

signed for the expansion of their own trade and were not suitable for transporting African products. To attempt to extend container transport in existing circumstances would once again place the under-developed countries at the mercy of the affluent countries, because the growth in the importation of containers of all sizes from the latter countries required the under-developed countries to spend large sums on adapting their ports and buying hoisting equipment, at a time when containerization brought no benefit to them. In any event, to equip oneself at great cost in order to facilitate the handling of foreign devices which benefited those who sent them at the expense of those who received them, was unfair.

81. Container standards for international transport should enable each country to build its own containers, according to its needs; that would enable the under-developed countries to acquire their own containers, which would likewise return empty from the affluent countries: thus a balance would be established in trading. Container standards should also make provision for financial assistance to the under-developed countries for the purpose of equipping themselves with containers, improving their port installations and buying hoisting equipment.

82. That was the only way in which containerization could be rationalized on a world scale and container transport in Africa developed.

83. Mr. BRITO (Brazil) requested that the statement by the representative of Zaire, which summarized the situation of the developing countries, should be reproduced as fully as possible in the summary record.

AGENDA ITEM 16

Study of the problems of raw materials and development

REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC COMMITTEE (E/5511)

84. The PRESIDENT said that the Council had before it the report of the Economic Committee on

the item (E/5511), paragraph 12 of which contained two draft resolutions recommended by the Committee to the Council for adoption. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council adopted without objection draft resolution I, on emergency measures in regard to the supply of fertilizers and pesticides.

Draft resolution I (E/5511, para. 12) was adopted without a vote [resolution 1836 (LVI)].

85. Mr. YEH Yuan-ke (China) said that his delegation supported draft resolution II, on the United Nations Revolving Fund for Natural Resources Exploration, even though it had serious reservations with respect to paragraph 2.

86. The PRESIDENT said that if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council adopted draft resolution II without objection.

Draft resolution II (E/5511, para. 12) was adopted without a vote [resolution 1837 (LVI)].

87. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the reservations which had been expressed by his delegation when the draft resolution was adopted by the Economic Committee still applied.

88. Mr. EKBLOM (Finland) said that the reservations expressed by his delegation in the Economic Committee when draft resolution II was adopted remained valid.

89. Mr. NEUGEBAUER (German Democratic Republic) said that his delegation had expressed its position when the draft resolution was being considered by the Economic Committee; it maintained its reservations.

90. The PRESIDENT said that if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council decided to defer further consideration of the item until its fifty-seventh session, as recommended by the Economic Committee in the draft decision in paragraph 13 of its report.

The draft decision (E/5511, para. 13) was adopted without a vote [decision 7 (LVI)].

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.

1896th meeting

Wednesday, 15 May 1974, at 3.30 p.m.

President: Mr. Aarno KARHILO (Finland)

E/SR.1896

AGENDA ITEM 13

International co-operation in cartography

REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC COMMITTEE (E/5508)

1. The PRESIDENT drew the attention of the Council to the report of the Economic Committee (E/5508), paragraph 15 of which contained two draft resolutions recommended by the Committee to the Council for adoption. Draft resolution I had been adopted by the Committee after a vote. He then invited the Council to vote on it.

Draft resolution I (E/5508, para. 15) was adopted by 42 votes to none, with 6 abstentions [resolution 1838 (LVI)].

2. The PRESIDENT said that draft resolution II had been adopted by the Economic Committee without a vote. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council also wished to adopt draft resolution II without a vote.

Draft resolution II (E/5508, para. 15) was adopted without a vote [resolution 1839 (LVI)].

3. Mr. FEDOROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution I, on the convening of the Eighth United Nations Regional Cartographic Conference for Asia and the Far East. The Soviet Union felt that there should be equal participation by all States in the Conference, and he therefore welcomed the inclusion in the draft resolution of a reference to the Democratic Re-

public of Viet-Nam. Notwithstanding, paragraph 1 discriminated against the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Viet-Nam, which was entitled to participate in the Conference on the same footing as other States.

4. His delegation had not raised any objection to draft resolution II, entitled "First United Nations Regional Cartographic Conference for the Americas", in view of the fact that a consensus had been reached. However, it still maintained its position, stated in the Economic Committee, that two conferences should not be convened in one year.

