

for the Asian States, three seats for the Latin American States, two seats for the socialist States of Eastern Europe and four seats for the Western European and other States. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council agreed to that composition.

It was so decided (see decision 197 (LXI)).

22. Mr. AMIRDZHANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that the representatives of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic and the Soviet Union had expressed their views on the composition of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group at the sixty-first session of the Council at Geneva. Speaking on behalf of those delegations, he said that any decision adopted on the matter should not constitute a departure from the existing principles of equitable geographical distribution within the United Nations system or serve as a precedent. He would like his remarks reported in the summary record.

23. The PRESIDENT said that the reservation did not seem relevant since the composition of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group as proposed was entirely consistent with current United Nations practice and had been arrived at through a gentleman's agreement. He too wished his comments to be recorded in the summary record and in the report of the Council.

24. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) read out a partial list of candidates, which were for the five seats allotted to African States: Algeria, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Uganda and Zaire; for the four seats allotted to Asian States: Iran, Japan and Pakistan; and for the three seats allotted to Latin American States: Colombia, Mexico and Venezuela.

25. Mr. VINCI (Italy), speaking as Chairman of the group of Western European and other States, said that his group had discussed the matter at great length and, in order not to hold up the work of the Working Group, had decided to endorse the candidature of the United States of America but was not in a position to present an agreed list of nominees, as there were eight Member States (the United Kingdom, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium, Canada,

Norway and Italy) and Switzerland that wished to participate in the Working Group. The group appreciated the fact that the Council was prepared to leave the *Ad Hoc* Working Group open-ended, on the basis of the rules of procedure and long-standing practice. Accordingly all those States would participate in the work of the Working Group on that understanding, and the possibility of expanding the Group in future would be kept open. He hoped that the spirit of co-operation thus demonstrated would be understood. Meanwhile, all the delegations named were in touch with their Governments in connexion with the possibility of reducing the number of candidates.

26. The PRESIDENT pointed out that Council resolution 2041 (LXI) stated clearly that the *Ad Hoc* Working Group would have 18 members. Any member of the Council or of the United Nations wishing to participate in the Working Group would have to act in accordance with the Council's rules of procedure. If the Council wished the Working Group to be open-ended it would have to take a decision to that effect.

27. Mr. UDOVENKO (Observer for the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), speaking at the invitation of the President, said that the Eastern European States had no candidates at the current stage.

28. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should elect the members representing the group of African States, the group of Asian States, the group of Latin American States and the group of Western European and other States.

Algeria, Colombia, Iran, Japan, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Sierra Leone, Uganda, the United States of America, Venezuela and Zaire were elected members of the Ad Hoc Intergovernmental Working Group on Corrupt Practices (see decision 197 (LXI)).

29. The PRESIDENT suggested that the chairmen of the regional groups should inform him of the other candidates in due course. The remaining members of the Working Group would be elected at a later date.

The meeting rose at 4.45 p.m.

2036th meeting

Monday, 15 November 1976, at 3.45 p.m.

President: Mr. Siméon AKE (Ivory Coast).

E/SR.2036

AGENDA ITEM 26

United Nations Special Fund (A/31/21)

1. Mr. ALGARD (Norway), President of the Board of Governors of the United Nations Special Fund, introducing the report of the Board of Governors of the Special Fund (A/31/21), said that, although the Fund had finally received its first contributions, he was somewhat more pessimistic about its future than he had been when reporting to the Council and to the General Assembly on previous occasions. His past optimism had stemmed from a refusal to believe that the appeals for contributions made by the General Assembly at two

special and two regular sessions would go unheeded, and he still hoped that he had been right. He had been convinced that, if only a few countries could be persuaded to come forward, that would break the vicious circle in which one group of potential donors waited for another to make the first move. He had hoped that a breakthrough had come when Venezuela and Norway, which belonged to different groups of potential donors, had responded to the appeal for contributions made as part of the consensus reached at the seventh special session of the General Assembly, but subsequent events had not met his expectations. The industrialized countries he had approached had preferred to give their

assistance to most seriously affected countries either bilaterally or through multilateral outlets. He had hoped to be able to persuade the countries members of the Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries to channel at least part of the generous aid they were giving for the most seriously affected countries through the Special Fund, but they had recently decided to establish a special fund of their own.

