



ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

FIFTY-FIRST SESSION

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Wednesday, 28 July 1971

at 3.25 p.m.

PALAIS DES NATIONS, GENEVA

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda items 17, 10 (b) and 3 (a):	
Measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council (<i>continued</i>)	
Science and technology:	
(b) Future institutional arrangements for science and technology	
Second United Nations Development Decade: review and appraisal of the objectives and policies of the International Development Strategy:	
(a) System of over-all appraisal of progress in implementing the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade: report of the Economic Committee	193

President: Mr. DRISS (Tunisia)

AGENDA ITEMS 17, 10 (b) AND 3 (a)

Measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council (*continued*) (E/4986 and Add.1-9, E/L.1382, E/L.1408/Rev.2, E/L.1422, E/L.1431, E/L.1435, E/L.1451 (part A), E/L.1458)

Science and technology

(b) Future institutional arrangements for science and technology (E/4954 and Corr.1, E/4989, chap. VII; E/5012 (Part I), chap. I, section B; E/L.1400, E/L.1407 and Add.1, E/L.1420 and Add.1, E/L.1451 (part B) and E/L.1451/Add.1, E/L.1458, E/L.1459)

Second United Nations Development Decade: review and appraisal of the objectives and policies of the International Development Strategy

(a) System of over-all appraisal of progress in implementing the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade: report of the Economic Committee (E/5029, annex; E/5059, E/L.1451 (part C) and E/L.1451/Add.1, E/L.1454-1458)

1. The PRESIDENT reminded the Council that at the 1794th meeting it had agreed to consider items 17, 10 (b) and 3 (a) of the agenda together and to give priority consideration to the draft resolution submitted by Congo (Democratic Republic of), Ghana, Haiti, Indonesia, Italy, Jamaica, Kenya, Lebanon, Madagascar, Malaysia, Niger, Norway, Sudan, Tunisia and United States of America (E/L.1451). He suggested that the Council should first consider draft resolution E/L.1458, submitted by the Greek delegation.

2. Mr. MOJSOV (Yugoslavia) agreed that it had been decided to consider the three items together. Nevertheless, since item 3 (a) had been dealt with by the Economic Committee, which had submitted a report to the Council, it would be best to discuss that item before considering the Economic Committee's report (E/5059).

3. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) said that, according to the decision taken at the 1794th meeting, the Economic Committee's report should not be taken first. The Council should follow the procedure outlined by the President.

4. Mr. FRAZÃO (Brazil) feared that, if the Economic Committee's report was not considered until a vote had been taken on draft resolution E/L.1451, it might be claimed that certain parts of the report had already been covered by the vote on the draft resolution. He did not agree that priority should be given to the draft resolution, for by so doing the Council would be rejecting without proper consideration a report by one of its Committees.

5. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) asked whether the Sudanese representative had been speaking on behalf of all the fifteen sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1451. He would also like to know whether the President had ruled that the report of the Economic Committee should not be considered. That would be a novel procedure, since in the past the Council had not considered draft resolutions until it had approved the reports of its Committees.

6. Mr. NESTERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that other sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1451 had expressed conflicting views on how the draft resolution should be interpreted.

7. A decision not to discuss the Economic Committee's report would constitute a disruption of the established procedures of the Council and would invalidate the work of the Committee.

8. Mr. RAZAFINDRABE (Madagascar) said that, as one of the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1451, he supported the views expressed by the Sudanese representative, who spoke on behalf of his co-sponsors because he had their confidence. The fifteen countries concerned had agreed to submit a joint draft resolution to the Council in order to avoid the submission of a large number of parallel resolutions. The draft resolution appeared to have the support of the majority of the Council and he hoped that it could be adopted by consensus in spite of the opposition of a small minority.

9. Mr. AMERASINGHE (Ceylon) supported the Yugoslav representative's suggestion that item 3 (a) should be con-

sidered first. Although the Council had decided to deal with the three items together, if there was to be an orderly and systematic discussion of such an important problem it would need to proceed in a logical fashion. Item 10 (b) and item 3 (a) were important elements in the consideration of item 17 and as parts of a whole they should be taken before it. To take all three items together could only lead to confusion. If the Council wished to respect its own procedures, it should first take up the report of its own Committee.