5. Mr. WANG Tzu-chuan (China) said that his delegation had not participated in the consideration and adoption of draft resolutions I and II in the Economic Committee or in the Council. The reasons for the non-participation had been stated in the Economic Committee. China did not oppose the convening of the Eighth United Nations Regional Cartographic Conference for Asia and the Far East in Indonesia, and it supported in principle the convening of the First United Nations Regional Cartographic Conference for the Americas. Its non-participation was due to different reasons.

6. Mr. SMID (Czechoslovakia) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution I for reasons stated previously. He had the same reservations on draft resolution II, although he had accepted the consensus.

7. Mr. DIETZE (German Democratic Republic) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution I, as there had been no change in the position his delegation had taken in the Economic Committee.

8. Mr. CZARKOWSKI (Poland) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution I because it did not include an invitation to the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Viet-Nam to the Eighth United Nations Regional Cartographic Conference for Asia and the Far East. He supported the other provisions of the draft resolution, however, in the light of what had been said in the Economic Committee.

9. Mr. OCHIRBAL (Mongolia) said that, for reasons stated in the Economic Committee, his delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution I.

10. Mr. MADEY (Yugoslavia) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution I, as it had in the Economic Committee, because it attached great importance to that question. Notwithstanding, he had reservations with regard to paragraph 1 of the draft resolution, because he felt it was discriminatory in that it prevented the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Viet-Nam from participating in the Conference. If a vote had been taken on paragraph 1, he would have abstained.

11. Mr. FASLA (Algeria) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution I, although it did have reservations with regard to paragraph 1, which did not invite the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Viet-Nam to participate in the Conference. If a vote had been taken on that paragraph, he would have abstained.

12. Mr. Cissé (Mali) said that his delegation had stated its views in the Economic Committee on paragraph 1 of draft resolution I. Its position on that question had not changed, and he reaffirmed it.

13. Mr. BA-ISA (Democratic Yemen) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution I, and that its position on paragraph 1, stated in the Economic Committee, had not changed.

14. Mr. OSMAN (Egypt) said that his delegation welcomed the adoption of draft resolution I, in view of the importance it attached to the United Nations Regional Cartographic Conference for Asia and the Far East. However, if a vote had been taken on paragraph 1, his delegation would have abstained for the reasons stated in the Economic Committee.

15. Mr. GORITZA (Romania) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution I, because it supported the principle of universality in United Nations conferences.

16. Mr. CHABALA (Zambia) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution I, and that its position with regard to paragraph 1 had not changed. If a vote had been taken on that paragraph, his delegation would have abstained.

AGENDA ITEM 3

World Food Conference

REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC COMMITTEE (E/5513)

17. The PRESIDENT said that, in paragraph 13 of the report of the Economic Committee (E/5513) on the item, a draft resolution on the World Food Conference had been recommended by the Committee to the Council for adoption. The draft resolution had been adopted by the Committee without a vote.

18. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) made a statement on the financial implications of the draft resolution in paragraph 13 of document E/5513, which recommended that the period allocated to the second session of the Preparatory Committee of the World Food Conference should be extended. He had already informed the Preparatory Committee at its first session that it was possible to arrange the second session at Geneva only by cancelling a meeting of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. Since it was necessary to service other meetings at Geneva, Manila, Mexico and Caracas, the free-lance interpreter resources were exhausted. Unless another meeting was cancelled, it would not be possible to extend the second session of the Preparatory Committee because there would be no interpretation services available.

19. Mr. MACKENZIE (United Kingdom) said that the information provided by the Secretary of the Council was discouraging. It was impossible to determine the relative importance of the meetings that were to be held at Geneva, but the World Food Conference was perhaps more urgent than any of the other meetings, and preparations for it were therefore of more importance. It was to be hoped that the statement made by the Secretary of the Council would not be the last word on that matter.

20. Mr. SANDERS (United States of America) supported the views expressed by the United Kingdom representative and said that the explanation given by the Secretary of the Council was difficult to understand. Delegations had agreed that more time might be needed to prepare for the World Food Conference. He therefore urged the Secretariat to study the matter and find a solution as soon as possible.

21. Mr. RYDBECK (Sweden) associated himself with those speakers who had felt it would be advisable to extend the session of the Preparatory Committee of the Conference and said that everything possible should be done to extend it, even for a few days.

