

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

OFFICIAL RECORDS

ORGANIZATIONAL SESSION FOR 1977

11-14 January 1977

THIRD SPECIAL SESSION

23 February 1977

SIXTY-SECOND SESSION

12 April-13 May 1977

Summary records of plenary meetings



UNITED NATIONS

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

OFFICIAL RECORDS

ORGANIZATIONAL SESSION FOR 1977

11-14 January 1977

THIRD SPECIAL SESSION

23 February 1977

SIXTY-SECOND SESSION

12 April-13 May 1977

Summary records of plenary meetings



UNITED NATIONS

New York, 1978

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

The *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council* consist of the summary records of the plenary meetings, incorporating corrections requested by delegations and any necessary editorial modifications, the supplements and the lists of delegations.

*

* *

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

CONTENTS

	Page		Page
Abbreviations	vi	2042nd meeting	
Agenda of the organizational session for 1977	vii	<i>Thursday, 13 January 1977, at 4.20 p.m.</i>	
Agenda of the third special session	vii	AGENDA ITEM 7:	
Agenda of the sixty-second session	viii	Elections to subsidiary bodies of the Council and confirmation of representatives on the functional commissions	14
Check list of documents	ix	2043rd meeting	
ORGANIZATIONAL SESSION FOR 1977		<i>Friday, 14 January 1977, at 11.15 a.m.</i>	
Summary records of the 2039th to 2044th plenary meetings		AGENDA ITEM 3:	
2039th meeting		Basic programme of work of the Council for 1977 (continued)	15
<i>Tuesday, 11 January 1977, at 11.15 a.m.</i>		2044th meeting	
OPENING OF THE SESSION	1	<i>Friday, 14 January 1977, at 4.45 p.m.</i>	
AGENDA ITEM 1:		AGENDA ITEM 3:	
Election of the Bureau	2	Basic programme of work of the Council for 1977 (concluded)	19
AGENDA ITEM 2:		AGENDA ITEM 7:	
Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters	3	Elections to subsidiary bodies of the Council and confirmation of representatives on the functional commissions (concluded)	21
AGENDA ITEM 3:		AGENDA ITEM 2:	
Basic programme of work of the Council for 1977	3	Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters (concluded)	21
2040th meeting		AGENDA ITEM 8:	
<i>Wednesday, 12 January 1977, at 4.15 p.m.</i>		Provisional agenda for the sixty-second session ...	22
AGENDA ITEM 1:		OTHER MATTERS	22
Election of the Bureau (concluded)	7	CLOSURE OF THE SESSION	23
AGENDA ITEM 5:			
Report on the Joint Meetings of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination and the Adminis- trative Committee on Co-ordination	7	THIRD SPECIAL SESSION	
2041st meeting		Summary record of the 2045th plenary meeting	
<i>Thursday, 13 January 1977, at 11.15 a.m.</i>		2045th meeting	
AGENDA ITEM 4:		<i>Wednesday, 23 February 1977, at 12.50 p.m.</i>	
Report of the Committee on Natural Resources on its second special session	10	ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA	25
AGENDA ITEM 6:		AGENDA ITEM 2:	
Rules of procedure of the functional commissions of the Council	13	Election of a Vice-President of the Council	25

	Page		Page
AGENDA ITEM 3:		2051st meeting	
World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination:		Monday, 25 April 1977, at 3.35 p.m.	
(a) Membership of the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the Conference;		AGENDA ITEM 3:	
(b) Venue of the Conference	25	Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (<i>continued</i>)	43
CLOSURE OF THE SESSION	26		
		2052nd meeting	
SIXTY-SECOND SESSION		Tuesday, 26 April 1977, at 11.05 a.m.	
Summary records of the 2046th to 2060th plenary meetings		AGENDA ITEM 3:	
2046th meeting		Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (<i>continued</i>)	50
Tuesday, 12 April 1977, at 10.50 a.m.			
AGENDA ITEM 1:		2053rd meeting	
Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters	27	Tuesday, 26 April 1977, at 3.55 p.m.	
2047th meeting		AGENDA ITEM 4:	
Tuesday, 19 April 1977, at 10.55 a.m.		Restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system	51
STATEMENT BY THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	28		
AGENDA ITEM 1:		2054th meeting	
Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters (<i>continued</i>)	31	Thursday, 5 May 1977, at 11.05 a.m.	
AGENDA ITEM 3:		AGENDA ITEM 2:	
Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination	32	Assistance to the drought-stricken areas of Ethiopia	53
2048th meeting		AGENDA ITEM 5:	
Wednesday, 20 April 1977, at 11 a.m.		Regional cartographic conferences	56
AGENDA ITEM 1:		AGENDA ITEM 7:	
Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters (<i>continued</i>)	33	Transport questions	58
AGENDA ITEM 3:		AGENDA ITEM 8:	
Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (<i>continued</i>)	34	Population questions	58
2049th meeting		AGENDA ITEM 9:	
Thursday, 21 April 1977, at 3.40 p.m.		Statistical questions	59
AGENDA ITEM 3:			
Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (<i>continued</i>)	34	2055th meeting	
2050th meeting		Wednesday, 11 May 1977, at 11.25 a.m.	
Friday, 22 April 1977, at 3.35 p.m.		AGENDA ITEM 15:	
AGENDA ITEM 3:		Elections	59
Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (<i>continued</i>)	37		
		2056th meeting	
		Wednesday, 11 May 1977, at 4 p.m.	
		AGENDA ITEM 15:	
		Elections (<i>continued</i>)	63
		2057th meeting	
		Thursday, 12 May 1977, at 11.15 a.m.	
		AGENDA ITEM 15:	
		Elections (<i>concluded</i>)	69

	Page		Page
2058th meeting		2060th meeting	
<i>Thursday, 12 May 1977, at 3.30 p.m.</i>		<i>Friday, 13 May 1977, at 3.40 p.m.</i>	
AGENDA ITEM 3:		AGENDA ITEM 12:	
Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (<i>continued</i>)	71	Human rights questions (<i>concluded</i>)	82
AGENDA ITEM 11:		AGENDA ITEM 3:	
Activities for the Advancement of Women; United Nations Decade for Women: Equality, Develop- ment and Peace	77	Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (<i>concluded</i>)	84
2059th meeting		AGENDA ITEM 6:	
<i>Friday, 13 May 1977, at 11.10 a.m.</i>		Agreement between the United Nations and the International Fund for Agricultural Development	84
AGENDA ITEM 13:		AGENDA ITEM 1:	
Narcotic drugs	78	Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters (<i>concluded</i>)	88
AGENDA ITEM 10:		RESEARCH WITHIN THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM ON THE ROLE AND POSITION OF WOMEN IN DEVELOPMENT	88
Social development questions	80	AGENDA ITEM 16:	
AGENDA ITEM 14:		Consideration of the provisional agenda for the sixty-third session	88
Non-governmental organizations	81	CLOSURE OF THE SESSION	89
AGENDA ITEM 12:			
Human rights questions	82		

ABBREVIATIONS

ACC	Administrative Committee on Co-ordination
CPC	Committee for Programme and Co-ordination
ECWA	Economic Commission for Western Asia
EEC	European Economic Community
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
IAEA	International Atomic Energy Agency
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
ILO	International Labour Organisation
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
OAU	Organization of African Unity
PLO	Palestine Liberation Organization
SWAPO	South West Africa People's Organization
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNDRO	Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
WFP	World Food Programme
WHO	World Health Organization
ZANU	Zimbabwe African National Union
ZAPU	Zimbabwe African People's Union

AGENDA OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL SESSION FOR 1977

**Adopted by the Council at its 2039th meeting
on 11 January 1977**

1. Election of the Bureau
 2. Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters
 3. Basic programme of work of the Council for 1977
 4. Report of the Committee on Natural Resources on its second special session
 5. Report on the Joint Meetings of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination and the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination
 6. Rules of procedure of the functional commissions of the Council
 7. Elections to subsidiary bodies of the Council and confirmation of representatives on the functional commissions
 8. Provisional agenda for the sixty-second session
-

AGENDA OF THE THIRD SPECIAL SESSION

**Adopted by the Council at its 2045th meeting
on 23 February 1977**

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. Election of a Vice-President of the Council
3. World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination:
 - (a) Membership of the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the Conference
 - (b) Venue of the Conference

AGENDA OF THE SIXTY-SECOND SESSION

**Adopted by the Council at its 2046th meeting
on 12 April 1977**

1. Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters
2. Assistance to the drought-stricken areas of Ethiopia
3. Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination
4. Restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system
5. Regional cartographic conferences
6. Agreement between the United Nations and the International Fund for Agricultural Development
7. Transport questions
8. Population questions
9. Statistical questions
10. Social development questions
11. Activities for the advancement of women; United Nations Decade for Women: Equality, Development and Peace
12. Human rights questions
13. Narcotic drugs
14. Non-governmental organizations
15. Elections
16. Consideration of the provisional agenda for the sixty-third session

CHECK LIST OF DOCUMENTS

NOTE. Listed below are the documents pertaining to the organizational session for 1977, the third special session and the sixty-second session. All documents were issued in mimeographed form unless otherwise indicated.

<i>Document No.</i>	<i>Title or description</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Observations and references</i>
Organizational Session for 1977			
E/5837	Arrangements for the negotiation of an agreement between the United Nations and the International Fund for Agricultural Development: note by the Secretariat		
E/5897 and Add.1-3	Elections and confirmation of representatives on functional commissions of the Council: note by the Secretary-General	7	
E/5898	Confirmation of three representatives on the Sub-Commission on Illicit Drug Traffic and Related Matters in the Near and Middle East: note by the Secretary-General	7	
E/5899	Note by the Secretariat transmitting the draft revised rules of procedure of the functional commissions of the Council	6	
E/5900	Draft basic programme of work of the Council for 1977: note by the Secretariat	3	
E/5901	Provisional annotated agenda for the organizational session for 1977	2	
E/5902	Note verbale dated 3 December 1976 from the mission of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the Secretary-General		
E/5903	Appointment of a member of the Committee on Crime Prevention and Control: note by the Secretary-General	7	
E/5904 and Corr.1	Preparatory Sub-Committee for the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination: letter dated 22 December 1976 from the President of the Council to the Secretary-General	2	
E/5905	International years and anniversaries: note by the Secretary-General		
E/5908	Arrangements for the negotiation of an agreement between the United Nations and the International Fund for Agricultural Development: note by the Secretariat		
E/DEC/204-212 (ORG-77)	Decisions adopted by the Council during its organizational session for 1977		For the final texts, see E/5988, decisions 204 (ORG-77)-212 (ORG-77)
E/L.1741	Election of 10 members to the Executive Board of the United Nations Children's Fund: note by the Secretary-General	7	
E/L.1742	Extract of the report of the Committee on Natural Resources on its second special session	4	For the report, see E/5907
E/L.1743	Draft decision proposed by the President of the Council in the light of consultative meetings of members of the Council	3	
E/L.1744	Arrangements for meetings of the Committee on Negotiations with Intergovernmental Agencies: draft decision proposed by the President of the Council	2	
E/L.1745	Preparatory Sub-Committee for the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination: draft decision proposed by the President of the Council	2	
E/L.1746	Provisional agenda for the sixty-second session	8	
E/SR.2039-2044	Summary records of the plenary meetings held by the Council during its organizational session for 1977		See <i>Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Organizational Session for 1977, Third Special Session and Sixty-second Session, Plenary Meetings</i> , 2039th to 2044th meetings

<i>Document No.</i>	<i>Title or description</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Observations and references</i>
Third Special Session			
E/5911	Venue of the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination: letter dated 4 February 1977 from the representative of Ghana to the Secretary-General	3	
E/5935	Agenda of the third special session adopted by the Council at its 2045th plenary meeting	1	
E/5936	Membership of the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination: letter dated 4 March 1977 from the President of the Council to the Secretary-General	3	
E/L.1754	Draft resolution proposed by the President of the Council	3	Adopted by the Council; see E/RES/2046 (S-III)
E/RES/2046 (S-III)	Resolution adopted by the Council at its 2045th plenary meeting		For the final text, see E/5988, resolution 2046 (S-III)
E/SR.2045	Summary record of the plenary meeting held by the Council during its third special session		See <i>Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Organizational Session for 1977, Third Special Session and Sixty-second Session, Plenary Meetings</i> , 2045th meeting
Sixty-Second Session			
E/5453/Rev.1/Amend.1	Review of the terms of reference of the subsidiary bodies of the Council: note by the Secretariat	4	
E/5890/Add.1-4	Addenda to the note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the Joint Inspection Unit on the technical co-operation provided by the United Nations system in the processes of integration in Latin America		
E/5906	First United Nations Regional Cartographic Conference for the Americas: report of the Secretary-General	5	
E/5909	Report of the Commission on the Status of Women on its twenty-sixth session and on its resumed twenty-sixth session	11	<i>Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Sixty-second Session, Supplement No. 3.</i>
E/5910	Report of the Statistical Commission on its nineteenth session	9	<i>Ibid., Supplement No. 2</i>
E/5912	Summary of the report of the International Narcotics Control Board for 1976 (E/INCB/33)	13	
E/5913	Report of the Population Commission on its nineteenth session	8	<i>Ibid., Supplement No. 4</i>
E/5914	Research within the United Nations system on the role and position of women in development and on ways and means to organize and finance further research: progress report of the Secretary-General	11	
E/5915	Report of the Commission for Social Development on its twenty-fifth session	10	<i>Ibid., Supplement No. 5</i>
E/5916	Transport of dangerous goods: report of the Secretary-General	7	
E/5917	Annotated provisional agenda for the sixty-second session	1	
E/5918	Eighth United Nations Regional Cartographic Conference for Asia and the Far East: report of the Secretary-General	5	
E/5919	Report of the Secretary-General	2	
E/5920	Report of the Secretary-General prepared in accordance with paragraph 18 (f) of the Programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination	3	
E/5921	Report of the Secretary-General prepared in accordance with paragraph 18 (e) of the Programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination	3	
E/5922	Report of the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination	3	
E/5923	Review of the methods in use for the confirmation of representatives on functional commissions: note by the Secretariat	4	

<i>Document No.</i>	<i>Title or description</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Observations and references</i>
E/5924	Report of the Committee on Negotiations with Intergovernmental Agencies	6	
E/5925	Proposals and suggestions for implementing the World Plan of Action and related resolutions of the World Conference of the International Women's Year: note by the Secretary-General	11	
E/5926	Progress achieved towards the establishment of an International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women and of a research programme on the position and role of women in development: report of the Secretary-General	11	
E/5927	Report of the Commission on Human Rights on its thirty-third session	12	<i>Ibid., Supplement No. 6</i>
E/5928	Allegations regarding infringements of trade union rights in the Bahamas: note by the Secretary-General	12	
E/5929	Letter dated 6 April 1977 from the Chairman of the Human Rights Committee to the President of the Council	1	
E/5930	Allegations regarding infringements of trade union rights in the Republic of South Africa: note by the Secretary-General	12	
E/5931	Agenda of the sixty-second session adopted by the Council at its 2046th plenary meeting	1	
E/5932	Allegations regarding infringements of trade union rights in Bahrain: note by the Secretary-General	12	
E/5932/Add.1	<i>Idem</i> : note dated 4 April 1977 from the representative of Bahrain to the Secretary-General	12	
E/5933 and Corr.1 and 2	Report of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs on its twenty-seventh session	13	<i>Ibid., Supplement No. 7 and corrigenda</i>
E/5934 and Corr.1	Report of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations	14	
E/5938	Communication dated 15 March 1977 from the Director-General of the International Labour Office to the Secretary-General	11	
E/5946	Applications for hearings: report of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations	1	
E/5960 and Corr.1	Report of the Economic Committee	9	
E/5961	Report of the Economic Committee	8	
E/5962	Report of the Economic Committee	7	
E/5962/Add.1	Programme budget implications of the draft resolution contained in document E/5962: note by the Secretary-General	7	
E/5963	Report of the Social Committee	11	
E/5964 and Corr.1	Report of the Social Committee	10	
E/5965	Report of the Social Committee	14	
E/5966	Report of the Social Committee	13	
E/5967	Report of the Social Committee	12	
E/5982	Credentials of representatives to the sixty-second session of the Council: report of the President and the Vice-Presidents of the Council		
E/5983	Application for participation in the work of the Council submitted by the Latin American Faculty of Social Sciences: note by the Bureau	1	
E/AC.6/L.591	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland: draft resolution	11	
E/AC.6/L.591/Rev.1	_____ [same sponsor]: revised draft resolution	11	
E/AC.6/L.592	_____ [same sponsor]: draft resolution	7	
E/AC.6/L.593	Yugoslavia: amendment to draft resolution I contained in chapter I of document E/5913	8	
E/AC.6/L.594	Algeria: amendment to draft resolution I contained in chapter I of document E/5913	8	
E/AC.6/SR.783-787	Summary records of the meetings held by the Economic Committee during the sixty-second session of the Council		

<i>Document No.</i>	<i>Title or description</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Observations and references</i>
E/AC.7/L.704	Argentina, Austria, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Denmark, Iran, Jamaica, Kenya, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland: draft resolution	11	
E/AC.7/L.705	Iran: amendment to draft resolution VIII contained in chapter I of document E/5909	11	
E/AC.7/L.706	Nigeria: amendment to draft resolution VIII contained in chapter I of document E/5909	11	
E/AC.7/L.707	Japan: amendments to draft resolutions IV, V, VIII, IX and X contained in chapter I of document E/5909	11	
E/AC.7/L.708	Austria: amendment to draft resolution VII contained in chapter I of document E/5909	11	
E/AC.7/L.709	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland: amendment to draft resolution VIII contained in chapter I of document E/5909	11	
E/AC.7/L.710	Poland: amendments to draft resolution IX contained in chapter I of document E/5909	11	
E/AC.7/L.711	Yugoslavia: amendments to draft resolution IX contained in chapter I of document E/5909	11	
E/AC.7/L.712	Algeria, Argentina, Cuba, Ethiopia, Iraq, Syrian Arab Republic, Yemen and Yugoslavia: draft decision	11	
E/AC.7/L.713	Argentina and Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic: amendments to draft resolution III contained in chapter I of document E/5909	11	
E/AC.7/L.714	Cuba: amendments to draft resolution III contained in chapter I of document E/5909	11	
E/AC.7/L.715	Cuba: amendments to draft resolution IV contained in chapter I of document E/5909	11	
E/AC.7/L.716	Cuba: amendments to draft resolution VI contained in chapter I of document E/5909	11	
E/AC.7/L.717	Cuba: amendments to draft resolution IX contained in chapter I of document E/5909	11	
E/AC.7/L.718	Nigeria: amendment to draft resolution VIII contained in chapter I of document E/5909	11	
E/AC.7/L.719	Argentina: amendments to draft resolution VI contained in chapter I of document E/5909	11	
E/AC.7/L.720	United States of America: amendments to draft resolution X contained in chapter I of document E/5915	10	
E/AC.7/L.721	Mexico: amendments to draft resolutions IV and X contained in chapter I of document E/5915	10	
E/AC.7/L.722	Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic: amendments to draft resolution V contained in chapter I of document E/5915	10	
E/AC.7/L.723	Algeria, Jamaica, Mauritania, Mexico, Nigeria, Venezuela and Yugoslavia: amendments to draft resolution V contained in chapter I of document E/5915	10	
E/AC.7/L.724	Algeria, Nigeria and Yugoslavia: amendments to draft resolution IV contained in chapter I of document E/5915	10	
E/AC.7/L.725	Algeria, Jamaica, Mauritania, Mexico, Nigeria, Venezuela and Yugoslavia: amendments to draft resolution X contained in chapter I of document E/5915	10	
E/AC.7/L.726	Greece: draft resolution	10	
E/AC.7/L.727	Portugal: draft resolution	10	
E/AC.7/L.728	Argentina: draft decision	14	
E/AC.7/L.729	Canada, Mexico and Yugoslavia: draft resolution	13	
E/AC.7/L.730	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland: draft resolution	13	

<i>Document No.</i>	<i>Title or description</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Observations and references</i>
E/AC.7/L.731	Colombia, Greece, Netherlands, Norway and Rwanda: draft decision	12	
E/AC.7/L.732	Italy: draft decision	12	
E/AC.7/L.733	Egypt, Jordan and Syrian Arab Republic: draft resolution	12	
E/AC.7/L.734	Nigeria and Philippines: amendments to draft resolution I A contained in chapter I of document E/5927	12	
E/AC.7/L.735	Algeria, Colombia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Jamaica, Mexico, Rwanda, Tunisia and Yugoslavia: draft resolution	12	
E/AC.7/SR.788-815	Summary records of the meetings held by the Social Committee during the sixty-second session of the Council		
E/CN.4/1222 and Corr.1	Report of the <i>Ad Hoc</i> Working Group of Experts on southern Africa	12	
E/CN.5/516	Report of the Committee on Crime Prevention and Control on its third session	10	
E/CN.5/527 and Corr.1	Progress report of the Secretary-General on the establishment of a co-operative arrangement among youth research and information centres	10	
E/CN.5/528 and Corr.1	Note by the Secretary-General on the role of youth in the promotion and protection of human rights	10	
E/CN.5/531	Progress report of the Secretary-General on the question of the elderly and the aged	10	
E/CN.5/534	Report of the Secretary-General on the problems confronting youth	10	
E/CN.5/536	Report of the Committee on Crime Prevention and Control on its fourth session	10	
E/CN.5/537	Joint report of the secretariats of the United Nations, the International Labour Organisation, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and the World Bank on social and institutional reforms as a means of increasing food production and distributing it equitably among the population	10	
E/CN.5/540	Report of the Secretary-General on the application by Governments of a unified approach to development analysis and planning	10	
E/CN.5/549	Report of the Secretary-General on popular participation, women, youth and children	10	
E/CN.6/598 and Add.1 and 2	Report of the Secretary-General on the measures undertaken under the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade and in the implementation of the World Plan of Action for the achievement of the objectives of the International Women's Year	11	
E/CN.6/601 and Corr.1	Progress report of the Secretary-General on the influence of the mass communication media on attitudes towards the roles of women and men in present-day society	11	
E/CN.7/602 and Add.1	Report of the Director of the Division of Narcotic Drugs on the study of measures to reduce illicit demand for drugs	13	
E/CN.9/332	Note by the Secretary-General concerning the establishment of a world-wide population information system (POPINS)	8	
E/DEC/213-243 (LXII) and Add.1	Decisions adopted by the Council during its sixty-second session		For the final texts, see E/5988, decisions 213 (LXII)-243 (LXII)
E/INCB/33	Report of the International Narcotics Control Board for 1976		United Nations publication, Sales No. E.77.XI.2
E/INF/157 and Add.1 and 2	Note by the Secretary-General on the notification of meetings of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination and its Preparatory Committee		
E/INF/158	Note by the Secretariat transmitting a revised calendar of conferences and meetings for 1977		
E/INF/159	List of representatives to the organizational session for 1977		
E/INF/160 and Add.1	List of representatives to the sixty-second session		

<i>Document No.</i>	<i>Title or description</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Observations and references</i>
E/L.1747 and Corr.1	Election of members of the functional commissions of the Council: note by the Secretary-General	15	
E/L.1748	Nomination of seven members of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination: note by the Secretary-General	15	
E/L.1749 and Add.1 and 2	Election of 11 members of the Committee on Housing, Building and Planning: note by the Secretary-General	15	
E/L.1750	Election of 30 members of the Committee on Review and Appraisal: note by the Secretary-General	15	
E/L.1751	Election of 16 members of the Commission on Transnational Corporations: note by the Secretary-General	15	
E/L.1752	Election of 16 members of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme: note by the Secretary-General	15	
E/L.1753	Election of five members of the Committee on Food Aid Policies and Programmes: note by the Secretary-General	15	
E/L.1755	Organization of the work of the session: note by the President of the Council	1	
E/L.1756	Calendar of meetings: note by the Secretariat	1	
E/L.1756/Add.1	Programme budget implications of the recommendation contained in paragraph 6 of document E/L.1756: note by the Secretary-General	1	
E/L.1757	Draft provisional annotated agenda for the sixty-third session: note by the Secretariat	16	
E/L.1758	Argentina, Bolivia, Canada, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, Jamaica, Mexico, Peru, United States of America and Venezuela: draft resolution	5	
E/L.1759	Algeria, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Kenya, Mauritania, Nigeria, Rwanda, Somalia, Sudan, Uganda, Upper Volta, Tunisia and Zaire: draft resolution	3	
E/L.1760	Bangladesh, Canada, Iran, Japan, Malaysia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Pakistan, Philippines, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America: draft resolution	5	
E/L.1761	Programme budget implications of draft resolution E/L.1758: note by the Secretary-General	5	
E/L.1762	Programme budget implications of draft resolution E/L.1760: note by the Secretary-General	5	
E/L.1763	Afghanistan, Argentina, Bangladesh, Cuba, Jamaica, Kenya, Malaysia, Mauritania, Nigeria, Philippines, Rwanda, Upper Volta and Yugoslavia: draft resolution	2	
E/L.1764	Algeria, Philippines, Uganda and Yugoslavia: draft resolution	3	
E/L.1765	Algeria, Egypt, Gabon, Kenya, Mauritania, Nigeria, Rwanda, Somalia, Sudan, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda and Upper Volta: draft resolution	3	
E/L.1766	Organization of the work of the sixty-third session: note by the Secretariat	16	
E/L.1767	Programme budget implications of draft resolution E/L.1765: note by the Secretary-General	3	
E/L.1768	Algeria, Bangladesh, Jamaica, Mexico, Nigeria and Yugoslavia: draft resolution	12	
E/NGO/55	Statement submitted by the International Organization for Standardization (ISO), a non-governmental organization in consultative status, category I	7	
E/NGO/56	Statement submitted by the International Council on Social Welfare, a non-governmental organization in consultative status, category I, and by the International Association of Schools of Social Work and the International Federation of Social Workers, non-governmental organizations in consultative status, category II	10	
E/NGO/57	Statement submitted by the International Movement for Fraternal Union among Races and Peoples and the World Union of Catholic Women's Organizations, non-governmental organizations in consultative status, category II	10	

<i>Document No.</i>	<i>Title or description</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Observations and references</i>
E/NGO/58	Statement submitted by Rehabilitation International, a non-governmental organization in consultative status, category II	10	
E/NGO/59	Statement submitted by the Women's International Democratic Federation, a non-governmental organization in consultative status, category I	11	
E/NGO/60	Statement submitted by the International Senior Citizens Association, Inc., a non-governmental organization in consultative status, category II	10	
E/NGO/61	Statement submitted by the International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations and the World Federation of Democratic Youth, non-governmental organizations in consultative status, category I; Pax Romana, the World Alliance of Young Men's Christian Associations, the World Association of Girl Guides and Girl Scouts, the Boy Scouts World Bureau, the World Student Christian Federation, the World University Service and the World Young Women's Christian Association, non-governmental organizations in consultative status, category II	10	
E/NGO/62	Statement submitted by the World Federation of Trade Unions, 3, 8, 10 and 12 a non-governmental organization in consultative status, category I		
E/RFS/2047-2087 (LXII)	Resolutions adopted by the Council during its sixty-second session		For the final texts, see E/5988, resolutions 2047 (LXII)-2087 (LXII)
E/SR.2046-2060	Summary records of the plenary meetings held by the Council during its sixty-second session		See <i>Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Organizational Session for 1977, Third Special Session and Sixty-second Session, Plenary Meetings, 2046th to 2060th meetings</i>
ST/SG/AC.10/2	Report of the Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods on the work of its ninth session	7	
TD/B/AC.20/6	Report of the <i>Ad Hoc</i> Intergovernmental Group on Container Standards for International Multimodal Transport	7	

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

ORGANIZATIONAL SESSION FOR 1977

**Summary records of the 2039th to 2044th plenary meetings, held at
Headquarters, New York, from 11 to 14 January 1977**

2039th meeting

Tuesday, 11 January 1977, at 11.15 a.m.

Temporary President: Mr. Kurt WALDHEIM (Secretary-General).

President: Mr. Ladislav ŠMÍD (Czechoslovakia).

E/SR.2039

Opening of the session

1. The SECRETARY-GENERAL declared open the organizational session of the Economic and Social Council for 1977. He warmly welcomed all the new members of the Council and wished all delegations every success at the beginning of another year of United Nations activities for international economic co-operation.

2. The main task of the Council at the current session was to formulate its annual programme of work, which would cover a very broad range of issues. The Council undoubtedly would undertake that task with both vision and realism, for that was the only way to meet successfully the dual challenge of international development and collective responsibility.

3. The session was being held against the background of a particularly intense period of negotiation within the process initiated at the sixth and seventh special sessions of the General Assembly for moving towards the establishment of a new international economic order. It was a process that had ushered in a new chapter in the history of United Nations endeavours to achieve peace, prosperity and social justice throughout the world. One notable aspect of the process was that, notwithstanding the slow and limited progress so far achieved, there was a very distinct determination on all sides to continue the dialogue. The decision of the General Assembly (decision 31/429 A of 22 December 1976) to suspend its thirty-first regular session, and to resume it in 1977, clearly attested to that determination. It would be very unfortunate indeed if the opportunity

afforded by that decision was not utilized to overcome the current impasse during the interval. The world community had managed, over the past two years, to avoid confrontation in dealing with economic and social issues. It was therefore with a sense of inspired hope that Governments should look ahead and reaffirm their commitment to pursue agreements designed to bring about concrete and practical solutions in the interests of all.

4. There was one aspect of the Council's programme of work for 1977 (see E/5900) which, in his view, had special significance; he was referring to the preparatory work which the Council would carry out for the over-all integrated assessment that the Assembly had decided to make, at its next regular session, of the implementation of the International Development Strategy, the decisions of the sixth and seventh special sessions and the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States. That constituted a concrete attempt to reach agreement on a unifying and comprehensive framework of policy within which Governments would pursue the common objectives of development co-operation. The underlying intention of the Assembly had been that those texts should serve as a dynamic guideline to action, which should remain continually responsive to changing circumstances. Those documents held forth the promise of a world offering fruitful opportunities for a better life to all its inhabitants. The fulfilment of that promise would require a large degree of political will and a carefully timed and co-ordinated set of negotiations. It must involve agreement in various forums on a number of pending issues of immediate concern, and also the acceptance of a well-defined time-table for further concerted measures and multilateral action.

5. The Council was undoubtedly conscious of the importance of its own responsibilities and work in rationalizing that whole effort. Nothing would enhance more the cohesion of the United Nations system—a problem that had engaged the Council's attention for so many years—than the adoption of an integrated approach to the consideration of the crucial economic and social problems facing the world. The current situation demanded that negotiations under way should proceed with a new sense of urgency. Meanwhile, he trusted that the Council would play its own part in the development of agreed guidelines for the future work of the organizations of the United Nations system. Indeed, co-ordination—or perhaps one should say harmonization of policies and action—could and should acquire a new meaning and perspective if the Council was to perform in a more effective manner the functions and duties assigned to it. When addressing the Abidjan session,¹ he had asked whether the Council was not a body in search of a role. He firmly believed that during the current year, in fulfilling that task, the Council might well find a meaningful answer.

6. Another aspect of the efforts to formulate a new international economic order concerned the process of restructuring the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system. The *Ad Hoc* Committee established by the General Assembly at its seventh special session (see resolution 3362 (S-VII)) had felt that its work should proceed parallel to the consideration of the substantive issues identified at that session. He had followed with great interest the deliberations of the *Ad Hoc* Committee in 1976,² and on several occasions had expressed his views on various issues under discussion. He once again pledged the Secretariat's assistance to the Committee's endeavours and reaffirmed his intention to take all the necessary measures relating to matters within his authority as chief administrative officer of the Organization. He believed that restructuring was necessary and urgent so that the United Nations system of organizations could serve better the interests and objectives of the member Governments. But, since every international organization was a creation of its member Governments, restructuring also required political will and a clear understanding by Governments of the purpose and nature of each institution and organizational arrangement, of the kind and scope of the relationships that should link them, and of their respective methods of work.

7. He personally had the strong conviction that the United Nations system would continue to play a central and crucial role in all future processes of deliberation, negotiation and operational action in search of a more viable and more just international economic order. Indeed, while every available mechanism of international co-operation should be utilized fully, the United Nations remained the only universal forum in which countries with widely different political institutions and at different stages of economic and social development might harmonize views and policies, share their problems and experiences and initiate collective action.

8. Those, it seemed to him, were the highlights of an agenda embracing many items, all important in their own

contexts. He had chosen, however, on the present occasion to dwell on the over-all responsibility of the Council for general policy formulation and for guidance to the United Nations system as a whole, because so very much depended upon how effectively that responsibility was discharged.

9. He wished the members of the Council all success during a year of great expectations and high promise.

10. In conclusion, he expressed the Council's deep appreciation to its outgoing President, Mr. Aké, for his wise guidance of the Council's proceedings in 1976 and to the Government and people of the Ivory Coast for their warm hospitality at the session at Abidjan.

AGENDA ITEM 1

Election of the Bureau

11. Mr. QADRUD-DİN (Pakistan) nominated Mr. Ladislav Šmíd (Czechoslovakia) for the office of President of the Council for 1977.

Mr. Ladislav Šmíd (Czechoslovakia) was elected President by acclamation.

Mr. Šmíd (Czechoslovakia) took the Chair.

12. The PRESIDENT expressed his appreciation to the members of the Council for the honour they had bestowed on him and on his country by electing him President. In discharging his duties, he would endeavour at all times to show the greatest possible understanding of the positions of all members and to pursue the objectives of the Council, as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations. He trusted that he would enjoy the traditional co-operation that members always extended to the Council's presiding officers, for it was only on the basis of co-operation that the Council would be able to accomplish its tasks in an efficient and thorough manner.

13. The Council was on the threshold of a period of intense activity. Besides its normal functions, it must in 1977 discharge a number of important responsibilities connected with the current efforts of the world community to establish a new international economic order. That very broad and comprehensive endeavour, involving every aspect of the Council's functions, would require sustained efforts on all sides to reach agreement on a wide range of highly complex issues.

14. The Council had clearly-defined responsibilities in the economic, social and human rights fields. In each of those areas, the draft basic programme of work (E/5900) listed a broad range of matters which would require careful and dedicated work, political will and a keen sense of urgency. He sincerely hoped that in the area of co-ordination the Council would achieve progress towards greater cohesion and towards the elaboration of concerted measures for solving the pressing problems facing mankind, thus contributing to the international effort for the maintenance of peace and the expansion of co-operation among nations.

15. Having been associated with the work of the Council over a number of years, he was well aware that satisfactory

¹ See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Sixty-first Session, Plenary Meetings*, 2006th meeting.

² See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-first Session, Supplements Nos. 34A and 34B (A/31/34/Add.1 and 2)*.

results depended on the determination of each delegation to spare no effort in seeking realistic solutions. Experience suggested that successful multilateral co-operation was largely based on a spirit of "give-and-take".

16. He suggested that the Council should suspend rule 18 of the rules of procedure and postpone the election of the Vice-Presidents until the following meeting.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 2

Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters (E/5901)

17. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) said that, under agenda item 2, it would be necessary for the Council to take certain decisions at the current session concerning the negotiation of an agreement with IFAD. In the course of the discussion of the draft basic programme of work (E/5900), he would inform the Council of the developments that had taken place since the Council had decided to enter into an agreement with the Fund. A communication had been received from the Fund containing a draft of the agreement.

18. He drew attention to document E/5904 and Corr.1, which contained a letter from the President of the Council for 1976 concerning the appointment of the members of the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. Should the Council agree to take up at the current session the question of the membership of the Sub-Committee, as was suggested in the letter, it might wish to consider the matter under item 2. In any case, it would be necessary for the Council to decide, under item 2, on the dates of the meetings of the Sub-Committee.

19. Mr. MAKEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had no objection in principle to the provisional agenda (E/5901). However, it had some doubts as to the feasibility of the Council's reviewing, under agenda item 6, the rules of procedure of the functional commissions in the short time available to it at the current session. Bearing in mind that the document relating to item 6 (E/5899) had been circulated only a few days earlier, his delegation believed that it might be advisable to set aside sufficient time at the Council's spring session for the consideration of that question.

The agenda for the organizational session (E/5901) was adopted.

AGENDA ITEM 3

Basic programme of work of the Council for 1977 (E/5900, Conference Room Paper No. 1)

20. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) explained that the Secretariat had modified somewhat the format of the draft basic programme of work: instead of issuing two documents, it had prepared a single document (E/5900)

which incorporated the legislative authority adopted both prior to and during the thirty-first session of the General Assembly. Experience had shown that, owing to the major modifications introduced by the Assembly into the Council's programme of work, neither delegations nor the Council secretariat could adequately plan on the basis of a report drawn up prior to the deliberations of that organ. In the present instance, for example, the programme of work of the Council prior to the thirty-first session of the Assembly had consisted of 85 questions; the Assembly had since caused 23 new questions to be added to the programme, had taken decisions which affected drastically nine questions included in it, and had taken approximately 20 other decisions which called for various actions by the Council.

21. As was indicated in paragraph 3 of document E/5900, the Council secretariat was submitting, for the first time, a preliminary list of questions for consideration by the Council in 1978, with a view to enabling the Council to assess more fully the frequently-made suggestion that the Council should adopt a work programme covering two years, instead of one year as at present. In view of the effect that the decisions of the General Assembly had on the work of the Council, it would be advisable for the Council to consider that matter very carefully, bearing in mind that it might not be practicable to adopt a two-year programme if major changes became necessary mid-way as a result of the Assembly's deliberations. It would therefore be necessary for the Council to consider the nature of its work programme, the periodicity of the consideration of various items and, most important of all, the nature of the discussions on the items on its agenda. One possibility that had already been considered was that the Council might extend the procedure currently followed in connexion with the report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to other items on its agenda, thus facilitating, and allowing additional time for, their consideration.

22. There was a need for the Council to review the approach it had adopted to various items on its agenda. For example, operational activities, as had been pointed out by a number of delegations, were at present discussed in three bodies representative or broadly representative of the whole membership of the United Nations: first, in the Governing Council of UNDP and other similar bodies, secondly in the Economic and Social Council, and lastly in the General Assembly. The Council, in its resolution 1768 (LIV), concerning the rationalization of its work, had decided that it would undertake a comprehensive policy review of operational activities in the years in which it was not engaged in the exercise of reviewing and appraising the International Development Strategy. However, the original cycle adopted for the biennial review had in practice been modified, because for the past three years the Council had in fact included in its agenda an item on the review and appraisal of the Strategy. The question therefore arose whether the Council's discussion of the question of operational activities should not every year take the form of a comprehensive policy review. A decision to that effect would have the advantage not only of saving time but also of rationalizing the Council's role in that context. Furthermore, if the Council did decide during 1977 to rationalize its work, it might explore similar possibilities pertaining to a number of other questions.

23. Paragraph 5 of document E/5900 dealt with a number of matters related to the manner in which the basic programme of work had been drawn up by the Secretariat which required a decision of the Council. Subparagraph (a) referred to the decision taken by the Council at its forty-seventh session to request the Secretary-General to report regularly to it on progress in the field of marine science. It was proposed that the Council should decide that resolution 1970 (LIX), in pursuance of which the Secretary-General would submit a study on the uses of the sea which would include a section on progress in marine science, should subsume the decision adopted at the forty-seventh session. That proposal had already been reflected in the draft programme of work.

24. It was suggested in paragraph 5 (b) that the question of new developments in the field of marine mineral resources beyond the continental shelf, which the Secretary-General had been requested by the Council in its resolution 1380 (XLV) to follow closely, might, starting in 1977, be considered in the context of the report of the Committee on Natural Resources, which had been established after the adoption of that resolution.

25. Since the Council had decided at its sixty-first session to refer the question of export promotion to UNCTAD, it was proposed in paragraph 5 (c) that the Secretary-General's report on the feasibility of establishing a United Nations export development fund should be submitted to UNCTAD, on the understanding that it would keep the Council informed of any action taken and submit recommendations on any matter requiring action by the Council or the General Assembly.

26. It was indicated in paragraph 5 (d) that the Secretary-General would be submitting to the Council at its sixty-second session only a progress report on research within the United Nations system on the role and position of women in development and on ways and means to organize and finance further research.

27. As indicated in paragraph 5 (e), the reports of the Joint Inspection Unit would be included either under the relevant agenda items or as separate agenda items when they were not related to an existing one.

28. Paragraph 5 (f) was particularly important since there was an apparent conflict between decisions taken previously by the Council with regard to the rationalization of its work and the current state of consideration of that question. Pursuant to its decision 153 (LX), the Council had transmitted to the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Restructuring of the Economic and Social Sectors of the United Nations System a number of documents and was planning, in the light of the conclusions reached by that Committee, to review at the earliest possible date in 1977 the agreements between the United Nations and the specialized agencies and IAEA and the terms of reference of the Council's subsidiary machinery. As the *Ad Hoc* Committee had submitted only an interim report, the question arose whether the Council would actually undertake the planned reviews. However, since the *Ad Hoc* Committee and the General Assembly had decided to extend the restructuring exercise, a tentative proposal had been made to include an item on restructuring in the agenda for the sixty-second

session. It remained for the Council to decide what questions it wished to discuss in that context.

29. The process of drafting a convention on international intermodal transport was taking longer than expected and thus, as indicated in paragraph 5 (g), no report on that question would be before the Council in 1977.

30. A number of other matters had arisen after the draft basic programme of work for 1977 had been prepared.

31. With regard to the question of institutional arrangements for international co-operation in the field of human settlements, which would be considered at the sixty-third session under agenda item 14, the Council had established in 1966 an International Institute for Documentation on Housing, Building and Planning and a related trust fund. The Board of Auditors had recently suggested that that trust fund, which had only nominal assets, should be closed. The Council might wish to consider that question in the context of the item on institutional arrangements in the field of human settlements.

32. The report on research on the interrelationship between population, resources, environment and development would not be ready in 1977 as had been expected, and consideration of it would have to be postponed until 1978.

33. Document E/5905 contained a letter from the Director-General of UNESCO in which he informed the Council under the terms of resolution 1800 (LV) of the proposal made in that organization to proclaim an international year for science and technology. That question might be considered at the sixty-third session under agenda item 23 (International co-operation and co-ordination within the United Nations system).

34. With regard to the possibility of establishing an *ad hoc* sessional committee on institutional arrangements for human settlements, the General Assembly had recommended, in its resolution 31/116, that the Council should consider that question at the expert or highest appropriate level at the outset of its sixty-third session. In view of the customary practice of the Council to hold a general debate at its summer session, it was thought best and most practical for such a committee to meet early in July and complete its task by 12 July. After that date, the Economic Committee would be meeting and, should the *ad hoc* sessional committee require additional time to complete its work, the allocation of meetings between the two committees would have to be worked out on the basis of consultations between their chairmen.

35. The Council had decided, in its resolution 2006 (LX), to request the Preparatory Commission for the International Fund for Agricultural Development to prepare a draft agreement for the purpose of bringing the Fund into relationship with the United Nations. The initial steps taken by IFAD to that end were described in document E/5837. The Secretary-General had subsequently received a letter from the chairman of the Preparatory Commission containing the text of a draft agreement for submission to the Committee on Negotiations with Intergovernmental Organizations. In that connexion, the Council would have to consider the question of the membership of that Com.

mittee. In 1976, it had decided that, for the purpose of negotiations with IFAD, any delegation might become a member of the Committee simply by notifying the Secretary-General before 21 June 1976 of its desire to do so. However, by that date, only three countries, namely France, Italy and Japan, had complied with the procedure laid down. Accordingly, the Council might wish to extend the deadline in order to provide for a more representative membership. A decision was also required regarding the selection of a chairman of the Committee, as the chairman for 1976 considered his mandate to have expired at the end of that year. With regard to the timing of the negotiations, although it was recommended that the question be considered at the sixty-third session, it might be possible for the negotiations with IFAD to take place at the spring session by taking advantage of the conference facilities allocated to the Economic Committee of the Council, which had only three items to consider at that time. In that way, it might be possible for the Committee on Negotiations to submit its report for approval by the Council before the end of the sixty-second session.

36. The question of the membership of the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination remained pending. The only dates available for the meetings of the Sub-Committee in 1977 were 14 to 25 March at Geneva.

37. Finally, on page 41 of the English text of document E/5900, "resolution 31/116" should be replaced by "resolution 31/109".

38. Mr. MAKEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted that the present agenda of the Council was larger and more complex than ever before. The basic task of the organizational session should, therefore, be to determine priorities and to allocate agenda items rationally to each of the Council sessions. Owing to the limited amount of time and resources, the Council might be forced to forgo some planned measures and the holding of meetings by some bodies. The Council should preserve its basic progressive approach aimed at restructuring international economic relations on a progressive and democratic basis and embodying those relations in specific practical measures.