10. Mr. CHTOUROU (Tunisia) said that he was astounded that the right of the Sudanese delegation to represent his co-sponsors should be questioned. He hoped that the question had been raised out of a desire to clarify the position and not from other motives. As he had understood the decision taken at the 1794th meeting, it had been agreed that the Council should begin by discussing draft resolution E/L.1451 and then proceed to draft resolution E/L.1458. The procedural problem of how the vote should be taken on the three separate sections of draft resolution E/L.1451 could be discussed at a later stage, as could the report of the Economic Committee, but there was no doubt that consideration of the resolution should come first.

11. Mr. NESTERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) urged that it should be made clear whether or not the Sudanese representative was empowered to speak on behalf of the fifteen sponsors. If that were so, he would have no objection, but there seemed to be some confusion on the point.

12. In his view the decision taken at the 1794th meeting was a contradictory one. If the three agenda items were to be considered together, representatives should be entitled to speak on any of those three items as they saw fit. It had also been decided, however, that priority should be given to consideration of draft resolution E/L.1451, which implied that representatives were entitled to speak on that draft resolution only. His delegation would prefer to abide by the first decision.

13. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) thanked the representatives of Madagascar and Tunisia for helping to clarify the position. He urged that the President should use his authority to put an end to the debate and to settle the issue.

14. The PRESIDENT said that the decision taken at the 1794th meeting which had been questioned by several delegations, had been that the Greek representative should be asked to introduce his draft resolution (E/L.1458) and that subsequently one of the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1451 should be invited to introduce that draft resolution. The two texts would then be considered by the Council in accordance with the rules of procedure.

15. Mr. HEDEMANN (Norway) and Mr. VIAUD (France) supported the President's interpretation of the decision.

16. Mr. MOJSOV (Yugoslavia) asked when the part of the report of the Economic Committee dealing with item 3 (a) would be considered by the Council.

17. The PRESIDENT pointed out that, since item 3 (a) was one of the three items now being considered by the Council, and since the report of the Economic Committee (E/5059) was included in the list of documents relating to that item, the Council already had that report before it. The adoption by the Council of draft resolution E/L.1451 would not prevent it from taking decisions on other issues, so long as they were not directly incompatible with the draft resolution.

18. Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya) said that the present discussion was wasting valuable time. He urged the Council to take up the substantive issues before it.

19. Mr. POISSON (Niger) and Mr. ARIFF (Malaysia) supported that view. The present discussion was unworthy of the Council and the decision taken at the 1794th meeting should be respected.

20. Mr. PATAKI (Hungary) disagreed: the question under discussion was an important one and arose directly out of the decision taken earlier. It was true that the majority of the Council had favoured considering the three items together, but it was a well established practice of the Council to discuss the reports of Committees under their relevant agenda items. He did not think that it would be proper to give the consideration of draft resolution E/L.1451 absolute priority.

21. Mr. FRAZÃO (Brazil) pointed out that the first preambular paragraph of the Greek draft resolution (E/L.1458) did not preclude a thorough debate on any other resolutions the Council might have before it. As he understood it, it implied that no decision should be taken on draft resolution E/L.1458 before resolution E/L.1451 had been discussed.

22. Mr. NESTERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the question he had raised was whether the Sudanese representative was to be considered the sponsor who most accurately represented the views of all the sponsors, since other sponsors of the draft resolution had given conflicting interpretations of it at the 1794th meeting. His delegation was willing to consider all the views that might be put forward on the subject, but urged that the procedure to be followed in the discussion should be clarified. In his view, the decision taken at the morning meeting had been a mistaken one, for it had merely complicated the situation.

23. Mr. CHAMMAS (Lebanon) said that it was surprising that the Council should still be engaged in a procedural discussion on points raised at the previous meeting. The representatives of France and Brazil had suggested a satisfactory course of action to enable the Council to continue its important work. Since it had been decided to consider together items 17, 10 (b) and 3 (a), the Council should be free to discuss any of the documents listed on the day's programme, including the report of the Economic Committee. Once it had concluded its joint consideration

of the three items it should give priority to specific discussion of draft resolution E/L.1451. Before proceeding to the vote on that draft resolution, the Council should decide whether or not to defer the adoption of decisions in accordance with the Greek draft resolution. The Council should abide by the clear directive given by the President to that effect.