22. Mr. EKBLOM (Finland) supported the views of the representatives of the United Kingdom, the United States and Sweden, and suggested that in paragraph 4 of the draft resolution on the World Food Conference the word "Recommends" should be replaced by the word "Urges".

23. Mr. SHEMIRANI (Iran) recalled that the Economic Committee had already considered the question of extending the second session of the Preparatory Committee of the World Food Conference. He supported the United Kingdom representative, who had urged the Secretariat to do everything possible to extend the session, as had been recommended.

24. Mr. CAVAGLIERI (Italy) associated himself with previous speakers; his delegation attached great importance to the preparations for the World Food Conference.

25. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) said that the Secretariat would do everything possible to solve the problem. Replying to the United States representative, he said that the Secretariat had been given adequate notice of the need for additional services. Therefore, attempts have been under way since February 1974 to find those services, which were in limited supply. The problem arose not only because of the unavailability of European interpreters but also because, as a result of the conference to be held in Caracas, interpreters from other areas would not be available either. The Secretariat would, however, investigate all possibilities with a view to finding another team of interpreters.

26. Mr. MACKENZIE (United Kingdom) asked whether the bodies that were to hold those meetings at Geneva had been informed of the importance of the preparations for the World Food Conference and whether their co-operation had been sought.

27. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) said that they had been informed, but that it was extremely difficult to change the dates of any of the meetings.

28. The PRESIDENT said that it appeared to be the general opinion that everything possible should be done to secure the necessary services for the Preparatory Committee of the World Food Conference. He drew attention to paragraph 11 of the report (E/5513), which contained a text that should be reproduced verbatim in the report of the Council on the item. On the understanding that the report of the Council to the General Assembly on the work of its fifty-sixth session would contain that text, he would take it, if there was no objection, that the draft resolution recommended by the Economic Committee for adoption was adopted by consensus.

The draft resolution (E/5513, para. 13) was adopted without a vote [resolution 1840 (LVI)].

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Jacob Doron (Observer for Israel) took a place at the Council table.

29. Mr. DORON (Observer for Israel) said that a Palestinian terrorist commando group had just occupied an Israeli school, killing 16 children and injuring 70 persons. That hideous action showed how iniquitous

it was for the Council to invite the liberation movements to participate in the World Food Conference. If he had had an opportunity of speaking before the draft resolution had been adopted, he would have urged members to reject such a disgraceful proposal.

Mr. Doron withdrew.

30. Mr. OSMAN (Egypt) welcomed the adoption by consensus of the draft resolution recommended by the Economic Committee, particularly paragraph 2 (b). The Council had thus recognized the importance of the peoples' struggle for self-determination.

31. Mr. NEUGEBAUER (German Democratic Republic) said he was glad that the resolution had been adopted by consensus and was particularly pleased that it had included the formula "all States", since that would enable all States which conducted their affairs in conformity with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations to participate. In future, that formula should always be used.

AGENDA ITEM 15

Report of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations

REPORT OF THE SOCIAL COMMITTEE (E/5492 AND ADD. 1)

32. The PRESIDENT drew the attention of the Council to the report of the Social Committee on the item (E/5492 and Add.1), paragraph 6 of which contained six draft decisions, (a) to (f), which the Committee recommended to the Council for adoption.

33. Mr. WANG Tzu-chuan (China) said that, when the item had been considered in the Social Committee, his delegation had stated that three non-governmental organizations still recognized the representatives of the Chiang Kai-shek clique as representatives of China and that it had therefore been wrong to grant them consultative status with the Council. Its position had not changed.

34. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, during the consideration of the item in the Social Committee, his delegation had stated that the granting of consultative status to a non-governmental organization should be governed by the criteria set forth in Economic and Social Council resolution 1296 (XLIV). Two of the organizations proposed, the International Council of Voluntary Agencies and the Lutheran World Federation, did not meet the requirements of that resolution and, accordingly, his delegation had opposed the recommendations concerning them. Had a separate vote been taken on each organization, his delegation would have voted against the recommendation in both instances.

35. Mr. NEUGEBAUER (German Democratic Republic) said that his delegation accepted the report in principle; however, the report should reflect the serious doubts which his delegation had expressed in the Social Committee regarding the classification of certain non-governmental organizations which did not meet the requirements stated in Economic and Social Council resolution 1296 (XLIV).