39. The Soviet Union viewed sympathetically and supported the broad programme, called for by the developing and non-aligned countries, which was aimed at eliminating colonialism in the economic sphere, terminating exploitation by the industrialized Western Powers and establishing favourable conditions so that developing countries could overcome their economic backwardness. In the view of his delegation, the extent to which the Council would be successful in eliminating discrimination, barriers, inequity and exploitation in international trade would be indicative of the actual contribution which the United Nations could make to solving the problems of restructuring international economic relations. The main obstacle to a radical restructuring of those relations on a democratic basis had been and continued to be the position of the monopolistic group of capitalist States. Although those States were making certain concessions and were increasing their economic "assistance", their policy was still aimed at continuing and strengthening the exploitation of developing countries and remained essentially unchanged. The Economic and Social

Council should concern itself with such problems and develop practical measures to eliminate such practices in the future. To that end it should undertake a study of long-term economic trends, the role of the government sector in the development process, the inalienable sovereignty of developing countries over their natural resources, the integrated approach to economic development, and the curbing of the arbitrary rule of foreign capital, especially transnational corporations.

40. The Soviet Union continued to support efforts by developing countries to develop economic relations among themselves so as to strengthen their political and economic independence and raise the social, economic and cultural level of their peoples.

41. The problems of economic development were closely related to political conditions. In that connexion, his delegation stressed the importance of strengthening the process of détente, the expansion of that process to include all the regions of the world, and the continued affirmation of the principles of peaceful coexistence. The curbing of the arms race, disarmament and the strengthening of security were closely linked to the normalization of world economic relations.

42. Mr. ROUGE (France) said that his delegation was gratified by the presence of the Secretary-General at the opening of the Council's session, the level of representation of delegations and the good attendance, which reflected the renewed importance of the Council in the new circumstances prevailing in the United Nations. While 1974 had been a year of confrontation between groups of States, 1975 had marked the resumption of dialogue both in the General Assembly and in other forums, and in 1976 the international community had sought to build on dialogue based on new principles to negotiate on a broad range of issues. The *Ad Hoc* Committee on Restructuring had clearly reaffirmed the need for a central body to co-ordinate activities in the diverse forums in which negotiations were progressing and, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and in the view of the *Ad Hoc* Committee itself, that body should be the Economic and Social Council. There was also unanimous recognition of the need to prepare the work of the General Assembly and other major United Nations organs and to ensure the harmonization of their activities. Once again, the Economic and Social Council was the only forum suitable for that purpose. In that connexion, the work of the Second Committee of the General Assembly at the thirty-first session would have advanced more smoothly if more careful and thorough preparations had been made by the Council at its sixty-first session.

43. The Council was therefore embarking on a vast programme of work in 1977 in favourable circumstances. It should concentrate on asserting itself as a kind of steering committee for the United Nations and on regaining control over the calendar of conferences. In that connexion, it was unfortunate that three other bodies, namely the Population Commission, the Intergovernmental Working Group on a Code of Conduct of the Commission on Transnational Corporations and the Sessional Committee on Technical Co-operation among Developing Countries of UNDP, were all meeting at the same time as the Council, whereas in the

preceding week there had been relatively few meetings. Those responsible for the calendar of conferences were concerned chiefly with the economical allocation of conference facilities. However, it was necessary to bear in mind that it was virtually impossible for delegations to be represented at the meetings of all four bodies. The work of United Nations bodies must be organized in such a way as to give priority to attendance at the Council's meetings in cases of conflict with the meetings of subsidiary bodies.

44. It was also important to bear constantly in mind the general context of the Council's work. Accordingly, the work of subsidiary bodies should be discussed in the Council only when it was necessary to compare the work of a number of bodies. In that connexion, his delegation fully endorsed the suggestion put forward by the Secretary regarding the manner in which the Council might deal with the question of operational activities for development, and welcomed the fact that the Council would have an opportunity of evaluating the report of the joint meetings of CPC and ACC. One of the most important tasks of the Council in 1977 would be to prepare for the integrated assessment of the implementation of the major texts relating to the new international economic order, to which the Secretary-General had referred earlier. The Council was equipped for that task, as it was fully representative of the international community and its work was organized in such a way as to allow the active participation of observers from many States, international organizations, including the specialized agencies, and non-governmental organizations.

45. Mr. MARSHALL (United Kingdom) welcomed the fact that the Council could now benefit from the impulse given to its work by the work of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Restructuring and the General Assembly's endorsement of the activities of that Committee.

46. He welcomed the draft basic programme of work (E/5900) prepared by the Secretariat but felt that it raised certain problems. He did not see how the Council could solve the problem of timing as its proper function was to carry out General Assembly decisions and to prepare for future sessions of the General Assembly. Thus, the interdependence of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council might make it difficult to adopt some of the Secretary's suggestions. In general, he approved the format of the document, although the Council might consider whether some slight rearrangement of the information might improve its usefulness. He also found the annex dealing with the 1978 sessions very useful, although there would be problems, such as those to which he had referred, in attempting biennial programming.

47. He noted that chapter III of document E/5900 contained a suggested integrated agenda for the sixty-second and sixty-third sessions of the Council, in which agenda items from preceding chapters of the document had

been grouped into clusters. He wondered, however, whether that clustering provided a sufficiently comprehensive analysis of the Council's responsibilities. There might be gaps or overlapping, and there remained the problem of priorities whose solution would require complete clarity as to the comprehensive nature of the list of items. Furthermore, there was the problem of allocating items between the sixty-second and sixty-third sessions. He noted that the proposed agenda for the sixty-third session was immense and wondered whether there was any possibility of shifting some items to the sixty-second session. There was also the problem of allocating items to various committees during sessions of the Council, which had not been done very successfully at the sixty-first session. He also wondered what guidance the Council might have for the system as a whole when it had finished considering its organization of work. In that connexion, he agreed with the representative of France that the Council needed to work very closely with other bodies in the United Nations system. The Council should also consider whether it had any particular directives or guidance for the secretariat to help it in preparing the work of the coming sessions.

48. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) said, with reference to the allocation of agenda items between the sixty-second and sixty-third sessions, that the addition to the spring session of the question of negotiating an agreement with IFAD would restore balance between the two sessions. There was, furthermore, the problem that services at the spring session were somewhat limited. In addition, the discussion relating to the United Nations Conference on Science and Technology for Development had been originally allocated to the spring session, but the General Assembly had decided specifically that it should be considered at the summer session. He noted, furthermore, that the question of the negotiations with IFAD was a very substantial item and would have financial implications if it were considered at the summer session.

49. Mr. HARRIMAN (Nigeria) asked whether in general those items whose consideration would derive maximum advantage from the participation of representatives of bodies based at Geneva and Vienna could not be considered at the summer session and those items for which such participation was irrelevant could not be considered at the spring session. In that connexion, he felt that the agenda items concerning assistance to Angola, Cape Verde, the Comoros, Mozambique, Sao Tome and Principe and Zambia should be transferred to the spring session.

50. Mr. KINSMAN (Canada) said that his delegation welcomed the draft basic programme of work (E/5900), which he hoped the Council would be able to examine very rigorously, despite the fact that delegations had received it only very recently.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.

2040th meeting

Wednesday, 12 January 1977, at 4.15 p.m.

President: Mr. Ladislav ŠMÍD (Czechoslovakia).

E/SR.2040

AGENDA ITEM 1

Election of the Bureau (*concluded*)

1. The PRESIDENT noted that, under rule 18 of the rules of procedure, the Council was required to elect four Vice-Presidents. He was informed that, on the basis of informal consultations among the regional groups, Mr. Rafael Rivas (Colombia), Mr. Ole Ålgård (Norway), Mr. Abdalla Mahgoub (Sudan) and Mr. Mehdi Ehsassi (Iran) had been nominated to serve as Vice-Presidents for 1977.

Mr. Rafael Rivas (Colombia), Mr. Ole Ålgård (Norway), Mr. Abdalla Mahgoub (Sudan) and Mr. Mehdi Ehsassi (Iran) were elected Vice-Presidents by acclamation.

AGENDA ITEM 5

Report on the Joint Meetings of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination and the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (E/5892)

2. The PRESIDENT recalled that the Council, in its decision 199 (LXI) of 15 November 1976, had decided to consider in depth at its organizational session for 1977 the report of the Chairman of CPC and the Chairman of ACC on the joint meetings of those committees (E/5892), 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 and ACC and of their joint meetings.

3. Mr. KJELDGAARD (Denmark), speaking also on behalf of the delegation of Norway, noted that, as reflected in paragraph 19 of the report on the joint meetings (E/5892), members of CPC took the view that a striking dispersal of efforts still characterized the work of organizations, and that conflicts of competences still occupied too great a proportion of the efforts of secretariats and of governing bodies, exploiting in some cases weaknesses in national co-ordination. The delegations of Norway and Denmark considered that remark to provide a good basis for an evaluation of the report.

4. The two delegations endorsed the conclusions set forth in paragraph 42 of the report. With regard to the joint meetings themselves, they shared the Secretary-General's view that participants had at times left the meetings with a feeling that a valuable opportunity had been missed. They therefore whole-heartedly endorsed the proposals for improving the preparation of the meetings. They continued to believe that a single well-prepared series of meetings each year at Geneva, after the session of CPC and immediately prior to the Council's summer session, would yield the best results.

5. The two delegations also felt that it was only by having a subsidiary body like CPC review the programme budget and the medium-term plan and undertake an in-depth examination of the various programmes that the Council could fulfil its responsibilities. It was with that in mind that CPC had been given its new and far-reaching mandate. CPC should now be expected not only to co-ordinate the implementation of approved programmes but to undertake a systematic effort to integrate the contributions of organizations at the planning stage and to promote concerted action at the implementation stage. For that task, CPC must have full support and co-operation from ACC, and the two Nordic delegations therefore fully subscribed to the various proposals for improving the co-operation between CPC and ACC, particularly through the attendance of the Chairman of CPC as an observer at the relevant meetings of ACC.

6. In conclusion, he emphasized that the Secretary-General, as Chairman of ACC, should fully utilize the co-ordinating function entrusted to him under the Charter of the United Nations.

7. Mr. KINSMAN (Canada) said it was the general view of the Canadian authorities that ACC should, wherever possible, explicitly describe interorganizational conflicts of which CPC and the Council should be aware, so that corrective action could be taken.

8. It was his delegation's understanding that ACC had agreed that its main tasks were to identify major problems, to advise on the best use of United Nations resources and to facilitate the co-ordination of the United Nations system. That underlined the importance of the flow of information to which the Chairman of ACC had referred at the most recent series of joint meetings.

9. The report also revealed that many Governments still harboured reservations about the closed meetings of ACC. The objectives of the Council's organizational session might well be to find means of promoting co-operation between CPC and ACC and of strengthening the Council's action.

10. ACC appeared to have placed more stress on the administrative convenience of agencies and less on some of the hard questions of management rationalization which were a major concern of the Canadian Government. He therefore fully endorsed the comments of the Chairman of CPC, particularly with regard to four main points. The first concerned the provision of a summary of the results of sessions of ACC and the attendance of the Chairman of CPC as an observer at the relevant meetings of ACC. Secondly, there should be consultations concerning the agenda of ACC, so that the latter could devote adequate attention to the priorities and programmes of the Council, as laid down by the Council itself. Thirdly, he agreed that the agencies should emphasize long-term planning and,

when possible, should use a system of evaluating alternative proposals, rather than working on the basis of available consensus. Fourthly, he agreed that the question of relations between CPC and individual agencies should be discussed in the light of the Committee's expanded mandate.

11. While he agreed with the conclusions of the joint meetings, he felt that they could have gone further by including recommendations for following up, if the Council so wished, some of the ideas raised at the joint meetings. On two occasions, CPC had considered informal proposals made by the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Restructuring of the Economic and Social Sectors of the United Nations System and had proceeded with the relevant reforms. His delegation hoped that such progress towards rationalization augured well for the future of co-ordination within the system.

12. Mr. VAN BUUREN (Netherlands) said that his delegation agreed with the conclusions set forth in the report on the joint meetings (E/5892), except for the suggestion in paragraph 42 (d). Commenting in general on the report, he noted that co-ordination of the activities of the United Nations system meant close co-operation in both the preparatory and the implementation stages. The effectiveness of the operations of each organization would be hampered if any one organization tried to attain certain goals entirely on its own. That co-operation should, on the other hand, in no way imply a mixing of responsibilities and tasks of the different bodies.

13. Those two basic elements of co-ordination, namely, co-operation and separate responsibilities, were also very valid for the work of ACC and CPC. His delegation therefore shared the view that the Chairman of CPC should participate in the spring sessions of ACC in order to prepare the joint meetings. However, such participation should be limited to those preparatory activities and should not include participation in the discussion of other items on the agenda of ACC. Similarly, his delegation did not favour the participation of members of CPC in meetings of ACC, nor visits by members of CPC to the headquarters of specialized agencies or other United Nations bodies.

14. He noted that the report under discussion reflected some disappointment at the results of ACC meetings. That was understandable, but his delegation was convinced that a proper functioning of the Council and of CPC would give a stimulus to the strengthening of ACC. A further involvement of the agencies in the preparatory process of decision-making of the Council and, through the Council, of the General Assembly could therefore be an appropriate way of strengthening ACC. Referring to paragraph 25 of the report, he emphasized that secretariats should make full use of their prerogatives in order to be able to fulfil their responsibilities.

15. His delegation favoured a reporting system for ACC open to all organizations within the United Nations. Such a system might lead to a better understanding, and even to greater effectiveness, of co-ordination activities under the auspices of ACC.

16. Mr. MYERSON (United States of America) said that he shared many of the views of previous speakers. The

report contained useful information on efforts to improve co-ordination and co-operation between ACC and CPC.

17. It was perhaps encouraging that the joint meetings seemed to be moving a little beyond the stage of abstract discussions of the need for co-ordination to the discussion of suggested methods of improving co-ordination. Prospects would be vastly improved if discussions were focused on the pragmatic need for information rather than on prerogatives and rights. CPC was still experimenting with improvements, and certainly needed the full support of all members of ACC.

18. In general, his delegation endorsed the conclusions set forth in the report. Like other delegations, however, it had doubts concerning paragraph 42 (d). While it did not oppose further consideration of that proposal, it felt that the practical problems could be formidable.

19. He hoped that the next series of joint meetings would be prepared well in advance, so that time was not wasted in discussing how to make the meetings productive.

20. Mr. WARSAMA (Somalia) expressed the view that the conclusions set forth in the report (E/5892) were the minimum that could be expected. He was rather encouraged to note from paragraph 20 of the report that members of ACC agreed that co-ordination in both the planning and the implementation stages was not yet at the required level. He also endorsed the hope expressed by the Secretary-General that ACC and CPC would co-operate more closely than in the past. ACC should be closely involved with the activities of the agencies at both the implementation and the programming and policy stages, since it was clear from the report that there was overlapping within the United Nations system.

21. On the other hand, his delegation was fully aware that most Member States did not know precisely what was taking place at the ACC level. It was therefore important that members of CPC should be involved with the work of ACC at all stages and should be thoroughly acquainted with the activities of the various organizations, which should provide CPC with analytical reports and other information on their activities.

22. Mr. QADRUD-DIN (Pakistan) felt that the strengthening of the role of CPC and the question of its relationship with ACC should be viewed in the context of the desire of developing countries to ensure that the decisions of the various legislative bodies were given the interpretation intended.

23. With regard to the joint meetings, the improvements suggested in document E/5892 should enable CPC to play a more effective role and to remain fully informed of the work of ACC; they were a step in the right direction. If the attendance of the Chairman of CPC at meetings of ACC proved successful, as was likely, then further measures should be considered.

24. Mr. MAKEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said it was appropriate that the Economic and Social Council should begin its work for 1977 by considering ways of strengthening consultation between CPC and ACC,

especially in the light of Council resolution 2008 (LX), which defined the new terms of reference of CPC. It was clear from Council resolution 1643 (LI) that the relationship between CPC and ACC should be changed to enable ACC to assist the Council in improving co-ordination.

25. The discussions at the joint meetings had shown that not all representatives of specialized agencies were ready to engage in increased co-operation. They seemed to overlook the fact that ACC had an auxiliary function in relation to intergovernmental bodies, which were the policy-making organs of the system. Members of CPC had frequently pointed out that the functions of ACC were not clearly defined and that, in addition, ACC continued to concern itself too much with substantive policy questions, thus encroaching on the functions of intergovernmental bodies.

26. Over the past five years great improvements had been made in the reporting system used by ACC, and Member States were now better informed with regard to its agenda. Those improvements should, however, be viewed only as a first step towards the full implementation of Council resolution 1643 (LI).

27. Members of CPC had frequently noted with regret that they continued to be prevented from participating in the meetings of ACC and its subsidiary bodies. The opponents of such participation adduced the most varied arguments to justify their position. For example, they suggested that the presence of representatives of Governments might hinder the frank exchange of views among members of ACC, especially with regard to such matters as the co-ordination of plans, budgets and programmes of work. Those arguments were unfounded. Access to meetings of ACC on the part of interested members of CPC could not but enhance the authority of ACC and foster closer co-operation between the two bodies.

28. His delegation viewed with great interest the suggestion that the Chairman of CPC should be invited to attend meetings of ACC. Such a step would enhance mutual trust and the exchange of news between the two bodies, particularly for those members of CPC who were not in any way represented in ACC.

29. Mrs. DERRE (France) recalled that her delegation had frequently expressed its great interest in the joint meetings. On the whole, it agreed with the views expressed by the Chairman of CPC in his introductory statement; it shared his regret that representatives attending the joint meetings at times felt somewhat frustrated, and hoped that in future a climate of greater mutual confidence would prevail. Everyone must make an effort to that end. Since it was difficult to deal with all the problems at the traditionally short series of joint meetings, consideration should be given to lengthening them. Her delegation could accept all the conclusions in paragraph 42 of the report except the one in subparagraph (d). It did not see any practical value in visits by representatives of CPC to agency headquarters, since CPC could always request information from ACC on specific points at the joint meetings themselves. It would be sufficient if the Chairman of CPC, in consultation with the other members, selected topics to be dealt with at the joint meetings.

30. Mr. YORK (Federal Republic of Germany) said that, although his Government was not a member of CPC, it attached great importance to co-ordination, especially since that was one of the main elements of the restructuring exercise. His delegation felt that the joint meetings had been useful and should be continued. It therefore supported the conclusions in document E/5892. The joint meetings should be designed to bring about greater mutual understanding and better co-ordination and should not lead to the establishment of further co-ordination machinery. He shared the doubts expressed by some delegations with regard to paragraph 42 (d). Greater care should be taken in formulating the agenda of the joint meetings, and in-depth consideration should be given to carefully selected programme areas in order to eliminate overlapping, for example in the scope and terms of reference of world conferences. His delegation also agreed that CPC and ACC should jointly consider selected areas where they could do useful work at the programming, implementation and evaluation stages.

31. Mr. ACEMAH (Uganda) said he felt that the members, or at least the Chairman, of CPC should be able to attend ACC meetings as observers, just as members of ACC attended CPC meetings.

32. The purposes of the joint meetings needed to be defined more explicitly and, as stated in paragraph 42 of the report, there was a need for better preparation and a careful formulation of the agenda of the meetings if their role was to be strengthened. The joint meetings should not be used as a forum for the heads of agencies to report in detail on agency activities, as had been the case to some extent at the last series of meetings. Appropriate forums already existed for the heads of agencies to give annual reports on their work.

33. He supported the conclusions in paragraph 42 and hoped that the next series of joint meetings would further contribute towards carrying out the original mandate of the meetings as outlined in Council resolution 1090 G (XXXIX).

34. Mr. MARSHALL (United Kingdom) said that, since his delegation had already expressed its views on the substance of the report at the resumed sixty-first session, it would now confine itself to suggesting how the Council might take note of the report. Paragraph 42 provided the basis for a decision by the Council, even though some reservations had been expressed with regard to individual subparagraphs. Subparagraph (a) could be made more specific by including a reference to the fact that the joint meetings should be held before the Council's summer session. A further look would also have to be taken at subparagraph (d), which did not fully convey the exact proposal that had been discussed at the joint meetings; as he understood it, the original idea had been that members of CPC might be able to hold discussions with agency officials. Since the Council would be able to consider the report again at its sixty-third session, it might wish to note for the record that it would be devoting particular attention to the report at that time.

35. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that, in his opinion, not too much should be expected of the joint meetings, at

which there was only time for a rather perfunctory consideration of documents. He agreed that the meetings should be held immediately before the Council's summer session. However, if there was an absence of dialogue not only at the joint meetings but throughout the year, it would be unrealistic to expect much progress. As to paragraph 42 (d), he did not understand why it had been proposed that representatives of CPC should travel to agency headquarters, rather than having the agency representatives attend CPC meetings. He wondered whether the representative of WHO could explain why such an expensive procedure had been proposed.

36. Mrs. KALM (World Health Organization) said that paragraph 35 of the report indicated the context in which the Director-General of WHO had made his proposal. That proposal had been intended not to replace the traditional procedure, but to provide an additional avenue of communication. She had noted the comments made in the Council, and she assured members that WHO was ready to co-operate in any way it could.

37. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that he doubted whether visits to the agencies could be carried out in a way that would produce results, and he wondered which representatives would be authorized to visit the agencies. Furthermore, other agencies should be consulted with regard to the proposal. He had doubts as to its practicality.

38. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should approve the conclusions in document E/5892, paragraph 42, taking fully into account the comments made during the debate on the item.

39. Mr. MARSHALL (United Kingdom) felt that the Council should do more than that and should produce a text to be made available to the members of CPC and ACC conveying its comments on the subject.

40. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) requested the Under-Secretary-General for Inter-Agency Affairs and Co-ordination to give the Council some guidance on the decision it should take.

41. Mr. NARASIMHAN (Under-Secretary-General for Inter-Agency Affairs and Co-ordination) said that the comments which had been made at the current meeting provided sufficient guidance with regard to the approach that should be taken to the joint meetings. The next series would consist of three meetings, and the members would therefore be less rushed than at the last series. The meetings would be held on 4 and 5 July, immediately before the Council's summer session, and the agenda would be drafted in close co-operation with the Chairman of CPC.

42. Mr. MAKEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, if the Council merely took note of the conclusions in document E/5892, his delegation would have no difficulty. If, however, it decided to approve them, his delegation would wish to place on record that it did not agree with all the conclusions. In particular, it wished to make a reservation with regard to paragraph 42 (d), which would involve an excessively complicated and costly procedure. Account must be taken of the financial implications of the conclusions.

43. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should take note of the conclusions contained in the report of the Chairman of CPC and the Chairman of ACC on the joint meetings of those committees (E/5892), taking fully into account the comments made thereon.

It was so decided (decision 208 (ORG-77)).

44. The PRESIDENT declared that the Council had thus concluded its consideration of agenda item 5.

The meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.

2041st meeting

Thursday, 13 January 1977, at 11.15 a.m.

President: Mr. Ladislav ŠMÍD (Czechoslovakia).

E/SR.2041

AGENDA ITEM 4

Report of the Committee on Natural Resources on its second special session (E/L.1742)

1. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council), speaking on behalf of the Secretary-General of the United Nations Water Conference, introduced the extract from the report of the Committee on Natural Resources on its second special session (E/L.1742) and drew the Council's attention to three recommendations of the Committee which were set forth in paragraph 1, subparagraphs (a) to (c), and other arrangements called for in subparagraph (d). After reading

out a correction to the text of subparagraph (d), which consisted in deleting the words "the third progress report of the Secretary-General (E/C.7/61) and", he noted that the Committee also wished to bring to the attention of the Council certain matters set forth in paragraph 2 of the report.

2. Mr. ROUGE (France) said that his delegation wished to make some general comments on the preparations for the Water Conference, especially the work of the Committee on Natural Resources as the preparatory committee for the Conference, and to see what lessons could be drawn from the experience gained in preparing the Conference. The

Council had before it a report of a subsidiary body, namely the Committee on Natural Resources, and was in a position to take some action. Without spending too much time or going into details of substance, the Council should study the report and consider the larger issue of the working of the United Nations system as a whole. In that connexion, his delegation would welcome the comments of other members of the Council.

3. His delegation was concerned at the slow progress of preparations for the Conference. With only five weeks remaining before the Conference, the Committee had not been able to agree on the objectives of the Conference, and some important documents had not been distributed in sufficient time for careful consideration. He urged the President of the Council to convey to the Secretary-General of the Water Conference the concern of his and other delegations regarding the short-comings in the preparations. He hoped that the Conference would be able to avoid spending too much time on subjects which had been poorly prepared. The procedure followed in preparing the document containing the consolidated action recommendations (E/C.7/L.52 and Add.1), whereby regional bodies had been asked to study the problem and submit reports to the central Secretariat, was a good practical model. The document would assist the Water Conference in arriving at important and effective decisions.

4. Water problems involved all aspects of the United Nations system and made the role of the Council particularly important in co-ordinating system-wide activities in the water sector. The Council would also have an important role to play after the Conference in allocating various tasks arising from the Conference to the appropriate bodies in the system.

5. Finally, in view of the failure of the preparatory committee to agree on such a basic matter as a statement of the objectives of the Conference, the Council should consider the advantages and disadvantages of holding special world conferences rather than using existing international forums.

6. Mr. CZARKOWSKI (Poland) said that his delegation generally approved the work which had been undertaken in preparation for the United Nations Water Conference and supported the recommendations in chapter one of the report of the Committee on Natural Resources on its second special session (E/L.1742). The situation with regard to documentation seemed to be satisfactory but, in the view of his delegation, the situation with regard to institutional arrangements and the programme of action seemed less satisfactory. The problems which had arisen during the Committee's discussion of the document containing the consolidated action recommendations (E/C.7/L.52 and Add.1) showed that there had not been sufficient preparation and that progress would be delayed, in particular with regard to international co-operation in the water sector. Further efforts would be required to accelerate preparations for the Conference in that area. His delegation generally supported the action recommendations but had reservations with regard to some of the items in Chapter III, dealing with action at the international level. First, with regard to financing arrangements for water development, his delegation felt that any financial arrangements which might emerge from the Conference should be

based on the principle of voluntary participation. While his delegation fully realized the importance of water as a world problem, it felt that caution was required with regard to further expansion of the already large existing institutional machinery. Secondly, with regard to co-ordination of United Nations programmes for the implementation of action proposals, his delegation agreed with the formulation of the recommendation but felt that the focus should be on the problem of co-ordinating the work of existing institutions and not on the establishment of new bodies. His delegation was concerned not merely with financial aspects but also with the need for proper organization of international action. His delegation did not feel that the problem of water should be made the concern of a separate institution as had been the case with the problem of the environment. Nevertheless, although his delegation was somewhat concerned at the proliferation of international conferences, it fully supported the United Nations Water Conference.

7. Mr. VAN BUUREN (Netherlands) said that his delegation supported the Secretariat's desire to link the results of previous conferences with the work of the Water Conference. In that connexion, the important recommendations of the recent Tripartite World Conference on Employment, Income Distribution, Social Progress and the International Division of Labour¹ should be considered by the Water Conference. He asked the Secretary-General of the Conference to consider preparing a paper, possibly in conjunction with the ILO, on the impact of the basic needs strategy on the policies on water supply to be considered at the Conference.

8. Mr. MARTYNENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that many delegations had noted that the document containing the consolidated action recommendations (E/C.7/L.52 and Add.1) was not complete and had not achieved its aims. He hoped that the Secretariat would continue work on the document and would take into account the views expressed at the regional preparatory meetings and meetings of the Committee on Natural Resources. His delegation had reservations in particular with regard to paragraphs 101, 104 and 105 of the document. In that connexion, it agreed with the representative of Poland that any decision adopted by the Conference concerning the establishment of a new fund should be based on the principle of voluntary participation. The establishment of a new fund should also be considered in the context of the whole problem of restructuring the United Nations system and the possibility of consolidating existing funds. In general, his delegation did not support the establishment of new bodies and would favour the use of existing ones to co-ordinate United Nations activities in the water sector. He felt, furthermore, that the Conference should not take a decision which might prejudice or complicate the work of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Restructuring of the Economic and Social Sectors of the United Nations System.

9. Although the Committee on Natural Resources had devoted two special sessions to preparing the Conference, it had not completed the preparations, and much would still need to be done by the Conference itself. For that reason,

¹ See E/5857.

delegations should avoid adopting any decisions with regard to matters which had not received proper preparation.

10. Mr. FLEMING (Argentina) associated himself with the previous speakers who had expressed concern about the documentation for the Conference and urged the Secretariat to take all necessary steps to circulate documents on time so that they could be studied thoroughly by delegations before they arrived at the Conference.

11. He expressed gratitude to delegations which, in different intergovernmental forums, had worked together with the Argentine Government in preparing for the Conference. Special gratitude was due to the Conference secretariat and to the Secretary-General of the Conference, who had made every possible effort to assist the Argentine Government with preparations at the national level.

12. With respect to the Council's own deliberations on the report of the Committee on Natural Resources, he stressed that no decisions taken by the Council should impair the right of the Conference to act in a sovereign way.

13. In recent meetings both in and outside the United Nations it had been emphasized that, in the interests of the success of the Conference, the delegations participating should be composed of high-level representatives. In that connexion, he drew attention to the statement made by the head of the Argentine delegation at the second special session of the Committee on Natural Resources (see E/C.7/SR.93).

14. In conclusion, on behalf of the Government and people of Argentina, he assured the Council that a warm welcome was awaiting the participants in the Conference.

15. Mr. BARCELO (Mexico) said that his delegation had every confidence that Argentina would be an excellent host. However, it was somewhat concerned about the slow progress made in the preparatory work. Experience showed that international conferences were likely to succeed only if they were carefully and thoroughly prepared. Having said that, his delegation was able to endorse the recommendations of the Committee on Natural Resources.

16. Miss BALOGUN (Nigeria) said that her delegation fully sympathized with the concern expressed by some delegations; however, it was confident that the Conference secretariat would ensure that the documentation was circulated ahead of time.

17. Mr. FANO (Technical Secretary of the United Nations Water Conference) observed that a number of representatives had expressed concern at the slowness of preparations for the Water Conference and the late date at which important documents had been submitted to the Committee on Natural Resources, acting as preparatory committee for the Conference. As the Secretary-General of the Conference had pointed out to the Committee on Natural Resources, a number of the causes for the delay had been beyond the control of the secretariat of the Conference. For example, the secretariat had not been able to begin work on the consolidated action recommendations (E/C.7/L.52 and Add.1) until the beginning of October, following the last of the four regional preparatory meetings. As the

period of preparation of that document had coincided with the thirty-first session of the General Assembly, it had been inevitable that the language versions had been issued rather late. The fifth regional preparatory meeting for the ECWA region had not taken place until December. The recommendations of that meeting would be incorporated in the final version of the document submitted to the Conference.

18. The purpose of repeating the objectives of the Conference in one of the basic documents was to assist participants who might not be familiar with the background of the Conference. However, it should not be thought that those objectives had only recently been established; they had been discussed by the Committee on Natural Resources at its first special session and had been taken into account by the regional preparatory meetings held in the summer of 1976 during their discussion of substantive issues.

19. The Conference secretariat had endeavoured as far as possible to incorporate word for word in document E/C.7/L.52 and Add.1 the recommendations culled from the regional preparatory meetings. In cases in which the regions differed in their stands on an issue, the different viewpoints had been expressed.

20. The documents referred to in document E/L.1742 (para. 1 (d)) had been prepared during the second half of 1976 as a result of a recommendation of Habitat: United Nations Conference on Human Settlements, which had requested the Secretary-General of the Water Conference to expand on its recommendation on community water supply. The Secretary-General of the Water Conference had considered that, in the light of that recommendation, it would be useful to set up a task force on community water supply in co-operation with WHO, the World Bank and UNICEF in order to endeavour to identify the strategies that would be required to implement the recommendation of Habitat. The Secretary-General of the Water Conference had also deemed it advisable to follow up some of the recommendations of other international conferences, including the World Food Conference, and to take account of the work of the International Hydrological Programme, so that there might be supporting documents concerning agriculture and the assessment of needs for community water supply. The meeting of the task force on technical co-operation among developing countries had been held in the light of the Council's own decision in the summer of 1976 (resolution 2023 (LXI)). Assistance had been received from the specialized agencies in the preparation of the documentation for all those meetings, thus making some delay inevitable.

21. In organizing the regional preparatory meetings, the Conference secretariat had worked closely with the regional commissions and the specialized agencies so as to ensure that the meetings would be co-ordinated as closely as possible. He thanked the representative of France for his appreciative comments in that regard.

22. Only two weeks remained before the documentation for the Conference had to be circulated to Governments. Unfortunately, therefore, it was too late to meet the request of the representative of the Netherlands and to prepare a new document on the subject of relations between the Tripartite World Conference and the water

sector. He welcomed the suggestion that the ILO might be asked whether, in the light of its experience, it would be able to prepare a brief paper on the subject.

23. Mr. CHEVRON (International Labour Organisation) said that the International Labour Office was entirely willing to co-operate with the secretariat of the Water Conference in preparing a document that linked that Conference and the relevant recommendations arising out of the Tripartite World Conference.

24. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council, having considered chapter one of the report of the Committee on Natural Resources on its second special session (E/L.1742), should approve the recommendations made by the Committee in paragraph 1, subparagraphs (a) to (c), and subparagraph (d) as orally revised by the Secretary of the Council.

It was so decided (decision 207 (ORG-77), subpara. (a)).

25. Mr. VOLOSHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking with reference to paragraph 1 (c) (iv) of the report, suggested that it would be preferable to express the wish that statements in plenary meetings should not exceed 15 minutes rather than to impose a rigid time-limit on such statements.

26. Mr. WARSAMA (Somalia) said that he shared the concern of the Soviet representative; he believed that it would be preferable to allow the Conference to decide what it wished rather than to include a time-limit in the rules of procedure.

27. He trusted that participants who wished to speak in the general debate would be able to inscribe their names on the list of speakers on arrival at the Conference, as well as earlier at United Nations Headquarters.

28. He suggested that the report on the consultations held at the pre-Conference meetings, referred to in paragraph 1 (c) (i), should be either oral or written, at the discretion of the Chairman of those meetings.

29. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) explained that a provision in the rules of procedure prescribing a time-limit for statements had been adopted by Habitat and had been applied without any difficulty. The advantage of such a time-limit was that senior government officials with very little time at their disposal could expect to speak at approximately the time for which they were inscribed. In any event, the proposal for a time-limit could be adopted only by the Conference itself, which would make its decision in the light of the recommendations of the pre-Conference meetings. Since the list of speakers was to be opened on 22 February, the Conference secretariat would be able to inform the participants in the pre-Conference meetings of the number of speakers inscribed on the list as at 12 March. The list of speakers, in accordance with traditional practice, would not be closed until the second or third day of the Conference. He agreed with the representative of Somalia that there was no need to specify that the report on the pre-Conference meetings

should be oral, even though reports of that nature were usually oral simply because there was no time to produce a written report. In conclusion, he pointed out that the Council was required to note, rather than to approve, the decisions of the Committee on Natural Resources in paragraph 1 (c), subparagraphs (i) to (iv), on the understanding that those decisions were subject to endorsement at the pre-Conference meetings.

30. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should take note of the decisions taken by the Committee on Natural Resources contained in paragraph 1 (c), subparagraphs (i) to (iv), and in paragraph 2, subparagraphs (a) to (c), taking fully into account the comments made thereon.

It was so decided (decision 207 (ORG-77), subpara. (b)).

31. The PRESIDENT announced that the Council had concluded its consideration of agenda item 4.

AGENDA ITEM 6

Rules of procedure of the functional commissions of the Council (E/5899)

32. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) said that document E/5899, containing the proposed revised rules of procedure of the functional commissions, was self-explanatory. It had been set out in such a way as to enable delegations to determine the background to each rule and how it conformed to the relevant rule of the Council's own rules of procedure. Reference to the comments in the third column of the annex would show that the rules were very similar indeed to those of the Council and had merely been adjusted *mutatis mutandis* to the requirements of the functional commissions.

33. The Soviet representative had suggested at the first meeting of the organizational session, prior to the adoption of the agenda, that item 6 might be postponed until the sixty-second session. If the Council agreed to that suggestion and to consider the revised rules within the context of the item on the restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system, which members had informally agreed to include in the agenda of the spring session, he suggested that 15 March should be set as a deadline for the submission of any corrections or amendments to the proposed revised rules. That would enable the Council to have before it in written form any proposals or changes.

34. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) supported that procedure, including the deadline of 15 March.

35. Mr. MAKEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he, too, supported that procedure on the understanding that delegations would be able to submit additional corrections and amendments during the spring session.

36. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should postpone its consideration of item 6 until the sixty-second

session and should set 15 March 1977 as the deadline for the submission of corrections or formal amendments to the draft revised rules of procedure of the functional commissions proposed in document E/5899, without prejudice to the right of delegations to make further proposals during the discussion of the question.

It was so decided (decision 209 (ORG-77)).

37. The PRESIDENT announced that the Council had concluded its consideration of agenda item 6.

The meeting rose at 12.35 p.m.

2042nd meeting

Thursday, 13 January 1977, at 4.20 p.m.

President: Mr. Ladislav ŠMÍD (Czechoslovakia).

E/SR.2042

AGENDA ITEM 7

Elections to subsidiary bodies of the Council and confirmation of representatives on the functional commissions

1. The PRESIDENT said that the elections would be taken in the order in which they were listed in the annotations to item 7 of the agenda (E/5901).

EXECUTIVE BOARD OF THE UNITED NATIONS CHILDREN'S FUND (E/L.1741)

2. The PRESIDENT said that he had been informed that two groups of countries wished the elections to the Executive Board of the United Nations Children's Fund to be postponed until the sixty-second session. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council agreed to the postponement.

It was so decided.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSING, BUILDING AND PLANNING

3. The PRESIDENT suggested that, in the absence of candidates, the Council should postpone the election of members of the Committee on Housing, Building and Planning until the sixty-second session.

It was so decided.

COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

4. Miss ST. CLAIRE (Assistant Secretary of the Council) said that there was only one candidate for the four vacancies on the Committee on Natural Resources. The Philippines was the candidate of the Asian States for a term of four years beginning on the date of election and expiring on 31 December 1980.

5. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would assume that the Council wished to elect the Philippines by acclamation and, in the absence of candi-

dates for the remaining vacant seats, to defer the elections to them until the sixty-second session.

It was so decided.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT

6. Miss St. CLAIRE (Assistant Secretary of the Council) said that there were no candidates for the vacancies on the Committee on Science and Technology for Development.

7. Mr. MAHGOUB (Sudan) said that there seemed to be some confusion since the African Group had endorsed a candidate for the Committee on Science and Technology for Development and had sent the Secretariat a communication to that effect. He therefore proposed that the election of the candidate of the African States should be postponed until the following meeting.

8. Miss ST. CLAIRE (Assistant Secretary of the Council) said that the Secretariat had not received the communication in question.

9. Miss BALOGUN (Nigeria) agreed that there was indeed a candidate from the African States and supported the proposal made by the representative of the Sudan.

The proposal was adopted.

10. The PRESIDENT suggested that, in the absence of candidates for the remaining vacancies on the Committee on Science and Technology for Development, the Council should postpone elections to fill those vacancies until the sixty-second session.

It was so decided.

COMMITTEE ON REVIEW AND APPRAISAL

Ad Hoc Intergovernmental Working Group on the Problem of Corrupt Practices

11. The PRESIDENT suggested that, in the absence of candidates, the Council should postpone the elections of

members of the Committee on Review and Appraisal and the *Ad Hoc* Intergovernmental Working Group on the Problem of Corrupt Practices until the sixty-second session.

It was so decided.

COMMITTEE ON NEGOTIATIONS WITH INTER-GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES ON AN AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

12. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should postpone consideration of the matter until the following day, when a draft decision on the subject was expected to be available.

It was so decided.

APPOINTMENT OF ONE MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE ON CRIME PREVENTION AND CONTROL (E/5903)

13. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to confirm the appointment recommended by the Secretary-General in document E/5903.

It was so decided.

COMMITTEE ON NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

14. The PRESIDENT stated that the Secretary-General had been informed that the Netherlands wished to withdraw from membership of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations as from 1 January 1977. The Group of Western European and other States had endorsed the candidature of Sweden for the seat vacated by the Netherlands. He therefore suggested that the Council should elect Sweden by acclamation for a term of office beginning on the date of election and expiring at the end of 1978.

It was so decided.

CONFIRMATION OF REPRESENTATIVES ON THE FUNCTIONAL COMMISSIONS (E/5897 AND ADD.1-3, E/5898)

15. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council agreed to confirm the representatives on the functional commissions named in document E/5897 and Add.1-3, and the three representatives listed in document E/5898, who had been nominated to serve as members of the Sub-Commission on Illicit Drug Traffic and Related Matters in the Near and Middle East.

It was so decided.

16. Mr. ROUGE (France), supported by Mr. CARANICAS (Greece), proposed that the Secretariat should study the possibility of doing away with the pointless formality the Council had just gone through and report its findings to the Council at the earliest possible opportunity, perhaps under the item on restructuring. Governments had a right to choose their own representatives, and all Governments were prepared to respect the choices of others.

17. Miss ST. CLAIRE (Assistant Secretary of the Council) pointed out that a decision to eliminate the confirmation of representatives on the functional commissions would require the amendment of all the Council resolutions which had set up those commissions, all of which dated back to 1946, as well as rules 12 and 13 of the rules of procedure of the functional commissions.

18. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Secretariat should be asked to prepare a document outlining the steps that would have to be taken in order to eliminate the formality of confirming representatives on the functional commissions.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 4.50 p.m.

2043rd meeting

Friday, 14 January 1977, at 11.15 a.m.

President: Mr. Ladislav SMÍD (Czechoslovakia).

E/SR.2043

AGENDA ITEM 3

Basic programme of work of the Council for 1977 (*continued*)* (E/5900, E/5905, E/L.1743)

1. The PRESIDENT drew attention to draft decision E/L.1743, which he was submitting in his capacity as President on the basis of the consultative meetings held so far during the Council's session. It had been hoped that in

accordance with tradition there would have been consensus on the draft decision relating to the Council's basic programme of work, but unfortunately, notwithstanding the efforts of delegations, consensus had not been reached on the draft decision in paragraph 4 (e) of document E/L.1743 concerning General Assembly resolution 31/33.

2. Mr. MAKEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that it would be better to reword agenda item 10, which the draft decision would assign to the sixty-second session, in order to bring it into line with the official title of

* Resumed from the 2039th meeting.

the United Nations Decade for Women. Accordingly, he suggested that the words "Activities for the advancement of women" should be replaced by the words "United Nations Decade for Women: Equality, Development and Peace".

3. Mr. TEMPLETON (New Zealand) said that his delegation would have no objection to the Soviet suggestion if the new wording of agenda item 10 was understood to include all the questions listed in chapter IV of document E/5900 in the section relating to activities for the advancement of women, including the report of the Commission on the Status of Women. Otherwise, his delegation would object to any narrowing of the wording of agenda item 10.

4. Mr. MARSHALL (United Kingdom) pointed out that the Commission on the Status of Women antedated and had a wider scope than the United Nations Decade for Women. It was necessary therefore to find a more comprehensive title for agenda item 10 than that which had been suggested by the Soviet representative.

5. Mr. MAKEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that the existing wording of the item should be retained and that the words "United Nations Decade for Women: Equality, Development and Peace" should be added at the end of that wording.

It was so decided.

6. Mr. MARSHALL (United Kingdom) proposed that the words "31/33 on adverse consequences for the enjoyment of human rights of political, military, economic and other forms of assistance given to colonial and racist régimes in southern Africa" should be deleted from paragraph 4 (e) of document E/L.1743. In operative paragraph 8 of the resolution in question, the General Assembly had invited the Economic and Social Council to undertake a task which, in the view of his Government, was wholly improper, namely, the review, by one organ established under the Charter of the United Nations, of the discharge of their responsibilities by certain member Governments, in another such organ, in accordance with the provisions of the Charter.

7. In extending that invitation to the Economic and Social Council, the General Assembly had set the Council a delicate problem. His delegation respected and fully endorsed the view that the Council should normally do what the General Assembly asked. On the other hand, it did not accept that the Economic and Social Council, a Charter organ, had no discretion whatever as to how it might discharge its responsibilities, or that the only course open to it in the circumstances was that proposed in document E/L.1743. The Council should weigh carefully the consequences of retaining the reference to General Assembly resolution 31/33 in its work programme. Although operative paragraph 8 of the resolution referred specifically to three States Members of the United Nations and a particular issue, the principle involved applied to every Member of the United Nations and to every issue that might come before it.

