were cross-sectoral and the language of the terms of reference should be broad enough to enable the new body to become involved in matters that affected science and technology but were not purely and simply developmental issues. Subject to the conclusions of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, to be held at Stockholm in 1972, he hoped that the terms of reference of the new body would also include the environment.

3. In conclusion, he expressed his delegation's support for the Yugoslav proposal (1754th meeting) that an *ad hoc* working group should be established to consider the matter further and report to the Council at its fifty-first session, on the understanding that it was without prejudice to any decision the Council might take at the current session.

4. Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) agreed with the view that the future institutional machinery for science and technology should not be considered in isolation from the specialized agencies or without bearing in mind the need for permanent co-ordination. He also agreed with the Pakistan suggestion that whatever machinery was agreed upon should be within the bounds of what was reasonable. His delegation felt, for instance, that terms of reference similar to those of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the

Sea-bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction or the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space would be too broad for the proposed intergovernmental committee on science and technology, whose main task would be co-ordination. Because of the cross-sectoral nature of its functions, which had been aptly referred to by the Soviet delegation, the intergovernmental committee should confine itself to laying down guidelines and formulating policy, and should not engage in operational activities, which belonged to the specialized agencies.

5. Since co-ordination was its primary role, the Council should have a close bond with the new body, and the latter should be a down-to-earth working body rather than solely a deliberative organ that might be accused of further splintering the United Nations decision-making process.

6. His delegation hoped that the new body would be an intersessional committee of the Council, so as to reflect the developing countries' wish to participate in decisions concerning science and technology. As such, it would not have to have the same membership as the Council itself. Notwithstanding the foregoing, he did not object to the arguments in favour of the new body being a direct subsidiary of the General Assembly, since that would also enable a larger number of developing countries to participate in it. In any event, he hoped that the new body would succeed in lifting itself out of routine work to a sufficient extent to be able also to develop a political role.

7. His delegation could support the Yugoslav proposal to establish an *ad hoc* working group to draw up draft terms of reference and make suggestions with regard to the level of representation and the relations between the new body and other intergovernmental organs concerned with science and technology, as well as with the Council itself. Such functions were not in his view appropriate for the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development. Having considered the views of the *ad hoc* working group, the Council could then decide which organ should establish the new body as its subsidiary. Although it was difficult to examine the terms of reference before such a basic decision had been made, such a course of action would have to be taken in the case in point in order to ensure that the Council maintained its prerogatives without damaging the interests of the developing countries. There would, of course, be less need for the establishment of a working group if a consensus were to emerge in the course of the Council's debate.

8. Mr. AYOUB (Tunisia) reminded the Council of its resolution 1544 (XLIX), in which it had already taken a decision in principle on the need for improved institutional arrangements for science and technology. That need had also been recognized by the Administrative Committee on

\* Resumed from the 1754th meeting.



Co-ordination (ACC) and the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development, and many of the Member States that had replied to the Secretary-General's questionnaire on the subject had indicated that they felt the existing machinery was inadequate. Unfortunately, no consensus appeared to be emerging either in the Council or in the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (CPC) on the question of whether a sessional committee or an intersessional committee of the Council or a new General Assembly body was the best solution, and that was due to the rigid position adopted by some delegations, which would not help the Council to achieve positive results. The fact was that the majority of Member States, whether or not developing countries, felt that the Council did not adequately represent the membership of the General Assembly, and the problem was really of a political nature.

9. His delegation agreed with Pakistan that it was important to avoid conflict between the proposed intergovernmental committee and other General Assembly bodies, such as the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed. Its terms of reference should therefore be restricted to science and technology in so far as they affected development. It would of course need expert assistance, and the best solution was probably to change the Advisory Committee into a smaller and more flexible body, with *ad hoc* groups to deal with special subjects. Since some of the matters to be dealt with by the new committee would go beyond the scope of the Council, it might be desirable for it to report to the General Assembly through the Council. Such a solution might also perhaps produce a majority decision on the issue or even a consensus in the Council.

10. He agreed with the Yugoslav suggestion to set up an *ad hoc* working group to consider draft terms of reference for the new intergovernmental committee, although such a procedure would turn out to be unnecessary if members of the Council agreed to go to the root of the problem at the current session. He hoped that delegations would continue to hold informal consultations on the subject with a view to reaching an early decision.

11. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) said that the Council was in agreement on one fundamental point: that there was an urgent need for co-ordination of United Nations activities in the field of science and technology. Hence some form of intergovernmental co-ordinating machinery must be established. Moreover, all members of the Council were in duty bound to try to relate programme priorities more closely to the budget. At the outset of the Second Development Decade, it was clear that future demands on the system could not be met if the present organizational fragmentation was allowed to continue.

12. Countries should try to take due account of the political and economic interests of all others and should recognize the need to secure the co-operation of international scientific opinion, without which efforts at the political level would have little significance. With respect to the institutional machinery that would best serve those requirements the goal was clear but the way to reach it strewn with obstacles. Some had proposed the establishment of a standing or intersessional committee of the Council on questions of science and technology because of

the Council's role, under Chapter X of the Charter, as co-ordinator of United Nations activities in the economic, social and related fields. Admittedly, the Council was at present going through a difficult time, but his delegation did not believe that the best interests of Member States would be served by an attempt to divest it of a responsibility which clearly fell within its co-ordinating function. The establishment of such a committee under the Assembly would weaken the Council, perhaps irreparably. Moreover, the Council had already built up a relationship with other intergovernmental bodies and with the specialized agencies which the General Assembly did not have. To give the Council a co-ordinating role in the field of science and technology would hardly be tantamount to bypassing the Assembly, for the Council was required to report to the Assembly. To reverse the process would be to put the cart before the horse. Lastly, any attempt by the Council to improve its organization and effectiveness would be nullified if it was undercut in the field of science and technology. In that respect, he could not help but consider it inconsistent to support, on the one hand, measures to improve the work of the Council and, on the other, to support a proposal that would circumvent the Council in the field of science and technology.

13. His delegation preferred to uphold the Council's role in a field so clearly related to its terms of reference under the Charter and supported the establishment of a standing committee of the Council on science and technology. An advisory body having the necessary technical competence should be associated with the standing committee. His delegation found considerable merit in the suggestion made by the United States delegation that such a body could be composed of panels of experts corresponding to the *ad hoc* working groups of the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development, although it felt that the Advisory Committee itself, with some modifications to its present terms of reference, could also perform that function. The United States proposal could no doubt be somewhat amended in order to reach general agreement. In that connexion, he stressed that the Advisory Committee should remain a subsidiary body of the Council.

14. In his delegation's view, a standing committee of the Council, whose membership need not be restricted to that of the Council, would go far towards meeting the objections to the effect that the Council did not adequately represent the membership of the United Nations. At the same time, its size should not be determined by numerical considerations but by the need for effective performance and real results.

15. The Council should give serious attention to the procedural proposal made by the Yugoslav delegation concerning the establishment of an *ad hoc* working group to consider the scope, terms of reference and composition of the new body on science and technology. The creation of such an interim preparatory body, however, should leave open the options before the Council regarding future institutional arrangements.

16. Mr. QUARONI (Italy) said that his delegation shared the view expressed by those speakers who saw the main problem as one of co-ordinating work that had already been performed or which existing organizations were in the



course of carrying out. At the tenth session of the Trade and Development Board, it had supported the establishment of a new UNCTAD intergovernmental group responsible for the transfer of technology and it believed that a more thorough, specific and perhaps even further-reaching co-ordination process was required in view of the Second Development Decade. It was of paramount importance that a greater number of the less developed countries should have the easiest possible access to the benefits of science and technology.

17. Since the Council's immediate objective was to ensure the application of science and technology to development, his delegation tended to agree that any new body with responsibility in the field should be an organ of the Council. The whole question was, of course, closely linked with the current discussions on the reorganization of the Council the purpose of which was to reinvest it with the prestige and authority in economic and social matters to which it was entitled. The arguments in favour of making the new body dependent upon the General Assembly were unconvincing, and such a procedure would deprive the United Nations of the expertise that the Council was able to contribute as a result of its access to expert bodies and individuals. The General Assembly would be better served if carefully prepared decisions on the more important problems were submitted to it by the Council. He advocated such a procedure not only because it would enhance the Council's prestige but also because it was important that the implications and advantages of developments in science and technology should be evaluated in a serious and effective manner.

18. The question as to whether a sessional or an intersessional committee of the Council was the more appropriate form for the new body to take was one that should be settled, having regard to the requirements of the developing countries. The most flexible solution would be perhaps to combine the two—ending up, by way of compromise, with a body larger than the membership of the Council itself. At present, his delegation had no firm position on the subject.

19. On the other hand, it did see merit in the Yugoslav proposal to set up an *ad hoc* working group to go more thoroughly into the various aspects of the problem. If no solution were found during the current session, it would be essential to ensure that all the necessary groundwork was prepared in time for the fifty-first session.

20. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan), referring to the comments made by the delegations of Greece and France on his own delegation's statement concerning the proposal to establish an intergovernmental committee for science and technology, explained that Pakistan would be quite content for the new body to be a subsidiary organ of the Council rather than of the General Assembly, if there was a genuine willingness to consider the enlargement of the Council's membership. His delegation could not be accused of sophistry, because the two proposals it had made were alternatives, and he hoped that it would be possible for the developed and the developing countries to reach a compromise on the subject. He drew attention to a number of bodies active in the economic and social fields, and dependent either on the General Assembly or the Economic and Social Council, which had larger membership than the

Council itself. That situation appeared to indicate an implicit desire to enlarge the membership of the Council on the ground that the present membership was inadequate to satisfy the aspirations of the developing countries. There were precedents for a total membership of up to 86, without undermining the principle of equitable geographical distribution. When the expansion of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-bed had been discussed, a number of Western countries had argued that a small committee could not deal adequately with the many individual problems that were likely to arise. After protracted negotiations, the Committee had been enlarged to 86 members.

21. There were several other arguments for enlarging the Council. The People's Republic of China, if it became a Member of the United Nations, would surely have to have a seat on the Council. Japan, with the world's third largest gross national product and its promise to contribute 1 per cent of its gross national product in aid by 1975, also deserved representation on a regular basis. It could be argued that the People's Republic of China and Japan should both sit on the Council on a quasi-permanent basis, as was quite rightly the case of the United Kingdom and France. If they did only three seats would remain for the rest of Asia.

22. His delegation was most anxious to strengthen the Council and believe that it would be more dynamic and more efficient with a larger membership. Furthermore, it would remove the need to have discussions about the merits of establishing subsidiary bodies with larger membership than the Council itself. In that connexion the USSR proposal deserved support.

23. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that the representative of Pakistan had raised a number of serious questions concerning subsidiary bodies. He had rightly said that the Council had established a number of subsidiary bodies which were larger than itself, and indeed nothing prevented the Council from establishing bodies composed of more than 27 members which would report through the Council to the General Assembly. If the Council established subsidiary bodies which were not within its administrative jurisdiction and it came to act as a rubber-stamp committee, the enlargement of the Council would become pointless. The correct course would be to strengthen the functional commissions of the Council, by conferring on them the right to establish their own subsidiary bodies. The supporters of an enlargement of the Council would then have created the necessary conditions for such a course. However, if the Council were to establish committees which would report directly to the General Assembly, its own role would decline in importance and it would be impossible to expand the scope of its activities vis-à-vis the General Assembly. There was a contradiction in the arguments used by those who supported an enlargement of the Council between their objective and the means employed to attain that objective. He had therefore used the word "sophistry" to describe those arguments. Since it was generally considered that the Council should be preserved, the Council should establish representative bodies to consider the question of its enlargement, if necessary, as an end in itself and not as a means to an end.

24. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan) agreed that the Council should be strengthened and should establish subsidiary bodies



while the question of enlargement was being considered. A standing committee of the General Assembly had been proposed simply because some delegations had thought that there was no real possibility of enlarging the Council.

25. The PRESIDENT said that, if there was no objection, he would assume that the Council wished to defer taking a decision on the question until a subsequent meeting.

*It was so decided.*

**(b) Application of computer technology to development  
(continued) (E/4800, E/4800/Summary)**

26. Mr. GROS (France) said that his delegation wished to make some observations concerning the principal conclusions and recommendations contained in paragraphs 29 and 30 of document E/4800. There was a need for further explanation of conclusion I and the four recommendations relating to it, which involved action at different levels. Conclusion II was all very well but it was essential that the developing countries should possess the information necessary to attain the objective set forth in it. That fact should be stated explicitly. The establishment of the international advisory board referred to in recommendation 7 would be premature. As paragraph 37 of the report indicated, much more information on computer installations and applications in the developing countries would be needed if a detailed and meaningful picture of the results and needs for the use of electronic computers in accelerating the process of economic and social development was to be achieved. That view had been supported by the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development (ACAST). A second report on the situation of the developing countries was therefore necessary. The Secretariat should also give some clarification of the meaning of the words "be encouraged" in recommendation 8. The "international professional organizations" referred to in recommendation 10 were dominated by the professional organizations of one country. It would be dishonest to establish direct relations with professional organizations which actually represented major international companies. The recommendation should therefore be reworded: technical assistance and information dissemination activities should be conducted through a body such as ACAST, which was composed of independent experts who were not subject to commercial pressures.

27. Mr. GRESFORD (Director for Science and Technology) said that the brisk demand for the report on the application of computer technology for development (E/4800) was indicative of the growing recognition of the importance of the subject. It was therefore all the more essential that the recommendations contained in the report should be sound and capable of producing the desired results.

28. The report was the outcome of considerable efforts by the United Nations, governmental experts, the international professional community and ACAST. Particular care had been devoted to the wording of the report and the judgements expressed in it. Although it was now over one year old, it reflected the best information available at the time of publication. Computer technology was growing

very rapidly and the pace of change could be expected to continue and even accelerate in the future.

29. Reference had been made to the effect of computer technology on employment. Careful consideration had been given to that question in formulating the recommendations contained in the report. Although little conceptual work had been done on the question, the report reflected a close examination of the available material. The *Ad Hoc* Panel of Experts, ACAST and Secretariat all agreed that more work should be done on the question. The Secretariat has been working in close contact with the relevant organizations within the United Nations family and with the international professional organizations referred to by the French representative. In many sectors, the assistance of such organizations was of the greatest importance to the work of the Secretariat. He fully appreciated the reservations expressed by the French representative, but considered that the situation did not call for any formal change of approach. The French representative had suggested that contact with such organizations should be maintained through a body such as ACAST. That course had effectively been followed in the production of the report and all information had been carefully weighed by ACAST and the *Ad Hoc* Panel of Experts.

30. The question of the generation of equipment to be used in the developing countries had also been considered very carefully. It should be pointed out that the respective importance of the topics covered in the report should not be gauged by the number of pages devoted to them. Chapter VII, for instance, although very short, was extremely important.

31. It had been suggested that a specific recommendation should be included in the report for the encouragement of the establishment of independent judgement capability. The establishment of such capability was a theme which underlay the whole report and formed the basis for recommendation 5 in paragraph 29.

32. The international advisory board on the application of computer technology for development referred to in recommendation 7 would require careful study from the point of view of both desirability and feasibility. In that connexion, he drew attention to the views expressed by ACAST as set forth in paragraph 6 of annex II of the report.

33. The answer to the question raised concerning recommendation 8 was to be found in the whole context of the report, which insisted that the developing countries should be encouraged to make the efforts referred to in recommendations 1 to 5 in conjunction with the relevant United Nations agencies.

34. It would be useful to conduct further case studies of particular developing countries, or, alternatively, the Secretary-General might be requested to prepare a further report on the present position of the developing countries on the question. The compilation of that information would make it possible to draw more precise conclusions.

35. At the present time, ACAST considered its work on computer technology as completed. However, in view of



the opinions which had been expressed in the debate, it was clear that computer technologies for developing countries would be an area in which the Council and successors to ACAST would have to devote particular attention in the future.

36. The PRESIDNET declared closed the general debate on the question. Delegations would be free to comment on any draft resolutions that might be submitted.

### AGENDA ITEM 3

#### **Outflow of trained personnel from developing to developed countries (E/4798, E/4820 and Corr.1 and Summary, E/4820/Add.1 and Corr.1, E/4948 and Corr.1, E/L.1379)**

37. Mr. HOWARD (Deputy Director, Social Development Division) said that the report of the Secretary-General (E/4820 and Corr.1) had been prepared with the co-operation of UNITAR, the specialized agencies concerned and other organizations of the United Nations system. The compilation of the report had proved to be a difficult exercise, for reasons well known to the Council. Statistics on the international movement of trained personnel were meagre. There was a lack of statistical data on departures from developing countries; consequently, most studies were based on the immigration statistics available for a few developed countries. The greatest obstacle to a clearer understanding of problems associated with the outflow of trained personnel could be said to be the lack of comprehensive data on return flows. Consequently, it was not now possible to measure the net gains accruing to developed countries from the outflow, on the one hand, and the net losses of developing countries, on the other. There were also substantial differences of opinion concerning the effects of the "brain drain". Such differences arose from the assumptions made in assessing the harmful and beneficial aspects. It had nevertheless been possible to assemble interesting and relevant assessments of the problems associated with the outflow of trained personnel in the five countries covered in the report.

38. The first report on the question,<sup>1</sup> which had provided a very preliminary picture, had been considered by the General Assembly at its twenty-third session. The chief problem faced in the preparation of the first report had been the lack of information concerning the size, composition, causes and consequences of the outflow from the developing countries.

39. In an effort to obtain a more complete picture, the General Assembly, in resolution 2417 (XXIII), had requested the Secretary-General to go beyond the mere use of the very incomplete available sources in clarifying the problem, by carrying out, in consultation with the Governments concerned, selective studies of a few developing countries that were seriously concerned with the "brain drain" problem. In particular, it had been requested that its consequences for the economic development of those countries be assessed and that appropriate recommendations be submitted for practical action to deal with

the problem at both the national and international levels. The recommendations of the Secretary-General were to be compatible with and relevant to the framework of the proposed Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade.

40. As the Council had been informed, the execution of the country studies had been delayed by the difficulty of finding resources with which to finance them. That, in addition to the fact that the report had had to be completed and processed in time for the forty-ninth session of the Council, had allowed very little time for the organization of the field studies, their implementation, the thorough revision required to correct faulty statistics and reconcile inconsistencies, the convening of a meeting of the authors and other experts to discuss the country studies and assess their implications, and the holding of interagency consultations.

41. Although the authors had based their studies on a uniform, detailed outline, their contributions had differed in form and scope; it had therefore been decided to prepare, as the main body of the report, document E/4820 which represented a synthesis of the five country case studies and contained a concluding section of suggestions and recommendations. The individual country studies appeared in summarized form in document E/4820/Add.1 and Corr.1.

42. In the past two years, more extensive work had been undertaken, in particular the survey of the international movement of professionals, which was being conducted by UNITAR. In view of the shortage of data and the complex nature of the problems associated with the outflow, more studies were needed at the national level. During the next few years Governments might wish to assess the nature and consequences of the outflow of trained personnel from their countries. That was particularly urgent if existing problems were to be tackled effectively at all levels. The country studies submitted by the Secretary-General could provide a model for similar studies that would require modest resources and could be carried out in a relatively short period of time. Although the advice of outside experts might be required in some cases for the organization of such studies, the experience of the five country studies now before the Council showed that they could be effectively executed by nationals who had had experience with the problem. The Secretariat would of course provide guidance for the design, organization and implementation of such additional studies.

43. The developed countries could provide resources for research in both the developed and the developing countries. More could be done to identify and analyse the manpower shortfalls in the developed countries in certain categories of professionals and technicians which attracted personnel from the developing countries. Developmental aid could also be increasingly channelled towards the solution of problems which, in part, accounted for the outflow.

44. The report of the Secretary-General indicated that, while there were no simple over-all solutions to the problem, significant progress could be made within the present decade in resolving their more extreme manifesta-

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-third Session, Annexes*, agenda item 47, document A/7294.



tions. Although those problems needed to be tackled on many fronts, there might also be a need for a more active dialogue between national leaders and youth designed to bring about a greater measure of agreement on national goals and objectives with a view to undertaking necessary changes in systems of education and training, manpower utilization and other aspects of national life that were linked to the outflow.

45. Mr. SZALAI (Deputy Director of Research, United Nations Institute for Training and Research) said that the report contained in document E/4948 supplemented that in document E/4798, which had been submitted to the Council at its forty-ninth session. Both reports related to a multinational comparative survey being conducted by UNITAR on the outflow of trained personnel to developed countries.

46. It must be borne in mind that even aggregate statistics concerning the migration of professionals were extremely deficient at the present time. Demographic aggregate statistics were of little use because they could not explain why a certain percentage of persons studying in developed countries decided to remain abroad and why others decided to return to their native countries. Very little was known about the reasons for outflows and return flows. If undue constraints on the free movement of individuals were to be avoided, much more information concerning motives would have to be obtained. Consequently, the UNITAR study differed from previous studies in a number of important respects. It consisted of a questionnaire survey of a large number of persons—students in developed countries, stay-ons, returnees and their employers—and covered five developed countries and fifteen developing countries. UNITAR was grateful to the Governments concerned, which had not only provided assistance, but had also allocated resources to domestic institutions co-operating with UNITAR in conducting research. The survey had covered such questions as the educational history and plans of the individuals concerned, their choice of country, their social and educational life in the countries of study, and the circumstances surrounding students' decisions to return to their native countries. In four countries UNITAR had already completed field work on student and returnee studies. In many others, field work was in progress and covered a large number of people. He hoped that UNITAR would shortly be able to submit an analytical report based on the results of field studies and containing not only statistics, but also an insight into the reasons underlying outflows and return flows. In that regard, UNITAR was endeavouring to fulfil the aims expressed in the relevant Council resolution and the report of the Secretary-General.

47. Mr. LEGNANI (Uruguay) said that the "brain drain", which was a matter of great concern to the developing countries, was largely due to the same causes and had the same effects in all the developing countries. Such factors as unemployment, low wages, the desire for further education, a lack of future prospects, poor conditions of work, inadequate scientific or technical development, insecurity due to social and political upheavals caused the outflow of technical and scientific personnel to countries where more favourable conditions prevailed, and those countries encouraged the "brain drain" in order to fill their own development needs. That created the paradoxical situation

in which the developing countries were subsidizing the development of the developed countries. Although some technicians returned to their countries of origin, or sent remittances home, the outflow of personnel from the economically weakest countries represented a net loss of the resources invested in education and technical training and, hence a stagnation of their development potential.

48. The developing countries could not improve public administration, agriculture, trade or health, nor could they make their industries more productive or increase employment or carry out other measures planned for the Second Development Decade unless they had the necessary know-how, and that presupposed technical training. Attempts to alleviate the problem of outflow of trained personnel from the developing countries would not of course solve all the complex problems of underdevelopment, but they would undoubtedly help.

49. His delegation was opposed to immigration policies which would obstruct the freedom of movement of individuals, since it believed that the right of human beings to move peacefully from one country to another was a basic human right whose exercise, as his country's Constitution provided, should be subject to no restrictions other than those necessary for reasons of health or security. Hence, his delegation would prefer other measures to prevent or remedy the damage caused to the developing countries by the "brain drain".

50. His delegation supported most of the suggestions and recommendations made in the Secretary-General's report but wished to make the following observations. First, an exchange of information among countries about the measures adopted and the results achieved in arresting the "brain drain" would be of great value, and the United Nations should transmit such information to Member States. Secondly, education should be geared to the needs of the country concerned in order to relate training to employment opportunities. Such education could include the scientific and technological knowledge necessary to transform the economic and social sector to which it would be applied. Moreover, an attempt should be made at serious vocational guidance to ensure that individuals found themselves in the most congenial profession. Thirdly, scientists and highly qualified personnel should be encouraged to return to their home countries through special allocations and benefits. Fourthly, technical assistance to developing countries should be increased. Furthermore, instead of being discouraged by the problem of the "brain drain", the developing countries should encourage the training of specialized personnel through the establishment of incentives and good working conditions which would tend to retain those who were best able to contribute to the progress and well-being of the country.

51. Instead of attracting technical and specialized personnel from the developing countries, the developed countries, in which conditions for the training of personnel were most favourable, should provide technical assistance, under the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade (General Assembly resolution 2626 (XXV)), to offset or remove the reason for the migration of technical personnel to the developed countries. Such assistance should be rendered through



United Nations agencies. The developing countries should be informed of how and where they should apply for such assistance and the conditions on which it was granted.

52. The most effective measures to combat the "brain drain" were laid down in the Strategy for the Second Development Decade. If the industrialized countries diverted the resources they were now spending on armaments to development on a world scale, the gap between the developed and the developing countries could be reduced and the world's unity restored.

53. His delegation would support any draft resolution compatible with the ideas he had put forward in order to staunch the "brain drain" from the developing countries and to stimulate the training of a larger number of technicians in such countries.

54. Mr. FILIMONOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that his delegation had explained in detail its position on the Secretary-General's report on the "brain drain" (E/4820 and Add.1) at the forty-ninth session.<sup>2</sup> However, despite the interesting reports prepared for the Council's present session and the great amount of work that had been done on the question, his delegation nevertheless felt that the Council did not yet have sufficient material for a thorough appraisal of the problem. The Secretary-General's report contained new data on the damage done to the developing countries as a result of the "brain drain": it showed that the proportion of non-returnees to the five developing countries studied was very high, and that the outflow of trained personnel amounted to an average of from 20 to 30 per cent with the highest percentage occurring among scientists, engineers, doctors and junior medical personnel.

55. The outflow from the developing countries could not be considered a normal phenomenon resulting from the operation of the laws of supply and demand. It could hardly be regarded as normal when a country having a low national income and limited resources made great efforts to train the personnel it needed only to lose them to another country with a high national income, large capital resources and a trained labour force. His delegation hoped that the study being prepared by UNITAR would make good the deficiency of the Secretary-General's report, which gave no information on the enticement of the developing countries' specialists by Western countries.

56. In appraising the effects of the "brain drain", it should be kept in mind that it had both short- and long-term effects. A committee of the United States Congress had come to the conclusion that migration did no short-term damage to developing countries but could have very serious long-range effects. At the present time the developing

countries, particularly because of inadequacies in their system of planning, were sometimes unable to use all their specialists. Since most development plans were long-range, the "brain drain" could seriously undermine their implementation. There could be no question that the "brain drain" was slowing down the economic development of the developing countries.

57. It was sometimes said that some Western countries also suffered from the "brain drain", but a distinction had to be made between real damage and losses which could be made up. The economically developed countries had financial and other resources to compensate for the loss of their scientific and technical personnel, who were often replaced by experts from the developing countries. The developing countries had no such reserves.

58. In his delegation's view, the Council's recommendations on the problem should not be addressed only to developing countries; the developed capitalist countries should also be asked to take serious action. For example, the immigration laws in those countries favoured the entry of foreign technicians. Even a former United States Secretary of State had once said that, skilfully directed, immigration could be one of the most important resources of the nation.

59. His delegation had submitted the draft resolution (E/L.1379) to the Council at its forty-ninth session and was resubmitting it to the present session, as it had lost none of its topicality. The draft resolution called for a study of the dimensions of the influx of foreign specialists from the developing countries to the developed capitalist countries and also for an assessment of the advantages those countries derived from their employment. In his delegation's opinion, the Council should state that every developing country which suffered loss through the outflow of trained personnel to developed countries was entitled to compensation from the developed countries concerned for the economic loss caused by that process. That question was not of course a simple one and it undoubtedly required further study by the United Nations and specialized agencies. For example, as one United States professor had said, there were many ways in which such compensation could be made: through subsidies to the developing countries; through increased assistance to education in such countries; and through temporary supplemental technical assistance. Moreover, some States of the United States were being compensated, in the form of tax abatements, for population loss caused by migration to other States. That principle could well be applied to developing countries. In his delegation's view, the adoption of the draft resolution would be a substantial contribution to the fulfilment of the objectives of the Second United Nations Development Decade.

<sup>2</sup> E/AC.6/SR.518.





## ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Fiftieth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

1757th meeting

Monday, 10 May 1971,  
at 3.10 p.m.

NEW YORK

*President: Mr. Rachid DRISS (Tunisia).*

## AGENDA ITEM 9

Transport development (*continued*):

- (a) Establishment of a United Nations transport centre (*continued*)\* (E/4964 and Add.1-4, E/4989, chap. VIII, E/L.1381);
- (b) Preparation for a United Nations/IMCO Conference on International Container Traffic (*continued*)\*\* (E/4963, E/L.1380, E/L.1388, E/L.1391/Rev.1/Add.1, E/L.1391/Rev.2, E/L.1393/Rev.1, E/L.1394, E/L.1398)

1. The PRESIDENT said that since no draft resolutions relating to the establishment of a United Nations Transport Centre had been submitted as yet, there did not seem to be any reason to continue the debate.

2. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil), supported by Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya), said that the representatives of the developing countries had said they favoured the establishment of the proposed centre and should be given more time to prepare a draft resolution.

3. The PRESIDENT suggested that 6 p.m. on Tuesday, 11 May, should be set as the deadline for the submission of draft resolutions on the item.

*It was so decided.*

4. The PRESIDENT said that the general debate on the preparation for a Conference on International Container Traffic had been concluded and invited members of the Council to state their views first on the amendments and then on the text of the draft resolution itself (E/L.1391/Rev.2). The Council should begin by considering the amendments submitted by the United Kingdom (E/L.1393/Rev.1).

5. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) said that the scope of the proposed TCM Convention was much broader than that of the United Nations/IMCO Conference on International Container Traffic. Moreover, the proposed study would deal with extremely varied aspects of the economic implications which the TCM Convention would have for the developing countries. His delegation could not therefore accept the amendments submitted by the United Kingdom (E/L.1393/Rev.1) any more than it could accept the one submitted by the Soviet Union (E/L.1398).

6. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) said that the new paragraph proposed by his delegation for the end of the

preamble contained only a factual statement. The new operative paragraph was designed to prevent the Conference from being hampered by delay in the preparation of the study on the economic implications of the proposed TCM Convention.

7. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the draft resolution dealt with a question of substance that was important for international co-operation: the Conference on International Container Traffic which the Council had decided to organize by a unanimous decision of all its members, including the USSR. Container traffic was a technological innovation that was important for international co-operation. Draft resolution E/L.1391/Rev.2 did not take account of the opinion expressed by two important bodies, UNCTAD and IMCO. In view of the importance of the TCM Convention, those two organizations had said that there was an urgent need for a study of the economic implications of the Convention. They had also stressed that the study was necessary in connexion with the preparations for the Conference. His delegation supported that point of view.

8. The amendments proposed by the United Kingdom were intended precisely to eliminate any tendentious or one-sided aspects of the draft resolution and took account of the wishes of UNCTAD and IMCO. If those amendments were adopted, his delegation was prepared to withdraw its amendment. The draft resolution submitted by Brazil, the United States of America and New Zealand did not seem to provide an adequate basis for the preparations for the Conference.

9. His delegation also wished to point out that the submission of the draft resolution had given rise to a flagrant violation of the rules of procedure. In accordance with rule 75 of the rules of procedure of the Economic and Social Council, any Member of the United Nations, invited to participate in the deliberations of the Council on any matter which the Council considered was of particular concern to that Member, could submit proposals which could be put to the vote by request of any member of the Council. The rules of procedure of the Economic and Social Council did not, however, contain provisions giving observers the right to join in sponsoring draft resolutions of any kind.

10. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) recalled that, at the 1749th meeting when the decision had been taken to request the Legal Counsel's opinion on the question, he had expressed the wish that the views of the Secretary-General should be communicated in writing to the Council. His delegation favoured the active participation of observers in the work of the Council, but in the present instant it shared the view of the Soviet representative. It would be inconvenient now to change the heading of the draft, but the

\* Resumed from the 1752nd meeting.

\*\* Resumed from the 1755th meeting.



Council should reconsider the matter later. His delegation endorsed the amendments proposed by the United Kingdom. The Brazilian representative seemed to go too far in his defense of the draft which he had joined in sponsoring. It was not a vital matter for the developing countries if changes were made in a few paragraphs. The first United Kingdom amendment merely stated a fact, while the proposed new operative paragraph made a proposal which a number of delegations regarded as logical and sensible.

11. Mr. PATAKI (Hungary) endorsed the United Kingdom amendments and said that the reasons advanced for deferring consideration of the preliminary draft of a Convention on the International Combined Transport of Goods did not seem convincing. Moreover, adoption of the draft resolution without change would set a dangerous precedent.

12. The PRESIDENT invited the members of the Council to vote on the United Kingdom amendments (E/L.1393/Rev.1).

*The United Kingdom amendments (E/L.1393/Rev.1) were rejected by 9 votes to 8, with 3 abstentions.*

13. Mr. KOEHRING (United States of America) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote because, unlike other delegations, it did not see a direct relation between the study on the economic implications of the TCM Convention and the Conference. However, that did not mean that it wished the study to be delayed in any way; it hoped that it would be completed as soon as possible.

14. The PRESIDENT invited the members of the Council to vote on the amendment submitted by the Soviet Union (E/L.1398).

*The USSR amendment (E/L.1398) was rejected by 8 votes to 7, with 3 abstentions.*

15. The PRESIDENT invited the members of the Council to vote on the draft resolution (E/L.1391/Rev.2).

16. Mr. MCCARTHY (United Kingdom) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution, in view of its importance, but with the reservations which it had already indicated.

*The draft resolution (E/L.1391/Rev.2) was adopted by 19 votes to 2.*

17. Mr. HEDEMANN (Norway) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the United Kingdom and USSR amendments because it was afraid that there might be a delay in the study on the economic implications of the TCM Convention which had been requested by UNCTAD and IMCO. Since the sponsors had agreed to take certain amendments into account in their draft resolution, his delegation had voted in favour of it. The convening of the Conference should help to increase the efficiency of international transport and to promote international relations.

18. Mr. PRAGUE (France) said that the fact that India and Chile were among the sponsors of draft resolution

E/L.1391/Rev.2 could not be interpreted as resulting from a decision of the Council based on the provisions of rule 75 of the rules of procedure. It had merely been decided to accede to the wishes of those two delegations to become sponsors.

19. His delegation had supported the draft resolution without enthusiasm because it considered that the financial implications were excessive and were out of proportion to the usefulness of the results that the proposed procedure could be expected to yield. His delegation had taken note of the assurance given to the Council by the Secretariat that the study would be ready by March 1972 at the latest.

20. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) fully shared the views expressed by the representative of Norway speaking in explanation of vote. Despite the defects in the draft resolution, his delegation had deemed it essential to vote in favour of it in view of the importance of the question.

21. On the other hand, in the view of his delegation, the mention of Chile and India in the subheading of the draft resolution could not be regarded as constituting a precedent.

22. Mr. QUARONI (Italy) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution but that it objected to the inclusion of Chile and India in the list of sponsors. His delegation associated itself with those delegations which had emphasized that it involved no decision of principle by the Council which could be invoked as a precedent.

23. The PRESIDENT invited the members of the Council to state their views on paragraphs 7 and 8 of the note by the Secretary-General (E/4963) relating to potential participants in the United Nations/IMCO Conference.

24. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), noting that some very important international conferences, including the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, would be held shortly, said that it was important that all interested States without exception should be able to participate in those conferences and that it was therefore time that the Council and other United Nations organs considered the question realistically and refrained from any discriminatory practices. That would mark a decisive step towards international co-operation. Paragraph 7 of the note of the Secretary-General (E/4963) was discriminatory in the sense that it excluded from the potential participants in the Conference a State such as the German Democratic Republic which played a very important role in the industrial field. That view was held not only by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and it was based on current realities.