24. As a matter of principle, when any draft resolution was introduced by one of the sponsoring delegations it should not be necessary for another member of the Council to ask whether the other sponsors associated themselves with that introduction. They were at liberty to put forward any divergent views without being prompted to do so.

25. Mr. SMOQUINA (Italy) appealed to delegations to begin their substantive discussion of the draft resolutions without further delay. The necessary rulings had been given to enable substantive discussion to begin and continuation of the procedural discussion was a waste of valuable time. The Sudanese representative had been entrusted with the task of introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors merely in order to save time. Discussions were not required to take place through one spokesman only and his delegation was prepared to listen to any views advanced by other delegations.

26. Mr. VIAUD (France) agreed with the Italian representative. Since it had been decided to give priority to draft resolution E/L.1451, which had already been introduced, the Council should proceed to give its views on the substance of that draft resolution and should then consider the Greek proposal for the postponement of decisions (E/L.1458) before voting.

27. Mr. ASANTE (Ghana) said that a number of irrelevant questions had been raised during the procedural discussion. His delegation had entire confidence in the President's ability to direct the Council's work. The decision taken at the 1794th meeting to consider first the Greek delegation's draft resolution should now be enforced.

28. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) said that there appeared to be some doubt about the interpretation of the Council's decision at its 1794th meeting. He proposed that the Council should formally decide to give priority to draft resolution E/L.1451.

29. Mr. RAZAFINDRABE (Madagascar) said that his delegation shared the desire of previous speakers to end the procedural debate and proceed to discussion of substantive issues.

30. He represented a small country that had been independent for only ten years. Such countries needed the help and guidance of the older and stronger countries. The delegations of those countries could show their friendship and support by giving favourable consideration to draft resolution E/L.1451.

31. Mr. POISSON (Niger) said that the procedural problem might have arisen because the fifteen sponsors of draft

resolution E/L.1451 were no longer all of the same opinion. Sponsors with dissenting views could perhaps be asked whether they wished to withdraw their sponsorship. The Council should abide by the decision taken at its 1794th meeting and proceed to a substantive discussion.

32. The PRESIDENT said that the Greek representative should first introduce draft resolution E/L.1458, after which the Sudanese representative should introduce draft resolution E/L.1451. The Council should then discuss the two draft resolutions and proceed to a vote if necessary.

33. Mr. NESTERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) suggested that it might be simpler to hold a discussion on the draft resolution first introduced before proceeding to the second.

34. The PRESIDENT said that the Council should proceed in accordance with rule 66 of its rules of procedure. He would accordingly request the Greek representative to introduce draft resolution E/L.1458, after which draft resolution E/L.1451 would be introduced before discussion began.

35. Mr. CHAMMAS (Lebanon) said that his delegation did not wish to oppose the President's ruling but would like to place on record its view that it would have been appropriate for the introduction and discussion of draft resolution E/L.1451 to take place before the introduction of draft resolution E/L.1458, which was of a procedural nature and would prejudice the nature and results of the substantive discussion. He appealed to the Greek representative to withhold the introduction of his draft resolution. Although it was a sponsor of draft resolution E/L.1451, the Lebanese delegation would wish to remain open-minded in hearing the arguments that might be produced against it. If the Greek representative decided to introduce his draft resolution at the present stage, however, his delegation would consider that premature political considerations were being raised and would strongly oppose that draft resolution.

36. Mr. NESTERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he would again like to ask which delegation was speaking on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1451. The Sudanese representative had stated that he would not question the sponsor's right to introduce draft resolution E/L.1458 in accordance with rule 66 of the rules of procedure. The Lebanese representative, on the other hand, had appealed to the Greek delegation not to do so. He wondered which of those representatives was expressing the views of the sponsors as a whole.

37. The PRESIDENT said that draft resolution E/L.1451 had been submitted by fifteen sponsors, all of whom had a right to speak. The question of a spokesman was their concern and not that of the Council as a whole. He would again call on the Greek representative to introduce his draft resolution (E/L.1458).

38. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that it would be more logical for draft resolution E/L.1451 to be introduced first, since it was of a more substantive nature.