2. The immediate task before the Fund, and its responsibility to the two donors, was to disburse the available resources with a minimum of delay and for the purposes for which they had been given. That question would be considered at a special session of the Board of Governors, to be held early in December. Meanwhile, consultations should continue between all delegations and countries concerned, in order to ensure that at its next regular session the Board of Governors could realistically assess the future prospects for the Fund with a view to making the necessary recommendations.

3. Despite his involvement in the practical preparations for launching the Fund and his efforts to attract resources for it, he had invested no prestige of his own in the Special Fund. For him, what was important was that aid for the most seriously affected countries should be forthcoming, and that at four sessions the General Assembly had singled out the Special Fund as the most suitable instrument for that purpose.

4. Mr. MWANGAGUHUNGA (Uganda) thanked those countries which had already made contributions to the Fund. As the representative of one of the most seriously affected countries and of a State in Africa, where there were many others in the same situation, he appealed to the developed nations and all others in a position to do so to heed the call of the President of the Board of Governors and make donations.

5. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should conclude its consideration of agenda item 26 by deciding to take note of the report of the Board of Governors of the United Nations Special Fund on the work of its second and third sessions (A/31/21) and to transmit it to the General Assembly at its thirty-first session together with the comments which had just been made on the subject.

It was so decided (decision 198 (LXI)).

AGENDA ITEM 18

International co-operation and co-ordination within the United Nations system (E/5892)

6. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the report on the Joint Meetings of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination and the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (E/5892).

7. Mr. MARSHALL (United Kingdom) asked whether the report was to be formally introduced by a representative of either of the Committees concerned.

8. Mr. BRUCE (Canada) said he too would like an answer to that question, as his delegation attached great importance to the work of CPC and to the question of co-ordination. It was a little discouraging that the latest round of Joint Meetings should have been the third on so basic a question as how CPC and ACC could get along better together. While his delegation shared some of the views expressed in the report, it felt that it was not entirely clear what should flow from the conclusions contained in it, and would appreciate being told more concretely what was planned for the future.

9. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) explained that the report on the Joint Meetings had been submitted to the resumed session of the Council because in 1976 the Joint Meetings had been rescheduled. Normally it was discussed during the summer session, and there was no formal introduction of the report. If the Council took note of the report, it would clearly have to consider at a future session all the actions suggested in the conclusions of the Joint Meetings.

10. Mr. FLEMING (Argentina) said he was concerned that, if the Council took note of the report, that would be tantamount to its agreeing to take action on the conclusions at its organizational session, without any opportunity for discussion of the document's implications by the General Assembly. If that was the case, it was important that the Council, not all of whose members had attended the Joint Meetings, should take the opportunity at the current stage to discuss the document in detail and to make any changes in the conclusions which it considered appropriate.

11. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) observed that the report had been submitted to the Council at its resumed session because the consideration of that document, however preliminary it might be, had to be reflected in the Council's annual report to the General Assembly.

12. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said it would seem necessary for the members of the Council to express their views on the report, and perhaps amend it, at the resumed session now underway. His delegation for one had doubts concerning some of the suggestions made in paragraph 42 of the report, especially that contained in subparagraph (d). Who, other than its Chairman, could represent CPC, and what was the value of the proposed visits to agency headquarters?

13. Mr. BRUCE (Canada) said he was not sure that the Council could alter the conclusions of CPC and ACC. What it should do was to identify the suggestions in the report which required action by the Council itself and make recommendations concerning them in its report to the General Assembly. If, as the Secretary's remarks seemed to suggest, there was to be a substantive discussion of the report on the Joint Meetings at a future session of the Council, the Council should take that opportunity to identify the major areas of concern on which it should give directives to CPC with regard to co-ordination. It might, for example, be useful for CPC and ACC to participate in the implementation of the decisions of major international conferences, such as those on food problems, the environment and population.

14. Mr. MARSHALL (United Kingdom) agreed that the Council must do more than take note of the report, for the Joint Meetings had been held at an unusual time and the participants had recognized them as being of unusual value. The Council should bear in mind that the report would be submitted to the General Assembly, of which CPC was also a subsidiary body, and that its own organizational session would deal with the sense of the Joint Meetings. It should hear the views of its own members on the content of the report, endorse the general sense of the Joint Meetings, and take note of the contribution of those Meetings and what flowed therefrom to its own work.

15. Mr. TREVIÑO (Mexico) said that the implications of the conclusions set forth in the report were too vast to be grasped at the current stage. He suggested,

therefore, that the Council should merely take note of the report, pending an in-depth discussion of its contents at the organizational session for 1977.

16. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation, having only received the report that day, would confine itself to preliminary remarks on the subject. He believed that, in the light of the current profound transformations in the international economic situation, the role of the Joint Meetings was more important than ever. The mandates of ACC and CPC had been defined in Council resolutions 1643 (LI) and 2008 (LX) respectively, and it was evident, in the light of the assertion of the central role of CPC contained in paragraph 1 of the annex to resolution 2008 (LX), that all the provisions of those resolutions must be implemented as soon as possible.

17. Paragraph 23 of the report under discussion (E/5892) stated what was required for that purpose, but, apart from the few insignificant changes which were reflected in the conclusions at the end of the report, CPC and ACC remained essentially as they had been. Since that was not what the Council wanted, it was important that the question of improving co-ordination and helping CPC to play a major and fruitful role within the United Nations system in all the areas mentioned in Council resolution 2008 (LX) should be taken up seriously.

18. Accordingly, he agreed with other speakers that the Council should not merely take note of the report on the Joint Meetings, but should study it in a constructive spirit at the forthcoming organizational session and add its own recommendations where appropriate.

19. Mr. KOCH (Federal Republic of Germany) observed that there seemed to be general agreement that the report merited careful consideration, which was impossible at the current stage because it had been issued so recently. He supported the idea that the Council should resume discussion of the item at its next organizational session.

20. Mr. FLEMING (Argentina) agreed that, because of the importance it attached to strengthening the role of CPC, the Council should try at its organizational session to evolve concrete recommendations pertaining to the conclusions in the report.

21. He also believed that the summary record of the current meeting should state that, while the Council had every confidence in the drafters of the report, the conclusions did not reflect all the views expressed at the Joint Meetings. Paragraph 42 (d), for example, gave the impression that the Director-General of the World Health Organization had intended that representatives of CPC should meet only with members of agency governing bodies, which would have the effect of conferring responsibility for co-ordination on them alone, whereas the goal was in fact to establish co-ordination between agency secretariats.

22. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should take note of the report and resume consideration of it at its organizational session for 1977.

23. Mr. MARSHALL (United Kingdom) said that the wording of the decision adopted by the Council should reflect the fact that in its discussions the Council had welcomed the evidence that important issues had been discussed at the Joint Meetings of CPC and ACC, that it had not had an opportunity to study the report in detail and that it would consider the report further at its organizational session in January 1977.

24. Mr. FLEMING (Argentina) suggested that the Council should take note of the report and decide to consider it, including the conclusions, in detail at its January session in the light of the discussions at the Joint Meetings of CPC and ACC and the current meeting of the Council.

25. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) suggested the following wording:

"The Council takes note of the report of the Chairman of CPC and the Chairman of ACC on the Joint Meetings of CPC and ACC (E/5892) and decides to consider it in depth at its organizational session for 1977, taking into account the comments made thereon at the resumed sixty-first session, with a view to reaching specific conclusions which would guide the future work of CPC, ACC and the Joint Meetings."

26. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt that wording.

It was so decided (decision 199 (LXI)).

AGENDA ITEM 29

Nomination of members of the World Food Council

27. The PRESIDENT said that in accordance with General Assembly resolution 3348 (XXIX), paragraph 8, the Council was called upon to submit nominations to the General Assembly at its thirty-first session to fill the 12 vacancies which would occur in the World Food Council on 31 December 1976, according to the following pattern: three seats for African States; two seats for Asian States; three seats for Latin American States; two seats for socialist States of Eastern Europe; two seats for Western European and other States. He invited the Secretary to read out the nominations which had been submitted to the Secretariat.

28. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) said that the following nominations had been submitted to the Secretariat: for the African States: the Ivory Coast, Madagascar and Nigeria; for the Asian States: Pakistan and the Philippines; for the Latin American States: Cuba, Guatemala and Jamaica; for the socialist States of Eastern Europe: Poland and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; for the Western European and other States: Australia and France.

29. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to nominate those States for election by the General Assembly to membership in the World Food Council.

It was so decided (decision 200 (LXI)).

AGENDA ITEM 5

United Nations University (A/31/31/Add.1 and Corr.1)

30. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the addendum (A/31/31/Add.1 and Corr.1) to the report of the Council of the United Nations University which had been considered at the summer session. The addendum did not deal with matters of substance but contained supplementary information on the University's activities since February 1976. In accordance with the new procedure established by the Council of the University for the preparation and adoption of its annual report, the latter would in future be adopted in June so that the

Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly might have before them a report covering activities during the current year. Since the addendum would be considered by the Second Committee, he would take it, if there were no objection, that the Council wished to

take note of it and transmit it to the General Assembly at its thirty-first session.