25. Mr. PATAKI (Hungary) said that his delegation, which had already explained its position on the problem during the general debate, could not accept the tenor of paragraph 7.

26. Mr. PRAGUE (France) said that he had no comment to make regarding the suggestions in paragraph 7.

27. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece), observing that the USSR and Hungarian delegations objected to paragraph 7 because

it did not take account of the principle of universality, said he thought it was for other organs and not the Economic and Social Council to solve the question since it was a political question. He was in favour of the formula proposed by the Secretary-General.

28. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) and Mr. KOEHRING (United States of America) subscribed to the views expressed by the representatives of France and Greece.

29. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to adopt the recommendations of the Secretary-General, taking into account the reservations formulated by some delegations.

30. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked for a separate vote on paragraph 7 which contained a discriminatory formula.

31. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that it was the Council's practice to take note of notes by the Secretary-General and not to adopt them. The purpose of the note in question was to guide the Council in its consideration of the matter.

32. The PRESIDENT pointed out that in paragraph 7 the Council was expressly invited to "take a decision" on the question.

33. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) drew the attention of the representative of Greece to the tenor of paragraph 7 and asked for a separate vote on that paragraph. The Council had to take a decision since it was important that the illogical attitude shown by some delegations towards the German Democratic Republic should be clearly demonstrated.

34. The PRESIDENT wondered whether it would not be better if the Council took a decision on the basis of a specific text. He asked the Secretary for his views on that point.

35. Mr. AHMED (Secretary of the Council) said that the Council was free to take a decision on the matter. The Council could vote on a text which might state that all States Members of the United Nations or members of the specialized agencies or the International Atomic Energy Agency and, in an advisory capacity, the specialized agencies and also, as observers, interested intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations having consultative status with the Council or having consultative status or special working arrangements with IMCO, should be invited to the Conference.

36. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he would like to have the Secretariat's formula submitted to the Council in writing.

37. The PRESIDENT asked whether or not the Council was prepared to take a decision.

38. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that in his view the best solution would be for the Council to take note of the note by the Secretary-General and for delegations which had formulated objections to submit a draft resolution.

39. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that at the following meeting his delegation would submit a draft resolution relating to paragraph 7.

✓ 40. Mr. KOEHRING (United States of America), referring to operative paragraphs 6 and 7 of draft resolution E/L.1391/Rev.2, which the Council had just adopted, said he wished to draw attention to and endorse the earlier statement of the representative of the Secretary-General, in connexion with the financial implications of those paragraphs, in which he said the Secretariat would do everything possible to provide the services within available resources.

*The meeting rose at 4.35 p.m.*





*President: Mr. Rachid DRISS (Tunisia).*

### AGENDA ITEM 8

#### Natural resources:

#### (a) Report of the Committee on Natural Resources (E/4969, E/4989, chap. VI, sect. C; E/L.1399)

1. Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya) pointed out that it was an error that the name of the Soviet Union appeared in document E/L.1399.
2. The Council had created by resolution 1535 (XLIX) of 27 July 1970 the Committee on Natural Resources in recognition of the great importance of that question for development, particularly that of the developing countries. The utilization of natural resources should be based on certain principles; firstly, raw materials should be processed more fully in the developing countries themselves rather than being exported to developed countries in the raw state. That was actually the only way for States to exercise permanent sovereignty over their resources. In that regard, attention should be paid to the need for interregional co-operation for natural resources development. Lastly, emphasis should be laid on the importance of multipurpose development, as in the case of river basin development not only for irrigation, but also for the production of power.
3. Although some might consider that the work of the Committee on Natural Resources at its first session had not been very encouraging because it had had to feel its way, it had nevertheless taken some extremely important decisions, particularly with regard to establishing a revolving fund, convening an international water conference and setting up natural resources advisory services. In that regard the Committee had decided to recommend that the Council approve the proposal of the Secretary-General for the setting up of advisory services and further recommended that the concept be broadened to accept the offers made by delegations in the course of the debate (see E/4969, para. 107). He, being the Chairman of the Committee on Natural Resources, hoped that the Council would approve the proposal and endorse the idea of broadening the concept of advisory services by including any experts made available by States Members of the United Nations and not only those made available by the United Nations.
4. As was stated in paragraph 112 of its report, the Committee on Natural Resources had agreed to the setting up of an intergovernmental working group consisting of 15 members to work out the details of the United Nations revolving fund for natural resources exploration. His delegation welcomed that decision and hoped that the Council would view it favourably. Developing countries needed the international community to help them by providing the technical know-how which they lacked in order to accelerate the exploration and exploitation of their resources.
5. The proposal to hold an international water conference in 1975 had received wide support in the Committee on Natural Resources and the Government of Argentina had offered to host the conference. In accordance with paragraph 53 of the report, he suggested that the Secretary-General should work out the details of the conference before the second session of the Committee.
6. One particular reason why the Committee had encountered certain difficulties during its first session was that there was no clear definition of natural resources. It had therefore requested the Secretariat to prepare a number of studies (see paras. 94, 98 and 149) which would be important elements at the second session. For its part, the Kenyan delegation tended to favour as broad a definition as possible but had no firm opinion in that regard.
7. As had been pointed out by the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination, the Committee on Natural Resources should play a definite central role in assisting the Council in the formulation of natural resources policies and work programmes and should plan its work with a view to drawing up short-term and medium-term work programmes.
8. His delegation welcomed the fact that the Committee on Natural Resources had emphasized training and the transfer of technology in the field of natural resources. The developing countries did indeed lack qualified personnel and needed the assistance of the United Nations family of organizations. Since progress in the developing countries depended to a large extent on their ability to exploit their own resources, it was to be hoped that, at its next session, the Committee would be able to assume its full role as co-ordinating organ of the United Nations in the field of natural resources exploration and exploitation.
9. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) said that for many developing countries, despite difficulties they might experience, natural resources were an invaluable asset, and they must see to it that their permanent sovereignty over the resources was recognized. The international community had an important role to play in assisting the developing countries to utilize their resources. Recognition of the importance of the three main sectors—water resources, mineral resources and energy resources—had led the United Nations to establish in 1970 the Committee on Natural Resources.
10. The results of the first session of the Committee had been somewhat disappointing, mainly because the Committee had been feeling its way. Although delegations had agreed on the main objectives, they had held divergent

views regarding priorities. A working group had endeavoured to draw up broad guidelines within the framework of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade (General Assembly resolution 2626 (XXV)), but the consensus which it had reached had unfortunately not been considered by the Committee as a whole.

11. In the field of programming, the Committee had been presented with an unusual number of proposals, some of which had been based on politically unacceptable concepts, such as truly colonialist schemes for the intercontinental transfer of energy. Others had reflected a juridical approach of doubtful value and some had even manifested a dangerous tendency to interfere in the internal affairs of States. The initiative must clearly be left to the countries concerned.

12. The proposal to organize an international water conference in 1975 was one example of the faulty juridical approach taken by the Resources and Transport Division, which had been pointed out in the report of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (see E/4989, para. 65). In the view of his delegation, the conference was undesirable because of the activities already taking place or projected in related fields such as the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, the sectoral approach which prevailed in matters concerning water development and the essentially regional character of such questions. At best it would be a conference on generalities.

13. As a result of the defects in the proposals submitted to it, the Committee on Natural Resources had not been able to make any recommendations on possible programmes and had decided to revert to the matter at its second session. Until basic principles had been formulated and proposals evaluated at the technical level, CPC and the Council would not be able to act on medium- or long-term programmes in the field of natural resources. The best that could be hoped for was that when the Secretary-General drafted the 1972 work programme for the economic, social and related fields, he would take due account, where natural resources were concerned, of the comments made and the views and criticisms expressed on the various proposals both at the first session of the Committee on Natural Resources and at the eighth session of CPC (see E/4989, para. 67). In the meantime, it would seem only logical for the Secretary-General to avoid any proposal which had already proved controversial.

14. In short, he was sorry to say that the projects and objectives contained in the proposals had not been related to a set of priorities or to a rational plan. In some cases, moreover, the practical application of new technologies to development and the performance of research had been confused. Although research was highly desirable, it could not be carried out with the meagre resources of the Organization. Worse still, legal misconceptions permeated some of the proposals. There had been a lack of planning, and the basic role of the United Nations in the field of natural resources had often been misconstrued.

15. Mr. PRAGUE (France) said that, despite the voluminous documentation prepared by the Secretariat and the enlightened leadership provided by the Chairman of the

Committee on Natural Resources, the Committee, as was to be expected at its first session, had not been able to find a middle ground between the general and the particular.

16. The Committee had not been able to avoid the hazards of being too general. Too often it had lingered over purely political considerations and had held rather lengthy discussions on the principle of permanent sovereignty over natural resources. Since his delegation had, at the request of the Secretary-General, been composed of experts who did not consider their task to be purely a political one, it had not participated in those discussions. He hoped that the Committee would gradually move away from political considerations since it had more useful work to do in other areas.

17. The Committee had also succumbed to the dangers of being too particular. As had been pointed out by the representative of the Netherlands, the Committee on Natural Resources should not be looked upon as the governing body of one division of the Secretariat with the sole function of approving that division's work programme. There were procedures within the United Nations by which Governments could familiarize themselves with the work programmes of divisions of the Secretariat and express their views on them. It would be detrimental to the smooth functioning of the Organization for each division to attempt to set up its own individual parliament which would be predisposed to support its views. It was for CPC and the Economic and Social Council to approve the Secretariat's work programme. The Committee on Natural Resources had a different function. Steering a course between policy considerations and work programmes, the Committee should seek to define directions of work and over-all priorities applicable to all United Nations institutions working in the field of natural resources and not just those of the Resources and Transport Division.

18. Therein lay the main failing of the documentation submitted to the Committee at its first session. By focusing on the work programme of the Resources and Transport Division, it had not afforded a broad view of the work being done by the rest of the United Nations family. That error should be corrected at the next session.

19. Because it had not been able to take a comprehensive view of the question, the Committee had wandered in a maze of individual projects. An attempt had been made to remedy the situation by setting up a working group under the chairmanship of the representative of the Netherlands, which had tried to extract some priorities and broad objectives. Unfortunately, the Committee had not thought it possible to endorse the conclusions reached by the working group and had deferred their consideration to its second session, at which time his delegation hoped they could be adopted.

20. If the Committee was to carry out its task and form an accurate conception of all the work done by the Organization, it would probably be necessary for it in future to confine its agenda for each session to one clearly defined subject. It would be foolhardy to attempt to consider all the work of the Organization at each session. The Committee should specialize and should concentrate at each session on one of the three broad sectors coming within its



purview. If an urgent problem arose in another sector, the Committee could of course always turn to it. If it was decided to specialize in that way, less time might be left between sessions than originally envisaged. If the Committee did not specialize, it would not be necessary to tighten its schedule, and for that reason his delegation had reservations as to the advisability of holding the next session in February 1972, which would be less than one year after the first session.

21. Two decisions had been adopted at the past session. First, the Committee had decided that special advisory services should be set up. His delegation had not shared the majority view on that matter. It had not considered it wise to take a final decision on a problem which chiefly concerned UNDP, the more so when that decision ran counter to the view expressed by the UNDP Administration. A better understanding of UNDP's opposition to the creation of such services was needed. However, his delegation was not adverse to the principle behind the decision. The new way of deploying experts could be adopted as an experiment for a certain time, after which a final decision could be taken on the basis of the experience gained and the views of UNDP. It was inaccurate to speak of the "establishment" of special advisory services since there was no question of creating them but rather of a more flexible deployment of experts already recruited for short-term assignments.

22. Secondly, the Committee had decided to support the establishment of a revolving fund. His delegation was aware of theoretical and practical difficulties connected with the Fund's establishment. The preassignment of funds to a given sector ran counter to the reforms recently adopted by UNDP. It was also hard to see when and for which project a country would be obliged to pay a portion of the profits from a given project into the revolving fund. His delegation favoured the establishment of a working group to study those matters and was prepared to participate actively in its work.

23. Mr. OGISO (Observer for Japan), speaking at the invitation of the President, recalled that the exploration and development of natural resources were a decisive factor in the economic and social development of developing countries, which, in turn, was dependent on the expansion of the world economy as a whole. Due attention should be paid to the links between the natural resources development and the growth of the world economy.

24. It would be useful if, as suggested in paragraph 65 of the report of CPC on its eighth session (E/4989), documentation for future sessions of the Committee on Natural Resources could be presented in a more rational and systematic manner, with due regard to the time element and the need for presentation of financial implications. His delegation hoped that the Committee would in future concentrate on matters of high priority.

25. The Committee should take into account studies carried out by other United Nations bodies and agencies. He welcomed its recommendation that the Council should approve the proposal to set up special advisory services. It should be possible to utilize not only United Nations experts but also those placed at the disposal of the United Nations by individual countries.

26. The proposal to establish a United Nations revolving fund for natural resources exploration was a very complex question and his delegation had already explained its position in detail. He was glad that the Committee had agreed to set up an intergovernmental working group to consider the question and hoped that the group would consider both the proposals submitted by the Secretariat and other proposals, so that it could work out acceptable arrangements. The Committee was to consider the working group's proposals at its second session and the Council should wait until that session had been held before taking up the question.

27. Mr. LOUYA (Democratic Republic of the Congo) congratulated the Committee on Natural Resources and its Chairman on the high quality of the work it had done. In years to come the Committee would undoubtedly justify the hopes developing countries placed in it. His country attached great importance to international co-operation in the sphere of natural resources. Older technology had been made uneconomic by recent advances, and the new technology extended beyond the confines of national sovereignty. Many problems were universal and required the international community to make a periodic appraisal of the general situation in order to ascertain the requirements of international co-operation and to stimulate development at the national and regional levels. The United Nations had an important part to play in developing and marketing natural resources, and in their conservation and the protection of the environment. It should study ways of helping developing countries to make an inventory of their resources. Furthermore, the United Nations and, in general, all the organs and agencies concerned, such as UNDP, UNIDO and IBRD, should give developing countries increased aid for establishing new geological research institutes and strengthening those already in existence. The time had come for action to enable the developing countries themselves fully to develop their natural resources; it was regrettable that, with their vast untapped resources, they were unable to exploit them through lack of capital and technical facilities.

28. Water resources were of vital importance to the well-being of humanity. The research being done on the subject seemed inadequate and he therefore supported the idea of convening an international water conference in 1975. The objectives of the conference should, however, be clearly defined.

29. The intensification of the activities of the United Nations system in the sphere of natural resources justified the establishment of a United Nations revolving fund for the exploration of natural resources.

30. He hoped the Council would approve the report of the Committee on Natural Resources without reservation.

31. Mr. GEOGHEGAN (United Nations Development Programme) said, on the subject of the special advisory services, that similar services were already being provided by experts serving on short-term missions in different countries under preparatory aid arrangements made and financed by UNDP, as reflected in the report of the Committee on Natural Resources (see E/4969, para. 106). The proposed decision called for agreement of the countries



concerned and, in the case of UNDP financed projects, of the Administrator. Accordingly, it was believed possible to work out arrangements to the satisfaction of those concerned. The details were not clear to UNDP and he hoped they would be clarified at the working level. Details could, however, probably be worked out between the Secretariats and would necessarily include arrangements to adjust individual country programme figures. The Office of the Controller might also have to be consulted. Thereafter, certain details which could not yet be forecast would have to be agreed with recipient Governments.

32. The Administrator of UNDP looked forward to consulting with the proposed intergovernmental working group on the revolving fund. He had certain views and comments, and he would like to make them known in the appropriate way.

33. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) congratulated the Committee on Natural Resources on its work and hoped it would continue to function satisfactorily. Some delegations had expressed their disappointment with the outcome of the Committee's work. However, it should be remembered that the session had been the Committee's first and that natural resources problems were very complex and involved scientific, technical and political issues. The representatives of Brazil and France had rightly pointed out that the Committee had had before it a huge volume of documents, information, draft decisions and proposals. He also congratulated the Secretariat on its work. Nevertheless, he said some proposals had been submitted prematurely or had been inadequately prepared. The composition of most delegations had been very representative. If the Committee had run into difficulties, the reason was that the Secretariat had not had time to study in depth the different proposals submitted to the Committee. There were grounds for optimism, however, in the proof the members of the Committee and its Chairman had given of their competence.

34. The USSR had a special interest in the international co-operation in the utilization of natural resources for the welfare of mankind. In the matter of exploring and developing national natural resources, the USSR itself could very well be considered a developing country: one needed only to mention the extent of the resources constantly being discovered in Siberia. The USSR was trying to exploit its own resources and at the same time to help other countries to develop their natural wealth. At the Twenty-fourth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mr. Brezhnev had stressed the importance of international co-operation in prospecting for and utilizing natural resources. Specific proposals had been submitted and the Congress had been greatly concerned with organizing international co-operation, particularly at the European level. For example, there had been a proposal to establish a European electric power network. Co-operation also involved many other countries. The earth was a small planet and its resources were very limited. It was the duty of all to establish effective international co-operation in the rational exploitation of natural resources and in the struggle against waste and the consequences of uncontrolled exploitation.

35. His delegation strongly opposed the view expressed by a number of delegations of Western countries that discus-

sions in the Committee should not deal with the political aspects of international co-operation in the utilization of natural resources and that the Committee should be a purely technical body composed entirely of technical experts. That position did not reflect the true state of affairs, since the question of natural resources, particularly in regard to the prospects for the economic development of the developing countries, could not be reduced to its technical aspects alone. It was a complex political question which embraced the areas of politics, economics and law. Even the question of inalienable sovereignty over natural resources, which some delegations sought to depict as purely political in nature, was essentially an important, complex problem with political, economic, scientific, technical and legal aspects. The Committee on Natural Resources should definitely give those various aspects its most urgent consideration. It was clear that satisfactory arrangements should be concluded between the developed countries and the developing countries whose natural resources they helped to develop. Countries in which foreign capital was invested for the exploitation of their natural resources should derive the maximum benefit from such capital. His own Government proposed to expand still further the technical assistance which it provided to developing countries, including that for the exploration and exploitation of mineral resources. Although his country lacked sufficient technicians to meet its own needs, it had increased the assistance which it provided without cost to the developing countries: it had, for instance, helped to train in geology more than 20,000 technicians in 22 African and Asian countries. Pakistan, in particular, had used the services of USSR experts in its petroleum exploration operations. The Committee on Natural Resources could usefully study the type of assistance provided by a socialist country to the developing countries.

36. His Government thought that the proposal to establish a revolving fund was excellent and had supported it in the Committee. His country had, however, refused to participate in the intergovernmental working group which was to consider the financial aspects of the proposal and in particular the question of the profit to be made from exploration projects, because it had never itself profited from the assistance which it provided for such work. His delegation considered that the establishment of special natural resources advisory services would be a waste of resources, because there was no need for such services.

37. Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) observed that it was difficult to produce new ideas and even more so to ensure that they were accepted from the outset. The task of the Committee on Natural Resources had been complicated by the confused documentation and the failure of the Secretariat to exercise selectivity with regard to the problems which had been assigned to it. Despite those difficulties, his delegation was convinced, given the obvious soundness of the Committee's aims, that the situation could be remedied.

38. He was gratified that the principle of self-help had been taken into account in the plans for the establishment of a revolving fund for natural resources exploration and therefore approved its establishment, on condition that the sources of finance and the amounts to be repaid were specified. His delegation thought it best not to have the fund financed by voluntary contributions. In its view, the



developed countries, too, should contribute to the financing of the new fund, as should foreign private companies involved in the exploration or exploitation of resources, in view of the fact that they made sizable profits from such operations.

39. As to the special natural resources advisory services, the proper course might be to expand UNDP's activities in that field which had been described earlier by the representative. In any event, the proposed advisory services should complement and not supersede current activities.

40. The organization of an international water conference should not lead to duplication of the forthcoming United Nations Conference on the Human Environment; that was why the Committee was required to define and consider in detail the purposes of the proposed meeting.

41. His delegation approved the decision, mentioned in paragraph 98 of the report of the Committee on Natural Resources (E/4969), to request the Secretary-General, in collaboration with the organs of the United Nations system concerned, to prepare a report on the operational activities of the United Nations system in the field of natural resources development for the second session of the Committee. Paragraph 149 of the report covered the French representative's comments on the Committee's difficulties as a result of the lack of information.

42. His delegation was convinced that the Committee and the Resources and Transport Division could do valuable work although their activities should in future be guided by the rational utilization of human and natural resources.

43. Mr. LA PORTA (United States of America) said that although his delegation was not a member of the Committee on Natural Resources it viewed its work with great interest, because the Committee was an important body with a responsibility to provide general guidance for United Nations activities in the field in question, including the function of identifying areas of desired programme emphasis.

44. His Government concurred with the comments of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination on the work of the Committee on Natural Resources and believed it essential that the latter should concentrate at its second session on the formulation of a work programme which stated an order of priorities and was accompanied by a full explanation of its financial implications.

45. In addition, CPC and the Economic and Social Council should have an opportunity to review the full work programme of the Resources and Transport Division together with precise financial implications and projections for the future, if possible.

46. He endorsed the comments of CPC on the question of special advisory services. However, further details should be provided on the mode of operation of the services and their implications for similar services already provided by the United Nations system, particularly with respect to UNDP. Accordingly, the Council should defer approval of the proposal, even in principle, until full details, including the financial implications, were available and the relevant arrangements had been worked out with UNDP. Those arrangements should be examined by the Governing Council of UNDP and the Council.

47. With regard to the establishment of a revolving fund, his delegation awaited the report of the intergovernmental working group of the Committee on Natural Resources which was to consider in detail the administrative, institutional and financial aspects of the proposal and, in the interim, would appreciate the views of the UNDP Governing Council on its implications for UNDP policy and operations.

**(b) International co-operation in cartography (E/4943 and Add.1)**

48. The PRESIDENT said that under the agenda item the Council had before it the report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Sixth United Nations Regional Cartographic Conference for Asia and the Far East, held at Teheran from 24 October to 7 November 1970 (E/4943) and the administrative and financial implications of the proposals in that report (E/4943/Add.1).

49. The Council would take up the item when the New Zealand delegation had introduced the draft resolution which it was preparing.

*Organization of work*

50. The PRESIDENT said that, if there was no objection, the time-limits for the submission of draft resolutions would be the following: for item 11 (a): Wednesday, 12 May at 6 p.m.; for items 8 (a) and (b): Thursday, 13 May at 3 p.m.; and for item 16: Friday, 14 May at 6 p.m.

*The meeting rose at 5.40 p.m.*





## ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Fiftieth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Wednesday, 12 May 1971,  
at 10.45 a.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Rachid DRISS (Tunisia).

## AGENDA ITEM 3

**Outflow of trained personnel from developing to developed countries (continued)\* (E/4798, E/4820 and Corr.1 and Summary, E/4820/Add.1 and Corr.1, E/4948 and Corr.1, E/L.1379)**

1. Mr. PATAKI (Hungary) said that his delegation had found the reports of the Secretary-General (E/4820 and Corr.1 and Add.1 and Corr.1) and the Executive Director of UNITAR (E/4948 and Corr.1) very useful. If any doubt remained about the importance of the problem or its significance to the developing countries, it should be dispelled by the figures quoted in the study entitled *Emigration of Highly Skilled Manpower from the Developing Countries*<sup>1</sup> made by UNITAR in 1970, one of the conclusions of which was that some 100,000 experts and professionals from the developing countries were working in developed countries, while roughly the same number of highly trained persons from the developed countries were working in the developing countries. While it was true that those workers were not necessarily equivalent in terms of training or working in the same fields of activity, the figure provided ample grounds for presuming that much waste and duplication could be avoided. It also tended to contradict the view expressed in the Secretary-General's report that the lack of absorptive capacity of the developing countries, in terms of economic demand and manpower policies, was the cause of the problem of the "brain drain".

2. His delegation could not agree that major responsibility for stopping the "brain drain" rested with the developing rather than the developed countries. Although the developed countries disclaimed responsibility for the problem, which they felt resulted from the play of economic laws impelling trained persons to move to areas where better incentives and a demand for their services existed, those countries did not follow the same reasoning with respect to the free flow of unskilled labour. Moreover, the very concept of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade (General Assembly resolution 2626 (XXV)) implied that the economic future of the developing countries could not be left to the play of free market forces. His country therefore supported the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union delegation (E/L.1379), the adoption of which, it felt, would bring the developing countries closer to realizing the goals and objectives of the Second Development Decade.

3. Although it was true that at some points in the history of human civilization certain urban cultural centres had tended to act as a magnet for migration, it was also true that no country could prosper unless it made full use of its own intellectual capacities and no country could be expected to sacrifice its own interests to a historical phenomenon of limited significance. Solutions to the new and unprecedented problems involved in the "brain drain" must be found in accordance with the needs of the modern world.

4. Mr. ORČIĆ (Yugoslavia) expressed his delegation's satisfaction with the reports submitted on the subject under consideration and noted that the findings of the studies on certain countries in the Secretary-General's report (E/4820/Add.1 and Corr.1) were also applicable to other developing countries faced with the problem of the "brain drain".

5. His delegation believed that the problem could not be solved by the developing countries alone, without the help of the international community, including the developed countries. Moreover, when studying the practical steps that could be taken it should be kept in mind that the problem could not be solved in isolation from related economic and social problems which were the main cause of the difficulty. In that connexion, his delegation endorsed the conclusion in paragraph 13 (i) of the summary of the report (E/4820) and stressed that under-development, the cause of the "brain drain", could not be solved unless the international community and especially the developed countries lived up to their commitments under the Second Development Decade.

6. Mr. LOUYA (Democratic Republic of the Congo) expressed his delegation's satisfaction with the report, which clearly analysed the problems facing the developing countries and presented practical recommendations for their solution. Although it was difficult to form any accurate idea of the dimensions of the "brain drain", the phenomenon was unquestionably harmful to the developing countries, which lost their most highly qualified people to the advanced countries. The problem, though not new, was particularly complex inasmuch as it involved some deeply rooted human traits as well as the intangible balance between an individual's obligations to himself and his duties to his society. His delegation welcomed the efforts being made by the United Nations, especially UNDP, to help the developing countries, at their request, to cope with the problem through research and assistance. The developing countries were fully aware of the dangers which the "brain drain" represented to their economies.

7. The time had come to turn from a somewhat theoretical discussion to the practical consideration of ways of solving the problem. In view of its scope and gravity, the

\* Resumed from the 1756th meeting.

<sup>1</sup> UNITAR Research Report No. 3.



assistance which the developed countries were rendering to the developing countries should be increased; if their assistance remained at its present level, the developing countries would have no alternative but to take drastic action to improve the situations especially by modifying their educational systems, which they had inherited from their colonial rulers and which were becoming more and more out of touch with reality, and by reducing the gap between their training programmes and actual employment opportunities.

8. His delegation welcomed the USSR draft resolution (E/L.1379) but had not yet taken a stand on it.

9. Mr. FAROOQ (Pakistan) observed that it was not possible, on the basis of the information presented to the Council, to draw conclusions which were generally applicable. Each country had to tackle the problem of the "brain drain" in the light of its own circumstances. Moreover, since the problem was essentially a human one, the short-term solution must be humane and the long-term solution scientific. To state that the developed countries were enticing qualified persons from the developing countries was as erroneous as to assert that the developing countries themselves were responsible for the "brain drain". A distinction should be drawn between two different types of students. The first category comprised officials sent by their respective Governments for further training abroad. Such students were obliged to return to their home countries in order to retain their jobs and receive promotions; very few of them failed to return. The second category comprised students studying abroad at their own expense. The latter group had no obligation to return on the completion of their training and generally did not return because of the paucity of suitable jobs and the inadequacy of material and working conditions in their home countries. Since there was little inducement for them to give up the jobs they had found abroad, efforts to persuade them to return were unlikely to be successful.

10. The real causes of the "brain drain" were under-industrialization, lack of scientific and technological advancement, lack of capital and a slow rate of economic development. To over-emphasize the importance of the "brain drain" would be to lose sight of the main issue. Measures to combat the problem should at the outset be taken at the national level, although co-operation at the international level in the form of exchanges of experience and information could be invaluable. In essence, the problem could be described as an overproduction of graduates and a kind of inertia in using them to the full. Preventive measures designed to stop people from emigrating could not be effective: they would contravene the various instruments adopted by the United Nations with respect to human rights and would deny to scientists and engineers the benefits of contacts and exchanges of ideas with their counterparts in the developed countries. The best course would be to create conditions at home which would encourage expatriates to return. On the other hand, the developed countries which had profited from the immigration of professionals from developing countries should feel a special obligation to help those countries improve conditions of education, especially in the fields of science and technology, and should offer substantial assistance in the establishment of additional international institutions

for development, as had been suggested in the Secretary-General's report on the subject to the twenty-third session of the General Assembly.<sup>2</sup>

11. In his view, a humane approach should be taken. The Council should not urge the adoption of steps which might affect the lives and careers of many qualified persons without making a thorough and critical examination of all the factors involved. The steps taken by his Government to encourage the return of persons it sent abroad for study—although it did not have a serious problem in that regard—included a reorganization of its educational structures, efforts to achieve a better balance between education and employment opportunities, an undertaking on the part of trainees to return, and an informal understanding with developed countries to discourage Pakistanis from remaining abroad.

12. In the final analysis, the "brain drain" was caused by under-development and any fruitful solution of the problem must be based on recognition of that fact. Any proposal for the payment of compensation would be unrealistic because the services rendered by trained personnel could not be quantified and no acceptable formula could be devised for payment in monetary terms for the utilization of experts. In his view, the recommendations in the Secretary-General's report to which he had just referred were far more helpful.

13. In conclusion, he suggested that UNITAR might be requested to submit its full report to the Council at its fifty-first session.

14. Mr. SPENCER (Observer for Canada), speaking at the invitation of the President, said that his country's immigration policy was both universal and non-discriminatory in that its selection criteria were applied in the same way to all immigrants regardless of their race, colour or geographical origin. The adoption of that policy had been accompanied by an expansion of its immigration facilities in many areas of the world. Canada was aware of the criticism by some developing countries that its policy tended to favour immigrants from more developed countries because of its requirements for educational and technical skills and it realized that some of the immigrants coming to Canada from developing countries possessed talents which those countries needed and would prefer to retain. However, its policy was designed to ensure that only those immigrants who could successfully settle in Canada were accepted; that was surely in the best interests of the immigrants themselves and enabled Canada to maintain its economic growth and thereby its ability to accept immigrants in large numbers. At the same time, because Canada recognized that the immigration of skilled persons represented a loss to their own countries, it had long followed a policy of refraining from actively promoting immigration from developing countries.

15. Despite its low population density, Canada was a highly complex, industrialized and urbanized society; accordingly, immigrants must of necessity have the education and training which would enable them to fill the jobs

<sup>2</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-third Session, Annexes*, agenda item 47, document A/7294, paras. 127 and 128.



available. Moreover, they must be able to enjoy the same standard of living as other Canadians. A policy which brought to Canada only unskilled or semi-skilled immigrants from a specific country would tend to create undesirable racial bias and a false impression about the abilities of the nationals of that country.

16. It should not be forgotten that Canada admitted more students from developing countries than immigrants. Furthermore, students admitted under bilateral programmes sponsored by the Canadian Government were nominated by their Governments for training in Canada on the understanding that they would return to their home countries upon completion of their studies. Canada itself suffered from a very substantial outflow of trained personnel, both through emigration to other industrialized countries and through temporary emigration to developing countries in connexion with its many and varied technical assistance programmes.

17. Mr. KOSCIUSKO-MORIZET (France) said that it was quite natural that people should choose the best employment available to them, and that tendency caused problems for all countries, not just the developing ones. Although it appeared to have more serious effects in the latter countries, it was a simplistic argument to blame the host countries, which, it should be remembered, had often borne the cost of at least part of the training of the persons concerned. Before a remedy could be found, the causes of the "brain drain", which was a serious and widespread economic and social problem, would have to be thoroughly diagnosed.

18. To begin with, it was important to distinguish between the "brain drain" and emigration in general. For example, Lebanon, whose position had been described, although somewhat superficially, in the Secretary-General's report (see E/4820/Add.1 and Corr.1, chap.III) had been an exporter of people for over a century, and there were today as many Lebanese outside Lebanon as in that country itself. With the rise in living standards and the expansion of education, it was natural that Lebanese emigrating today should be better educated than in the past. He observed in that connexion that the figures given were based on the experience of a single educational institution and that the conclusions based on them should perhaps be re-evaluated. In the African countries the attainment of independence had been accompanied by a wave of enthusiasm for expanded education as a means of solving national problems. Unfortunately, that had led to a glut of well-trained graduates in the administrative and political sciences who had inadequate opportunities for practising their skills and had become an unstable element in the political and social life of their countries. Many graduates found that their countries' growth rates were too low to enable them to find suitable jobs and were therefore reluctant to return from abroad, or, having returned, were soon eager to leave again. Even where there were suitable jobs, salaries and working conditions were in many cases unsatisfactory, and more often than not there were fewer opportunities for research and further training than in other countries.

19. His delegation believed that it would be better to try to solve the problem through international co-operation

than to have the countries of origin compensated by the host countries. Indeed, the principle underlying the latter solution was questionable in the extreme, for students were not being kept in the host countries by force, and the scholarships that had enabled them to carry on their studies had in many cases been granted under educational assistance programmes the purpose of which was precisely to help the developing countries. His delegation would be opposed to any authoritarian measures on the part of the host countries, which would be contrary to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the liberal principles subscribed to by France. Nevertheless, France was willing to use methods of persuasion and to refuse to permit endless extensions of studies without valid reasons.

20. With regard to the study on Cameroon (see E/4820/Add.1, chap.V), the author had neglected to mention a number of recent developments to which France had contributed, such as the University of Yaoundé and the establishment of a medical school. France's current policy was to encourage African students to continue their studies at local universities whenever possible and it had ceased to grant scholarships in cases where the desired training was available at local establishments. At the same time, it could not prevent students from coming to France at their own expense or convince them that one university was better than another. In co-operation with the other Governments concerned, France was endeavouring to keep the number of requests for education in France to a minimum and it assisted local training as much as possible.

21. For the countries of origin, it was of course essential to relate training to development and to ensure that manpower planning was in harmony with the requirements of future economic and social development. A conference of National Education Ministers from French-speaking African countries, which was dealing with that very problem, was currently taking place in Paris, and many similar meetings had been held in the past. In that connexion, it was important that the private sector, which had many job vacancies because qualified personnel were not available, should not be neglected.

22. His delegation had no objection to the idea of a contract being concluded between a student and his Government at the commencement of his studies. Such a procedure was followed in France and it was good for a scholarship holder to know that he was committing himself to serve his country for a number of years. Another good idea was to arrange for persons who studied abroad and returned to their own country to take refresher courses after a few years, and they should also keep their professional knowledge up to date in the meantime by means of correspondence and specialized journals.

23. However, men were not robots and they were not always willing to make decisions affecting their careers or the basis of their countries' requirements. A number of French-trained doctors who had returned to the Democratic Republic of the Congo had for financial and family reasons preferred to take up private practice in Kinshasa rather than do work of greater national importance in the provinces. A great international effort was needed to solve the problem and he hoped that after consultations with the Soviet Union a common text could be produced.