8. The substance of the issue in question could be debated in the proper place at the proper time. His delegation, for its part, would have no difficulty whatever in justifying the

action taken by its Government. It was grateful to all those who had sought a means whereby the Council could preserve the consensus which was appropriate to handling its work programme. The fact that the Council was not able to agree on paragraph 4 (e) should not be allowed to affect the consensus which had been reached on every other issue or the spirit in which the members of the Council should carry out their work together.

9. Mr. MYERSON (United States of America) said that the significant point was not that the Council had failed to agree on paragraph 4 (e) but that it had been able to agree on everything else. His delegation endorsed the United Kingdom proposal and agreed with the reasoning put forward to support it. What was at issue was not the substance of economic or social policy, but rather a principle involving important political elements. General Assembly resolution 31/33 had been, to some extent, wrong in principle and unwise politically, as would be any decision by the Council to refer the matter to the Commission on Human Rights. His delegation felt strongly about the substance of the issue and continued to hold the views it had expressed on it in the Third Committee of the General Assembly at its thirty-first session. It continued to believe that the best and most effective manner of organizing the Council's work was through true consensus. Such a consensus had not been achieved with regard to the paragraph under consideration.

10. Mr. ROUGE (France) endorsed the views expressed by the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom. The phrase in question should be deleted for legal and political reasons which did not affect the substance of the issue.

11. Mr. MAHGOUB (Sudan) said that a distinction should be made between the substantive and procedural aspects of the issue before the Council. The deletion from paragraph 4 (e) of the reference to General Assembly resolution 31/33 would be tantamount to a challenge of a General Assembly decision. His delegation understood the difficulties of some delegations with regard to the reference to that resolution and was mindful of its political implications. However, *apartheid* was an economic and social fact of life and the Economic and Social Council could not escape its responsibilities in that matter. His delegation therefore could not agree to any revision of the text contained in document E/L.1743.

12. Mr. BAMBA (Upper Volta) said his delegation regretted that no consensus had been reached on the phrase in question. The General Assembly should be able to remind members of the Economic and Social Council which enjoyed the power of veto in the Security Council of their responsibilities and a study of the consequences of the use of the veto would be quite useful for that purpose. His delegation therefore could not support the United Kingdom proposal.

13. Mr. BENHOCINE (Algeria) said his delegation too regretted that the Council had not been able to reach a consensus on paragraph 4 (e), especially since, from the procedural point of view, all the provisions of document E/L.1743 were in strict conformity with the usual work methods of the Council.

14. Reference had been made by previous speakers to the question of principle. The deletion of the reference to General Assembly resolution 31/33 would call into question a fundamental principle, namely the primacy of decisions taken by the General Assembly as the paramount organ of the United Nations. In the event, the General Assembly had adopted a resolution and certain members of the Assembly did not agree with the substance of it. The provisions of the resolution in question should be discussed elsewhere and delegations which had objections to the substance of the resolution might simply place them on record at the current session, while agreeing to adopt the Council's work programme by consensus. Such a procedure was the one normally followed.

15. Mr. IBRAHIM (Ethiopia) observed that the organizational sessions of the Council were concerned only with allocating items for which legislative authority existed between the two sessions in each year. There were no legal grounds for deciding at the organizational session not to include an item in the basic programme of work. Delegations which had objections to the substance of some items should raise them when the Council conducted a substantive discussion of the items in question. His delegation therefore believed that it would be wholly inappropriate to put the United Kingdom proposal to a vote.

16. Miss ILIĆ (Yugoslavia) regretted that a consensus had not been reached on paragraph 4 (e) and agreed with the representatives of the Sudan, the Upper Volta and Algeria regarding the necessity of maintaining the paragraph as it stood.

17. Miss BALOGUN (Nigeria) appealed to the United Kingdom delegation not to press its proposal. The General Assembly had adopted a resolution which assigned a specific task to the Economic and Social Council and it would be wrong for the Council to call that decision into question. Moreover, the Council should not discuss at its organizational session how it would deal with any particular item and it would be wrong, therefore, to put the United Kingdom proposal to a vote.

18. Mr. ACEMAH (Uganda) said that his delegation endorsed the views put forward by the representatives of Nigeria, the Upper Volta, Yugoslavia, the Sudan and Algeria. It regretted the inability of the Council to reach agreement in spite of the intensive consultations and the informal meetings which had been held. The question before the Council was a purely procedural one. The Council did not have the power to question a decision of the General Assembly, which was a superior body. His delegation therefore could not agree to the proposal to delete the reference to General Assembly resolution 31/33.

19. Mrs. MAIR (Jamaica) said that her delegation's main concern was for the status within the United Nations of the decisions of the General Assembly. The supremacy of those decisions would be seriously undermined if the Council decided to delete the reference in paragraph 4 (e) to General Assembly resolution 31/33. Her delegation's view on that matter was without prejudice to its position on the substance of the question, which could be considered at an appropriate time and place.

20. Mr. QADRUD-DIN (Pakistan) said that the discussion seemed to revolve around two distinct questions. The first and most important one was the procedural problem as to whether the Council could refuse to carry out directives it had received from the General Assembly. In the view of his delegation, the Council could not do so. The second question related to the difficulty which some delegations had with the substance of General Assembly resolution 31/33. In the view of his delegation, the appropriate place for expressing views on the substance of the resolution had been the General Assembly; a further opportunity would arise during discussions on the item at coming sessions of the Council and the Commission on Human Rights. His delegation could, therefore, not accept the United Kingdom proposal and hoped that that delegation would not press its proposal.

21. Mr. YORK (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation hoped that the draft basic programme of work proposed by the President (E/L.1743) could be adopted by consensus but felt that the proposal made by the representative of the United Kingdom raised an important procedural point, namely whether one body established by the Charter could review the activities of another such body. In adopting the draft as it stood, the Council would simply pass on the problem to the Commission on Human Rights, where it did not belong. For that reason, his delegation supported the United Kingdom proposal.

22. Mr. GAMBOA (Venezuela) recognized that it would be difficult for the Council to arrive at a consensus on the matter but thought that, since a decision had been taken by the General Assembly with respect to resolution 31/33, it would be a dangerous precedent for the Council to accept the amendment proposed by the United Kingdom delegation.

23. Mr. ALSAIDI (Yemen) said that his delegation could not accept any amendment to paragraph 4 (e) and wished the text to be left as proposed by the President.

24. Mr. YANKOV (Bulgaria) said that there were three aspects to the problem. The first was procedural: the General Assembly had adopted a resolution and the Council, under rule 9, paragraph 2, of its rules of procedure, was required to include the item in question in its provisional agenda. Secondly, there was the constitutional aspect of the problem, namely whether the Council was competent to challenge or interpret provisions of the Charter. Such considerations were not appropriate to the matter at issue and should be confined to a special discussion on that topic. Finally, there was the political or substantive aspect of the problem, namely whether the Council should be compelled to make judgements with regard to the principle of unanimity of the permanent members of the Security Council.

25. He agreed with the representative of Ethiopia that a vote could be avoided, as the Council had been specifically invited in paragraph 8 of General Assembly resolution 31/33 to examine a certain question in collaboration with the Commission on Human Rights. He noted that, when the Council began the substantive discussion of the matter, it could declare itself incompetent with regard to the consti-

tutional aspect of the problem. In any case, no formal decision was required at the present time from the Council and the most impartial course of action would be to follow the General Assembly's directives. He appealed to those delegations supporting the United Kingdom amendment not to prejudge the Council's action.

26. Mr. BARCELO (Mexico) felt that the statement by the representative of Bulgaria made it clear that the matter was entirely procedural and that, under the rules of procedure, the Council must include in its provisional agenda all items transmitted to it by the General Assembly. There was no necessity even to vote on the matter.

27. Miss BALOGUN (Nigeria) said that, in her view, the President of the Council had the authority to rule that the matter required no discussion, as the Council had no authorization at its organizational session to refuse to carry out its obligations. Many Member States had difficulties with various resolutions but they had not requested, and indeed they had no right to request, the deletion of matters which ran counter to their interests. She appealed to the President to rule on the matter and end the discussion.

28. Mr. KANAZAWA (Japan) said that his delegation had already expressed its reservations with regard to General Assembly resolution 31/33, particularly its constitutional aspects, and supported the United Kingdom proposal to delete the reference to that resolution from paragraph 4 (e).

29. Mr. IBRAHIM (Ethiopia) felt that the statement made by the representative of Bulgaria had helped to clarify the issue. In his view, the Assembly had transmitted an entire item, which could not be divided or amended, for inclusion in the Council's provisional agenda. He asked the President to rule on the matter.

30. Mr. DIRAR (Observer for the Organization of African Unity) said that his organization attached great importance to the substance of resolution 31/33 and was concerned at the dangerous precedent being established by the current procedural debate in the Council. OAU fully supported the inclusion of the entire item in the Council's provisional agenda.

31. Mr. MYERSON (United States of America) said that his delegation had carefully avoided any discussion of the substance of the item, since the organizational session was not the appropriate forum. He wished, however, to avoid any possibility of misunderstanding. The position of his delegation with regard to *apartheid* and majority rule in southern Africa was quite clear and known to all and had not changed. His delegation had difficulties with a number of the items and resolutions listed in the provisional agenda, but felt that the procedural difficulty caused by the reference to resolution 31/33 was unique and important and raised a question of principle related to powers established under the Charter.

32. Mr. YANKOV (Bulgaria) said that the powers of the Council and the General Assembly were clearly established in the Charter and that Article 66 stated the relationship between those two bodies.

33. The Council should now decide on the preliminary question whether to take a decision on the inclusion or

non-inclusion of an item in its agenda. The issue was whether the matter should be the subject of a formal decision or consensus.

34. He noted that rule 9, paragraph 2, of the Council's rules of procedure, which covered the drawing up of the provisional agenda, had been drafted in conformity with Article 66 of the Charter and that the Council could, therefore, not take a decision on the receivability of an item, only on its merits.

35. He supported the Ethiopian request that the President should rule on the matter or have the Council take a decision on the preliminary question.

36. Miss BALOGUN (Nigeria) suggested that informal consultations should be held; if the matter could not be settled by informal consultations, her delegation reserved the right to invite the President of the General Assembly to give his opinion.

37. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should vote on the Bulgarian motion, which, in accordance with rule 56 of the rules of procedure, called for a decision on the competence of the Council to adopt the United Kingdom proposal.

38. Mr. MARSHALL (United Kingdom) said that the comments of the representative of Bulgaria were only partly relevant to and only partly explained the issue. The provisions of rule 9, paragraph 2, of the rules of procedure, which that representative had cited, were not at issue. The purpose of his delegation's proposal was to avoid taking a decision replete with political, constitutional and procedural considerations, namely, the decision to refer the matter at the current stage to the Commission on Human Rights. That was a point to which the representative of Bulgaria had not addressed himself.

39. Miss BALOGUN (Nigeria) suggested that the Council should vote on the Bulgarian motion.

40. Mr. IBRAHIM (Ethiopia) suggested that the Council should vote on the United Kingdom proposal.

41. Miss BALOGUN (Nigeria) reiterated her suggestion that the Council should vote on the motion that it was not competent to consider the proposal made by the United Kingdom delegation.

42. Mr. YORK (Federal Republic of Germany) said that rule 9 of the rules of procedure was clearly not pertinent to the issue, because the Council secretariat had already included the item in the draft basic programme of work. The relevant provision was to be found in rule 13, paragraph 1, of the rules of procedure, which, if it meant anything, must signify that the Council could adopt an agenda of its own choice and that the agenda finally adopted need not necessarily be the one drawn up by the Secretariat. In that context, the purpose of the United Kingdom proposal was to determine whether or not resolution 31/33 should be referred to the Commission on Human Rights.

43. Mr. WARSAMA (Somalia) said that the Council could not ignore the fact that the General Assembly had

addressed an invitation to it in resolution 31/33, paragraph 8. The pertinent issue was therefore whether the Council could refuse to consider an item referred to it by the Assembly.

44. Mr. BENHOCINE (Algeria) said that the United Kingdom proposal seemed to mean different things to different delegations. In his delegation's view, adoption of that proposal would be tantamount to the Council's failing to act on a request from the General Assembly at the appropriate time. The Assembly had asked the Council to study the question and to submit a report to it at its thirty-third session. Consequently, if the item was not referred to the Commission on Human Rights immediately, it would not be possible to complete the study by the appointed date. He believed that the Council should take a decision as to whether it was competent to vote on the United Kingdom proposal.

45. Mr. LINDENBERG SETTE (Brazil) said that he tended to agree with the representative of Algeria. If the point at issue was simply whether or not the Council would require the collaboration of the Commission on Human Rights, a subsidiary body, he would be inclined to agree with the view that the Council might dispense with such collaboration if it so desired. However, the item must appear somewhere in the Council's agenda since the Council could not simply ignore a request by the General Assembly.

46. Mr. AMIRDIVANI (Iran) said that his delegation considered the United Kingdom proposal to be an amendment in accordance with rule 66 of the rules of procedure.

47. Mr. BAMBA (Upper Volta) agreed with the representative of Brazil that, even if the question was not referred to the Commission on Human Rights, it must be included in the Council's agenda. At the same time, he was not at all sure that the Council was empowered to question the General Assembly's judgement that the Commission on Human Rights was the competent body to study the item.

48. Mr. MARSHALL (United Kingdom) said that the motion concerning the Council's competence to decide whether or not it could delete some wording in its draft work programme was misleading. The substance of his delegation's proposal was simply that the Council should not decide at the present juncture to refer the matter to the Commission on Human Rights. It was ridiculous to assert that the Council was not competent to take such a decision.

49. Mr. YANKOV (Bulgaria) said that he disagreed with the reasoning of the United Kingdom delegation. The United Kingdom proposal was unconstitutional, and it was therefore necessary for the Council to decide first of all whether the proposal could be the subject of a formal decision.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

2044th meeting

Friday, 14 January 1977, at 4.45 p.m.

President: Mr. Ladislav ŠMÍD (Czechoslovakia).

E/SR.2044

AGENDA ITEM 3

Basic programme of work of the Council for 1977 (concluded) (E/5900, E/5905, E/L.1743)

1. The PRESIDENT invited members of the Council to comment on the two proposals made orally at the preceding meeting, and urged them to be flexible with regard to the application of the rules of procedure.

2. Mr. EHSASSI (Iran) proposed that the words referring to General Assembly resolution 31/33 in document E/L.1743, paragraph 4 (e), should be voted on separately. He was making the proposal on the understanding that the representatives of the United Kingdom and Bulgaria would allow it to be given priority.

3. Mr. RIVAS (Colombia) said that, in view of the situation in which the Council found itself, he supported the Iranian proposal. Although his delegation did not find the United Kingdom proposal acceptable, it did not believe that it constituted a challenge to the Council's competence, since the United Kingdom representative had said his sole concern was that the Council should not decide at the

current stage whether to refer resolution 31/33 to the Commission on Human Rights. If the United Kingdom proposal was put to the vote directly, it might lead to a reopening of the discussion on the document as a whole and thus prolong the debate. The Iranian proposal would give an opportunity to delegations which had expressed reservations to register them formally through their votes.

4. Mr. YANKOV (Bulgaria), reiterated his view that, although any member of the Council had the right to make any proposal or amendment, the United Kingdom proposal could not be put to the Council for a decision because to do so would have procedural and constitutional implications that might create confusion in other instances. It would be unconstitutional for the Council to challenge a resolution adopted by the General Assembly. Nevertheless, in a spirit of accommodation, he would not press for a vote on the constitutionality of the United Kingdom proposal.

5. Mr. QADRUD-DIN (Pakistan), reiterating his delegation's position on the constitutional question, said that the Council should not take a position that would contravene the directives of the General Assembly. The Iranian proposal offered a way out of the dilemma facing the

Council. By taking a separate vote on whether or not to retain the words in question, the Council would be deciding whether it should refer resolution 31/33 to the Commission on Human Rights immediately or later, and it would not be going into the question whether there was any challenge to the Council's competence. His delegation believed that, if the Council was to implement fully the General Assembly's directives, taking into account the timing of the resolution and of the Commission's meeting, that action should be taken immediately, and it would therefore vote in favour of retaining the words in question. However, his earlier appeal that the Council should simply adopt the document by consensus and leave it to delegations to make their interpretative statements for the record still stood.

6. Mr. MAHGOUB (Sudan) said that his delegation reluctantly accepted the proposal of the representative of Iran. However, that did not mean that it accepted the implication that the substance of the General Assembly resolution was open to question.

7. Mr. WARSAMA (Somalia) said that the Council should be quite clear about what it was voting on. The representative of Colombia had said that the intention was to refrain from taking a decision at the present time to refer the matter to the Commission on Human Rights. His delegation's understanding had been that the United Kingdom was proposing the deletion of the words stating the Council's decision to refer resolution 31/33 to the Commission. If the Council was going to vote on whether it should decide at the current stage to refer the resolution to the Commission, his delegation could agree to that proposal in a spirit of co-operation. If, however, the Council was voting on whether the resolution should at any time be referred to the Commission, his delegation's position remained as stated previously.

8. Mr. MARSHALL (United Kingdom) said it was evident from the debate that there had been some misunderstanding of his proposal. He was grateful to the two Vice-Presidents, the representatives of Iran and Colombia, for their suggestion. The interpretation of the proposal given by the representative of Colombia was correct. His delegation would be happy to go along with the proposal of the representative of Iran that the words in question should be voted on separately, on the understanding that both his delegation and the Bulgarian delegation withdrew their proposals.

9. Mr. MYERSON (United States of America) associated his delegation with the expressions of appreciation to the representative of Iran. His delegation assumed that each delegation was free to interpret matters as it wished; accordingly, the statements of other delegations were not binding on it.

10. Mr. IBRAHIM (Ethiopia) said that, as he had stated at the preceding meeting, his delegation still considered that the question need not be put to a vote, since it was not included in the agenda of the organizational session. His delegation's agreement to the Iranian proposal should not be interpreted as challenging in any way General Assembly resolution 31/33.

11. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the words "31/33 on adverse consequences for the enjoyment

of human rights of political, military, economic and other forms of assistance given to colonial and racist régimes in southern Africa" in draft decision E/L.1743, paragraph 4 (e).

At the request of the representative of the United States of America, the vote was taken by roll-call.

Austria, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Bangladesh, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, China, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Iraq, Jamaica, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina.

Against: Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of Italy, Japan, Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Iran, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The words in question were adopted by 33 votes to 8, with 10 abstentions.

Draft decision E/L.1743, as orally amended, was adopted (decision 204 (ORG-77)).

12. Mr. MAKEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on draft decision E/L.1743 for the same reasons that had caused it to abstain on General Assembly resolution 31/33. At the time when that resolution had been adopted, his delegation, while unreservedly supporting all those of its provisions that were designed to end all forms of assistance to colonial and racist régimes in southern Africa, had had serious objections to paragraph 8 on the ground that it conflicted with other provisions of the resolution. An invitation to the Commission on Human Rights to study adverse consequences of assistance to colonial and racist régimes in southern Africa could be interpreted as meaning that those consequences were not yet known and required further study, thereby weakening the position of Member States which favoured the immediate adoption of measures against those régimes. Furthermore, paragraph 8 of General Assembly resolution 31/33 could be used to undermine the principle of unanimity among the members of the Security Council. His delegation would continue to oppose any attempt to revise that principle. It was not the right of veto, but the policies and practices of certain countries, that had adverse consequences for the enjoyment of human rights.

13. Mr. CZARKOWSKI (Poland) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on the draft decision because of its constitutional implications. His delegation's position with regard to the principles of the Charter had already been expressed in the Third Committee. He supported the main objectives of the draft decision.

14. Mr. BAMBA (Upper Volta) said that his delegation had voted for the retention of the reference to General

Assembly resolution 31/33 because it considered the proposal to delete it unconstitutional. As far as the procedure adopted by the Council was concerned, his delegation did not regard the vote taken as constituting a precedent. It was in the interest of the small countries, such as his own, scrupulously to respect the constitutional texts of the United Nations.

15. Mr. YANKOV (Bulgaria) said that his delegation had voted for the adoption of the existing wording of paragraph 4 (e) of draft decision E/L.1743 on the understanding that it was not the constitutional principle of unanimity in the Security Council that was at stake, but rather the constitutionality of including on the Council's agenda a question which had already been decided by the General Assembly.

16. When General Assembly resolution 31/33 had been adopted, his delegation had endorsed all its provisions except paragraph 8, which it considered went beyond the terms of reference of the Council and its subsidiary bodies.

17. Miss BALOGUN (Nigeria) said that her delegation's participation in the vote should not be construed as detracting from General Assembly resolution 31/33. The Council had no right to suggest at its organizational session that certain aspects of the programme adopted by the General Assembly should not be accepted. Consequently, her delegation had voted for the adoption of the existing wording of paragraph 4 (e) in order to ensure that the provisions of General Assembly resolution 31/33 were observed.

18. Mr. QADRUD-DIN (Pakistan) said that his delegation had participated in the vote on paragraph 4 (e) of draft decision E/L.1743 because it felt that such a vote in no way constituted a challenge to General Assembly resolution 31/33, but simply concerned the advisability of transmitting the resolution to the Commission on Human Rights at the current time.

19. Mr. BARCELO (Mexico) said that, for procedural reasons and in the light of rule 9, paragraph 2 (b), of the Council's rules of procedure, his delegation had voted for the retention in draft decision E/L.1743 of the wording proposed by the Secretariat, which reflected the decisions taken at the thirty-first session of the General Assembly.

20. Mr. MARSHALL (United Kingdom) observed that document E/5900 provided the Council with a very valuable tool for analysis of its work, and said he hoped that a similar single document could be produced for future organizational sessions. Such a document would be even more helpful if an annex listing the dates of the meetings which the Council was to consider were added and the introduction were reshaped to indicate clearly what was to be found in each section of the document. Although document E/5900 had been designed specifically to serve the limited purpose of the adoption of the agenda for the coming sessions of the Council, it could be of use at those sessions in considering the progress made in various areas. Finally, he suggested that the document might be transmitted to the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Restructuring of the Economic and Social Sectors of the United Nations System as an annex to draft decision E/L.1743, since it was

the best guide to developments between sessions of the General Assembly.

21. The PRESIDENT announced that the Council had concluded its consideration of agenda item 3.

AGENDA ITEM 7

Elections to subsidiary bodies of the Council and confirmation of representatives on the functional commissions (concluded)*

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT

22. The PRESIDENT said the African Group had informed him that it would like the Council to postpone until the sixty-second session the election of one member from African States to the Committee on Science and Technology for Development for a term of four years beginning on the date of election and expiring on 31 December 1980. If there were no objection, he would take it that the Council agreed to that request.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 2

Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters (concluded) (E/L.1744, E/L.1745)**

23. The PRESIDENT drew attention to draft decision E/L.1744, regarding arrangements for meetings of the Committee on Negotiations with Intergovernmental Agencies.

Draft decision E/L.1744 was adopted (decision 205 (ORG-77)).

24. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft decision E/L.1745, regarding the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination established by Council resolution 1990 (LX), which he, as President, was submitting on the basis of his consultations with the Chairmen of the regional groups.

25. It had been agreed to enlarge the membership of the Sub-Committee from 16 to 23, with the following distribution of seats: six from African States, four from Asian States, four from Latin American States, four from Eastern European States and five from Western European and other States.

26. A number of delegations had requested that the Sub-Committee should hold its first session in New York rather than Geneva. He understood that that would be possible if the dates of the session were 14-18 March instead of 14-25 March 1977, as originally proposed.

27. Mr. RUTLEDGE (Department of Conference Services) recalled that the original suggestion that the Sub-

* Resumed from the 2042nd meeting.

** Resumed from the 2039th meeting.

Committee should meet at Geneva had been based on General Assembly resolutions stating that bodies should meet at their established headquarters. However, the Sub-Committee could meet in New York if the Council so wished. The permanent staff of the Headquarters Secretariat was committed for the period in question, but even at Geneva it would have been necessary to recruit temporary staff. In view of the shorter session suggested, he believed that the expenditure could be met from existing funds.

28. Mr. MAHGOUB (Sudan), supported by Mr. BENHOCINE (Algeria), proposed that, in view of the importance of the session and the volume of work facing the Sub-Committee, the session should continue at least until 21 March. The Council should also recommend that the session should have priority in the provision of conference facilities.

29. Mr. WARSAMA (Somalia) said he was of the view that the original dates of 14-25 March should be retained.

30. Mr. RUTLEDGE (Department of Conference Services) said he was not sure at the current stage what would be the full impact of a two-week session at Headquarters during that period, since it would coincide with the United Nations Water Conference. In any case, the Secretary-General was required under the relevant General Assembly resolutions to transmit the decision of the Council to the Committee on Conferences, which would be informed of the financial implications.

31. Mr. MAHGOUB (Sudan) proposed that the Council's wish that the duration of the Sub-Committee's session should be two working weeks should be conveyed to the Committee on Conferences.

32. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should adopt draft decision E/L.1745, amended as proposed by the representatives of the Sudan, Algeria and Somalia to indicate that the Council wished the Sub-Committee to meet in New York for two working weeks.

It was so decided (decision 206 (ORG-77)).

COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

33. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) recalled that the General Assembly, in its resolution 31/140, had approved the convening of the sixth session of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea in New York for a period of seven to eight weeks, starting on 23 May 1977. It had been recognized that changes would be required in the programme of scheduled meetings in order to accommodate the Conference. Among the meetings to be changed was the fifth session of the Committee on Natural Resources, scheduled to meet at Headquarters from 16 to 27 May 1977. The proposal had been made to convene the Committee at Geneva from 9 to 20 May 1977, since the services at Geneva could not accommodate the session on the dates already scheduled.

34. A statement of the administrative and financial implications of the proposal regarding the holding of the Conference in New York had been submitted to the General Assembly in document A/C.5/31/50.

35. The fifth session of the Committee on Natural Resources could be held at Geneva from 9 to 20 May 1977, unless the Council decided otherwise or unless a Member State should offer to act as host.

36. At its 74th meeting, the Committee on Conferences had taken note of those arrangements.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL WORKING GROUP ON A CODE OF CONDUCT

37. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) informed the Council that the Intergovernmental Working Group on a Code of Conduct had decided to recommend that its second session, scheduled to be held in New York from 21 February to 4 March 1977, should be postponed until 18-22 April 1977. The Working Group felt that more time was needed for Governments to prepare their views on the annotated outline of a code of conduct for transnational corporations. Since conference services would be fully committed on the new dates proposed, there would be financial implications. Details were not yet available; they would, however, be submitted to the Committee on Conferences and to the Council at its sixty-second session.

38. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objection, he would take it that the Council agreed to the two changes in scheduling mentioned by the Secretary.

It was so decided (decision 211 (ORG-77)).

AGENDA ITEM 8

Provisional agenda for the sixty-second session (E/L.1743)

39. The PRESIDENT pointed out that the list of items in part A of paragraph 1 of draft decision E/L.1743, which the Council had adopted at the current meeting, would constitute the provisional agenda for the sixty-second session, with the addition of items relating to the consideration of the provisional agenda for the sixty-third session and the elections which the Council had postponed.

40. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) noted that item 10, concerning the advancement of women, would have to be reworded in the light of the decision taken at the preceding meeting.

41. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objection, he would take it that the Council approved as the provisional agenda for the sixty-second session the list of items contained in part A of paragraph 1 of the draft decision, with the additions he had mentioned.

It was so decided.

Other matters

SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE VICE-PRESIDENTS

42. The PRESIDENT informed the Council that, as a result of the consultations which he had held in accordance with rule 18 of the rules of procedure, it had been decided that during 1977 Mr. Rivas (Colombia) would be Chairman

of the Economic Committee, Mr. Ålgård (Norway) would be Chairman of the Social Committee, Mr. Ehsassi (Iran) would be Chairman of the Policy and Programme Co-ordination Committee and Mr. Mahgoub (Sudan) would be Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Human Settlements.

HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE TO LEBANON

43. The PRESIDENT said that, in informal consultations, it had been agreed that he should make, on behalf of the Council, the following statement:

“The Economic and Social Council has taken note with satisfaction of the appeals made by the Secretary-General to the international community to respond to the urgent humanitarian needs created by the tragic conflict in Lebanon. It has also noted the establishment of a Special

Fund for that country, the appointment of Under-Secretary-General William B. Buffum as Co-ordinator of International Relief, and the progress made thus far in the administration of such relief.

“The Economic and Social Council commends the Secretary-General for the efforts he has made to provide humanitarian relief to the people of Lebanon and welcomes the programmes already started within the United Nations system to that effect, and expresses the hope that the international community will contribute generously to these endeavours.”

Closure of the session

44. The PRESIDENT declared the organizational session for 1977 closed.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

THIRD SPECIAL SESSION

Summary record of the 2045th plenary meeting held at Headquarters, New York

2045th meeting

Wednesday, 23 February 1977, at 12.50 p.m.

President: Mr. Ladislav ŠMÍD (Czechoslovakia).

E/SR.2045

Adoption of the agenda

1. The PRESIDENT said that, in accordance with rule 11 of the rules of procedure of the Council, he wished to propose the following draft agenda for the third special session of the Council:

1. Adoption of the agenda;
2. Election of a Vice-President of the Council;
3. World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination:
 - (a) Membership of the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the Conference;
 - (b) Venue of the Conference.

The agenda of the third special session was adopted.¹

AGENDA ITEM 2

Election of a Vice-President of the Council

2. The PRESIDENT said that, in accordance with rule 22 of its rules of procedure, the Council was required to elect a Vice-President to replace Mr. Rafael Rivas (Colombia), who had resigned. Mr. Donald O. Mills (Jamaica) had been nominated by the Latin American group to serve as Vice-President for 1977.

Mr. Donald O. Mills (Jamaica) was elected Vice-President by acclamation.

3. Mr. LASCARRO (Colombia) paid a tribute to Mr. Mills and congratulated him on his election to the office of Vice-President of the Council.

4. The PRESIDENT said that it had been decided that Mr. Mills would assume the functions of Chairman of the

Economic Committee and he proposed that the other Vice-President, Mr. Abdalla Mahgoub (Sudan), should assume the functions of Chairman of the Committee on Negotiations with Intergovernmental Agencies.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 3

World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (E/5911, E/L.1754):

- (a) Membership of the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the Conference;
- (b) Venue of the Conference

5. The PRESIDENT said that, in pursuance of the decision taken by the Council, at its organizational session, to enlarge the membership of the Preparatory Sub-Committee from 16 to 23 members of the Council (decision 206 (ORG-77)), he had held consultations with the Chairmen of the regional groups. However, some of the States nominated by the regional groups for membership in that Sub-Committee were not currently members of the Council. That problem had been discussed in considerable detail with the Chairmen of the regional groups concerned, who did not believe that they would be in a position to nominate exclusively members of the Council. It had also been pointed out that, in any case, the Sub-Committee would be in existence beyond December 1977 and that the same problem might therefore arise if members of the Sub-Committee ceased to be members of the Council on 31 December 1977. In an informal meeting of the members of the Council, it had been agreed that the only possible solution was to amend resolution 1990 (LX) and decision 206 (ORG-77) so that all States Members of the United Nations might be eligible for membership in the Sub-Committee.

¹ Subsequently circulated as document E/5935.

6. He drew attention to a letter from the Government of Ghana to the Secretary-General (E/5911) withdrawing the invitation to hold the World Conference in that country. It was therefore necessary to review the terms of reference of the Preparatory Sub-Committee which provided, *inter alia*, that the preparations for the Conference should be made in consultation with the Secretary-General and the Government of Ghana. The situation was urgent, as the Sub-Committee was scheduled to hold its first session at Headquarters from 14 to 25 March 1977. Accordingly, he proposed the adoption of draft resolution E/L.1754.

7. Mr. MYERSON (United States of America) said that the United States delegation had not participated in the adoption of resolution 1990 (LX) or any of the other decisions associated with it. He requested therefore that the records of the Council should reflect the fact that his delegation was not participating in the decision on draft resolution E/L.1754.

8. Mr. YORK (Federal Republic of Germany) said that it was his delegation's understanding that the draft resolution did not constitute an endorsement of any list of candidates presented thus far by the regional groups and that an opportunity would be given to the latter to reconsider their nominations in the light of the changed basis of eligibility.

9. The PRESIDENT said that he would inform the regional groups of that possibility after the adoption of the draft resolution.

10. Mr. ROUGE (France) said that his delegation did not wish to raise any objections to the draft resolution although it had some doubts about it. He hoped that his delegation's attitude would be interpreted as an indication of its goodwill and that similar goodwill would be forthcoming if, in the future, the Council was called upon to demonstrate greater flexibility with regard to the *Ad Hoc* Inter-

governmental Working Group on the Problem of Corrupt Practices. The problem of the membership of that Working Group should be resolved in the same spirit of understanding as was shown in the case of the issue dealt with in draft resolution E/L.1754.

11. Mr. MAKEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had made clear its position on the membership of the Preparatory Sub-Committee at the informal meeting preceding the special session. The regional groups had already submitted their lists of candidates and the Council should confirm their nominations. The adoption of draft resolution E/L.1754 need not delay the work of the Preparatory Sub-Committee, which should begin on time.

12. Mr. STOFOROPOULOS (Greece) said that he understood that the President would proceed to confirm members of the Preparatory Sub-Committee as soon as the lists of nominations prepared in the light of the change envisaged in draft resolution E/L.1754 were received from the Chairmen of the regional groups and that it would not be necessary to await the receipt of the nominations of all regional groups before doing so.

13. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt draft resolution E/L.1754 without a vote.

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 2046 (S-III)).

Closure of the session

14. The PRESIDENT declared the third special session closed.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

SIXTY-SECOND SESSION

**Summary records of the 2046th to 2060th plenary meetings held at
Headquarters, New York, from 12 April to 13 May 1977**

2046th meeting

Tuesday, 12 April 1977, at 10.50 a.m.

President: Mr. Ladislav ŠMÍD (Czechoslovakia).

E/SR.2046

AGENDA ITEM 1

Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters (E/5917, E/L.1755)

1. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) said that, in addition to the elections referred to in the annotations to item 15 of the provisional agenda for the sixty-second session contained in document E/5917, the Council must also elect two members from Western European and other States to the Board of Governors of the United Nations Special Fund. A reference to those elections should be added to the annotations.

2. Mr. MAKEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had no objection to the adoption of the provisional agenda as set out in document E/5917. However, he noted that a number of documents relating to items on the provisional agenda had not been made available in all working languages sufficiently early to enable delegations to study them. Such a situation was in contravention of rule 13 of the Council's rules of procedure. Moreover, it was difficult to understand why there had been such a delay, particularly since the material necessary for the preparation of many of the documents in question, such as the reports on the most recent sessions of the Commission for Social Development and the Commission on the Status of Women, had been in the hands of the Secretariat for some time. Such delays were not limited to the Council. A number of United Nations bodies had been obliged to convene resumed sessions and to postpone consideration of certain questions because of the unavailability of the necessary documents, thus incurring extra expenditure for the Organization. He asked the Secretariat for a detailed explanation of the situation.

3. Mr. FAURIS (France) recalled that, because of lack of time, the Council had been unable at its sixty-first session

to consider the possibility of shortening the list of items to be considered by the Committee on Science and Technology for Development at its fourth session. The agenda for that session was very heavy, particularly in view of the fact that the Committee would have to devote one week to the preparation of the United Nations Conference on Science and Technology for Development. It might be useful, therefore, if the Committee could postpone consideration of a number of those items until a later session.

4. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) said that the whole question of the way in which the Committee on Science and Technology for Development was to function during the preparatory period would have to be discussed by the Council at its sixty-third session. Consequently, the Council might wish to defer consideration of the matter referred to by the representative of France until that time.

5. Referring to the question asked by the representative of the Soviet Union, he said that, while he could provide a detailed report on the situation with regard to individual documents, if the Council wished to find an appropriate solution to the problem, it must adopt an over-all approach. The delay in issuing documents was attributable to the volume of documentation which the Secretariat was required to produce, and to transport and reproduction problems. In spite of those difficulties, however, all the documents for the current session were now available, with the exception of the report of the Commission on Human Rights on its thirty-third session.

6. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt the provisional agenda as contained in document E/5917.

The agenda of the sixty-second session (E/5917) was adopted.

7. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council), referring to the programme of work for the second week of the session, said that it would be preferable for the Economic Committee to consider population questions after item 7, rather than before it as proposed in document E/L.1755.

8. Mr. BENHOCINE (Algeria) noted that, according to the programme of work suggested in document E/L.1755, item 3 was to be considered in plenary meetings during the second week of the session, when the Social Committee would also be meeting to consider items 10 and 14. He therefore proposed that, in order to enable smaller delegations to participate fully in the deliberations of both the Social Committee and the Council, items 10 and 14 could be considered in either the first or third weeks of the session. Alternatively, the Social Committee could be asked to organize its work so that it would meet as infrequently as possible during the second week.

9. Mr. HERRERA VEGAS (Argentina) supported the proposal made by the representative of Algeria.

10. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) said that, because of the limited facilities available, the Social Committee and the Council would be unable to meet simultaneously. There was therefore no danger that meetings would overlap.

11. Mr. EHSASSI (Iran) said that, since a number of the documents relating to item 11 had been issued only very recently, that item should be considered after items 10 and 14 to allow delegations sufficient time to consider the documents in question.

12. The PRESIDENT said that the organization of the work of the two Committees would be discussed by the Committees themselves.

13. Mr. ALFONSO MARTINEZ (Cuba) said that his delegation would be represented in the discussion of item

11 by persons coming from Havana for that purpose. Consequently, while he did not oppose the suggestion made by the representative of Iran, he felt that each of the Committees should be allowed to determine its own time-table.

14. Mr. MARSHALL (United Kingdom) agreed with the views expressed by the representative of the Soviet Union with regard to the problem of documentation. He suggested that the Council could discuss the question when considering the provisional agenda for the sixty-third session.

15. Referring to the organization of work for the current session, he said that it might be best to adopt the programme as proposed in document E/L.1755. A number of Governments which intended to send experts to participate in the deliberations of the Council were working on the basis of that programme, so that any change might create problems. The Committees should be allowed to organize their own programme of work.

16. Mr. BRUCE (Canada) said that, if the Council was to discuss the question of documentation at the end of the current session, it might save time if the Secretariat could prepare a brief paper on the situation with regard to documentation.

17. The PRESIDENT said that the Bureau and the Secretariat would take care of the matter. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt the programme of work proposed in document E/L.1755, on the understanding that details of the programmes of work of the Economic and Social Committees should be left to the discretion of the Committees themselves.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 11.25 a.m.

2047th meeting

Tuesday, 19 April 1977, at 10.55 a.m.

President: Mr. Ladislav ŠMÍD (Czechoslovakia).

E/SR.2047

Statement by the representative of the United States of America

1. Mr. YOUNG (United States of America) emphasized the importance which his Government attached to the work of the Economic and Social Council and said that the most critical task confronting the Council was the advancement of the quality of life of humankind in all its aspects. If the Council was to be successful in its work, its members must establish a common agenda directed against the basic human misery which it was within its capacity to eliminate or alleviate; they must focus on the common enemies of humankind rather than on denunciation and polemics

against each other; they must concentrate their energy on problem-solving and not ideological arguments; and they must work towards building an effective consensus founded on those basic commitments already undertaken in the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other major international instruments.

2. Because of the concern of the Government and people of the United States with the problems dealt with by the Council, he felt compelled to warn against what he sensed was a certain impatience among the people of the United States with international development programmes or "foreign aid programmes". It was not that the people of the

United States, or of any other nation, were basically opposed to helping other peoples but that they had often been disappointed that their efforts had not resulted in any appreciable help for the poor of the world or in the liberation of the oppressed. No one could doubt, for example, the idealism or generosity of the people of the United States when in the 10 years between 1969 and 1978 the United States would have delivered more than \$10 billion worth of food. It was often asked, however, why the poor of a rich nation should be taxed in order to aid the rich of a poor nation. A significant part of the dissatisfaction of the people of the United States with the programmes of international development stemmed from the fact that efforts had been directed to giving military rather than economic and social aid and to bolstering repressive régimes. If the commitment of the people to economic and social programmes of development and to human rights programmes was to be maintained, leaders must be able to demonstrate that such programmes really worked and affected in a real and positive way the lives of the hungry, the poor, the oppressed, the tortured and the homeless.

3. In a spirit of searching for consensus in combating the enemies of all peoples, he wished to make some general comments and specific suggestions for the work of the current session.

4. Some truths could never be repeated too often, the most fundamental of which was that man was born to be free. Everything which the Economic and Social Council did should be devoted to the well-being of human beings, irrespective of race, religion, sex, age or economic condition. That truth was valid for all countries, whether or not they were Members of the United Nations, as it was an idea inherent in the human condition. It was in the nature of humankind to strive for dignity and justice, to hunger for freedom and to seek to live in community.

5. It was the duty of public officials, and especially of the governing élite of every nation, to do their utmost to realize those common goals of humankind. In that connexion, he quoted from a statement made by the new Prime Minister of India, Mr. Desai, at a meeting of non-aligned nations at New Delhi in which he had said that there had to be a moral and spiritual base for development along with its materialistic content and that freedom from want and freedom from fear had to be secured in order to make that base.

6. The words of the Indian statesman did not imply that all societies had to be perfect, since no system and no amount of money could create perfect justice. At the same time, however, there were some things which simply must never be accepted, such as the governing élites not doing their best to meet basic human needs and to prevent starvation and malnutrition, or their using the power of government to coerce their people, or their tolerating barbarous cruelties inflicted by lower-level officials.

7. The Western democracies had often been accused of giving the highest priority to political rights and of paying insufficient attention to economic and social rights. That was not so, and he drew attention in that connexion to a very important document in the history of his country, President Roosevelt's 1941 message to Congress, in which

the latter had described a world in which every inhabitant of every nation would enjoy freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom from fear and freedom from want. The current United States administration confirmed the country's commitment to those ideals, a commitment manifested over the past 30 years by its co-operation in a series of economic development programmes.

8. The inseparable nature of those human freedoms would always be borne in mind by policy-makers in the United States, and the very name of the Council clearly implied that it should do likewise.

9. Development could not be measured in terms of gross national product, and the lustre of material achievements was soon dulled if people feared political repression or not being able to feed themselves and their children.

10. The problems of hunger, torture and racism could be attacked in the Economic and Social Council with near-unanimity and high expectations of success.

11. With regard to the first-mentioned of those problems, he noted that 400 million people—15 per cent of the world's population—were starving and that many more received only minimal food requirements. That situation was not simply the legacy of international manipulations, as some would have it, but reflected mistaken perceptions of development and growth, particularly ignorance of the needs of rural populations. Millions of Americans had left the farms to seek their fortunes in cities, where many had failed to find what they had sought. If developing countries could learn from the mistakes of others, they could adapt productive systems to meet their own special conditions of climate, geography and human resources.

12. The international community could and should do much to help in that area. Countries with food surpluses could provide food aid. Through the International Fund for Agricultural Development, the United States and other countries with the financial means to do so would support efforts in the poorest countries to increase production. In addition, efforts should be made to attain the goal set at the seventh special session of the General Assembly to reduce by half the food now wasted because of poor storage. Furthermore, a system of nationally held grain reserves should be established in order to endure basic food security. It was also necessary to devise technologies and systems which took into account the relationship among food production, available resources and the environment. New systems were needed which did not rely heavily on expensive products and which were better able to deal with natural disasters. In that connexion, the creative initiative of France in establishing the Club des Amis du Sahel provided a good example.

13. Without freedom from want, words on economic development or on human rights would have little meaning to the great majority of the world's people. Similarly the problem of hunger could not be attacked without remembering justice as the goal of human society. Efforts at increasing food production would not be successful unless all nations faced up to the problems of poor distribution of land ownership and income. Without justice there could be no true stability, and there could be no true social stability

until everyone had enough to eat. Hunger continued to be a scourge in the modern world, and the growing gap between the affluent minority and the great majority of poor only highlighted the problem. While famine was a real possibility, small groups in almost every nation lived lives of luxury and waste. And if the hungry remained silent, they were not blind or deaf. Common humanity required the Economic and Social Council to find new and effective means to solve the problem.

14. He stressed that economic and social development could not be separated and expressed his Government's support for the recommendation of the Commission for Social Development (see E/5915, chap. I, draft resolution X) that the Secretary-General should be invited to appoint a working group to study ways of better integrating social development activities into the work of the Organization.

15. Referring to the problem of torture, he said that it was most deplorable that at the present time some of the gravest offences to the human person were still being committed. Not only was torture practised in its most horrible forms, but sick minds had utilized science and technology to invent unbelievably cruel and highly sophisticated methods. Torture was not used today primarily as a means of extracting information from hard-core opposition militants but rather as a means of intimidating masses of poor and oppressed people and preventing them from expressing their legitimate aspirations. That was why torture must be combated at the international level so that the poor and oppressed could find more spokesmen and thus be more fully represented in international forums.