It was so decided (decision 201 (LXI)).

The meeting rose at 4.45 p.m.

2037th meeting

Wednesday, 17 November 1976, at 11.10 a.m.

President: Mr. Siméon AKE (Ivory Coast).

E/SR.2037

AGENDA ITEM 24

Trade and development (A/31/15 and Corr.1)

1. Mr. COREA (Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development), introducing the report of the Trade and Development Board on the first part of its sixteenth session (A/31/15, vol. II), said it was the first time that the Board was meeting in its enlarged form since the decision to permit all members of UNCTAD to become members of it.¹ It was also the first meeting of the Board since the fourth session of UNCTAD, held at Nairobi from 5 to 31 May 1976, and its work had therefore been almost exclusively devoted to implementing the decisions taken at Nairobi, particularly to the necessary institutional and organizational arrangements.

2. The decisions adopted at Nairobi (see TD/217, part one, sect. A) could be divided into two categories: the first comprised decisions of a long-term character aimed at drawing up a programme of work for UNCTAD in such fields as the export of manufactured goods from the developing countries, strengthening of the technological capacity of those countries, the promotion of trade among countries with differing economic and social systems, measures to be taken in favour of the disadvantaged countries and economic co-operation among developing countries. In all those fields, the Conference had laid a foundation upon which it was now necessary to build. The second category comprised decisions having a more immediate effect and aimed at initiating three processes of negotiation on the integrated programme for commodities, an international code of conduct for the transfer of technology and the formulation of a series of principles on restrictive trade practices. In those fields, the aim of the work was the preparation of a series of texts acceptable to all.

3. Consequently, all the decisions taken at Nairobi had added considerably to the task of the Conference and had placed a heavier burden on its programme of action and calendar of meetings. It must therefore organize itself very efficiently, and that was the aim of the majority of the decisions adopted by the Trade and Development Board at its sixteenth session (see A/31/15, vol. II, annex I).

4. First, the Board had established, pursuant to UNCTAD resolution 93 (IV), an *Ad Hoc* Intergovernmental Committee for the Integrated Programme for Commodities (decision 140 (XVI)) which would serve as the central element of the integrated programme for

commodities. In the past, UNCTAD had initiated negotiations on various commodities, but those negotiations had been piecemeal and separate in nature. The objective of the integrated programme was to remedy that weakness, and the *Ad Hoc* Committee's role would therefore consist primarily in following the process of negotiation on all commodities, a process which would probably take between 18 months and two years. That Committee, which would be open to all States members of UNCTAD, would co-ordinate the work of the various meetings on each commodity and supervise the common fund; it would concern itself with all the overall policy problems that might arise, including the determination of the commodities covered; and it would co-ordinate the implementation of the measures embodied in the integrated programme. At its first session, it would draw up its schedule of meetings and would submit periodic reports to the Board at its regular sessions. It was difficult to foresee at the current stage how that Committee's work would evolve; everything depended on progress made in the negotiations themselves.

5. The Board had also established a Committee on Economic Co-operation among Developing Countries (decision 142 (XVI)); the question of the expansion of trade among developing countries had long been of concern to UNCTAD, but it was the first time a permanent body had been assigned the task of dealing with it. That Committee, which would also be open to all members of UNCTAD, would have the primary task of preparing and recommending measures to support the efforts of developing countries to promote co-operation, although the question of the scope of that co-operation would of course be dealt with by the developing countries themselves. The Board had requested the Secretary-General of UNCTAD to study the sections of the report² of the Conference on Economic Co-operation among Developing Countries, held at Mexico City from 13 to 22 September 1976, which dealt with the supportive measures that UNCTAD had been invited to take, and to report to it on that question, as well as on the financial and administrative implications of the measures. In view of the importance on the political scene of the question of economic co-operation among developing countries, UNCTAD naturally showed interest in it, and the Secretary-General felt sure that it could make a very constructive contribution.

6. Pursuant to UNCTAD resolution 95 (IV), on trade relations among countries having different economic

¹ General Assembly resolution 31/2 of 29 September 1976.

² TD/B/628 and Add.1; transmitted also to the General Assembly as document A/C.2/31/7 and Add.1.