

session, in order to enable the members of ECWA to have further consultations with a view to reaching unanimity on the question of the site of the permanent headquarters.

9. The PRESIDENT pointed out that the Council could not entertain that appeal unless a member of the Council put it forward as a formal proposal.

10. Mr. KITTANI (Observer for Iraq), speaking at the invitation of the President, pointed out that the Commission had been discussing the matter for two years and that all members had had ample time to make their offers. The decision had been postponed once at the Commission level, at the request of Lebanon, and he saw no purpose in further postponement unless the intention was to bring political or other considerations into the question. His delegation would strongly oppose any such move.

11. Mr. GHORRA (Observer for Lebanon), speaking at the invitation of the President, reiterated the view that, owing to current conditions in Lebanon, his delegation had not had a fair chance to present its views to the Commission. Besides, there was no urgent need for a decision.

12. Mr. STOFOROPOULOS (Greece) said that certain elements of the question caused his delegation some uneasiness and it did not believe that the Council should be rushed into taking a decision on a matter. Since the report on the second special session of ECWA had been issued only recently and contained some rather technical material, it might be a good idea to postpone a decision for a few weeks so as to give delegations time for consultations.

13. Mr. KITTANI (Observer for Iraq), speaking at the invitation of the President, said that the matter was

in fact urgent. Unless work on the buildings was started fairly soon they would not be ready by September 1979, when the agreement concerning the temporary siting of the Commission at Beirut expired. The Secretary-General had been asked for his views on the various offers, and the verdict had been that while the proposal of Iraq presented no difficulties, the other two did. Moreover, the Iraqi proposal had no financial implications for the Organization. The report on the second special session of ECWA should be read together with document E/ECWA/38 and Add.1.

14. Mr. SALLAM (Yemen) proposed that the meeting should be suspended.

The meeting was suspended at 4.55 p.m. and resumed at 5.20 p.m.

15. The PRESIDENT suggested, in the light of the consultations he had held, that the Council should postpone consideration of the matter and the adoption of a decision on the draft resolution until Monday, 25 October, at the earliest, and Wednesday, 27 October, at the latest.

It was so decided.

16. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), supported by Mr. ROUGE (France), pointed out that although, according to the statement submitted by the Secretary-General (E/L.1738 and Corr. 1), a decision to accept Iraq's offer would not have financial implications for the United Nations, some expense would be involved in moving the Commission to Baghdad. He therefore requested a detailed breakdown of those expenses.

17. The PRESIDENT said that the Secretariat had taken note of the request.

The meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.

2034th meeting

Monday, 25 October 1976, at 11 a.m.

President: Mr. Siméon AKE (Ivory Coast).

E/SR.2034

AGENDA ITEM 25

Industrial development co-operation (A/31/16)

1. Mr. KHANE (Executive Director of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization) said that during the previous 18 months UNIDO had made substantial progress in reshaping its structures, policies and programmes. A new phase had begun with the Lima Declaration and Plan of Action,¹ adopted at the Second General Conference of UNIDO in March 1975, and for the first time a specific target for the developing countries' share in total industrial production had been set: 25 per cent by the year 2000. The Plan of Action laid down guidelines and instruments for facilitating the attainment of that target and providing a firm basis for continued growth.

¹ See A/10112, chap. IV.

2. The UNIDO secretariat considered that its activities should be divided into categories. First, it would provide a set of analyses, deductions and data. Mainly through the International Centre for Industrial Studies, the necessary research programmes had been initiated on decision-making, on transfer and adaptation of technology, and on the reasons for past successes in industrialization. Secondly, a new system of consultations was being built up which was expected to lead to new modes of international co-operation in certain industrial sectors. The decisive element in the success of the system would, of course, be the political will and conscious effort involved. The first consultations on the iron and steel and fertilizer sectors were planned for 1977, and comprehensive studies on all aspects of those sectors were nearing completion. The third broad area of work was to provide more effective technical assistance, especially in priority sectors and for the least developed, landlocked and island developing countries. A special pro-

gramme for those countries had been prepared by the reorganized secretariat.

3. UNIDO had been assigned the central co-ordinating role for industrial development in the United Nations system, and during the year he had had discussions with most of the United Nations agencies and offices and with the regional commissions. The second meeting of the United Nations Industrial Development Advisory Council at Vienna in September 1975 had paved the way for increased interagency co-ordination of United Nations technical assistance programmes devoted to industry.