24. Mr. DUNN (United States of America) said that the public and private sectors in the United States had both expressed concern about the flow of skilled personnel from developing as well as developed countries and a number of studies had been carried out with a view to shedding light on the complex factors involved, which were economic, social, educational, political and even ethical. Of course, there had always been a strong tradition in the United States that the international mobility of human beings was beneficial for mankind as a whole, and the flow of skilled personnel moved in all directions. Moreover, article 13 (2) of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights stated that everyone had the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country. His delegation was therefore not in favour of restricting the movement of people, but would prefer to find a solution to the underlying and broader problem by developing a political, economic, educational and scientific climate that would both encourage and challenge trained people to stay in their own countries and contribute to their development. One essential element was careful manpower planning by the developing countries to enable them to meet their needs accurately in the context of balanced economic and social progress.

25. The United States Agency for International Development screened all applicants for its training schemes to ensure that they were serious, mature and interested in their own countries' problems. As a result of that process, less than 1 per cent of the 100,000 persons trained under the Agency in education, health, engineering and atomic science had failed to return to their own countries after training. Moreover, the Fulbright Programme required foreign students who had received training in the United States to leave the country for at least two years before being allowed to return.

26. His delegation found the proposals in draft resolution E/L.1379 unacceptable and considered that paragraphs 13, 14 and 15 of the Secretary-General's report (E/4820) offered a well-balanced and sensible approach to the problem.

27. Mr. ANTOINE (Haiti) said that the principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights were reflected in most national constitutions, including that of Haiti. However, it was distressing for the developing countries to see their skilled nationals, trained at considerable expense, leave their homes and enter the international labour market, where there was intense competition on the part of employers, in addition to high salaries. Skilled emigrants often took the citizenship of the countries in which they settled, and were thus permanently lost to their countries of origin. In view of the seriousness of the situation for the developing countries, the draft resolution (E/L.1379) submitted by the Soviet Union was most timely. There should indeed be some method of compensating countries of origin for their expenditure on training.

28. Mr. MARSH (Jamaica) said that Jamaica had been an exporter of people for over a century and now regarded the "brain drain" problem as a very serious one. As far back as the late 1940s, calculations had been made of the precise loss incurred by a country when its skilled graduates emigrated, the figure for an arts graduate being at that time

£5,000, for science graduates £10,000 and for doctors and other professionals £20,000. Moreover, there was an additional incalculable loss to the society of origin as a whole.

29. One factor that should be taken into account in seeking a solution to the problem was the difficulty encountered by students not only in adjusting at first to the way of life in the host country but also in readjusting to life in their own countries after extended periods of residence abroad. Perhaps ways might be found to absorb émigré graduates in some of the new investment projects in the developing countries that were being carried out within the framework of the Second Development Decade. Another possible solution would be to grant extra aid for manpower planning and training in the developing countries themselves, which would obviate the need for students to undergo those processes of adjustment and readjustment to which he had referred.

30. The greater part of the loss to the developing countries was suffered by the private sector, whose industrial patterns were often archaic and unattractive to returning graduates. The solution to that aspect of the problem would be to modernize personnel policies.

31. A factor favouring a reverse flow was that graduates who migrated to the developed countries were sophisticated enough to realize that their real salaries were not as high as they might seem. Very often, it was more advantageous to remain in their own countries, where they could enjoy a social status and standard of living that was unattainable in the developed countries.

32. If all the psychological and social aspects of the "brain drain" were studied, the problem as a whole should be capable of solution, with the assistance of the developed countries and the United Nations.

33. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) said that the "brain drain" was a powerful factor militating against the development of the developing countries and was becoming increasingly serious. In support of that view, he drew attention to the difference between the 1956 and 1967 figures for immigration of scientists, engineers and doctors from developing countries into one developed country—1,769 and 7,913 respectively. The latter figure represented a loss to the developing countries equivalent to \$158 million on the basis of \$20,000 *per capita*. Brazil was one of the countries participating in UNITAR's study of the "brain drain" problem. It fully supported the study and hoped that it would give a complete and accurate analysis of the situation, which could not be viewed in purely statistical terms. The study would be of great assistance to the developing countries in drawing up their future manpower plans. Although not all the factors influencing the "brain drain" were fully understood, the main reasons lay in the under-development of the developing countries, which meant that career possibilities, research facilities and salaries were below the levels offered in the developed countries. As a first step in finding a solution to the problem, his delegation welcomed the proposal made by the representative of Uruguay (1756th meeting) to the effect that there should be an exchange of experience at the national level. Developing countries would certainly benefit



from information about what steps had been taken in other countries to cope with the problem. Even before the "brain drain" had been fully studied, it seemed fairly clear that one of the best ways to ensure that trained personnel remained in their countries of origin was to provide local training adapted to the conditions prevailing in the developing countries. However, that alone would not reverse the tendency observed, for instance, among doctors to remain in the major urban centres after returning to their own countries. To combat that tendency, Brazil's policy was to establish training facilities in various parts of the country, including the provinces.

34. He hoped that the Council would be able to have a more substantive discussion on the item when the UNITAR study was completed, at which time it should be possible to decide on a general international policy as well as on effective local action.

### AGENDA ITEM 9

#### Transport development (*continued*):

#### (a) Establishment of a United Nations transport centre (*continued*)\* (E/4964 and Add.1-4, E/4989, chap. VIII; E/L.1381, E/L.1397, E/L.1401)

35. Mr. FINGER (United States of America) said that his delegation had sponsored draft resolution E/L.1397 because, in its opinion, there was widespread support for the view that the Council did not yet possess sufficient information to take the important and irrevocable step of establishing a transport economics and technology documentation centre. The general debate on the question had shown that a number of delegations, including some of the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1401, had different views on the activities of such a centre. The Council would therefore be well-advised to take the action proposed in his delegation's draft, which provided for the gradual development of activities over the next few years and subsequent consideration of the desirability of establishing a centre. It had been conservatively estimated that the total budget of the centre, if it became operative, would amount to approximately \$558,000. His delegation did not object to the amount involved, which was relatively small, but merely wanted to be sure that United Nations resources were being put to the best possible use. It was not convinced by the arguments adduced by the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1401.

36. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) said that draft resolution E/L.1401 was the product of extensive consultations on transport development and embodied proposals which not only were reasonable but also met the actual requirements of developing countries. The preambular paragraphs were self-explanatory. The Council needed to have a clear view of action taken by the United Nations in the field of transport development. It was now confronted with a specific problem: it must promote assistance to the developing countries in the area of transport development and it must enable the United Nations to provide appropriate back-stopping facilities for all problems in the field. There was at the present time a trend towards increased

regional activities; the Economic Commission for Europe (ECE), for example, already possessed substantial capability and experience in transport problems. However, the situation in the other regional economic commissions was quite different; only during the last 15 years had efforts been made to develop more integrated systems of transport. Of course, all the available resources could be put at the disposal of the regional economic commissions, but his delegation favoured a middle course: the activities of the commissions should gradually be expanded and, at the same time, for reasons of economy, substantive support in the form of research and the dissemination of information should be provided from one central point at United Nations Headquarters. Individual countries could, of course, undertake such activities, but they could ill afford the research needed to plan a transport network consistent with modern technology. A centre would obviate unnecessary difficulties in obtaining information, as well as duplication of activities by developing countries.

37. In proposing, in operative paragraph 2 of the draft, that the establishment of the centre should be phased over a period of time, the sponsors wished to give the centre an opportunity to modify its activities in the light of experience. The terms of reference outlined in operative paragraph 3 were modelled on those suggested in paragraph 12 of document E/4964/Add.3. It was made clear in operative paragraph 3 that other international organizations concerned should be consulted on all relevant questions. The sponsors had taken account of all the reservations raised at previous sessions of CPC and the Council and hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted unanimously.

38. Mr. FINGER (United States of America) said that a confrontation between the developing and developed countries on the question at issue would be extremely undesirable. It would be wrong to assume that the two groups of countries had adopted monolithic positions, since in the general debate the delegations of three developing countries had expressed doubts concerning the establishment of a transport centre. The sponsors of both draft resolutions agreed that transport was a particularly important element in the economies of the developing countries, that the adequate dissemination of information was vital to transport planning and development, and that those countries should be given assistance in developing their transport systems. The only difference of opinion was whether the irrevocable step of establishing a transport centre should be taken at the present time. His delegation considered that such a step would be unwise and was not convinced that it would represent the most efficient use of resources. In view of the limited resources now available, it would be a mistake for the Council to commit itself to a regional approach.

39. Mr. GAMACCHIO (International Civil Aviation Organization) said that ICAO reserved its position on both the draft resolutions before the Council. His organization's views had been expressed in document E/4964/Add.1. The proposal that either a transport centre or the Department of Economic and Social Affairs should deal with intermodal transport might create many difficulties for ICAO. For example, inclusive tours, comprising travel by air and surface transport, and city-airport transportation, on which

\* Resumed from the 1757th meeting.



ICAO provided up-to-date information to all interested States, might be interpreted as being covered by the expression "intermodal transport".

40. As far as air transport was concerned, the proposed centre would not only involve duplication of ICAO's activities but would also complicate the procedure by which a developing country could receive up-to-date information on relevant subjects. ICAO compiled and catalogued information on all matters relating to air transport and that information could be provided directly to any country. If a separate documentation centre was established, a situation might arise in which a country would have to apply first to the centre for information which it could obtain directly from ICAO.

41. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that the Brazilian representative had not made a convincing case for regional co-operation in solving transport problems. There were other fields of activity which deserved greater attention and a higher priority than the establishment of a transport centre. Not only ICAO but also IMCO and the UNCTAD Committee on Shipping favoured the existing arrangements, which enabled all developing countries to obtain the information they wanted. Document E/4964/Add.3 likewise failed to present a convincing argument for the establishment of a transport centre. The action proposed in draft resolution E/L.1401 was consistent with the tendency towards duplication of the activities of various international organizations. His delegation would support the United States draft resolution (E/L.1397).

42. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation found it difficult to decide which of the

two draft resolutions to support. At the present time there were in existence a large number of international organizations that were concerned with transport questions. The Council was successfully co-ordinating their activities through the Department of Economic and Social Affairs. There was accordingly no urgent need to establish a transport centre, especially when a Transport Section already existed within that Department. All the relevant specialized agencies provided copious information on the economics and technology of transport; to establish a small documentation centre in the Secretariat would merely confuse the situation and reduce the effectiveness of their work. Furthermore, UNCTAD, IMCO, ICAO and ECE, which possessed a wealth of experience in transport questions, had all expressed opposition to the establishment of a centre, because it was not clear what purpose it would serve. The United Nations Secretariat, too, was not convinced of the need for a centre. The question was not yet ripe for consideration.

43. A confrontation between two groups of countries on such a minor matter would be regrettable. The Council should seek a rational solution to the problem on the basis of mutual understanding. His delegation fully appreciated the need for attention to be paid to the development of the developing countries, but could best help them to attain that goal by removing the real obstacles to development, and not by frittering away their good intentions on a comparatively minor matter. It was simply not in the interests of the developing countries to set up the small six-man department envisaged. In that connexion, the Council should bear in mind the opinion expressed by ICAO in paragraph 12 of document E/4964/Add.1.

*The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.*



## ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Fiftieth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

1760th meeting

Wednesday, 12 May 1971,  
at 3.15 p.m.

NEW YORK

*President: Mr. Rachid DRISS (Tunisia).*

## AGENDA ITEM 9

*Transport development (concluded):*

(a) *Establishment of a United Nations Transport Centre (concluded) (E/4964 and Add.1-4, E/4989, chap. VIII; E/L.1381, E/L.1397, E/L.1401)*

1. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) felt that, in view of the differences of opinion at the previous meeting regarding the establishment of a United Nations transport economics and technology documentation centre, it would be preferable for the Council not to take action on the draft resolutions under consideration (E/L.1397 and E/L.1401). However, if they were put to the vote, his delegation would vote for the draft resolution submitted by the United States (E/L.1397).

2. Mr. HEDEMANN (Norway) thought the question of the establishment of the centre should be approached with caution and therefore, if the Council should decide to take action on the two draft resolutions, he would vote in favour of document E/L.1397.

3. Mr. PRAGUE (France) thought, like the representative of the United Kingdom, that the Council should avoid publicizing its dissensions. However, in case of a vote, the French delegation would support draft resolution E/L.1397.

4. Mr. SAM (Ghana) stated that his delegation was not convinced of the need for the proposed centre, which should be decided upon only after the indispensable preliminary studies had been made. His delegation therefore preferred the United States draft resolution (E/L.1397) which appeared not to exclude the possible establishment of such a centre. If the reasons motivating its establishment were well founded, financial considerations should not be an obstacle.

5. Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya) supported draft resolution E/L.1401, which his delegation had agreed to co-sponsor. Kenya and the other developing countries of Africa, and east Africa in particular, knew from experience that the lack of information, of authoritative advice and of technical knowledge concerning transport cost them a lot of money which might be invested in other sectors. For that reason, the United States draft resolution (E/L.1397) did not fulfil the hopes of the developing countries.

6. Mr. FINGER (United States of America) stated that the Ghanaian representative's conclusion was correct. The draft resolution submitted by the United States delegation did

not exclude the possibility of the proposed centre's being established in the future.

7. Moreover, as the Secretariat would be in touch with ICAO, there would be no duplication of that organization's activities.

8. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) stressed that the developing countries attached great importance to the establishment of the centre. His delegation, which was a sponsor of draft resolution E/L.1401, felt that the Council should take a decision on the two draft resolutions before it.

9. He recalled that the International Civil Aviation Organization's remarks on the question had been made before the Secretary-General's proposal had been revised and had therefore been taken into account. As for the decision taken by the UNCTAD Committee on Shipping at its fifth session (E/L.1381), it must be noted that shipping, for which existing arrangements were adequate, would not be included in the work of the centre and that therefore no duplication was to be feared.

10. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) deplored the inflexibility of certain delegations which were pressing for a vote on the two draft resolutions. He requested the sponsors to withdraw their drafts. The Council could then decide to take up the matter again at a later date.

11. The PRESIDENT suggested that the meeting be suspended to enable the delegations to confer.

*It was so decided.*

*The meeting was suspended at 3.30 p.m. and resumed at 3.45 p.m.*

12. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) stated that the Council should be ready to vote. He stressed again that the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1401 had not shown any lack of flexibility, as they had been accused, but had taken account of all remarks, and particularly of ICAO's.

13. Mr. GAMACCHIO (International Civil Aviation Organization) recalled that ICAO's remarks on the subject appeared in document E/4964/Add.1 and that his statement at the previous meeting specially concerned the two draft resolutions being studied. He had, of course, made that statement not in his personal capacity but as his organization's representative.

14. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) stated that his delegation, which, if necessary, would vote in favour of the United States draft resolution (E/L.1397) was prepared to support the proposal of the representative of Greece.



15. Mr. FINGER (United States of America) stated in reply to the representative of Greece that, if it was agreed to put neither of the draft resolutions to the vote, his delegation would not insist on the adoption of its draft resolution.

16. The PRESIDENT said that the Council must take a decision, since the explanations of the votes were finished. He asked the representative of Greece whether his suggestion was a formal proposal for the Council not to vote on the two draft resolutions before it.

17. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) moved, in accordance with rule 66 of the rules of procedure, that no decision be taken on the two draft resolutions (E/L.1397 and E/L.1401).

18. The PRESIDENT put the motion by the representative of Greece to the vote.

*The Council adopted the motion by 12 votes to 9, with 6 abstentions.*

**(b) Preparation for the United Nations/IMCO Conference on International Container Traffic (concluded)\*  
(E/4963, E/L.1380, E/L.1388, E/L.1402, E/L.1405)**

19. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom), speaking also on behalf of the representatives of the United States of America and France, introduced draft resolution E/L.1402, concerning participants in the United Nations/IMCO Conference on International Container Traffic. He stated that the text was aimed at providing the Conference organizers with precise instructions. The single operative paragraph reproduced the conventional wording.

20. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) stated that draft decision E/L.1405, which he was introducing on behalf also of Hungary, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Yugoslavia, was not very different from draft resolution E/L.1402, but that it stressed the universal character of the Conference. Whenever the international community proposed to take any decision, all States without exception should be included as a matter of course.

21. Mr. PATAKI (Hungary) recalled that his delegation had already spoken at the 1742nd meeting against the efforts made to exclude the German Democratic Republic from the proposed Conference. That country could contribute greatly to the success of the work of the Conference in view of its industrial and social development. The Council's decision to exclude certain States from participation in the Conference was not founded on any provision of the Charter.

22. Hungary, one of the sponsors of draft decision E/L.1405, hoped that the Council would adopt it.

23. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that draft resolution E/L.1402 repeated a formula which had been proposed on many occasions by various industrialized countries and which discriminated against socialist countries whose remarkable development could be held up as an example. Draft decision E/L.1405, on the other hand,

was based on the opposite principle, that of universality, which was an indispensable condition for co-operation among all States. The Conference on International Container Traffic would be a particularly important technical conference and it was unthinkable that it should take place without the participation of a country such as the German Democratic Republic, a country which was situated in the centre of Europe, at the very heart of the various European transport networks.

24. Mr. YOGASUNDRAM (Ceylon) proposed that draft resolution E/L.1402 should be amended by the deletion of the words "Members of the United Nations or members of the specialized agencies or of the International Atomic Energy Agency" in the operative paragraph.

25. Mr. FINGER (United States of America) observed that that amendment would make the text of draft resolution E/L.1402 exactly the same in substance as the text appearing in document E/L.1405. Nevertheless, he had no desire to engage in a debate about procedure.

26. Since its creation the United Nations had always used the formula contained in the draft resolution submitted by his own and other delegations. That was not because it wished to adhere obstinately to a tradition which it regarded as sacrosanct, but much more simply for practical reasons. If, in fact, the Secretary-General was merely instructed to invite "all States", it would often be difficult for him to decide which political entities could be described as sovereign States. There were, for instance, separatist movements which called themselves States, such as Katanga, Biafra or Rhodesia, at least one of which had been recognized by other States. United Nations bodies had wisely decided not to place such a difficult political burden on the Secretary-General.

27. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) said that the sponsors would withdraw draft decision E/L.1405 in view of the amendment to the draft resolution submitted by the representative of Ceylon.

28. The representative of the United States had cited extreme cases to justify his position. The formula suggested by the Ceylonese amendment, however, would present no difficulties for the Secretary-General who would invite States generally recognized to be sovereign States.

29. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that it was time to consider international co-operation as co-operation among all States and to put an end to such a discriminatory attitude towards certain sovereign States. As the representative of Sudan had said, the arguments advanced by the United States were, to say the least, specious. The German Democratic Republic, for example, was not a vague political entity but an industrially powerful and developed sovereign State. Similarly, there were in Asia States which played an important role in the contemporary world. There could be no true international co-operation without their participation.

30. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) thought that the formula suggested by the Secretary-General in paragraph 7 of his note (E/4963) should be respected. The question should, however, be considered in detail not by the Council but by organs which had a political mandate.

\* Resumed from the 1757th meeting.



31. The PRESIDENT noted that draft decision E/L.1405 had been withdrawn and said he would first put to the vote the amendment to draft resolution E/L.1402, proposed by the representative of Ceylon.

32. Mr. SAM (Ghana), speaking on a point of order, noted that the amendment proposed by the representative of Ceylon had the effect of deleting any mention of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

33. Mr. PRAGUE (France), also speaking on a point of order, observed that the Ceylonese amendment had the effect of making the text of draft resolution E/L.1402 identical to the text of the draft decision which had been withdrawn. Accordingly, if the Council were to vote first on the amendment that would be tantamount to voting first on draft decision E/L.1405, although the latter had been submitted after draft resolution E/L.1402. That would be a real distortion of procedure resulting in rule 66 of the rules of procedure not being applied. He therefore proposed that the Council should keep to the order in which the proposals had been submitted and should vote first on draft resolution E/L.1402.

34. The PRESIDENT pointed out that draft decision E/L.1405 had been withdrawn and that the Council therefore only had one draft resolution before it, a draft resolution to which an amendment had been proposed.

35. Mr. YOGASUNDRAM (Ceylon) proposed that, in order to take account of the point made by the representative of Ghana, the words "the International Atomic Energy Agency" should be added after the words "the specialized agencies" in the operative paragraph. He pointed out that under rule 65 of the rules of procedure amendments were put to the vote before the texts to which they related.

36. Mr. FINGER (United States of America), speaking on a point of order, observed that the representative of Ceylon had in fact submitted two amendments. He therefore proposed that the two amendments should be put to the vote separately.

37. The PRESIDENT said he would put to the vote the second amendment proposed by Ceylon, relating to the reference to IAEA in the operative paragraph.

38. Mr. FINGER (United States of America) said he thought the first amendment should be put to the vote first.

39. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) pointed out that there was in fact only one amendment since the second was a correction of the first.

40. Mr. FINGER (United States of America) said that the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1402 had decided to incorporate the second Ceylonese amendment in the text of their draft resolution.

*The Ceylonese amendment, to the effect that the words "Members of the United Nations or members of the specialized agencies or of the International Atomic Energy*

*Agency" should be deleted, was rejected by 13 votes to 6, with 7 abstentions.<sup>1</sup>*

*Draft resolution E/L.1402 was adopted by 19 votes to 3, with 4 abstentions.*

### AGENDA ITEM 3

#### **Outflow of trained personnel from developing to developed countries (continued) (E/4798, E/4820 and Corr.1 and Summary and Add.1 and Corr.1, E/4948 and Corr.1; E/L.1379)**

41. Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) said that his delegation was aware of the complexity of the question which brought into play two fundamental principles: on the one hand, the duty of citizens to participate in the development efforts of their country and, on the other, the rights and freedoms of the individual as set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Accordingly, a middle way had to be found which would take account of both principles. It would be an illusion to seek to codify such a compromise and the only solution would be to approach the problems peculiar to each country in a practical manner.

42. Trained personnel from the developing countries who chose to work in the developed countries could be classified into three main categories. First, there were those who voluntarily chose to live permanently outside their own country. Secondly, some had studied in a foreign country and for economic or other reasons decided to remain in that country. Lastly, others had been trained in their country of origin and had been tempted to leave it because of the advantages offered to them elsewhere. The first category should be left out of consideration since the freedom of the individual must be respected. As for the other two categories, measures to remedy the situation had been suggested in the report of the Secretary-General (E/4820) and he referred in particular to the need for employment planning, the importance of a manpower utilization policy in keeping with the national development plan, and the granting of material benefits and technical facilities to specialists.

43. It was quite clear that the main responsibility in the matter lay with the developing countries themselves. However, both the organizations within the United Nations system and the developed countries could and should help the developing countries to establish the necessary structures to plan employment policy and intensify their training activities. That would be more practical than, for instance, to provide for damages which would be extremely difficult to assess.

44. Three main conclusions could be drawn from a study of the problem: first, the problem of the outflow of trained personnel from developing countries to developed countries could never be fully solved as long as the international community, as was to be hoped, respected the rights of the individual. Secondly, the outflow could be reduced when

<sup>1</sup> The delegation of Pakistan subsequently stated that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the Ceylonese amendment (see 1762nd meeting, para. 43).



economic and social differences between countries disappeared. Lastly, overplanning of training and employment might harm the developing countries. His Government, for its part, attached especial importance to the improvement of the statistical data necessary for determining which sectors were particularly affected by the outflow and also to the publication of numerous country studies, which could help Governments to profit from the experience of other countries.

45. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that the report of the Executive Director of the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (E/4948 and Corr.1), which explored the reasons for the outflow of trained personnel from developing to developed countries, was a very useful document. Statistics could not, of course, *per se* provide all the answers, but they were none the less necessary. Thus, a very extensive questionnaire had been sent to students in twenty developing countries and five developed countries. He hoped that the substantive report to be issued in 1972 would be based on the replies to that questionnaire. He wondered how UNITAR had chosen the countries to which it had sent the questionnaire as his country would have liked to receive one.

46. His delegation supported the recommendations and suggestions made in document E/4820 as a whole. One delegation had suggested that institutions should be set up to assist students returning to their home countries after study abroad and to help them readjust to life in their countries of origin; that was a very useful suggestion.

47. The report stressed that there were some gains from the outflow of trained manpower, in particular the remittances sent by professionals residing abroad and the transfer of business opportunities, knowledge, technology and science. Nevertheless, it should be pointed out that, generally speaking, it was not so much professionals as semi-skilled workers who sent remittances.

48. Instead of trying to control the movement of professionals, his Government had decided to adapt its educational system in such a way as to solve the problem. According to the report, other countries had also taken action, by introducing, for example, institutional measures, but it should be noted that any action Governments might take could infringe the fundamental rights of the individual. Moreover, there was also the danger of retaining in the developing countries a great many professional people for whom not enough employment opportunities existed. Since the search for economic betterment was the main reason for the outflow, only measures taken jointly by developed and developing countries could reduce its volume.

49. He disagreed with the contention in paragraph 132 of the Secretary-General's report (E/4820) as it was not always undesirable for private firms in a particular country to place foreign standards above local standards. Singapore and Hong Kong were excellent cases in point. Lastly, the United Nations had no business discussing the private sector in different countries; the example given in paragraph 134 concerning nepotism engaged in by certain private companies therefore had no place in a report by the Secretary-General.

50. Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya) said that the question of the outflow of trained personnel was not of immediate concern to his Government. However, there were conditions prevailing in the countries of East Africa which might lead to such an outflow. For the time being those countries did not feel themselves directly threatened because they were remote from the great industrialized centres of other continents and even more remote in another sense from another industrialized centre, South Africa. The Secretary-General stated in his report (E/4820) that the main causes of the outflow of trained manpower from developing countries were: a general lack of development of the country, over-population, shortage of employment opportunities for professionals and skilled workers, low salaries, discrimination in salaries between categories of professionals, lack of professional opportunities and satisfactory working conditions, under-utilization of professional skills and the lack of supporting staff. To the extent that unemployment was a contributing factor, the solution lay in accelerating the rate of development. The economies of the developing countries must be able to offer adequate employment to their trained manpower. Some of them had inherited from the colonial period a wage scale with a considerable gap between the salaries paid to officials and office employees and the wages paid to agricultural labourers. To reduce that gap was one of the objectives of Kenya's development plan.

51. Another cause of the outflow of trained manpower was the common practice whereby foreign investors in the developing countries assigned the highly skilled jobs to their own nationals. To remedy that state of affairs, Kenya was trying to obtain a commitment from foreign companies to give preference to local personnel in employment and to devote part of their profits to the training of local personnel. At the same time, it had recognized that public service was not sufficiently attractive to many Kenyans. In 1969 a commission had therefore been set up to study the problem and, in the report it had submitted to the Government, it had proposed that certain categories of posts should be set up and that the salary scale for civil servants should be improved. Professionals should, for example, be able to receive salaries which were equal to or even higher than those of their heads of department.

52. Lastly, the Kenyan Government had launched a campaign to inform its nationals, students and professionals in the United States and in the United Kingdom of the employment opportunities open to them in Kenya.

53. The PRESIDENT announced that the general debate on item 3 was closed.

#### *Organization of work*

54. The PRESIDENT pointed out that the Council still had before it items 16, 8 and 11 of the agenda. The Council might also wish to take up such matters as the enlargement of its membership, the establishment of machinery for the review and appraisal of the results of the Second United Nations Development Decade, and certain procedural questions.

55. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) said that he was not sure that all delegations were prepared to begin to

discuss the machinery for the review and appraisal of the Second Development Decade. It would be premature for the Council to begin to discuss that item at the present time as it was on the agenda of the fifty-first session.

56. Mr. GROS (France) supported the observation made by the Brazilian representative which also applied to agenda item 11 (a).

57. Mr. SKATARETIKO (Yugoslavia) felt that the Council could not as yet consider the machinery for the

review and appraisal of the results of the Second Development Decade as it had not received a report from the Secretary-General on the subject and could not therefore take any meaningful decision.

58. The PRESIDENT pointed out that a number of replies from Governments had been received on that point. In any case, he was not suggesting that the Council should go beyond the agenda of the current session.

*The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.*





## ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Fiftieth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

1761st meeting

Thursday, 13 May 1971,  
at 10.50 a.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Rachid DRISS (Tunisia).

## AGENDA ITEM 16

## Measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council (continued)\* (E/4986 and Add.1-7, E/L.1382, E/(L)/CRP.1)

1. Mr. VINCI (Italy), noting that the question of reorganizing the procedures and working methods of the Economic and Social Council had been under consideration for a number of years, said that if no practical results had so far been achieved that was not because of lack of interest but rather because of the complex nature of the problem. However, the Council should not be discouraged, especially since it had taken certain procedural decisions which would enable it to consider more effectively the various suggestions that had been made. It was against that background that his delegation wished to make some observations on the question.

2. The Council should never lose sight of its ultimate objective, namely, the expansion of its prestige, powers and functions. That objective was in keeping not only with the responsibilities which the Charter specifically entrusted to the Council under the authority of the General Assembly but also with the evolution of contemporary society, which made it increasingly clear that peace and stability were to a large extent dependent on the achievement of greater social justice, progress and a general rise in living standards. The statements made by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Italy at the two most recent sessions of the General Assembly,<sup>1</sup> at which he had stressed the need for a global peace strategy, had been based on that principle. The drive and co-ordination provided by the Council should be seen in the context of that strategy, as a means of enabling the United Nations to achieve the purposes set forth in Article 55 of the Charter, and in the light of the changes which had occurred since the establishment of the United Nations.

3. The first requirement was to restore to the Council the full functions entrusted to it by the Charter, but it was also essential to re-establish confidence in the Council itself and in its ability to discharge its responsibilities. For both purposes, a common political will was needed. Some delegations, in particular that of Brazil, had stated that the growing conflict within the Council between the interests of the developing and the industrialized countries was the primary reason for its decline. His delegation could only express regret at that development in so far as it reflected a

growing tendency for the developing countries to place their problems directly before other organizations in the United Nations family or the General Assembly, which they considered to be more favourably disposed towards their interests. In following that course, there was a danger that an artificial dichotomy might be established between the Council and the Assembly. Their mutual relations were clearly set forth in the Charter and the fact that delegations were trying to restore a more effective and important role to the Council did not mean that they wanted to upset the institutional balance of the United Nations. Nor did it mean that they were trying to promote the interests of certain countries at the expense of others. On the contrary, the purpose of the effort to restore confidence in the Council and strengthen its capacity to perform its rightful functions was precisely to enable all Member States to participate in the most important aspect of its work, namely, assisting the less fortunate countries in their development and promoting a greater equilibrium and increased economic and social justice in the world.

4. The best opportunity for reaffirming the responsibilities and functions of the Council would be provided by the process of implementation and appraisal of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade (General Assembly resolution 2626 (XXV)). He noted in that connexion that the agendas of the current and forthcoming sessions of the Council respectively included the item on future institutional arrangements for science and technology and the item on review and appraisal of the objectives and policies of the International Development Strategy, which were two of the most important development policy questions.

5. The question of restoring the prestige of the Council and strengthening it in the exercise of its functions was closely linked to that of its expansion. His Government considered that it should be expanded and that action on that question should be taken shortly. It was necessary, on the one hand, to make the Council more representative of the total membership of the United Nations, and, on the other, to ensure the continuous participation in the Council's work of countries which had the means and the desire to contribute to the implementation of the economic and social policy of the Organization. In that connexion, his delegation had been impressed by the statement on the subject made by the representative of Pakistan at the 1735th meeting. It fully realized that the expansion of the Council raised difficult problems and could be achieved only through a further amendment to the Charter. However, such difficulties did not mean that that objective should be considered less urgent, since it might play a vital role in restoring to the Council its appropriate place and functions. His delegation would find it difficult at the present stage to express an opinion on the size of an increase in the Council's membership. Useful experience

\* Resumed from 1745th meeting.

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 1783rd meeting and *ibid.*, *Twenty-fifth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 1857th meeting.



might be gained from any decision taken by the Council on expansion of the body which would be made responsible for the appraisal of the International Development Strategy or on the establishment of a standing committee to consider problems of science and technology. Further useful indications could be provided through the implementation of suggestions such as those which had been made concerning the election of members of the sessional committees of the Council, in particular the suggestion that such committees might have a different composition from that of the Council itself. Such a procedure would enable a greater number of countries to participate in the work of the Council without an amendment to the Charter. However, the advantages of such a solution might prove more apparent than real in view of the complexity which it would introduce into the election of members of the Council and the danger that it would tend to encourage repetition of debate at the various stages of consideration of an item.

6. His delegation wished to draw attention to a suggestion which it had originally made in the course of informal consultations. It had proposed that the experiment successfully conducted by a number of members of the Group of Western European and other States, which had included in their delegations to the Council representatives of other countries having very similar interests and positions, might profitably be followed by other regional groups. That procedure might make for rapid and easy progress in enabling a greater number of States not members of the Council to participate in its work. It might be of special benefit to certain countries represented by small delegations which could thus secure the co-operation of other countries and make use of their expertise and experience in certain fields.

7. He wished to make it clear that he was not putting forward that suggestion as an alternative to expansion of the Council, which his delegation considered imperative. However, the implementation or further study of the suggestions might enable the Council to obtain a clearer idea as to what would be the optimum increase in membership.

8. An essential function of the Council was that of co-ordination, which should be undertaken in such a way as to ensure that the greatest possible benefit was derived from the new programme approach. In no circumstances should that function be interpreted in a static or essentially negative context; on the contrary, it should be based on the concept of a moderate and reasonable expansion of United Nations activities, with more rigorous selection of priorities and ruthless elimination of duplication and of the irrational use of financial and human resources. In that connexion, the suggestion made by the French delegation (1743rd meeting) concerning the expansion of CPC and a study of the respective functions of CPC and the sessional Co-ordination Committee of the Council merited further consideration.

9. Another important function of the Council was that of providing a forum for annual general debates on the world economic and social situation. That could, as the Secretary-General had suggested at the 1696th meeting of the forty-ninth session, be transformed into an opportunity to

look into the problems of the future and diagnose as far in advance as possible, the probable development of those situations and the dangers and challenges that were likely to arise. The Council should not simply react to events but should serve as a kind of early warning system to prevent or minimize the effect of surprises in a world changing with dizzying rapidity. So conducted, the general debates on the world economic and social situation would not be a mere academic exercise but would enable the Council to identify what subjects required discussion and to establish an order of priority for taking action. That would also mean that the press in general, which tended to ignore the Council's deliberations, would begin to take a livelier interest in them.

10. His delegation considered many of the suggestions made in the note by the Secretary-General (E/(L)/CRP.1) to be very valuable. In his opinion, those suggestions had a sufficient measure of support so that the Council could take decisions on them before the end of its current session. Such decisions, although of a procedural and organizational nature, would go far towards improving the quality and effectiveness of the Council's work; the Council could then begin to tackle far more difficult subjects.

11. Mr. KITTANI (Assistant Secretary-General for Inter-Agency Affairs) said that, since no reference to the Office for Inter-Agency Affairs was made in document E/(L)/CRP.1, he wished to draw attention to the role which it could play in assisting the Council in co-ordinating the activities of the United Nations system. In that connexion, the Secretary-General's bulletin,<sup>2</sup> in particular the first sentence, the second function outlined in part I, and subparagraph (a) of part II, might be of special interest to the Council.

