

1852nd meeting

Tuesday, 17 April 1973, at 3.55 p.m.

President: Mr. Sergio A. FRAZÃO (Brazil).

E/SR.1852

Organization of work (E/5240/Rev.1, E/L.1543)

1. The PRESIDENT suggested that item 27 (Measures to be taken following the floods in Tunisia) should be allocated to the Co-ordination Committee for consideration as its first item and that item 28 (Implementation of Security Council resolution 329 (1973) concerning the question of economic assistance to Zambia) should be allocated to the Economic Committee for consideration during the fourth week or, if possible, the latter part of the third week of the session.

It was so decided.

2. Mr. HACHANI (Tunisia) said that his delegation was very appreciative of the Council's decisions to adopt the item concerning measures to be taken following the floods in Tunisia and to send a cable of sympathy to the President of Tunisia. Such action bore witness to a great spirit of solidarity. In addition, he wished to express his gratitude to the delegation of Madagascar for its initiative (see 1851st meeting, para. 27) in calling for the inclusion of the item on the Council's agenda (E/5240/Rev.1).

3. Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he fully realized that the suggested allocation and order of consideration of items outlined in the note by the President (E/L.1543) were the outcome of considerable thought and discussion by the officers of the Council. However, at its 53rd session the Council had in fact decided to postpone consideration of the item entitled "Permanent sovereignty over natural resources of developing countries" and to deal with it as a matter of priority at the present session (agenda item 2). Paragraph 6 of document E/L.1543 contained a suggestion that it should be considered concurrently with item 5 (Natural resources) during the third week. He feared that the item on permanent sovereignty over natural resources would to some extent be lost among the problems relating to natural resources. Consequently, he felt that the two items should be considered separately and that item 2 should be dealt with by the Economic Committee at the beginning of the session.

4. Mr. VERCELES (Philippines) endorsed that view. If the two items were considered simultaneously, it would not be possible to do justice to either of them.

5. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) said that the officers of the Council had suggested simultaneous consideration of the two items because they were in some sense interrelated. The reason for suggesting that they should be dealt with in the third week was simply that the report of the Committee on Natural Resources would not be available in time for the items to be considered in depth earlier in the session. In his view, nothing would be lost if the debate was deferred until the third week.

6. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) recalled that one of the main items on the agenda of the most recent session of the Committee on Natural Resources had been precisely that of permanent sovereignty over

natural resources. Accordingly, the best course would be to await the appearance of the report of the Committee on Natural Resources and consider items 2 and 5 together.

7. Mr. JAIN (India) agreed that the topics should be discussed when all the documents were available. Since it was a member of the Group of 77 and therefore interested in both items, his delegation felt, however, that the debate would be more fruitful if they were dealt with separately.

8. Mr. NDUNG'U (Kenya) shared the view of the representative of India. Item 5, on natural resources, dealt with technical issues such as the establishment of a revolving fund, while item 2, on the question of permanent sovereignty, concerned matters of principle.

9. Mr. GETMANETS (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) endorsed the remarks of the representative of Kenya. His country had been among the first to raise the question of permanent sovereignty over natural resources of developing countries, and it continued to attach importance to the matter, feeling that an appropriate decision by the international community would have a great impact on the development of those countries. In his view, the two items should be considered separately and the Economic Committee should proceed to discuss item 2 first.

10. Mr. OLIVERI LÓPEZ (Argentina) considered that it would be useful to bear in mind the Brazilian representative's comment that the item concerning permanent sovereignty over natural resources had also been considered by the Committee on Natural Resources at its session in New Delhi. Accordingly, he felt that the timing should be as suggested in document E/L.1543 but that the two items should be dealt with separately, as advocated by the representatives of India and Kenya.

11. Replying to a question by Mr. NDUNG'U (Kenya), the PRESIDENT said that the priority to be attached to consideration of the item concerning the question of economic assistance to Zambia, which would depend to some extent on when the report of the Secretary-General was issued, would be decided by the Economic Committee in the light of the Council's expressed view. Meanwhile, the Economic Committee might commence its deliberations with item 2 in the first week and defer item 6 (Fiscal and financial matters) until the third week, after discussion of item 5.

12. Mr. MOLINA-DUARTE (Venezuela) pointed out that his delegation and those of other developing countries had prepared a draft resolution on permanent sovereignty over natural resources of developing countries. The sponsors of the draft resolution would need time to bring it up to date in the light of the latest developments in the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and the Committee on Natural Resources. However, if the general debate on the item took place first, he could accept the President's suggestion to consider the item on permanent sovereignty first in the Economic Committee.