4. In resolution 46 (X) the Industrial Development Board (see A/31/16, part one, annex I) had taken action to implement the decisions of the Second General Conference of UNIDO on the question of sovereignty over natural resources and industrialization of developing countries. The draft resolution on international co-operation on the transfer of technology had been discussed at length before being referred to the Permanent Committee at its ninth session (*ibid.*, part two, para. 16). As requested by the General Assembly, the Board had prepared the basic instruments for the establishment of a United Nations Industrial Development Fund, and a draft resolution on the subject had been recommended to the General Assembly (*ibid.*, para. 34). The Board had also recommended that the General Assembly should convene the Third General Conference of UNIDO in 1979 on the basis of the mandate proposed in paragraph 70 of the Lima Declaration (*ibid.*, para. 20).

5. Progress had been made towards the establishment of an industrial technological information bank, as requested in General Assembly resolution 3507 (XXX), and was reported to the General Assembly in document A/31/147, which was before it under item 66 of the agenda of its thirty-first session.

6. The resources of UNIDO were still inadequate to meet its increased responsibilities. A fall in the resources of the United Nations Development Programme had coincided with the reorganization of the secretariat, which was capable of delivering increased technical assistance, but it was hoped that the gap between resources and requirements would be reduced by the proposed United Nations Industrial Development Fund. The UNIDO regular budget was to be considered by the General Assembly, which had requested the Secretary-General to submit a new proposal for 1976-1977. The proposals currently under examination by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions showed a modest but steady increase, mainly attributable to new programmes of the International Centre for Industrial Studies.

7. Finally, the Committee on the Drafting of a Constitution for UNIDO as a specialized agency was to hold its fourth session at Vienna, beginning on 2 November.

8. Mr. ROUGE (France) said that the limited time at the Council's disposal should not be used to discuss in detail the many problems raised by the report of the Industrial Development Board (A/31/16), which was to be considered shortly by the General Assembly. It was because the Council's working methods were unsatisfactory that many difficult questions had to be referred directly to the General Assembly by the Board without the Council's having an opportunity to devise acceptable solutions. For that reason, his delegation was prepared to support a procedural decision that the report

should be transmitted to the General Assembly for examination and decision.

9. Mr. NEUHOFF (Federal Republic of Germany) stated that at the resumed tenth session of the Board his delegation had explained its position on certain aspects of the UNIDO budget for 1976-1977, on the proposed financial rules of the United Nations Industrial Development Fund, on the project for an industrial and technological information bank and on the system of consultations. His Government's opinions had not changed and his delegation would revert to them during the deliberations of the Second and Fifth Committees.

10. The PRESIDENT proposed that the Council should take note of the report of the Industrial Development Board on its tenth session (A/31/16) and transmit it to the General Assembly at its thirty-first session.

It was so decided (decision 193 (LXI)).

AGENDA ITEM 2

Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters (E/5894, E/L.1736, E/L.1737, E/L.1740)

11. Mr. KANAZAWA (Japan) referred to the proposed changes in the calendar of meetings arising from the recommendation of the Commission on the Status of Women that the Council should authorize it to hold a resumed twenty-sixth session for two weeks in December 1976 (E/L.1737, para. 2). His delegation had supported General Assembly resolution 3521 (XXX), in which the Commission was requested to complete in 1976 the elaboration of the draft Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, on the understanding that the work would be completed at the twenty-sixth session of the Commission in September 1976. In view of the divergence of views which had emerged at that session, it was unrealistic to expect that agreement on the text could be reached only two months later and within two weeks. Furthermore, since the period in question came during the General Assembly session, it was doubtful whether Secretariat staff could be spared to service a resumed session at Geneva in December. For all those reasons, he could not support the Commission's recommendation; a more practical course for it would be to continue the work on the draft Convention at its twenty-seventh session.

12. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had not had time to give full consideration to the substance of the note by the Secretariat (E/L.1737). Accordingly, and without prejudging its position on the recommendation of the Commission on the Status of Women for a resumed session in December 1976, he proposed that substantive consideration of that recommendation should be deferred until the Council's following meeting.

13. Mr. EHSASSI (Iran) said that at its September session the Commission on the Status of Women had worked exclusively on the completion of the draft Convention and on proposals and recommendations concerning the United Nations Decade for Women. Unfortunately, in the limited time at its disposal it had been unable to complete those tasks, although the bulk of the work on the draft Convention had already been done. His delegation strongly supported the recommendation for a resumed twenty-sixth session in December at Geneva. In order to reduce the costs of the resumed session, summary records might be eliminated.