16. He recognized that in his own country there still existed subtle but very strong systems of intimidation that inhibited the poor, the discriminated against and dissidents from speaking freely for the redress of injustices. Torture meant three things: physical torture, the problem of "missing persons" and the problem of political assassinations, for kidnapping and murder were intimidating practices which had arisen out of the recent protest movement against torture. "Torture" was a word that was repugnant to the ears, and reasons of politeness prevented discussion of the topic in society. It should be asked whether such politeness was not mere cowardice or an unwillingness to fulfil elementary duties as human beings.

17. After describing some of the methods of torture used in various parts of the world, he recalled that in recent years the General Assembly had taken a number of unanimous decisions reiterating its condemnation of torture and endorsing measures to combat it. At the thirtieth session, the Assembly had adopted, in its resolution 3452 (XXX), the Declaration on the Protection of All Persons from Being Subjected to Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, but in spite of those ringing pronouncements, adopted with unanimous support, torture continued.

18. He was convinced that, in many circumstances, cases of torture were the result of the actions of disturbed or misguided individuals, although, in a few extreme instances, the prevalence and persistence of torture suggested that it had been practised as a deliberate weapon of intimidation by Governments.

19. At all events, it was imperative to put an end to such practices and find means of making better use of the institutions in existence, because what had been done so far was obviously not enough, in spite of the unquestionable value of such instruments as the Declaration against torture and the Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners or the draft body of principles for the protection of all persons under any form of detention or imprisonment, which was currently before the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities; support for those legal instruments by all Governments could be extremely significant in strengthening the barrier against mistreatment of prisoners by lower-level officials.

20. Since the ultimate remedy, namely, publicity and public condemnation, had not yet been fully exploited, steps should be taken that would help to expose cases where torture was part of a consistent pattern of gross violation of human rights and would make it possible to learn from the experience of some Governments which had institutionalized legal norms for the protection of dissidents. That second element was important because it got to the heart of the problem. In some countries, Governments had felt themselves threatened by subversive or terrorist forces, and that situation had led them to be less stringent than they might otherwise have been in controlling the spread of torture. Nevertheless, it was necessary to bear in mind, first, that no conditions which might threaten the existence of a Government could justify resort to torture, as was recognized in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Secondly, torture as a means of maintaining order was ultimately self-defeating, because the reaction which it provoked almost always created even greater problems of public order. Thirdly, historical experience showed that many new and weak Governments had taken hold and had survived without resort to such methods.

21. For all the reasons he had mentioned, it would be worth while to consider establishing a special group of distinguished and impartial experts to investigate under United Nations mandate the problem of torture on a world-wide basis, point out where it persisted, identify the most flagrant instances and find out about cases in which Governments had been successful in combating its practice. His delegation also fully supported the United Kingdom initiative to have the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities formulate guidelines for the protection of those detained on the grounds of mental illness.

22. The United States, which attached great importance to strengthening the United Nations machinery for the protection of human rights, believed that everything possible should be done to exploit the advances made in that area over the past 30 years, to strengthen the structure of the newer procedural devices, like those provided for in Economic and Social Council resolution 1503 (XLVIII), and to provide, in addition, for new initiatives, including the idea of establishing a United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. Furthermore, the Commission on Human Rights must be made a more effective body, and the key to that lay in more complete co-operation with the Commission on the part of all nations.

23. Referring to the problem of racism and racial discrimination, he pointed out that his country had a particular responsibility in that area. As a nation long afflicted with the problem of racism and racial discrimination, it felt a responsibility to contribute to the world struggle to eliminate all those evils, and the President of the United States had therefore recently called for ratification of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. At all events, it should be borne in mind that the struggle against racism and racial discrimination in the United States, which was still going on, had been waged in general in an open and effective way which minimized violence and that the experience of that country thus offered many examples from which the rest of the world might profit. Although the United States was still struggling to appreciate the richness of diversity and to purge itself of belief in conformity and uniformity, perhaps no nation had made as much progress in its struggle against racism as the United States.

24. What was needed at the present time was a persistent, creative and concerted attack on the problem, which meant guaranteeing respect for human dignity and social justice for all. All delegations had a responsibility to see that the United Nations played a central role in that process, and the priorities which he had suggested might constitute the basis of a new consensus that would enable the world to move forward in the difficult task of realizing the dream of a world of justice and freedom. The Economic and Social Council was one of the principal places where that consensus could be formulated, strengthened and put into practice, especially since it could be hoped that, where it was a question of combating hunger, torture and racism, political rivalries and conflicts would not make consensus impossible. Although political confrontation might be a fact of life and correcting the balance of power was perhaps a prerequisite for the struggle for world justice and peace, that struggle was also a prerequisite for the building of any real world order. Accordingly, political confrontation in the Economic and Social Council was unnecessary and unhelpful, and the Council must unite its forces against the common enemies of humankind.

AGENDA ITEM 1

Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters (continued) (E/L.1756 and Add.1)

25. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) drew attention to the proposals for changes in the calendar of meetings for the remainder of 1977. He explained that it was envisaged that the organizational meeting of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination would be held on 9 May. He pointed out also that document A/AC.172/12/Add.2 set forth the financial implications of the decision to change the date of the session of the Intergovernmental Working Group on a Code of Conduct of the Commission on Transnational Corporations.

26. Mr. VOLOSHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had no objections concerning the proposals for changes in the calendar of meetings for 1977, on the understanding that in all cases the necessary documentation would be available at the appropriate time. Furthermore, if the question of the administrative and

financial implications of the continuation of the *Ad Hoc* Intergovernmental Working Group on the Problem of Corrupt Practices was put to the vote, his delegation would abstain.

27. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objection, he would take it that the Council agreed to the changes in the calendar of meetings for the remainder of 1977 proposed in document E/L.1756 and Add.1.

It was so decided (decision 213 (LXII)).

28. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council), referring to the provisional agenda for the fifth session of the Committee on Natural Resources (E/C.7/63), recalled that the Secretary-General, in accordance with rule 9 of the rules of procedure, had to draw up the provisional agenda of the Council and its standing committees. The practice followed in connexion with the Committee on Natural Resources consisted of consulting the officers of the Committee with regard to the matter.

29. On the basis of an opinion from the Office of Legal Affairs, the Secretariat had informed the officers of the Committee on Natural Resources that under the provisions of Council resolution 1979 (LIX), paragraph 1, the Council had delegated to the Committee on Natural Resources only the function of assisting the Secretary-General in the preparation and organization of the United Nations Water Conference. If the Council had found it desirable or necessary for the Conference to submit its report through the Committee on Natural Resources, it would no doubt have included an express provision to that effect. The decisions of the Water Conference were recommendations to the Council and it was the body which must consider them. For that reason, no statement of financial implications had been submitted to the Conference; that information would be available to the Council when it considered the recommendations of the Conference at its sixty-third session.

30. However, the Secretariat had also understood that there would be no legal difficulty if, through a statement which would be made by the Secretary-General of the Conference, the Committee on Natural Resources was informed of the conclusions of the Conference. That would in no way limit the terms of reference or the freedom of action of the Council when it took up the report of the Conference.

31. Subsequently, the Conference itself had adopted a decision in which it had requested that certain proposals submitted to it by ACC should be examined by the Committee on Natural Resources at its fifth session so that the latter could then submit recommendations to the Council at its sixty-third session.

32. In view of the foregoing, the Secretariat felt that the Council might wish at that point to note that, in accordance with information received from the officers of the Committee on Natural Resources, that body's provisional agenda for its fifth session would include an item on the Water Conference. The Council might also wish to place on record its understanding that in view of the status of the decisions of the Conference, that item was being included

only to give the Committee the opportunity to receive information from the Secretary-General of the Conference on its results and to consider the specific request which the Conference had made to the Committee in connexion with the ACC proposal on institutional questions.

33. Mr. YORK (Federal Republic of Germany) said that he thought the Council could take note of the inclusion of the item on the Water Conference in the provisional agenda of the fifth session of the Committee on Natural Resources, provided it was understood that no undue restrictions would be imposed on the Committee's consideration of the deliberations of the Conference. The Committee on Natural Resources was the subsidiary body of the Council competent to deal with the matter and two years would be lost if the Council waited until its sixty-third session to consider the conclusions of the Conference in depth and then refer them to the Committee.

34. Mr. MARSHALL (United Kingdom) and Mr. VOLOSHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) supported the position of the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany.

35. Mr. LINDENBERG SETTE (Brazil) said that he could not agree with the views expressed by the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany. In his opinion, since the Council was the only body competent to consider the recommendations of the Conference, any deliberations by the Committee on Natural Resources in that connexion might, instead of solving problems, create difficulties for the Council when it took up the question at its sixty-third session.

36. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) said that the only purpose of the opinion from the Office of Legal Affairs had been to clarify what were the terms of reference of the Committee on Natural Resources in connexion with approval of the recommendations of the Water Conference. That approval could be given only by the Economic and Social Council. Furthermore, it should be pointed out that the full report of the Conference would not be completed in time to be submitted to the Committee on Natural Resources at its fifth session and the Committee would therefore receive a provisional version of the recommendations of the Conference.

37. Mr. PETRELLA (Argentina) said he wondered whether it would not be possible to postpone the debate on the matter, which had not been expected at the current session, until all delegations had studied the question and could discuss the suggestions made.

38. The PRESIDENT suggested that the proposal by the delegation of Argentina should be accepted.

It was so decided.

39. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) said that in connexion with agenda item 4 (Restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system), the Council had decided to consider four specific questions, namely: (a) the agreements between the United Nations and the specialized agencies; (b) the terms of reference of the Council's subsidiary machinery; (c) the rules of pro-

cedure of the functional commissions of the Council; (d) the methods in use for the confirmation of representatives on functional commissions, a question raised by the representative of France on which there was a note by the Secretariat (E/5923). Furthermore, the Council had decided to consider in that context the question of documentation. Since the question of the rules of procedure of the functional commissions of the Council was urgent because the current rules were not fully in line with those of the Council, he suggested that the Council should examine that question first and, for that purpose, Friday, 22 April, should be the time-limit for delegations to submit amendments in writing to the draft provisional rules (E/5899).

40. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objection, he would take it that the Council agreed that Friday, 22 April, should be the time-limit for submitting amendments in writing to the draft provisional rules of procedure (E/5899), without prejudice to any other amendments which delegations might wish to submit during the course of the discussion on the matter.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 3

Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (E/5920, E/5921, E/5922)

41. The PRESIDENT suggested that the list of speakers in the general debate on item 3 should be closed on Wednesday, 20 April, at 6 p.m.

It was so decided.

42. Mr. BROAD (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the delegations of the Federal Republic of Germany and France and his own delegation, said that he wished to make some remarks concerning the report of the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (E/5922). First, he wished to point out that chapter I of the report, entitled "Matters calling for action by the Economic and Social Council or brought to its attention", had not been submitted to the Preparatory Sub-Committee for its approval and observations and he presumed that it had been prepared on the initiative of the Secretary-General himself. It followed that the delegations on behalf of which he was speaking bore no responsibility for the contents of that chapter; what was more, they wished to dissociate themselves from some parts of it. While they understood that it was desirable for reports submitted to the Council to contain chapters summarizing the issues which required its attention, it was a matter of principle that any chapter of that type should be submitted to the relevant body for its approval before being included in that body's report. The Secretariat should observe that practice in future reports submitted to the Council. Furthermore, the report unfortunately contained errors and omissions which he did not wish to go into in detail at that point. Nevertheless, he wished to place on record the over-all reservations of the

delegations on whose behalf he was speaking with regard to the report as a whole and he reserved the right to intervene on any specific point if the need to do so arose during the debate.

43. Mr. TEIXEIRA DA MOTTA (Portugal), supported by Mr. ORTNER (Austria), said that possibly the pressure of time and the fact that no summary records had been prepared for the Sub-Committee's session could explain a

series of inaccuracies in the report, which did not truly reflect what had taken place at that session. For that reason, his delegation's position would not necessarily be in line with some parts of the report. He expressed his reservations on some points included in the report and reserved the right to deal with them more fully when he thought it might be necessary to do so.

The meeting rose at 12.10 p.m.

2048th meeting

Wednesday, 20 April 1977, at 11 a.m.

President: Mr. Ladislav ŠMÍD (Czechoslovakia).

E/SR.2048

AGENDA ITEM 1

Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters (continued)

1. The PRESIDENT suggested that, taking into account the discussion at the preceding meeting and the informal consultations held since then, the Council should take note of the fact that the provisional agenda for the fifth session of the Committee on Natural Resources would include an item entitled "United Nations Water Conference" and that, under that item, the Secretary-General of the Conference would inform the Committee of the results of the Conference.

2. Mr. MARSHALL (United Kingdom) asked if it were the case that the Water Conference had requested that the Committee on Natural Resources should consider certain proposals made at the Conference, and whether the Committee's views on the subject would be available to the Council at its sixty-third session.

3. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) said that in the resolution adopted by the Water Conference on institutional arrangements for international co-operation in the water sector, it had been recommended that the proposals for interagency co-ordination presented to the Conference in the report of ACC and the Environment Co-ordination Board should be examined by the Committee on Natural Resources at its fifth session with a view to submitting its recommendations to the Economic and Social Council at its sixty-third session for consideration and implementation. Obviously, the last part of that recommendation clearly indicated that the Conference intended the Council to be the sole organ empowered to consider and implement its recommendations.

4. Miss RICHTER (Argentina) pointed out that the Economic and Social Council had already had before it the report of the Committee on Natural Resources on its fourth session.¹ That report had contained the provisional agenda

for the fifth session, which had included an item on the Water Conference. Since the Council had already approved that report of the Committee on Natural Resources, she wondered what more the Council could do in that regard at the present time.

5. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) explained that, when considering the reports of the Committee on Natural Resources, the Council did not approve the provisional agendas included therein. Thus, the Council had not yet taken any decision concerning the provisional agenda for the fifth session of the Committee on Natural Resources, nor was it being asked to do so now. However, since doubts had been raised concerning the legality of the inclusion of an item in the provisional agenda of the Committee, the Secretary-General wanted the Council to take note of the inclusion of that item.

6. Mr. YORK (Federal Republic of Germany) said that he was prepared to accept the President's suggestion, on the understanding that the Committee on Natural Resources was authorized to examine the proposals of ACC referred to it by the Water Conference, make recommendations thereon to the Council and consider the deliberations of the Conference without exceeding its powers under its terms of reference.

7. The PRESIDENT said that that was his interpretation also.

8. Mr. LINDENBERG SETTE (Brazil) requested clarification as to whether the Committee on Natural Resources would be empowered to consider the decisions of the Conference and to make recommendations to the Council on those decisions in general or only on the question which the Conference had referred to it specifically.

9. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) said that the Committee on Natural Resources could not approve the recommendations of the Conference, since they were addressed to the Council. Nevertheless, the Council could at present, if it saw fit, entrust to the Committee such tasks as it deemed appropriate.

¹ *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Fifty-ninth Session, Supplement No. 3.*

10. Mr. YORK (Federal Republic of Germany) said he was not proposing that any special task should be entrusted to the Committee. He merely desired that restrictions that were not laid down in its terms of reference should not be imposed on it.

11. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objection, he would take it that the Council took note of the fact that the provisional agenda for the fifth session of the Committee on Natural Resources would include an item entitled "United Nations Water Conference" and that, under that item, the Secretary-General of the Conference would inform the Committee of the results of the Conference.

It was so decided (decision 214 (LXII)).

AGENDA ITEM 3

Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (*continued*) (E/5920, E/5921, E/5922)

12. Mr. AL-HUSSAMY (Syrian Arab Republic) said that, with deep concern over the danger represented by racism and racial discrimination and with faith in the role which the United Nations could play in eliminating all ideologies and practices based on racism, his delegation had always striven to participate actively in the elaboration and implementation of international instruments to combat those evils, including the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (General

Assembly resolution 2106 A (XX)), the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid* (General Assembly resolution 3068 (XXVIII)) and the Programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (General Assembly resolution 3057 (XXVIII), annex). It had likewise supported the General Assembly resolutions aimed at identifying all manifestations of racism and providing for adequate means for the implementation of the Programme for the Decade. That was the spirit that should inspire preparations for the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, which should be one of the most meaningful events of the Decade.

13. For all those reasons, he commended the work done by the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the Conference and reaffirmed his delegation's decision to co-operate in all activities designed to ensure the success of the Conference. Nevertheless, since the report of the Preparatory Sub-Committee (E/5922) included the reservations made by some of its members, his delegation felt obliged to point out to the Council the danger of an attitude aimed at preventing the Conference from considering what must be its main topic, as was expressed clearly in paragraph 13 of the Programme for the Decade. It should be borne in mind that all the instruments and resolutions adopted by the United Nations on racism and racial discrimination were interrelated and expressed the sentiment of the international community.

The meeting rose at 11.30 a.m.

2049th meeting

Thursday, 21 April 1977, at 3.40 p.m.

President: Mr. Ladislav ŠMÍD (Czechoslovakia).

E/SR.2049

AGENDA ITEM 3

Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (*continued*) (E/5920, E/5921, E/5922)

1. Miss RICHTER (Argentina) said that, in participating in the discussion of the question of racism and racial discrimination, her delegation was fully aware of the importance of the topic and of the implications for States of the decisions to be adopted at the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. The fact that the General Assembly had considered it necessary to convene a world conference indicated that the measures adopted so far, although they had been valuable measures in the right direction, had not been sufficient to meet expectations and attain the goals set.

2. Proof of that was provided by the fact that the General Assembly and the Security Council were obliged time and time again to consider the situation in southern Africa,

which had given rise to situations of exceptional political gravity that went beyond the strictly humanitarian framework in which the problem had been analysed. The point was not to assign responsibilities but to co-operate closely in the search for solutions. It should be noted that the gravity of the existing situation was not caused by any indifference on the part of the United Nations to the emergence of a trend which currently appeared to be irresistible; on the contrary, the General Assembly and the Security Council had, particularly following the adoption of the historic resolution 1514 (XV), adopted decisions in which they had acknowledged that the situation in southern Africa was endangering international peace and security, and had recommended specific measures.

3. Most States had succeeded in modelling their international behaviour on the principles advocated by the United Nations. It was encouraging to note that groups of countries with a definite influence on world events shared the concern about the maintenance of colonial situations and of the policies of *apartheid*, to which the United

Nations had for some time been drawing the attention of the international community.

4. Argentina had from the outset participated in that publicizing activity. There were no problems of racism and racial discrimination in Argentina, despite the diversity of racial groups which enriched its human assets. That was no coincidence, but was due to an attitude inspired by humanitarian philosophies, which were particularly relevant at the current time. For those reasons, Argentina was particularly concerned that the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination should culminate in positive changes. Far from wishing to judge other people's behaviour or to set itself up as an example, Argentina humbly and without pride offered its own experience, which had been most satisfactory, particularly with regard to its immigrants.

5. With regard to the report of the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (E/5922), her delegation considered that detailed consultations should be held on some aspects of the report, with a view to the adoption of the best arrangements for the Conference. It was to be hoped that, in view of the importance of the subject, the necessary financial backing would be provided. With reference to the participation of non-governmental organizations in consultative status, the Argentine delegation agreed with the Sub-Committee that an extremely selective criterion should be adopted when extending invitations.

6. In conclusion, she announced her delegation's willingness to co-operate in the preparatory work for the Conference, in the same constructive spirit and in accordance with the same principles which had guided it throughout the process of decolonization.

7. Mr. MAKEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, when in 1973 it had proclaimed the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, the General Assembly had placed on the agenda of the international community the important and urgent task of totally and unconditionally eliminating racism and racial discrimination. In accordance with the principles and purposes of its Charter, the United Nations had made praiseworthy efforts to that end, adopting in particular the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, which had so far been ratified by 93 States, the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid*, to which more than 30 States were parties, and a large number of resolutions of the General Assembly and other organs. It was obvious, however, that the international community would have to adopt more forceful measures to eliminate all manifestations of racism and racial discrimination, the most repulsive form of which was the policy and practice of *apartheid* of the Pretoria and Salisbury régimes, which were trampling on the rights of the indigenous populations and maintaining them in subjection by terror.

8. The Programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, approved by the General Assembly in resolution 3057 (XXVIII), called for the international isolation of the colonialist and racist régimes in southern Africa as a first step towards their elimination.

The Programme stressed in particular that success would ultimately depend on the determination of Governments to implement the decisions of the United Nations. The racist practices of the illegal régimes had rightly been condemned, but now they should be eliminated. Those régimes would have ceased to exist long ago without the aid given to them by some imperialist States which were maintaining ties with Pretoria and Salisbury in defiance of the decisions of the United Nations and were still helping to sustain those régimes, thus becoming voluntary or involuntary accomplices in their acts.

9. The Commission on Human Rights in its resolution 7 (XXXIII), as well as other international organs, had recognized the gravity of the situation in southern Africa, expressed concern at it and reaffirmed their support for the peoples struggling for their freedom and independence. The situation in southern Africa had quite rightly moved to the forefront of world attention, since in addition to representing a human tragedy it had become a source of international tension.

10. It should not be forgotten that the evil of racism and racial discrimination was not confined to southern Africa. It also existed in other forms and manifestations in many other countries in which the citizens themselves and immigrant workers were victimized because of their race or the colour of their skin. Such discrimination, which was rooted in the social situation, was practised in a more covert and concealed manner.

11. The sixtieth anniversary of the founding of the Soviet State was being celebrated in 1977. Over so short a period of time, Soviet society had achieved noteworthy success, as a result of the brotherly friendship which existed between all the peoples in the Soviet Union. That country was an example of a felicitous solution to a problem which was afflicting all mankind. The Constitution of the Soviet Union guaranteed the equality of all Soviet citizens with no distinction of any kind. The struggle for the equality of all peoples was the official policy of the Soviet Union, which enjoyed the support of the people. The Soviet Union had been one of the first States to ratify the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid*, whose provisions it strictly observed. The Soviet Union did not recognize the illegal white minority régime in Rhodesia and had no relations of any kind with the régime in South Africa. One of the basic principles of the Soviet Union's foreign policy was support for the national liberation movements, in accordance with the decisions of the United Nations. The Soviet Union supported the adoption of the most forceful measures to combat racism and racial discrimination and advocated the just cause of the oppressed peoples of Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa.

12. The Soviet delegation believed that the resolution which the Council was to draft on the subject of the Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination should be a logical sequel to all the earlier resolutions on the question and should provide for effective measures for the rapid attainment of the goals of the Decade. For its part, the Soviet Union was prepared to assist in the preparation of such a draft resolution.

13. The Council had before it the report of the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (E/5922). The Soviet delegation considered that the work done by the Preparatory Sub-Committee, as reflected in its report, constituted a good basis for the holding of such an important international meeting before 1978, as specified in the Programme for the Decade. There was no doubt that the Conference would provide an incentive for the implementation of the United Nations resolutions calling for the isolation and boycott of the colonialist and racist régimes in southern Africa.

14. The Conference should be fully representative and he was therefore glad that the Sub-Committee had agreed that all States should be invited to participate, together with all the national liberation movements recognized by the Organization of African Unity and the League of Arab States, and that the specialized agencies and the regional intergovernmental organizations should be invited to send observers. His delegation noted with satisfaction that the Sub-Committee had satisfactorily fulfilled the tasks entrusted to it by the Council and felt that the Council should approve the Sub-Committee's recommendations and adopt the measures necessary for their submission to the General Assembly. Convinced that the Council would satisfactorily fulfil its obligations with regard to the Decade, his delegation would spare no effort to contribute to the success and implementation of the noble objectives of the Decade.

15. Mrs. SEMICHI (Algeria) said she was glad that preparations had started for the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination which, as laid down in General Assembly resolution 3057 (XXVIII), was to be one of the major features of the Decade.

16. In view of the reservations made at the previous meeting concerning the report of the Preparatory Sub-Committee, she recalled that all the delegations which had taken an active part in the preparation of the report were aware that the Rapporteur of the Sub-Committee had noted that the document would be presented in a somewhat different form, without the substance being affected. Although, in her delegation's opinion, it would have been preferable to include the agenda outlined in annex I in the body of the report, it must be pointed out that the reservations made in the Sub-Committee appeared in the report and that it was for the Council to take a definite stand on that document. For that reason, her delegation, recalling the spirit that had prevailed during the discussions, hoped that those delegations which had expressed reservations on the report as a whole would withdraw them, so as to facilitate the work of the Council and the preparations for the Conference.

17. Mr. LAMB (Observer for Australia), speaking at the invitation of the President, said that it was appropriate for his country to place before the Council some of its views on the Decade because the Council had the important responsibility of functioning as the Preparatory Committee for the World Conference. Since the Conference would be able to provide a useful focus for the Decade and would also give the international community a new impetus in the continuing struggle against the evil of racism, the Australian Government wanted it to be a success.

18. Australia regretted but understood the decision of the Government of Ghana which now required the Council to review the question of the site of the Conference. In view of the probability that the Conference would now be held at Geneva or New York, his delegation wished to point out that, since Africa was afflicted with the disease of institutionalized racism in its most virulent form, the holding of the Conference in Africa would have additional positive impact on the struggle for human rights in the southern part of that continent. Nevertheless, Australia looked forward to being able to participate in the Conference, wherever it was to be held, in order to make its contribution to the success of the common goals.

19. He would not describe in detail the Australian experience with the struggle against racism because Australia had already reported fully to the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination at its fifteenth session at Vienna (28 March–15 April 1977) on recent developments in Australian law and practice. The Australian Government believed that discrimination was an evil which affronted the dignity of mankind and which in many respects continued to exist in different forms in many parts of the world, although it was most obvious in southern Africa. There were few countries which could honestly assert that racially discriminatory habits were totally unknown to them; if racism were confined only to those countries where it was now most evident, there would be no need for an International Convention and the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination would have another name. Racism was a perversion which legislation alone could not eradicate; there must be, in tandem with legislation, vigorous educational programmes, publicity and a reiteration of the commitment to eradicate the evil.

20. On 21 March, on the occasion of the celebration of the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, the Australian Prime Minister had said that the practice of *apartheid* and of racial bigotry continued to offend human dignity and that in the pursuit of equality of man with man there could be no compromise.

21. Australia was an active member of the United Nations Council for Namibia and of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. It would also be represented at the forthcoming International Conference in Support of the Peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia to be held at Maputo from 16 to 21 May 1977. As a practical expression of its confidence in the usefulness of the Maputo Conference, the Australian Government had just announced a substantial financial contribution to the costs of the Conference.

22. Mr. VELESKO (Observer for the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), speaking at the invitation of the President, said that the Byelorussian SSR had always favoured the final elimination of racism and racial discrimination and had supported the Charter of the United Nations and the resolutions adopted on the subject. Accordingly, it fully agreed with the Secretary-General's statement, made during the celebration of the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, to the effect that racial discrimination was an affront to human

dignity and that the cruellest form of that deeply seated evil was *apartheid*.

23. The Byelorussian SSR had voted in favour of General Assembly resolution 3057 (XXVIII) and at subsequent sessions had consistently supported the struggle against racism and racial discrimination, with the conviction that those evils were vestiges of colonialism which not only impeded the exercise of the self-determination of peoples but also constituted a constant threat to international peace and security.

24. It was essential to implement General Assembly resolution 31/77, of 13 December 1976, in which the Assembly had condemned the intolerable conditions which continued to prevail in southern Africa and elsewhere, including the denial of the right to self-determination, and had urged all States to co-operate loyally and fully in achieving the goals of the Decade.

25. There were thousands of prisoners in South African gaols and mass detentions continued to be carried out under the existing repressive legislation. The South African régime, the instigator of the bloody killings at Sharpeville and Soweto, had reached the extreme of accusing children of 4 to 10 years old under the Sabotage Act, according to the statements of Mr. Makatini,¹ leader of the African National Congress. Furthermore, South Africa was persisting in its illegal occupation of Namibia in open violation of General Assembly resolution 31/146.

¹ See A/AC.115/SR.339, para. 27.

26. In Southern Rhodesia, the Smith régime was spreading humiliation and terror and its increasing aggressiveness had induced the Security Council to adopt, at the request of Botswana, resolution 403 (1977) in which it demanded the immediate and total cessation forthwith of all hostile acts committed against Botswana by the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia.

27. The blame should be placed not only on the racist régimes themselves but also on those States which collaborated with them by supplying them with economic and other aid; indeed, the imperialist circles were impeding in that manner the struggle of peoples for liberation and self-determination, an attitude which had been condemned in General Assembly resolutions 2955 (XXVII), 3117 (XXVIII), 3246 (XXIX), 3382 (XXX) and 31/34.

28. Finally, the Byelorussian SSR unreservedly supported the holding of the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination since it felt that it would be an effective means of achieving the implementation of the United Nations resolutions in that field.

29. The PRESIDENT said that, at the suggestion of the delegation of Hungary, the members of the Council would be shown the emblem which had been chosen from 42 submissions in the international competition organized by the United Nations to publicize the Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. The winner of the competition had been the Bulgarian artist, Peter Slanov Petrov.

The meeting rose at 4.40 p.m.

2050th meeting

Friday, 22 April 1977, at 3.35 p.m.

President: Mr. Ladislav ŠMÍD (Czechoslovakia).

E/SR.2050

AGENDA ITEM 3

Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (*continued*) (E/5920, E/5921, E/5922)

1. Mr. ZACHMANN (Observer for the German Democratic Republic), speaking at the invitation of the President, said that his delegation, which was a member of the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, agreed with the proposals concerning the agenda and the organizational aspects of the Conference which were contained in the relevant report (E/5922).

2. No one would deny that the elimination of racism, racial discrimination and *apartheid* was necessary in the interests of peace and international co-operation. Despite the numerous appeals and resolutions aimed at ending those abominable practices, racist régimes continued to suppress the legitimate rights of the African peoples by terror and force.

3. It was well known that the racist régimes were able to persist in their attitude because of the political, economic and military support they received from other States, whose conduct had been condemned in various resolutions adopted by the General Assembly at its thirty-first session. While the representatives of those States condemned *apartheid* and racism in word, they advanced all kinds of reservations when the time came to take concrete measures.

4. A number of States, including the German Democratic Republic, had repeatedly emphasized that racism, racial discrimination and *apartheid* were not only violations of individual human rights, or manifestations of psychopathic excesses of certain individuals, but were systematic crimes against humanity aimed at securing profits for capitalism, maintaining colonial exploitation and oppression and setting peoples against each other.

5. The time had come for words to be followed by deeds. The relevant resolutions of the United Nations must be fully applied and the objectives of the Decade for Action to

Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination must be fully attained.

6. In the view of his delegation, the task of the Conference was to make a mid-term review of the Decade and adopt an action-oriented programme on the elimination of racism, racial discrimination and *apartheid*. In that connexion, the Conference should, among other things, contribute to the full application of United Nations resolutions on racism, racial discrimination, *apartheid*, decolonization and self-determination, and discuss new measures aimed at isolating and defeating the racist régimes. The Conference should unmask the peace-threatening role of the racist régimes. It should point out the main obstacles to the elimination of racism and racial discrimination and outline ways and means for putting an end to the political, economic and military support given to racist régimes in southern Africa by certain States and international corporations. It should adopt measures for increasing assistance to the legitimate struggle of the national liberation movements in Namibia, Zimbabwe and South Africa.

7. The more secure world peace was, the easier it would be to fight actively against colonialism, racism and imperialist threats. Peace, détente and effective measures to end the arms race would promote the implementation of the goals and objectives of the Decade. His delegation therefore believed that that inseparable interrelationship should be given due consideration in the deliberations of the forthcoming Conference.

8. In conclusion, he quoted the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party and Chairman of the Council of State of the German Democratic Republic, who, in his message to the Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* on the occasion of the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, had stressed that his country, like other socialist States, would continue to contribute to the struggle to end racial discrimination which had brought so much suffering to mankind and to be a reliable ally of peoples fighting for national and social liberation.

9. Mr. VALDERRAMA (Philippines) said that it was the hope of his delegation that the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination would contribute to the universal struggle to attain justice, human dignity and freedom.

10. His country had given full support to the objectives of the Programme for the Decade and was committed to the fight for the elimination of colonialism, racism, racial discrimination and *apartheid*. As a State party to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the Philippines had supported the work of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination. His country's membership in the Special Committee against *Apartheid* and the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against *Apartheid* in Sports was further proof of its commitment to the struggle.

11. The Government of the Philippines had always supported the work of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on

the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the Special Committee against *Apartheid* and the United Nations Council for Namibia, as well as that of the Commission on Human Rights and the Commission on the Status of Women, and had contributed to various United Nations humanitarian funds and to the Support and Solidarity Fund for Southern Africa, which had been established by the non-aligned countries and which was dedicated to improving the lot of the oppressed black peoples of Namibia, Zimbabwe and South Africa.

12. His Government regretted the inability of Ghana to act as host to the Conference and hoped that that country would remain in the forefront of the struggle for human dignity and the attainment of the objectives of the Programme for the Decade. His delegation hoped that another African country would offer to serve as host country; failing that, however, his delegation reserved the right to express its preference in the choice between Geneva and New York.

13. With regard to the report of the Preparatory Sub-Committee (E/5922), he expressed support for the provisional agenda in general and, in particular, for the proposal to appoint a Secretary-General and invite all States to participate in the Conference. His delegation agreed with the suggestion that the Conference should concentrate on the struggle against racism, racial discrimination and *apartheid* in southern Africa.

14. Convinced of the necessity of giving the widest possible publicity to the Conference, his delegation welcomed the reports of the Secretary-General on the activities undertaken by Governments, United Nations organs and the specialized agencies for that purpose (E/5920 and E/5921).

15. Finally, he observed that the established procedure had not been followed, since the report of the Preparatory Sub-Committee had not been introduced, and he expressed the hope that that would not constitute a precedent.

16. Mr. WU Hsiao-ta (China) said that racial discrimination and *apartheid* still constituted heavy shackles on the people of some regions, in particular those in southern Africa who were yet to achieve their independence. In order to suppress the Azanian people, the South African racist régime had promulgated over many years countless discriminatory laws and regulations such as the *apartheid* laws and the Public Safety Act, brutally persecuting the Africans. The South African authorities had forcibly corralled more than 17 million Africans within barren lands accounting for only 13 per cent of the total area of South Africa, while allowing some 4 million whites to appropriate 87 per cent of the country which included the cities, industrial centres, mines and fertile land. The black inhabitants, whether they lived in bantustans or cities, were leading a sub-human existence. In Namibia, the South African authorities had driven 800,000 Africans into "homelands", while letting the white racists seize all the mines and fertile lands. The Rhodesian racist régime had promulgated more than 60 discriminatory laws and had forcibly occupied the fertile land accounting for half the total area of the country. Large numbers of people in Zimbabwe had been forced to leave their homes and move

to "reservations", thus becoming cheap labour for the white capitalists and plantation owners. To the black inhabitants, South Africa, Namibia and Rhodesia were a veritable hell on earth.

17. Racism and racial discrimination were the products of colonialism. In order to smash the shackles imposed on them, the peoples of southern Africa who had not yet achieved independence were waging heroic struggles. Since the middle of June 1976, Azania had seen a succession of large-scale struggles led by the students of Soweto and supported by the people of various social strata. The patriotic armed forces of Zimbabwe were growing in strength and the area in which they operated had continued to expand, thus dealing increasingly heavy blows to the colonial army. The armed forces of Namibia were also making great strides on the road to victory.

18. The Vorster and Smith racist régimes, like all other reactionary forces, would never of their own accord yield their positions and, on the contrary, were intensifying the use of dual counter-revolutionary tactics in an attempt to maintain their domination. On the one hand, they increased their military power and, on the other hand, they continued to resort to "peace talks" and to various kinds of political fraud. In October 1976, the reactionary authorities of South Africa had directed the farce of the so-called "independence of Transkei"; in 1977, they had established a puppet "transitional government" in Namibia. Those clumsy frauds had not, however, deceived the peoples of southern Africa, who understood that it was only by persisting in armed struggle that they could defeat racism and colonialism.

19. Currently, the super-Powers were stepping up their rivalry in southern Africa. While one super-Power was trying by every possible means to maintain its interests, the other super-Power, which had styled itself the "natural ally" of the national liberation movement, was intensifying its infiltration and expansion in southern Africa, sowing discord and creating divisions among the national liberation organizations and African States. Recently, that super-Power had recruited mercenary forces for a large-scale invasion of the Republic of Zaire. All those events had made it more difficult for the people of southern Africa to obtain their national liberation. On the other hand, by negative example, those events had taught them to be wary not only of the danger of racism and colonialism but also of that of super-Power hegemonism.

20. The just struggle of the peoples of southern Africa against racism and for national liberation was a component part of the struggle of numerous third world peoples against imperialism, colonialism and hegemonism, and it was only natural that they could count on the solidarity and support of people the world over. The Political Declaration¹ adopted by the First Conference of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity and the League of Arab States, which was held at Cairo from 7 to 9 March 1977, had demonstrated the unshakable will of 60 African and Arab States to support the peoples of southern Africa and to fight and triumph together with them. The Government and people of China would, as always, support

the peoples of southern Africa in their just struggle against colonialism, racism, zionism, imperialism and hegemonism.

21. His delegation supported the convening of the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination and wished it success.

22. Mr. KUBRA (Iraq) reiterated his Government's resolute support for the Programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, which it regarded as a good basis for action to liberate the world from colonialism, imperialism and racism. One of the most pernicious forms of racial discrimination was that being applied in southern Africa and in the occupied Arab territories. The various forms of oppression to which the people of South Africa had been subjected had become a threat to peace and stability not only on the African continent but throughout the world.

23. The problems of the oppressed Arab people in occupied Palestine were analogous to those of the people of South Africa, and the struggle for national liberation of the people of South Africa, Zimbabwe, Namibia, occupied Palestine and other lands was a common struggle. For that reason, the First Conference of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity and the League of Arab States had reaffirmed the need to strengthen their peoples' united front for national liberation and had condemned imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, zionism and *apartheid* and all other forms of discrimination and racial and religious segregation.

24. Iraq fully supported the effective implementation of all the United Nations decisions and resolutions on the item under consideration. It believed that the report of the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (E/5922) was a positive step towards eliminating those ills and therefore hoped that it would be accepted without reservation.

25. Mr. FAKTOR (Czechoslovakia) said that, despite the efforts made by the United Nations, the specialized agencies and many other organizations, the reality was that racism and racial discrimination continued. One example of that fact was that in Southern Rhodesia, South Africa and Namibia such practices had become the official policy of the white régimes, which were able to persist in that course of action thanks to the support received from the imperialist countries, particularly members of NATO, despite the fact that the representatives of those countries often spoke of freedom, human rights and equality.

26. Racism and racial discrimination were concepts alien to the nations of Czechoslovakia, and its Government, by policy and through its system of education and mass media, gave its citizens the opportunity of acquainting themselves with all the negative aspects of such practices.

27. Czechoslovakia fully supported the struggle of all oppressed peoples against racism and racial discrimination, and his delegation, which had supported the adoption by the General Assembly of the Programme for the Decade, expected that the Council would at the current session evaluate the course of the Programme and adopt measures to ensure the effectiveness of all contemplated action.

¹ See A/32/61.

28. Miss DJURIČKOVIC (Yugoslavia) said that she regarded the item under consideration as one of the major topics being dealt with by the Council at the current session. It had become manifest that, in addition to the struggle of the oppressed peoples, it was necessary to adopt political measures to ensure the elimination of racism, racial discrimination and *apartheid* in South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and Namibia as well as other strongholds of colonialism and foreign domination.

29. The World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination constituted a significant part of the efforts of the United Nations to isolate politically and economically the racist régimes of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia, particularly in the field of military and technological co-operation. Furthermore, that Conference, together with those to be held at Maputo and Lagos, should result in full support being given to the liberation movements.

30. Since, as stated in the Programme for the Decade, it was highly important that the Conference should be convened in 1978, her delegation believed that the adoption of a decision to that effect by the Economic and Social Council at the current session would be very useful in order to enable the General Assembly to take up the item at its thirty-second session. For that reason, her delegation was prepared to support any draft resolution summing up the proposals contained in the report of the Preparatory Sub-Committee. As a member of the Sub-Committee, her delegation was also prepared to participate in any future work of that body if the need arose.

31. In conclusion, despite the reservations which some delegations might have with regard to the report of the Preparatory Sub-Committee, there seemed to be general agreement on the need to hold the Conference, and it would be very important for the Council to take a decision on the various issues related to the organization of the Conference in order to expedite its preparation.

32. Mr. MARTYNENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that it could be inferred from the documentation submitted for consideration of the item that in recent years meaningful contributions had been made to the cause of the elimination of racism and racial discrimination. Significant among those contributions were those of the socialist countries and the developing countries; as a result of their efforts, the General Assembly had adopted the Programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination and important international instruments, among which mention should be made of the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid*, and the resolutions which condemned other forms of racism adopted at the thirtieth and thirty-first sessions.

33. Mention should also be made of the significant work carried out by the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, the World Conference for Action against *Apartheid* to be held at Lagos in August 1977 and the International Conference in Support of the Peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia which would be held at Maputo from 16 to 21 May 1977. The Ukrainian SSR would participate in the latter Conference in order to support the cause of self-

determination and independence, and it had already made an important financial contribution to that Conference. It should also be noted that the First Conference of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity and the League of Arab States had condemned the activities of the racist régimes.

34. Despite all that, racism had not yet been eliminated and continued to enjoy the support of the most reactionary circles of imperialism. It was regrettable that many States were not applying the measures set forth in the Programme for the Decade and had not become parties to international instruments such as the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. That situation indicated a negative attitude towards the struggle against racism.

35. South Africa was the principal bulwark of racism and racial discrimination, the law of that country being based on those principles. The South African Government supported the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia, and the violent and cruel oppression employed by those two régimes had been condemned by the entire world. Furthermore, the bloody struggle which they had undertaken against the national liberation movements represented a threat to neighbouring independent countries and to international peace and security.

36. However, the Pretoria and Salisbury régimes were not solely responsible for the situation, and the same charges could be made against those States whose economic and military aid made it possible for the two régimes to maintain their current position. There could be no doubt that investments in southern Africa by transnational corporations from NATO countries represented investments in the system of *apartheid* itself, a system which ensured their continued exploitation of African resources. Furthermore, those very forces which supported racism in southern Africa were also trying to change the course of history in the independent countries of Africa and Asia and, among other things, had even resorted to the assassination of progressive political leaders.

37. Racial discrimination was anachronistic and had been strongly condemned by the peoples of the world. For their part, the socialist States had eliminated all forms of discrimination and had made it possible for hundreds of nationalities to live together in perfect harmony. Accordingly, the struggle being waged by other peoples against oppression had the full support of the socialist countries. The twenty-fifth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union had declared that the total elimination of systems of colonialist oppression and racism represented an urgent task. The Ukrainian SSR firmly supported the implementation of the Programme for the Decade and the other relevant decisions of the United Nations, and would provide every assistance in ensuring respect for the principle of self-determination, a principle which lay at the very heart of the socialist system. His country also condemned South African manoeuvres aimed at establishing a puppet régime in Namibia, as well as oppression of the indigenous people of Southern Rhodesia.

38. In proclaiming the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, the General Assembly

had based its decision on a desire to put an end to the last manifestations of such evils, and all Member States had an obligation to implement the Assembly's decisions in that respect. Chapter V of the Secretary-General's report (E/5920) showed that the Office of Public Information had conducted certain activities in that respect. However, the Office must make a greater effort, and in that connexion, it should be noted that, in resolution 31/6 H, the General Assembly had proclaimed that any collaboration with the racist régime of South Africa constituted a hostile act against the people of South Africa and a defiance of the United Nations and the international community. That idea must be more fully reflected in all aspects of the Office's work, as well as in the information activities of the ILO and UNESCO.

39. The resolutions adopted at the most recent sessions of the General Assembly, as well as the exchange of views which had taken place in the Council and in the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the Conference, showed clearly that the overwhelming majority of Member States attached great importance to the convening of the Conference in 1978 as a means of drawing attention to the struggle against racism and racial discrimination throughout the world, and in southern Africa in particular. His delegation considered that the Secretariat should make every effort to ensure the timely preparation of documentation needed for the Conference and make practical and specific recommendations on organizational measures leading to the convening of the Conference in 1978.

40. In general, his delegation supported the recommendations and proposals concerning the provisional agenda contained in the report of the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (E/5922); that provisional agenda included, among other things, a review of progress achieved and the identification of major obstacles encountered at the global, regional and national levels with regard to combating racism, racial discrimination and *apartheid*. His delegation thought it extremely important to include in the agenda of the Conference the question of the evaluation of the effectiveness of methods employed for combating racism and racial discrimination, including the impact of international conventions, declarations and recommendations. The Conference should consider the question of the formulation of effective ways and means and concrete measures for securing the full eradication of racism, racial discrimination and *apartheid*, particularly with respect to the full and universal implementation of the relevant United Nations resolutions and the preparation of new international instruments.