12. Although both procedural and structural changes should be made in an effort to increase the Council's effectiveness, such changes were of marginal importance. Far more could be required if the Council was effectively to discharge the central role assigned to it by the Charter. While a large measure of the responsibility for increasing the effectiveness of the Council lay with Member States, the Secretariat too had an important role to play in providing maximum assistance to States and helping the Council to discharge its role as set forth in the Charter.

13. Mr. OGISO (Observer for Japan), speaking at the invitation of the President, said that his country felt strongly that the Economic and Social Council, as the main organ of the United Nations concerned with economic and social matters, should be strengthened. That was particularly important in the case of its co-ordination function because of the recent establishment of a number of United Nations organs dealing with specific fields, such as UNDP and UNCTAD. The Council must also play the primary role in reviewing and appraising the progress made in implementing the International Development Strategy.

14. To enable the Council to discharge its various functions, it should be increased in size so that more Members of the United Nations could take part in its work and it could act with greater dynamism in the field of inter-

<sup>2</sup> Document ST/SGB/131/Amend.21.



national co-operation. Although that would require an amendment to the Charter, which would undoubtedly be a very lengthy process, the Council could, as a first step, recognize at its present session the desirability of such an enlargement. The actual size of the enlargement should be decided in informal consultations.

15. With a view to making the institutional arrangements necessary to enable the Council to discharge its important responsibilities in connexion with the review and appraisal of the implementation of the International Development Strategy, the Council might set up a special committee for substantive consideration of the question or might open its Economic Committee to participation by non-members of the Council. As only a year and a half had passed since the last reconstitution of CPC, his delegation felt that the Council should not be in a hurry to change the composition of that body. However, delegations which were not members of CPC, particularly those which were members of the Council, should be encouraged to take part in CPC's work as observers.

16. With regard to the Council's programme and methods of work, he felt that it was now over-burdened by having to consider highly technical matters in detail. Subsidiary bodies should deal with such matters and formulate recommendations or proposals in the form of draft resolutions for adoption by the Council. He concurred in the view that they should adopt a rule under which they would meet every two years.

17. His delegation supported the suggestion made at the 1743rd meeting by the Observer for India that, if the

Council decided to establish a working group to consider proposals on measures to improve its work, such a group should be open to interested delegations which were not members of the Council.

18. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) drew the attention of the Assistant Secretary-General for Inter-Agency Affairs to paragraph 17 of the report of CPC on its eighth session (E/4989) and asked whether he intended to consider procedures whereby the Council could be kept better informed of the somewhat mysterious work being done by ACC. In particular, he wondered whether the Council could be informed of the conclusions reached or decisions taken by ACC's Preparatory Committee and the recommendations adopted by ACC itself at its most recent session.

19. Mr. AHMED (Secretary of the Council) recalled that, in paragraph 3 of its resolution 1547 (XLIX), the Council had instructed CPC to review the sphere of activities and competence of ACC in the light of the relevant discussion in the Council and to submit recommendations to the Council at its fifty-first session. At its most recent session, CPC had held only a preliminary exchange of views on the matter and had asked the Chairman of ACC for his views on the two proposals that had been made. In the light of ACC's views, CPC would continue its discussion at its ninth session, to be held later this month, and would submit its final recommendations to the Council at its fifty-first session in July 1971. He therefore suggested that the Council should defer consideration of the problem of ACC until it had received CPC's final recommendations.

*The meeting rose at 11.50 a.m.*



## ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Fiftieth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Thursday, 13 May 1971,  
at 3.10 p.m.

NEW YORK

*President: Mr. Rachid DRISS (Tunisia).*

## AGENDA ITEM 8

**Natural resources (continued):\*****(a) Report of the Committee on Natural Resources (continued) (E/4969, E/4989, chap. VI, sect. C; E/L.1399)**

1. Mr. GATES (New Zealand) said that it was unfortunate that the report of the Committee on Natural Resources on its first session (E/4969), which had appeared late, contained no firm conclusions or recommendations. No doubt that was due to the fact that the Committee was meeting for the first time and was taking up vast new subjects. However that might be, it seemed unlikely that the report submitted to the Council could serve as a basis for productive discussion. It would have been better to postpone substantive consideration of the subject until after the Committee had reached a broader measure of agreement on the recommendations concerning its work programme. The Committee for Programme and Co-ordination had experienced the same problems because of the tardy submission of the report and the indecisiveness of its recommendations. In the absence of a work programme, CPC had expressed the hope that the Committee on Natural Resources would give priority at its next session to the consideration of a short-term and medium-term programme, which would enable CPC to revert to the matter early in 1972. New Zealand agreed with that recommendation.

2. Furthermore, it seemed desirable for the Committee to concentrate mainly on the technical aspects of the question of natural resources, although that should not preclude it from submitting policy recommendations to the Council.

3. The proposal regarding advisory services should make some 600 experts employed by the United Nations in the areas of geology, mining, cartography, energy and water available for short-term advisory assignments—to a maximum, for example, of three weeks—in the field of natural resources. Experts engaged on a project in one country could be detached on a short-term basis to another country. Arrangements of that kind would appear to have merit, provided that current projects would not be disrupted. It appeared from the report that most of the members of the Committee on Natural Resources and of CPC had supported the proposal. However, a number of representatives had felt that it would be premature to take a decision on the establishment of such a service until more information on its proposed scope was available and until the views of the Governing Council of UNDP were known.

It seemed advisable to defer a decision on it until the latter had been consulted; that statement, however, should not be taken to mean that New Zealand did not approve of the project in principle.

4. A number of delegations had thought that it would be useful if the Secretariat could maintain a roster of experts on natural resources matters who might be recruited in the same way for short-term assignments. There was still some uncertainty as to how such an arrangement would fit in with the tenor of the Jackson Report,<sup>1</sup> which had laid stress on recruiting experts on a sub-contracting or commission basis. That approach to expert assistance had much to commend it, and New Zealand would continue to make experts available to the United Nations whenever possible. The proposal before the Council of course complemented the normal methods of obtaining the services of consultants. It was an interesting innovation and deserved further study.

5. His delegation welcomed the proposal to establish a United Nations revolving fund for the exploration of natural resources. However, in view of the Committee's decision to set up an intergovernmental working group to study the question, there was no need for the Council to take a decision on the matter at that stage.

6. Mr. PATAKI (Hungary) said it was disappointing to learn from the report (E/4969) that the Committee on Natural Resources had not succeeded in establishing general principles or a coherent programme during its first session. It had been expected that the Committee would encounter difficulties during its first session, but it ought to have a more clearly defined action programme for its second session. Such a programme should take account of the recommendations of CPC and the Council, and should ensure the proper co-ordination with all the specialized agencies concerned. The financial implications of the programme should be determined in accordance with the usual Secretariat procedures. Economic and Social Council resolution 1535 (XLIX) and General Assembly resolution 2692 (XXV) clearly indicated that one of the guiding principles in establishing the Committee had been the recognition of the need to help developing countries in the formulation and implementation of their policies so as to enable them to make the fullest use of their own natural resources. Unfortunately, with few exceptions, the working papers submitted during the Committee's first session had failed to provide the proper guidance on that matter. It was to be hoped that shortcomings of that kind would be remedied when the work programme for the next session was prepared. The Resources and Transport Division had important responsibilities in that regard.

\* Resumed from the 1758th meeting.

<sup>1</sup> *A Study of the Capacity of the United Nations Development System* (United Nations publication, Sales No.: E.70.I.10).



7. His delegation had noted with satisfaction that the Committee intended to devote particular attention to the problem of water resources. Hungary attached great importance to the protection of waters and to international co-operation in that field. Over 95 per cent of Hungary's surface water supply came from abroad. The Danube, which accounted for 71 per cent of the water supply, and the Tisza, which provided 14 per cent, rose beyond the frontiers of Hungary. The Hungarian Government therefore attached special importance to the conclusion of international conventions concerning water pollution control, flood prevention and related matters. The Government was making an immense effort to protect water supplies against pollution and to safeguard their quality. Hungary had joined in implementing programmes of the International Hydrological Decade. It had passed on the fruits of its experience in that area to other countries. On two occasions, an international extension course had been organized in Hungary to enable experts from developing countries to become acquainted with the most recent developments in hydrology and related sciences. On the other hand, Hungary itself needed more experience in matters of water quality control. In view of the importance of international co-operation in that field, the idea of organizing an international water conference in 1975 was most welcomed.

8. Chapter IV of the report (E/4969) reflected a tendency to advocate turning the Resources and Transport Division into a kind of world centre for depositing data on natural resources. His delegation could not approve of that tendency. The natural wealth of each country belonged to it alone and a world-wide compilation of data did not appear likely to promote the interests of developing countries.

9. His delegation was also opposed to the establishment of special advisory services. The report contained only a very sketchy outline of the proposed scheme, and the Council was therefore not in a position, considering the importance of the matter, to take a decision on it.

10. As could be seen from General Assembly resolution 2692 (XXV), one of the Committee's main tasks was to prepare a special report on the progress achieved by Member States in safeguarding the exercise of permanent sovereignty over their natural resources. That was a question of practical importance for every country, particularly the developing countries, and the Resources and Transport Division should give high priority to it in preparing for the Committee's second session.

11. Mr. SKATARETIKO (Yugoslavia) said that most of the difficulties arising in connexion with the Committee on Natural Resources were due to the different approaches taken by the developed and the developing countries to the question of the Committee's function. His delegation did not agree that the Committee's mandate was ambiguous or unclear. It felt that Economic and Social Council resolution 1535 (XLIX) made it clear that the Committee's main role was to assist the Council in formulating policy measures in respect of the development of natural resources and in establishing programmes of action. The Committee had not been able to make any headway at its first session because the developed countries, particularly the great Powers, had dwelt primarily on the Committee's co-ordinating role in

the formulation of action programmes and policy in the field of natural resources.

12. The Council had established the Committee on Natural Resources with a view not only to co-ordinating the activities of United Nations organs in the field of natural resources but also—and more importantly—to promoting the rapid acceleration of the activities of the international community through a carefully elaborated programme of action. In view of the importance of the exploitation of natural resources for the economic development of the developing countries, it was unthinkable that that aspect of the question should continue to be treated as though it was a minor consideration. He felt it was no accident that it had been relegated to a secondary position.

13. His country, like all developing countries, had to give urgent consideration to the formulation of development policies and programmes of action in the field of natural resources. It therefore felt that the Committee's activities should be brought into line with the objectives of the International Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade (General Assembly resolution 2626 (XXV)). It was especially important to respect the basic principles set forth in paragraphs 10 and 74 of the Strategy. Those principles should be taken into consideration by the States whose political philosophies were still opposed to the concept of multilateral economic co-operation and of equal partnership among States which had not been equally favoured at the outset. During the past few years, there had been a veritable boycott of some United Nations organs concerned with economic matters. The time had come for a change in attitude, for if the present trend continued, it could mark the beginning of the end for the United Nations. It was for the Council to play the leading role in that regard. The first positive measures to be taken by the Council should be to help the Chairman of the Committee on Natural Resources to set up an intergovernmental working group comprising 15 members of the Committee, as recommended in paragraph 112 of the Committee's report (E/4969).

14. He hoped that the Council would take a positive decision at its current session concerning the special natural resources advisory services and a United Nations revolving fund for natural resources exploration.

15. A draft resolution on all the matters raised at the first session of the Committee would soon be submitted to the Council, and he hoped that its sponsors would not again be confronted with an inflexible attitude on the part of certain countries.

16. He thanked the Government of Kenya for its offer to accommodate the second session of the Committee at Nairobi at the beginning of 1972.

17. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan), noting that his delegation had participated in the first session of the Committee on Natural Resources, said it was to be regretted that the Committee's work programme and terms of reference had not been more clearly defined. Paragraph 4 of Council resolution 1535 (XLIX) gave a broad outline of some of the Committee's functions, but there was still some doubt as to the methods to be applied. It had not yet been decided

whether the Committee should formulate general guidelines, approve the work programme of the Resources and Transport Division, adopt draft resolutions or take decisions by consensus, make proposals only on the purely technical aspects of the problems considered or deal with their legal and financial aspects as well. The documentation submitted to the Committee had included a great many proposals. Those proposals had to a large extent blocked the action which some delegations had hoped to take with a view to defining the Committee's work programme. His delegation had felt that the Committee should retain only those short-term or medium-term proposals of immediate concern to the developing countries. It had also felt that emphasis should be put on ways of applying existing technology to the development of natural resources with a view to striking a real balance in the distribution of the benefits accruing from development. Moreover, it had seemed important to lay down guiding principles to enable the Committee to carry out its mandate, such principles to be applied not only to the Committee but to all United Nations. Since it had not been possible to adopt the Secretariat's proposals on non-operational activities separately, it had been felt that the Committee should confine itself to defining its work programme within the general framework of item 4 of its agenda (see E/4969, annex I).

18. The Committee had organized a working group to formulate guidelines for future action in the field of natural resources. However, those principles had not been adopted by the Committee, which had simply included them in annex V of its report. He hoped that they would be adopted at the next session. The fact that the Resources and Transport Division had not furnished a document on a future programme of non-operational activities had caused the Committee great difficulty. His delegation had submitted proposals (see E/4969, appendix I, para. 5), but unfortunately the Committee had not been able to reach agreement on them.

19. His delegation supported the proposal to set up a working group on the establishment of a United Nations revolving fund for natural resources exploration. It hoped that the Council would endorse the proposal and that the working group would be able to work out an acceptable scheme. His delegation also favoured the establishment of special natural resources advisory services.

20. In order to facilitate the Committee's future work, the areas in which the Council might provide guidance should be specified. As paragraphs 21 and 94 of the report (E/4969) showed, there were differences of opinion among members of the Committee on the very meaning of "natural resources". Although delegations favouring the broader interpretation had been in the minority, they had succeeded in having item 4 (a) (iv) placed on the agenda. Too broad an interpretation might, however, divert the Committee from its three main spheres of activity: water resources, mineral resources and energy resources.

21. Budgetary considerations should not be the sole criterion in determining the work programme; the intrinsic value of the questions to be considered should obviously be taken into consideration. The proposed advisory services should naturally be co-ordinated with similar services being provided by UNDP.

22. The Secretary-General's proposal to convene an international water conference in 1975 had aroused considerable interest, but much criticism, too. The Secretariat should work out the details of such a conference, including its objectives and procedures, with the assistance of a panel of experts and in close co-operation with the specialized agencies concerned. His delegation hoped that the Committee would take into account all the comments when it made its decision at the following session.

23. The representative of France had suggested that the Committee should devote each session to a particular sector; however, in view of the magnitude of the Committee's task, his delegation believed that that course would be unwise. It believed, in fact, that the Committee should meet early in 1972 and welcomed Kenya's invitation to hold the second session at Nairobi.

24. Mr. GUPTA (Observer for India), speaking in accordance with rule 75 of the Council's rules of procedure, said that he profoundly regretted that the delaying tactics of certain delegations had paralysed the Committee on Natural Resources during its first session. The Council should endeavour to remedy that situation.

25. The Resources and Transport Division had been roundly criticized for the documentation it had prepared for the Committee. His delegation contended, however, that the documentation had been very full and that the informal meetings which had been held to introduce the documents prior to their distribution had been most useful.

26. The arrangements for the Committee's sessions should not be subject to unduly narrow rules and his delegation agreed that the second session should be held early in 1972.

27. Despite the very clear statement by the representative of UNDP (1758th meeting), some delegations still maintained that the proposed advisory services would duplicate existing activities. His delegation approved the Secretary-General's proposal on that subject (see E/4969, para. 107). Moreover, his Government was prepared to provide a list of water resources experts who would be available for short-term missions under the proposed scheme.

28. The idea of establishing a revolving fund was excellent in principle; however, rational methods of financing would have to be adopted. For that reason the setting-up of an intergovernmental working group was justified.

29. A decision to convene an international water conference in 1975 would probably be premature, since preliminary studies would clearly have to be carried out in co-operation with the specialized agencies concerned before the utility of such a conference could be determined.

30. The Committee should have before it at its second session an integrated work programme, the objections repeatedly voiced by the Resources and Transport Division on the subject notwithstanding. The success of its work depended on the formulation of guiding principles and policy. The French suggestion that the Committee should devote each session to a specific sector had much merit.



31. Mr. AYOUB (Tunisia) said that, although his delegation approved in general of the report of the Committee on Natural Resources on its first session (E/4969), it greatly regretted that the Committee had been unable to work out guiding principles to govern work on natural resources. The Committee should make special efforts to do so at its second session. The lack of short-term and medium-term work programmes was equally regrettable and that deficiency should be remedied as a matter of urgency.

32. The proposed special natural resources advisory services were of great interest, since expert advice was essential; nevertheless, since the success of the system would depend on co-ordination with UNDP, it should not be put into effect until more information on its proposed scope and methods of operation was available and the views of the Governing Council of UNDP were known.

33. The setting-up of an intergovernmental working group to consider the detailed administrative, institutional and financial aspects of the proposed revolving fund was entirely justified. His delegation agreed that the developed countries should also be involved in the operation of financing of the fund.

34. His delegation also warmly welcomed the idea of convening an international water conference in 1975. It would be helpful if the Committee had before it at its second session a report by the Secretary-General on the question; the report should be prepared in close co-operation with FAO and UNESCO, which had already done extensive work on the subject.

35. His delegation also supported the suggestion that the Secretary-General and the specialized agencies should be requested to prepare a report on the activities currently being undertaken in the field of natural resources. On the question of the periodicity of the Committee's sessions, his delegation believed that the Committee should meet annually for a five-year trial period.

**(b) International co-operation in cartography (concluded)\*  
(E/4943 and Add.1, E/L.1406)**

36. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) introduced draft resolution E/L.1406 which was sponsored by his delegation and the delegations of Indonesia and Malaysia. There was a slight change in the third preambular paragraph and in operative paragraph 1, in which the date "October/November 1973" should be replaced by "during the second half of 1973"—a less rigid formula that would allow the organizers more latitude.

37. The wording of the draft resolution was very similar to that of resolutions previously adopted on the topic. He was aware that, although the Council normally adopted such documents unanimously, its content was unlikely to find favour with all members, if the differences of opinion that had emerged on the subject of the Conference on International Container Traffic was any guide. His delegation hoped, nevertheless, that the members concerned would be

content with having the views they had earlier expressed on the subject placed on record and allow the draft resolution to be adopted unanimously, as the draft resolution on the Sixth United Nations Regional Cartographic Conference for Asia and the Far East, held at Teheran in October-November 1970, had been.

38. Mr. SUMANTERA (Indonesia) and Mr. TAIB (Malaysia) commended the New Zealand delegation for its initiative in submitting a draft resolution which highlighted the importance of the Seventh United Nations Cartographic Conference for Asia and the Far East. They thanked the Japanese Government for its offer to act as host for the Conference and to provide all the assistance possible.

39. Mr. OGISO (Observer for Japan), speaking in accordance with rule 75 of the rules of procedure, said that his Government had agreed to defray the additional costs that would result from holding the Conference in Japan. His delegation assured the Council that it would co-operate fully with the Secretary-General with regard to making the necessary arrangements for the Conference and ensuring its success. It hoped that the Council would adopt draft resolution E/L.1406 unanimously.

40. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he was amazed that the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1406 should have embodied in the document a restrictive and discriminatory formula which was at variance with the wording of the title. There was little prospect of achieving international co-operation if an entire group of Asian countries that played an important part in international relations was to be excluded from the Conference. Some countries were seeking to discriminate by such means against other countries whose economic and social structures differed from their own. While such an attitude on the part of New Zealand—which consistently sided with American imperialism—was to be expected, it was difficult to see what motive Indonesia and Malaysia had denying the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and several other countries the right to participate in a regional conference. His delegation was not able to support draft resolution E/L.1406.

41. Mr. YOGASUNDRAM (Ceylon) said that he too would have preferred that participation in the Conference should be open to every country in Asia, but that, in view of the importance of the Conference, he would support the draft resolution with that reservation.

42. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) said that he too believed that all States should be invited to participate in the Conference and would support any amendment to that effect. He nevertheless intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution because of the great importance of the Conference.

43. He informed the Council that, by mistake, his delegation had voted against the Ceylonese amendment to draft resolution E/L.1402 at the 1760th meeting, whereas it had intended to vote in favour.

44. Mr. DUNN (United States of America) said that his delegation supported all the recommendations of the Sixth

\* Resumed from the 1758th meeting.

Cartographic Conference and the observations in the Secretary-General's report (E/4943). In particular, it concurred with the recommendation on convening a group of experts to study in depth the problem of cadastral survey. It believed that a study of that subject should be included in the work programme of the Resources and Transport Division and should be financed from the resources available to the Division for its work programme.

45. His delegation thanked the Japanese Government for its offer to act as host for the Seventh Conference. It supported draft resolution E/L.1406 without reservations and, without any wish to revive a debate which had already taken up too much time, it felt bound to state that the invitation formula in operative paragraph 1 was satisfactory.

46. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on draft resolution E/L.1406.

*The draft resolution, as orally revised, was adopted by 22 votes to 2.*

47. The PRESIDENT thanked the Japanese Government for its generous offer and its deep interest in the work of the Council. He expressed the hope that by the second half of 1973 all States would be members of the United Nations.

48. Mr. MOBARAK (Lebanon) stated that his delegation would have voted in favour of the draft resolution had it been present when the vote was taken.

*The meeting rose at 5.5 p.m.*





## ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Fiftieth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Friday, 14 May 1971,  
at 10.45 a.m.

NEW YORK

*President: Mr. Rachid DRISS (Tunisia).*

## AGENDA ITEM 3

**Outflow of trained personnel from developing to developed countries (continued)\* (E/4798, E/4820 and Corr.1 and Summary, E/4820 and Add.1 and Corr.1, E/L.1379/Rev.1, E/L.1409)**

1. Mr. LEGNANI (Uruguay), introducing draft resolution E/L.1409, said that it was based on the belief already expressed by his delegation that the problem of the migration of skilled personnel from the developing countries could be eliminated only by development. Its aim was to improve the position of the peoples of the world by means of co-operation between the developed and the developing countries. In connexion with operative paragraph 3, he stressed that the developing countries would have to make sacrifices in order to encourage their trained personnel to return. In the long term, however, those sacrifices would pay dividends, for the developing countries would not be able to make progress unless they had such trained personnel in sufficient numbers. In connexion with operative paragraph 2, he drew attention to the fact that poor working conditions were not the only reason for the migration of trained personnel: sometimes technicians were forced to emigrate because of the elimination of the entire industrial sector to which their skills were relevant.

2. Mr. VIAUD (France), introducing draft resolution E/L.1379/Rev.1, explained that it had been prepared following consultations between his own and the Soviet delegation. With reference to the operative part, he reaffirmed his delegation's view that the "brain drain" was a complex problem and that there was a need to determine, *inter alia*, whether the migration of skilled personnel was a temporary or permanent phenomenon. The sponsors were convinced that it was in the interests of both the developed and the developing countries to co-operate in solving the problem because the former were already heavily committed to training and education programmes for students from the latter and their efforts would be negated if such students remained in their territory instead of returning to their own countries. However, it was felt, particularly by his own delegation, that Governments should not be recommended to take measures that would be in violation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights or international agreements concerning technical assistance or residence. Hence the reference to the Declaration in operative paragraph 3. He noted that there was no such reference in the Uruguayan draft.

\* Resumed from the 1760th meeting.

3. Mr. DE RIVERO (Peru) expressed his delegation's support for the Uruguayan draft (E/L.1409), operative paragraph 3 of which was highly appropriate in the context of the Second United Nations Development Decade. With regard to draft resolution E/L.1379/Rev.1, he fully agreed with the points that had been stressed by the French representative in his introduction. Since the two drafts were not mutually exclusive, he suggested that the sponsors should consult with a view to producing a combined text.

4. Mr. SAM (Ghana) referring to the Uruguayan draft, said that he thought operative paragraph 5 was inappropriate and should be deleted. He also noted that in operative paragraph 4 there was no reference to the item under discussion.

5. With regard to draft resolution E/L.1379/Rev.1, he pointed out that the developed countries were not actually taking any special measures to encourage the permanent settlement of trained personnel from the developing countries, who were simply attracted by the advantages which the former had to offer. He therefore proposed that the second half of operative paragraph 4 should be amended to read "to adopt special measures to discourage ...".

6. If the suggestions of his delegation were acceptable, it would be prepared to join the sponsors.

7. Mr. YOGASUNDRAM (Ceylon) said that, although his Government had no wish to restrict the movement of human beings, it had suffered such serious losses of trained personnel that it had felt bound to take action to remedy the situation. The basic problem was, of course, one of promoting development, which would narrow the gap between the developed and the developing countries with regard to salaries, working conditions and research facilities.

8. Both the drafts before the Council fell short of what his delegation felt was needed. Operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution E/L.1379/Rev.1, for instance, was of little value. United Nations resolutions were full of such exhortations. The very fact that the item was on the Council's agenda testified to its importance, and the invitation in that paragraph was tantamount to advising a penniless man with starving children to feed them.

9. Some of the ideas expressed in the Uruguayan draft (E/L.1409) were good, and he proposed that its last three preambular paragraphs should be incorporated in the preamble of draft resolution E/L.1379/Rev.1. He then proposed that operative paragraph 4 of the draft (E/L.1379/Rev.1) should be amended to read:

*"Calls upon the developed countries to provide increased financial and technical assistance to the de-*

veloping countries for the establishment of training institutes and research facilities.”

He also proposed the addition to the draft of a new operative paragraph 5 which would read:

“*Urges* the developed countries when considering the quantum of such assistance to keep in mind as an additional factor the loss to the developing countries from the outflow of trained personnel therefrom.”

Finally, he proposed the addition of an operative paragraph 6, which would be identical to operative paragraph 4 of the Uruguayan draft up to and including the words “United Nations system”, after which it would read “to increase the technical assistance which they can each provide in their own spheres”.

10. The delegation of Brazil had associated itself with his own in sponsoring all those amendments.

11. Mr. ANTOINE (Haiti) said that the outflow of trained personnel from developing countries seriously impeded the scientific and technical progress of those countries, which were thus deprived of the benefit of the knowledge that their nationals had acquired. It was understandable that a certain number of trained personnel who had completed their studies in developed countries should wish to remain there. However, the developing countries were especially concerned at the loss of specialists who had been trained at institutions in the developing countries themselves. In the case of Haiti, where university training was provided free of charge, technicians were frequently lured abroad by high salaries and were reluctant to return to their own country. He therefore proposed that operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution E/L.1379/Rev.1 should be amended to include a reference to specialists trained in their own countries.

12. His delegation supported the suggestion that the two draft resolutions before the Council should be combined.

13. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) said that the “brain drain” was attributable to the technical gap between the developing and developed countries and to the nature of the training provided in the developed countries for nationals of the developing countries under technical assistance programmes. Serious efforts must be made to narrow the gap between the two groups of countries and to work out a new approach to the requirements of the developing countries. In that connexion, his delegation in principle supported operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution (E/L.1379/Rev.1). However, the study referred to in subparagraph (a) would be merely an academic exercise and would have no practical results. He therefore felt that the amended operative paragraph 4 proposed by the Ceylonese representative should be strengthened by the addition of the words “at both the regional and national levels”. He supported Ceylon’s proposal that the third, fourth and fifth preambular paragraphs of the Uruguayan draft resolution should be included in draft resolution E/L.1379/Rev.1. He also supported the new operative paragraphs 5 and 6 proposed by the delegation of Ceylon and said his delegation wished to join in sponsoring the Ceylonese amendments. However, the draft resolution even if amended would not solve the problem. What was really

needed was an effort to adjust modern technology to the needs of the developing countries.

14. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon) expressed his delegation’s appreciation of the reports prepared by the Secretary-General and UNITAR.

15. The two draft resolutions before the Council contained some extremely pertinent provisions. With the adoption of the various amendments which had been proposed, the two resolutions would be complementary. His delegation supported in principle the Uruguayan draft resolution (E/L.1409), which had the merit of embodying the suggestions and recommendations for practical action at the national and international levels made in paragraphs 138 to 177 of the report of the Secretary-General (E/4820). While the problem was one which was mainly of concern to individual Governments, and their national plans must include measures for its solution, the international community and the developed countries could provide increased technical and financial assistance to help the developing countries meet their need for trained personnel.

16. His delegation welcomed operative paragraph 2, in particular, of draft resolution E/L.1379/Rev.1. However, the problem of the “brain drain” should be kept under constant review by the Council and it was to be hoped that the sponsors of the draft resolution would accordingly take account of the need to bring up to date the information received from various countries, particularly those which had been the subject of case studies. To that end, the Secretary-General might be requested to add a few other countries to the five in which the problem had been studied in detail.

17. An important aspect of the problem was referred to in paragraph 166 of the report, namely, the developing countries should benefit from each other’s experience. Another very important point was made in paragraph 160. His delegation would be the last to criticize efforts made by the Governments and institutions of developed countries, since it was receiving educational assistance from a large number of both Western and socialist countries. Consequently, in drawing attention to paragraph 160 it was not trying to minimize the assistance which developing countries could receive from the developed countries but was merely urging that action should be taken along the lines proposed in that paragraph. It would therefore welcome the inclusion of an appropriate provision to that effect in any resolution adopted by the Council.

18. The amendments introduced by the Ceylonese representative appeared to have considerable merit.

19. Mr. FAROOQ (Pakistan) agreed with the points made by the delegation of Lebanon and supported the amendments introduced by the delegation of Ceylon, which it would like to join in sponsoring. The problem of the “brain drain” should be tackled by the United Nations, the developed countries and the developing countries in concert. The Uruguayan draft resolution (E/L.1409) contained a number of important provisions, but failed to include certain ideas which were embodied in the amendments introduced by the Ceylonese representative. The principle outlined in paragraph 160 of the report of the Secretary-General should be taken into account in the final text to be submitted to the Council.



20. His delegation agreed that other countries should be added to the five which had formed the subject of case studies, which would then be more representative.

21. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) said that, since both draft resolutions had considerable merit, his delegation was endeavouring to integrate them into a single constructive text.

22. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that draft resolution E/L.1379, which his delegation had originally submitted, had embodied a number of important practical measures to assist the developing countries in the use of technical personnel to meet their economic and social requirements. His delegation's draft resolution had also included an important provision concerning compensation to be paid to every developing country for the economic loss caused by the outflow of trained personnel to developed countries. However, since a number of delegations had expressed doubts concerning the advisability of such a provision, his delegation had, in a spirit of co-operation, agreed to co-sponsor draft resolution E/L.1379/Rev.1, which would be more realistic at the present stage and would pave the way for subsequent practical action. It was consistent with the recommendations and conclusions contained in the report of the Secretary-General and would form the basis for further United Nations action. The Secretary-General was requested to conduct further studies of two important aspects of the "brain drain" problem which had not yet been explored. Such studies would make it possible to assess both the income accruing to the developed countries as a result of the influx of foreign specialists and the consequences for the economies of developing countries, in order that the Council might make practical recommendations. Operative paragraphs 3 and 4 of draft resolution E/L.1379/Rev.1 embodied an important general principle. No provision was made for compensation, but co-operation should be maintained in seeking practical solutions.

23. Although the Uruguayan draft resolution (E/L.1409) expressed some useful ideas, it had the disadvantage of stressing only action to be taken by the developing countries themselves.

24. He agreed with the representative of Lebanon that the number of countries covered by case studies should be increased. His delegation had some difficulty with the amendments introduced by the delegation of Ceylon. A large number of students from developing countries received technical training in the Soviet Union. However, under Soviet legislation his Government was obliged to ensure that such students returned to their countries of origin once they had completed their studies. Other socialist countries followed the same principle. Consequently, his delegation would be unable to support any provision which did not differentiate between the policies followed by the Western and the socialist countries.

25. The most appropriate course of action might be for the Council to use draft resolution E/L.1379/Rev.1 as the basis for a final text.

26. Mr. LEGNANI (Uruguay) said that as the sponsor of one of the draft resolutions before the Council, his delegation would be pleased to meet with the sponsors of

the other draft resolution with a view to combining the two texts.

27. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that in many respects the two draft resolutions were complementary and that it should be possible to combine them successfully. Furthermore, many interesting suggestions had been put forth during the general discussion and, if they could be worked in, would enhance such a combined draft. However, it was vital to keep sight of the ultimate purpose, which was to ensure that personnel trained in the developed countries would return after their training to their own countries. That was the desire of developed and developing countries alike. The idea that the loss of the latter was the gain of the former was a spurious one. Like the socialist countries, the market-economy countries were eager to ensure that foreign students and trainees returned to their countries after training. Far from seeking to entice the nationals of other countries into their industries and commerce, their policies were geared to ensuring that specialists trained abroad did not absent themselves from their own countries permanently. If some of the foreign personnel chose to settle permanently, no blame attached to the host country. That was why there could be no question of compensation as had originally been proposed by the Soviet Union. Furthermore, some Governments protested when the entry of their citizens into another country was limited by measures taken by the latter, showing that there was a basic contradiction in their thinking. With regard to the amendments proposed by the delegation of Ceylon, he warned that if the developed countries were called upon to provide large amounts of assistance to remedy situations which they had not sought to create, there was a serious danger that other forms of technical assistance would suffer. It was necessary to find a reasonable solution which could be endorsed by all concerned.

28. Mr. LEGNANI (Uruguay) proposed that a working group should be established to prepare a new draft resolution.

29. The PRESIDENT suggested that the best course might be to hold informal consultations.

30. Mr. VIAUD (France) agreed with the Uruguayan representative that a working group should be established and he proposed that it should consist of the sponsors of the two draft resolutions before the Council together with those delegations which had actively participated in the discussion.

31. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objections, he would take it that the French proposal was adopted by the Council.

*It was so decided.*

## AGENDA ITEM 11

### Science and technology (continued):\*

#### (b) Application of computer technology to development (concluded) (E/4800 and E/4800 Summary; E/L.1410)

32. Mr. GROS (France) introduced draft resolution E/L.1410 on behalf of the sponsors.

\* Resumed from the 1756th meeting.

33. Mr. QUARONI (Italy) said that his delegation was anxious to see the International Computation Centre play a more active role than hitherto in the application of computer technology to development. He accordingly proposed the addition of a new operative paragraph, to be inserted between the present operative paragraphs 2 and 3, which would read:

*"Considers that it would be desirable for the Inter-governmental Bureau for Informatics—International Computation Centre to be associated with these consultations and that a role should be envisaged for that organization in the future activities of the United Nations."*

He also proposed that in the existing operative paragraph 3 the phrase "and the specialized agencies concerned" should be added after "the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development".

34. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) observed that it would be improper for the Council to prejudice the outcome of the issue by deciding which Committee should prepare another report on the subject. He therefore proposed that operative paragraph 3 should be amended to begin with the words *"Further requests the Secretary-General, in consultation with the appropriate bodies of the United Nations system, to prepare . . ."*. That change was in no way intended to reflect adversely on the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development which was doing valuable work in the field of computer technology. The reason for it was purely a procedural one.

35. Mr. GROS (France) said he hoped that the Brazilian representative would not press his amendment since the Council had in several previous resolutions called for the assistance of the Advisory Committee. There should be no procedural difficulty about doing so in the draft resolution now before the Council.

36. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) said that he would not insist on his amendment provided it was understood that the existing wording did not prejudice any future decision by the Council on the establishment of additional institutional machinery for science and technology.

37. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked for more information on the role and composition of the International Computation Centre.