39. As Chairman of the Economic Committee, he wished to state that never before in the history of the Council had a committee report been discussed without first having been introduced and approved. If the Council wished to depart from that established procedure it should make a ruling to that effect.

40. The Council should first discuss the report of the Economic Committee, after which draft resolution E/L.1451 should be introduced and the Council should discuss it. He would then introduce the Greek draft resolution, on which the Council should take a decision.

41. Mr. CHTOUROU (Tunisia) said that draft resolution E/L.1458 should be considered first, in accordance with the second paragraph of rule 66 of the Council's rules of procedure. The Council should then vote on that draft resolution before proceeding to discuss draft resolution E/L.1451.

42. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that, although his delegation agreed that the Greek draft resolution should be considered first, that draft resolution did not fall within the terms of the second paragraph of rule 66 of the Council's rules of procedure since it was a draft resolution in its own right and not merely a motion regarding the other draft resolution.

43. Mr. FRAZÃO (Brazil) agreed with the French representative. It was clear from the preamble that draft resolution E/L.1458 was not a motion for adjournment. It was a proposal to postpone decisions after the adoption of relevant resolutions. The President's ruling on the procedure to be adopted seemed perfectly acceptable.

44. Mr. NESTERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation upheld its interpretation of rule 66 of the rules of procedure and considered that draft resolution E/L.1458 should have priority. As, however, the Greek representative himself had stated that draft resolution E/L.1451 should be discussed first, his delegation would agree to that procedure.

45. His delegation had not intended to deprive Council members of the opportunity of discussing draft resolution E/L.1451. Its only desire had been to respect the right of any delegation to submit a draft resolution.

46. The PRESIDENT said that, in view of the Greek representative's observations, he would call upon the Sudanese representative to introduce draft resolution E/L.1451.

47. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) said that the draft resolution was the result of intensive and strenuous negotiations not only among the sponsors but among most other delegations both in New York and at the Council's current session. The urgent necessity of enlarging the Council's membership had become one of the most important topics in recent months

because of the present stage of international co-operation. The adoption of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade represented a rededication to the principles of the Charter and particularly those set forth in Article 55. Member States individually and collectively were committed to a Strategy for the realization of specific objectives through the implementation of policy measures covering all sectors of economic and social life. In that context, the sponsors of the draft resolution had felt the need to strengthen the Council and enhance its authority to discharge the responsibilities conferred on it by the Charter. It had become evident that, with the growth in the membership of the Organization, the present representation in the Council was inadequate. The enlargement of the Council's membership would be one of the most effective ways of strengthening it, making it more representative and giving more Member States an opportunity to contribute to its work.

48. Part B of the draft resolution dealt with the important question of establishing a standing committee to deal with matters relating to the application of science and technology to development. The General Assembly and the Council had recognized the need for such a body in view of the importance of science and technology for the Second Development Decade.

49. Part C of the draft resolution dealt with the machinery for review and appraisal of progress in the realization of the objectives of the Second Development Decade. The Council was required by General Assembly resolution 2626 (XXV) to assist the General Assembly in its task of over-all review and appraisal. The terms of reference of the standing committee to be responsible for the task had not yet been drawn up since they would depend on the responsibilities which the General Assembly would assign to the Council.

50. The following amendments had been made to the draft resolution. In part B the word "development" at the end of the last preambular paragraph should be deleted and the words "to be" should be inserted after the word "members" in paragraph 1. In part C the phrase "the measures and attainment of objectives embodied in the Strategy" at the end of the first preambular paragraph should read "the policy measures and the attainment of the goals and objectives embodied in the Strategy"; the phrase "the measures and objectives of the International Development Strategy" in paragraph 3 should read "the policy measures and the goals and objectives of the International Development Strategy".

51. Mr. NESTERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he did not agree with the representative of Sudan that everyone was aware of the urgent need to enlarge the Council, that its enlargement would best serve the purposes of the Charter, especially Article 55, and that its present membership did not adequately reflect the balance of forces in the United Nations. No argument had been advanced in support of the proposals in the draft resolution. The USSR did not consider the enlargement of the Council necessary, or indeed that it was a pressing issue. The "package" offered in the draft resolution was not in accordance with the Charter, but on the contrary would

entail a violation of the Charter, and had no bearing on Article 55.