41. It was also essential to emphasize the importance of international support and assistance for the peoples and movements active in the struggle against colonialism and racial discrimination, as well as for those forces committed to the isolation and elimination of racist régimes in southern Africa.

42. With regard to the participation of non-governmental organizations in the Conference, his delegation thought that, in view of the large number of organizations which had been granted consultative status by the Council, it was important, when preparing invitations to participate in the

Conference, to take into account the activities of the said organizations in the struggle against racism and their real contribution to the Programme for the Decade. His delegation was prepared to support the draft resolution being prepared in connexion with the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, and pledged its full co-operation in ensuring the Programme's success.

43. Mr. ABDALLAH (Tunisia) said that the ideals of States Members of the United Nations must be translated into positive concerted action. Racism and racial discrimination, which were a disgrace to humanity and represented an open and shameful violation of the Charter of the United Nations, had been resolutely condemned by the international community and world public opinion. However, it was now necessary to embark on an unceasing struggle against the last bulwarks of that loathsome scourge. Ever since its independence, Tunisia had been engaged in increasing efforts to combat the evils of racism, racial discrimination and *apartheid* in all their forms. Although Tunisia had never experienced problems of that kind, any manifestation of discrimination in any form whatsoever was, in accordance with the country's legislation, a punishable offence.

44. On many occasions, the President of the Republic of Tunisia had pledged his total support for the oppressed peoples of southern Africa and Palestine in their struggle against all forms of racism and colonial domination. In that connexion, Tunisia was one of the countries which had ratified the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid*, and it hoped that other countries would ratify the Convention as quickly as possible since it provided States with an opportunity to give concrete expression to their good intentions.

45. The Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination should strengthen the determination of all States to act together in eliminating all forms of discrimination and in liberating those still subject to it. Tunisia reaffirmed its solidarity with the peoples of Zimbabwe, Namibia and Palestine in their struggle to free themselves from such evils. The international community should not limit itself to condemning those racist régimes which still existed in southern Africa and Palestine, but should also, and above all, condemn those which were really responsible for the survival of racist policies, namely those States which provided the racist régimes with political and material aid, since, without such help and support, the oppressors would long since have collapsed in the face of the determination of States Members of the United Nations and their repeated condemnation.

46. Tunisia firmly supported the convening of the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination to be held in 1978, and hoped that participation in that Conference would be as broad as possible. It was vital to work together to ensure the success of an undertaking which would provide the final impetus for the elimination of régimes based on discrimination, particularly in southern Africa and the Middle East.

47. His delegation welcomed the report of the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the Conference, which augured well for the future success of the Conference, in accordance with all the relevant United Nations resolutions.

48. Mrs. SEMICHI (Algeria) said that, in proclaiming the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination in 1973, the General Assembly had based its decision largely on the serious way in which racism in all its forms impeded progress and the strengthening of international peace and security.

49. It should not be forgotten that the entry into the United Nations of a large number of newly independent third world countries had led to the acceleration of a movement which encouraged the international community in its efforts to eliminate racism and racial discrimination wherever it occurred, but particularly in Africa, a continent which for centuries had been the site chosen by a few colonial Powers for the exploitation of all physical and human resources. Even now, at a time when almost the entire continent was independent, and despite the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council, the illegal régimes of southern Africa continued to implement their racist policy, euphemistically referred to as the "policy of separate development"; such a policy could conceal from no one the desire of those régimes to maintain the policy of *apartheid* and "bantustanization" permanently in the region, with consequences which represented a real threat to international peace and security.

50. With a feeling of revulsion and indignation, she noted that racism and racial discrimination extended to other parts of the world, with similar manifestations of violence and cruelty. The tragedy of the Palestinian people and their sufferings at the hands of a system based on religious discrimination was a living example which the international community had before it. Algeria would continue to give its full and lasting support to the Palestinian people, who were the victims of a form of racism in the service of an expansionist and discriminatory policy. With the same faith in the principles which had always guided its international conduct, Algeria dedicated itself to combating racism and racial discrimination, however they might be disguised.

51. The situation of migrant workers continued to be a cause of concern for many third world countries. Although it must be recognized that some Governments of the countries receiving such workers appreciated the contribution which they made to the balance of their economy and had adopted some measures to guarantee their security, it was none the less deplorable to see that social efforts were not commensurate with the sacrifices of those groups of emigrants. In that connexion, she noted with satisfaction the proposal that the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination should consider an item related to international and national action to ensure the cessation of all discriminatory measures against migrant workers.

52. Her delegation wished to stress once again its satisfaction at the progress made in the preparations for the Conference; substantial results had been obtained with the adoption by the Preparatory Sub-Committee of the report containing the draft provisional rules of procedure and the draft provisional agenda for the Conference. The latter was the result of close collaboration among a large number of member delegations and had been adopted by the Sub-Committee by consensus.

53. The Conference was unquestionably a milestone in the struggle waged by the international community for the

elimination of the scourge of racism, which afflicted a large part of mankind, a decisive moment in the Decade and a testimony to world solidarity and the commitment of Member States in the struggle against racism and racial discrimination. Algeria, which had ratified the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, would spare no effort to ensure the success of the Conference.

54. Miss HOLZER (Austria) said that Austria's basic position on the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination and the World Conference was well known. The Programme for the Decade, as approved by the General Assembly in resolution 3057 (XXVIII), and the objectives and policy measures contained therein continued to meet with its full approval. One proof of the importance which Austria attached to the question of human rights and fundamental freedoms was its participation in the work of the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the Conference and in various other United Nations bodies dealing with human rights. Austria was particularly concerned about the situation in southern Africa, where the persistence of the grossest form of racial discrimination presented the threat of bloody racial confrontations. Austria hoped that the World Conference would help to increase general awareness of the problem of the existence and persistence of racism in certain parts of the world and its consequences, inspire further efforts for the elimination of racial discrimination, and ensure that reason prevailed in southern Africa and that a peaceful solution was achieved.

55. On the occasion of the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, on 21 March, the Austrian Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Willibald Pahr, had sent a message to the Secretary-General in which he had expressed his country's profound concern about the persistence of racism and its solidarity with the victims of racial discrimination. In line with its support for the struggle of the oppressed peoples of southern Africa, Austria had recently contributed the sum of \$5,000 to the International Conference in Support of the Peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia, to be held in May at Maputo.

56. Austria had welcomed with appreciation the offer made by the Government of Ghana to act as host to the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination and regretted that that offer could not be maintained, because it felt that it would have been most appropriate to hold the Conference on African soil.

57. Mr. MOHAMMED (Bangladesh) said that the Government and people of Bangladesh were strongly committed to the total and final eradication of all forms of racism and racial discrimination. Under its Constitution, Bangladesh was committed to support for oppressed peoples throughout the world struggling against imperialism, colonialism and racism.

58. The scourge of racism and racial discrimination was an affront against humanity. Africa was merely the geographical context where the struggle had gained momentum; with the collapse of colonialism, the islands of racism and *apartheid* in southern Africa had become the focus of the wrath of the whole international community. Those régimes would, however, have to yield to the irreversible tide of history.

59. Racism and racial discrimination in all their forms had been unequivocally condemned by the United Nations and world public opinion. The international community should now express through action its determination to eliminate those evils completely. To that end, the General Assembly had proclaimed the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination and had adopted a broad programme of action, including the holding, in 1978, of the World Conference. His delegation felt that wide publicity should be given to the Programme for the Decade, because it believed that it was essential to mobilize world public opinion. It also in general supported the recommendations contained in the report of the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the Conference because it felt that that report constituted a solid basis for the preparation of the Conference and that it was essential that there should be the widest possible representation and participation in the Conference.

60. In conclusion, he pointed out that Bangladesh, which was one of the least developed countries, appreciated the inability of the Government of Ghana to act as host to the Conference and hoped that it would continue to keep its place in the vanguard of the struggle against racism and racial discrimination.

61. Mr. KARUHIJE (Rwanda) said that the scourge of racism and racial discrimination constituted one of the main obstacles to the implementation of the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, inasmuch as it divided men from birth, throughout their lives, and even after death, since there were separate cemeteries for blacks and whites.

62. Rwanda felt solidarity with the people of South Africa, who were suffering the most perverse form of racism, *apartheid*, and with the Palestinian people, who were the victims of infamy, and it condemned the external aid received by the racist régimes of southern Africa.

63. With regard to the Decade, his delegation paid a tribute to the specialized agencies, and to non-governmental organizations and private organizations for the work they

had done in support of the Decade, and it thanked the Council and all its bodies for the efforts they had made in that connexion.

64. Investigations carried out in the United States of America and France showed that there was destined to be a mingling of the races and that in 2,000 years time the population of the globe would be homogeneous. He hoped that it would not be necessary to wait 20 centuries to see the scourge of racial discrimination disappear from the face of the earth.

65. His delegation considered that the holding of the Conference was necessary and urgent, because it would enable the international community to gain an awareness of the problem of racism. Referring to the reservations set forth in the report of the Preparatory Sub-Committee, he said he hoped that the Council would be able to approve that document by consensus.

66. Mr. DOWNES-THOMAS (Assistant Secretary of the Council) said that the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination had recommended, in part one of its report (E/5922), that a member of the Division of Human Rights should attend the International Conference in Support of the Peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia to be held at Maputo. That recommendation, if approved by the Council, would entail financial consequences for the Division of Human Rights in the amount of \$2,000 for travel and subsistence expenses.

67. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objection, he would take it that the Council accepted the recommendation of the Sub-Committee that a member of the Division of Human Rights should attend the International Conference in Support of the Peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia.

It was so decided (decision 215 (LXII)).

The meeting rose at 5.25 p.m.

2051st meeting

Monday, 25 April 1977, at 3.35 p.m.

President: Mr. Ladislav ŠMÍD (Czechoslovakia).

E/SR.2051

AGENDA ITEM 3

Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (*continued*) (E/5920, E/5921, E/5922)

1. Mr. WASILEWSKI (Poland) said that racism and racial discrimination were totally incompatible with the basic principles and ideological foundations of the socio-political system in his country. Poland had always attached great importance to United Nations activities aimed at eradicating colonialism, racism, *apartheid* and all forms of racial

discrimination; it was a party to international instruments relating to that subject, including the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid*; in March 1977 it had ratified the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights; finally, it had been on Poland's initiative that the Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity, which classified *apartheid* as a

crime against humanity, had been adopted. In addition, Poland gave constant and unlimited support to the liberation movements in southern Africa, his delegation was a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia and his Government had no relations whatsoever with the racist régimes of southern Africa.

2. For all those reasons, Poland fully supported the goals of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. The World Conference on that topic would be a highly appropriate means of ensuring the full success of the Decade and Poland, which was in favour of holding that Conference in 1978, welcomed the recommendations made by the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the Conference in its report (E/5922), which provided a sound basis for the successful work of the Conference.

3. Miss MANGANARA (Greece) said that her country, in which racial discrimination was unknown, supported the goals of the Decade and for that reason had voted in favour of General Assembly resolution 3377 (XXX), in addition to having ratified the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

4. For the success of the Programme for the Decade sustained efforts by the entire international community would be needed and it must be borne in mind that the elimination of racism and racial discrimination would also require educational action and profound changes of outlook.

5. Her delegation considered that the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, whose objectives were set forth in paragraph 13 (a) of the Programme for the Decade, which was annexed to General Assembly resolution 3057 (XXVIII), should not be simply a technical meeting for the study of racism and racial discrimination but should be a political meeting at the highest level which would make it possible to adopt effective measures for the elimination of those evils. In that context, her delegation supported, in its basic aspects, the report of the Preparatory Sub-Committee (E/5922). However, it maintained any reservations which it might have stated on earlier occasions with regard to certain specific points raised in that report. The position which her delegation would adopt in relation to any draft resolution submitted on the item would be determined in the light of the principles which she had just set forth.

6. Mr. SIDDIQ (Afghanistan) said that racial discrimination constituted one of the gravest violations of human rights and that his country, which had enshrined the principle of human dignity, freedom and equality in its Constitution, had always condemned racial discrimination in all its manifestations. The most extreme forms of racism and racial discrimination were those which were practised in southern Africa, but in that region the effort of the peoples to secure respect for their fundamental rights had been given new impetus, as demonstrated by the armed struggle of the peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia and the rebellion of the people of South Africa against the *apartheid* régime. Afghanistan, which considered that the situation prevailing in southern Africa constituted a threat to international peace and security, supported the right of the peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia to self-deter-

mination and independence and considered that *apartheid* was a crime against humanity. Similarly, it supported the Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and the Programme for the Decade, particularly the World Conference to be held in 1978, which, it was to be hoped, would be held in Africa.

7. In that connexion, he said that his delegation was in agreement with the proposals made by the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the Conference as they appeared in its report. In view of the importance of the decisions taken by the United Nations with regard to the matter, he hoped that all of them would be put into effect by the international community.

8. Mr. SAAD (Sudan) said that under the Constitution of the Sudan all persons were equal before the law, irrespective of origin, race, domicile, sex, language or religion. Moreover, the President of the Sudan had stated in February 1977 that his country's foreign policy with regard to Africa was firmly based on its commitment to the principles of defending the liberation struggle and human rights and of actively combating racism and racial discrimination. The Sudan had ratified the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid* and had acceded to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. It fully supported the oppressed peoples of Azania, Namibia, Palestine and Zimbabwe, who were the victims of racist policies and racial discrimination.

9. Those policies had been condemned by the international community. That condemnation represented a positive step, but it was not enough. Moral support for oppressed peoples gave them hope and inspiration, but the material support given to those who oppressed them rendered those efforts ineffective. If the international community really wished to combat racism and racial discrimination during the Decade, it had but two options: either to withhold the means of strengthening the position of those who were oppressing the peoples of southern Africa and Palestine or to provide those peoples with the material means that would enable them to liberate themselves from racism, racial discrimination and *apartheid*.

10. His delegation, which attached great importance to the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, felt that everything possible should be done to ensure that it produced positive results. It therefore hoped that the Council would adopt unanimously the recommendations of the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the Conference.

11. Mr. KANAZAWA (Japan) observed that his country had always opposed all forms of discrimination and that more than half a century earlier it had been among the first to oppose racial discrimination in an international forum, condemning it in the League of Nations. Its present Constitution barred all discrimination and, in the light of those facts, and in the belief that no meaningful social and economic development could be attained by any society where discrimination was widely practised, Japan had supported the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination.

12. In that same spirit, it supported the convening of the World Conference and considered that the Preparatory Sub-Committee had performed a praiseworthy task. Participation in the Conference should be sufficiently broad to enable it to command the greatest possible support from all countries that opposed racism. The items on the draft provisional agenda for the Conference were well organized and the Conference could achieve important results if it considered those items in a constructive manner and if all the participating States exercised restraint so as to avoid turning the Conference into a forum of political confrontation.

13. In trying to formulate effective measures, the Conference would have to bear in mind, first, that the measures to be adopted should be practical measures that could be implemented in each of the participating countries. In that connexion, greater emphasis should be placed on the importance of long-range educational programmes aimed at inculcating international understanding and respect for human rights and eliminating the ignorance and fear which nourished racism and racial discrimination. Secondly, any measure adopted by the Conference recommending concerted action by the international community should be of a peaceful nature.

14. Miss BALOGUN (Nigeria) said that Nigeria's position with relation to the question of racism and racial discrimination had been set forth repeatedly in many international forums within and outside the United Nations. Nigeria had no racial problems and therefore the question of discrimination between different races was virtually non-existent in that country. The Constitution of Nigeria included provisions prohibiting discrimination on grounds of sex, race or religion, and Nigeria was a party to both the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid*. Throughout the years, Nigeria had always given complete moral, material and political support to the peoples who were victims of racism and discrimination, particularly to those who were struggling to free themselves from oppression and repression in the racist and colonialist régimes of southern Africa. For those reasons, it was in favour of the adoption of political, economic and other sanctions to oblige those régimes to agree without delay to black majority rule.

15. Some Member States, in contravention of United Nations resolutions, continued to collaborate with the racist régime and, in so doing, contributed directly or indirectly to their maintenance. In that context, she recalled that, in his statement in the Security Council debate on the question of South Africa, the Commissioner for External Affairs of Nigeria had said, *inter alia*, that the hesitation of some Members to invoke Chapter VII of the Charter was due to the fear that that would open the door to economic sanctions.¹ It must be recognized that countries which had invested heavily in racist South Africa had invested even more heavily in the countries of black Africa. The time had come for Africans to consider seriously which way they must go in that matter. They

could not continue to deal with institutions which at the same time catered to régimes that held fellow African people in bondage and slavery. Economic sanctions, especially the cessation of new investments in South Africa, was an action that must be taken. In Western countries, there was a school of thought which believed that loans and investments went a long way towards helping the black majority and that their cessation would have devastating effects on the blacks. That reasoning was, however, highly questionable, for the black people did not benefit from the gigantic development in certain sectors of the South African economy and could not sink lower into poverty or live under more humiliating conditions than they currently did, confined in bantustans.

16. It was clear from the words of the Commissioner for External Affairs that the United Nations must invoke Chapter VII of its Charter. Member States must think less of the economic losses that that would entail for some States and think more about the appalling situation of the black peoples oppressed by the racist and colonial régimes in southern Africa.

17. As part of Nigeria's commitment to the implementation of the Programme for the Decade, her delegation had participated in the preparatory work for the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination scheduled for 1978. The Government of Nigeria would, in addition, have the privilege of acting as host to the World Conference for Action against *Apartheid*, to be held at Lagos, arrangements for which had already reached an advanced stage. Nigeria had also been Chairman of the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, the report of which was one of the basic documents currently under consideration. Her delegation believed that the groundwork done by the Sub-Committee would provide a meaningful basis for further action which the Council might see fit to take at the current session. Her delegation therefore hoped that the report of the Sub-Committee would be adopted in the usual manner.

18. In view of the importance which her Government attached to the item under consideration, her delegation had taken the liberty of circulating among members of the Council copies of a statement made by the representative of Nigeria during the Security Council debate on the question of South Africa. That statement included a comprehensive review of the current situation in South Africa and placed the whole question of racism and racial discrimination in the correct political, social, economic and humanitarian perspective.

19. Mr. HERZOG (Observer for Israel), speaking at the invitation of the President, said that in 1973, when the Third Committee had recommended the Programme for the Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, Israel had supported it firmly and unequivocally, not only because of its abhorrence of the very notion of discrimination based on race, colour or creed, but also because for centuries the Jewish people had been the classic victim of racism in various parts of the world. The Jews were a multiracial people whose religion could be adopted by anyone without distinction as to race, colour or sex. The fact that young Jewish activists had not waited until the

¹ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-second Year, 1989th meeting, para. 19.*

1960s to play a prominent role in the fight for black civil rights in the United States clearly demonstrated the Jewish attitude on the question of racial discrimination. As early as 1902, Theodore Herzl, founder of the Zionist movement, had summed up that attitude when he had spoken of the misfortunes of blacks subjected to the horrors of slavery and expressed the desire to assist in the redemption of the black people, once the redemption of the people of Israel had been secured.

20. In Israel's reply to the questionnaire sent by the Secretary-General in accordance with paragraph 18 of resolution 3057 (XXVIII), it frankly and unreservedly stated that racism and racial discrimination did not exist in Israel. Having regard to the great ethnic, religious and linguistic diversity of its people, the State of Israel had, from its very inception, been guided by the principles of freedom, justice and peace and had done its utmost to ensure equality of social and political rights for all its inhabitants. Given the hostility surrounding it, it was no mean achievement for Israel to have consistently upheld the personal and national rights of its Arab citizens, who were represented in all walks of Israeli life.

21. Israel was eager to participate in the Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. On 10 November 1975, the General Assembly had adopted resolution 3379 (XXX), which would live in infamy and which had discredited the United Nations and provoked a storm of revulsion throughout world opinion. As a result, Israel had been obliged to withdraw its support for the Decade and the World Conference which was scheduled to be held in 1978, as long as that outrageous slander was associated with the Programme. It was clear from the report of the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the Conference (E/5922) what the intentions of the sponsors of resolution 3379 (XXX) were. Item 11 (a) of the draft provisional agenda called for the full and universal implementation of United Nations decisions and resolutions on racism, racial discrimination, etc. Since the adoption of the anti-semitic resolution 3379 (XXX), equating the national liberation movement of the Jewish people with racism, the unqualified language of item 11 (a) of the provisional agenda for the Conference could only be construed as embracing that pernicious resolution as well; that had been understood at the sixty-first session of the Council.

22. Despite the reservations expressed by some delegations, the Preparatory Sub-Committee had recommended that the Secretariat should prepare a compilation of United Nations resolutions and decisions relevant to combating racism and racial discrimination, a move calculated to include resolution 3379 (XXX) and thus enable the forces of anti-semitism to raise the Zionist issue at the Conference. Lest any doubt should remain about those intentions, it had been proposed that the documentation for the Conference should include the report of the so-called symposium on zionism held at Baghdad in November 1976, which had been referred to in paragraph 41 of the Sub-Committee's report as a "symposium of racial discrimination". Attention should also be drawn to the recommendation that the so-called Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People should be invited to participate in the Conference. That Committee had no connexion whatsoever with the Conference, unless

the intention was to drag the Zionist issue into its deliberations. Having prepared the ground so thoroughly, it was obvious that some Arab States and their satellites would not let slip the opportunity to monopolize the Conference as they had done on previous occasions.

23. If Iraq wished the Conference to embrace the common struggle of all peoples for national liberation, as the Iraqi representative had stated at the previous meeting, then it would certainly be necessary to include in the agenda for the World Conference an item on the long and bitter struggle of the Kurdish people against Iraqi oppression. The Conference would then be able to discuss the evidence recently presented by various United Nations bodies and international agencies charging Iraq with grave violations of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, demonstrated by systematic attempts to destroy the political, economic, cultural and linguistic identity of the Kurdish ethnic group, as well as executions, instances of torture, and the detention and deportation of tens of thousands of Kurds. If, in the words of the Iraqi representative at the previous meeting of the Council, the right of peoples to self-determination was an inalienable right which could not be denied, he would surely have no objection to the question of the struggle of the Kurdish people for self-determination being placed on the agenda for the World Conference.

24. It was rather odd that the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the Conference should consider including the report of the Baghdad symposium on zionism—a symposium whose ideological unanimity was known to all—in the documentation for the Conference, and yet ignore the evidence of Iraqi violations of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination presented to various United Nations committees. It should be recalled that that evidence formed part of the official records of the Economic and Social Council.

25. If the recommendations in the report were accepted, the Conference would undoubtedly become a Conference against zionism. However, there was still time to insulate the Conference against that form of abuse and restore it to its original conception. The Council had yet to decide whether or not to accept the recommendations. It could exclude resolution 3379 (XXX) from the documentation for the Conference; it could exclude the report of the Baghdad symposium on zionism; it certainly could exclude participation by the "Palestine Committee" in the Conference. In brief, the Council should ensure that the World Conference was not diverted from its original purposes by the intrusion of narrow, reactionary and anti-semitic overtones. It should ensure that the Conference's terms of reference were made to conform to the aims and intentions of the resolution adopted in 1973 which had inspired it. In other words, the choice before the Council was between a Conference genuinely devoted to combating racial discrimination and one held under United Nations auspices that would become an instrument for the partisan aims of the Arab States in their unrelenting political warfare against the Jewish State and for the sinister forces of reactionary anti-semitic racism.

26. Before concluding, it should be stressed that the Jewish world was following closely the decisions which

would be taken on that issue, since it was one on which the Jewish people everywhere were solidly and fearlessly united. How nations had voted on resolution 3379 (XXX) in 1975 had been taken as the touchstone of their attitude towards the Jewish people. Jewish people throughout the world would use the same measure when decisions were taken regarding the attempt which was currently being made to inject into the World Conference false and wicked allegations based on that most blatant form of racial discrimination, anti-semitism.

27. Mr. YANKOV (Bulgaria) said that ideologies and practices of racism and racial discrimination were historically alien to the Bulgarian people. Bulgaria itself had waged a protracted struggle for survival, for national and social liberation, for the full realization of its right to self-determination and for the preservation of its national identity. The Bulgarian people therefore identified with peoples which were struggling against imperialism, colonialism, foreign domination, racism and racial discrimination. Together with other socialist countries, Bulgaria had been providing assistance to those peoples and their national liberation movements and, as an active member of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, it had made a financial contribution to the forthcoming Maputo Conference.

28. His delegation welcomed the positive contributions made by various United Nations organs and by some specialized agencies towards the attainment of the goals and objectives of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, as described in the report of the Secretary-General (E/5920). In that connexion, he pointed out the important role played by the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination and expressed the hope that the Commission on Human Rights would effectively carry out the function assigned to it of applying the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid*. Mention should also be made of the efforts of UNESCO in that field and of the contributions of the Special Committee on the Situation with Regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the Special Committee against *Apartheid* and the United Nations Council for Namibia.

29. Document E/5921, which provided an account of various government activities related to the Programme for the Decade, reflected the full awareness of Governments throughout the world of the fact that colonialism, racism and racial discrimination continued to pose a threat to international peace and security and were serious impediments to progress and international co-operation in the economic, social and humanitarian fields, and of the need to intensify efforts to achieve the complete elimination of those evils.

30. In contrast to the positive will and concerted action of the vast majority of States Members of the United Nations, the negative attitude or intentional inaction of certain States was all the more conspicuous. The efforts of the Security Council to apply effective measures, in accordance with the United Nations Charter, against the racist régimes

had been repeatedly blocked by that group of States. Efforts were being made to undermine the role of the forthcoming World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination or to create disagreements among different countries or groups of countries. Recent events in Africa, and in particular the assassinations of President Ngouabi of the Congo and the Lebanese political leader Kemal Jumlat, as well as public statements at the current session of the Council, revealed the intentions behind such tactics. It was ironic that, at the same time, appeals were being made for constructive and concerted action and a zealous campaign had been initiated in defence of human rights. In that connexion, his delegation shared the hope of other delegations, in particular, that of Algeria, that such tactics would be reconsidered. While the struggle against colonialism and racism required sacrifices of all nations and institutions, it should be remembered that the most painful and the greatest sacrifices were made by the victims of those evils. The pain and suffering experienced by mankind today, especially in southern Africa, were the price paid for the attainment of freedom and justice.

31. The Great October Socialist Revolution had ushered in a new era for the world in which peoples had ceased to be passive objects of history and had become the masters of their destiny. The Decree on Self-Determination and Equality of Nations had been among the first legislative acts of the first socialist State. The right of peoples to self-determination was now enshrined as a fundamental human right in the Charter of the United Nations. The very membership of the Organization was a living example of the historic significance of the principles and rights proclaimed by the Great October Socialist Revolution.

32. His delegation believed that the report of the Preparatory Sub-Committee (E/5922) provided a good basis for subsequent preparations for the World Conference and that the Council should recommend it for approval by the General Assembly, in view of the fact that it had been adopted by the Preparatory Sub-Committee by consensus. In addition, he suggested that the resolution which the Council would adopt should indicate that the Conference should concentrate on the struggle against racism and racial discrimination throughout the world and, in particular, in southern Africa. Finally, he suggested that, pending the appointment of a Secretary-General of the Conference, the crucial task of co-ordination and supervision of the preparations for the Conference might be entrusted to the President of the Economic and Social Council.

33. Mr. OULD SID'AHMED (Mauritania) said that the daily suffering and sacrifices of the peoples of Palestine, Namibia, Azania and Zimbabwe and the torture, deprivation and terror on which the policies of the illegal régimes of those Territories were based were problems that were sufficiently concrete—and potentially dangerous—for the international community to go beyond expressions of solidarity with their peoples.

34. The words of condemnation adopted by the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council to encourage the racists of Tel Aviv and southern Africa to reflect and to convince them of the anachronistic and dangerous nature of their repressive systems had resulted only in the perfection of their police

and military machinery and in even more barbarous oppression.

35. United Nations resolutions continued to go unheeded because the régimes of Tel Aviv, Salisbury and Pretoria understood only the language of force. The liberation movements of Palestine, Azania, Namibia and Zimbabwe, which enjoyed the unswerving support of all peace-loving peoples, were more determined than ever to obtain through struggle what they could not achieve by peaceful means, and their political maturity, their spirit of sacrifice and the justice of their ideals ensured that they would be triumphant. The most sacred duty of every Government which was concerned with the preservation of peace and justice in the world was not only to assist those oppressed peoples but also scrupulously to avoid any act which might impede their progress towards victory.

36. His delegation believed that in evaluating the progress made in eliminating racism and racial discrimination, the Council must take concrete and concerted measures towards that end.

37. It was unnecessary to describe in detail Mauritania's position on racism, racial discrimination and *apartheid*, as it was sufficiently clear and consistent. That position was based on the principles set forth in General Assembly resolution 3057 (XXVIII) and was reflected in complete and unconditional support for the peoples struggling against racism and racial discrimination. As a militant supporter of Africa as a whole and of the Arab world, Mauritania would make every effort to promote awareness of the threat posed by those evils.

38. His delegation attached the greatest importance to the implementation of the Programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination and welcomed the convening of the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination.

39. Finally, his delegation was in agreement with the report of the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the Conference (E/5922) and hoped that, despite the reservations of some delegations, the Council would adopt it in its current form. As to participation in the Conference, all organs and committees of the United Nations should be allowed to make a contribution to its work.

40. Mr. SHER (Pakistan) said that Pakistan had been one of the first States to sign and ratify the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and that it did not maintain relations of any kind with the racist minority régimes of Southern Rhodesia and South Africa. The Government of Pakistan had consistently extended moral and material assistance to peoples struggling against racial discrimination and would make every effort to ensure the elimination of those evils.

41. On 21 March Pakistan had joined the world community in observing the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination and commemorated the martyrdom of the innocent victims of Sharpeville and Soweto. On that day, the Prime Minister of Pakistan had reiterated Pakistan's determination to work actively in solidarity with the liberation movements and the "front-

line" African States, for the liberation of southern Africa. He had said also that the heroic liberation struggle of the peoples of Mozambique, Angola and Guinea-Bissau illustrated that not only the balance of justice but the logic of history itself was arraigned against the last bastions of colonialism and that the peoples of Azania, Zimbabwe and Namibia could no longer be diverted from their destiny by the illusion of nationhood under colonial tutelage and the installation of puppet régimes in their territories. It was no accident that the colonial régimes had survived because their exploitative and aggressive designs had been abetted directly or indirectly by those who continued to place greater value on policies of power and commercial interests than on the ideals of human dignity, equality and freedom enshrined in the United Nations Charter. Each victory against colonialism and racism in southern Africa was a victory for the third world and for the uninhibited political and economic freedom of all peoples.

42. His delegation would support any resolution or decision by the Council which called for the total and unconditional elimination of racism and racial discrimination.

43. His delegation whole-heartedly supported the report of the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the Conference and the draft provisional agenda for the Conference itself. With regard to the draft provisional rules of procedure of the Conference contained in annex II to the report of the Preparatory Sub-Committee (E/5922), his delegation considered that in rule 1, concerning composition of delegations, there should be no limit to accredited and alternate representatives. With regard to rule 6, concerning the election of officers, the number of vice-presidents should be left blank, to be decided by regional groups after consultation.

44. His delegation favoured the early appointment of the Secretary-General of the Conference and, given the impossibility of holding the Conference on African soil, as would have been desirable, it would prefer the venue to be United Nations Headquarters, where the cost would be least.

45. Miss RWABAZAIRE (Uganda) said that, although many peoples had managed to liberate themselves from racism and racial discrimination, those evils still affected those living under the minority régimes in southern Africa and the Palestinians in the Middle East. Her delegation paid tribute to all those who had made efforts to contribute to the elimination of those crimes against humanity, and it appealed to all those States who continued to do so to stop giving moral or material support to the racist régimes.

46. Her delegation attached great importance to the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination and therefore commended the work of the Preparatory Sub-Committee and approved, in particular, the draft provisional agenda, the draft provisional rules of procedure and the proposals to appoint a Secretary-General of the Conference and to invite all States, as well as other entities, to participate in it as recommended in the Sub-Committee's report.

47. Her country fully appreciated the Government of Ghana's inability to act as host to the World Conference

and hoped that some other Member State would offer to do so. If no offer to that effect was received, her delegation would in due time consider whether the Conference should be held in New York or Geneva. It agreed in principle to the date recommended by the Preparatory Sub-Committee, subject to any change which might be necessary should an offer from another country to act as host be forthcoming.

48. Mr. KUBBA (Iraq) said that the representative of the Zionist entity, condemned by the General Assembly and world public opinion, had said that his Government was opposed to any form of racism and racial discrimination. Nevertheless, that representative seemed to have forgotten the real position of the régime which he represented. The annals of the United Nations showed perfectly clearly the racist nature of the Zionist entity. Furthermore, on 25 June 1969, Golda Meir had said that what her Government wanted was to ensure the existence of a Jewish State with a clear Jewish majority. The Prime Minister of South Africa, for his part, had stated that what his Government proposed was to guarantee the survival of a white South Africa, which implied domination, control and supremacy of the white population. If the word "Jewish" was interchanged with the word "white" or vice versa, the similarities between the South African and the Zionist régimes could be clearly appreciated.

49. The Council had just witnessed a new attempt to assimilate Judaism, as a religious faith, with zionism, which was a racist ideology. That was another example of the way in which the Zionist régime endeavoured to use the Jewish faith, which as such merited all respect, for its own ends. The denunciation of zionism by the United Nations showed that the Organization was fully aware of what were true racist ideas.

50. His delegation maintained that it was out of order to mention the Kurdish question, since that question no longer existed, because the Government of Iraq had resolved it successfully. It was well known that all Iraqis now lived in peace and that, furthermore, they were preparing diligently to struggle for the just cause of the Palestinian people.

51. Mr. TERZI (Observer for the Palestine Liberation Organization), who was invited by the President to speak under rule 73 of the rules of procedure and decision 129 (LIX) of the Council, fully supported the report of the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination and awaited the convening of the Conference with great interest.

52. When hearing the representative of the Zionist racist régime, the Council had been witness to a new attempt at discrimination. That representative had maintained that the Conference had to adopt a selective attitude regarding the documentation which it would consider and should not concern itself with General Assembly resolution

3379 (XXX). In his view, all that the representative of the Zionist régime had to do was to come before the Conference and convince the world that zionism was not a form of racism and racial discrimination. He himself was convinced that that representative would be unable to do so because the facts spoke more clearly than his words.

53. Furthermore, it was not true that zionism wanted the liberation of the black population of the world. In General Assembly resolution 31/6 E, which, it should be noted, was not quoted in paragraph 14 of document E/5920, the General Assembly condemned Israel's collaboration with the racist régime in South Africa, and, moreover, it was known that entry to Tel Aviv had been refused to black north American Jews.

54. Nor should it be forgotten that Herzl himself, who, according to the representative of the Zionist régime, had wanted the liberation of the blacks, was the person who had proposed the expulsion of the Palestinians from their home.

55. It was significant that the Political Declaration² adopted by the Fifth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Colombo in 1976, after expressing full support for the Programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, had supported General Assembly resolution 3379 (XXX). The Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity and the League of Arab States, meeting at Cairo in March 1977,³ had also condemned imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, zionism and *apartheid*, as well as all other forms of racism and racial discrimination and segregation, particularly in Africa, Palestine and the occupied Arab territories.

56. He recalled that the previous March, the National Council of Palestine had reaffirmed the importance of maintaining relations and ensuring co-ordination with progressive democratic Jewish forces, both within and outside the occupied homelands, which were struggling against the Zionist ideology and its practices.

57. Mr. PETROV (Bulgaria) said that, during the debate which had just taken place, various questions had been put with regard to the documentation which the Council had before it, in particular with regard to document E/5922. Since the documentation had not been submitted at the outset of deliberations on the item, he suggested that the Council should give the representative of the Division of Human Rights an opportunity to make observations regarding the documents and to answer some of the questions raised by various speakers.

The meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.

² See A/31/197.

³ See A/32/61.

2052nd meeting

Tuesday, 26 April 1977, at 11.05 a.m.

President: Mr. Ladislav ŠMÍD (Czechoslovakia).

E/SR.2052

AGENDA ITEM 3

Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (*continued*) (E/5920, E/5921, E/5922)

1. Mr. SANON (Deputy Director of the Division of Human Rights) expressed appreciation for the comments made, particularly about documents E/5920, E/5921 and E/5922. Document E/5922 had not been formally introduced, because it was a report not of the Secretary-General but of a subsidiary organ of the Preparatory Committee for the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, which was the Council itself. However, in view of the comments and queries which had been made, some clarifications appeared necessary.

2. Chapter I of the draft report of the Preparatory Sub-Committee had been redrafted and summarized in order to bring it into line with standard editorial practices of the Council and, in the process, some errors had been made. First, subparagraph (*d*) under the heading "Participation in the Conference" should not have been included among the recommendations; as was clear from paragraph 29, the suggestion had in fact been made by one representative. Secondly, the paragraph under the heading "Venue, date and duration of the Conference" differed somewhat from paragraph 45, which reflected the Preparatory Sub-Committee's views more clearly. Thirdly, whereas the Preparatory Sub-Committee had decided that the provisional agenda drafted by the Division of Human Rights should not be reproduced in the body of the report, the editorial services had decided that it should because changes to the draft agenda were discussed in the text of the report. In addition, the draft provisional agenda as approved by the Sub-Committee was annexed to the report in accordance with standard practice in the case of Economic and Social Council documents, as were the draft provisional rules of procedure of the Conference.

3. The organization of future work was a matter to be decided by the Council, as Preparatory Committee for the Conference. However, since the venue was still undecided—it was still possible that a Member State might offer to act as host to the Conference—it might be advisable, in view of the work that remained to be done, to be able to revert to the matter and to discuss possible future developments. With regard to the assistance which the Council might see fit to request in accordance with paragraph 4 (*c*) of its resolution 1990 (LX), he pointed out that the Preparatory Sub-Committee had not been established until almost one year after the relevant decision had been taken and had not met until the middle of March, by which time the Commission on Human Rights and the other bodies referred to in paragraph 4 (*c*) had either completed or were in the middle of their session. It had therefore been hard for them to make any recommendations. Accordingly, the

Council might see fit to ask for their contributions at some other time.

4. He had taken the liberty of informing the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination of the Sub-Committee's work and had been told that participation might be possible, since that Committee's sessions would overlap for one week with the World Conference. Moreover, the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination would prepare a memorandum on the mandatory provisions of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the Committee's activities and their impact on the implementation of the Convention. However, no final decision had been taken on either matter.

5. Mr. KHALEF (Iraq) said he saw from chapter I of the report that all views had been honestly reflected. Although some members of the Sub-Committee had expressed reservations in connexion with chapter I, the report was perfectly satisfactory.

6. Mr. S. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that his delegation had already expressed regret that it had taken almost one year to establish the Sub-Committee. However, the Sub-Committee had made appropriate recommendations concerning participation in the Conference, the agenda, rules of procedure and all other matters connected with the Conference. The recommendation that the Secretary-General of the Conference should be designated from among Secretariat officials was worth considering. In view of the time consumed by the preparatory work, the Council's draft resolution on the Conference should clearly reflect all elements needed to conclude the preparations, including the preparation of all documents in good time, in order to ensure that the Conference was successful. His delegation hoped that the draft resolution would be prepared on the basis of the recommendations in the report of the Preparatory Sub-Committee, provided that no offer to act as host to Conference was made by a Member State.

7. Mr. HEINEMANN (Netherlands) asked what was the precise status of sub-paragraph (*d*) under the heading "Participation in the Conference", in view of the Deputy Director's remarks.

8. Miss BALOGUN (Nigeria) said that she, too, was uncertain whether sub-paragraph (*d*) would remain or be replaced by the text in paragraph 29. She proposed, on behalf of those delegations which were preparing a draft resolution concerning the World Conference, that the Council should adjourn immediately following the discussion of the item, so that the delegations could continue the drafting work.

9. Mr. SANON (Deputy Director of the Division of Human Rights) said that chapter I was an introductory

chapter, which had been prepared in accordance with the Council's normal practice. Since it had not been possible for a representative of the Division to be present at all times during the drafting, a mistake had occurred and a sentence which reflected a suggestion made by one representative had wrongly been interpreted as a recommendation of the entire Sub-Committee. Sub-paragraph (d) was not a recommendation of the Sub-Committee.

10. Mr. KHALEF (Iraq) said that subparagraph (d) was not a mistake. One delegation—his own—had indeed suggested that the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People should be invited to participate in the Conference in order to ensure the broadest representation. The Secretariat had reflected that quite correctly.

11. Mr. PETROV (Bulgaria) asked whether, if the Council approved the recommendations of the Sub-Committee, the

Secretary-General would legally be in a position to appoint a Secretary-General of the Conference prior to the thirty-second session of the General Assembly. That was an important point, because it would affect the manner in which the draft resolution on the Conference was prepared.

12. Mr. SANON (Deputy Director of the Division of Human Rights) said that the matter should be decided by the Council. However, if a Secretary-General of the Conference was not appointed until the thirty-second session of the General Assembly, he would have less than one year in which to prepare for the World Conference.

13. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should adjourn to enable delegations to continue their work on the draft resolution.

The meeting rose at 11.45 a.m.

2053rd meeting

Tuesday, 26 April 1977, at 3.55 p.m.

President: Mr. Ladislav ŠMÍD (Czechoslovakia).

E/SR.2053

AGENDA ITEM 4

Restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system (E/5453/Rev.1/Amend.1, E/5453/Rev.1/Add.1 and 2, E/5476 and Add.1-3, Add.3/Corr.1, Add.4-13, E/5524 and Add.1-4, Add.4/Corr.1 and Add.5, E/5633, E/5899, E/5923)

1. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) said that, in connexion with the item under consideration, the Council had decided to review the following four questions: (a) the agreements between the United Nations and the specialized agencies and IAEA; (b) the terms of reference of the Council's subsidiary bodies; (c) the rules of procedure of the functional commissions; and (d) the methods in use for the confirmation of representatives on functional commissions. In addition, at the beginning of the current session, it had also been agreed that, under that item, the Council would consider the question of documentation for its sixty-third session. With regard to subitems (a) and (b), the Council might wish to take a decision at the current session as to when they should be considered since the item had been on the Council's agenda for four years and had caused a large number of technical problems.

2. With regard to subitem (c), the Council had before it a document prepared by the Secretariat (E/5899) which contained the draft revised rules of procedure of the functional commissions, based on the revised rules of procedure of the Council. The observer for Switzerland had quite rightly drawn the Secretariat's attention to a discrepancy between the text proposed in the document prepared by the Secretariat and the rules of procedure of the Council. Rule 69 of the proposed text did not coincide with rule 72 of the Council's current rules of procedure. In

order to avoid that discrepancy, it was proposed that the words "which the commission considers to be" in rule 69, paragraph 1, of the proposed text should be deleted since they did not appear in rule 72 of the Council's rules of procedure. Accordingly, in rule 69, paragraph 2, the words "which it considers to be" should also be deleted.

3. Secondly, he pointed out that, since the Council had agreed that the rules of procedure of the functional commissions should be brought into line with those of the Council, in rule 55 of the proposed text the words "by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting", which were in square brackets, should be deleted. Thus, rule 55 would be brought into line with rule 57 of the Council's rules of procedure, which in turn reflected Article 67 of the United Nations Charter. In accordance with the foregoing, the corresponding change should be made to rule 58 of the proposed text, in which the reference to rule 55 appearing in square brackets should be deleted.

4. Subitem (d) stemmed from a proposal put forward by the delegation of France at the organizational session; in compliance with a request made at that time by the Council, the Secretariat had prepared a review of the background to the problem (E/5923) and its possible solutions. In paragraph 8 (a) and (b) of that document, the Secretariat suggested two possible solutions. If the Council accepted one of them, it would be necessary to make a few changes in rules 12 and 13 of the draft rules of procedure of the functional commissions.

5. With regard to the documentation that the Council would have before it at its sixty-third session, he said that, in the light of the decision taken by the Council at the beginning of the current session, the draft provisional

agenda for the sixty-third session (E/L.1757) had been distributed much earlier than usual so that the Council could form an idea of the documentation that would be submitted at that session. The agenda itself might have to be amended in the light of any decisions by the Council that might affect the agenda for the sixty-third session. Those changes would be drawn to the Council's attention when the provisional agenda was considered. In addition, at the request of the delegation of Canada, the Secretariat had prepared Conference Room Paper No. 1, which contained a breakdown of that documentation. Each of the documents which the Council would have before it was being prepared in accordance with a specific request by the General Assembly or by the Council itself. The second part of the document indicated the dates of the sessions of the subsidiary or related bodies that would submit reports to the Council at its sixty-third session. From that list it appeared that at its summer session the Council would encounter the same problems regarding documentation as it had encountered at the current session.