38. Mr. QUARONI (Italy) said that an account of the objectives and activities of the Centre could be found in

paragraphs 133 to 136 of the Secretary-General's report on the application of computer technology for development (E/4800).

39. Mr. GROS (France) said that he was sympathetically disposed to the Italian idea of referring to the International Computation Centre but felt that such a reference could be made in the existing text of operative paragraph 3. He proposed that the words "and in co-operation with the specialized agencies, particularly UNESCO assisted by the International Computation Centre", should be added after the words "the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development". He noted that the Centre, which was located in Rome, had been set up as an international computer centre under the auspices of UNESCO and that membership was open to all States.

40. Mr. QUARONI (Italy) said that in view of the proposed French amendment, he would withdraw his two oral amendments.

41. Mr. MARSH (Jamaica) said that he supported the French proposal because consultations with the Centre would have the advantage of bringing its activities into sharper focus. It was doing valuable work and had already rendered the third world considerable assistance in the matter of applying computer technology to development.

42. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested a separate vote on the French representative's oral amendment adding a reference to the International Computation Centre to operative paragraph 3.

43. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the oral amendment submitted by the representative of France, and on draft resolution E/L.1410 as a whole.

*The French representative's oral amendment was adopted by 14 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.*

*The draft resolution, as a whole, as orally amended, was adopted unanimously.*

44. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand), speaking in explanation of his vote, said that his delegation had abstained from the vote taken on the oral amendment because it had been unsure of the exact wording of the text on which the vote was being taken.

*The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.*





## ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Fiftieth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Monday, 17 May 1971,  
at 10.50 a.m.

NEW YORK

*President: Mr. Rachid DRISS (Tunisia).*

## AGENDA ITEM 8

*Natural resources (continued):**(a) Report of the Committee on Natural Resources (continued)\* (E/4969, E/4989, chap. VI, sect. C; E/L.1399, E/L.1411)*

1. Mr. BUTLER (Observer for Australia), speaking at the President's invitation, said that his Government had welcomed the establishment of the Committee on Natural Resources because it recognized that the rational development by countries of their natural resources was fundamental both to their economic and social development and to the proper management of their natural and human environment. The rational utilization of natural resources was basic to the process of economic development and therefore of great importance to the developing countries. His delegation's view of the Committee and its work programme was guided by the Council's resolution 1535 (XLIX). The clear terms of reference established in that text would permit the Committee to provide precise and valuable guidance to the Council on the important issues of natural resources development. It had been inevitable that, at its first session, the Committee should have had to consider how best to fulfil those terms of reference. However, his delegation shared the view of the French representative that there seemed to have been some confusion at that first session on the role of the Committee in relation to the Resources and Transport Division. Under its terms of reference, the Committee was to provide advice to the Council. Therefore, it should not find itself acting as a policy-making body for the Division. The Committee should bear in mind at all times its direct relationship to the Council and should regard the Division as the unit of the Secretariat responsible for providing it with necessary technical advice and documentation.

2. As to the substantive work of the Committee, the discussion during its first session had served to identify the main areas of concern in natural resources development. Much of that discussion had been at a technical level and had therefore been constructive; while on occasions it had moved a little too far into political issues, the consensus of the Committee had been that future discussions should remain, as far as possible, at a technical level.

3. The tentative consensus reached by the Working Group (see E/4969, annex V) on guidelines for action in the field of natural resources was a considerable achievement. Subject to further study by Governments, it should

facilitate the Committee's future work. It covered extremely complex issues which deserved the most detailed study. His delegation did not expect that the Committee would be asked to make a final pronouncement on the consensus for some time. Nevertheless, it was a useful framework for the future conduct of the Committee's work. Australia's delegation to the Committee had attached considerable importance to the discussion of the collection and dissemination of natural resources data and to the need for a consolidation of the legislative basis for further United Nations activities in the field of natural resources.

4. A number of delegations had clearly attached importance to the preparation of a further report on the question of permanent sovereignty over natural resources. His delegation had doubts as to the usefulness of a periodic report on the subject; the importance of the exercise of permanent sovereignty was self-evident and many past studies of the subject had confused the question of permanent sovereignty with the issues involved in foreign investment for developmental purposes. A further study of the question would have little value unless it recognized, first, the fact that if natural resources were not utilized they would be of no use to the country that owned them, secondly, the crucial relationship between the need for capital and the development of natural resources, and, thirdly, the importance of encouraging investment in developing countries and establishing a fruitful and equitable basis for such investment.

5. The Committee had acted positively in its consideration of the question of establishing special natural resources advisory services and his delegation looked forward to the results of the study of the question of a revolving fund by a working group of the Committee.

6. He emphasized that his delegation had viewed the Committee's first session as a formative one. It had revealed that the Committee must narrow its sights so as to be able to fulfil precisely its terms of reference and to give detailed technical consideration to the very important issues before it. That would in no way impose a limitation upon the Committee, which, if it was to provide effective advice to the Council, to Governments and to the United Nations system, must produce considered technical guidelines on the practical questions of natural resources development.

7. Mr. NDUNG'U (Kenya), speaking on behalf of the delegations of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Pakistan, Sudan and Yugoslavia as well as his own, introduced the draft resolution in document E/L.1411 and announced that the delegation of Jamaica had also agreed to sponsor it.

8. The most important provisions in part A were those in operative paragraphs 2 and 3, which reflected the agree-

\* Resumed from the 1762nd meeting.

ment reached in the Committee on Natural Resources and should therefore occasion no argument.

9. As to part B, the sponsors had felt that the Council should formally approve, in operative paragraph 1, the establishment of special natural resources advisory services, having regard to the consensus to that effect. Operative paragraphs 3 and 4 were the core of the whole issue and had been drafted after laborious negotiations between the sponsors. Operative paragraph 5 involved no new departure.

10. The operative paragraph in part C reproduced the general views expressed by most delegations in the Committee concerning the establishment of an intergovernmental working group to consider the question of the revolving fund and should therefore not cause extensive debate.

11. The quotation in the first preambular paragraph of part D was from paragraph 16 of annex V of the report (E/4969), which listed fundamental objectives in water resources development. A number of delegations had suggested the addition of WHO to the organizations listed in operative paragraph 1. Provided there was no objection from the other sponsors, he could accept that addition especially in view of WHO's role in connexion with the quality of water supplies. The sponsors attached particular importance to the latter part of operative paragraph 2 because it was largely true that most developing countries had not had the opportunity to participate fully in the type of technical meeting described. Operative paragraph 3 had been drafted in the light of the second preambular paragraph and the fact that there were some countries where a lack of water or distribution difficulties hindered development. He pointed out that the sponsors had not recommended that the Committee should consider water resource development as its highest priority item.

12. The provisions of part E were self-explanatory. With regard to part F, he said that although a number of delegations had expressed concern or regret at the Committee's failure to formulate an integrated work programme, the sponsors had felt that the second preambular paragraph should be moderate in tone. Operative paragraph 1 reflected the sponsors' feeling that the formulation of short-term and medium-term work programmes should be given special importance.

13. As to part G, the sponsors had felt that it would not suffice merely to note paragraphs 131 to 134 of the Committee's report. In that connexion, he read out paragraph 131 (a) to (e), which was particularly significant.

14. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) said that his delegation had no special comment to make on parts A and E of draft resolution E/L.1411. With regard to part B, he stressed that his delegation fully supported the concept of special natural resources advisory services on the understanding that appropriate arrangements would be made with UNDP. It had made its position clear in that connexion during the Committee's debates.

15. Turning to part C, he said that his delegation had expressed reservations with regard to the idea of the revolving fund in the form proposed by the Secretary-

General. Further discussion at the expert level was unlikely to be fruitful. It was for the Council, with the assistance of UNDP, to continue examination of the subject in order to work out suitable alternative proposals to achieve the same objectives without the disadvantages of the proposal as presently formulated. He asked for a separate vote on part C and said that he would abstain in that vote because he believed that the convening of a working group by the Committee on Natural Resources was not the best way to proceed and would result in unnecessary delay.

16. His delegation had already indicated, in the Committee on Natural Resources, during the eighth session of CPC and in the current debate, the reasons for its disapproval of the suggestion that an international water conference should be convened in 1975. A number of delegations had serious doubts as to the advisability of such a step or had not found the issues clear enough to make it possible to reach a decision. In operative paragraphs 1 and 2 of part D an attempt was made to clarify the issues. Rather than request a report from the Secretary-General at the current stage, however, it would be preferable to ask him to prepare a consolidated document giving the views of Member States, UNESCO, FAO, regional bodies and other interested organizations within the United Nations system as to the desirability of and possible topics for such a conference. That would provide a better basis for discussion at the second session of the Committee on Natural Resources. Speaking on behalf of the USSR delegation as well as his own, he proposed that operative paragraphs 1 and 2 should be replaced by the following text:

*"Requests the Secretary-General to prepare, after ascertaining the views of Governments of Member States, UNESCO, FAO, regional bodies and other interested organizations within the United Nations system, a consolidated document with the views expressed on the desirability and possible topics for the conference, such a document to be submitted to the second session of the Committee on Natural Resources."*

The question of the conference had reached a stage where it was essential to know the wishes of Governments. Secretariat work should follow and not precede the definition of policies. He also proposed the deletion of operative paragraph 3 on the ground that other resources deserved the same priority as water resources.

17. In part F, the sponsors had ably reflected the main lines of thought expressed by CPC with respect to the programming aspects of natural resources. To make the draft more complete, however, he proposed, speaking also on behalf of the USSR delegation, the addition of the following operative paragraph:

*"Endorses the wish expressed by the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination in paragraph 67 of the report on its eighth session (E/4989) in relation to the drafting of the work programme for 1972 in the field of natural resources."*

He read out paragraph 67 of the CPC report, noting that the text was specifically concerned with the immediate future. Comments, views and criticisms had been put forward concerning the different proposals brought before



the first session of the Committee on Natural Resources. It was important to make certain that the Secretary-General would take such comments and criticisms into account in the work programme for 1972 which was to be submitted to the General Assembly at its twenty-sixth session.

18. Mr. PRAGUE (France) said that part F of draft resolution E/L.1411, which sought to define the role of the Committee on Natural Resources, was misplaced and should follow immediately after part A. There appeared to be two schools of thought on the role of the Committee: one was that it should be responsible for providing broad guidelines for natural resources activities throughout the United Nations system, while according to the other it should give the Resources and Transport Division detailed directives on its work programme. His delegation felt that both views were correct and that the second followed logically from the first. As it stood, however, part F was ambiguous. It would be better to recommend in the operative part that the Secretary-General should take account of the primary role of the Committee on Natural Resources when preparing for the second session. After that, it would be appropriate to say that the Committee should give its views on the detailed work programme of the Resources and Transport Division.

19. Mr. DUNN (United States of America) said that operative paragraph 2 of part A of the draft resolution should include the words "not more frequently than once every other year", in accordance with the usual procedure for the Council's subsidiary organs. With regard to part B, his delegation considered that the Council should not take a position on special natural resources advisory services until the Governing Council of UNDP had stated its views on the subject. The Brazilian amendment to part D was appropriate, since the need for an international water conference was indeed doubtful. In any event, WMO, which was doing useful work in operative hydrology, should be added to the bodies listed in operative paragraph 1. The proposals in part E would overburden the Committee on Natural Resources and lead to duplication with the work of other bodies. His delegation agreed with the French delegation that part F should be placed immediately after part A, and he proposed the addition of the words "with a full explanation of the financial implications" after the words "work programme" in operative paragraph 2. He could also support the Brazilian amendment to that part of the draft. With regard to part G, he reminded the Council that the United States had voted against General Assembly resolution 2692 (XXV) and it did not feel that the Committee, which was a technical body, should take up matters of a political nature. He assumed that the Council intended to vote on the resolution section by section; if not, he would have to request such a procedure.

20. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that operative paragraphs 2 and 3 of part A of the draft resolution were unclear. All that was needed was a straightforward reference to the fact that the Committee on Natural Resources would, as a subsidiary body of the Economic and Social Council, hold its sessions in accordance with the latter's rules of procedure.

21. His delegation disagreed with the proposal to establish special natural resources advisory services. The Council

would do better to decide how to obtain the maximum benefit from the 2,000 United Nations experts working in the developing countries rather than making a declaration which would merely give a new label to an existing system that was perfectly satisfactory. As it stood, part B might do more harm than good and he hoped that the sponsors would confine themselves to reaffirming the existing practice, under which experts did in fact offer advice on projects other than the ones on which they were working.

22. His delegation was in favour of a revolving fund for natural resources exploration but felt that the reference to alternative proposals in the operative paragraph of part C cast doubt on the idea. It did not wish to participate in the proposed intergovernmental working group and would vote against part C in its present form.

23. His delegation believed that water problems should be solved on a national or regional basis and doubted whether an international water conference was necessary in the immediate future. The role of such a conference should be to formulate clear-cut recommendations after the ground-work had been laid at the national and regional levels. His delegation did not think that any special emphasis should be placed on water problems, and it had consequently co-sponsored the Brazilian amendment. Nor could his delegation support part E, since many of the seven points listed in paragraph 94 of the Committee's report (E/4969) were vague. He hoped that the sponsors would redraft that section.

24. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) said that the operative paragraphs of part A of draft resolution E/L.1411 were in conflict with the Council's decision that its subsidiary bodies should meet every other year. He agreed with the French proposal that part F should be placed earlier in the draft resolution. He had serious reservations with regard to part B and felt that a sectoral approach was inadvisable. No decision should be taken until far more information was available and until the Administrator of UNDP had given his views. Part C placed emphasis on one sector at the expense of others and ran counter to the system of country priorities. There again, the Council should not take a decision before hearing the Administrator's views. The proposal for an international water conference in 1975 was misconceived: there had been a world conference on water only four years ago, and water, in any case, was a problem to be dealt with nationally or regionally. The case for a conference had not been made out; a decision on one in 1975 would therefore be premature, and his delegation therefore supported the Brazilian amendment to part D. Neither part E nor part G was acceptable in its present form; he noted in that connexion that the United Kingdom had voted against General Assembly resolution 2692 (XXV). He felt that the various proposals contained in the draft resolution approached the question of natural resources at the wrong level. A country and regional approach rather than a global one was needed.

25. Mr. AYOUB (Tunisia) said that the provisions embodied in draft resolution E/L.1411 were of two types: those which required a definite decision by the Council and those which related to comparatively minor matters. He

supported part A, on which the Council should take a decision since it was within its competence to decide when its subsidiary bodies should meet. He was whole-heartedly in favour of part B for reasons which his delegation had already expressed in its general statement. However, he doubted whether the Council needed to endorse the decision of the Committee on Natural Resources referred to in part C. Irrespective of any decision taken by the Council on that question, the working group referred to in the operative paragraph would be established and would report to the Committee. He therefore suggested that part C should be deleted, although, in view of the importance of the question, he was prepared to support the existing text if necessary. Part D was consistent with views which his delegation had already expressed and was acceptable in its present form. There was no need for the Council to take a decision on part E. The Committee on Natural Resources had already requested the studies referred to in paragraphs 94 and 98 of its report and the Secretary-General would take appropriate action. Part F reflected views which had been expressed in the Committee on Natural Resources and CPC. He would, however, have no objection to the French amendment. He had certain reservations concerning part G, even though Tunisia had been a sponsor of General Assembly resolution 2692 (XXV). Paragraph 131 of the report of the Committee on Natural Resources contained a list of points which, although important, had been mentioned only in the statement made by the Director of the Division of Public Finance and Financial Institutions to the Committee and should not form the basis for a decision by the Council. The other paragraphs of the report regarding permanent sovereignty over natural resources of developing countries dealt with purely procedural matters and did not require a decision by the Council. The Committee on Natural Resources had already received clarification concerning the report to be submitted to the General Assembly in accordance with paragraph 5 of the Assembly's resolution 2692 (XXV). His delegation therefore opposed further action on the question and hoped that part G would be reworded.

26. Mr. GATES (New Zealand) said that his delegation in general supported the reservations expressed by the United Kingdom delegation, particularly those relating to parts B and F of the draft resolution. In its general statement, his delegation had welcomed the concept of special natural resources advisory services. However, in order to ensure the harmonious functioning of such services, the Governing Council of UNDP should be given an opportunity to consider the question, and in particular the arrangements under which experts would be withdrawn from ongoing projects. Unless such arrangements were fully satisfactory to UNDP, the establishment of advisory services would lead to inefficiency and friction between UNDP, the executing agencies and the Resources and Transport Division. A decision on part B should therefore be deferred until after the forthcoming session of the Governing Council. His delegation proposed that the words "in principle" should be inserted after the word "Approves" in operative paragraph 1 of part B and that a new paragraph on the following lines should be inserted after operative paragraph 2:

*"Requests the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Fund to consider these arrangements at its*

*twelfth session with a view to offering comments to the fifty-first session of the Economic and Social Council."*

27. His delegation supported the amendments to part F proposed by the Brazilian and United States delegations. It proposed that the word "first" should be inserted before the word "priority" in operative paragraph 1.

28. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon) said that his delegation in general supported the draft resolution. However, the first preambular paragraph of part D was somewhat obscure. No one would disagree with the general principle set forth in the paragraph, but in that context it might give rise to conflicting interpretations and might have the effect of predetermining the approach to be taken by the international water conference referred to in the third preambular paragraph. Considerations such as those outlined in the second and third preambular paragraphs would form a more appropriate basis for the conference. If part D was put to a vote, his delegation would express reservations concerning the first preambular paragraph.

29. Mr. PATAKI (Hungary) said that his delegation had reservations concerning parts B, C and D of the draft resolution and supported the observations made by the USSR and the United Kingdom delegations with regard to part A.

30. He supported the concept and purpose of the special natural resources advisory services referred to in part B of the draft resolution, but considered that the measures envisaged in the draft were excessively complicated. A decision on the establishment of such services would therefore be premature. He had serious reservations concerning part C: he felt that a revolving fund for natural resources exploration would be extremely desirable, but that to call for the establishment of an intergovernmental working group to conduct further studies might simply distract attention from the primary objective. He supported in principle the convening of an international water conference as referred to in part D, subject to further clarification of its scope. Such clarification could be obtained in the manner indicated in the Brazilian amendment, which his delegation supported.

31. In view of the controversial nature of most parts of the draft resolution, he hoped that it would be voted on paragraph by paragraph.

32. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that the draft resolution had the disadvantage of attempting to cover too many problems and failing to devote sufficient attention to each one of them. His delegation was somewhat confused about the real function and purpose of the Committee on Natural Resources. Was it responsible for co-ordinating the activities of all the United Nations bodies concerned? Was it an intergovernmental body responsible for reviewing the activities of the Secretariat? Was it supposed to deal with world-wide problems? Was it action-orientated? The crux of the matter was that the economic development of the less developed of the developing countries required the establishment of priorities. When certain resources were limited, they assumed a high priority; however, it was difficult to establish clear priorities for other resources. Given the limited financial resources available at both the



international and national levels, the Committee on Natural Resources and the Secretariat would have to select specific areas for action. It was impossible for the Committee and the Secretariat to cover the wide range of activities referred to in the draft resolution. The Council should instruct the Committee to establish priorities and to concentrate on particular sectors, such as the formulation of a water resources policy or the transfer of modern technologies to the developing countries.

33. Part A of the draft resolution was confusing because it was not clear whether the work programme of the Resources and Transport Division would be formulated by the Committee on Natural Resources or the Division itself. In the past, the work programme had not been approved by any intergovernmental body. In general terms, the Committee should follow the directives laid down in the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade (General Assembly resolution 2626 (XXV)) by providing assistance to the developing countries in the exploration, utilization and exploitation of natural resources, the application of science and technology to natural resources development, the training of qualified personnel, and the establishment of inventories of natural resources with a view to their rational utilization. In connexion with the Committee's work programme, he observed that paragraph 61 of the report of CPC on its eighth session was somewhat unorthodox in that it contained a recommendation to the Council: it was not customary for CPC to make recommendations to the Council concerning action by subsidiary bodies of the

Council or other United Nations bodies. In any event, part A of the draft resolution should be reworded and operative paragraph 3 should be deleted.

34. He supported the new paragraph proposed by the New Zealand delegation for inclusion in part B, since he agreed that no action should be taken on the question without eliciting the views of the Governing Council of UNDP. He had certain doubts concerning the establishment at the present time of the revolving fund referred to in part C. He was, however, prepared to support the establishment of an intergovernmental working group to consider the question. He agreed that the international water conference, which formed the subject of part D, should be considered as a matter of priority at the forthcoming session of the Governing Council of UNDP. He supported the Brazilian amendments to parts D and E. He doubted the advisability of including part G in the draft resolution, since it raised a political question that could not appropriately be considered by the Committee on Natural Resources, which was composed of experts. In any case, the Committee was attempting to tackle an extremely broad range of problems relating to natural resources and could scarcely be expected also to consider political questions, even if it held annual sessions. As was stated in paragraph 150 of the Committee's report, it might be more convenient to consider each of the specialized sectors of the Committee's extensive terms of reference at a given session.

*The meeting rose at 1 p.m.*



## ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Fiftieth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Monday, 17 May 1971,  
at 3.20 p.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Rachid DRISS (Tunisia).

## AGENDA ITEM 16

**Measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council (continued)\* (E/4986 and Add.1-7, E/L.1382, E/L.1408, E/(L)/CRP.1)**

1. The PRESIDENT announced that the time-limit which had been set for the submission of draft resolutions on the present item was lifted.

2. Mr. MARAMIS (Indonesia) said the very fact that the Council was considering the question of improving its work bore witness to the dynamic changes which were taking place and the need for institutional and organizational reforms. No fields had expanded more than those that were of concern to the Council, and the time had come to redefine the Council's functions. Under the Charter, the Economic and Social Council was a forum for the discussion and formulation of broad economic and social policies. It was a co-ordinator of the activities of the United Nations system in the economic, social and human rights fields and also a governing body for activities in those fields carried out by the United Nations itself.

3. It seemed that, on the whole, delegations were agreed that there was a need to strengthen the central role of the Council. That role had gradually changed over the years because the number of organs had multiplied and the Council's task of co-ordination had therefore become increasingly complex. Moreover, as a result of the emergence of autonomous programmes with their own decision-making authority, the Council's responsibility was not so great. Consequently, its role might be reduced to that of a co-ordinator of other organs. Again, there were now a number of matters of a multidisciplinary nature such as the issues of natural resources, the environment and population, which required an integrated approach.

4. Many suggestions and proposals had been made with a view to improving the organization of the work of the Council, including in particular an improved level of documentation, so as to make documents more concise and analytical, and a recommendation that reports to and from the Council should be brief, concrete and contain specific recommendations. In addition, the agenda should be simplified. Generally speaking, in the work of reorganization any repetition or duplication caused by the agenda should be avoided.

5. In his view, the summer session of the Council should be broadened to include consideration of social questions,

for the economic and the social fields were interrelated. Furthermore, a number of functional commissions met immediately before or even during the Council's spring session. Their reports did not therefore reach the Council in sufficient time to enable it to consider some matters in the spring. Lastly, attendance at the summer session was often at a higher level of representation.

6. Like many others, his delegation considered that it would be advantageous to increase the membership of the Council. The difficulties in that regard should not be insurmountable. Meanwhile, efforts could be made to increase the co-operation between members and non-members, for example at sessional meetings or in working groups.

7. The Council had a role to play in the Second United Nations Development Decade, for it would have to direct the review and appraisal of the International Development Strategy—an enormous task, but one which gave it the opportunity of playing its true part in development as a whole.

8. He supported the proposal contained in draft resolution E/L.1382 that the Council should draw up and submit to the General Assembly a list of questions on which it was empowered to take a final decision. The adoption of that proposal would make it possible to affirm the Council's autonomy and its authority in particular areas.

9. It should be stressed that co-ordination was not an end in itself, but a means of carrying out policy. The Council's first responsibility was to set that policy, and that should be borne in mind when attempting to balance the Council's various functions.

10. The Council should endeavour to reach a consensus on areas for short-term action and present them to the fifty-first session. It might not yet be in a position to take a decision on long-term measures, but it would be useful to undertake the preparatory work by means of informal discussions and negotiations before the fifty-first session.

11. Mr. BUSH (United States of America) said that the statements made so far had shed light on the challenges which the Economic and Social Council had to meet if it wished to become an effective force for leadership in the Second Development Decade. It was encouraging to note that the discussion had taken place in a particularly constructive atmosphere. The statements made both by members of the Secretariat and by representatives were witness to that fact.

12. His delegation had an open mind on the question of enlargement of the Council. At all events, his delegation would see merit in considering enlargement of the Council

\* Resumed from the 1761st meeting.



provided that such enlargement was accompanied by a firm determination that the enlarged Council would indeed assume the role of leadership and co-ordination provided for in the Charter. It should also be clearly stated that any enlargement was envisaged solely to strengthen the work of the Council and not to encourage the enlargement of other United Nations bodies. Under those conditions, his delegation would be ready to give the question the most serious consideration.

13. The Council must play the role assigned to it in the Charter as the principal organ under the General Assembly responsible for directing and co-ordinating all activities of the United Nations in the social and economic field, and it was his hope that the Council would be able to proceed quickly with detailed programmes and actions to reassert its authority.

14. But even before such long-term decisions were taken, the members of the Council should in some way make a down payment by taking interim measures as an unequivocal token of their political will to make the Council the right arm of the General Assembly. They should envisage the establishment of subsidiary bodies to deal with the issues of review and appraisal of the Strategy, and of science and technology. Such bodies could in the short run have a larger membership than that of the Council.

15. In his view, failure to adopt such early measures might raise serious doubts as to the need to consider changes in the Council itself since, in all probability, the altered body would be no more concerned with fundamental matters than it was at the present time.

16. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece), introducing draft resolution E/L.1408, said that it was primarily concerned with marginal questions—the “down payment” referred to by the United States representative—and the more fundamental questions were left for the summer session.

17. The preamble of the draft reaffirmed the role and the functions of the Council, recalled the task it was to carry out in the Second Development Decade and stressed that great importance must be attached to the definition of priorities. In the last preambular paragraph, the words “in particular” should be replaced by the word “including”. In addition, the words “are required” should be replaced by “seem to be required in order”.

18. The first operative part dealt with the work programme of the Council. Paragraph 2 (c) stated that, in alternate years, the summer session would devote itself to the question of the implementation of the International Development Strategy. In other words, an appraisal of the Strategy would be made every two years. The brief resumed session envisaged in paragraph 2 (d) would facilitate the consideration of certain matters such as the report of the IBRD or IMF.

19. Part II dealt with the Council's agenda and prescribed some concrete measures for simplifying it.

20. Part III, which concerned documentation, outlined measures intended to facilitate the Council's work. Paragraph 4 stated that the Council considered that it was

desirable to eliminate the present exceptions to the rule that the functional commissions should meet biennially. He knew that some delegations objected to that rule, often for political reasons. Paragraph 6 reaffirmed the so-called “six-week rule” provided for in rule 14 (4) of the Council's rules of procedure.

21. Part IV provided that the consideration of changes in the structure of the Council and its committees should be deferred to the fifty-first session. The sponsors had attempted to deal only with marginal questions and to leave the options open on such matters as the enlargement of the Council.

22. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand), speaking as a co-sponsor of draft resolution E/L.1408, said that the draft attempted to distinguish between short-term and long-term measures since the long-term measures, unlike the others, had proved to be somewhat controversial. The Council should take a step towards adopting the more important measures by unanimously adopting the draft resolution.

23. Operative paragraph 3 of part II should not be interpreted as preventing the exercise of the right to speak on questions relating to human rights which delegations felt to be important. The exception referred to in operative paragraph 4 of part III was, as everyone knew, the Commission on Human Rights. The paragraph meant that the Council would regard it as desirable to eliminate that exception, but not take any concrete action. The sponsors were not trying to deny that the Commission on Human Rights played an important role; they merely wished to organize the work of the Council and the Assembly as effectively as possible on a biennial basis. If that paragraph were adopted, the Third Committee would have a lighter workload. It would not depend so much on the Commission and would deal with certain questions itself.

24. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), introducing draft resolution E/L.1382, said that that draft was based on the practical experience gained by the General Assembly and the Council over the past 25 years, as reflected in the resolutions referred to in the preamble. It was also based on the need for strict observance of the basic principles of the Charter and for practical action based on those principles. It was for that reason that the preamble referred to Chapter IX of the Charter, which specified that the General Assembly and, under its authority, the Economic and Social Council were responsible for the development of economic and social co-operation. The preamble also referred to Chapter X of the Charter, which required the Economic and Social Council to play a key role within the United Nations system in the economic, social and human rights fields. By introducing a more rational order into the consideration of economic and social and scientific and technological questions confronting the Organization, the draft resolution sought to solve a serious practical problem. It aimed at striking a better balance between the spheres of activity of the Assembly and the Council. One of the most important operative paragraphs was paragraph 4, which called the attention of the Council to the need for greater precision and efficiency in the exercise of its functions and powers, particularly those defined in Article 63 of the Charter. In paragraph 5, the Assembly instructed the Council to prepare and submit to it proposals concerning effective measures to remedy present shortcomings.

25. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that his delegation had some fears and misgivings about adopting measures which had not been given adequate consideration. The General Assembly had on a number of occasions called into question decisions which had been agreed upon by groups of countries. It was important that doubt should not be cast on decisions taken on a question as vital as the one under consideration.

26. The body to which States Members of the United Nations attached the most importance in the economic field and the one most whole-heartedly supported by the developing countries since its creation was the Trade and Development Board, which had 55 members, or about twice as many as the Council. Despite its relatively large membership, the Trade and Development Board had been very active since its inception. The Preparatory Committee for the Second United Nations Development Decade had been at least equally popular with the Group of Seventy-seven. It had served a really useful purpose in drawing up the International Development Strategy for the Second Development Decade, and it too had had about twice as many members as the Council. The Council's performance during the same period had, by comparison, been rather lacklustre. It was tempting to conclude that all that was needed to give new vitality to the Council was to increase its membership, as had been done in 1963 when the number of Council members had been raised from 18 to 27. The results of that increase had, however, been disappointing. Enlarging the membership of a body was not a cure-all. The vitality of the Trade and Development Board and the Preparatory Committee for the Second United Nations Development Decade appeared not to depend mainly on their size, but rather on the nature of the questions they dealt with; they were concrete questions which brought into play key ideas on economic and social matters.

27. If that was indeed the case, the reforms to be undertaken should turn on the kind of problem to be considered by the Council. As the representative of the United States of America had said, the Council should be officially assigned the role of examining the machinery for evaluating the results of the Second Development Decade. That was at present the most important and urgent question for the developing countries. It could be argued that if agreement was reached on the establishment of subsidiary committees with enlarged membership, the question of enlarging the Council would become secondary. There could be one Committee to evaluate the results of the Decade and another on the application of science and technology to development. The natural result of establishing such enlarged committees and of confirming the mandate of the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development might be to enlarge the membership of the Council itself. However, he felt that the idea of establishing committees directly under the General Assembly would have to be abandoned. A sensible agreement to expand the role and membership of the Council's subsidiary bodies might actually strengthen the prestige and effectiveness of the Council itself. He hoped that measures to restructure the Council could be brought under study in the near future.

28. In view of the foregoing considerations, his delegation wished to see some changes made in the draft resolution

submitted by Greece and New Zealand (E/L.1408). The Greek representative had already read out an amendment to the last preambular paragraph. If, in addition, the sponsors really wished to press for examination of the problem rather than a solution, it would be easier to arrive at a text which all could accept. Moreover, the proposal in question related more to form than to substance. The sponsors of the draft resolution proposed that consideration of the question of changes in the structure of the Council and that of its committees should be deferred until the fifty-first session. His delegation supported that idea, since it considered that all aspects of that question should be reviewed simultaneously and as a whole. It regretted, however, that the sponsors had confined themselves to mentioning the committees of the Council. Mention should also be made of advisory bodies such as the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development. It would be in the interests of the sponsors to broaden their formula to encompass all the subsidiary bodies of the Council.

29. The rule that the functional commissions should meet biennially should, of course, be reaffirmed, but the Council should first find out the reactions of its members. Some might want to retain, in certain cases, the practice of annual sessions.

30. His delegation considered that the draft resolution submitted by the USSR (E/L.1382) contained many ideas worth retaining. The Council was to some extent the servant of the General Assembly and it should prepare the way for the Assembly's deliberations in such a way as to direct its attention to the most important questions. That meant that all important subjects should first be considered by the Council. The General Assembly was a sovereign body and the members of the Council neither could nor wanted to encroach upon its sovereignty. However, it should not be forgotten that the proposed measures would be of no value unless they were approved by the Assembly and that a subsequent session of the Assembly could always reverse decisions made by the previous one.

31. The Council could make use of the two draft resolutions before it by taking what was best in each of them; that would enable it to reach a decision that would make a great contribution towards improving the organization of the work of the Council and its effectiveness.

32. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had received with interest the draft resolution submitted by Greece and New Zealand (E/L.1408). The text in question was based in part on the principles of the Charter. However, it provided for some specific measures to improve the work of the Council which went in a different direction from the Charter. His delegation therefore endorsed all the provisions of the draft resolution which were directly derived from the Charter but could not accept those which departed from it.

33. The last preambular paragraph of draft resolution E/L.1408 stated that longer-term measures, in particular measures to increase the membership of the Council, were required to strengthen the representative character, the authority and the dynamism of the Council. Similarly, operative paragraph 1 of part IV clearly indicated that the



sponsors intended to change the membership of the Council. When such radical changes were proposed, convincing arguments should be given in support of them. However, none had been given. In his statement at the 1735th meeting of the Council, the Pakistan representative had spoken on behalf of the developing countries, but it was clear that the developing countries were not unanimous on the question. An enlargement of the Council which was not based on solid arguments would reflect only a vague impulse towards generosity. The strength of the United Nations during the past 25 years had lain in the fact that all delegations had collaborated on the basis of the main principles of the Charter. The decision in the Charter that the General Assembly was to be the principal organ and would consist of all the Members of the United Nations and that the Council would have only 18 members, a figure which had since been increased to 27, had not been arrived at by accident. A very important question of principle was, in fact, involved. Some delegations were trying to provoke an artificial confrontation between the Assembly and the Council. Whereas all Member States were represented in the General Assembly, the Council, which consisted of 27 members, represented the regional groups and took account of regional problems when formulating proposals. The Council's proposals were then transmitted to the Assembly, where the representatives of Member States considered them in relation to their national interests. That was a reasonable principle set out in the Charter. Such a dialectical contradiction made it possible to ensure that decisions were worked out in a reasonable manner. The enlargement of the membership of the Council would result in a decrease in the responsibility of its members towards the regional groups. His delegation agreed with the French representative's statement that the effectiveness of a body did not depend on the number of its members. During the first session of the Committee on Natural Resources, whose membership had been increased to 38, it had been noted that one third of the seats had been unoccupied. The enlargement of that Committee might explain in part why the results achieved had been inadequate. The weakening of the responsibility of the members towards the regional groups had led to a decrease in the quality of the work done by that body.

34. As to operative paragraph I of part II of draft resolution E/L.1408, his delegation feared that a simplified agenda might be detrimental to the Council's activities and might weaken its role. As to paragraph 3, under which consideration of the reports of the Commission on Human Rights and the Commission on the Status of Women should be confined to the specific recommendations addressed to the Council, his delegation was astonished that a discriminatory attitude was being taken with regard to very important bodies. His delegation also failed to understand why, in paragraph 5 of part II and paragraph I of part III, the sponsors had felt it necessary to assign a more important role to the Secretary-General than to the Council itself.