36. Mr. Van GORKOM (Netherlands) said that his delegation supported the proposal in subparagraph (d) which was to be added to paragraph 6 (E/5492/Add.1). He recalled that in the Social Committee his delegation had expressed its understanding that the

Secretary-General would consult with the non-governmental organizations and subsequently report to the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations on the matter.

37. Mr. WIGGINS (United States of America) said that his delegation considered the report to be perfectly in order and felt that the Lutheran World Federation met all the requirements of Council resolution 1296 (XLIV). He failed to see how the representative of the Soviet Union could speak with authority about non-governmental organizations, when all the organizations in his country were governmental.

38. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the statement by the United States representative was unfounded and that probably such information came from sources hostile to the Soviet State. His delegation categorically rejected that distortion of the facts.

39. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the six draft decisions recommended by the Social Committee for adoption were adopted by consensus.

The draft decisions (E/5492 and Add.1, para. 6) were adopted without a vote [decision 8 (LVI)].

AGENDA ITEM 8

Social questions:

- (a) National experience in achieving far-reaching social and economic changes for the purpose of social progress;
- (b) Channels of communication with youth and international youth organizations

REPORT OF THE SOCIAL COMMITTEE (E/5506 AND CORR.1)

40. The PRESIDENT drew the attention of the Council to the report of the Social Committee on the item (E/5506 and Corr.1), paragraph 24 of which contained two draft resolutions, I and II, which the Committee had adopted by consensus and which it recommended to the Council for adoption. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council adopted both draft resolutions by consensus.

Draft resolutions I and II (E/5506 and Corr.1, para. 24) were adopted without a vote [resolutions 1841 (LVI) and 1842 (LVI)].

41. Mr. WANG Tzu-chuan (China) said that, if a vote had been taken on draft resolution I, his delegation would not have participated, for the reasons it had explained in the Social Committee.

42. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) reiterated the reservations he had expressed in the Social Committee concerning paragraph 7 of draft resolution II.

AGENDA ITEM 9

Narcotic drugs:

- (a) Report of the International Narcotics Control Board;
- (b) Report of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs on its special session

REPORT OF THE SOCIAL COMMITTEE (E/5504)

43. The PRESIDENT announced that paragraph 9 of the report of the Social Committee (E/5504) con-

tained six draft resolutions and a draft decision which the Committee had recommended to the Council for adoption. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council adopted by consensus draft resolution I, which the Social Committee had also adopted by consensus.

Draft resolution I (E/5504, para. 13) was adopted without a vote [resolution 1843 (LVI)].

44. Mr. WANG Tzu-chuan (China) reiterated the reservations which his delegation had expressed in the Social Committee concerning the draft resolution just adopted.

45. The PRESIDENT put to the vote draft resolution II, which had been adopted by the Social Committee after a vote.

Draft resolution II (E/5504, para. 13) was adopted by 46 votes to none, with 6 abstentions [resolution 1844 (LVI)].

46. The PRESIDENT put to the vote draft resolution III.

Draft resolution III (E/5504, para. 13) was adopted by 47 votes to none, with 5 abstentions [resolution 1845 (LVI)].

47. The PRESIDENT drew the attention of the Council to paragraph 9 of the report of the Social Committee (E/5504), in which it was stated that the Committee had adopted draft resolution IV by consensus. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council was in favour of adopting the draft resolution in the same manner.

Draft resolution IV (E/5504, para. 13) was adopted without a vote [resolution 1846 (LVI)].

48. The PRESIDENT said that paragraph 10 of the report of the Social Committee indicated that the Social Committee had adopted the draft resolution after a vote. He invited the Council to vote on the draft resolution.

Draft resolution V (E/5504, para. 13) was adopted by 43 votes to none, with 9 abstentions [resolution 1847 (LVI)].

49. Mr. BERK (Turkey) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution V although it had some reservations on the first preambular paragraph, which referred to General Assembly resolution 3147 (XXVIII). His delegation believed that there should be a just balance between the duties and responsibilities of States under the 1961 Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs and the Convention on Psychotropic Substances, of 1971.

50. The Government of Turkey was not therefore prepared to ratify the 1972 Protocol Amending the Single Convention until the Convention on Psychotropic Substances entered into force in the major industrialized countries.

51. The PRESIDENT drew the attention of the Council to the end of paragraph 11 of the report, which indicated that the Committee had adopted draft resolution VI after a vote.