13. The PRESIDENT said that he had suggested that permanent sovereignty over natural resources should be discussed first because it was a priority item. If there was no objection, he would consider that the Council had decided that the Economic Committee should consider item 2 first, but with sufficient flexibility to take into account the observation made by the representative of Venezuela.

14. Mr. VERCELES (Philippines) proposed that the Economic Committee should consider item 3 (Special measures in favour of the least developed among the developing countries) and item 4 (Special measures related to the particular needs of the land-locked developing countries) first and then go on to consider item 2 towards the end of the first week and possibly into the beginning of the second week. Such an arrangement would meet the requirements of the representative of Venezuela and would not disrupt the work of delegations.

15. Mr. ROUGÉ (France) said that, in the interests of brevity, his delegation would align itself with the majority view. However, he felt that, for the purpose of efficiency, the suggestion of the officers of the Council was entirely satisfactory.

16. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council approved the Philippine proposal that the Economic Committee should consider items 3 and 4, followed by item 2, during the first week of the session, possibly continuing consideration of item 2 at the beginning of the second week.

It was so decided.

17. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would consider that the Council approved the suggested allocation of items and order of consideration of items outlined in document E/L.1543, as well as his oral proposal concerning items 27 and 28 (see paragraph 1, above), with the modification that item 2 would be considered by the Economic Committee in the first week and item 6 deferred until the third week.

It was so decided.

18. The PRESIDENT, speaking on behalf of the Council, expressed appreciation for the work carried out by Mr. Rafeeuddin Ahmed during his three years as Secretary of the Council. He wished him well in his new post as Director of the Resources and Programme Planning Office and welcomed the new Secretary, Mr. Diego Cordovez, to his post.

AGENDA ITEM 29

Question of the admission of Bangladesh to membership in the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East (E/L.1547)

19. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) proposed that the Council should waive rule 56 of the rules of procedure and consider the draft resolution on the admission of Bangladesh to the Economic Committee for Asia and the Far East (ECAFE) submitted by Mongolia (E/L.1547). Many delegations had spoken in favour of the draft resolution at the previous meeting and had pointed out the urgent need for a decision by the Council. The ECAFE conference at Tokyo would end on 23 April. If the representatives of Bangladesh were to attend that conference, the Council must take a decision immediately.

20. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, the Council would proceed to consider draft resolution E/L.1547.

It was so decided.

21. Mr. FACK (Netherlands) said that, like many speakers at the previous meeting, his delegation welcomed draft resolution E/L.1547. The Netherlands had been deeply concerned over the sufferings of the people of Bangladesh since 1971, and his delegation had made considerable efforts during the twenty-sixth General Assembly to relieve the situation in the area. The Government of the Netherlands had recognized Bangladesh early, and it maintained diplomatic relations and other friendly ties with that country. The Netherlands was involved in providing bilateral and multilateral aid for reconstruction, rehabilitation and development in Bangladesh. He was confident that Bangladesh could contribute to the work of ECAFE and that the activities of ECAFE would benefit the people and Government of Bangladesh. He therefore supported draft resolution E/L.1547.

22. Mr. BREITENSTEIN (Finland) said that, in his Government's view, co-operation within the framework of the regional economic commissions could be meaningful only if all countries could participate in and benefit from such co-operation. He would support draft resolution E/L.1547, because his delegation believed that the principle of universality should be applied in the regional economic commissions. He had been authorized to state that his delegation's views were shared by all the Nordic delegations.

23. Mr. WANG Jun-sheng (China) said that his delegation had clearly stated its position on the admission of Bangladesh to ECAFE at the previous meeting and would maintain that position.

24. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) said that his delegation reiterated its objections and reservations concerning draft resolution E/L.1547. Those objections and reservations should be reflected in the Council's report and should accompany the draft resolution if it was adopted.

25. Mr. AMINA (Niger) said that, in the absence of instructions from his Government, he would have to reserve his position on the draft resolution under consideration.

26. Mr. FASLA (Algeria) said that, while his delegation supported the principle of universality in the United Nations, that principle must be qualified by other fundamental principles embodied in the Charter and other relevant United Nations instruments. His delegation would therefore abstain in the vote on draft resolution E/L.1547.

27. Mr. TOURÉ (Guinea) said that, in view of his delegation's reservations on the matter, it would abstain in the vote on draft resolution E/L.1547 and would like its reservations to be reflected in the report.