35. Moreover, in accordance with operative paragraph 3 of part III, the reports of subsidiary bodies were to contain a concise summary of recommendations; those reports would have no substance whatsoever if they did not mention the views of delegations. As to paragraph 4 of part III, the current exceptions to the rule that the functional commis-

sions should meet biennially could not be eliminated abruptly, in view of the current nature of those commissions.

36. His delegation hoped that the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1408 would either amend their text in the light of the observations made during the debate or agree not to put it to the vote.

### AGENDA ITEM 3

#### Outflow of trained personnel from developing to developed countries (*continued*)\* (E/4798, E/4820 and Corr.1 and Summary, E/4820 and Add.1 and Corr.1, E/L.1379/Rev.1, E/L.1409, E/L.1412)

37. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon) introduced draft resolution E/L.1412, prepared by the Working Group which had been requested to prepare a new draft resolution on the basis of the two earlier draft resolutions (E/L.1379/Rev.1 and E/L.1409).

38. He pointed out that the new draft resolution combined some of the provisions of the preceding two draft resolutions. In view of the spirit of compromise which had already been shown by the delegations concerned, he hoped that the Council would be able to approve the text unanimously.

39. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) thanked the representative of Lebanon and the members of the Working Group for their work in preparing a new text.

40. His delegation, which unfortunately had been unable to participate in the Working Group's discussions, was not satisfied with the wording of operative paragraphs 3 (*e*) and 5. There was insufficient emphasis on the role which the developed countries should play in support of the efforts of the developing countries, especially under paragraphs 62 and 64 of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade (General Assembly resolution 2626 (XXV)). Nor was enough importance given to the aid which developed countries should give to developing countries in establishing scientific and technical research centres in an attempt to bridge the existing gap between those countries in science and technology and to encourage scientists and trained personnel from the developing countries to return to their countries.

41. His delegation would therefore request a separate vote on operative paragraphs 3 (*e*) and 5 unless the present wording was changed.

42. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon) drew the attention of the representative of Sudan to the fact that operative paragraph 3 (*e*) was intended to encourage Governments of the developing countries to set up their own programmes to put an end to the outflow of technicians and trained personnel, to improve their teaching and research facilities, and request the technical assistance which they needed for that purpose. The wording of the subparagraph was also

\* Resumed from the 1763rd meeting.

designed to satisfy certain members of the Working Group who were concerned about ensuring a balance between the provisions of operative paragraphs 3 and 4.

43. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thanked the members of the Working Group for their work in reconciling the various points of view. He wished, however, to suggest several minor changes.

44. First, the exact terminology to be used in drafting operative paragraph 2 (a) in the various languages was not yet clear, and should be specified.

45. Also, in operative paragraph 3 (e) it was inappropriate to speak of agencies "in the United Nations system", since those agencies did not provide technical assistance directly, but worked through the Council.

46. Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya) said that his delegation appreciated the spirit of co-operation which had prevailed in the Working Group, but regretted that a number of important provisions had been omitted from the text before the Council. Operative paragraph 2 (a) seemed pointless to his delegation, since the study in question would serve very little purpose. As for paragraph 2 (b), it was the responsibility of the Economic and Social Council to guide the Secretary-General in that matter.

47. The recommendations to the governments of developing countries in operative paragraphs 3 (a) and 3 (c) also served no purpose, since the measures which they mentioned had already been taken. His delegation had already had occasion to observe that as long as development remained stagnant, the outflow of trained personnel from developing countries would continue. Many investors, in order to protect their investments in developing countries, called foreign specialists into their firms instead of using qualified local personnel. One of the main causes of the outflow of trained personnel from the developing countries was, of course, that those countries could not offer high salaries.

48. A major shortcoming of the draft resolution was that it provided for no specific measures to eliminate the outflow of trained personnel. His delegation therefore wished to submit amendments at the next meeting.

49. Mr. ANTOINE (Haiti) said that in the French text, the term "*hommes de science*" would be more appropriate than "*scientifiques*". His delegation also regretted that the draft resolution, although it was a good synthesis of the two previous draft resolutions, made no mention of the efforts which the developing countries were making to hold onto the scientists and researchers who had been trained in their countries.

50. He endorsed the remarks of the representatives of Kenya and the Sudan.

51. Mr. DUNN (United States of America) said that the Working Group had performed a difficult job successfully and that his delegation supported the draft resolution as it stood. It had reservations, however, concerning the financial implications of operative paragraph 2 (b). It

thought that the Council should vote as soon as possible on draft resolution E/L.1412.

52. The PRESIDENT asked whether the members of the Council preferred to vote immediately on the draft resolution or to wait until the amendments which had been announced had been submitted.

53. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) agreed with the representative of the United States that the Council should vote on the draft resolution at once. If necessary, it could first vote separately on some paragraphs.

54. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) said that although the Council's time was precious, the question of the outflow of trained personnel from developing to developed countries was too important to be resolved hastily. In operative paragraph 3 (e), his delegation wished to propose that the word "obtain" should be replaced by the word "seek". It also proposed that operative paragraph 5 should be amended to read:

"Calls upon developed countries, the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, the United Nations Development Programme, the International Atomic Energy Agency and the various organs, commissions and agencies in the United Nations system to assist developing countries to establish scientific and technological research centres, at both the national and the regional level."

55. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) urged the Council not to vote on the draft resolution until it had the text of the amendments of the representative of Kenya, which raised very important points.

56. Mr. ANTOINE (Haiti) recalled that when France had submitted a late amendment in the Council two sessions previously, it had been decided not to consider it. Perhaps, therefore, there was no reason to postpone the vote in the present case. If a vote was taken, however, his delegation would abstain.

57. Mr. GROS (France) said that his delegation had no fundamental objection to the Council allowing the representative of Kenya a short period of time to submit his amendments. However, some of the amendments that had been suggested, by the Sudan in particular, seemed unacceptable, since they called into question the consensus which the Working Group had arrived at with some difficulty.

58. Moreover, it should not be forgotten that the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development was studying the question of local training of skilled personnel, which was a costly but none the less effective project, as it made it possible to keep such personnel in the countries where they were trained.

59. If the majority of the members of the Council were in favour of an immediate vote, his delegation would not object.

60. Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya) thanked the representative of Brazil for his support. His delegation would be grateful if



the Council would agree to wait for his amendments, which related to operative paragraph 3.

61. The PRESIDENT said that the Council would authorize the representative of Kenya to submit his amendments at the next meeting, at which it would vote on draft

resolution E/L.1412. He set Tuesday, 18 May, at 11 a.m. as the final deadline for the submission of formal amendments to the draft resolution.

*The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.*



## ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Fiftieth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Tuesday, 18 May 1971,  
at 10.45 a.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Rachid DRISS (Tunisia).

## AGENDA ITEM 8

## Natural resources (concluded):

(a) Report of the Committee on Natural Resources (concluded)\* (E/4969, E/4989, chap. VI, sect. C; E/L.1399, E/L.1411 and Add.1, E/L.1413, E/L.1414, E/L.1415)

1. Mr. FAROOQ (Pakistan) observed that document E/L.1411/Add.1 stating the administrative and financial implications of draft resolution E/L.1411 gave no indication of the financial implications of the periodic report which would have to be prepared pursuant to part G of the draft, concerning permanent sovereignty over natural resources.

2. Mr. BENOIT (Chief, Financial Policy and Institutions Section, Division of Public Finance and Financial Institutions) said that the wide-ranging report called for in paragraph 131 of the report of the Committee on Natural Resources (E/4969) would require a great deal of research. For that reason, it had been envisaged that the proposed report would cover a limited number of countries at a time—five in Africa, five in Asia and five in Latin America. Virtually none of the information required was available in existing published material and intensive on-the-spot research by staff members would thus be necessary. At the time of the adoption of General Assembly resolution 2692 (XXV), the Secretary-General had not been requested to prepare a report and, therefore, no financial provision had been made for that purpose. The Division of Public Finance and Financial Institutions, which would be responsible for drawing up the report, had no funds at its disposal to defray the cost involved and an additional allocation of \$20,000 would be required to prepare the report in the form proposed by the Committee on Natural Resources.

3. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said with reference to part D of the draft resolution (E/L.1411) that he thought the Secretary-General, in co-operation with the agencies concerned, should be able to accomplish the task of defining more clearly the objectives and purposes of the proposed international water conference without the advice and assistance of an *ad hoc* group of experts, the convening of which would cost an estimated \$12,000.

4. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) endorsed the comments of the USSR representative. He also wished to point out that the views of a larger number of government experts concerning such a conference could be ascertained at the next session of the Committee on Natural Resources at no cost whatsoever to the United Nations.

5. Mr. AYOUB (Tunisia), referring to parts C and G of the draft resolution, said he wondered whether endorsement by the Council of decisions taken by the Committee on Natural Resources was necessary to enable funds for the implementation of those decisions to be provided. Was that procedure customary or did it apply solely to that Committee? Moreover, it did not seem appropriate for the Council to consider the financial implications of convening an *ad hoc* group of experts, as referred to in operative paragraph 2 of part D of the draft resolution, since that paragraph recommended only that the Secretary-General should convene such a group "if necessary". Thus the decision would be taken by the Secretary-General himself.

6. Mr. AHMED (Secretary of the Council), noting that estimates of expenditure were provided in accordance with rule 34 of the Council's rules of procedure, said that document E/L.1411/Add.1 contained a statement of the financial implications of convening an *ad hoc* group of experts simply because such a possibility was provided for in part D of the draft resolution.

7. Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya) said that an international water conference would enable the developing countries to learn a great deal about the latest technological advances in water resources development. The conference held in 1967 had not been as representative as some had wished and it would therefore be extremely useful if another was held in 1975. Accordingly, his delegation could not accept the first of the amendments proposed by Brazil and the USSR in document E/L.1413.

8. Mr. FAROOQ (Pakistan) supported that view. It was not enough to affirm that water resources development was a matter that should be dealt with at the country and regional levels. The eight years between 1967 and 1975 were bringing many new developments which would have to be considered. Moreover, it was his understanding that the programme for the 1967 conference had not been drawn up with the assistance of intergovernmental bodies, as would be the case if part D of the draft resolution was adopted.

9. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) noted that the Committee on Natural Resources had failed to come to a decision as to whether it was necessary to convene an international water conference. Most delegations had either opposed the idea or expressed some doubts about it. The next step, therefore, should be to ascertain the views of all States Members of the United Nations. A number of speakers had said that the question of water resources development should be dealt with at the national or, at the very most, the regional level. He wished to stress that the amendment in question would be without prejudice to the final decision on the matter—it merely asked for a consolidated document containing the views of Member States and various intergovernmental bodies.

\* Resumed from the 1764th meeting.



10. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that in principle there was no conflict between the provisions of the draft resolution and the first amendment proposed in document E/L.1413. His country was greatly interested in the question of international co-operation in water resources development and it had no desire to prevent an international water conference from being held. The purpose of the amendment was to ensure that the views of Governments and of WHO and WMO, in addition to the bodies mentioned in the draft resolution, would be taken into account. If the amendment was adopted, the preparation for such a conference would thus be much more thorough.

11. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) said he hoped that the Brazilian and USSR delegations would not press their proposals (E/L.1413). The sponsors of the draft resolution were in no way prejudging the question of the desirability of convening an international water conference. They were merely requesting the Secretary-General to prepare a report on the matter. It was unnecessary to consult Governments at the present preliminary stage, since the report would be considered by the Committee on Natural Resources, the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly.

12. Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya) noted that the second of the New Zealand amendments in document E/L.1414 was concerned with the position of UNDP in relation to the draft resolution before the Council. He read out a statement made by a representative of UNDP during the 1758th meeting of the Council according to which the Administrator had indicated that it would be possible to work out details of the arrangements necessary to implement the proposal for advisory services to the satisfaction of all concerned. The Administrator had also expressed confidence that the arrangements could be made between the Secretariat of the United Nations and that of UNDP. It was clear from the statement that UNDP was prepared to co-operate in the matter and there was accordingly no need for the amendment in question.

13. Mr. GATES (New Zealand) said that, in submitting the amendments in document E/L.1414, his delegation had in no way intended to delay the establishment of the special natural resources advisory services. Rather, it had hoped that associating the Governing Council of UNDP with the arrangements to be made would enable the services to become operational on the best possible terms. In its view, they should not become operational until the relevant arrangements had been considered by UNDP.

14. Mr. SKATARETIKO (Yugoslavia) said that operative paragraph 2 of part B as it stood was sufficient to ensure the harmonious functioning of the advisory services, since it recommended that the Secretariat and UNDP should work out the relevant arrangements. There was no need for further discussion of the question; the Council should decide the issue forthwith if delay was to be avoided.

15. Mr. MILTON (United Kingdom) said that his delegation welcomed the second New Zealand amendment as an attempt to place the proposal concerning natural resources advisory services in an appropriate wider framework. The implications of the proposal to establish advisory services were too important, in the context of country pro-

gramming, to be left for settlement through intersecretariat arrangements. The Governing Council of UNDP should be given an opportunity to express its views, especially as by far the greater proportion of experts who would be involved in providing the services would come from UNDP projects. The first New Zealand amendment, however, went rather farther than his delegation was prepared to go in approving the establishment of the services at the present stage.

16. Mr. LENNON (United States of America) associated his delegation with the remarks of the New Zealand and United Kingdom representatives. He noted that the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination had also come to the conclusion that it would be desirable for the Administrator and Governing Council of UNDP to participate in any arrangements to be made. It would be regrettable if that Committee, responsible as it was for co-ordination, was over-ruled by the Council. With reference to the first New Zealand amendment, he said that he would not be in favour of deciding even in principle to establish the services before the relevant arrangements had been concluded.

17. Mr. FAROOQ (Pakistan) agreed with the Yugoslav representative that the provisions of the draft resolution concerning arrangements to be worked out by the United Nations Secretariat and UNDP were adequate as they stood. The Council should not anticipate complications in that connexion; its approach should be optimistic. It should not hesitate to take immediately a decision on the question, which was most important.

18. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the amendments to draft resolution E/L.1411 submitted in documents E/L.1413, E/L.1414 and E/L.1415, in that order.

*The amendments in document E/L.1413 were adopted by 16 votes to 7, with 1 abstention.*

19. Mr. MILTON (United Kingdom) requested separate votes on each of the New Zealand amendments in document E/L.1414.

*The amendment in paragraph 1 of document E/L.1414 was rejected by 13 votes to 4, with 7 abstentions.*

*The amendment in paragraph 2 of document E/L.1414 was adopted by 16 votes to 6, with 3 abstentions.*

*The amendment in paragraph 3 of document E/L.1414 was rejected by 8 votes to 7, with 10 abstentions.*

*The amendment in document E/L.1415 was adopted by 10 votes to 6, with 9 abstentions.*

20. Mr. LENNON (United States of America) asked for separate votes on each part of draft resolution E/L.1411.

21. Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya) said that the sponsors of the draft resolution had accepted a proposal by the representative of Lebanon that the first preambular paragraph of part D should be deleted. They would also be willing to accept a suggestion by the representative of France that the word "its" should be inserted after "such a

manner as to ensure that" in operative paragraph 1 of part F.

22. Mr. PRAGUE (France) said that, in a discussion with the sponsors of the draft resolution, he had asked what interpretation should be given to operative paragraph 1 of part F and, in particular, whether the work programmes referred to were those of the Committee on Natural Resources or those of the Resources and Transport Division. He had been told that the reference was to the work programme of the Committee. To clarify the text, therefore, he had made the suggestion to which the representative of Kenya had referred. The sponsors had not accepted more substantive amendments proposed by his delegation, which had accordingly not pressed them.

23. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) said that the French representative's suggestion concerning operative paragraph 1 of part F was actually a substantive amendment which, under rule 63 of the rules of procedure, would be out of order if introduced at that juncture. The work programmes referred to were in fact all United Nations programmes in the field of natural resources, including those of Secretariat units.

24. Mr. SKATARETIKO (Yugoslavia) requested a roll-call vote on each part of draft resolution E/L.1411, and on the draft resolution as a whole.

#### Part A

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

*In favour:* Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Sudan, Tunisia, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Brazil, Ceylon, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Ghana, Haiti, Indonesia, Italy, Jamaica, Kenya, Lebanon, Madagascar, Malaysia, New Zealand, Niger.

*Against:* Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Hungary.

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

*Part A was adopted by 21 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions.*

#### Part B

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

*In favour:* Kenya, Lebanon, Madagascar, Malaysia, New Zealand, Niger, Pakistan, Peru, Sudan, Tunisia, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Brazil, Ceylon, Congo (Democratic Republic of), France, Ghana, Haiti, Indonesia, Italy, Jamaica.

*Against:* Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Greece, Hungary.

*Abstaining:* Norway.

*Part B, as amended, was adopted by 21 votes to 5, with 1 abstention.*

#### Part C

*New Zealand, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

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

*Against:* Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Greece, Hungary.

*Abstaining:* Brazil.

*Part C was adopted by 22 votes to 4, with 1 abstention.*

#### Part D

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

*In favour:* France, Ghana, Greece, Haiti, Hungary, Indonesia, Italy, Jamaica, Kenya, Lebanon, Madagascar, Malaysia, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Sudan, Tunisia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Ceylon, Congo (Democratic Republic of).

*Against:* None.

*Abstaining:* Brazil.

*Part D, as amended, was adopted by 26 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

#### Part E

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

*In favour:* France, Ghana, Greece, Haiti, Indonesia, Italy, Jamaica, Kenya, Lebanon, Madagascar, Malaysia, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Sudan, Tunisia, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Brazil, Ceylon, Congo (Democratic Republic of).

*Against:* Hungary, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

*Abstaining:* United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*Part E was adopted by 23 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions.*

#### Part F

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

*In favour:* Jamaica, Kenya, Lebanon, Madagascar, Malaysia, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Sudan, Tunisia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United



Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Brazil, Ceylon, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Ghana, Haiti, Hungary, Indonesia, Italy.

*Against:* None.

*Abstaining:* France, Greece.

*Part F, as amended, was adopted by 25 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

#### Part G

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

*In favour:* Kenya, Lebanon, Madagascar, Malaysia, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Sudan, Tunisia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Brazil, Ceylon, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Ghana, Haiti, Hungary, Indonesia, Italy, Jamaica.

*Against:* United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*Abstaining:* New Zealand, France, Greece.

*Part G was adopted by 22 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions.*

25. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on draft resolution E/L.1411 as a whole, as amended.

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

*In favour:* Indonesia, Italy, Jamaica, Kenya, Lebanon, Madagascar, Malaysia, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Sudan, Tunisia, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Ceylon, Congo (Democratic Republic of), France, Ghana, Haiti.

*Against:* None.

*Abstaining:* Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Brazil, Greece, Hungary.

*The draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 21 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.*

26. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had supported the United States amendment (E/L.1415) to part F because rule 34 of the rules of procedure laid down that a separate estimate of the cost involved in any proposal should be circulated to members of the Council. It had voted against part E, which was contrary to the rules of procedure in several respects, and it regretted that the sponsors had been unable to delete the reference to paragraph 94 of the report of the Committee on Natural Resources (E/4969), because it was fundamentally in favour of the proposal. It had also voted against part B because it felt that the special natural resources advisory services would disorganize the established practice with regard to the employment of experts. It

was in favour of a revolving fund for natural resources exploration, but had had to vote against part C because of the unsatisfactory procedure that was proposed.

27. Mr. AYOUB (Tunisia) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it felt that the time had come for the Council to take action.

28. Mr. PRAGUE (France) explained that his delegation had abstained in the vote on part A of the draft resolution on the ground that, if the Committee on Natural Resources was to hold more frequent meetings, its agenda should also be lightened. It had voted in favour of part E in the belief that the Committee should concentrate on the three main natural resources referred to in the preambular paragraph. He regretted that his amendment to part F had not been accepted, because as it stood operative paragraph 1 was open to two interpretations and did not make clear the primary role of the Committee on Natural Resources, which was to exercise responsibility over all natural resources activities in the United Nations system. He had therefore abstained in the vote on that part of the draft. With regard to part G, on which he had also abstained, he restated his delegation's belief that the Committee on Natural Resources was not qualified to take up matters with political implications.

29. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on part C because it disagreed with the procedure proposed and felt that the Council should take a decision at its fifty-first session after the Governing Council of UNDP had stated its views. It had abstained on part D and on the draft resolution as a whole because it disapproved of the untimely proposal for an international water conference. Nevertheless, he wished to reaffirm his delegation's full support for parts A, B, E, F and G.

30. Mr. DØRUM (Norway) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on part B because, as it had stated in the Committee on Natural Resources, the establishment of special natural resources advisory services was premature. UNDP should first state whether it would support the proposal. Although the draft resolution as a whole still contained some unsatisfactory provisions, he had been able to vote for it because of the amendments that had been adopted.

## AGENDA ITEM 11

### Science and technology (continued):

#### (a) Future institutional arrangements for science and technology (continued)\* (E/4959, E/4989, chap. VII; E/L.1400, E/L.1407 and Add.1)

31. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil), introducing draft resolution E/L.1400, said that, although the application of science and technology to development was only one aspect of the United Nations role in the field of science and technology, it unquestionably deserved priority; hence the second preambular paragraph. The purpose of recalling paragraph 4 of the Council's resolution 1544 (XLIX) in the last preambular paragraph was to draw attention to the

\* Resumed from the 1756th meeting.

need for the Council to begin moving ahead. With regard to the operative part, he explained that paragraph 1 should be read in conjunction with paragraph 3. The proposed new standing committee would have to adopt a global approach, and that was why the words "at a general and planning level" had been used. Because the purely developmental aspects of the application of science and technology had to be viewed together with the sectoral activities of the specialized agencies and with UNCTAD's activities in relation to the transfer of operative technology, the sponsors felt that the new body should be at the level of the General Assembly. Another reason was that although the phenomena of science and technology were essentially non-political, solutions to the problems involved required political decisions. In that connexion, he recalled that the United States representative to the Second Committee had recognized that fact in his statement in the Committee.<sup>1</sup> The past 25 years had witnessed a democratic evolution in accordance with which the Assembly had increasingly affirmed its responsibilities. It was thus no accident that UNCTAD and UNIDO, for example, were General Assembly bodies. That process of democratic evolution could not and should not be reversed; it reflected a need for action, which required a process of negotiation that only the

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fifth Session, Second Committee*, 1347th meeting, paras. 15 to 22.

General Assembly could provide. The Council, for its part, was an inadequate forum for negotiation. However, operative paragraph 2 of the draft took into account the view of those who believed that the Council had a role to play in the sphere of science and technology, and as in the case of the reports of UNDP, UNCTAD and UNIDO, the Council would have an opportunity to take measures at its own level when it was considering the reports of the new standing committee.

32. Operative paragraph 4 was taken from a draft circulated informally by the United States delegation when the subject had first been considered; there seemed to be general agreement on the need for the assistance of experts to complement the activities of the proposed intergovernmental body. The sponsors envisaged *ad hoc* panels of experts, but it would be for the General Assembly to decide on that matter.

33. The reiteration in operative paragraph 5 of the need for additional resources was included because the sponsors wished to make it clear that they did not envisage the future activities of the United Nations in the field of science and technology as a mere academic exercise.

*The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.*





## ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Fiftieth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Tuesday, 18 May 1971,  
at 3.20 p.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Rachid DRISS (Tunisia).

## AGENDA ITEM 11

## Science and technology (continued):

(a) Future institutional arrangements for science and technology (continued) (E/4959, E/4989, chap. VII; E/L.1400, E/L.1407 and Add.1)

1. Mr. KITCHEN (United States of America) recalled that during its successive statements on the question under consideration, the United States delegation had always borne in mind the interests which the General Assembly, UNCTAD, the specialized agencies and IAEA had in the matter. He hoped that the tendency for dispersal of work programmes and co-ordination activities would cease. If the Council agreed to consider measures designed to entrust scientific and technological questions to a standing committee of the Council, the United States delegation would be prepared to give serious study to the other aspects of the question. It had listened with interest to the Brazilian delegation's introduction of draft resolution E/L.1400. However, if it was decided to adopt the proposed measures many activities which had originally been envisaged would no longer come under the Council.

2. He wished to stress the importance of operative paragraph 2 of the United States draft resolution (E/L.1407) which provided that, pursuant to Article 62 of the Charter, the Council would report to the General Assembly what action it had taken on the report of the standing intergovernmental committee on science and technology, establishment of which was envisaged, and what matters in the committee's report were forwarded for its consideration. The draft did not state definitely how many members would serve on the intergovernmental committee and provided for equitable geographical distribution. The committee could draw on scientific and technical expertise supplied by *ad hoc* panels of experts attached to it or from the specialized agencies and the IAEA. The United States delegation had already stated that its draft resolution did not aim at limiting the work of the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development.

3. Mr. DE SEYNES (Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs) noted with concern that draft resolution E/L.1400 made no mention of the possible maintenance of the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development and that draft resolution E/L.1407 was rather vague on the subject.

4. It was not easy to define the role of the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology

to Development, because that Committee had no prospect of being able to act in a positive and practical fashion. Although some had become impatient at not seeing the work of the Committee translated into concrete programmes, it had performed a great deal of work. The experience of other international organizations showed that the success of national or international action, particularly in questions of science and technology, greatly depended on the interaction between intergovernmental and independent scientific bodies. In most countries, such interaction was systematically organized. In the same way, in other international organizations, whether the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) or the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, there was a subtle balance between government bodies and panels of experts. It would seem that such interaction was just as necessary for the United Nations to achieve effective work in the application of science and technology to development.

5. The work of the Advisory Committee had an obvious influence, even outside the United Nations system, as was shown by the following instance. During a recent meeting of an OECD committee of experts, science and technology specialists from industrialized countries chose a dozen points from the plan of action drawn up by the Advisory Committee. They recommended that an OECD intergovernmental body should particularly encourage new research and an overhaul of teaching programmes.

6. The Advisory Committee's influence on intergovernmental and national bodies should be borne in mind before taking a decision on its future. Its initial success was certainly due to the eminence of its members and to their prestige in their own countries, which had enabled them to have direct access to decision-making government bodies. By means of that happy combination of scientists and economists, the needs of developing countries had never been lost sight of in academic discussions. The Committee's uncertainty for the past two years as to the renewal of its mandate had certainly not been favourable to its work. A speedy end should therefore be brought to the situation. With regard to the proposal that the Advisory Committee's responsibilities should be divided up, it should be recalled that in any event its usual method of work was to form working groups, whose activities were subsequently taken up by the Committee itself. Moreover, since its establishment, the Committee had acquired an identity, an outstanding reputation, which enhanced its influence.

7. He had abstained from taking part in the debate on the question of which government bodies should have problems submitted to them. In his opinion, the interplay of political factors was not really affected at present by the choice of the body where those problems were to be discussed. Consequently, the work of the United Nations bodies might perhaps be divided up in a rational manner on the basis of

their functions, with a view to achieving maximum impact and efficiency.

8. The PRESIDENT stated that, in view of the complexity of the question being considered, he thought it better to wait until a subsequent meeting before voting on the two draft resolutions before the Council. Consultations aiming at a compromise could thus continue.

9. Mr. VIAUD (France) noted that the Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs was not alone in his concern regarding the future of the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development. The French delegation also shared that concern when it saw that the aim of the United States draft resolution appeared to be to terminate the Committee's mandate. The French delegation was not in favour of any proliferation of independent groups of experts, since current work was often made more complicated because of the large number of bodies which were devoid of governmental responsibility and which made recommendations to the Council. However, an exception was justified in the case of the Advisory Committee and of the panel of experts on planning, because of the important part that those two committees could play in the relatively new activities of the United Nations concerning science and technology and the evaluation of the work of the Second Development Decade.

10. The French delegation was somewhat perplexed by the United States draft resolution (E/L.1407) because of its lack of precision, and was frankly dismayed by the draft resolution of Brazil, Kenya, Sudan and Yugoslavia (E/L.1400). There could be a place for an independent body in the structure of subsidiary bodies of the Council.

11. Although the time-limit for the submission of draft resolutions had expired, the French delegation would like to be authorized to present a text which would bridge the gaps in the other two drafts. If the Council found it impossible to agree to that request, the French delegation would propose an amendment to replace operative paragraph 6 of the United States draft resolution.

12. The PRESIDENT asked the French representative if his amendment related to the question as a whole or only to the Advisory Committee.

13. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that his delegation's draft resolution was not incompatible with the other two drafts and related to the Advisory Committee only. Were it to be submitted as an amendment it would complete the United States draft resolution (E/L.1407) which would then consist of two parts.

14. The PRESIDENT said that, if there was no objection, he would consider that the Council authorized the French delegation to submit its draft resolution.

*It was so decided.*

15. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) said that the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1400 had tried to be as specific as possible and had even taken one paragraph (operative paragraph 4) from the text submitted by the United States. While acknowledging the excellent work

done by the Advisory Committee in certain sectors, particularly that of proteins, the sponsors had nevertheless decided to recommend to the General Assembly the establishment of a standing committee to deal with all questions relating to science and technology. Brazil for its part would not object to the term of the existing Advisory Committee being extended, but the question was one to be decided by the General Assembly at the appropriate time. Contrary to what certain members seemed to be contending, politics played a very important role and that was why the question should be settled by the General Assembly, the most democratic body of the United Nations.

16. Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya), speaking as a sponsor of draft resolution E/L.1400, said that the intentions of the sponsors, who were fully aware of the importance of science and technology in economic and social development, could not be questioned. It now appeared essential to establish a committee with sufficient authority to enable it to co-ordinate activities and establish the necessary priorities. The sponsors did not want to prejudge the standing committee's mandate. His delegation had already said that the Advisory Committee should be maintained; it would be able to furnish technical support to the standing committee whose establishment was recommended in operative paragraph 1. Moreover, the doubts expressed by certain delegations had been taken into account in the wording of operative paragraph 4. The standing committee to deal with all questions related to science and technology should be a General Assembly committee. The democratic nature of that proposal, which was designed to give the new committee sufficient authority, must be admitted. The purpose of the recommendation in operative paragraph 2 that the proposed standing committee should report to the General Assembly through the Economic and Social Council was to ensure the efficacy of the new body.

17. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the statement of the Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs had been extremely useful in that it had made it possible to form a coherent idea of the experience of United Nations bodies in co-operation in science and technology and provided a summary of the Secretariat's views on the matter. The emphasis had rightly been placed on the need to combine the activities of two bodies, one an intergovernmental body responsible for defining general policy in science and technology and the other a body composed of leading experts in the application of science and technology to development. The Under-Secretary-General had referred to factual data, particularly to the activities of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance which prepared basic directives for scientific and technological co-operation at the intergovernmental level, and, in doing so, relied on the advice of leading experts. The same practice was followed at the national level. The systematic combination of expert advice and policy-making should be adopted by the Council. In that connexion, he endorsed the French representative's comments.

18. Any intergovernmental organ must of course receive its instruction from a governing body, in the present case the General Assembly, and take account of the role to be played by the Secretary-General. Now, in its resolution 2658 (XXV), the General Assembly had requested the Secretary-General to inform the Council at its fifty-first



session of progress made in economic, technological and scientific co-operation between States. His delegation wondered, therefore, if the Council was indeed adopting the right approach. It was difficult to draw precise conclusions from the current discussions.

19. The PRESIDENT said that progress did not necessarily consist in formal decisions. In any case, the Council should facilitate the Secretary-General's task by making progress in its work.

20. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) said that the main point of disagreement was whether the proposed body should be a Council or a General Assembly body. He wondered whether the sponsors of the two draft resolutions could not hold consultations with a view to producing a joint text. In view of the very pronounced differences prevailing in the Council, that would seem the best course.

21. Mr. AKWEI (Ghana) said that neither of the drafts before the Council fully satisfied his delegation. The text of draft resolution E/L.1407 was too vague about the role to be allocated to the Advisory Committee. As the Under-Secretary-General and the French representative had emphasized, the Committee discharged an extremely useful function and was in a position to assume responsibilities other bodies could not. Both draft resolutions placed emphasis on *ad hoc* panels of experts attached to the proposed intergovernmental body or to the specialized agencies. Now, the Advisory Committee was useful precisely because it had a global view of all matters relating to science and technology whereas expert panels dealt with only one particular subject. As several countries' national experience showed, the various sectors of science and technology could not be separated. As constituted, the Advisory Committee could if it wished establish *ad hoc* expert panels to meet its needs. The sponsors of the texts should therefore indicate more clearly that they intended to maintain the Advisory Committee's very positive role.

22. Some speakers had contended, in support of the idea of an intergovernmental committee, that the Advisory Committee's ineffectiveness stemmed from the fact that it could not call on the support of Governments. If that was so, it would be up to the Council to make recommendations to remedy the situation. Moreover, if the proposed committee's main function was to provide expert advice, it was difficult to see what purpose would be served by its being an intergovernmental body.

23. The representative of Ghana did not agree with those who felt that the proposed committee would be more effective if it came under the General Assembly rather than the Council. That would merely complicate the Council's work of co-ordination and weaken its role as the organ responsible for economic and social matters. It might even lead to a kind of confrontation between the Council and the Assembly.

24. According to draft resolution E/L.1400 the Secretary-General would be requested to submit a report to the General Assembly on the possible terms of reference of the standing committee. If the sponsors were convinced of the value of the new committee they must already know what role they wished it to play. The draft resolution submitted

by the United States (E/L.1407), on the other hand, clearly defined the responsibilities of the new body. However, it appeared that the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development would be perfectly capable at present of undertaking those responsibilities.

25. Lastly, draft resolution E/L.1400 stated that the standing committee would deal with all questions related to science and technology. That seemed extremely ambitious. Obviously, the Committee would have to confine itself to certain well-defined areas.

26. In view of the differences of opinion it would, perhaps, be advisable to hold informal consultations, as the representative of the Sudan had suggested. The amendment suggested by the French delegation might expedite decisions.

27. Mr. KITCHEN (United States of America) agreed with the representative of the Sudan that informal consultations might help to reconcile the texts of the two draft resolutions.

28. The principle of the independence of experts would be upheld by the existence of *ad hoc* panels of experts to assist the standing committee. His delegation was prepared to clarify operative paragraph 6 of its draft if anyone felt that its purpose was not clear.

29. In the third paragraph of his note (E/L.1407/Add.1) the Secretary-General indicated the financial implications of implementing operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution E/L.1407. He wondered whether the sum of \$60,000 mentioned in that paragraph was more or less than the sum that would be necessary to maintain the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development in its present form.

30. Mr. GRESFORD (Director for Science and Technology) said that no funds had been requested for the Advisory Committee in the budget estimates for 1972 since it was not yet known if its mandate would be renewed. The estimate for the current year (1971) was \$100,000, that was to say more than the estimated cost of the expert panels (\$60,000).

31. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) said that the representative of Ghana had quite rightly emphasized the need for an integrated approach to matters relating to science and technology. That was precisely why the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1400 had suggested that the standing committee should deal with "all" questions relating to science and technology. However, that did not mean that the committee would examine all those matters in detail but merely that it would deal with them "at a general and planning level" (operative paragraph 1). Each field of activity would therefore be studied by the various panels of experts and the standing committee's task would be to prepare an integrated plan covering the whole field.