52. His delegation had often advocated that the Council's co-ordinating role in United Nations economic and social activities should be enhanced, but that should be done strictly in accordance with the Charter, which made adequate provision for increasing the Council's effectiveness, and that potential was far from exhausted. He agreed that the Council should have more specific functions: it should be relieved of work of minor importance and given an opportunity to concern itself with major problems, i.e. those relating to international co-operation in the economic and social fields. In a draft resolution on measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council (E/L.1382), submitted to the Council at its fiftieth session, the Soviet Union had made specific proposals concerning the possible reorganization of the Council's work to make it more effective, in accordance with the existing provisions of the Charter and without changing its structure. A detailed explanation of those proposals appeared also in other Council documents. The USSR did not consider the present situation in the Council to be entirely satisfactory and had proposed remedial measures at successive sessions; those proposals had not been supported by the delegations which were not advocating the radical restructuring of the Council itself.

53. To try to increase the Council's effectiveness by enlarging its membership was perhaps the easiest course, but it was also the least reliable and most hazardous. Any change in the Council's membership would involve changes in the Charter, which was the basis of all United Nations activities. The United Nations was by no means an ideal organization, but it had proved useful within the limits of its possibilities. The Council's present membership was the result of long and difficult negotiations and reflected the general pattern of international forces. It would be most dangerous at the present stage to seek what the sponsors of the package resolution called more adequate representation. It was not a formal issue, as some delegations maintained: the enlargement of the Council to fifty-four members would alter its character and in effect create something in the nature of a second General Assembly. Moreover, the disproportionate expansion of machinery for dealing with economic, social and technical matters would not make the work in those fields any more effective but would relegate to the background other problems which were no less important, such as peace and security, for whose solution the United Nations had been established.

54. The weakness of the Council lay, not in its numerical composition, but in the distribution of forces within it. If the sponsors of the draft resolution wanted to change that distribution of forces, they should say so and explain what new balance of power they had in mind and what motives had prompted their proposals. If that was not their intention, he would like to know why they had raised the issue and why they were proposing a membership of fifty-four. When the United Nations had been established, there had been long, exhaustive discussions on the balance of forces in its principal organs and on their hierarchical importance. The Council now represented all categories of

countries and the interests of each category were to some extent taken into consideration. Any changes in that representation would have to be frankly discussed, in the Council or elsewhere, and the sponsors would have to specify clearly what new categories of countries they had in mind.

55. The enlargement of the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council in the past had not resulted in any radical change in their working efficiency. The change in numerical composition made little difference to a body's effectiveness. Full representation, as in UNCTAD and UNIDO as well as in the General Assembly, had advantages and disadvantages. There was no need for the Council to copy the structure of those organizations. If the intention of the sponsors was to transform the Council into another UNCTAD or UNIDO, the implications of such a course must be carefully examined. The Council was a co-ordinating centre and its structure was designed for that specific role.

56. The inclusion of that far-reaching, controversial issue with other proposals in a package resolution submitted on an all-or-nothing basis meant that the Council could not reach a unanimous decision on any of the issues, or even discuss them constructively. Had they been introduced separately, their systematic consideration might have yielded some practical results.

57. There were contradictions in the draft resolution itself. The preamble to part A referred simply to the enlargement of the Council's membership, while paragraph 1 recommended that the membership should be increased to fifty-four, the new seats being allocated in accordance with the present geographical distribution in the Council. It was not explained why the membership should be fifty-four, and not more or less, and what purpose such an enlargement would serve if the balance of forces in the Council remained unchanged. Surely it was not more important for a larger number of countries to participate in the Council's work than to have a Council in which the interests of each group of countries was represented by a delegation, so that urgent matters could be decided expeditiously on the basis of constructive discussion. Paragraph 2 provided for action in the "interim period", which seemed to be a device for enlarging the Council *de facto* without waiting for the decision of the General Assembly and its ratification by the permanent members of the Security Council. The implication seemed to be that the Council would do as it wished whatever the decision of the General Assembly. The proposal in paragraph 5 was clearly designed to weaken the role of the CPC and thereby strengthen that of the ACC, an exclusive secretariat club which was in the habit of dictating to intergovernmental bodies what the United Nations should do in the economic and social fields. The USSR had opposed numerous attempts to strengthen the authority of the ACC since it considered that the CPC, as an intergovernmental body, should have a predominant role. Eliminating or weakening it would not strengthen the Council. The present proposal implied that the CPC had not discharged its functions satisfactorily, a verdict which was not based on a proper investigation.