If the Commission had to hold a special session in 1977, the financial implications would certainly be higher than those set forth in the Secretary-General's statement (E/L.1740) for a resumed session.

14. Mr. ROUGE (France) said that his delegation had expressed a reservation when the Commission on the Status of Women had adopted its recommendation concerning a resumed session in 1976; the recommendation could not be justified. In that connexion, he endorsed the comments made by the representative of Japan. To accede to the Commission's request would be encouraging other subsidiary organs of the Council, when they failed to complete their agenda, to resort to the same procedure. The Council should not set a deplorable precedent by authorizing a functional commission which failed to complete its agenda at its regular session to hold a resumed or special session. Furthermore, his delegation had reservations concerning the high cost of convening a resumed session of the Commission in 1976 even if summary records were eliminated.

15. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) observed that the Economic and Social Council secretariat had suggested during the September session that the Commission might extend its regular session, inasmuch as a one-week extension was feasible without financial implications. However, the Commission had decided to recommend that the Council should authorize a resumed session in December 1976.

16. Mr. KJELDGAARD (Denmark) said that his delegation would be reluctant to reject that recommendation, particularly since it felt that the members of the Commission had made it because they were confident that they could complete work on the draft Convention during the additional two-week period. The doubts expressed by the representative of Japan concerning the servicing of the resumed session during the General Assembly were not supported by the statement of the programme budget implications of the Commission's recommendation (E/L.1740). He shared the view of the Iranian representative, however, that some savings could be made by eliminating summary records.

17. Mr. RIVAS (Colombia) also supported the Commission's recommendation. The members of the Commission would not have voted overwhelmingly to request authorization for a resumed session unless they believed that they could complete the work on the draft Convention during that period, notwithstanding the divergence of opinion on various issues. It was not merely a question of a subsidiary body of the Council which had failed to complete its agenda; the elaboration of the text of a formal Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women was infinitely more important than any normal agenda item of a subsidiary organ of the Council and warranted an exception's being made to the rules governing the Council's relationship with its functional commissions. The Commission's case was particularly strong because the draft Convention was one of the priorities which the Council itself had established. Moreover, it would be sensible to hold the recommended resumed session in New York in order to reduce costs.

18. Mr. DE MOURA (Brazil) said it would be a mistake to eliminate summary records of a session devoted to the drafting of a convention; they should be retained for the Commission's resumed session. On the other hand, he would welcome an explanation of the reasons for not holding the proposed session in

New York. The availability of staff to service it was not a problem because the Assembly would be approaching its conclusion, and the Main Committees would not have much work left and were unlikely to be meeting concurrently with the Commission. The question of holding the Commission's resumed session in New York should be taken up in the Third Committee.

19. Mrs. SIPILA (Assistant Secretary-General for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs) said that she had had long experience with the Commission on the Status of Women and had been present at the first two weeks of its latest session. She admired its capacity to work as fast as it did and felt that disagreement was natural when drafting international law, especially law dealing with individual lives and families. With regard to the draft Convention itself, she felt that there had been agreement on all substantive issues and that the procedural questions would raise few difficulties. The Commission had considered extending its session at Geneva, but only a very small minority had been in favour of that procedure since all representatives had made plans to return to their regular occupations and had already worked very hard. In her view, therefore, the recommendation to hold a resumed session was quite reasonable.

20. The twenty-seventh session of the Commission would be held in 1978, and if the draft Convention was not to come before it until then, the text could not be submitted to the General Assembly until the thirty-third session in 1978, at the earliest, which would leave no hope of ratification before 1980, the mid-point of the United Nations Decade for Women.

21. With regard to the financial implications of the recommendation (E/L.1737, para. 2), she noted that some savings had been achieved at the September 1976 session. She believed that there would be no problem of overlapping duties for the United Nations staff involved during the proposed session, as their work on General Assembly affairs, principally the Third Committee, would be finished by the date suggested.

22. In conclusion, she said that the Commission had no wish to create a bad precedent; the session should be treated as a normal biennial session and a normal follow-up to a major conference involving preparations for a further major conference. It was her belief that it would not serve the purposes of the United Nations to reject the Commission's request.

23. Mr. TUKAN (Jordan) said that, while he generally agreed with the representatives of Japan and France, he felt that the considerations advanced by the representative of Denmark and the Assistant Secretary-General were more persuasive. His delegation was therefore in favour of accepting the Commission's recommendation. Summary records would be useful, but other priorities would have to be carefully weighed. He supported the Soviet suggestion to postpone a decision on the item until a later meeting of the Council.