32. The four sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1400 had decided not to spell out the standing committee's terms of reference because they felt that it was the task of the General Assembly since the Assembly would establish the



committee. However, sufficiently clear indications relating to the question had been given in operative paragraphs 1 and 3.

33. It should be emphasized that it was the Advisory Committee itself which had felt that it would be advisable to establish an intergovernmental body. Far from wishing to ignore the Advisory Committee the sponsors had, on the contrary, sought to comply with the wish it had expressed.

34. The PRESIDENT suggested that the sponsors of the two draft resolutions should hold consultations in order to reach agreement on a compromise text for the two draft resolutions (E/L.1400 and E/L.1407).

#### AGENDA ITEM 14

##### Report of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (E/4989)

35. The PRESIDENT recalled that the Council had already reviewed most of the chapters of CPC's report in connexion with its consideration of other items of its agenda. That was so for chapter VI (Selected Programme Areas), chapter VII (Future Institutional Arrangements for Science and Technology), chapter VIII (Question of the Establishment of a United Nations Transport Centre) and chapter IX (Development of Tourism). As for chapter II (Review of the Sphere of Activities and Competence of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination), CPC had recognized that more time would be needed to examine the question and had therefore decided to include it in the agenda of its ninth session. The Council would no doubt receive CPC's report on that important item at its fifty-first session. It would then have an opportunity to undertake a detailed study of general co-ordination questions and the reports of the Joint Inspection Unit.

36. If there were no objections, he would suggest that the Council should take note of the report of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination on the work of its eighth session.

*It was so decided.*

#### AGENDA ITEM 3

##### Outflow of trained personnel from developing to developed countries (*continued*)\* (E/4798, E/4820 and Corr.1 and Summary, E/4820 and Add.1 and Corr.1, E/L.1379/Rev.1/Add.1, E/L.1412, E/L.1416, E/L.1417, E/L.1418)

37. The PRESIDENT stated that three delegations had expressed a desire to submit amendments to draft resolution E/L.1412. He invited the members of the Working Group set up by the Council at its 1763rd meeting and the sponsors of the amendments to hold an informal meeting.

*The meeting was suspended at 5 p.m. and resumed at 7.10 p.m.*

38. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon) said that an agreement had been reached between the members of the Working Group who had drawn up draft resolution E/L.1412 and the delegations which had submitted amendments. The amendment to operative paragraph 3(e), proposed by the USSR delegation (E/L.1417) had been accepted with a slight change proposed by the Sudan. The Sudanese amendment (E/L.1416) had been accepted after a slight modification. The Working Group had then considered the amendments submitted by Brazil, Haiti, Jamaica and Kenya (E/L.1418). It had agreed to the addition of a new paragraph (a) after the second paragraph of the preamble. On the other hand, the co-sponsors of the draft amendments agreed to withdraw the proposed paragraph (b). It had been decided to add the three new paragraphs between operative paragraphs 4 and 5.

39. The PRESIDENT congratulated the Working Group and the sponsors of the amendments for their spirit of co-operation. Voting on the draft resolution would have to be postponed until the new text had been distributed.

*The meeting rose at 7.20 p.m.*

\* Resumed from the 1765th meeting.





## ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Fiftieth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

1768th meeting

Wednesday, 19 May 1971,  
at 3.10 p.m.

NEW YORK

*President: Mr. Rachid DRISS (Tunisia).*

## AGENDA ITEM 3

**Outflow of trained personnel from developing to developed countries (concluded)** (E/4798, E/4820 and Corr.1 and Summary, E/4820 and Add.1 and Corr.1, E/1379/Rev.1/Add.1, E/L.1412/Rev.1)

1. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon) introduced the revised text of the draft resolution (E/L.1412/Rev.1) agreed on by the members of the Working Group, of which he had been Chairman, and by the sponsors of draft amendments.

2. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no comments, he would take it that the text was adopted by consensus.

*It was so decided.*

3. Mr. FILIMONOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had supported the draft resolution, which in any event was merely a first step towards solving the problem. It had done so on the understanding that operative paragraph 4 would have no financial implications. He recalled that, so far as his delegation was concerned, the basis for the measures to be taken "in accordance with the Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade" was the joint statement on the second decade of development and social progress by the delegations of the socialist countries dated 21 September 1970.<sup>1</sup>

4. Mr. GROS (France) asked whether the adoption of the draft resolution would have any financial implications other than those for operative paragraph 2 (a) and (b) originally referred to in document E/L.1379/Rev.1/Add.1. He added that his delegation had some reservations with regard to operative paragraph 4 in its present form.

5. Mr. KOEHRING (United States of America) said that his delegation had supported the draft resolution but did not accept the idea that, as stated in the third preambular paragraph, developing countries were suffering material loss from the "brain drain" to some advanced countries. It would have been more correct to say "may suffer material loss". The reference in operative paragraph 8 to General Assembly resolution 2688 (XXV) was, to be more accurate, a reference to paragraph 41 of the annex to that resolution.

6. The PRESIDENT confirmed that the resolution would have no financial implications other than those stated in document E/L.1379/Rev.1/Add.1. The Council had con-

cluded its consideration of item 3 and could now continue its discussion of agenda item 16.

## AGENDA ITEM 16

**Measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council (continued)\*** (E/4986 and Add.1 to 7, E/L.1382, E/L.1408, E/L.1421, E/(L)/CRP.1)

7. Mr. HAMBRO (Norway) said that, in paragraph 7 of its reply (E/4986/Add.1) to the Secretary-General's questions regarding measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council, the Norwegian Government had stated that it continued to have an open mind on the subject-matter and that it would give careful consideration to any constructive proposal or suggestion aimed at strengthening the Council and its standing, thus assuring increased confidence among Member States in the Council as one of the main instruments in the world community's efforts to promote sustained economic and social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom throughout the world. With regard to concrete suggestions for measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council, he would draw attention to his Government's views, which had been presented in document E/4986/Add.1.

8. A number of delegations had argued that enlarging the membership of the Council would provide it with additional political strength and support. His delegation concurred with that view. It also agreed with the proposals for enlarging the membership of the Council in order to enhance its central role in the review and appraisal of the objectives and policies of the International Development Strategy of the Second United Nations Development Decade (General Assembly resolution 2626 (XXV)). The developing countries had argued that the present size of the Council did not make it adequately representative of a United Nations membership of 127 countries. His delegation recognized that that was a valid point, and it was prepared to consider with other delegations any formula for enlargement which might emerge as a consensus of the members of the Council. However, the question of enlargement of the membership was closely linked with two other most important questions, namely, the review and appraisal machinery for the Second Development Decade and future institutional arrangements for science and technology. Those three questions should be considered as three aspects of one single problem. The Council should not take any decision with regard to one of those aspects without taking due account of the decisions it might take concerning the others. His delegation hoped that the members of the Council would be prepared to take final decisions on those matters at the fifty-first session.

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fifth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 42, document A/8074.

\* Resumed from the 1765th meeting.

9. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) said that the Council should pause and take stock of a complex of draft documentation on the subject, not all under the item, before taking any decision. The first document in chronological order, had been draft resolution E/L.1382 submitted by the Soviet delegation.

10. The United States delegation had then submitted draft resolution E/L.1407 on future institutional arrangements for science and technology (agenda item 11). Although that draft resolution did not relate directly to the item under consideration, the fact that it proposed the establishment of a subsidiary body with an enlarged membership was directly relevant.

11. Next, and still under item 11, and after warning against the dangers of abolishing the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development and replacing it by another committee, the French delegation had produced draft resolution E/L.1420, which was designed to keep the Advisory Committee in existence.

12. The Council had also been presented under item 11 with draft resolution E/L.1400, the sponsors of which had, in the view of his delegation, endeavoured to bypass rather than strengthen the authority of the Council.

13. Draft resolution E/L.1408, now submitted by Greece and New Zealand, was a balanced text which merited serious consideration. His delegation did not endorse proposals for enlarging the membership of the Council, because enlargement would not necessarily lead to greater effectiveness. The Secretariat and every delegation would have to carry a heavier burden, and the volume of documentation would simply increase. However, draft resolution E/L.1408 did not call for an immediate decision. It proposed many practical measures to which his delegation could agree, while delegations would have sufficient time before the fifty-first session to decide whether certain matters could be considered by existing committees or whether new ones were needed. In that context, the last preambular paragraph of the draft resolution would state in terms that implied that the Council as a whole were agreed that longer-term measures to increase the membership of the Council were required to strengthen the representative character, the authority and the dynamism of the Council. His delegation was not yet convinced that such measures were advisable: as a factual statement of apparently agreed view the wording went too far. His delegation would therefore like the words "in particular" in that paragraph to be replaced by "including, it has been suggested,".

14. His delegation could not agree with the amendments to draft resolution E/L.1408 contained in document E/L.1421. The effect of the first of the paragraphs intended to replace those in section IV would be to precipitate a decision on enlargement of the membership of the Council, while the second would lead to the adoption of a general decision to enlarge the membership of the sessional committees, without regard to the merits in each case. It would be better to make no changes in the text submitted by Greece and New Zealand.

15. Mr. PATAKI (Hungary) said that a number of delegations had attempted to link any improvement in the

organization of the work of the Council to an increase in its membership. There seemed to be no adequate basis for that argument, since an arithmetical increase could not be a guarantee of greater effectiveness. No speaker so far had explained in detail why the organization of the work of the Council would be improved if its membership was increased. Nor did draft resolution E/L.1408 give any explanation on that point. Because of the changes in the world of today, the problems awaiting the Council during the 1970s were different from those it had had to deal with during the 1960s. In order to bring about a genuine improvement in the organization of the work of the Council, it would first be necessary to review the most urgent problems confronting the United Nations. The next step would be to consider what must be done under the auspices of the Council and the General Assembly, bearing in mind the relationship between the two organs. That was the only way of increasing the effective role and the prestige of the Council. The Soviet draft resolution (E/L.1382) was aimed in that direction, and his delegation hoped that the Council would be able to agree to it.

16. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon) said it was generally recognized that the Council had lost some of the authority which had been vested in it under the Charter. It was generally felt that over the past 25 years the United Nations had achieved greater results in the economic and social field than in the political field. Nevertheless, it was clear that the Council could do even more. The proliferation of specialized agencies—whose role could not, of course, be minimized—was a source of weakness because of the duplication and overlapping which occurred and the lack of co-ordination in general. A parallel trend could be seen at the national level in many countries. Chapters IX and X of the Charter conferred on the Council broad responsibilities and great powers. However, it was clearly necessary to stimulate the will of Member States to enable the Council to exercise those powers effectively and define precisely the guidelines to be followed in the economic and social field. During the past two years, the Council had been taking stock of the situation and had carried out a review which was in itself of great importance. However, what was needed now was effective action. The question of enlarging the membership of the Council must be considered as soon as possible. In that respect, the Soviet draft resolution (E/L.1382) was based on the principles of the Charter, but in the opinion of his delegation it did not go far enough. Operative paragraphs 2 and 4 were rather vague, perhaps intentionally. With regard to operative paragraph 5, asking the General Assembly what should be done could only delay the solution of the problem.

17. In the case of draft resolution E/L.1408, his delegation wished to stress the importance of the Commission on Human Rights and the Commission on the Status of Women, which were referred to in operative paragraph 3 of section II. It could not, therefore, support operative paragraph 4 of section III of the draft resolution. Questions relating to the violation of human rights arose daily and must be kept under active review. From that standpoint, it did not even seem to be enough that the Commission on Human Rights should meet once a year, and it would be desirable for it also to hold special sessions.

18. With regard to operative paragraph 5 of section II and operative paragraph 1 of section III of draft resolution



E/L.1408, he hoped that it was not the intention of the sponsors to give the Secretary-General the power to formulate solutions in areas where the responsibility for decisions rested with the Council. His delegation was in general agreement with the draft resolution but reserved the option of submitting amendments.

19. Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) said that it was necessary to recognize the political functions of the Council and to affirm its leadership role in connexion with the International Development Strategy for the Second Development Decade. The developing countries wished to be associated more closely with the formulation of over-all policy. An increase in the membership of the Council might not be sufficient to guarantee the effectiveness of its work, but in any event the desire of the developing countries to be associated with the making of political decisions on which their economic and social development would depend should be acceded to. The industrialized countries should not regard an expansion of the membership of the Council as being directed against them. Draft resolutions E/L.1382 and E/L.1408 appeared to be complementary. The Soviet draft resolution stressed the relationship between the Council and the General Assembly, whereas the text submitted by Greece and New Zealand related solely to the work of the Council.

20. With regard to the Soviet draft resolution (E/L.1382), it appeared essential to go beyond mere recommendations and to take real decisions. Strict respect for the Charter should not doom the United Nations to immobility. Procedurally, it would seem that consideration of the relationship between the General Assembly and other organs should be a matter for the Special Committee on the Rationalization of the Procedures and Organization of the General Assembly, which was responsible for making a comprehensive study of the question.

21. With regard to draft resolution E/L.1408, the need for arrangements, including institutional arrangements, for implementing the Strategy must be recognized. The provisional agenda must be co-ordinated and synthesized, and duplication should be avoided. The documentation submitted should be clear and precise, and the Council's recommendations to the General Assembly should be made in such a way as to permit worth-while discussions at the Assembly level.

22. It still appeared possible to revise the texts of the two draft resolutions with a view to reaching agreement on a single text. Finally, his delegation wished to stress that there could be no reorganization without reinforcement, and no reinforcement without reorganization.

23. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan), introducing the amendments (E/L.1421) to draft resolution E/L.1408 on behalf of the delegations of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ghana, Indonesia, Italy, Kenya, Lebanon, Madagascar, Pakistan, Sudan and Tunisia, said it was clear from the debate on agenda item 16 that the Council had been unable to fulfil the hopes placed in it, that some of its former functions were now being increasingly entrusted to other bodies or to the General Assembly because they were considered better able to deal with particular questions, and that if that distressing trend continued the Council's

authority would naturally continue to decline. In order to remedy the situation, it was therefore only natural to consider an expansion of the membership of the Council, especially since it had a central role to play in connexion with the machinery for the review and appraisal of the implementation of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade. The debate on future institutional arrangements for science and technology had also proved that, if the Council was more broadly representative, it would be in a much better position to take meaningful decisions in that area. The extent of the Council's role was undoubtedly linked to its enlargement, as had been noted by a number of delegations, including, in particular, that of Italy. It was also heartening to note the favourable attitude adopted by the United States delegation on that question. He did not rule out the possibility afforded by draft resolution E/L.1408, but its provisions did not go far enough. Practically all the developing countries and some developed countries supported the principle of a change in the composition of the Council, which did not mean a violation of the Charter as some had said they feared. The membership, which had originally been 18, had already been increased to 27. It would be sufficient, in the present case, to adopt a proposal for the amendment of the Charter. Although some seemed to think otherwise, amendment of the Charter was a minor point, since it would relate only to the composition of the Council and not to that of other United Nations organs. The sponsors of the amendments (E/L.1421) were not pressing for the measures in question to be taken necessarily at the twenty-sixth session of the Assembly, but they would like the principle that measures should be discussed to be accepted.

24. While some provisions of draft resolution E/L.1408 were acceptable, the delegations submitting the amendments had been unable to endorse the provisions of operative section IV, for consideration of changes in the structure of the Council could not be postponed until the fifty-first session. For that reason the first of the two paragraphs proposed to replace that section recommended to the General Assembly at its twenty-sixth session to take all necessary steps, including a proposal aimed at amending the Charter, to ensure an adequate and early enlargement of its membership and the second paragraph would in the interim period, enlarge the membership of the sessional committees of the Council up to 54, and the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination to 27.

25. The sponsors of the amendments were prepared to discuss them with interested delegates in order that the Council might take a constructive decision before the end of the current session.

26. Mr. VIAUD (France) asked the sponsors of amendments E/L.1421 why they had proposed 54 as the enlarged membership of the sessional committees of the Council in the interim period and whether they would agree to change it if the General Assembly decided on a different number.

27. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan) said that the sponsors were open to any suggestion in connexion with any of their amendments. The General Assembly would not necessarily have to agree to the number mentioned, which had been

chosen because it would ensure a sufficiently broad representation.

28. Mr. SAM (Ghana) pointed out that the question of measures to improve the organization of work of the Council had been on the agenda for two years and that the draft resolution under discussion was the first constructive proposal submitted to the Council. His delegation, although it was a sponsor of the amendments, would have liked to become a sponsor of draft resolution E/L.1408, since it had so many good features; it therefore hoped all the more that the amendments would be taken into account, thereby making the draft resolution more satisfactory.

29. As the Pakistan representative had said, the number suggested for the membership of the sessional committees could be discussed with interested delegations. The General Assembly obviously would not have to accept that number.

30. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) drew attention to a number of points in the proposed draft resolutions to which his delegation objected. Draft resolution E/L.1382 was objectionable because it would limit the role of the Second Committee of the General Assembly and thus reduce the Assembly's freedom of action. The solution it proposed was not satisfactory, since it altered the existing balance between the various organs of the United Nations. Draft resolution E/L.1408 contained a number of excellent provisions, such as operative paragraph 6 of section III; strict observance of rule 14 (4) of the rules of procedure of the Council was indeed very important. Governments should have enough time to communicate their instructions. Similarly, the provisions of operative paragraph 3 of section II and operative paragraph 3 of section III were fully justified, and in that connexion he pointed out that final decisions should not be made by subsidiary bodies.

31. On the other hand, his delegation joined the Soviet delegation in objecting to the provision in operative paragraph 1 of section III, requesting the Secretary-General to suggest a particular course of action in the Council.

32. His delegation would also like to propose some amendments.<sup>2</sup> It suggested replacing the third preambular paragraph by the following text:

*"Noting that paragraph 83 of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Decade, approved by the General Assembly in resolution 2626 (XXV), provides that an over-all appraisal of the progress in implementing the International Development Strategy will be made by the General Assembly, on the basis of the above-mentioned reviews [at the national, regional and sectoral levels] and of comments and recommendations, within the framework of a specific mandate, by the Committee for Development Planning."*

33. In addition, in operative paragraph 2 (c) of section I, the words "a debate on" should be added after the words "in alternate years" and the words "with a view to assisting the General Assembly in performing the over-all appraisal" after the words "United Nations Development Decade".

<sup>2</sup> Subsequently circulated as document E/L.1422.

34. Lastly, the following new section should be inserted after section III:

#### "IV

"1. *Welcomes* the participation in its deliberations, in accordance with rule 75 of the rules of procedure of the Council, of Member States which are not members of the Council, in the conviction that such a participation will ensure a politically more solid and wider basis for decisions;

"2. *Invites* Member States which are not members of the Council to make full use of the right accorded them in rule 75 of its rules of procedure, by presenting draft resolutions, draft decisions or amendments, in their own name or in conjunction with members of the Council, in such a manner as to provide adequate treatment for the interests of all Members of the Organization."

The existing section IV would accordingly become section V.

35. The PRESIDENT recalled that it had been previously decided to postpone consideration of the question of observers. He asked whether the Council believed that the question could be included in the problem now under consideration.

36. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil), speaking on a procedural point, said that he saw no reason why the Council could not consider his amendment on the question of observers, since a wide range of questions had already been raised during the debate.

37. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) said that while his delegation understood the Brazilian representative's position, it believed that the question of the rules of procedure, which was in fact the subject of the amendment, could not be included in the problem under discussion.

38. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) pointed out that the Council did not have much time before the close of the session and that if it agreed to consider the Brazilian amendment, the debate might be prolonged without arriving at any result. Moreover, it should be noted that if it was decided in principle to enlarge the membership of the Council, the question would be settled automatically.

39. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) thought that the representative of Brazil was within his rights in suggesting his amendment. His delegation saw no reason why matters which might affect rule 75 of the rules of procedure could not be discussed in connexion with agenda item 16, since the whole structure and operation of the Council was being discussed. The Brazilian amendment was therefore admissible, even though he thought at first hearing that it was unnecessary and divisive.

40. The PRESIDENT said that it had been decided to postpone consideration of the question of observers because the question was not on the Council's agenda. He wondered whether it could really be considered part of the item on measures to improve the organization of work.



41. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) said that a clearer distinction than that suggested by the Brazilian representative should be made between observers and members of the Council.

42. The discussion on agenda item 16 was very broad and included all sorts of topics. The Brazilian representative therefore had the right to introduce the aspect of the question that he had raised. His amendment should, however, be worded differently, since it would, if adopted, result in a change in the Council's rules of procedure.

43. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) remarked that the Brazilian amendment could be made a proposal to amend the rules of procedure. It was, however, out of place in draft resolution E/L.1408.

44. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) felt that a proposal to amend the rules of procedure was always admissible, although his delegation could see no need for it in the present case. However, if a delegation felt that such a proposal was necessary, it should have the question of amending the rules of procedure included in the agenda and then submit proposals after the general debate on that question.

45. Mr. SAM (Ghana) asked the Secretariat what procedure was usually followed when a proposal to amend the rules of procedure was adopted.

46. Mr. AHMED (Secretary of the Council) said it was his understanding that when the Council took a decision which would have the effect of amending the rules of procedure, the Secretary-General submitted suggestions concerning the amendment, which were then considered by the Council. Instead of amending the rules of procedure, the Council might also decide to suspend the application of particular rules. Thus, the application of some rules was still suspended at present.

47. Mr. SAM (Ghana) pointed out that the Council itself had not been very sure how rule 75 should be interpreted and had had to rely on an interpretation by the Office of Legal Affairs. When the question had been raised during the session, at its 1750th meeting the Council had taken a decision enabling it to proceed but had not settled the substance of the problem. Consequently it should now make it clear that the rules of procedure, and in particular rule 75, were to be interpreted in the manner indicated by the Office of Legal Affairs. He saw no reason, therefore, to regard the Brazilian amendment as inadmissible, since it was intended simply to clarify the interpretation of rule 75.

48. Contrary to what had been implied, a decision to enlarge the membership of the Council's sessional committees, or even the Council itself, would not settle the question of observers, since many States Members of the United Nations would still not be members of the Council or of its sessional committees and therefore, according to some, would not have the right to submit proposals.

49. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) said that the Brazilian amendments should be submitted in writing and that in the meantime the Council could continue its consideration of the draft resolutions and other amendments before it.

50. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) observed that his delegation, which was a full member of the Council, was being denied even the right to submit amendments while it was trying to affirm the right of observers to submit proposals. Such an attitude on the part of the Council might create a dangerous precedent.

51. Draft resolution E/L.1408 dealt with many other questions not explicitly included in the agenda. Why, then, should the question of observers, which was of undeniable interest, be excluded? Such exclusion smacked strongly of discrimination. Contrary to what some representatives had said, the amendment was not designed to change the rules of procedure but simply to clarify the interpretation of rule 75 by the Office of Legal Affairs.

52. The PRESIDENT said that the intent was not to deprive anyone of the right to submit amendments but simply to apply rule 56 of the rules of procedure, which provided that amendments must be introduced in writing and handed to the Secretary-General, who must circulate copies to the representatives 24 hours before they were discussed and voted upon. In the meantime, the Council was continuing its consideration of the documents before it.

53. Mr. FINGER (United States of America) recalled his delegation's position on enlargement of the Council. At the 1765th meeting the United States representative had said that any enlargement was envisaged solely to strengthen the work of the Council and not to encourage the enlargement of other United Nations bodies; on that condition, among others, his delegation would be ready to give the question serious consideration.

54. In the meantime, temporary measures should be taken, and for that reason his delegation looked favourably on draft resolution E/L.1408; it wished merely to make several proposals at a later date to the sponsors regarding section IV.

55. As the representative of Norway had pointed out, measures designed to improve the Council's organization of work should be adopted by the largest possible majority. For that reason his delegation was glad that the sponsors of the amendments (E/L.1421) had shown a spirit of compromise and co-operation.

56. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he was sorry that, apparently as a result of a misunderstanding, one delegation felt that it had been discriminated against. Naturally any member of the Council was entitled to submit amendments to any draft under consideration by the Council. In fact, other amendments had been submitted to draft resolution E/L.1408. However, all those amendments dealt with the substance of the question that was being discussed, namely, measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council. If, on the other hand, a delegation wished to make proposals for the amendment of a rule of procedure it should follow a specific and well established procedure. Since the question was not on the agenda, the Brazilian amendments could not be accepted.

57. The PRESIDENT pointed out that the question of the Brazilian amendments had been left pending until the amendments were submitted in writing.

58. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) said that the amendments (E/L.1421) would change the character of draft resolution E/L.1408, in that the Council would be required to decide at that early stage on the question of the enlargement of its composition. The sponsors had considered it advisable, for the time being, to deal only with short-term measures, which were also less controversial, and to postpone consideration of long-term measures until the fifty-first session. The proposed amendments would call for an amendment of the Charter and it would therefore be dangerous to take a hasty decision in the matter. It would be better to allow time for clear-cut views to emerge so that it would be possible to estimate the amount of support for the proposals to expand the Council.

59. He would like to know if the United States delegation was ready to submit the proposals it had referred to.

60. He agreed that, with a view to facilitating the Council's deliberations and also for practical reasons, it might be better to postpone consideration of the Brazilian amendments until later. He would point out, however, that if it was possible to submit proposals that implied an amendment of the Charter there was every reason for allowing amendments that merely entailed amendments to the rules of procedure.

*Mr. Caranicas (Greece), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

61. The PRESIDENT suggested that the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1408 might wish to hold consultations with the sponsors of the amendments to see if they could come to some agreement.

62. Speaking as representative of GREECE, he pointed out that if, as some representatives had suggested, draft resolution E/L.1408 was evasive on certain points it was because the sponsors wished it to be adopted unanimously or at least by a large majority. It was not too important whether the draft was adopted at the present session or at the Council's fifty-first session, which was not very far off.

63. Mr. KITCHEN (United States of America) said that his delegation would like to hold consultations with the sponsors to find out if it would be possible for draft resolution E/L.1408 to cover some points embodied in a draft resolution (E/L.1407) on future institutional arrangements for science and technology, submitted by the United States delegation.

64. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan) said that his delegation did not approach the question of amending the Charter lightly. In any case, it had indicated at the previous session of the General Assembly that it was, generally speaking, opposed

to a revision of that basic instrument. That did not mean, however, that the United Nations should remain static.

65. He agreed that it would be wrong to take a hasty decision on such an important matter as the enlargement of the Council. However, it was the duty of all the members of that organ to take every possible opportunity to try to harmonize different views. Any progress in that direction was encouraging, even if no formal decision was taken.

66. The amendments submitted by his and other delegations (E/L.1421) were certainly not intended to create confusion or complicate the work of the Council. It was simply that, as a result of a compromise, some delegations had accepted the view that the new standing committee for science and technology should be set up under the Council rather than under the General Assembly. Those delegations thought, however, that in that event it would be advisable to enlarge the composition of the Council and of the sessional committees and, unfortunately, that steps could not be taken without altering the Charter. It should be made clear, however, that the sponsors of the amendments were not insisting that the Charter should be amended at the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly but only wished the question to be actively considered at that session.

67. Section IV of the draft contained in document E/L.1408 was worded somewhat ambiguously since it was not very clear if the "possibility of the enlargement of their membership, modification of their terms of reference and the pattern of their meetings" referred only to the sessional committees or both to the committees and the Council.

68. Mr. QUARONI (Italy) said that he was very much in favour of the idea of holding consultations between the sponsors of the draft resolutions and the sponsors of amendments.

69. Mr. PRAGUE (France) thought that such consultations should be open to all who wished to participate in them.

70. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) thanked the representatives of the United States and Pakistan for their clarifications. He, too, thought that consultations would be very useful.

71. The PRESIDENT said that consultations would be held the following morning between the sponsors of the draft resolutions and the sponsors of amendments and that those consultations would be open to all who wished to take part in them.

*The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.*





## ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Fiftieth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Thursday, 20 May 1971,  
at 10.50 a.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Rachid DRISS (Tunisia).

## AGENDA ITEM 4

## Capital punishment

REPORT OF THE SOCIAL COMMITTEE  
(E/4993 and Corr.1)

✓ 1. The PRESIDENT drew attention to a draft resolution, the adoption of which was recommended by the Social Committee in paragraph 9 of its report (E/4993 and Corr.1).

*The draft resolution was adopted by 14 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.*

2. Mr. ANTOINE (Haiti) said that, since Haitian law provided for the death penalty, his delegation had abstained from voting. He would, however, bring the resolution to his Government's attention.

3. Mr. DAMMERT (Peru) said that his delegation, while appreciating the humanitarian motives of a resolution which sought to extend maximum protection to the right to life in the spirit of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, had abstained from voting because the particular circumstances of Peru required that its legislation prescribing the death penalty for a small number of specific criminal offences should be maintained intact for the time being.

4. Mr. STILLMAN (United States of America) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on the resolution because, first, the imposition of the death penalty in the United States was complicated by the existence of separate federal and state systems of justice; secondly, several cases concerning the constitutionality of the death penalty were pending before the Supreme Court; and, thirdly, a task force of the Department of Justice was examining the question of abolition of the death penalty in federal offences.

## AGENDA ITEM 13

## Development of information media

## REPORT OF THE SOCIAL COMMITTEE (E/4987)

5. The PRESIDENT drew attention to a draft resolution, the adoption of which was recommended by the Social Committee in paragraph 10 of its report (E/4987).

6. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested separate votes on operative paragraphs 2 and 3 of the draft resolution.

*Operative paragraph 2 was adopted by 19 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

*Operative paragraph 3 was adopted by 22 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

*The draft resolution as a whole was adopted unanimously.*

7. Mrs. BOIVINEAU (France) recalled that her delegation had requested a separate vote on operative paragraph 4 in the Social Committee because it had felt that it would be premature for the Council to take a decision on a matter that would be discussed in July 1971 at the Conferences to revise the Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works and the Universal Copyright Convention. It had not, however, felt that it was necessary to repeat that request.

8. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, although his delegation considered that the draft resolution went beyond the scope of the agenda item and of the UNESCO report (E/4958), and indeed beyond the Council's own terms of reference, it had voted for the draft resolution as a whole because it supported UNESCO's programme for 1972; in fact, the USSR had been one of its original sponsors. His delegation had requested separate votes, and had abstained from voting on operative paragraph 2 because the USSR was a party neither to the Berne Convention nor to the Universal Copyright Convention and on operative paragraph 3 because the USSR did not participate in the work of the UNESCO International Copyright Information Centre.

## AGENDA ITEM 6

## Narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances:

- (a) United Nations Conference for the Adoption of a Protocol on Psychotropic Substances;
- (b) Report of the International Narcotics Control Board;
- (c) Proposal to convene a plenipotentiary conference to amend the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961

## REPORT OF THE SOCIAL COMMITTEE (E/5025)

9. The PRESIDENT drew attention to three draft resolutions, the adoption of which was recommended by the Social Committee in paragraph 13 of its report (E/5025).



10. Mr. YEVDOKYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested a separate vote on operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution I.

11. Mr. LE DIRAISON (France) requested a separate vote on the words "these comments would be fully taken into account by the Conference" in operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution II.

*Operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution I was adopted by 20 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions.*

*Draft resolution I as a whole was adopted by 23 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.*

*The words "these comments would be fully taken into account by the Conference" in operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution II were adopted by 16 votes to 3, with 7 abstentions.*

*Draft resolution II as a whole was adopted by 24 votes to 2.*

12. Mr. EREN (Observer for Turkey), speaking at the invitation of the President, said that he wished to inform the Council of some recent measures taken by the Turkish Government with respect to the regulations and control of opium growing and marketing in Turkey. In order to bring under more effective control the growing and smuggling of opium, his Government had restricted the area of cultivation to a single region in central Anatolia far from border areas. In the current month it had adopted new regulations to streamline its machinery and methods for supervising and controlling the cultivation of the opium poppy. Under the new regulations, joint field commissions, composed of representatives of the government ministries concerned and the police, had been set up at the district level to ensure, through spot inspections, that no illicit planting was taking place within their respective jurisdictions, that crop estimates were made more accurately and realistically and that deliveries closely corresponded to the estimates. A new bill on the licensing of opium cultivation, which provided for a strict licensing system and severe penalties for violations, was now before the Grand National Assembly. A few days previously, the Council of Ministers had decreed a 66 per cent increase in price at which the State purchased opium in order to discourage illegal marketing.

13. In addition to the measures taken with respect to poppy cultivation, the police and security forces responsible for combating drug offences had been reorganized; special task forces had been set up, a central police drugs bureau had been established, and both the police and the gendarmerie had been specially trained and given up-to-date equipment, including aircraft.

14. His Government continued to believe that, if the fight against drug abuse was to be effective, there must be concerted action on the national and international levels at all three stages, namely, production, trafficking and demand. He wished to assure the Council of Turkey's continued co-operation in all three areas.

15. Mr. YEVDOKYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had voted against operative

paragraph 3 of draft resolution I because it was wrong for the United Nations to accept the functions assigned by the Convention of Psychotropic Substances (E/4966) before it had entered into force. It had also voted against draft resolution II, because it was undesirable to amend the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, until the provisions of article 47 had been carried out.

16. Mr. LE DIRAISON (France) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on the last part of operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution II because it believed that it was premature to review the question of psychotropic substances. Although it agreed in principle with the convening of a conference of plenipotentiaries, it did not wish the conference or its participants to be bound to certain positions in advance.

*Draft resolution III was adopted unanimously.*

## AGENDA ITEM 12

### Relations with intergovernmental organizations:

- (a) Relations with non-United Nations intergovernmental organizations in the economic and social field;
- (b) Co-operation and relations between the United Nations and the World Tourism Organization

### REPORT OF THE SOCIAL COMMITTEE (E/5023)

17. The PRESIDENT drew attention to recommendations made by the Social Committee in paragraphs 8 and 9 of its report (E/5023).

*The recommendation in paragraph 8 of the report was adopted without objection.*

18. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that in the Social Committee his delegation had not opposed the proposal set out in paragraph 9 of the report because there had been no indication in the Russian text of documents E/AC.7/L.585 and E/AC.7/L.585/Rev.1 that the observer for India was among the sponsors. He did not believe that rule 75 of the rules of procedure authorized non-members of the Council to co-sponsor draft decisions. He requested that the Soviet position should be fully reflected in the Council's report.

*The recommendation in paragraph 9 of the report was adopted without objection.*

## AGENDA ITEM 15

### Non-governmental Organizations

### REPORT OF THE SOCIAL COMMITTEE (E/5021)

19. The PRESIDENT drew attention to two draft resolutions the adoption of which was recommended by the Social Committee in paragraph 20 of its report (E/5021) and to the recommendations made by the Committee in paragraphs 21 to 23 of the report.

*Draft resolution I was adopted by 24 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*



*Draft resolution II was adopted unanimously.*

*The recommendations in paragraphs 21 to 23 of the report were adopted without objection.*

20. Mr. YEVDOKHEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that in the Social Committee his delegation had asked for separate votes on certain non-governmental organizations. He requested that its views should be reflected in the Council's report by the inclusion of the following paragraph:

"The Soviet delegation believed that the Council should recommend that the Council Committee on Non-Govern-

mental Organizations should, in accordance with its resolution 1296 (XLIV), deprive of consultative status those non-governmental organizations, such as the World Jewish Congress and the Women's International Zionist Organization, which had taken part in anti-Soviet meetings held at Brussels in February 1971, and that the Committee should submit its conclusions and recommendations to the Council at its fifty-second session."