58. In part B of the draft resolution, the third preambular paragraph seemed to suggest that an institutional framework should be established to fill unspecified "institutional gaps" which might or might not exist. Paragraph 2 also referred to unspecified institutional arrangements. The proposal in paragraph 1 to establish a standing committee seemed to put the cart before the horse, since paragraph 3 requested a report on possible terms of reference for such a committee; the Council was being asked to establish a standing committee without knowing what its functions would be. It would be more logical to identify the problems, ascertain whether or not the present structure of the Council and its subsidiary bodies was adequate to deal with them and then consider the possibility of establishing a new body. The best course would be to establish a sessional committee on science and technology for the world-wide promotion of co-operation in that field, as the USSR had proposed at the fiftieth session of the Council;¹ if that proved to be inadequate, the establishment of a standing committee might be considered. There would then be a problem of co-ordination with other organizations concerned with science and technology, perhaps leading to the establishment of a co-ordination committee and to a whole pyramid of new bodies. However, as was pointed out in paragraph 5, it would be pointless to establish a committee for science and technology unless adequate resources were available for its use. As far as he knew, no such resources were available at present.

59. Part C of the draft resolution also proposed the establishment of a new body to carry out a task for which there were already adequate resources within the Council's present structure. Since the over-all review and appraisal of progress in the implementation of the International Development Strategy would have to be carried out by experts and not diplomats, the Committee for Development Planning was the most appropriate body to undertake that work. If necessary its expert staff could be increased. There were no grounds for assuming in advance that the Council's existing machinery, with the support of the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system, would be inadequate for carrying out the review and appraisal.

60. It was unbusinesslike to establish new international machinery before existing facilities had proved inadequate. The only correct course in dealing with the problems before the Council was to make the fullest use of existing resources, without violating the provisions of the Charter, establishing unnecessary international bodies or duplicating the work of other organizations. The Council should discontinue work that was of little or no importance and concentrate on major problems in the economic, social and technical fields. That would serve the interests of developed and developing countries alike.

¹ See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Fiftieth Session, 1752nd meeting.*

61. Mr. ARCHIBALD (Observer for Trinidad and Tobago), speaking under rule 75 of the rules of procedure, said that he would confine his remarks to part C of draft resolution E/L.1451. He was speaking as Chairman of the Latin American Group, which was concerned about the divergence of opinions on a matter of such vital significance as the review and appraisal of the International Development Strategy. That matter was of particular importance to the Latin American and other developing countries in connexion with the preparations for the third session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. The agenda for that session would be discussed by those countries at Bogotá in the near future and by the Ministerial Meeting of the Group of 77 at Lima in November 1971. In view of its importance, the Latin American Group would be grateful if the Council would consider postponing a decision on the matter to give more time for discussion and reflection and to provide further opportunity for reconciling points of view which were at present divergent even though all sought the same basic objective. Thus the decision, when taken, would be consistent with the Council's responsibility to the international community under the Charter.

62. Mr. HEDEMANN (Norway) said that his delegation's views on the issues before the Council had been explained at length on previous occasions. The Economic and Social Council had been entrusted with important tasks to be performed and equally important responsibilities to be discharged on behalf of the total membership of the United Nations.

63. His own Government and the Governments of Denmark, Finland and Sweden considered draft resolution E/L.1451 to be one of the most significant and important in the history of the Council. Those four Nordic countries gave it their unqualified support and he was honoured to be one of its sponsors. The composition of the group of sponsors was significant and showed that the matters with which it dealt were of interest to developing and industrial countries alike.

64. The Nordic countries were convinced that if the draft resolution was adopted, an important measure would have been taken to strengthen the Economic and Social Council in conformity with its role as the principal United Nations organ responsible for economic and social development as defined by the Charter. Its adoption would contribute significantly to the world community's endeavours to make its lofty aspirations, as embodied in the provisions of the International Development Strategy, a success.

65. For those reasons, the Governments of the Nordic countries urged that the draft resolution should be adopted forthwith.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.