24. Mr. BARCELO (Mexico) pointed out that during the Commission's discussion of the recommendation, no member delegation had objected to it. He was not in favour of delaying the Commission's work on the draft Convention. The Council should, however, do its utmost to arrange for the resumed session to be held at Headquarters.

25. Mr. MARSHALL (United Kingdom) said that, while he had no objection to postponing a decision on the recommendation, he wished to draw attention to

the fact that the proposal before the Economic and Social Council was not entirely the same as the recommendation made by the Commission. First, the Council should consider whether it was asked to give the Commission more time to devote to its agenda as a whole or only to its work in relation to the World Conference in 1980 and the draft Convention. Secondly, it should consider the possibility of a resumed session in New York, if not in December 1976 then at another time, possibly concurrently with the spring session of the Economic and Social Council. Finally, the disadvantages of not having summary records available should be weighed; in that connexion, he tended to agree with the representative of Brazil. With reference to the final sentence of paragraph 2 of E/L.1740, he asked whether the costs in question could be expected to be absorbed regardless of when a resumed session was convened and whether temporary assistance would be required.

26. Mrs. SIPILA (Assistant Secretary-General for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs) said that it was important for several reasons that the resumed

session of the Commission be held in 1976. For one thing, the existing membership of the Commission was familiar with the draft Convention, and one third of the members were due to be replaced in January 1977.

27. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to defer further discussion of the recommendation until the meeting on Wednesday, 27 October, as suggested by the representative of the Soviet Union.

It was so decided.

Report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of the medium-term and long-term recovery and rehabilitation programme in the Sudano-Sahelian region (A/31/259)

28. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to take note of the report of the Secretary-General (A/31/259) and transmit it to the General Assembly at its thirty-first session.

It was so decided (decision 194 (LXI)).

The meeting rose at 12.25 p.m.

2035th meeting

Wednesday, 27 October 1976, at 3.45 p.m.

President: Mr. Siméon AKE (Ivory Coast).

E/SR.2035

AGENDA ITEM 4

Regional co-operation (concluded)* (E/5845, E/L.1738 and Corr.1, E/L.1738/Add.1, E/L.1739)

1. Mr. GHORRA (Observer for Lebanon), speaking at the invitation of the President, said that he had been unable to complete consultation with his Government or receive final instructions. However he had no desire to delay any further the Council's decision on the location of the headquarters of the Economic Commission for Western Asia, but he wished the following reservation on the part of his Government to be included in the record:

"The Lebanese Government has submitted a detailed financial and technical plan for the establishment of ECWA in Lebanon (E/ECWA/38/Add.1). The offer still stands. The Lebanese Government regrets that the conditions that have prevailed in Lebanon for one and a half years have prevented the normal and needed exchanges of view about its plan and the exploration of its possibilities. Therefore the Lebanese Government registers its reservation at the present time regarding recommendation 35 (S-II) adopted by ECWA at Doha during its session of 22-23 August 1976, as well as its right to reconsider the question at a later stage should it decide to do so."

2. The Lebanese Government welcomed the maintenance of the temporary headquarters of ECWA at Beirut and was ready to meet its obligations in that regard.

3. Mr. KITTANI (Observer for Iraq), speaking at the invitation of the President, expressed his appreciation of the Lebanese representative's statement to the effect that there would be no more attempts to delay a decision by the Council concerning the recommendation of ECWA. With reference to the Lebanese reservation, it must be understood that once the Council had taken a decision, the work on the establishment and construction of the headquarters must proceed. Any representative could, of course, make any reservations he wished, or could try to reverse the Council's decision.

4. Mr. STOFOROPOULOS (Greece) said that since the 2033rd meeting he had studied additional documents, on the basis of which he had held further informal consultations with other delegations. He would have liked more time to consider alternative proposals. However, he would not stand in the way of any decision which the Council might wish to take.

5. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the question of the headquarters of ECWA was urgent. He respected the decision taken by ECWA itself, and hoped that the Council would adopt draft resolution E/L.1739 unanimously. His delegation reserved the right to make detailed comments on the statement of financial implications submitted by the Secretary-General (E/L.1738 and Corr.1 and E/L.1738/Add.1) when it was considered by the Fifth Committee at the current session of the General Assembly. However, he noted with appreciation that the construction of the building would have no financial consequences for the United Nations budget.

6. The PRESIDENT proposed that the Council should adopt draft resolution E/L.1739 without a vote.

* Resumed from the 2033rd meeting.