6. Mrs. DERRE (France) said that her delegation withdrew the request that had led to the preparation of document E/5923.

7. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council adopted the revised rules of procedure of its functional commissions proposed by the Secretariat (E/5899), with the oral revisions suggested by the Secretary.

It was so decided (decision 216 (LXII)).

8. Mr. KUYAMA (Japan) said that his delegation would have preferred the decision relating to the draft rules of procedure of the functional commissions to be postponed until the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Restructuring of the Economic and Social Sectors of the United Nations System had concluded its work, so as to take account of any amendments to the rules of procedure which the *Ad Hoc* Committee might put forward.

9. Mrs. DERRE (France) said that her delegation's position with regard to the participation of the liberation movements was well known and it merely wished to state its reservations concerning rule 70 of the draft rules of procedure of the functional commissions.

10. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) suggested that the Council should indicate when it proposed to consider subitems (a) and (b). Since several delegations had expressed the view that the Council should consider them as soon as the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Restructuring had adopted its report, perhaps it would be appropriate for the Council to take a decision at its next organizational session, as to when it would consider those questions.

11. Mr. S. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his position as to when the Council should consider subitems (a) and (b) had been very clearly stated when document E/L.1757 had been adopted. In his delegation's view, the agenda for the Council's sixty-third session was already heavily overloaded and it was not

possible to add an item which entailed such a large volume of documentation. He therefore supported the Secretary's suggestion that the decision as to when the Council should consider those questions should be taken at the next organizational session.

12. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council decided to postpone the decision as to when it should consider subitems (a) and (b) until its organizational session for 1978.

It was so decided (decision 217 (LXII)).

13. Mr. MARSHALL (United Kingdom) welcomed the fact that the provisional agenda for the sixty-third session (E/L.1757) had already been distributed and felt that Conference Room Paper No. 1 was extremely useful. It would be necessary to decide whether any question raised by that document would be considered at the current session under the item on restructuring or under item 16, entitled "Consideration of the provisional agenda for the sixty-third session".

14. Furthermore, it was his understanding that the Council was faced with a dilemma: on the one hand, in taking note of the preliminary report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Restructuring of the Economic and Social Sectors of the United Nations System, the General Assembly had requested the Council to continue its work; on the other hand, the Council would clearly have great difficulty in taking any action at that stage without running the risk of interfering with the work of that Committee, which was to reconvene the following week.

15. His delegation took the view that no action could be taken with regard to subitems 4 (a) and (b) before the submission of the final report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Restructuring, which the Council was to consider at its sixty-third session. Consequently, he understood that consideration of the item would be resumed at that session and that the Council would determine at that time its obligations vis-à-vis the General Assembly under the resolution relating to restructuring.

16. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) said he understood that the representative of the United Kingdom was referring both to the General Assembly's request to the Council to continue its own process of rationalization and reform, partly on the basis of the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Restructuring, and to the consideration of the question of the report which the Council was to submit to the General Assembly on that matter. That would be reflected under item 8 in the annotated agenda for the Council's sixty-third session.

17. The PRESIDENT, replying to the question raised by the representative of the United Kingdom concerning the documentation of the Council, said that the information in Conference Room Paper No. 1 could be considered under item 16 of the agenda for the current session (E/5917).

The meeting rose at 4.30 p.m.

2054th meeting

Thursday, 5 May 1977, at 11.05 a.m.

President: Mr. Ladislav ŠMÍD (Czechoslovakia).

E/SR.2054

AGENDA ITEM 2

Assistance to the drought-stricken areas of Ethiopia (E/5919, E/L.1763)

1. Mr. BERKOL (United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator) said that he wished to update the information provided in the report of the Secretary-General on assistance to the drought-stricken areas of Ethiopia (E/5919). He would do so on the basis of the findings of the joint FAO/WFP/UNDRO mission to Ethiopia and the consultations held with the UNDP Resident Representative at Addis Ababa.

2. There had been crop failures in four provinces of Ethiopia, notably in the north-eastern escarpment areas of Wollo and Tigre, although the immediate reaction of the Ethiopian Government's Relief and Rehabilitation Commission had helped considerably to alleviate the situation for the time being. Mention should also be made of the progress achieved by the Commission with regard to preparedness to respond to emergency situations.

3. Because of the difficulty of obtaining reliable data on the number of people likely to require food assistance in the coming months, it was also impossible to make a reliable estimate of the quantity of relief grain needed. The general impression, shared by government officials, was that, although crop losses had occurred, the situation was not comparable in severity to the crisis of 1973 and 1974. Nevertheless, a serious situation would undoubtedly arise in certain parts of the region before the next harvest in October, so that the "food-for-work" projects for soil conservation and reforestation implemented by the Government deserved the fullest support during that critical period.

4. Ethiopia's grain import requirements for 1977, both commercial and food aid, were estimated at 200,000 tons. Of those, 100,000 tons of wheat were scheduled as commercial imports and 53,000 tons of cereal were already committed as food aid. However, that left a shortfall of about 50,000 tons, and donors were earnestly requested to consider that need.

5. The import of food through the ports of Assab and Djibouti had been complicated not so much by the lack of port handling equipment as by the insufficiency of road transport. The existing fleet of trucks was not sufficient for the task of clearing from the ports and distributing the 200,000 tons of grain needed in 1977. The Government was currently short of 500 trucks, and it was recommended that it should plan to purchase approximately 450 trailer trucks each year in order to maintain a fleet suitable to its needs. In the light of the findings of the joint mission, his Office had on 18 March 1977 endorsed the Ethiopian

Government's request to the donor community for 150 trucks and four 3-ton mobile cranes. So far, one donor had offered 10 trucks, and he stressed that the remaining 140 trucks and the cranes were vital in order to improve the transport situation.

6. The situation in the drought-affected areas of Ethiopia depended largely on the outcome of the current "small rains". There were indications that they would be below normal; for example, workers building a road between Kobo and Lalibella had begun to request food payments instead of cash. In the Wollo and Tigre provinces, representatives of overseas agencies and government officials had expressed to the mission their growing concern about free relief food distributions, which they felt ran counter to efforts to promote the self-reliance of the population. The mission had emphasized the urgency of continuing development activities, such as terracing, soil conservation and afforestation, to fight the underlying causes of the drought.

7. It was to be hoped that, with the assistance of the international community, and given time and stability so that the longer-term measures could take effect, the Government of Ethiopia would be able steadily to improve the chronic food situation which had affected its northern areas for the past four years.

8. Mr. DOO KINGUÉ (Assistant Administrator and Regional Director for Africa of the United Nations Development Programme) recalled the measures of assistance to Ethiopia taken by the UNDP Governing Council at its seventeenth and eighteenth sessions. At the latter session, the Governing Council had authorized the Administrator to approve projects for drought-related activities which might be requested by the Government of Ethiopia, up to an amount of \$2 million for the period ending 31 December 1976.

9. As of that date, UNDP expenditure under that authorization had amounted to \$1.6 million. Those resources had primarily been directed towards the provision of expertise and equipment aimed at reversing on a long-term basis the devastating effect of the drought, as well as shoring up those national institutions which were needed in the rehabilitation process. UNDP activities had included agricultural research, settlement assistance, public health assistance and the services of sanitary and water supply engineers.

10. In addition, in April 1975 the UNDP Administrator had approved a water supply project for an amount of \$1,266,000 and a rural roads project for an amount of \$1,793,000, both financed through the United Nations Capital Development Fund. Part of the equipment for the first of those projects had been delivered, and the remainder would arrive in Ethiopia in the next two months.

It was anticipated that operations under the rural road project would terminate in June 1977. The Administrator had just received from the Ethiopian Government another request for assistance from the United Nations Capital Development Fund in relation to the new situation in the country, and the request was being examined.

11. Because Ethiopia was one of the less developed countries and a drought-stricken country, it had been given for 1977-1981 an indicative planning figure of \$42 million, which represented an increase of over 100 per cent compared to the previous figure. Ethiopia had also recently been granted, as a less developed country, a special UNDP allocation from which the Government had set aside \$109,000 for agricultural and economic rehabilitation in those provinces hardest hit by the drought.

12. The UNDP Regional Representative, in addition to acting as the representative in Ethiopia of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator and of the Executive Director of WFP, had within the past year also assumed the task of co-ordinating the implementation of other donor aid programmes. For that purpose, monthly meetings were being held under his auspices with the representatives of donor institutions, regular communications were maintained with the Relief and Rehabilitation Commission and information was disseminated on the effects of the drought. Those activities enhanced the effectiveness of the assistance, ensured that it was provided to the areas most in need, and permitted a flow of information between donor institutions and the Government, whose requirements and policies were thus conveyed to those institutions on a regular basis.

13 Mr. ADUGNA (Ethiopia) said that the drought in Ethiopia had been more severe than the one which had affected all the Sahelian countries, in terms of loss of human lives and livestock and of soil erosion and exhaustion, and that long-range recovery and rehabilitation efforts would be required, for which substantial funds would have to be allocated. The cost of combating the effects of natural disasters such as those facing the Sahelian countries and Ethiopia far exceeded the meagre resources of many developing countries. Thus, despite its sincere desire to solve its problems on its own, the Government of Ethiopia had been obliged to seek the support and assistance of the international community, for whose co-operation it was grateful.

14. It was currently estimated that 1.5 million people needed relief assistance for periods ranging from six months to one year, and that their needs could be met in part with the 50,000 tons of grain committed and the 18,000 tons already delivered. Ethiopia was still awaiting donor response for the remaining 50,000 tons of cereals. The logistic problems of delivering the grain to the population requiring relief assistance were considerable, and very expensive to solve. For that reason, and because the task would be even more difficult during the "big rains", an appeal had been made for the donation of a fleet of trucks, but so far the aid received had fallen far short of requirements. It would be recalled that the Ethiopian delegation had already alerted donors and the United Nations system to that problem at the thirty-first session of

the General Assembly and at the sixtieth session of the Economic and Social Council.

15. If relief work was to be effective, it had to be followed by an efficient rehabilitation programme, but the persistent pressure of emergency assistance was diverting much of the national resources from recovery work. The UNDP technical assistance with regard to settlements, and the assistance provided by the United Nations Capital Development Fund, had therefore been very useful in putting into practice the United Nations resolutions concerning rehabilitation work. UNICEF co-operation in the field of health services, the provision of drinking water and the education of nomads at the settlement sites had also been invaluable.

16. The Government of Ethiopia, for its part, had carried out settlement projects for the nomads who had been victims of the drought, had taken soil and water conservation measures, had undertaken road construction and reforestation and was developing the country's irrigation potential. It had also set up an early warning system and worked out a strategy for an emergency food reserve with the assistance of the United Nations system and bilateral donors.

17. In the early days of the drought the Government then in power in Ethiopia had not sought aid from abroad. All the assistance given at that time had been the result of international pressure. Information on the drought in the Sahel had been more readily available and for that reason the Office for Sahelian Relief Operations of FAO and the United Nations Sahelian Office had been established, whereas no similar organization had been established for the countries of East Africa. In view of the long-term needs of rehabilitation, perhaps it would be worth while to consider the possibility of using the existing machinery to provide services for other African countries which, like Ethiopia, might be devastated by drought. If recourse was had to those offices, along with UNDP, for co-operation in the recovery and rehabilitation of the areas of Africa affected by the drought, satisfactory results could be achieved.

18. He appealed to the international community to co-operate with his country in accelerating rehabilitation measures so that they would proceed at a pace commensurate with the needs of the population. The Government of Ethiopia, for its part, would do everything in its power to eliminate the effects of an antiquated system of land tenure and persistent drought and to ensure the satisfaction of at least the basic requirements of its population.

19. Mr. MOHAMMED (Bangladesh) said that the situation which Ethiopia was experiencing epitomized the fate of the majority of areas in the world which were disaster-prone. In those areas, adverse climatic conditions at the harvest time, a flood, or any other natural disaster created emergency conditions which jeopardized the development efforts of the Governments. The subsistence economies of those areas did not have the requisite absorptive capacity to enable them to meet situations of that kind. UNDRO had done commendable work in concentrating its assistance on the humanitarian aspects of the problem in the areas devastated by drought. Accordingly, his delegation fully supported the continuation of the efforts of UNDRO to assist Ethiopia

and advocated strengthening its activities and the activities of other development aid bodies such as UNDP and UNICEF in their respective spheres of competence.

20. Mr. MADEY (Yugoslavia) said that the fact that Yugoslavia was one of the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1763, entitled "Assistance to the drought-stricken areas of Ethiopia", was indicative of the importance which it attached to that question and its desire to respond to the appeal to the international community and to the donor countries to increase the assistance they were providing to Ethiopia to mitigate the effects of a problem which had been continuing for four years. It was to be hoped that the international community would respond fully to that appeal. Yugoslavia maintained friendly relations with Ethiopia and was promoting co-operation in various fields, including assistance in solving the problem which the Council was now considering. He hoped that the Council would adopt draft resolution E/L.1763 which was before it. On behalf of the sponsors, and in order to dispel any confusion with respect to some paragraphs of that draft resolution, he said that the sponsors interpreted operative paragraph 1 and the relevant provisions of General Assembly resolution 3202 (S-VI) in the light of section X of that resolution, which dealt with emergency measures.

21. Mr. CZARKOWSKI (Poland) said that Poland traditionally supported measures to assist African countries in raising the level of living of their populations. The situation in Ethiopia required all the attention and help that the international community could give it. His delegation supported draft resolution E/L.1763, particularly the paragraphs calling for the adoption of short-term and long-term measures. It was satisfied with the criteria for assistance to Ethiopia which had been adopted by the organizations within the United Nations, particularly UNDRO, FAO, UNDP and UNICEF, and it hoped that those organizations would continue to act with speed and efficiency. Poland intended to give greater impetus to its economic relations with Ethiopia, including assistance; it hoped that the Council would adopt draft resolution E/L.1763 by consensus and would ensure its early implementation.

22. Mr. MAINA (Kenya), introducing draft resolution E/L.1763 on behalf of the sponsors, said that the statements of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator, the Assistant Administrator and Regional Director for Africa of UNDP and Mr. Adugna, the representative of Ethiopia, had highlighted the seriousness of the situation confronting the people and Government of Ethiopia, which should be a matter of concern to the entire international community. That situation had been further aggravated by a poor harvest in the provinces which traditionally exported grain. It was those considerations that had prompted the formulation of draft resolution E/L.1763, which required no further explanation. In operative paragraph 1 the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator, the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Children's Fund and other organizations were requested to continue and intensify their assistance to Ethiopia in its relief and rehabilitation effort in their respective areas of competence; the sponsors of the draft resolution wished to take the opportunity to express to those bodies their appreciation of the commendable work which they had been doing to mitigate the seriousness of the situation in Ethiopia.

23. In paragraph 2 the sponsors of the draft resolution had deemed it appropriate to ask Member States and inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations to increase their assistance, for the battle was far from won. The sponsors appealed to the generosity of those who had contributed to that noble cause and asked those who had not done so to consider the possibility of granting assistance so as to put an end to the serious situation in Ethiopia. As was noted in the Secretary-General's report (E/5919), Ethiopia's estimated import requirements included 200,000 tons of grain, and 150 trucks, 15 forklifts, three cranes of 5-15 tons for port handling and five large storage sheds were also required. Donations in kind or in cash would be welcome.

24. Since the problem was not a temporary one, the sponsors had felt it necessary to include operative paragraph 3, with a view to the Council's continuing to consider the question. In order to acknowledge the efforts made by UNDP in that connexion, he proposed that the following new preambular paragraph should be added after the fourth preambular paragraph:

"Having also heard the report of the UNDP Assistant Administrator and Regional Director for Africa on the assistance being provided by UNDP to the Government of Ethiopia in relation to its relief and rehabilitation programmes in the drought-stricken areas of the country".

25. He announced that Afghanistan, Argentina, Bangladesh, Malaysia and Rwanda had joined in sponsoring the draft resolution.

26. Mrs. MAIR (Jamaica) pledged Jamaica's solidarity with and support of the Government and people of Ethiopia and announced that her delegation was joining the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1763.

27. Mr. KOSSEV (Bulgaria) said that the report of the Secretary-General (E/5919) and the statements which the Council had heard left no room for doubt that the situation in the drought-stricken areas of Ethiopia continued to be a precarious one. For that reason his delegation felt that both bilateral and multilateral assistance to Ethiopia should be continued. His Government viewed with sympathy the efforts being made by Ethiopia to overcome the situation. On two occasions it had provided assistance to the fraternal people of Ethiopia and had given 157 tons of food-stuffs, including special food for children, and medicines. Bulgarian doctors were working in Ethiopia helping the Ethiopian people in their efforts to combat the effects of the drought. Bulgaria had intensified its economic and technical co-operation with Ethiopia and the two countries had entered into bilateral agreements in those fields. For those reasons his delegation, like others, hoped that draft resolution E/L.1763 would be adopted by consensus.

28. Mr. NEUHOFF (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his Government, as had been stated on earlier occasions, was fully aware of the need to take emergency relief and rehabilitation measures to assist the drought-stricken areas. Therefore, in the period from 1973 to 1976 the Federal Republic of Germany had provided humanitarian assistance to a value of DM 57 million from both

official funds and humanitarian institutions in the Federal Republic of Germany.

29. Mr. OULD SID'AHMED (Mauritania) said that Mauritania belonged to a region which had also been suffering for long years from a devastating drought whose effects were felt in all sectors of the country's economy, for which reason it could appreciate the immensity of the problems besetting Ethiopia and it hoped that the international community would realize the seriousness and urgency of the situation. His delegation wished to join in sponsoring draft resolution E/L.1763.

30. Mr. AMIRDZHANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he supported draft resolution E/L.1763. The progressive economic and social changes taking place in Ethiopia and the efforts of the Ethiopian Government to eliminate the effects of the drought evoked a sympathetic response in the Soviet Union. His country provided substantial assistance to countries which were victims of natural disasters and had intensified its equitable co-operation with Ethiopia, with due respect for national sovereignty, in order to accelerate Ethiopia's economic, technical and cultural progress and strengthen its economy.

31. Mr. PARSI (Iran) said his delegation was concerned about the seriousness of the situation which had prevailed for four years in Ethiopia. His Government, aware of the difficulty of that situation, had been one of the first to assist Ethiopia, whose people and Government were to be congratulated on their efforts to solve the problem. His delegation felt that the international community should provide more assistance to Ethiopia to help it cope with its desperate situation, and therefore hoped that draft resolution E/L.1763 would be adopted by consensus.

32. Mr. ALFONSO MARTINEZ (Cuba) said that his country, which reacted to the situation in the sister country of Ethiopia as though it were itself involved, was fully aware of the Ethiopian Government's efforts to overcome that situation. As at previous sessions, Cuba associated itself with other delegations in order to assist Ethiopia and in the current instance supported draft resolution E/L.1763 and wished to be added to the list of sponsors.

33. Mr. DUMAS (France) said that his country, like other countries of the European Economic Community, had sent food aid to Ethiopia. His delegation associated itself with the expressions of solidarity with the Ethiopian people.

34. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objection, he would take it that the Council agreed to adopt draft resolution E/L.1763, as revised by the representative of Kenya, without a vote.

Draft resolution E/L.1763, as orally revised, was adopted (resolution 2047 (LXII)).

35. Mr. ADUGNA (Ethiopia) thanked delegations for their expressions of solidarity with the Ethiopian people and expressed his country's gratitude to the United Nations system for the assistance it had provided. He also expressed his satisfaction at the unanimous adoption of draft resolution E/L.1763.

AGENDA ITEM 5

Regional cartographic conferences (E/5906, E/5918, E/L.1758, E/L.1760-1762)

36. Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) said that his delegation had studied carefully the report of the Secretary-General on international co-operation in cartography (E/5906), prepared in accordance with the guidelines laid down by the Economic and Social Council in resolution 1839 (LVI), embodying the decision to convene the First United Nations Regional Cartographic Conference for the Americas at Panama in March 1976.

37. The results of that Conference had been encouraging, not only because 38 countries had attended, but also because of the progress made in the consideration of items which were vitally important to the development process, especially physical planning and other matters that could enable the American countries to take further steps towards the implementation of the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order (General Assembly resolution 3202 (S-VI)), particularly such aspects thereof as the exercise by States of permanent sovereignty over their natural resources. The items considered by the Conference, from cadastral mapping to remote sensing by satellite, constituted specific aspects of that process.

38. The work involved had to be carried out in a painstaking and continuous manner, and required constant stimulation by Governments and the support of all the technical and economic means of the United Nations system. Consequently, another Latin American meeting should be held so that that region would be able to contribute to the progress of cartography throughout the world and accelerate the transfer of technology in that area.

39. He was privileged to introduce, on behalf of the delegations of Argentina, Bolivia, Canada, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, Jamaica, Mexico, Peru, the United States of America and Venezuela, a draft resolution (E/L.1758), entitled "Convening of a Second United Nations Regional Cartographic Conference for the Americas", in which the Secretary-General was requested to make the necessary arrangements to convene the Conference at Mexico City during the first half of 1979. The draft resolution also requested the Secretary-General to implement the recommendations of the First Cartographic Conference, held at Panama, which entailed such important and necessary activities as hydrographic charting, photogrammetry, cadastral mapping, remote sensing and satellite imagery and remote sensing information transfer. His delegation considered that all those measures would undoubtedly help to strengthen the technical position of the countries concerned with regard to matters dealt with in other bodies and organizations of the United Nations system, such as the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, activities concerning population, the environment and human settlements, and technical services relating to the evaluation of natural resources.

40. Draft resolution E/L.1758 also expressed the Council's appreciation of the generous offer of Mexico to act as host to the Conference and to extend full co-operation in that regard.

41. Lastly, he pointed out that in operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution E/L.1758 the reference to General Assembly resolution 2609 (XXIV) of 16 December 1969 should be replaced by a reference to resolution 31/140 of 17 December 1976, which superseded the earlier resolution.

42. Mr. HANNAH (New Zealand) said that his delegation had the privilege to introduce, on behalf of Bangladesh, Malaysia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Philippines, the United Kingdom and the United States of America, draft resolution E/L.1760, entitled "Convening of the Ninth United Nations Regional Cartographic Conference for Asia and the Pacific". He was glad that Canada and Iran had joined the list of sponsors.

43. New Zealand had for many years attached considerable importance to its participation, together with the other countries of Asia and the Pacific, in the work of the United Nations cartographic conferences held in that region. The valuable results of those meetings were evident from the report of the Secretary-General on the Eighth United Nations Regional Cartographic Conference for Asia and the Far East (E/5918). Accordingly, New Zealand was pleased to offer to act as host to the Ninth Regional Cartographic Conference for Asia and the Pacific, to be held early in 1980.

44. The draft resolution did not require extensive comment. Operative paragraph 1 would have the Council approve the recommendation of the Eighth Conference that the name of future regional conferences should be brought into line with the new title of the region, i.e. that the words Asia and the Far East should be replaced by Asia and the Pacific. In operative paragraph 2 the Secretary-General was requested to make the necessary arrangements to convene the Ninth United Nations Regional Cartographic Conference for Asia and the Pacific in New Zealand in February 1980. The timing recommended by the Eighth Conference reflected consultations between the New Zealand authorities and the Secretariat and also took account of the proposal to convene the Second Regional Conference for the Americas in the first half of 1979. He pointed out that in operative paragraph 2 the reference to General Assembly resolution 2609 (XXIV) of 16 December 1969 should be replaced by a reference to resolution 31/140 of 17 December 1976, which superseded the earlier resolution. In operative paragraph 3 the Secretary-General was requested to take measures for the implementation of the recommendations of the Eighth United Nations Regional Cartographic Conference for Asia and the Far East, held at Bangkok from 17 to 28 January 1977, including a further meeting of the Group of Experts on Hydrographic Surveying and Nautical Charting. His delegation was happy to note that according to document E/L.1762 on financial implications, the meeting of a small group of experts at Headquarters would not entail any additional expenditure.

45. Lastly, his delegation commended draft resolution E/L.1760 to the Council for adoption and expressed its support for draft resolution E/L.1758 introduced by the representative of Ecuador.

46. Mr. LOPEZ BASSOLS (Mexico) thanked the representative of Ecuador for his kind words and said that Mexico had recently been the site of various international

conferences and meetings, such as meetings of the Working Group on the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, the World Conference of the International Women's Year and the Conference on Economic Co-operation among Developing Countries. Mexico also had the technical infrastructure for planning, co-ordination and production of an inventory of the country's natural, human and economic resources and considered that the study, recording and dissemination of information on those resources should create a new awareness of the development possibilities for each region and thus identify the needs, means, solutions and goals to pave the way for collective progress. The basic task of the Commission for the Study of the National Territory (CETERNAL) was the compilation of the inventory of Mexico's resources. In order to carry out that task, it was doing studies on human resources, resources in infrastructure and installations, natural resources, both renewable and non-renewable, and topographical relief surveys with a view to compiling basic information for sectoral and regional planning and, subsequently, over-all national planning.

47. Mexico was sure that the countries seeking to emerge from under-development would need adequate planning for population activities as the underlying basis for their development effort. But without a real knowledge of their resources it would not be feasible to put economic development theories into practice with any guarantee of success. For those reasons, the Government of Mexico had offered, at the Panama Conference, to host the Second United Nations Regional Cartographic Conference for the Americas for two weeks during the first half of 1979, at a date to be decided in the future, after consultations with the Secretariat and the delegations planning to attend.

48. Having the necessary facilities at Mexico City, and having the technical infrastructure of CETERNAL as well as extensive regional experience in the field, the Government of Mexico was looking forward confidently to acting as host to the Second Regional Cartographic Conference for the Americas.

49. His delegation felt that it would have been desirable for the Council to have before it the final document adopted at the Panama Conference,¹ since that document contained a summary of the plenary meetings and those of the four committees and the resolutions adopted, and bore eloquent testimony to the collective scientific work accomplished. His delegation also wished to congratulate Mr. Chris Christopher, Chief of the Cartography Section, who had served as Executive Secretary of that Conference, and hoped that it would be possible to have the benefit of his advice and experience in the organization of the next regional conference.

50. Mr. NAKAMURA (Japan) said that his country recognized the importance of cartography in the formulation of development plans and, in keeping with that position, had participated positively in the Eighth Regional Cartographic Conference for Asia and the Far East.

51. His delegation wished to express its appreciation to the Government of New Zealand for offering to act as host

¹ L/CONF.67/3.

to the next conference for the ESCAP region, and hoped that that Conference would not only provide a forum for the exchange of information and techniques, but also consider concrete measures for regional and international co-operation at the intergovernmental level. His delegation had decided to join the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1760.

52. Mr. DUMAS (France) said that his country had always taken an interest in cartographic activities and had participated in them through the National Cartographic Institute in Paris. The French delegation supported draft resolutions E/L.1758 and E/L.1760.

53. Miss TYERMAN (Canada) said that the Canadian delegations that had attended the First United Nations Regional Cartographic Conference for the Americas, held at Panama in 1976, and the Eighth Regional Cartographic Conference for Asia and the Far East, held at Bangkok in 1977, were pleased with the work of the Conferences.

54. In her delegation's view, those regional conferences provided a unique opportunity for the exchange of technical information, which was facilitated by the quality of their organization and the high calibre of the working papers submitted by delegations. They also enabled experts on the subject to exchange knowledge and experience with their counterparts from all over the world and to discuss, formally and informally, the latest developments in geodesy, mapping and surveying. Such exchanges could be of particular benefit to developing countries, which, like Canada, needed to survey and map large areas with limited resources.

55. Her delegation hoped that the Council would adopt the two draft resolutions under consideration (E/L.1758 and E/L.1760) by consensus.

56. Mr. RIEMER (United States of America) stressed the usefulness of regional cartographic conferences for all countries, and particularly for the developing countries, in view of the exchange of technical information they promoted, and he thanked the delegations of Mexico and New Zealand for their Governments' offers to act as host to forthcoming conferences.

57. Mr. WU Hsiao-ta (China) said that since China had not been represented at the Eighth United Nations Regional Cartographic Conference for Asia and the Far East, the resolutions adopted by that Conference were not binding on China and that, should those resolutions be put to a vote at the current session of the Council, the Chinese delegation would not take part in the voting.

58. At the Council's fifty-sixth session, the delegation of China had stated that the presence of the Chiang Kai-shek clique, claiming to represent China, at the first six Regional Cartographic Conferences for Asia and the Far East, had been illegal and invalid. On that occasion the delegation of China had also said that the Sixth Regional Cartographic Conference had improperly recommended the establishment of a so-called "South China Sea Hydrographic Commission" and had included the Nansha Islands, belonging to China, and the adjoining sea areas in the hydrographic plan of the Commission. On numerous

occasions, the Chinese Government had stated that the Nansha Islands, as well as the Hsisha, Tungsha and Chungsha Islands, had always been Chinese territory and that the People's Republic of China had indisputable sovereignty over those islands and adjoining sea areas. The Chinese delegation had asked the competent authorities to take action to put an end to the hydrographic plan in question and to prevent similar cases from arising in the future, and it now reiterated that position.

59. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt draft resolutions E/L.1758 and E/L.1760, as orally revised by the representatives of Ecuador and New Zealand respectively, without a vote.

Draft resolution E/L.1758, as orally revised, was adopted (resolution 2048 (LXII)).

Draft resolution E/L.1760, as orally revised, was adopted (resolution 2049 (LXII)).

60. Mr. AMIRDZHANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation reserved the right to revert, in the Fifth Committee of the General Assembly, to the question of the financial implications of the resolutions just adopted by the Council. In his delegation's opinion, expenditure on conferences financed from the regular budget should be reduced to a minimum. Where possible the necessary funds should be obtained by economizing and by cutting down or discontinuing other programmes.

AGENDA ITEM 7

Transport questions (E/5916, TD/B/AC.20/6)

REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC COMMITTEE (E/5962 AND ADD.1)

61. Mr. DOWNES-THOMAS (Assistant Secretary of the Council) said that the French text of paragraph 5 of the draft resolution, entitled "Work of the Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods", recommended by the Economic Committee in paragraph 11 of its report (E/5962) would be corrected so that it conformed to the English version.

62. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt the draft resolution and draft decisions A, B and C recommended by the Economic Committee in its report (E/5962) without a vote.

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 2050 (LXII)).

Draft decisions A, B and C were adopted (decisions 213 (LXII), para. 2, 218 (LXII) and 219 (LXI)).

AGENDA ITEM 8

Population questions (E/5913)

REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC COMMITTEE (E/5961)

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

resolutions I, II and III and draft decisions A and B recommended by the Economic Committee in paragraph 14 of its report (E/5961), without a vote.

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 2051 (LXII)).

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 2052 (LXII)).

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 2053 (LXII)).

Draft decisions A and B were adopted (decisions 221 (LXII) and 222 (LXII)).

AGENDA ITEM 9

Statistical questions (E/5910)

REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC COMMITTEE (E/5960 AND CORR.1)

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

resolutions I and II and draft decisions A and B recommended by the Economic Committee in paragraph 13 of its report (E/5960 and Corr.1), without a vote.

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 2054 (LXII)).

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 2055 (LXII)).

Draft decisions A and B were adopted (decisions 220 (LXII) and 213 (LXII), para. 1 (e)).

65. The PRESIDENT said that, as recommended by the Economic Committee in paragraph 11 of its report, the question of the date of the twentieth session of the Statistical Commission could be considered at the sixty-third session of the Council, within the context of its consideration of the biennial calendar of conferences.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

2055th meeting

Wednesday, 11 May 1977, at 11.25 a.m.

President: Mr. Ladislav ŠMÍD (Czechoslovakia).

E/SR.2055

AGENDA ITEM 15

Elections (E/L.1741, E/L.1747 and Corr.1, E/L.1748, E/L.1749 and Add.1 and 2, E/L.1750-1753)

1. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should take the elections in the order in which the bodies concerned were listed in the annotations to item 15 in the provisional agenda for the sixty-second session (E/5917), beginning with the Statistical Commission.

STATISTICAL COMMISSION (E/L.1747 AND CORR.1)

2. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect eight members of the Statistical Commission for a term of four years beginning on 1 January 1978.

3. Miss ST. CLAIRE (Assistant Secretary of the Council) read out the following list of candidates: for two of the three seats allotted to African States: Ethiopia and Tunisia; for the seat allotted to Latin American States: Jamaica; for the three seats allotted to Western European and other States: Canada, Spain and the United States of America; for the seat allotted to Eastern European States: the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

4. The PRESIDENT suggested that those countries should be elected by acclamation, with the understanding that the third African seat would be filled at a later time.

Canada, Ethiopia, Jamaica, Spain, Tunisia, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America were elected members of the Statistical Commission by acclamation.

POPULATION COMMISSION (E/L.1747)

5. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect nine members of the Population Commission for a term of four years beginning on 1 January 1978.

6. Miss ST. CLAIRE (Assistant Secretary of the Council) read out the following list of candidates: for the two seats allotted to African States: Egypt and Malawi; for the two seats allotted to Asian States: India and Japan; for the two seats allotted to Latin American States: Barbados and Panama; for the two seats allotted to Western European and other States: the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America; for the seat allotted to Eastern European States: the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

7. The PRESIDENT suggested that those countries should be elected by acclamation.

Barbados, Egypt, India, Japan, Malawi, Panama, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America were elected members of the Population Commission by acclamation.

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS (E/L.1747)

8. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect 11 members of the Commission on Human Rights for a term of three years beginning on 1 January 1978.

9. Miss ST. CLAIRE (Assistant Secretary of the Council) read out the following list of candidates: for the three seats allotted to African States: Burundi, Ethiopia and the Ivory Coast; for the seat allotted to Asian States: Iran and the Philippines; for the two seats allotted to Latin American States: Brazil, Colombia and Costa Rica; for the three seats allotted to Western European and other States: Australia, France, the Federal Republic of Germany and the United States of America; for the two seats allotted to Eastern European States: Poland and Yugoslavia.

10. Mr. ZAIMI (Observer for Morocco), speaking at the invitation of the President, said that his country was a candidate for one of the three seats being relinquished by Egypt, Senegal and the Upper Volta.

11. Mr. SOBHY (Observer for Egypt), speaking at the invitation of the President, said that there was no consensus on the candidates endorsed by the African Group. His delegation maintained its candidature for a seat on the Commission on Human Rights.

12. Mr. BAMBA (Upper Volta) said that, contrary to the statements made by the observers for Egypt and Morocco, there had been a consensus in the African Group on the three African States included in the list of candidates read out by the Assistant Secretary of the Council. Any State was, of course, free to nominate itself.

13. Miss BALOGUN (Nigeria) agreed that there had been a consensus in the African Group, and said that the Council should endorse the Group's position without a vote.

14. Mr. MESTIRI (Tunisia) also agreed that there had been a consensus in the African Group. However, the Nigerian representative's proposal that there should be no vote was not in conformity with the spirit and practice of the Council.

15. Miss ST. CLAIRE (Assistant Secretary of the Council) said that normally the Secretariat read out the names of candidates endorsed by a given group. If a vote was to be taken to fill the seats allotted to African States, she would inform the Council that the delegations of Senegal and the Upper Volta had also submitted the candidatures of their countries for those seats by letter to the Secretary-General.

16. Mr. BAMBA (Upper Volta) insisted that there had been consensus in the African Group, and said that his delegation had withdrawn its candidature for that reason. The Group had proceeded by assigning one seat to each of the three subregions, central Africa, east Africa and west Africa, and the candidates chosen had been Burundi, Ethiopia and the Ivory Coast. The delegations of Senegal and the Upper Volta had supported the Group's decision; the delegations of Egypt and Morocco had dissented, but there had still been a consensus in the Group.

17. Mr. BENHOCINE (Algeria) agreed that the African Group had reached a consensus on the three candidates

read out by the Assistant Secretary of the Council, as could be seen from a document circulated by the Organization of African Unity. It should be remembered, however, that a consensus was not necessarily a unanimous decision. Some African countries continued to maintain their candidature, and they had the right to do so. He felt that the Council should take a vote by secret ballot.

18. Miss BALOGUN (Nigeria) said that a question of morality was involved. The African Group had tried to follow the principle of geographical distribution. The seat intended for an east African State had been assigned to Ethiopia. Was it morally correct for a country from another subregion to attempt to take that seat? She appealed to the observers for Egypt and Morocco to withdraw their countries' candidatures.

19. Mr. AL-HUSSAMY (Syrian Arab Republic) noted that, apart from the excess number of candidates for the seats allotted to African States, there were similar problems with regard to the Asian, Latin American and Western European and other States. Apparently only the Eastern European States had reached a consensus. He therefore suggested that a vote should be taken on the seats for all regions.

20. Mr. MADEY (Yugoslavia) said the practice of the Council was that, when the number of candidates was equal to the number of seats becoming vacant, the list submitted was endorsed by the Council. He therefore urged the Council to endorse without a vote the candidates nominated by the Eastern European States.

21. Mr. AMIRDZHANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) supported the Yugoslav proposal.

22. The PRESIDENT suggested that in the case of the Eastern European States, where the number of candidates was equal to the number of available seats, the Council should elect those candidates by acclamation, and in the case of the other four regional groups the Council should vote by secret ballot.

23. Miss BALOGUN (Nigeria) said that the supreme body of African States, the Organization of African Unity, had circulated a document endorsing the candidates. She did not feel that the Council should question the position of OAU, and she therefore called for a decision by the Council on whether a ballot was necessary with regard to the seats allotted to African States.

24. Mr. BENHOCINE (Algeria) reaffirmed that there had been a consensus in the African Group and that the three States whose names had been read out were indeed the candidates endorsed by the Group. However, votes had been taken by the Council in the past, even when the number of candidates had been equal to the number of seats available. He suggested that the Council might wish to obtain the advice of the Legal Counsel on the matter.

25. Mr. MWANGAGUHUNGA (Uganda) suggested that the list of candidates for the seats allotted to African States should be reconsidered by the African Group through consultations. He did not wish to see a bad precedent set in the Council.

26 Miss BALOGUN (Nigeria) supported the Ugandan suggestion and said that, if it was accepted, she would withdraw her own proposal. African States were accustomed to settle matters as a family.

27. Mr. LOWENSTEIN (United States of America) expressed the hope that the spirit which had prevailed at the last session of the Commission on Human Rights would also prevail in the Council. He did not wish the Council to be put in the position of having to act as if it chose not to take into account the will of the African Group. He therefore supported the Ugandan representative's suggestion, which might promote a better atmosphere for the next session of the Commission.

28. The PRESIDENT suggested that the candidates for the two seats allotted to Eastern European States should be elected by acclamation.

Poland and Yugoslavia were elected members of the Commission on Human Rights by acclamation.

29. The PRESIDENT suggested that the elections for the three seats allotted to African States should be postponed until a future meeting.

It was so decided.

30. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect one member from the two candidates proposed by the Asian States, two members from the three candidates proposed by the Latin American States and three members from the four candidates proposed by the Western European and other States.

At the invitation of the President, Ms. Kongshem (Norway) and Mr. Pierce (Jamaica) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

Number of ballot papers:	54
Invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	54
Required majority:	28

Number of votes obtained:

Colombia	46
France	45
United States of America	43
Brazil	42
Iran	40
Australia	36
Germany, Federal Republic of	29
Costa Rica	20
Philippines	14

Having obtained the largest number of votes and the required majority, Australia, Brazil, Colombia, France, Iran and the United States of America were elected members of the Commission on Human Rights.

COMMITTEE FOR PROGRAMME AND CO-ORDINATION (E/L.1748)

31. The PRESIDENT said that, in accordance with the procedure instituted in its decision 139 (ORG-76), the

Council was required to nominate seven members for election by the General Assembly at its thirty-second session to fill the vacancies in the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination which would occur at the end of 1977. The term would be three years, beginning on 1 January 1978. He drew attention to the reminder, in document E/L.1748, paragraph 2, that the General Assembly, in its resolution 3392(XXX), had encouraged Member States to be represented in the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination at an adequate level in order to raise the expertise of that Committee.

32. Miss ST. CLAIRE (Assistant Secretary of the Council) read out the following list of candidates: for the three seats allotted to African States: Burundi, Ghana and Kenya; for the three seats allotted to Asian States: India, Indonesia and Japan; for the seat allotted to Latin American States: Brazil.

33. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should nominate those countries for election by the General Assembly at its thirty-second session.

Brazil, Burundi, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Japan, and Kenya were nominated for election to the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination by the General Assembly at its thirty-second session.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSING, BUILDING AND PLANNING (E/L.1749 AND ADD.1 AND 2)

34. The PRESIDENT said that nine members of the Committee on Housing, Building and Planning were to be elected for a four-year term beginning on 1 January 1978. In addition, there were two vacancies, one for an African State and one for an Asian State, for a term beginning on the date of election and expiring on 31 December 1980. The election to fill the latter two vacancies had been postponed until the sixty-second session.

35. Miss ST. CLAIRE (Assistant Secretary of the Council) read out the following list of candidates: for the two seats allotted to African States: the Central African Empire and Egypt; for the additional seat allotted to African States: Malawi; for the two seats allotted to Asian States: Iraq and Thailand; for the additional seat allotted to Asian States: the Syrian Arab Republic; for the two seats allotted to Latin American States: Barbados and Jamaica; for the two seats allotted to Western European and other States: Canada and Sweden; for the seat allotted to Eastern European States: the German Democratic Republic.

36. The PRESIDENT suggested that those countries should be elected by acclamation.

Barbados, Canada, the Central African Empire, Egypt, the German Democratic Republic, Iraq, Jamaica, Malawi, Sweden, the Syrian Arab Republic and Thailand were elected members of the Committee on Housing, Building and Planning by acclamation.

COMMITTEE ON REVIEW AND APPRAISAL (E/L.1750)

37. The PRESIDENT said that 27 members of the Committee on Review and Appraisal were to be elected for

a four-year term beginning on 1 January 1978. In addition, the Council was called upon to elect one member from African States and two members from Asian States for a term beginning on the date of election and expiring on 31 December 1979, as well as two members from Asian States for a term beginning on the date of election and expiring on 31 December 1977. The election of the latter five members had been postponed until the sixty-second session.

38. Miss ST. CLAIRE (Assistant Secretary of the Council) read out the following list of candidates: for five of the 10 seats allotted to African States: Algeria, Egypt, Kenya, Nigeria and the United Republic of Cameroon; for the five seats allotted to Asian States: none; for the five seats allotted to Latin American States: Argentina, Colombia, Ecuador, Surinam and Venezuela; for the seven seats allotted to Western European and other States: Austria, Belgium, Canada, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

39. The PRESIDENT suggested that those countries should be elected by acclamation.

Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Colombia, Ecuador, Egypt, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Kenya, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Surinam, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United Republic of Cameroon and Venezuela were elected members of the Committee on Review and Appraisal by acclamation.

40. The PRESIDENT suggested that the elections for the remaining seats allotted to African States and for the seats allotted to Asian States should be postponed until a future meeting.

It was so decided.

COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

41. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect two members of the Committee on Natural Resources from African States for a term beginning on the date of election and expiring on 31 December 1980 and one member from Asian States for a term beginning on the date of election and expiring on 31 December 1978. The election of those members had been postponed from previous sessions.

42. Miss ST. CLAIRE (Assistant Secretary of the Council) said that Sierra Leone was a candidate for one of the two seats allotted to African States. There was no candidate for the seat allotted to Asian States.

43. The PRESIDENT suggested that Sierra Leone should be elected by acclamation

Sierra Leone was elected a member of the Committee on Natural Resources by acclamation.

44. The PRESIDENT suggested that the elections for the remaining seat allotted to African States and for the seat allotted to Asian States should be postponed until a future session.

It was so decided.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT

45. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect one member of the Committee on Science and Technology for Development from African States for a term beginning on the date of election and expiring on 31 December 1980 and two members from Asian States, one for a term beginning on the date of election and expiring on 31 December 1978 and one for a term beginning on the date of election and expiring on 31 December 1979. The election of those members had been postponed from previous sessions.

46. Miss ST. CLAIRE (Assistant Secretary of the Council) said that Sierra Leone was a candidate for the seat allotted to African States. There were no candidates for the two seats allotted to Asian States.

47. The PRESIDENT suggested that Sierra Leone should be elected by acclamation.

Sierra Leone was elected a member of the Committee on Science and Technology for Development by acclamation.

48. The PRESIDENT suggested that the elections for the seats allotted to Asian States should be postponed until a future session.

It was so decided.