21. The PRESIDENT said that a paragraph along the lines proposed by the Soviet delegation would be included in the Council's report.

*The meeting rose at 12.5 p.m.*



## ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Fiftieth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

1770th meeting

Thursday, 20 May 1971,  
at 3.35 p.m.

NEW YORK

*President: Mr. Rachid DRISS (Tunisia).*

## AGENDA ITEM 17

**Elections (E/4946, E/4968 and Add.1, E/L.1371,  
E/L.1373, E/L.1374, E/L.1375 and Corr.1)**

1. The PRESIDENT suggested that no vote should be taken when the number of candidates was equal to, or less than, the number of vacant seats. Elections would be held only when there were more candidates than there were seats.

*It was so decided.**Statistical Commission*

2. The PRESIDENT announced that there were eight seats to be filled for a term of four years and that the following seven candidates had been nominated: Ghana and Kenya for the African States, India and Malaysia for the Asian States, Spain for the group of Western European and other States, Czechoslovakia and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic for the socialist States of Eastern Europe. There was no candidate for the Latin American group, and that vacancy would be filled later.

*The seven candidates were elected by acclamation.**Population Commission*

3. The PRESIDENT announced that nine candidates had been nominated for the same number of seats to be filled, for a term of four years, starting on 1 January 1972. The candidates were: Ghana, Morocco and the United Arab Republic for the African States, Indonesia and Philippines for the Asian States, Peru for Latin America, France and Sweden for the group of Western European and other States, and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic for the socialist States of Eastern Europe.

*The nine candidates were elected by acclamation.**Commission for Social Development*

4. The PRESIDENT announced that eleven members were to be elected to the Commission for Social Development for a term of four years, starting on 1 January 1972. Eleven countries had been nominated as candidates: Ivory Coast and Nigeria for the African States, India and Indonesia for the Asian States, Dominican Republic and Uruguay for the Latin American States, Belgium, France and the United States of America for the group of Western European and other States, and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic

and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for the socialist States of Eastern Europe.

*The eleven candidates were elected by acclamation.**Commission on Human Rights*

5. The PRESIDENT announced that eleven States had been nominated for the eleven seats to be filled for a term of three years, starting on 1 January 1972. The eleven candidates were: Nigeria, Senegal and the United Arab Republic for the African States, Iran for the Asian States, Chile and Ecuador for the Latin American States, Italy, Norway and the United States of America for the group of Western European and other States, and the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic and Romania for the socialist States of Eastern Europe.

*The eleven candidates were elected by acclamation.**Commission on the Status of Women*

6. The PRESIDENT announced that the following States had been nominated for the ten seats to be filled for a term of four years: Kenya and Liberia for the African States, Japan for the Asian States, Costa Rica for the Latin American States, France and Norway for the group of Western European and other States, and Romania for the socialist States of Eastern Europe. There were thus only seven candidates, and there was still a vacant seat for the Asian States, and two for the Latin American States. Those vacancies would be filled at a later date.

*The seven candidates were elected by acclamation.**Commission on Narcotic Drugs*

7. The PRESIDENT explained that the eight members to be elected to serve on the Commission on Narcotic Drugs for a four-year term were to be chosen from among States Members of the United Nations, States members of the specialized agencies and Parties to the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, having regard to the need for equitable representation of countries which were substantial producers of opium or coca leaf, countries which were important from the point of view of the manufacture of narcotic drugs, and countries where drug addiction or the illicit traffic in narcotic drugs constituted a serious problem, and also having regard to the principle of equitable geographical distribution. The following seven countries were candidates: Canada, France, Nigeria, Peru, Switzerland, the United States of America and Yugoslavia. The eighth seat would be filled later.

*The seven candidates were elected by acclamation.*



*Committee on Housing, Building and Planning*

8. The PRESIDENT informed the Council that Ghana, whose candidature was mentioned in document E/4968, had stated that it was withdrawing its candidature. The following nine countries were still candidates: Cameroon and Nigeria (African States), India (Asian States), Panama and Trinidad and Tobago (Latin American States), Austria, France and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (group of Western European and other States), the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (socialist States of Eastern Europe).

*The nine candidates were elected by acclamation.*

*Executive Board of the United Nations Children's Fund*

9. The PRESIDENT announced that the following ten countries were candidates for the ten seats vacant on the Executive Board of UNICEF, for a term of three years starting on 1 August 1971: Algeria, Canada, the Federal Republic of Germany, India, Norway, Pakistan, Romania, Thailand, Uruguay and Venezuela.

*The ten candidates were elected by acclamation.*

*Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme*

10. The PRESIDENT announced that twelve seats on the Governing Council of UNDP were to be filled for a term of three years from 1 January 1972. There were three candidates for the African group of States although there were only two seats to be filled for that region.

11. Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) explained that the situation had arisen as the result of a misunderstanding, since the African group of States had believed that it was entitled to three seats. He wondered whether it would be possible to postpone the election of members of the African group until the following day.

12. The PRESIDENT suggested that the elections to the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme should be postponed until the following day.

*It was so decided.*

*Committee for Programme and Co-ordination*

13. The PRESIDENT announced that the following seven countries were candidates for the seven vacancies to be filled on the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination for a term of three years from 1 January 1972: Kenya, Uganda and the United Republic of Tanzania (African States), India, Indonesia and Japan (Asian States), and Brazil (Latin American States).

*The seven candidates were elected by acclamation.*

*United Nations/FAO International Committee of the World Food Programme*

14. The PRESIDENT announced that the following four countries were candidates for the four seats to be filled for a term of three years starting on 1 January 1972: Denmark, Hungary, Togo and Turkey.

*The four countries were elected by acclamation.*

15. The PRESIDENT, on behalf of the Council, congratulated the countries that had just been elected members of the functional commissions and other organs of the Council.

**AGENDA ITEM 6****Narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances:**

- (a) **United Nations Conference for the Adoption of a Protocol on Psychotropic Substances;**
- (b) **Report of the International Narcotics Control Board;**
- (c) **Proposal to convene a plenipotentiary conference to amend the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961**

**REPORT OF THE SOCIAL COMMITTEE (concluded)**  
(E/5025)

16. Mr. SEKYIAMA (Ghana) regretted that his delegation had been absent when a vote had been taken on the Social Committee's report on narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances at the previous meeting. If it had been present, it would have voted in favour of the two draft resolutions. However, his delegation's support for resolution I would depend on the ratification of the Convention by his Government, and its approval of resolution II did not prejudice the position which his Government would adopt at the conference of plenipotentiaries to be held in 1972.

*Organization of work*

17. The PRESIDENT announced that consideration of the question of social development would be postponed until the following day, since the Social Committee's report on social development (E/5029) was not ready in all the languages.

18. Mr. MAHMASSANI (Lebanon) observed that the Social Committee had completed its consideration of questions relating to social development a week earlier. It was therefore surprising that the Secretariat had not had time to issue the report in all the languages. It was to be hoped that the Social Committee's report on questions relating to human rights would be ready for all delegations at the next meeting.

*The meeting rose at 4.15 p.m.*





## ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Fiftieth Session  
OFFICIAL RECORDS

1771st meeting

Friday, 21 May 1971,  
at 10.10 a.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Rachid DRISS (Tunisia).

## AGENDA ITEM 17

## Elections (continued) (E/L.1371)

1. The PRESIDENT said that, if there was no objection, the election to fill the two seats on the Governing Council of UNDP from among members of the African States would be postponed until the following meeting. The other 10 members would be those whose names had been read out by the Secretary of the Council at the preceding meeting.

*It was so decided.*

## AGENDA ITEM 2

## Social development

## REPORT OF THE SOCIAL COMMITTEE (E/5029)

2. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to adopt draft resolutions I to VIII, which the Social Committee had recommended for adoption by the Council in paragraph 19 of its report (E/5029).

*Draft resolution I was adopted by 15 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

3. Mr. TARASOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested a separate vote on the eighth preambular paragraph of draft resolution II and on operative paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of that resolution.

4. Mr. FOURATI (Tunisia) endorsed the Soviet representative's request for a separate vote on operative paragraph 3.

*The eighth preambular paragraph was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.*

*Operative paragraph 3 was adopted by 8 votes to 4, with 6 abstentions.*

*Operative paragraph 4 was adopted by 13 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions.*

*Operative paragraph 5 was adopted by 16 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.*

*Draft resolution II as a whole was adopted by 18 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

*Draft resolution III was adopted by 11 votes to 4, with 5 abstentions.*

*Draft resolution IV was adopted by 18 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.*

5. Mr. TARASOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested a separate vote on operative paragraphs 1, 2 and 7 of draft resolution V. He said that they could be voted on together.

*Operative paragraphs 1, 2 and 7, voted on together, were adopted by 18 votes to 2.*

*Draft resolution V as a whole was adopted by 20 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

6. Mr. TARASOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested a single separate vote on operative paragraphs 3, 4, 5 and 8 of draft resolution VI.

*Operative paragraphs 3, 4, 5 and 8, voted on together, were adopted by 20 votes to 2.*

*Draft resolution VI as a whole was adopted by 21 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

7. Mr. TARASOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that the sequence in which the draft resolutions were being taken up was different from that followed in the Social Committee.

*Draft resolution VII was adopted by 21 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

*Draft resolution VIII was adopted without objection.*

8. The PRESIDENT said that he would take it that the Council adopted without objection the draft decisions reproduced at the end of paragraph 19 of the report of the Social Committee.

*It was so decided.*

9. Mr. TARASOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution I because it believed that far-reaching social and economic changes were essential if social progress was to be made. It very much regretted that in operative paragraph 2 the words "all Governments" had been replaced by a far more restrictive formula. His delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution II but against draft resolution III on the same item, because the provisions of the latter to a large extent duplicated those of the former. His delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution V as a whole and had voted against operative paragraphs 1, 2 and 7 because, in its judgement, the work programme of the Commission for Social Development included many items of secondary



importance which were or could be adequately dealt with by the specialized agencies and other bodies.

10. His delegation's attitude toward the proposed conference of European Ministers responsible for Social Welfare had been made known in the Commission for Special Development and the Social Committee, but it should also be reflected in the Council's report to the General Assembly. That conference would be desirable only if it had a universal character and did not entail financial implications for the United Nations.

11. Mr. CALOVSKI (Yugoslavia) said that his delegation had voted against draft resolution III because its contents duplicated those of draft resolution II and, at times, even conflicted with them. For instance, operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution III was at variance with operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution II.

12. Miss SOLESBY (United Kingdom) said that had her delegation been present, it would have abstained in the vote on draft resolution I. Her delegation's abstention on the eighth preambular paragraph of draft resolution II had been due to inadvertence: it had intended to cast an affirmative vote.

13. Miss MAKOLO (Democratic Republic of the Congo) said that her delegation fully supported draft resolutions I to VII recommended for adoption by the Social Committee. Her only regret was that draft resolutions I to III had not been combined into a single text.

## AGENDA ITEM 5

### Human rights:

- (a) Report of the Commission on Human Rights;
- (b) Allegations regarding infringements of trade union rights

### REPORT OF THE SOCIAL COMMITTEE (E/5032)

*On the proposal of the President, the Council observed one minute of silence for victims of discrimination of any kind throughout the world.*

14. The PRESIDENT, stressing the delicacy and importance of the questions on human rights included in the report of the Social Committee, appealed to all delegations to do their utmost to expedite the Council's work.

15. He drew the Council's attention to draft resolutions I to XIII recommended by the Social Committee in paragraph 37 of its report (E/5032).

*Draft resolution I was adopted unanimously.*

*Draft resolution II was adopted unanimously.*

16. Mr. RYBAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested a separate vote on operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution III.

*Operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution III was adopted by 21 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

*Draft resolution III as a whole was adopted unanimously.*

*Draft resolution IV was adopted by 16 votes to 2, with 6 abstentions.*

17. Mr. RYBAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed the deletion of the word "Member" in the third preambular paragraph of draft resolution V and requested a separate vote on operative paragraph 5 of that text.

*The proposal for the deletion of the word "Member" in the third preambular paragraph of draft resolution V was rejected by 10 votes to 4, with 10 abstentions.*

*Operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution V was adopted by 16 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.*

*Draft resolution V as a whole was adopted by 17 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.*

*Draft resolution VI was adopted by 16 votes to 5, with 3 abstentions.*

*Draft resolutions VII to X were adopted unanimously.*

*Draft resolution XI was adopted by 21 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.*

18. Mr. MAHMASSANI (Lebanon) asked the Secretariat what effect it was giving to resolution 9 (XXVII) of the Commission on Human Rights, especially to paragraph 10 of that resolution, which requested the Secretary-General to give wide publicity to United Nations documents dealing with violations of human rights in territories occupied by Israel as a result of the hostilities in the Middle East. He would also like to know why a similar paragraph of the Commission's resolution 10 (XXVI) (paragraph 12) had not so far been implemented.

19. Mr. SCHREIBER (Director, Division of Human Rights) remarked, with respect to the resolution adopted by the Commission at its twenty-seventh session, that in accordance with existing practice resolutions adopted by functional commissions were given full effect only after the Economic and Social Council had either approved or at least taken note of them. He assured the representative of Lebanon, however, that the United Nations information services had been informed of the resolution in question and of its contents, and would, at the appropriate stage, be informed that the Council had taken note of it. He had been informed by the Office of Public Information that all available means of information were being utilized in order to publicize the report and other documentation referred to in the Commission's resolution 10 (XXVI). If the Lebanese representative wanted any further or more specific information, he would consult the appropriate services and inform him in greater detail.

20. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Secretary should inform the Office of Public Information of the Lebanese representative's query.

21. Mr. MAHMASSANI (Lebanon) expressed his satisfaction with the President's suggestion. With respect to the statement of the Director of the Division of Human Rights,

he said that he realized that the Office of Public Information usually publicized any resolution adopted by any United Nations body; what his delegation wanted was to ensure that all violations of human rights in the Israeli-occupied territories were given as much publicity as violations of human rights resulting from the policy of *apartheid*. He would bring the matter up again in the future.

*Draft resolution XII was adopted unanimously.*

*Draft resolution XIII was adopted by 20 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.*

22. The PRESIDENT drew the Council's attention to the recommendation made by the Social Committee in paragraph 36 of its report that the Council should transmit to the Commission on Human Rights the records of the discussions concerning the Commission's work programme in relation to draft resolution E/AC.7/L.601.

23. Mr. LE DIRAISON (France) proposed that the word "summary" should be inserted before the word "records" in the recommendation. The same proposal also applied to paragraph 35.

*The French proposal was adopted.*

*The Social Committee's recommendation was adopted without objection.*

24. Mr. RYBAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution XI not because it was opposed to the operative paragraph of that text but because it felt that the preliminary draft international convention on the protection of journalists engaged in dangerous missions should reflect the principle of universality and should strike a balance between the rights and duties of States and those of journalists. Its specific observations would be transmitted in the USSR Government's reply to the Secretary-General in accordance with the fourth preambular paragraph.

25. Mr. STILLMAN (United States of America) said that his delegation had voted against draft resolution IV for three reasons. First, it doubted the advisability of retaining an item on nazism indefinitely on the agenda of the General Assembly. Secondly, the title of the draft resolution was inconsistent with the wording of paragraph 4 of Assembly resolution 2713 (XXV), which was "measures to be taken against nazism and other totalitarian ideologies and practices based on incitement to hatred and racial intolerance". Thirdly, it could not support the inclusion in a draft resolution for adoption by the General Assembly of a reference to the Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes Against Humanity and the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, the provisions of which were so vague as to render them widely unacceptable.

26. His delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution V, not because it was opposed to the content of the draft resolution—it abhorred *apartheid* and racial discrimination—but because the resolution contained poli-

tical recommendations which were within the field of competence of other bodies.

27. It had voted against draft resolution VI because, although it favoured self-determination, the text as drafted contained tendentious and unrealistic statements.

28. Lastly, it had abstained in the vote on draft resolution XIII because, as it had explained in the Social Committee, it felt that the effect of the resolution would be to duplicate the commendable work being done by the ILO, which deserved support.

29. Mr. LE DIRAISON (France) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution IV, because the final version had dropped some of the ambiguous provisions in the original draft. Nevertheless, it had reservations with regard to operative paragraph 4 which were similar to those expressed by the United States representative. His delegation did not think that nazism should be maintained as an agenda item unless it was treated *pari passu* with other similar ideologies. Moreover, it considered that the words "all States" in operative paragraph 6 referred to all States Members of the United Nations.

30. His delegation had had to abstain in the vote on draft resolution V because it felt that the provisions of the operative part went beyond the competence of the United Nations and encroached upon the domestic sovereignty of States. Nevertheless, France was in favour of the spirit of the draft and did, of course, make substantial contributions to the victims of *apartheid*.

31. It had voted against draft resolution VI, just as it had voted against General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 October 1960. It believed that the matter was political in nature and beyond the competence of the Commission on Human Rights. The wording was in conflict with that of the Charter, and his delegation believed that the Commission should deal with human rights and not with the right of peoples under alien political rule.

32. With regard to draft resolution XIII, on which his delegation had abstained, he reaffirmed France's disapproval of the continued existence of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group of Experts, which appeared to be assuming the role of a permanent quasi-judicial body. Nevertheless, France strongly disagreed with the labour practices followed in southern Africa and fully supported the activities of the International Labour Organisation in that field. Having ratified more of the ILO's conventions than any other country, his Government hoped that the ILO would continue to deal with the question of infringements of trade union rights.

33. In conclusion, he expressed regret that the Social Committee had not been able to reach agreement on the working methods of the Commission on Human Rights.

34. Miss MAKOLO (Democratic Republic of the Congo) said that her delegation's position on the draft resolutions contained in document E/5032 was identical with the position it had expressed in the Social Committee.



35. The PRESIDENT informed the Council that the Observer for India wished to address it under rule 75 of the rules of procedure.

36. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan), speaking on a point of order, said that, if the Observer for India was to be allowed to reiterate in a plenary meeting of the Council what he had already said on more than one occasion in the Social Committee, there was a danger that the Council would become an arena for political conflicts and sterile debates. The matters he had raised in the Social Committee had been of little relevance to the agenda and mostly concerned the domestic situation in Pakistan. As the representative of Pakistan, he had personally replied to the statements made and had thrown light on facts that had been suppressed. The Council was no longer discussing the reports either of the Commission on Human Rights or of the Social Committee. Nor indeed was it considering the Social Committee's recommendations—on which action had already been taken. There was absolutely no reason, therefore, for stretching rule 75 of the rules of procedure to enable the Observer for India to restate what had already been heard. The only consequences would be propaganda for India, delay in completion of the Council's work and the establishment of a dangerous precedent for future sessions.

37. The PRESIDENT assured the representative of Pakistan that in the event of the Observer for India speaking on a subject that was not germane to the item before the Council, he would apply the rules of procedure.

38. Since there was no further objection, he would invite the Observer for India to make his statement.

39. Mr. SEN (Observer for India) informed the Council that the situation in East Bengal was deteriorating rapidly. He recalled the statements made by him in the Social Committee on problems arising out of the recent chain of tragic events in East Bengal. It was estimated that there would be 5 million East Bengali refugees in India by the end of May. India had insufficient resources to cope with the influx yet did not have the heart to turn them back. In response to a request from India, the Secretary-General had already taken action to mobilize international relief, and the report of the United Nations team that had visited the refugees could be expected soon. Initial offers of help by

way of food, medical supplies, clothing, and tents, etc., had already been announced by the United States and by other Governments, and it was hoped that further large-scale and adequate response would be forthcoming. There was an urgent need to translate the international concern expressed into prompt and effective measures to alleviate the serious hardships and human sufferings of the millions of human beings involved. However, the permanent solution to the problem was to create conditions in Pakistan that would enable the refugees to return to their homeland as soon as possible. That right was recognized by the Universal Declaration on Human Rights, and if, as the Pakistan authorities had announced, food supplies were nearly adequate and the situation generally was returning to normal, their return should create few obstacles. In the meantime, the Council should urge Pakistan to take back its own nationals and should also take action to strengthen the hand of the Secretary-General with regard to relief activities. Since that was a human problem of such an unparalleled magnitude, the present situation was generating tensions which needed to be removed with utmost speed.

40. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan) said that the events in Pakistan were of a deeply tragic nature and threatened to destroy the very existence of his country. In raising his point of order, he had not wished to challenge India's right to address the Council under rule 75 of the rules of procedure, but had merely wished to establish whether the statement that was to be made was germane to the Council's agenda. He had wished to prevent the Pakistan relief operations from being hampered by the introduction of political considerations. What was happening in Pakistan was an attempt at secession by means of armed rebellion, and it was the first duty of the Government to put an end to that rebellion. It was inevitable that in such a process there would be innocent victims. But no country supported respect for human rights more staunchly than Pakistan. Its record in human rights was unblemished, and at present its main concern was to salve the wounds and allow the scars time to disappear. To that end, it was making arrangements with the United Nations for the mobilization of international assistance, and it would be a matter for deep regret if the efforts of the international community were frustrated as a result of ulterior motives of a political nature.

*The meeting rose at noon.*



**ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL**  
**Fiftieth Session**  
**OFFICIAL RECORDS**

Friday, 21 May 1971,  
 at 4.15 p.m.

NEW YORK

*President: Mr. Rachid DRISS (Tunisia).*

**AGENDA ITEM 17**

**Elections (concluded) (E/L.1371)**

*Governing Council of the United Nations  
 Development Programme*

1. The PRESIDENT announced that there were two candidates, Ethiopia and Nigeria, for the last two seats to be filled on the Governing Council of UNDP for a period of three years from 1 January 1972.

*The two candidates were elected by acclamation.*

**AGENDA ITEM 18**

**Consideration of the provisional agenda and list of documents for the fifty-first session (E/L.1384, E/L.1385)**

2. Mr. AHMED (Secretary of the Council) drew attention to the note by the Secretary-General (E/L.1385) which contained the lists of the items to be considered at the fifty-first and the resumed fifty-first sessions. The lists were based on the 1971 programme considered by the Council at its 1735th meeting on 12 January 1971 and incorporated the changes which the Council had made in the programme at that meeting.

3. As indicated in paragraph 2 of the note, it was suggested that two additional items should be included in the list of items for consideration at the resumed fifty-first session: the report of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination on its tenth session and the World Food Programme (pledging target for 1973/1974).

4. In paragraph 3 it was suggested that item 4 in the provisional list of items for consideration at the resumed fifty-first session should be amended. Apart from those changes, the provisional agenda was in conformity with the decision taken by the Council in January 1971. In addition, items 10 (a) and (b) and 17 would remain on the agenda or would be deleted, depending on the decision taken by the Council at the current session. With regard to the question of the establishment of a world tourist organization, the Secretary-General had been requested, in accordance with the decision taken by the Council at its 1769th meeting, to report before the fifty-first session.

5. Referring to the documents for the fifty-first session (E/L.1384), he said that the report relating to item 2 of the provisional agenda could not be issued on 24 May because

all the necessary data could not be collected in time and because it would require lengthy consultations.

6. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) suggested that consideration of the question of the establishment of a United Nations transport economics and technology documentation centre, which had been postponed indefinitely (see 1760th meeting), should be included as an additional item in the agenda for the fifty-first session.

7. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that he was opposed to the Pakistan representative's suggestion because he considered it premature to resume consideration of the item only six weeks after deciding to postpone it indefinitely and because the agenda for the fifty-first session was already heavy enough.

8. He wished to make a few comments concerning document E/L.1385. It seemed to him that the question of the World Food Programme item 8 (f) was already included in the agenda for the resumed fifty-first session (item 7). Furthermore, item 3 (a) of the agenda for the fifty-first session was related to item 17, and the Council would normally take it up when it had completed its consideration of item 16. Item 5 (d) concerning budget policy and management could be dealt with by the Council without it even being mentioned in the agenda. Also, item 7 (d) could be combined with item 10 (d). Those amendments should make it possible to lighten the agenda for the fifty-first session.

9. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) asked whether the Council would have the UNDP Governing Council's recommendations on the question of natural resources when it considered item 8 (a) at the fifty-first session.

10. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) said that his delegation would prefer item 7 (d) to be kept as a separate item of the agenda for the fifty-first session; if items 7 (d) and 10 (d) were merged, the importance of an integrated approach to the question of industrial development would not be brought out.

11. His delegation supported the Pakistan representative's suggestion that consideration of the question of the establishment of a transport economics and technology documentation centre should be taken up at the fifty-first session.

12. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) said that it would be preferable to include that question in the agenda for the fifty-second session and not in that for the fifty-first, which, as had been pointed out, was already very heavy.

13. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) said that at its next session the Council would have before it many



subjects grouped together, and therefore in effect twice as many items as it had for the fiftieth session. The view expressed by the Sudanese representative therefore seemed to him to be perfectly justified.

14. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that the provisional agenda for the fifty-first session was acceptable to his delegation, although it was rather heavy. The Council might experience great difficulty in completing its consideration of very important items in four weeks. It might perhaps be useful to stress, in the general debate, items 2 and 3 of the provisional agenda.

15. Furthermore, his delegation regretted that the agenda for the resumed fifty-first session was also overburdened. The question of the establishment of an international university, the report of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination and the item concerning the World Food Programme should not appear in the provisional list of agenda items for the resumed session. His delegation noted with regret that the relevant documentation would not be ready in time.

16. With regard to the question of the establishment of a United Nations transport economics and technology documentation centre, his delegation hoped that the Pakistan representative would be persuaded by the arguments of the Sudanese representative. It was preferable for the item to be postponed until the fifty-second session.

17. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation was prepared to accept the provisional agenda for the fifty-first session. However, he endorsed the views of the Sudanese representative on the inclusion in the agenda of the fifty-first session, which was already extremely heavy, of an additional item concerning the establishment of a United Nations transport economics and technology documentation centre. His delegation therefore appealed to the Pakistan representative to agree that the item should be carried over to the fifty-second session.

18. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) said that he accepted, with reservations, the proposal made by the representative of Sudan.

19. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objections, he would take it that the Council had decided to include that item in the provisional agenda for the fifty-second session.

*It was so decided.*

20. Mr. AHMED (Secretary of the Council) explained to the representative of Greece that item 5 (d) had been included in the provisional agenda of the Council at its organizational meetings. The Council could decide at its fifty-first session whether it wished to consider the item in detail or deal with it briefly.

21. With respect to the question put by the representative of New Zealand (see para. 9 above), he said that the Council was to consider the report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme under item 8 (a) and that the Governing Council of UNDP had most probably included its comments on natural resources in that report.

22. He also explained to the representative of France, that the Council had decided at its organizational meetings to include the establishment of an international university in the agenda for the resumed fifty-first session basically because of the time factor involved. In resolution 2691 (XXV) the General Assembly had authorized the Secretary-General to establish a group of experts to help him in his consultations and studies. The Executive Board of UNESCO was to consider the recommendations and conclusions of the group of experts, but its next session would not be held until the autumn of 1971. Consequently, the Council could not consider the question of establishing an international university before the resumed fifty-first session.

23. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objections, he would take it that the provisional agenda for the fifty-first session of the Council (E/L.1385) had been provisionally adopted, with the amendments made, and subject to decisions which could still be taken at the meeting.

*It was so decided.*

## AGENDA ITEM 16

**Measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council (concluded)\* (E/4986 and Add.1-9, E/L.1382, E/L.1408 and Rev.1, E/L.1421 and Rev.1, E/L.1422, E/L.1423, E/(L)/CRP.I)**

24. Mr. MARAMIS (Indonesia) reported on the outcome of the consultations held in the Working Group, of which he had been Chairman, on draft resolution E/L.1408, submitted by Greece and New Zealand. Subject to certain amendments to the first, third and fourth paragraphs, the members of the Working Group had been able to agree on the preamble as a whole. Similarly, with regard to the operative paragraphs, part I of the draft had been accepted with one amendment to paragraph 2 (c). Changes had been made in several paragraphs in part II and part III. However, the members of the Working Group had not been able to agree on paragraph 4 of part III; some wanted to delete the paragraph and others wanted to retain it. The sponsors had not been able to accept the amendments proposed by the representative of Brazil. Moreover, the sponsors of the amendments contained in document E/L.1421 had revised their amendments to the original draft resolution. Their revised draft had appeared as document E/L.1421/Rev.1, with 12 co-sponsors.

25. The Working Group had not considered draft resolution E/L.1382, submitted by the USSR, and had referred it to the plenary meeting.

26. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) asked if the representative of the USSR would agree to have his text (E/L.1382) considered after the revised draft resolution (E/L.1408/Rev.1) despite the fact that the latter had been submitted later; the text submitted by Greece and New Zealand was more controversial and had already been the subject of much consultation and negotiation.

\* Resumed from the 1768th meeting.



27. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he thought the two texts were complementary and could perhaps be discussed together. However, if one was to be given priority, he agreed that the draft submitted by Greece and New Zealand should be considered first.

28. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that the revised draft submitted jointly by his delegation and that of New Zealand (E/L.1408/Rev.1) incorporated many amendments made to the original draft. For example, the third preambular paragraph had been amended so that it reproduced the text of paragraph 83 of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade (General Assembly resolution 2626 (XXV)) in order to accommodate the representative of Brazil. Similarly, in the last preambular paragraph, the sponsors had agreed to replace the words "are required" by the words "need to be studied", in order to show their willingness to co-operate.

29. As a compromise, the sponsors had agreed to specify that the session to be held in the third quarter of the calendar year would also be devoted to "a debate on the implementation of the International Development Strategy",—and not to the implementation itself—"with a view to assisting the General Assembly in the over-all appraisal". Similarly, in paragraph 1 of part II, the words "the consideration of important substantive issues . . . where this is appropriate" had been added to satisfy some representatives. As suggested by the Secretariat, and in conformity with established practice, paragraph 2 of part II stated that the High Commissioner for Refugees could also request that his report be the subject of a debate. In accordance with a suggestion made by the representative of the United Kingdom, the sponsors had agreed to replace, in paragraph 3 of part II, the words "of the Commission on Human Rights and the Commission on the Status of Women" by the words "of all its functional commissions and subsidiary bodies" and to add the words "as far as possible". For the same reason, mention of subsidiary bodies had been added in two places in paragraph 3 of part III. It had also been specified in the same paragraph that the reports of those bodies should contain a résumé of the discussions. The sponsors had thus demonstrated their understanding and had tried as far as possible to accept the amendments which had been proposed.

30. Members of the Working Group had, however, not all agreed on paragraph 4 of part III for political reasons which the sponsors considered inappropriate in the Economic and Social Council. He had proposed, as a solution to the problem, a formula which would have reaffirmed the rule that functional commissions and subsidiary bodies should meet biennially and retained the present exceptions to that rule. His text read:

*"Considers that the exceptions to the rule that the functional commissions meet biennially should be confined to those commissions presently exempted".*

He said he did not understand why his solution had not been accepted, unless it was because some representatives wished the exemptions to be retained, without expressly saying so.

31. The Working Group had not agreed on part IV of the draft resolution, although it was so vague as to commit no one. Rather than accept the amendments submitted to part IV (E/L.1421/Rev.1), he would prefer to delete it altogether and have only the first three parts put to the vote.

32. The PRESIDENT asked whether, in view of the extreme complexity of the matter under consideration, the Council preferred to postpone its consideration until the fifty-first session or to extend the current session for a few days.

33. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) observed that the Council would be taking a useful step if it simply voted on the first three parts of the draft resolution.

34. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) said that the twelve delegations were withdrawing the revised text of their amendments (E/L.1421/Rev.1). In the event that the matter was postponed until the fifty-first session, document E/L.1421 would still be valid.

35. If, however, the Council decided to vote on draft resolution E/L.1408/Rev.1 at the current session, the twelve delegations had certain amendments to propose. In the last preambular paragraph, they wished to delete the words "longer-term measures, including". In the same paragraph, the words "need to be studied in order" should be replaced by "are required". It should also be made clear in part IV that consideration was to be given to the possibility of enlarging the membership and modifying the terms of reference and the pattern of meetings not only of the Council's committees but of the Council itself. Lastly, speaking on behalf of his own delegation, he requested the deletion of paragraph 4 of part III.

36. Mr. VIAUD (France) recalled that draft resolution E/L.1420, which had been introduced by his delegation, had not been formally submitted for consideration by the Council. Since it pertained to item 11(a), which was related to item 16 of the agenda of the current session, and bearing in mind that the Council might decide to postpone consideration of item 16 until its fifty-first session, his delegation wished to know whether its draft was officially regarded as having been introduced. If so, it would automatically be considered at the fifty-first session.

37. With regard to item 16, it would be preferable to take no decision at the present time rather than extend the session. In any event, it would not be possible to speak of a failure on the part of the Council, for it had in fact made progress on that item. Delegations had shown a great deal of good will on a delicate matter which the Council had perhaps not been sufficiently prepared to consider. The only partial solution that could be adopted in the time remaining before the end of the session would be to approve the first three parts of the draft resolution submitted by Greece and New Zealand (E/L.1408/Rev.1) and take no decision on part IV. The Council would thus be taking a decision on a procedural matter and not on one of substance. If that approach gave rise to objections, however, it would be best to adopt the solution suggested by the President, namely to postpone consideration of the matter until the fifty-first session.



38. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) said that the revised draft resolution (E/L.1408/Rev.1) was an improvement on the previous text in many respects. His delegation was also grateful to the sponsors of the revised amendments contained in document E/L.1421/Rev.1 for the spirit of understanding they had shown. However, the question was a very complex one and had political aspects. Since the system of appraising the progress made in implementing the International Development Strategy for the Second Development Decade and future institutional arrangements for science and technology were on the provisional agenda for the fifty-first session, it would be wiser to give Governments more time to consider the question of measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council.

39. Therefore, invoking rule 50 of the rules of procedure of the Council, his delegation proposed that the debate on the question under consideration should be postponed until the fifty-first session.

40. Mr. FINGER (United States of America) supported the Brazilian representative's proposal.

41. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that his delegation was opposed to the Brazilian representative's proposal. The Council could take a decision now on the procedural matters. His delegation and that of New Zealand were withdrawing part IV of draft resolution E/L.1408/Rev.1.

42. The PRESIDENT read out rule 50 of the rules of procedure and invited members of the Council to vote on the proposal made by the representative of Brazil.

*It was decided, by 12 votes to 6, with 6 abstentions, that consideration of item 16 and of the proposals before the Council should be postponed until the fifty-first session.*

#### AGENDA ITEM 11

##### **Science and technology (concluded):**

(a) **Future institutional arrangements for science and technology (concluded)\*** (E/4959, E/4989, chap. VII; E/L.1400, E/L.1407 and Add.1, E/L.1420 and Add.1)

43. Mr. SKATARETIKO (Yugoslavia) supported by Mr. FINGER (United States of America) proposed that consideration of the item in question should be postponed until the next session.

44. Mr. VIAUD (France) also supported the proposal and requested that it should be put to the vote.

*It was decided, by 17 votes to none, with 7 abstentions, that consideration of item 11 (a) should be postponed until the fifty-first session.*

##### *Closure of the session*

45. The President declared the fiftieth session of the Economic and Social Council closed.

*The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.*

---

\* Resumed from the 1767th meeting.

---

#### **HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS**

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

#### **COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES**

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre librairie ou adressez-vous à: Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

#### **КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ**

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Приводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

#### **COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS**

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

---