28. The PRESIDENT suggested that a vote on the draft resolution would not be necessary and that the Council could adopt the draft resolution with the reservations expressed.

29. Mr. HAMID (Sudan) pointed out that some delegations had not expressed their reservations, so that a vote on the draft resolution would be needed. He suggested that the vote should be postponed until delegations had had time to contact their Governments on the matter.

30. The PRESIDENT said that the vote must be taken by the plenary Council; hence if the Council was to vote, it must do so now.

31. Mr. WANG Jun-sheng (China) said that his delegation would vote against draft resolution E/L.1547.

32. Mr. FACK (Netherlands) proposed that a vote should be taken in order to avoid further confusion on the matter. He would vote for the draft resolution.

Draft resolution E/L.1547 was adopted by 21 votes to 1, with 5 abstentions.¹

33. The PRESIDENT said that the Permanent Observer of Bangladesh had expressed the wish to address the Council. If he heard no objection, he would give him the floor.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. S. A. Karim, Permanent Observer of Bangladesh to the United Nations, took a place at the Council table.

34. Mr. KARIM (Permanent Observer of Bangladesh) expressed his Government's gratitude for the decision just adopted to admit Bangladesh to membership in ECAFE. It would enable his country to take

part in the ECAFE conference currently in session at Tokyo.

35. In its Declaration of Independence, dated 10 April 1971, the Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh had stated that it would undertake, observe and give effect to all duties and obligations that devolved upon it as a member of the family of nations and would abide by the Charter of the United Nations. Since its liberation, Bangladesh had been admitted to many international organizations, including the World Health Organization, the International Labour Organisation, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Monetary Fund, the International Civil Aviation Organization, the Universal Postal Union and the International Telecommunication Union. The admission of Bangladesh to membership in ECAFE was an additional mark of confidence on the part of the international community. Bangladesh would play its part in fulfilling conscientiously the obligations arising out of membership in ECAFE, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the terms of reference of ECAFE.

The meeting rose at 5 p.m.

¹ Council resolution 1735 (LIV).

1853rd meeting

Friday, 27 April 1973, at 10.50 a.m.

President: Mr. Sergio A. FRAZÃO (Brazil).

E/SR.1853

Address by the Minister of Trade and Industry and Associate Minister for Foreign Affairs of New Zealand

1. The PRESIDENT welcomed Mr. Walding, Minister of Trade and Industry and Associate Minister for Foreign Affairs of New Zealand, and gave him the floor.

2. Mr. WALDING (Minister of Trade and Industry and Associate Minister for Foreign Affairs of New Zealand) recalled that the creation of the Economic and Social Council had been largely due to the efforts of a few small countries, including New Zealand, which had been aware at the time when the Charter had been drawn up that international peace and security could not be guaranteed by a world body that was preoccupied with political issues alone. Since then, the United Nations had been trying to eliminate the causes of tension in the economic and social sector, particularly with regard to malnutrition, health, unemployment, education and the environment. However, despite all its efforts, those problems remained, and the United Nations must see to it that they were solved. Moreover, during the last decade of the twentieth century, economic and social disparities seemed likely to become the basic source of international tension, and even conflict. The United Nations should devote its attention increasingly to such questions in order to maintain international peace and security and promote social justice. The Economic and Social Council was an essential part of the United Nations system and should enjoy the confidence and respect of the international community.

3. Throughout its term on the Economic and Social Council, which would terminate at the end of the year, New Zealand had sought with others to find ways to revitalize the Council and restore it to its rightful place in the United Nations. New Zealand had supported the enlargement of the Council which allowed for a more equitable representation of the membership of the United Nations and had been among the first countries to ratify the amendment to Article 61 of the Charter. He urged those Governments which had not done so, particularly members of the Security Council, whose ratifications were essential if the wishes of the majority of the Members of the United Nations were to be respected, to complete their ratification procedures by the end of the year.

4. As it might be some years before New Zealand served on the Council again, he explained briefly his Government's position with regard to world affairs as they related to the work of the Economic and Social Council. New Zealand had a new Government which was seeking to create a juster domestic society; at the same time, it took a more humane approach in international affairs and placed more emphasis on the improvement of economic and social conditions in other countries. New Zealand maintained friendly relations with many countries, particularly those in the South Pacific and in South East Asia, and was forging new links with countries on the western coast of Latin America. Although many of New Zealand's traditions derived from Western Europe, which must remain a major factor in its marketing arrangements for the foreseeable future, its geographical location and Polynesian heritage had given it a distinctive Pacific identity.