COMMITTEE ON FOOD AID POLICIES AND PROGRAMMES (E/L.1753)

49. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect five members of the Committee on Food Aid Policies and Programmes from among States Members of the United Nations or members of FAO for a term of three years beginning on 1 January 1978.

50. Miss ST. CLAIRE (Assistant Secretary of the Council) said that four candidatures had been received: the African States had nominated Tunisia; the Western European and other States had nominated Greece and Norway; the Eastern European States had nominated Hungary.

51. The PRESIDENT suggested that those countries should be elected by acclamation.

Greece, Hungary, Norway and Tunisia were elected members of the Committee on Food Aid Policies and Programmes by acclamation.

52. The PRESIDENT suggested that the election for the remaining seat should be postponed until a future session.

It was so decided.

UNITED NATIONS SPECIAL FUND FOR LAND-LOCKED DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

53. The PRESIDENT recalled that at its thirty-first session the General Assembly had decided that the election of the members of the Board of Governors of the United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries should take place at its resumed thirty-first session. If the

thirty-first session were not resumed, however, the Economic and Social Council was authorized to elect the members of the Board.

54. If there were no objection, he would take it that the Council preferred not to hold the elections to the Board of Governors of the Special Fund at its current session but to leave the elections to the General Assembly at its resumed session.

It was so decided.

COMMISSION ON TRANSNATIONAL CORPORATIONS (E/L.1751)

55. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect 16 members of the Commission on Transnational Corporations for a term of three years beginning on 1 January 1978.

56. Miss ST. CLAIRE (Assistant Secretary of the Council) read out the following list of candidates: for the four seats allotted to African States: Benin, Ghana, Tunisia and Zambia; for one of the four seats allotted to Asian States: Japan; for the three seats allotted to Latin American States: Argentina, Colombia and Surinam; for the three seats allotted to Western European and other States: Australia, France, the Federal Republic of Germany and Switzerland; for the two seats allotted to Eastern European States: the German Democratic Republic and Romania.

57. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should elect by acclamation the candidates from the Group of African States, the Group of Asian States, the Group of Latin American States and the Group of Eastern European States.

Argentina, Benin, Colombia, the German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Japan, Romania, Surinam, Tunisia and Zambia were elected members of the Commission on Transnational Corporations by acclamation.

58. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect three members from among the Western European and other States.

At the invitation of the President, Ms. Kongshem (Norway) and Mr. Pierce (Jamaica) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

<i>Number of ballot papers:</i>	54
<i>Invalid ballots:</i>	0
<i>Number of valid ballots:</i>	52
<i>Required majority:</i>	28

<i>Number of votes obtained:</i>	
Switzerland	42
Germany, Federal Republic of	41
France	40
Australia	33

Having obtained the largest number of votes and the required majority, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, and Switzerland were elected members of the Commission on Transnational Corporations.

59. The PRESIDENT suggested that the elections for the remaining seats allotted to Asian States should be postponed until a future session.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

2056th meeting

Wednesday, 11 May 1977, at 4 p.m.

President: Mr. Ladislav ŠMÍD (Czechoslovakia).

E/SR.2056

AGENDA ITEM 15

Elections (*continued*) (E/L.1741, E/L.1747 and Corr.1, E/L.1750, E/L.1752)

COMMISSION ON NARCOTIC DRUGS (E/L.1747)

1. The PRESIDENT said the criteria to be applied with regard to the composition of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs were set out in paragraph 4 of document E/L.1747: the Council was required to elect 15 members for a period of four years.

2. Miss ST. CLAIRE (Assistant Secretary of the Council) said that the following candidatures had been proposed for

the Commission on Narcotic Drugs: the African States had proposed Algeria, Togo and Tunisia; the Asian States had proposed Indonesia, Iran and Japan; the Latin American States had proposed Brazil, Chile, Mexico and Panama; the Western European and other States had proposed Australia, Belgium, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Turkey; and the Eastern European States had proposed the German Democratic Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

3. Mr. AMIRDZHANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) wished it to be placed on record that his delegation had taken no part in the decision proposing the candidature of the Chilean junta for a seat on the Commission on Narcotic Drugs and that if the election were held by secret

ballot his delegation would vote against that candidature. It would likewise be unable to accept the outcome of any vote to that effect.

4. The PRESIDENT suggested that, since there was no fixed distribution by group for the seats on the Commission and since the number of candidatures submitted exceeded the number of vacancies, the Council should elect the 15 members by secret ballot.

5. Mr. ALFONSO MARTINEZ (Cuba) supported the suggestion of the President. Since an objection had been raised to one candidature, the Council should hold the election by secret ballot, in accordance with rule 68 of the rules of procedure.

6. Mr. KANAZAWA (Japan) said that, although there was not a stipulated number of seats on the Commission on Narcotic Drugs for each region, it was the custom for each region to occupy a certain number of seats. That procedure should be followed on the current occasion, since it would facilitate the functioning of the Commission. That being so, he suggested that a secret ballot should be held only for the candidatures from the regional groups where the number of candidates exceeded the number of vacancies.

7. Mr. LINDENBERG SETTE (Brazil) said he agreed with the representative of Japan; if the Council were to hold a secret ballot for the regional groups where the number of vacancies was the same as the number of candidatures and where in addition those candidatures were supported by the group concerned, he would be obliged to state that he completely disagreed with that procedure. The Latin American Group had never opposed the candidatures submitted by other groups, and he did not remember a secret ballot ever having been held to elect members of bodies when the number of candidates was the same as the number of vacancies for each region and when, moreover, the candidatures in question were supported by the regional group concerned.

8. Miss BALOGUN (Nigeria), speaking on behalf of the African delegations which were members of the Council, expressed support for the statement by the representative of Brazil. The Council should not be misled by the Secretariat, and candidates who were supported by their regional groups should be elected immediately, without a secret ballot.

9. Mr. FUENTES IBÁÑEZ (Bolivia) said that the Council could not make any change in established practices at the current stage. The Latin American Group had officially submitted its candidates for the four seats available to it on the Commission on Narcotic Drugs and his delegation would regard any decision which did not take those candidatures into account as unjustified and unacceptable interference.

10. Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) supported the statements of previous speakers to the effect that the candidatures proposed by the regional groups should be respected.

11. Mr. ALZAMORA (Peru) said that the Council should respect the principle of equitable geographical distribution in the composition of its functional commissions and the agreements reached in the regional groups.

12. Mr. ALFONSO MARTINEZ (Cuba) said that the secret ballot which in his view the Council should hold in no way endangered the agreements reached by the regional groups and would not alter the geographical balance in the Commission on Narcotic Drugs. It should be remembered that there was no fixed distribution of seats by region in that Commission and that consequently its members could not be elected according to the same criteria as were applied in the case of other organs. Moreover, since an objection had been raised to one candidature, the Council must inevitably apply the relevant provision of rule 68 of the rules of procedure, which, moreover, showed that the general principle was that of election by secret ballot, and that cases in which such balloting was not used constituted the exception.

13. Mr. CZARKOWSKI (Poland) said that his delegation respected the decisions taken by the regional groups, but it should also be remembered that the case of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs had special characteristics. Although equitable geographical distribution should be taken into account with regard to its composition, it was also necessary to apply the relevant provisions of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961. It should also be borne in mind that the current case involved the candidature of a Government which had been repeatedly condemned by the United Nations. In the light of those considerations, the only correct way of proceeding would be to adopt the President's suggestion.

14. Mr. BATIOUK (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the very nature of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs prevented any fixed geographical distribution of its members; in fact, the problem of narcotic drugs did not affect all regions of the world equally. In the circumstances, since there were 15 vacancies and 16 candidatures, the only course was for the Council to hold a secret ballot on all the candidates proposed.

15. Mr. LINDENBERG SETTE (Brazil) said that two questions had been raised during the current discussion: first, it had been stated that there was no established geographical distribution of seats on the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, an assertion which was highly debatable if it was remembered that there were tacit understandings whereby it was agreed that the members of the Council would work in concert with one another. He did not wish to enter into a debate and if it was asserted that the criterion of geographical distribution did not apply in that Commission, then for the time being and for the purposes of the current election, his delegation would not object to that view and would vote accordingly. With regard to the second question, which was procedural, if one or two members of the Council invoked the rules of procedure in order to put to the vote a matter which was normally decided by consensus, his delegation would accept that course, since it did not question their right to do so, and once again, would vote accordingly on the current occasion and in the current circumstances.

16. Mr. ALZAMORA (Peru) requested that the list of candidates and regional groups should be read out once again, indicating the regional groups whose candidates exceeded the number of vacancies.

17. Miss ST. CLAIRE (Assistant Secretary of the Council) read out the following list of candidates:

Three members from African States: Algeria, Togo and Tunisia;

Three members from Asian States: Indonesia, Iran and Japan;

Four members from Latin American States: Brazil, Chile, Mexico and Panama;

Two members from Eastern European States: German Democratic Republic and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics;

Four members from Western European and other States: Australia, Belgium, Turkey and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The candidatures from the last group thus exceeded the number of vacancies, of which there were three.

18. Mr. TREVIÑO (Mexico) stressed the importance which his Government attached to the Commission on Narcotic Drugs and observed that none of the members of the Group of 77 was occupying a seat to which it was not entitled. He stressed once again his country's great interest in becoming a member of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs.

19. The PRESIDENT suggested that the voting to elect 15 members of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs should be held by secret ballot.

At the invitation of the President, Ms. Kongshem (Norway) and Mr. Pierce (Jamaica) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

<i>Number of ballot papers:</i>	54
<i>Invalid ballots:</i>	0
<i>Number of valid ballots:</i>	54
<i>Required majority:</i>	28

Number of votes obtained:

Mexico	52
Algeria	50
Turkey	50
Iran	49
Japan	48
Panama	48
Brazil	46
Indonesia	46
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	46
Belgium	44
Togo	44
Tunisia	43
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	40
German Democratic Republic	38
Australia	34
Chile	25
Morocco	3
Poland	1
Yugoslavia	1
Austria	1
Jamaica	1

Having obtained the required majority, Algeria, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, the German Democratic Republic, Indonesia, Iran, Japan, Mexico, Panama, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland were elected members of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs.

COMMITTEE ON REVIEW AND APPRAISAL (concluded)
(E/L.1750)

20. Miss ST. CLAIRE (Assistant Secretary of the Council) observed that, of the 10 members from African States who were to be elected to the Committee on Review and Appraisal to fill the vacancies that would occur on 31 December 1977, 5 had already been elected. The candidature of Benin had been proposed, leaving four seats to be filled.

21. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objection, he would take it that the Council agreed to elect Benin a member of the Committee on Review and Appraisal.

It was so decided.

EXECUTIVE BOARD OF THE UNITED NATIONS
CHILDREN'S FUND (E/L.1741)

22. The PRESIDENT observed that the Council had to elect 10 States Members of the United Nations or members of specialized agencies to the Executive Board of the United Nations Children's Fund for a three-year period starting on 1 August 1977. In accordance with General Assembly resolution 1038 (XI) the members would be elected "with due regard to geographical distribution and to the representation of the major contributing and recipient countries".

23. Miss ST. CLAIRE (Assistant Secretary of the Council) read out the list of candidates. The African States supported the candidature of one member: Zambia; the Asian States had submitted a list of four members without supporting their candidatures: Afghanistan, Jordan, Pakistan and Thailand; the Latin American States supported the candidatures of two members: Barbados and Chile; the Western European and other States supported the candidatures of three members: Canada, the Federal Republic of Germany and Norway; the Eastern European States supported the candidature of one member: Yugoslavia. The total number of vacancies was 10.

24. Mr. AMIRDZHANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that in connexion with the candidature of the Chilean junta, he wanted the record to show that his delegation had not taken part in that designation and would vote against it. His delegation also wished the record to show that it did not accept that candidature.

25. Miss BALOGUN (Nigeria) said that in her delegation's view, when agreement had been reached within a particular group, especially in view of the clear stipulation that due regard must be given to the question of geographical representation, the Council should accept the proposal made by that group. One delegation had expressed reservations and the wish that those reservations should be mentioned in Secretariat documents, but as she understood

it, no member of the Council thus far had made a formal proposal to put the entire question to a vote by secret ballot. Accordingly, she proposed that the reservations should be accepted and that the Council should continue its consideration of the item before it.

26. The PRESIDENT, after recalling the relevant provision of the rules of procedure (rule 68), said that the Council could decide not to put the question to a vote by secret ballot and could proceed instead to elect by acclamation the candidates of those groups whose lists did not exceed the number of vacancies.

27. Mr. LINDENBERG SETTE (Brazil) proposed that the Council should immediately take a decision concerning whether or not it would elect by acclamation the candidates proposed by those groups whose lists did exceed the number of existing vacancies.

28. Mr. ALFONSO MARTINEZ (Cuba) said that in order to facilitate the work of the President and the delegations and in accordance with the provisions of rule 68 of the rules of procedure, he proposed that the Council should take a vote by secret ballot on all the candidates proposed for membership in the UNICEF Executive Board, for the same reasons which he had already stated in connexion with the Commission on Narcotic Drugs. That position of his delegation eliminated any need for consultation by the Council as a whole whenever anyone simply invoked the prerogative granted to any Member State under rule 68 of the Council's rules of procedure.

29. Mr. WASILEWSKI (Poland) said that in the particular case of the election in question, due regard must be given not only to geographical distribution but also to the representation of the principal contributing and recipient countries.

30. Mr. LINDENBERG SETTE (Brazil) said that rule 68 had been invoked and that while his delegation would in no way oppose the application of its provisions, it would bear in mind that particular use being made of rule 68. However, Poland had injected into the question before the Council some new criteria which he did not consider appropriate; consequently, with all due respect to the representative of Poland, he asked the Council to disregard the Polish intervention, which did not contribute anything useful to the debate.

31. Miss RICHTER (Argentina) said that when regional groups gave their support to candidates for a committee or any other body, they were helping the work of that committee in a manner that could not be disregarded; for that reason, her delegation considered it harmful to abide by the letter of rule 68 as a matter of priority and to disregard the practice of respecting the proposals made by regional groups, which had proved so useful.

32. Miss BALOGUN (Nigeria) reminded the Council that it seemed to be deviating from a practice it had followed in recent years. In suggesting that the positions adopted by the regional groups should be respected, her delegation was not defending anyone in particular; it was making that suggestion simply as a matter of principle. Furthermore, if the Council wished to strike down that principle at the

present time, it would have to accept in the future the position of any delegation that acted in accordance with the Council's decision. What was favourable now to some delegations might be unfavourable to them at a later time. She wished the record to show that her delegation, speaking on behalf of the Group of African States, had stated that the positions of the regional groups should be respected in so far as possible.

33. Miss ST. CLAIRE (Assistant Secretary of the Council) pointed out that, as document E/L.1741 made clear, the terms of only three of the Asian States would expire on 31 July 1977, whereas those States had proposed four candidates.

34. The PRESIDENT, after reading out rule 68 of the rules of procedure of the Council, proposed that the Council should proceed by secret ballot to elect 10 candidates to fill 10 vacancies on the Executive Board of UNICEF.

35. Mr. LINDENBERG SETTE (Brazil) said that he disagreed with that procedure because he considered it incorrect, particularly in the present case, when it was stipulated that in filling the vacancies due regard should be given to geographical distribution.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Hachami (Tunisia) and Mr. Nakamura (Japan) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

<i>Number of ballot papers:</i>	54
<i>Invalid ballots:</i>	0
<i>Number of valid ballots:</i>	54
<i>Required majority:</i>	28

<i>Number of votes obtained:</i>	
Norway	53
Zambia	53
Barbados	51
Canada	50
Pakistan	47
Germany, Federal Republic of	46
Yugoslavia	45
Jordan	42
Afghanistan	41
Chile	32
Thailand	31
India	2
Japan	1

Having obtained the largest number of votes and the required majority, Afghanistan, Barbados, Canada, Chile, Germany, Federal Republic of, Jordan, Norway, Pakistan, Yugoslavia and Zambia were elected members of the Executive Board of the United Nations Children's Fund.

GOVERNING COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (E/L.1752)

36. The PRESIDENT said that 16 members of the Governing Council of UNDP were to be elected for a term of three years which would begin on 1 January 1978.

37. Miss ST. CLAIRE (Assistant Secretary of the Council) said that three members were to be elected from African States and the candidatures of the Ivory Coast, Kenya and Senegal had been proposed. Three members were to be elected from Asian States and Yugoslavia, and the candidatures of Fiji, Democratic Yemen, Indonesia and Jordan, had been proposed. Three members were to be elected from Latin American States, and the candidatures of Argentina, Ecuador and Trinidad and Tobago had been proposed. Five members were to be elected from Western European and other States, and the candidatures of Finland, the Federal Republic of Germany, the Netherlands, Spain, Switzerland and Turkey had been proposed. The Council also had to elect two members from Eastern European States, and the candidatures of Czechoslovakia and Poland had been proposed.

38. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should take a vote by secret ballot to elect the members of the Governing Council from Asian States and Yugoslavia and from Western European and other States, since for those groups the number of candidates exceeded the number of vacancies. He also suggested that the candidates from the other groups should be elected by acclamation by the Council.

Argentina, the Ivory Coast, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Kenya, Poland, Senegal and Trinidad and Tobago were elected members of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme by acclamation.

39. Mr. PAPOULIAS (Greece) said that the candidatures of Spain and Turkey had been proposed as representatives of the Mediterranean subgroup within the Group of Western European and other States. Those candidatures were based on the principle of rotation among subgroups within the regional groups and on the provisions of paragraph 1(c) of General Assembly resolution 2813 (XXVI). Since the Mediterranean subgroup had been insufficiently represented in the UNDP Governing Council, he hoped that the Council would support those candidatures.

40. Mr. SOUSA SOARES (Portugal) endorsed the remarks made by the representative of Greece.

41. Mr. CAMILLERI (Observer for Malta), speaking at the invitation of the President, supported the candidatures of Spain and Turkey for membership in the UNDP Governing Council. The General Assembly had established the principle that the composition of seats within each group should at all times reflect adequate subregional representation. Of the 17 seats allocated to the Group of Western European and other States in the UNDP Governing Council, the Mediterranean subgroup had received only one. That meant that each member of the Mediterranean subgroup could participate in the work of the Governing Council only once every 15 years, a situation which was contrary to both the letter and the spirit of General Assembly resolution 2029 (XX). He was convinced that an allocation of two seats to the Mediterranean subgroup would bring the representation on the UNDP Governing Council into stricter conformity with the provisions of that resolution.

42. During the past three years, Malta had served on the UNDP Governing Council for the first time; the experience had been particularly helpful to his delegation and had enabled it to play a part in the deliberations of one of the most vital organs of the United Nations. At the end of its term as a member of the Governing Council, his delegation recognized its responsibility to give an opportunity to other countries to participate in the work of that body.

43. Mr. DE PINIES (Observer for Spain), speaking at the invitation of the President, said that resolution 2813 (XXVI) was possibly one of the most precise resolutions adopted by the General Assembly. Among its provisions he singled out paragraph 1(c) which, in his opinion, included a very sensible criterion for determining the composition of the UNDP Governing Council.

44. The delegation of Spain, which was a contributing, not a recipient country, considered that it was in a position to make a useful contribution to the deliberations of the Governing Council and appreciated any support that its candidacy might receive in the Economic and Social Council.

45. Mr. TÜRKMEN (Observer for Turkey), speaking at the invitation of the President, supported the statements made by the previous speakers and considered that, in view of the provisions of General Assembly resolution 2813 (XXVI), it was clear that the Mediterranean subgroup had for a long time been inadequately represented in the Governing Council of UNDP. That situation needed to be rectified and he hoped that the Council would approve his country's candidacy.

46. Mr. GJESDAL (Norway), speaking also on behalf of Denmark, supported the re-election of Finland for the seat traditionally held by the Nordic countries in the UNDP Governing Council. In paragraph 5 of its resolution 2029 (XX), the General Assembly had requested the Economic and Social Council to provide for equitable and balanced representation of the economically more developed countries, having due regard to their contribution to UNDP. The support for Finland was based not only on the criterion of its contribution but also on that of its active participation in the work of the UNDP Governing Council.

47. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should elect, by secret ballot, three members of the UNDP Governing Council for the Group of Asian States and Yugoslavia and five members for the Group of Western European and other States.

At the invitation of the President, Ms. Kongshem (Norway) and Mr. Pierce (Jamaica) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

<i>Number of ballot papers:</i>	54
<i>Invalid ballots:</i>	0
<i>Number of valid ballots:</i>	54
<i>Required majority:</i>	28

*Number of votes obtained:**Asian States and Yugoslavia:*

Indonesia	42
Jordan	40
Democratic Yemen	37
Fiji	34

Western European and other States:

Finland	46
Spain	45
Netherlands	43
Switzerland	41
Germany, Federal Republic of	40
Turkey	32

Having obtained the greatest number of votes and the required majority, Democratic Yemen, Finland, Germany, Federal Republic of, Indonesia, Jordan, the Netherlands, Spain and Switzerland were elected members of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme.

AD HOC INTERGOVERNMENTAL WORKING GROUP ON THE PROBLEM OF CORRUPT PRACTICES

48. The PRESIDENT said that the following vacancies needed to be filled on the *Ad Hoc* Intergovernmental Working Group on the Problem of Corrupt Practices: one for African States, two for Eastern European States and three for Western European and other States, whose term would begin immediately.

49. Miss ST. CLAIRE (Assistant Secretary of the Council) said that no candidacies had been submitted for the Asian States or for the Eastern European States. The Western European and other States proposed the candidacy of Belgium, Canada, Italy and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

50. Mr. MARSHALL (United Kingdom) said that the Western European and other States had not been able to present an agreed list of candidates to fit the number of vacancies allocated for the Group. After considering ways and means of ensuring effective participation, they had therefore decided to achieve it by means of a large number of observers. He suggested that the *Ad Hoc* Group should be expanded or at least that the number of members should not be limited, so that the representatives of Western European and other States, which had shown great interest in the work of the *Ad Hoc* Group, could continue to participate in that work. The Western European and other States hoped to be able to continue to contribute as before, and that the Council shared their point of view.

51. The PRESIDENT suggested that the election should be postponed until a later session.

It was so decided.

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS (continued) (E/L.1747)

52. The PRESIDENT recalled that at the previous meeting the election of three members from African States had been postponed.

53. Mr. KOROMA (Observer for Sierra Leone), speaking at the invitation of the President and on behalf of the Chairman of the Group of African States, said that he had been instructed to state the position of the African Group regarding candidacies for the Commission on Human Rights. The African Group supported the candidacy of Burundi for the central African region, of the Ivory Coast for the west African region, and of Ethiopia for the east African region. During consideration of those candidacies, two delegations which did not belong to any of the regions mentioned had decided to enter reservations concerning the Group's decision or insisted on maintaining their candidacies, and those positions had been duly noted by the African Group.

54. Mr. BENGELLOUN (Observer for Morocco) pointed out to the Council that, regardless of the decision of the African Group, Morocco maintained its candidacy and consequently requested a vote by secret ballot, in accordance with rule 68 of the rules of procedure. He had definite reservations concerning the African Group's decision and would like the Secretariat specifically to place on record the fact that Morocco continued to be a candidate for one of three vacancies on the Commission on Human Rights assigned to African States, in view of the expiry of the terms of Egypt, Senegal and the Upper Volta.

55. Miss BALOGUN (Nigeria) quoted from paragraph 1 of General Assembly resolution 2813 (XXVI) and said that the allocation of posts for each group must duly and at all times reflect adequate subregional representation. Speaking on behalf of the Group of African States which were members of the Economic and Social Council, she said that the Council should not waste time on such a patently clear question. The Group of African States had already included the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya among the candidates for the Commission on Human Rights to represent the north African region, and she therefore wondered how some delegations could try to occupy a seat that belonged to another subregion. Neither on behalf of her own delegation nor on behalf of the Group of African States was she questioning the right of every State to seek to obtain a seat, but she believed that, as a matter of principle, the representation of a group should conform to the decisions taken within that group concerning subregional representation. The committee of the whole of the Group of African States had made a recommendation which had been submitted to the Council at the previous meeting and which the Group of African States had reaffirmed. Therefore, on behalf of her delegation, she suggested that the Council should take a decision on the question and declare that the proposals submitted by the Group of African States reflected the position adopted by consensus in the Group and that it supported the candidacies of the three countries proposed, namely, Burundi, Ethiopia and the Ivory Coast.

56. Mr. OULD SID'AHMED (Mauritania) said that he had no intention of opposing a consensus which had been reached in the Group of African States and to which the representative of Nigeria had referred. There had been an apparent consensus but reservations had been expressed. He did not think that it was for the Council to make a ruling on questions that should be decided by a particular group. He for his part supported the candidacy of Morocco and did not feel that there was any other course but to put the

matter to a vote by a secret ballot, as requested by one delegation.

57. Mr. BENHOCINE (Algeria) supported the statements made by the representatives of Sierra Leone and Nigeria. He considered that two principles were involved in the entire issue: one was respect for the rules of procedure of the Council, and the other was respect for a decision taken by a group, and in that particular instance a decision adopted by consensus in the Group of African States. That second principle involved a question of a political nature. His delegation wished to respect the decision of the Group of African States. It was for the Council to decide whether or not it wished to apply its rules of procedure.

58. Miss BALOGUN (Nigeria), after reading out rule 72, paragraph 2, of the rules of procedure, said that she did not believe that Morocco had been invited to take the floor and, even if that had been the case, Morocco would have no right to propose that a vote should be taken on any question unless a member of the Council so proposed. She asked the Council to support the decision submitted by the Group of African States at the morning meeting.

59. Mr. SOBHY (Observer for Egypt), speaking at the invitation of the President, said that Egypt understood that there had actually been no consensus in the Group of

African States. It was not raising that question in the Council but merely reiterating that Egypt had officially offered its candidacy and had not withdrawn it. The Egyptian delegation would oppose any attempt to prevent the Council from following the proper procedure in accordance with its request.

60. Mr. MUBAREZ (Yemen) suggested that a vote should be taken by secret ballot to elect the members of the Commission on Human Rights to represent the Group of African States.

61. Miss BALOGUN (Nigeria) insisted that no official proposal had been made to the Council that would prevent it from electing the three candidates proposed by the Group of African States. She therefore urged the Council to act accordingly.

62. The PRESIDENT suggested that the election of three members of the Commission on Human Rights to represent the African States should be postponed until the next meeting of the Council.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6.25 p.m.

2057th meeting

Thursday, 12 May 1977, at 11.15 a.m.

President: Mr. Ladislav ŠMÍD (Czechoslovakia).

E/SR.2057

AGENDA ITEM 15

Elections (*concluded*) (E/L.1747 and Corr.1)

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS (*concluded*)
(E/L.1747)

1. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to proceed to the election of three members from African States to the Commission on Human Rights for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1978.

2. Mr. SIMBANANIYE (Observer for Burundi), speaking at the invitation of the President, said that he had not wished to take part in the debate because his country was one of the candidates for a seat on the Commission. However, there seemed to be some confusion, which he would like to clear up. The Group of African States had reached a consensus on its candidates for the three seats on the Commission and had made its choice known to the Council on two occasions. It had always been agreed that the three African posts should go to representatives of the three regions of Africa. Furthermore, it was the practice of the United Nations, as reaffirmed in General Assembly resolution 2813 (XXVI), to ensure that the composition of seats in each group should at all times give due expression to adequate subregional representation.

3. He wished to pay a tribute to the delegations of the Upper Volta, Senegal and Egypt, which had rendered the Commission a service of which they could be proud. His delegation had supported their election for the term that was about to expire, and it appreciated the democratic gesture of those States which could have sought re-election but had refrained from doing so in order to leave room for others. He appealed to the other African States which had submitted their candidatures to withdraw them in order to allow the Council to elect the candidates that had been endorsed by the African Group and to maintain the cohesion of the Group.

4. Mr. KOROMA (Observer for Sierra Leone), speaking at the invitation of the President, said that, if the Council decided to vote, he wished to reserve the right to speak before the vote.

5. Mr. IBRAHIM (Ethiopia) drew the attention of the Council to summary record No. 13 of the 1974 session of the Organization of African Unity, in which it was indicated that the Permanent Representative of Gabon, endorsed by the representative of Zaire, had informed the Group that the two delegations were ready to yield the seat allotted to the central region to the delegation of Egypt. They had also emphasized that the seat, which should be occupied by Egypt, should go back to the central region at the end of the latter's mandate.

6. Mr. SOBHY (Observer for Egypt), speaking at the invitation of the President, said that he had been awaiting instructions from his Government with regard to the appeal to his delegation to withdraw its candidature. However, since he had received no new instructions, he maintained his country's candidature for a seat on the Commission. He regretted the confusion and misunderstanding that had arisen on the matter. There had, in fact, been no agreement in the African Group, and it was unfortunate that some delegations had dramatized a situation which otherwise would have been very simple. It was quite normal for a group to have difficulty in reaching agreement on candidates for such positions; the problem was an internal one within the Group and should not be discussed in the Council.

7. Miss BALOGUN (Nigeria) said the observer for Egypt knew very well that the seat his country was seeking belonged to another subregion. Perhaps he personally wished to withdraw his country's candidature. The General Assembly had traditionally recognized the need for adequate representation of subregions within each region. That had been the basis for her plea at the preceding meeting. It was simply not correct to say that the African Group had not reached a consensus. The Council had no choice but to go along with the African position that had been agreed upon in OAU. The discussion on the matter should now be closed. If the Council wished to proceed to a vote, she had no objection, as she knew that justice would be done. She trusted that Burundi, Ethiopia and the Ivory Coast would be unopposed in the election.

8. Mr. SOBHY (Observer for Egypt) said that the representative of Nigeria was mistaken in her interpretation of his previous statement. He had no private desire to withdraw the candidature of Egypt and had clearly stated that, in the absence of instructions to the contrary, he wished to maintain that candidature.

9. Mr. OULD SID'AHMED (Mauritania) said that the whole question was one of procedure. The discussions on the African candidatures should not be taking place in the Council, as they were an internal affair of the African Group. The Council should proceed to vote, since there had been no consensus in the Group.

10. Mr. FALL (Observer for Senegal), speaking at the invitation of the President, said that he had not wished to intervene in the discussion, since his country was a candidate for a seat on the Commission. His delegation had submitted its candidature at the request of many Member States which had appreciated the work of Mr. Kéba M'Baye as Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group of Experts on southern Africa. However, in considering candidates for seats on the Commission, the African Group had to apply other criteria in addition to that of merit, and the candidature of Senegal had not been endorsed because the Group gave priority to the criterion that members of a body should not stand for immediate re-election. His delegation had deferred to the rules of the African Group. However, the Council was not bound by the Group's decision; if it decided to proceed to a vote, taking into account the criterion of merit, his delegation would have to reaffirm the desire of its Government that Mr. Kéba M'Baye should continue to sit in the Commission. In brief, if the

Council went along with the consensus of the African Group his delegation would agree, but if a vote was taken it would maintain its candidature.

11. Mr. BAMBA (Upper Volta) said that his delegation had accepted the consensus of the African Group in deciding to submit the candidatures of the Ivory Coast and other friendly African countries. It had done so only out of respect for the agreement that had always existed in the African Group, but now it seemed that the accepted rules were no longer being applied. If the Council proceeded to a vote in accordance with its rules of procedure, he, having no new instructions, would withdraw his delegation's candidacy. He continued to believe that the principle of equitable geographical distribution in all United Nations bodies, by region and also by subregion, should be respected. His delegation had always adhered to that principle and would continue to do so, regardless of the outcome of the current election.

12. Mr. KOROMA (Observer for Sierra Leone) said that in his statement at the preceding meeting, when he had been speaking on behalf of the Chairman of the African Group for the month of May, he had not thought it proper to discuss the criteria for the Group's endorsement of Burundi, Ethiopia and the Ivory Coast for the three seats allotted to African States, as the Group continued to feel that the basis for its decisions was an internal matter. He had attempted to preserve unity within the Group but, since the Council now appeared to be preparing to vote on the elections, it was his responsibility to seek to protect the interests of every member of the Group. He therefore appealed to the Council and all regional groups to respect the position of the African Group, which was clear and was in accordance with General Assembly resolution 2813 (XXVI), paragraph 1 (c).

13. The PRESIDENT said that, since there were more candidates than there were seats available, he would invite the Council, in accordance with its rules of procedure, particularly rule 68, to elect by secret ballot three members from African States to the Commission on Human Rights for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1978.

14. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) said that the candidates endorsed by the African Group were Burundi, Ethiopia and the Ivory Coast, and the other candidates were Egypt, Morocco, Senegal and the Upper Volta.

At the invitation of the President, Ms. Kongshem (Norway) and Mr. Nakamura (Japan) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

<i>Number of ballot papers:</i>	54
<i>Invalid ballots:</i>	0
<i>Number of valid ballots:</i>	54
<i>Required majority:</i>	28

<i>Number of votes obtained:</i>	
Ivory Coast	33
Senegal	27
Egypt	26
Morocco	26

Burundi	20
Ethiopia	19
Upper Volta	4

Having obtained the required majority, the Ivory Coast was elected a member of the Commission on Human Rights.

15. The PRESIDENT announced that, since none of the other candidates had obtained the required majority, a further ballot would be held. In accordance with rule 70, paragraph 2, of the Council's rules of procedure, the ballot would be restricted to the four unsuccessful candidates which had obtained the greatest number of votes in the first ballot, namely Burundi, Egypt, Morocco and Senegal. He invited the Council to elect two members from among those candidates.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

Number of ballot papers:	54
Invalid ballots:	3
Number of valid ballots:	51
Required majority:	26

Number of votes obtained:	
Senegal	33
Egypt	25
Morocco	23
Burundi	18

Having obtained the required majority, Senegal was elected a member of the Commission on Human Rights.

16. The PRESIDENT said that, since none of the other candidates had obtained the required majority, a further ballot would be held. In accordance with rule 70, paragraph 2, of the Council's rules of procedure, the ballot would be restricted to the two unsuccessful candidates which had obtained the greatest number of votes in the second ballot, namely Egypt and Morocco. Furthermore, since only one place was to be filled, rule 69 of the rules of procedure would apply.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

Number of ballot papers:	53
Invalid ballots:	3
Number of valid ballots:	50
Abstentions:	5
Number of members voting:	45
Required majority:	23

Number of votes obtained:	
Egypt	28
Morocco	17

Having obtained the required majority, Egypt was elected a member of the Commission on Human Rights.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.

2058th meeting

Thursday, 12 May 1977, at 3.30 p.m.

President: Mr. Ladislav ŠMÍD (Czechoslovakia).

E/SR.2058

AGENDA ITEM 3

Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (continued)* (E/5920, E/5921, E/5922, E/L.1759, E/L.1764, E/L.1765, E/L.1767, E/NGO/62)

1. The PRESIDENT drew attention to an error in the French text of draft resolution E/L.1759, entitled "Implementation of the Programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination". At the end of paragraph 5, the word "*activités*" should be replaced by the word "*entreprises*".

2. Mr. BUFFUM (Under-Secretary-General for Political and General Assembly Affairs) said that paragraph 2 of draft resolution E/L.1765, concerning the appointment of the Secretary-General of the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, restricted the powers of the Secretary-General of the United Nations by requesting that such appointment be made at the level of Assistant Secretary-General and after consultation with regional

groups. The Legal Counsel had expressed the opinion that Article 101 of the Charter of the United Nations laid down as the only procedural limitation on the appointment of staff by the Secretary-General that such appointments should be made "under regulations established by the General Assembly". The proposed text of the draft resolution would therefore not be in accordance with the Charter. Since the Secretary-General attached great importance and priority to the success of the World Conference, he recognized that the individual appointed to co-ordinate it must be highly competent, must enjoy wide confidence and must be of the highest level necessary to ensure the successful organization of the Conference. For the sake of economy, the candidate would be appointed from among United Nations staff. The Secretary-General therefore hoped that the Council would not limit his flexibility in choosing the most experienced and competent senior official available at the required time.

3. Under paragraph 8 of the draft resolution, the Council would recommend "that the Conference be held in Geneva or New York or any other place which may be suggested by and accepted from, any Government that may subsequently

* Resumed from the 2052nd meeting.

offer to act as host to it". On the other hand, paragraph 6 of the draft resolution recommended in draft resolution E/L.1765, paragraph 10, for adoption by the General Assembly, authorized "the allocation from the regular budget of the United Nations of the costs involved in holding the Conference". He drew the Council's attention to General Assembly resolution 31/140, section I, paragraph 5, in which it was stated that "United Nations bodies may hold sessions away from their established headquarters when a Government issuing an invitation for a session to be held within its territory has agreed to defray, after consultation with the Secretary-General as to their nature and possible extent, the actual additional cost directly or indirectly involved". That provision had been interpreted as applying to United Nations conferences, and the Secretary-General therefore understood that paragraph 6 of the draft resolution recommended for adoption by the General Assembly should be interpreted in a manner consistent with resolution 31/140, namely that, should the Conference be held in a location other than one of the headquarters, the host Government would have to cover the additional costs.

4. Miss ILIĆ (Yugoslavia) introduced draft resolution E/L.1764, entitled "World Conference for Action against *Apartheid*", on behalf of the sponsors, which had been joined by Uganda. The draft resolution took into account the fact that *apartheid* was a crime against humanity and that action against *apartheid* should be one of the main features of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. On behalf of the sponsors, she said that the word "further" in the second preambular paragraph should be deleted and that the following new third preambular paragraph should be added: "*Recalling further* its resolution _____ (LXII) in which it recommended that the General Assembly should declare 1978 International Anti-*apartheid* Year". The existing third preambular paragraph would become the fourth preambular paragraph.

5. The draft resolution had been approved by the African Group and contained no controversial elements. The sponsors therefore hoped that no difficulties would arise in its adoption.

6. The PRESIDENT pointed out that the new preambular paragraph referred to a decision which had not yet been adopted by the Council. Draft resolution E/L.1764 could therefore not be voted on until a decision had been taken concerning the proposal to declare 1978 International Anti-*apartheid* Year.

7. Miss BALOGUN (Nigeria) said that she wished to explain the position of the African Group on the item under consideration by the Council, and to introduce draft resolutions E/L.1759, on behalf of the sponsors to which should be added Somalia, and E/L.1765, also on behalf of the sponsors—to which should be added Gabon, Togo and the Upper Volta. Various points on which the sponsors had been in unanimous agreement had not been included in the draft resolution out of a desire to be conciliatory and in the hope that both resolutions would be adopted by the Council by consensus, that the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination would be successful and that participation in it would be as broad as possible. The sponsors of the draft resolutions were convinced that the Second World Black and African

Festival of Arts and Culture, held at Lagos from 15 January to 12 February 1977, had highlighted the relations between the participants in the Festival and the rest of the societies from which they came.

8. Racism and racial discrimination were world problems which existed, in various forms and dimensions, in all parts of the planet. Because of the role they played in world affairs, certain countries should assume leadership in that sphere. In doing so, they must bear in mind that when they formed judgements about morality and social progress in other countries, their credibility would increasingly depend on the progress they themselves made in their own societies in that respect.

9. The two draft resolutions had taken into account the fact that, as the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination had indicated in its report (E/5922), special attention should be paid to the situation prevailing in southern Africa, where the problem was aggravated by *apartheid*.

10. With regard to paragraph 2 of draft resolution E/L.1765, she explained that it was not the intention of the sponsors to tie the hands of the Secretary-General, who could choose any one of the 20 Assistant Secretaries-General to be Secretary-General of the Conference. With regard to paragraph 8, the purpose of the phrase "and accepted from" was to ensure that the Economic and Social Council would consider any offer from a Government to act as host to the Conference. The sponsors did not, for instance, want South Africa as host country, even in the hypothetical case that an offer was made in that respect. With regard to paragraph 6 of the draft resolution recommended to the General Assembly for adoption in paragraph 10 of the draft resolution, the sponsors thought that any country which wanted the Conference to be held in its territory should be prepared to pay the additional costs involved in holding the Conference somewhere other than Geneva or New York, in accordance with the General Assembly resolution to that effect.

11. With reference to operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution E/L.1759, about which some delegations appeared to have reservations, the sponsors thought that it should be considered in the context of the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council concerning economic sanctions against the racist régimes of southern Africa. The economic relations which some countries maintained with those régimes had various aspects, but the sponsors believed that the sanctions covered not only trade relations but also industrial relations. They also believed that, if the various countries had sufficient political will, it was possible to adopt measures at the local level which would prevent certain corporations from continuing their investments in southern Africa. Those measures were necessary in order to bring about black majority rule in the area, an objective on which all members of the Council were agreed; then, once that objective had been achieved, it would no longer be necessary to adopt measures or sanctions of any type.

12. Finally, her delegation asked that both draft resolutions should be adopted by consensus; that would reflect the political will of Governments not only to eliminate

racism and racial discrimination, but also to support unreservedly the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination.

13. Mr. MARSHALL (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had difficulty in accepting some of the provisions of draft resolution E/L.1759, in particular the last preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 5 which, in his opinion, went beyond the competence of the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly. For that reason, and despite the fact that the remaining provisions of the draft resolution were acceptable, his delegation could not support the draft resolution and would be obliged to abstain in the vote on it.

14. Mr. VALDERRAMA (Philippines) drew the Council's attention to the fact that, in the English text, paragraph 1 (c) of the annex to draft resolution E/L.1765 should read "International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid*" and not "International Covenant ...".

15. Miss BALOGUN (Nigeria) informed the members of the Council that paragraph 4 (b) of draft resolution E/L.1765 and paragraph 5 (b) of the draft resolution recommended to the General Assembly in paragraph 10 of that draft resolution should read: "...to participate in the sessions and work of all international conferences convened under its auspices in accordance with General Assembly resolutions 3237 (XXIX) of 22 November 1974 and 31/152 of 20 December 1976". The latter resolution referred to SWAPO and had not been mentioned in the original text because, when drafting it, the sponsors had not had the number of the resolution to hand.

16. With regard to the reservations expressed by the United Kingdom representative concerning operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution E/L.1759, she repeated what she had said on that point in her earlier statement and urged that both draft resolutions submitted be adopted by consensus and separately.

17. Mr. MERKEL (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation fully shared the views expressed by the United Kingdom representative and he pointed out that the economic sanctions adopted by the Security Council, which his country had continuously observed, referred only to Southern Rhodesia. Moreover, he had doubts concerning the possibility of effectively improving the situation of human rights in South Africa by means of economic sanctions.

18. Mr. FAURIS (France) said that his delegation shared the views expressed by the United Kingdom representative. Thus, it also considered that the last preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution E/L.1759 dealt with matters which were within the competence of other United Nations organs, in particular the Security Council. His delegation would therefore abstain if that draft resolution was put to the vote, but it was prepared to join in a consensus if one should emerge.

19. With regard to the substance of the question, he referred to the statements made by the President of the French Republic on 21 April 1977 at the Franco-African

Conference at Dakar, where he had said that it was important not to ignore the impact which the problems of southern Africa had on the deterioration of the general situation in Africa, since they were an aggravating cause of the tensions manifest there. Those questions and the manner of resolving them had given rise to dangerous divisions which had allowed some outside intervention among Africans and had resulted in the adoption of ideological positions which involved Africa in disputes which did not concern it. The indignation and anxiety of the Africans in the face of a situation which was an affront to morality and human dignity was understandable. France would do everything possible to base its position on immovable principles in order to bring about a just solution in keeping with the dignity of the black man. In that spirit, France would contribute to the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination.

20. Mr. VISCONTI (Italy) said that his delegation would abstain in the vote on draft resolution E/L.1759 for the same reasons as those stated by the United Kingdom, the Federal Republic of Germany and France.

21. Mr. HAMMAD (Observer for the United Arab Emirates), speaking at the invitation of the President, said he was glad that the Palestine Liberation Organization was to be invited, together with SWAPO, to participate as an observer in the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. He also welcomed the revision made by the sponsors in paragraph 4 (b) of draft resolution E/L.1765 and in paragraph 5 (b) of the resolution recommended for adoption by the General Assembly. Because of the word "organizations" in the plural and the reference only to resolution 3237 (XXIX), the original wording had been misleading, since all knew that resolution 3237 (XXIX) referred not to several organizations but only to the Palestine Liberation Organization, which was the sole authentic representative of the Palestinian people. An error of the same kind had already been committed in the Sixth Committee during the thirty-first session of the General Assembly in connexion with invitations to participate in the United Nations Conference on Succession of States in Respect of Treaties and, in order to prevent annoying confusion, it would be advisable to avoid a repetition of such mistakes in the future.

22. Miss BALOGUN (Nigeria) apologized on behalf of the sponsors for the omission from the original text and explained that there had been absolutely no ill will on their part. She interpreted the statements made by some delegations at the current meeting as formal reservations, and hoped that they would not prevent the adoption of the draft resolutions by consensus.