Draft resolution VI (E/5504, para. 13) was adopted by 52 votes to none, with 1 abstention [resolution 1848 (LVI)].

52. The PRESIDENT noted that the draft decision had been adopted by the Committee by consensus, as

indicated in paragraph 12 of the report. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council was in favour of adopting it in the same manner.

The draft decision (E/5504, para. 13) was adopted without a vote [decision 9 (LVI)].

AGENDA ITEM 14

Report of the Commission on the Status of Women

REPORT OF THE SOCIAL COMMITTEE (E/5507)

53. Miss ST. CLAIRE (Assistant Secretary of the Council) noted that there were a few errors in the

report of the Social Committee (E/5507) and said that the Secretariat would take the necessary steps to correct them.¹

54. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he had received the Russian version of the report that afternoon and, accordingly, his delegation was not yet ready to consider it. He requested that consideration of the report should be postponed to the next meeting.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 4.45 p.m.

¹ The corrections were subsequently distributed as document E/5507/Corr.1.

1897th meeting

Thursday, 16 May 1974, at 3.30 p.m.

President: Mr. Aarno KARHILO (Finland)

E/SR.1897

AGENDA ITEM 14

Report of the Commission on the Status of Women (concluded)

REPORT OF THE SOCIAL COMMITTEE (CONCLUDED) (E/5507 AND CORR.1)

1. The PRESIDENT said that there were some further corrections to be made to the report of the Social Committee (E/5507 and Corr.1). In paragraph 11 (b) on page 3 of the phrase "with one abstention" should read "with 13 abstentions", and the word "unanimously" should be added in paragraph 11 (f). In paragraph 72, draft resolution VII, the word "and" should be added after the words "United Nations system" in paragraph 6.
2. He drew the Council's attention to the fact that paragraph 72 of the report contained 14 draft resolutions and 3 draft decisions recommended by the Social Committee to the Council for adoption. He invited the members of the Council to vote on draft resolution I.
3. Mr. WANG Tzu-chuan (China) said that his delegation had explained its views on the activities to be undertaken during the International Women's Year during the discussions at the twenty-fifth session of the Commission on the Status of Women, in January 1974, and in the Social Committee. His delegation did not agree with draft resolution I and would not participate in the voting if it was put to the vote.
4. The PRESIDENT noted that the Social Committee had adopted draft resolution I without a vote. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council also wished to adopt it without a vote.

Draft resolution I (E/5507 and Corr.1, para. 72) was adopted without a vote [resolution 1849 (LVI)].

5. The PRESIDENT noted that the Social Committee had adopted draft resolution II without a vote. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to do the same.

Draft resolution II (E/5507 and Corr.1, para. 72) was adopted without a vote [resolution 1850 (LVI)].

6. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring to draft resolution III, said that his delegation had expressed its views on the convening

of an international conference during the International Women's Year in the Social Committee. The question had been raised for the first time at the twenty-fifth session of the Commission on the Status of Women. Such a conference would be extremely important, however, and could not be adequately prepared in so short a time without jeopardizing its success. Furthermore, apart from meetings scheduled at other levels, five important conferences were already planned for 1975 and the proposed conference would make six, whereas several General Assembly resolutions urged that no more than one major conference should be held each year. Furthermore, the draft resolution gave no indications regarding participation in the conference—which meant, he hoped, that all States would be invited without discrimination—or its duration. Finally, such a conference, if it had to take place, should not place an additional burden on the United Nations budget; the expenditures it would entail should therefore be absorbed within the existing 1975 budget. His delegation would therefore vote against paragraph 5 of the draft resolution if it were put to the vote separately, and would abstain if the draft resolution as a whole were put to the vote.

7. Mr. ROUX (Belgium) said that he was speaking, not to explain his vote on draft resolution III, but to state that, in his view, in order to prepare satisfactorily for the international conference, arrangements should be made for the officers of the Commission on the Status of Women to meet before the conference, and also for brief regional meetings to enable countries to come to an agreement on the measures to be taken at the national level in preparation for the conference.

8. Mrs. GEORGE (Trinidad and Tobago) suggested that, in paragraph 1 of the draft resolution, the words "in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council" should be added after the words "interested non-governmental organizations".

9. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council accepted the amendment proposed by the representative of Trinidad and Tobago.

It was so decided.