23. Mr. KAUFMANN (Netherlands) announced that his delegation would abstain in the vote on draft resolution E/L.1759, because it had difficulty with operative paragraph 5, which referred to questions within the competence of the Security Council.

24. Mr. ALFONSO MARTINEZ (Cuba) said that his delegation had been unable to participate in the drafting of the texts, which it considered could have been worded slightly differently. It had not insisted on its views, however, in the interest of achieving a consensus. He

regretted that, despite the efforts made by the African Group to prepare a text acceptable to all, some delegations had indicated that consensus would not be possible; in that case, the Cuban delegation would vote in favour of both draft resolutions.

A vote was taken by roll call on draft resolution E/L.1759.

Somalia, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Greece, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mexico, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Rwanda, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: None.

Abstaining: France, Germany, Federal Republic of Italy, Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Draft resolution E/L.1759 was adopted by 47 votes to none, with 5 abstentions (resolution 2056 (LXII)).

25. Mrs. OGATA (Japan) said that, although her delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution E/L.1759, since it generally supported its objectives, it had reservations regarding the fourth preambular paragraph and paragraphs 5 and 6 (b).

26. Mr. SPETSIOS (Greece) explained that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution E/L.1759, in order to demonstrate its constant support for the implementation of the Programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. However, for legal reasons, the Greek delegation had reservations about paragraph 5 of that draft resolution.

27. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt draft resolution E/L.1765 by consensus.

Draft resolution E/L.1765 was adopted (resolution 2057 (LXII)).

28. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) pointed out that in paragraph 4 of draft resolution E/L.1765 and paragraph 5 of the draft resolution contained therein a recommendation was made to the General Assembly concerning the observers to be invited to the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. Several United Nations committees and commissions were mentioned by name among those observers and the Secretary-General would assume that, in the case of the Economic and Social Council, the intergovernmental organs listed were those which were primarily interested in the question. Paragraph 4 (i) of the draft resolution also re-

ferred to other interested committees of the United Nations. In implementing paragraph 4, the Secretary-General would send invitations to the committees and commissions which were mentioned by name, and the other interested committees of the United Nations would receive invitations when they informed the Secretary-General that they considered themselves to be covered by paragraph 4 (i) and that they therefore wished to be invited to the Conference.

29. Mr. BROAD (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of those members of the European Economic Community which were represented on the Economic and Social Council and on behalf of the observers for Belgium, Ireland and Luxembourg, said that those delegations had been able to accept the consensus on draft resolution E/L.1765 and wished to express their appreciation of the efforts made by the sponsors, who had demonstrated skill and goodwill in preparing the text.

30. The members of EEC had repeatedly stated that, if the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination were permitted to revert to the agreed purposes and Programme laid down in General Assembly resolution 3057 (XXVIII), they would be ready to reaffirm their support for the Decade and, more particularly, for the Conference. In his view, the resolution just adopted and the statement of introduction by the delegation of Nigeria gave reason to believe that the Conference could proceed on the original basis of resolution 3057 (XXVIII), without the intrusion of extraneous elements. The members of EEC had joined in the recent consensus on the assumption that that situation would continue; should that assumption prove unfounded, they would be obliged to draw the inevitable conclusions.

31. With regard to the agenda for the Conference, the members of EEC endorsed the observations made during the session of the Preparatory Sub-Committee by the delegations of the Federal Republic of Germany, France and the United Kingdom. In addition, it was their understanding that paragraph 4 (j) of draft resolution E/L.1765 would be interpreted in a liberal way and would not be abused to exclude non-governmental organizations which believed that they could contribute to the success of the Conference.

32. Mr. QUARTIN-SANTOS (Portugal) said that, although his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution E/L.1759, since it supported the Programme for the Decade, it had reservations regarding paragraph 5, where reference was made to a question which was within the competence of the Security Council, the implementation of which would pose internal legal problems.

33. With regard to draft resolution E/L.1765, he reiterated his delegation's support for the text as a whole. That should not, however, be interpreted as implying approval for all the provisions and recommendations in the text; his delegation would have preferred a different wording for some aspects of the draft resolution and it considered, for example, that there was a contradiction between paragraph 4 (i) and previous subparagraphs enumerating the United Nations organs which would be invited to participate as observers in the Conference.

34. Miss HOLZER (Austria) said that her delegation had supported the two draft resolutions because of her country's devotion to the cause of human rights and the struggle against racism, particularly in southern Africa. It still believed, however, that the objectives of the Decade were those set out in General Assembly resolution 3057 (XXVIII). With regard to draft resolution E/L.1759, she placed on record her delegation's reservations regarding paragraph 5, which were based on fundamental legal considerations; if a separate vote had been taken on that paragraph, the Austrian delegation would have abstained.

35. She had some reservations with regard to draft resolution E/L.1765, while appreciating the spirit of co-operation and understanding displayed by the sponsors. Lastly, with regard to paragraph 4 (j) of that text, concerning invitations to non-governmental organizations, she expressed the hope that a solution would be found which would result in the broadest possible participation in the Conference.

36. Mr. KINSMAN (Canada), speaking in explanation of vote, said that Canada had been active in support of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination from the time of its inauguration by the unanimous vote of the General Assembly in 1973 until the introduction, under General Assembly resolution 3379 (XXX) in 1975, of an alien element which had diverted the Decade from its original purposes and deprived it of that unanimity of support which was essential for the achievement of its aims. Since that time, however, substantial efforts had been made to restore universal support. Accordingly, and as a demonstration of its commitment to the eradication of real racism, as defined in the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, his delegation had supported the two draft resolutions. Nevertheless, it had reservations with regard to some of their provisions.

37. Paragraph 5 of draft resolution E/L.1759 failed to make the necessary distinctions between the situations in South Africa, Rhodesia and Namibia. His Government agreed that any activity of a transnational corporation which served to circumvent or undermine the mandatory sanctions of the Security Council against Southern Rhodesia was illegal. It likewise recognized that the illegal South African administration in Namibia did not have legal authority to permit the operation of transnational corporations in that territory and it had informed Canadian corporations operating in Namibia that they did so at their own risk. There was likewise little disagreement on the principle that the activities of transnational corporations in South Africa should not serve to perpetuate or intensify inequality on the basis of race. Nevertheless, some of the actions suggested in paragraph 5 fell within the mandate of the Security Council and could be effectively implemented only following a decision of that body. If a separate vote had been taken on paragraph 5, his delegation would have abstained, as it had abstained during the previous week in a vote on a draft resolution on the same subject in the Commission on Transnational Corporations.

38. With regard to draft resolution E/L.1765, in paragraph 1 of which the Council approved the draft provisional agenda for the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, his delegation interpreted the item

calling for the formulation of means to secure "full and universal implementation of United Nations decisions and resolutions" (E/5922, para. 13) as referring to those decisions and resolutions that had been adopted by consensus since 1973. The international community should be united and not divided in its resolve to fight racism. Canada's decision to attend the Conference would depend on whether the aims of combating racism and racial discrimination remained as outlined by the General Assembly in resolution 3057 (XXVIII).

39. Mr. AASEN (Norway), speaking in explanation of vote, said that following the adoption of General Assembly resolution 3057 (XXVIII), Norway had actively participated in the implementation of the Programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination; some aspects of its participation were referred to in the Secretary-General's report (E/5921). It had therefore witnessed with deep regret the introduction of an alien and unacceptable element, which had threatened his country's further participation in the activities of the Decade, including the planned World Conference. He accordingly welcomed the efforts of many delegations, particularly those of African countries, to put the Decade back on the right track. Because of those efforts his delegation had been able to vote in favour of draft resolutions E/L.1759 and E/L.1765. His delegation's position was that General Assembly resolution 3379 (XXX) was not relevant, and it would join in all concerted actions against racism and racial discrimination, as defined in article 1 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

40. Mr. LOWENSTEIN (United States of America) said that although his delegation had not participated in the vote, he wanted to explain its reasons for not participating. They were the same reasons, known to all members of the Council and expressed at the current session by the representatives of Canada and Norway, which had prevented the United States from participating in the activities of the Decade in spite of its vote in favour of General Assembly resolution 3057 (XXVIII). The United States was still determined to participate in efforts to go beyond a formal consensus with a view to eliminating racial discrimination from the planet. Paradoxically, he himself had, as a private citizen some years earlier, spoken at the United Nations as a representative of the people of Namibia and at its request, opposing the world community's acceptance at that time of the situation in which that people had been placed. He pointed out that, like the Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations, Ambassador Andrew Young, he had been identified with the anti-racism activities of Martin Luther King.

41. He commended the efforts of the representative of Nigeria to devise wording capable of producing consensus; he hoped that those efforts and those of other delegations, together with a spirit that had led to the adoption of the first unanimous decision on *apartheid* at Geneva, would in the near future lead to arrangements that would concentrate the struggle against *apartheid* and the worst forms of racism. In that way the Decade would again become a suitable instrument of concerted action against those scourges, which were a menace to peace and the sense of justice.

42. Mr. SPETSIOS (Greece), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had participated in the consensus on draft resolution E/L.1765 and fully supported the World Conference. He wished to make it clear, however, that, in the case of paragraph 1, in which the Council approved the draft provisional agenda, his delegation was entering a reservation with regard to resolutions that it had not supported or on which it had abstained.

43. Mr. KUBBA (Iraq) said that, to judge from the comments made by the representative of the United Kingdom and other delegations, some members of the Council seemed to be trying to prejudge the terms of reference of the Conference and the Decade and to impose their own interpretation by introducing elements and criteria that in no way reflected the draft resolution just adopted.

44. Mr. AL-HUSSAMY (Syrian Arab Republic) said that his delegation had supported the two draft resolutions because it felt that they were in accordance with the spirit of the provisions for the Decade and the resolutions adopted by the United Nations on *apartheid*, racial discrimination and self-determination, and that the provisions of the two draft resolutions in no way jeopardized the work of the Conference.

45. Mr. PEDERSEN (Denmark) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution E/L.1759 and had joined the consensus on draft resolution E/L.1765. He had, however, had some difficulties in accepting paragraph 5 of draft resolution E/L.1759.

46. Ms. BEAGLE (New Zealand) said that her country was resolutely opposed to racial discrimination wherever it occurred, and to none more strongly than the institutionalized discrimination that was practised in South Africa. Her Government had been a consistent contributor to the three United Nations funds that rendered humanitarian assistance to the victims of *apartheid* and colonialism in southern Africa and had during the current year renewed and increased those contributions. New Zealand had likewise been a strong supporter of the aims and objectives of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination from the start, and it deeply regretted that the original consensus on the objectives of the Decade had been destroyed and that the entire Programme for the Decade, including the World Conference, had been placed in jeopardy. In voting in favour of General Assembly resolutions 31/77 and 31/78, her delegation had reaffirmed its commitment to the universally accepted definition of racial discrimination contained in article 1 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and it hoped that an international consensus on the Programme based on resolution 3057 (XXVIII) might be rebuilt.

47. Her delegation had followed the work of the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the World Conference and it was gratified by the degree of co-operation exhibited by its members and by the extent to which it had been able to reach consensus on the majority of its recommendations. Problems remained, but the resolutions just adopted by the Council undoubtedly reflected a genuine desire on the part of the great majority of delegations to continue their

efforts to eliminate racial discrimination. Her delegation had accordingly supported both resolutions. It was disappointed, however, to find that certain elements of draft resolution E/L.1759, particularly paragraph 5, had made it impossible for some delegations to join in the consensus. Although New Zealand had no significant investment in South Africa, it had reservations about that paragraph, which went beyond the terms of General Assembly resolution 31/6 K and, unlike that resolution, was not addressed to the Security Council.

48. Mr. BENHOCINE (Algeria) said that, as a sponsor, he wished to make a statement in the light of the explanations of vote which had just been made. He welcomed the fact that some countries, which had been trying to impose their views about the Conference and applying all kinds of pressure to that end, had given up the effort and were supporting the Conference in accordance with the wishes of the majority. It seemed, however, after the explanations of vote of some countries, that that was not the case with all of them. As a sponsor, he therefore wished to state his delegation's understanding of the two resolutions which had been adopted.

49. He wanted to make it clear once again that Algeria considered zionism to be equivalent to racism as long as it continued to resemble racism in its actions and to give rise to a discriminatory and expansionist policy. The General Assembly had adopted resolution 3379 (XXX) on that subject, and it was therefore clear that by racism and racial discrimination, which were condemned in draft resolution E/L.1759, was meant all forms of racism, including zionism. Moreover, all delegations were well aware that the expression "relevant resolutions" in draft resolution E/L.1759 referred particularly to resolution 3379 (XXX). His delegation held that the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People had just as much interest in the matter as the other bodies specifically mentioned in that draft resolution.

50. He emphasized that his delegation, as a member of the African Group, had participated in the efforts of that Group to find a version acceptable, with regard to form, to the greatest number of delegations, but that should not be interpreted as a change with regard to substance. Both resolutions, in any event, covered Algeria's position on the substance, which was that, like many sponsors of the draft resolution, it considered that the Conference should cover all forms of racial discrimination, including zionism.

51. Mr. BARCELO (Mexico) said that, in accordance with its traditional position, Mexico had supported the two draft resolutions which had just been adopted. Such support did nothing to change the scope of the meaning attributed by Mexico to United Nations resolutions adopted on the subject, as clearly expressed in the explanations of vote which were to be found in the records of the past two sessions of the General Assembly.

52. Mr. MUSSA (Somalia) said that, as a sponsor of the two draft resolutions just adopted, he fully supported the statement made by the representative of Algeria.

53. Mr. ALFONSO MARTINEZ (Cuba) said that, in view of some of the explanations of vote given, he wished to

state that although the Cuban delegation had been able to approve the text of draft resolution E/L.1765, in the interests of securing a consensus, it interpreted the terms racism and racial discrimination as used in the title of the Conference in the light of the provisions of General Assembly resolution 3057 (XXVIII) and of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, and in the light of other United Nations resolutions on the subject, particularly General Assembly resolution 3379 (XXX).

54. Mr. OULD SID'AHMED (Mauritania) said that his delegation was pleased that a consensus had been reached on draft resolution E/L.1765 because, in its opinion, such a consensus denoted a change of position on the part of some delegations and a deeper awareness on the part of certain countries. He wished to make it clear that the adoption of the two draft resolutions in no way changed the Mauritanian position regarding General Assembly resolution 3379 (XXX) on the question of zionism.

55. Miss BALOGUN (Nigeria), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that after having heard the explanations of vote, the sponsors of the draft resolutions wished to reiterate their hope that the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination would be as successful as possible. She considered the position stated by the representative of the United States to be unacceptable, since although he had said that he had not participated in the voting, he had been present when the draft resolution had been adopted by consensus, and consensus implied the favourable opinion of all those present. The United States could not fail to participate in the Conference, because there were more than 20 million blacks in its territory, and the fate of all blacks, wherever they might live, was a problem which concerned everybody. She therefore urged that the Government of the United States should reconsider its decision not to participate in the Conference.

56. The PRESIDENT said that, according to his interpretation, the explanation of the representative of the United States referred to his decision not to participate in the voting, not to whether or not his country would participate in the Conference.

AGENDA ITEM 11

Activities for the Advancement of Women: United Nations Decade for Women: Equality, Development and Peace (E/5909, E/5925, E/5926)

REPORT OF THE SOCIAL COMMITTEE (E/5963)

57. The PRESIDENT said that, in paragraph 56 of its report on agenda item 11 (E/5963), the Social Committee recommended that the Economic and Social Council should adopt six draft resolutions and two draft decisions.

58. He said that the Social Committee had adopted without a vote draft resolution I, entitled "Draft Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women". If there were no objection, he would take it that the Council also adopted the draft resolution without a vote.

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 2058 (LXII)).

59. The PRESIDENT said that the Social Committee had adopted without a vote draft resolution II, entitled "Training of women for the preparation and implementation of project proposals". If there were no objection, he would take it that the Council also adopted the draft resolution without a vote.

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 2059 (LXII)).

60. The PRESIDENT said that the Social Committee had adopted without a vote draft resolution III, entitled "Review and appraisal of progress made in the implementation of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade and in the implementation of the World Plan of Action for the Implementation of the Objectives of the International Women's Year". He pointed out that the reference to the Committee on Development Planning in paragraphs 3 and 4 of the draft resolution would be deleted, since that Committee had already held its thirteenth session. If there were no objection, he would take it that the Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote.

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 2060 (LXII)).

61. The PRESIDENT said that the Social Committee had adopted without a vote draft resolution IV, entitled "Improvement of the data base for measuring the implementation of the World Plan of Action for the Implementation of the Objectives of the International Women's Year". If there were no objection, he would take it that the Council also adopted the draft resolution without a vote.

Draft resolution IV was adopted (resolution 2061 (LXII)).

62. The PRESIDENT said that the Social Committee had adopted without a vote draft resolution V, entitled "Preparatory work for the World Conference of the United Nations Decade for Women, 1980". If there were no objection, he would take it that the Council also adopted the draft resolution without a vote.

Draft resolution V was adopted (resolution 2062 (LXII)).

63. The PRESIDENT said that the Social Committee had adopted without a vote draft resolution VI, entitled "Influence of the mass communication media on attitudes towards the roles of women and men in present-day society".

64. Mr. WASILEWSKI (Poland) said that his delegation had proposed in the Social Committee that the first part of paragraph 8 of draft resolution VI should be amended to read "Requests the Secretary-General, in co-operation with the Director-General of UNESCO, . . .". That amendment had been voted on in the Committee and rejected by a very narrow margin, a result which could well be reversed in the Council. Although he had no intention of pressing the point, he wished to stress that the special rapporteur to be appointed should bear in mind that the roles of women and men in present-day society were determined by the socio-economic system to which they belonged and by the cultures and traditions of individual societies, and that, as such cultures and traditions were complex and were not readily grasped by an outsider, his delegation would have

preferred to see UNESCO and the United Nations Secretariat combine their efforts in the preparation of the report. In any event, he hoped that the special rapporteur would draw on the specialized knowledge of UNESCO in that field and would take into account the necessity of giving coverage in the report to all the different groups in various countries and regions and not simply base the report on the experience of the particular group to which the special rapporteur belonged.

65. Miss BALOGUN (Nigeria), referring to paragraph 8 of draft resolution VI, said that her delegation had already expressed doubts in the general debate as to whether it would be appropriate to appoint a special rapporteur. In any event, it interpreted the amendments introduced in the Social Committee as meaning that the special rapporteur not only had to gather information but must also conduct broad and original research on the subject, including an analysis of the roots of the problem, and that in so doing he should discard the prejudices to be found in the studies carried out in various countries, whose account of the situation of women in developing countries was in many cases ill-balanced.

66. Mrs. MAIR (Jamaica) associated herself with the comments of preceding speakers and stressed that her delegation would have preferred to entrust the preparation of the study to UNESCO.

67. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objection, he would take it that the Council adopted draft resolution VI without a vote.

Draft resolution VI was adopted (resolution 2063 (LXII)).

68. Miss RICHTER (Argentina), speaking on a point of order, asked whether a vote on draft decision A had been requested.

69. Mr. ALFONSO MARTINEZ (Cuba), speaking on a point of order, said that there had been no request for a vote and that a vote should be avoided lest, by reason of a negative decision of the Council, the Social Committee might be required to embark on a fresh consideration of draft resolutions VII and X in the report of the Commission on the Status of Women.

70. The PRESIDENT informed the Council that a vote had been requested.

Draft decision A was adopted by 30 votes to 13, with 4 abstentions (decision 223 (LXII), para. 1).

71. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objection, he would take it that the Council adopted draft decision B without a vote.

Draft decision B was adopted (decision 223 (LXII), para. 2).

72. Miss BALOGUN (Nigeria), referring to paragraph 3 of draft resolution V, said that the preparatory committee of the 1980 World Conference of the United Nations Decade for Women should consider the appointment of a Secretary-General of the Conference, with the rank of Assistant Secretary-General.

The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.

2059th meeting

Friday, 13 May 1977, at 11.10 a.m.

President: Mr. Ladislav ŠMÍD (Czechoslovakia).

E/SR.2059

AGENDA ITEM 13

Narcotic drugs (E/5912, E/5933 and Corr. 1 and 2)

REPORT OF THE SOCIAL COMMITTEE (E/5966)

1. Miss RICHTER (Argentina) informed the Council that the South American Agreement on Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances and the Additional Protocols thereto, which had been signed by representatives of the Governments of Venezuela, Uruguay, Paraguay, Ecuador, Colombia, Brazil, Bolivia and Argentina, had entered into force on 30 March 1977 and had been registered with the Secretariat in accordance with Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations.

2. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the report of the Social Committee on agenda item 13 (E/5966). He suggested that the Council should proceed to vote on the six draft resolutions and one draft decision recommended for adoption in paragraph 14 of the Committee's report, and that any members wishing to explain their votes should do so later.

It was so decided.

Draft resolution I was adopted by 42 votes to none, with 5 abstentions (resolution 2064 (LXII)).

3. Mr. LAVAU (Director of the Budget Division) said that the Secretary-General would experience a number of

difficulties in implementing draft resolution II, entitled "Above-average priority for international drug control", if it was adopted. The instruction in operative paragraph 2 relating to the 1978-1979 budget was in direct conflict with General Assembly resolution 31/93, paragraph 4, in which the Assembly endorsed the recommendations made by the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination in the report on its sixteenth session.¹ In those recommendations, which had also been endorsed by the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 2019 (LXI), a "below-average" growth rate had been recommended for the international drug control programme. It was on the basis of that legislative authority, which still stood, that the Secretary-General had prepared the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1978-1979. In the absence of any explicit amendment of General Assembly resolution 31/93 and Council resolution 2019 (LXI), the Secretary-General must continue to base his budget proposals on the relative growth rates endorsed by those resolutions. In any case, in practical terms it was too late to alter the 1978-1979 budget, which had already been prepared and submitted to CPC and the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions. Similarly, in view of the provisions of General Assembly resolution 31/93, paragraph 3, the Secretary-General would be unable to take draft resolution II into account unless and until it was endorsed by CPC and the General Assembly. It would be recalled in that connexion that in resolution 31/93, paragraph 7, the General Assembly had requested the Secretary-General to ensure compliance with the planning and programme budgeting procedure established in that resolution.

4. Mr. BYKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said it was clear from the statement made by the Director of the Budget Division that draft resolution II ran counter to decisions already taken by CPC and the General Assembly; obviously, therefore, it could not be adopted by the Economic and Social Council. In the circumstances, the Council should apply the provisions of rule 67, paragraph 2, of the rules of procedure and defer its decision on the draft resolution, the text of which should be referred back to the Commission on Narcotic Drugs for further consideration.

5. It was regrettable that the Commission on Narcotic Drugs had not been informed that its proposal ran counter to a decision already taken by the General Assembly.

6. Mr. MERKEL (Federal Republic of Germany) said it was also regrettable that the Council's attention had not been drawn earlier in the session to the legal difficulties posed by draft resolution II. In view of the situation described by the Director of the Budget Division, he proposed that in operative paragraph 2 the words "the Secretary-General . . . 1978-1979 and" should be replaced by the words "the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination and the General Assembly to continue".

7. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) drew attention to the summary record of the 831st meeting of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs (E/CN.7/SR.831), which showed that the Commission had been informed of the decisions of CPC and the General Assembly.

8. Mr. KEMAL (Pakistan) said that, as the representative of the USSR had proposed, the proper procedure would be to refer the draft resolution back to the Commission on Narcotic Drugs for further consideration. If, however, the Council felt that it should take a decision on the draft resolution at its current meeting, it would have to amend paragraph 2 in such a way as to request the Secretary-General to consider the possibility of giving due priority to international drug control.

9. Mr. MERKEL (Federal Republic of Germany), observing that the draft resolution had been approved by the Commission on Narcotic Drugs and the Social Committee, suggested that the Council should take some action on it. He asked whether, from the legal point of view, a formulation such as that suggested by the representative of Pakistan would be acceptable to the Secretariat.

10. Mr. DE FARIA (Portugal) suggested that the proper procedure would be to refer the draft resolution back to the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, which would then be able, at its twenty-eighth session, to take a decision on the matter in full knowledge of the legal and administrative implications.

11. Miss RICHTER (Argentina) said that, according to the Spanish text of the draft resolution, the Secretary-General had been requested to give "special" priority to international drug control. There was a difference between special priority and above-average priority; the Spanish text did not, therefore, run counter to the decision of the General Assembly. If the text in the other languages did run counter to the General Assembly's decision, her delegation could agree that action on the draft resolution should be postponed. Alternatively, it would be able to accept an amendment in the other languages replacing the word "above-average" by the word "special".

12. Miss BALOGUN (Nigeria) said that, in terms of resources provided, CPC was already giving priority to international drug control. She therefore agreed with the suggestion of the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany that paragraph 2 should be amended so as to request CPC and the General Assembly to continue to give priority to international drug control. The word "above-average" would thus be deleted from the text, and it should also, of course, be deleted from the title of the draft resolution. If, however, the majority of the Council wished to defer taking a decision on the matter, her delegation would have no objection.

13. Mr. STOFORPOULOS (Greece) suggested that the Council might request the General Assembly to re-examine the priority allocated to international drug control. Accordingly, he proposed that paragraph 2 of draft resolution II should be amended to read:

"Recommends that the General Assembly, in approving the biennial programme budget 1978-1979 and in future medium-term plans, should ensure . . ."

14. Ms. MATTESON (United States of America) said her delegation agreed with the representatives of Nigeria and Greece, whose suggestions would preserve intact many parts

¹ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-first Session, Supplement No. 38.*

of the draft resolution instead of returning it to the Commission on Narcotic Drugs.

15. Mr. KEMAL (Pakistan) supported the Greek amendment and suggested that the Council should adopt it forthwith.

16. Mr. FAURIS (France) said his delegation understood the motivations of the expert members of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs; however, they had not been fully aware of the budgetary requirements and the need for co-ordination with other bodies. He therefore proposed the following amendment, which should allow maximum flexibility:

"Decides to draw the attention of the competent bodies, in the preparation of future medium-term plans, to the importance of the role of international drug control."

17. Mr. BARCELO (Mexico) thanked those delegations which had tried to maintain the fundamental element of the draft resolution, namely, the need for special priority to be given to providing funds for the Commission. He suggested that the Greek amendment should be changed to include the words "special priority" in order to preserve that concept.

18. Mr. LINDENBERG SETTE (Brazil) said that he supported the French proposal. While he sympathized with the Greek representative's viewpoint, he felt it was important to remember that the Fifth Committee would be taking up the programme budget for 1978-1979 under the usual difficult conditions. It would be hard for it to make changes in the budget that favoured one sector over others without even the advice of CPC. The French amendment was the most flexible that had been proposed so far.

19. Mr. BYKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that in view of the limited time available to the Council, and in order not to depart from the established practice under the rules of procedure, it would be more reasonable to take no decision on the draft resolution and to return it to the Commission. Of the amendments proposed, that of France was the most flexible.

20. Mr. BROAD (United Kingdom) said his delegation endorsed the French amendment and hoped that it would provide the basis for a consensus in the Council.

21. Mr. STOFOROPOULOS (Greece) said that his delegation had nothing against the French amendment, but felt that it did not go far enough because it precluded the possibility of allowing the General Assembly to reconsider the matter. He himself had served in the Fifth Committee and was well aware of the constraints mentioned by the representative of Brazil. However, the Council should not rule out in advance the possibility of a re-examination.

22. The PRESIDENT suggested that the sponsors of the various amendments should hold consultations in order to submit a formula that would be acceptable to all.

It was so decided.

23. Mr. STOFOROPOULOS (Greece) said that, following consultations between interested delegations, the following agreed text for operative paragraph 2 had been worked out:

"2. Recommends that the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination and the General Assembly should ensure that the necessary resources shall be allocated under the regular budget of the United Nations for international drug control, bearing in mind the importance of this programme."

24. The title of the draft resolution would be changed to read: "Resources for international drug control".

Draft resolution II, as orally amended, was adopted (resolution 2081 (LXII)).

Draft resolution III was adopted by 41 votes to none, with 5 abstentions (resolution 2065 (LXII)).

Draft resolution IV was adopted by 44 votes to none, with 5 abstentions (resolution 2066 (LXII)).

Draft resolution V was adopted by 45 votes to none, with 5 abstentions (resolution 2067 (LXII)).

Draft resolution VI was adopted (resolution 2068 (LXII)).

The draft decision was adopted (decision 224 (LXII)).

25. The PRESIDENT drew attention to paragraph 12 of the report of the Social Committee (E/5966) regarding the recommendation made by the Commission for Narcotic Drugs in chapter I of its report (E/5933 and Corr.1 and 2) concerning the calendar of conferences for 1978 and 1979, and said that the matter would be considered at the sixty-third session in the context of the approval of the biennial calendar of meetings.

AGENDA ITEM 10

Social development questions (E/5915, E/CN.5/516, E/CN.5/527 and Corr.1, E/CN.5/534, E/CN.5/536)

REPORT OF THE SOCIAL COMMITTEE (E/5964 AND CORR.1)

26. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the report of the Social Committee on agenda item 10 (E/5964 and Corr.1) and drew attention to paragraph 42 of the report, in which the Committee recommended the adoption of 12 draft resolutions and two draft decisions. The reference in draft resolution X, operative paragraph 4, should be to the thirty-fourth session of the Commission on Human Rights, not the thirty-third session.

Draft resolutions I to X were adopted (resolutions 2069 (LXII) to 2078 (LXII)).

27. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) said that, since draft resolution XI, operative paragraph 2, might be open to different interpretations, he wished to make clear to the Council the understanding of the Secretary-General with regard to the sequence of events envisaged. It was his

understanding that the working group would have to meet after the thirty-second session of the General Assembly, since it had to take into account the decision of the Assembly at that session on the subject of preparations for the new international development strategy. The report of the working group would be sent by mail to members of the Commission for Social Development, which was to meet in 1979, and the comments of members would be submitted to the Economic and Social Council with the report, as they were received by the Secretary-General.

28. Miss HOLZER (Austria) suggested that, in view of the Secretary's explanation, the words "at its sixty-fourth session" should be deleted from the paragraph.

29. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) said that, if it was agreed that the consultation with members of the Commission for Social Development was to be by mail and that their comments would be submitted as they were received, it would still be possible to submit them to the Council at its sixty-fourth session.

Draft resolution XI was adopted (resolution 2079 (I.XII)).

Draft resolution XII was adopted (resolution 2080 (I.XII)).

Draft decisions A and B were adopted (decisions 225 (I.XII) and 226 (I.XII)).

30. Mr. BROAD (United Kingdom) said that his delegation wished to express its appreciation to the delegation of Portugal for having submitted draft resolution VIII, concerning the range of application of the *Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners*.²

31. The United Kingdom accepted that it was right that the underlying spirit of humane treatment which characterized the Standard Minimum Rules should, consistent with the proper administration of justice, be applied to persons who had been deprived of their freedom but who had not been charged with any offence. At the same time, his Government had made it clear in reports to the Secretary-General as well as in statements in a number of committees of the United Nations that the Standard Minimum Rules were designed first and foremost for persons held in prison following the order of a court and in terms of the facilities and amenities likely to be available were not considered applicable to persons held, usually very briefly, in police custody.

32. For that reason, his Government had urged that a body of experts should be commissioned to draw up a set of commentaries on the Rules which would enable them to be seen in a modern context and afford greater flexibility in their application. A study of that kind might well be able to consider how the Rules might most appropriately be applied to persons held without charge, particularly when, as was the case in the United Kingdom, the period involved was normally an extremely short one.

AGENDA ITEM 14

Non-governmental organizations (E/5934)

REPORT OF THE SOCIAL COMMITTEE (E/5965)

33. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the report of the Social Committee on agenda item 14 (E/5965).

34. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) recalled that in its resolution 1770 (LIV) the Council had decided that, before any resolution or decision involving the preparation of documentation for submission by specific dates was adopted by the Council or any of its subsidiary bodies, the Secretary-General should indicate to that body whether he would be able to comply with the deadline. When the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations had met early in 1977, the necessary documentation had been circulated only at the beginning of the session. The reasons for the delay included the amount of documentation involved, the fact that the General Assembly had just concluded its session, and the fact that priority had been assigned to preparing the programme of work of the Council. As a result, it had not been possible to circulate the documentation for the Committee's session sufficiently in advance.

35. Implementation of the draft decision on non-governmental organizations recommended by the Social Committee (E/5965, para. 12) would involve similar and probably more serious difficulties. The review of the activities of the non-governmental organizations called for in the draft decision would probably result in a document of at least 1,000 pages. The Secretary-General wished to inform the Council that it would not be possible to submit the document in compliance with the six-week rule for the next scheduled session of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, nor could he assure the Council that the document would be ready if another session of the Committee were scheduled for the purpose of carrying out the review before the sixty-fourth session of the Council, in order to comply with the draft decision. A special effort could be made to have the document ready by the time the Committee began its session, tentatively scheduled for the beginning of March 1978, but even in that case it would not be possible to have the document ready six weeks in advance of the session.

36. Miss RICHTER (Argentina) drew attention to paragraph 11 of the Social Committee's report (E/5965), in which it was stated that the Committee had agreed that the Council should defer action on the recommendation of the Committee of Non-Governmental Organizations regarding its future meetings until its sixty-third session, when it would consider the calendar of meetings for 1978 and 1979. The statement made by the Secretary of the Council might be helpful to delegations attending the sixty-third session in deciding when the next meeting of the Committee should be held. Her delegation, in agreeing that non-governmental organizations should be requested to submit their reports by 30 October 1977, had intended to co-operate with the Secretariat and had thought that that would enable it to complete its work in time. In any case, her delegation wished to stress that the Committee on

² *First United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders: report by the Secretariat* (United Nations publication, Sales No. 1956.IV.4), annex I.A.

Non-Governmental Organizations should meet at the earliest opportunity and carry out, as a matter of priority, the mandate laid down in Council resolution 1296 (XLIV), a task which had been deferred for many years.

37. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) pointed out that, if the report of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations concerning its review of the organizations was required for the Council's sixty-fourth session, the reports submitted by non-governmental organizations would be required by the Committee six weeks before its own session; it was the latter deadline which, in the view of the Secretary-General, could not be met by the Secretariat.

38. Mr. BROAD (United Kingdom) said he fully understood the difficulties referred to by the Secretary of the Council. His delegation had had reservations with regard to fixing the Council's sixty-fourth session as the time-limit for the review of the activities of non-governmental organizations by the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, and felt that the sixty-sixth session might be a more practical target.

The draft decision recommended by the Social Committee was adopted (decision 227 (LXII)).

39. The PRESIDENT said that the matter referred to in paragraph 11 of the report (E/5965) would be considered at the sixty-third session in the context of the approval of the biennial calendar of meetings.

AGENDA ITEM 12

Human rights questions (E/5927-5932, E/CN.4/1222 and Corr.1, E/L.1768)

40. Miss BALOGUN (Nigeria), introducing draft resolution E/L.1768 on behalf of the sponsors, said that it was traditional for the Council to adopt a resolution on trade union rights of African workers in South Africa. The sponsors hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.

2060th meeting

Friday, 13 May 1977, at 3.40 p.m.

President: Mr. Ladislav ŠMÍD (Czechoslovakia).

E/SR.2060

AGENDA ITEM 12

Human rights questions (concluded) (E/5927-5932, E/CN.4/1222 and Corr.1, E/L.1768)

REPORT OF THE SOCIAL COMMITTEE (E/5967)

1. The PRESIDENT said that, in paragraph 29 of its report on agenda item 12 (E/5967), the Social Committee recommended four draft resolutions and 11 draft decisions to the Council for adoption.

2. Sections A and B of draft resolution I had been adopted by the Committee without a vote. If there were no objection, he would take it that the Council also wished to adopt them without a vote.

Sections A and B of draft resolution I were adopted.

Section C of draft resolution I was adopted by 36 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

Draft resolution I, as a whole, was adopted (resolutions 2082 A (LXII), 2082 B (LXII) and 2082 C (LXII)).

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 2083 (LXII)).

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 2084 (LXII)).

Draft resolution IV was adopted by 35 votes to 2, with 11 abstentions (resolution 2085 (LXII)).

Draft decisions A to D were adopted (decisions 228 (LXII) to 231 (LXII)).

At the request of the representative of Cuba, a vote was taken by roll-call on draft decision E.

The Federal Republic of Germany, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, China, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Greece, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Rwanda, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of Italy, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Draft decision E was adopted by 43 votes to 1, with 5 abstentions (decision 232 (LXII)).

Draft decisions F to K were adopted (decisions 233 (LXII) to 238 (LXII)).

3. Mr. MUBAREZ (Yemen) said that he wished it to be noted that, if a vote had been taken on draft decision G, his delegation would have abstained.

4. Miss BALOGUN (Nigeria), referring to draft resolution E/L.1768, said that after holding consultations the sponsors had decided to make certain changes in the text, which did not alter the substance but broadened its scope. In the first place, the following new preambular paragraph should be inserted after the first preambular paragraph: "*Taking note of the report of the Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts on southern Africa (E/CN.4/1222 and Corr.1)*". At the end of the following preambular paragraph, the words "Namibia and Zimbabwe" should be added after the words "African workers in South Africa". In the last preambular paragraph, after the words "trade union solidarity with", the existing text should be replaced by the words "the struggle of African workers in southern Africa". At the end of paragraph 1, a comma should be inserted after the words "South Africa" and the words "Namibia and Zimbabwe" added. In paragraph 2, after the words "under detention" the words "in South Africa" should be replaced by the words "in southern Africa". In paragraph 3, a comma should be inserted after the words "South Africa" and the words "Namibia and Zimbabwe" added.

5. Mr. MOHAMMED (Bangladesh) said that his delegation wished to be added to the list of sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1768.

6. Mrs. MAIR (Jamaica) said that her delegation, which was one of the original sponsors of the draft resolution, accepted the changes introduced by the Nigerian representative. The report of the *Ad Hoc* Group of Experts (E/CN.4/1222 and Corr.1) clearly indicated that the problems referred to in the draft resolution were not confined to South Africa but existed throughout southern Africa, where there was a whole series of laws which openly violated international norms concerning trade union freedoms. She hoped that draft resolution E/L.1768 would be adopted without a vote.

7. Miss ILIĆ (Yugoslavia) said that her delegation wished to become a sponsor of draft resolution E/L.1768.

8. Mr. BARCELO (Mexico) said that his delegation fully supported draft resolution E/L.1768 and wished to become a sponsor.

9. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt draft resolution E/L.1768, with the revisions introduced by the representative of Nigeria, without a vote.

Draft resolution E/L.1768, as orally revised, was adopted (resolution 2086 (LXII)).

10. Mr. MERKEL (Federal Republic of Germany), referring to draft decision B, just adopted, recalled the reservations his delegation had expressed in the Social Committee concerning the wording of the title of the study. He requested that in the preparation of the study due regard should be paid to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, in which international and national dimensions of economic rights were

considered side by side. Moreover, in the opinion of his delegation it would have been preferable, instead of using the word "requirements", to take into account the objectives of the relevant resolutions.

11. Mr. LINDENBERG SETTE (Brazil) said that his delegation had explained its position on draft decision F at meetings of the Social Committee. It was pleased to lend its full support to draft resolution E/L.1768, especially after the explanation of the representative of Nigeria to the effect that its scope had been broadened to cover the whole of southern Africa.

12. Mr. OTAKA (Japan) said that he wished to explain his delegation's position with respect to the references to the concept of the new international economic order made in several resolutions and decisions adopted by the Council, particularly in draft resolutions IV and XI in document E/5964 and Corr.1 and in the draft decisions in document E/5967. Although his delegation had agreed to support those resolutions and decisions when they had been adopted by the Council, the position of the Government of Japan was still the same as had been explained when General Assembly resolutions 3201 (S-VI) and 3202 (S-VI) had been adopted.

13. Miss MASSIP (Canada), referring to draft resolution IV (E/5967) on the question of the violation by Israel of human rights in the occupied Arab territories, said that pending a final settlement of the conflict in the Middle East every effort must be made to ensure that the rights of all people living in the region were respected. As a member of the Commission on Human Rights, Canada had participated in the Commission's thirty-third session, at which the question of the violation of human rights in the occupied territories had been discussed. At that time, her delegation had been unable to support one of the resolutions (resolution 1A (XXXIII)) and during the deliberations had explained its objections in detail.¹ Consistent with that position, her delegation had also opposed draft resolution IV when it had been put to the vote in the Social Committee. It had done so not only because draft resolution IV implicitly referred to the resolution adopted by the Commission on Human Rights but because it commended the Commission for having adopted measures which, in the opinion of Canada, had been based on unsubstantiated conclusions concerning violations of human rights in the occupied territories.

14. Her Government had carefully considered the text before the Council. It respected the humanitarian implications of its provisions and therefore supported paragraph 2 of draft resolution E/L.1768. Nevertheless, as the text as a whole clearly endorsed the substance of the resolution of the Commission on Human Rights, her delegation's objections persisted and it reluctantly had to maintain its position.

15. Miss RICHTER (Argentina) and Mr. BOZA (Peru) reiterated the views expressed by their delegations when draft decision F had been considered in the Social Committee.

¹ See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Sixty-second Session, Supplement No. 6*, chap. II.

16. Mr. FUENTES IBÁÑEZ (Bolivia) said that, if draft decision F had been put to a vote, his delegation would have abstained.

17. Mr. KEMAL (Pakistan) said that, if it had been present, his delegation would have voted in favour of draft decision E.

AGENDA ITEM 3

Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (concluded)* (E/5920, E/5921, E/5922, E/L.1764, E/NGO/62)

18. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt draft resolution E/L.1764, as orally revised by the Yugoslav delegation at the 2058th meeting, without a vote.

Draft resolution E/L.1764, as orally revised, was adopted (resolution 2087 (LXII)).

19. Mr. ALFONSO MARTINEZ (Cuba) said that, although the fact that the Council had just adopted draft resolution E/L.1764 prevented Cuba from becoming a sponsor, he wished to state that it would have liked to do so.

AGENDA ITEM 6

Agreement between the United Nations and the International Fund for Agricultural Development (E/5924)

20. Mr. MAHGOUB (Sudan), Chairman of the Committee on Negotiations with Intergovernmental Agencies, introduced the Committee's report (E/5924), which had been prepared in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 3 of Economic and Social Council resolution 2006 (LX) and to which was annexed the text of a draft agreement between the United Nations and the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD).

21. The text of the draft agreement was the result of long and difficult negotiations and represented a compromise worked out by the members of the Committee on Negotiations and the Chairman of the Preparatory Commission for IFAD. Paragraphs 7 and 8 of the report reflected the observations made by the Chairman of the Preparatory Commission for IFAD on article IX of the draft agreement and by the representative of Algeria on article XI.

22. The Committee on Negotiations had adopted the draft agreement on the understanding that its adoption would be without prejudice to the right of the members of the Committee to take a final position on the agreement at a later stage.

23. He hoped that the Council would endorse the draft agreement submitted by the Committee on Negotiations.

24. Mr. KHAMIS (Algeria) stressed the importance which his country had always attached to the problem of food

and recalled in that connexion that the idea of holding the World Food Conference, which had resulted in the establishment of IFAD, had been formulated precisely at the Fourth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Algiers in 1973.

25. The negotiations which had produced the draft agreement before the Council, representing a compromise, had been especially difficult. His delegation was pleased that the draft agreement clearly stipulated that IFAD would be constituted as a specialized agency. Therefore, in spite of its wish to facilitate some compromise which would make it possible to ensure an early start to IFAD operations, it had been obliged to express reservations on article XI of the draft, since that article did not include provisions which were contained in agreements concluded with other specialized agencies.

26. Consequently, his delegation proposed that the Council should amend article XI of the draft agreement by replacing the words "Article 55" with the words "Chapters IX, XI and XII of the Charter of the United Nations and in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples".

27. His delegation was well aware that the Agreement establishing IFAD² stipulated that IFAD should provide direct assistance only to developing countries that were members of the Fund or to intergovernmental organizations in which those countries participated. Nevertheless, the amendment which he had just proposed was fully warranted since its purpose was not, as had been stated, to enable IFAD to provide direct assistance to colonial territories or liberation movements but simply to reaffirm the general principle of decolonization accepted without reservation by the United Nations.

28. Furthermore, his delegation's intention was to ensure equality among all specialized agencies; for example, the agencies had to submit an annual report to the Economic and Social Council on how they were implementing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. He hoped that the amendment which he had just proposed would be accepted by the Council, since he did not wish the question to be put to a vote.

29. Mr. HERRERA VEGAS (Argentina) said that his delegation welcomed the consensus on the draft relationship agreement between the United Nations and IFAD, especially since a delegation from the Preparatory Commission for IFAD, headed by its Chairman, had participated in the consensus. On behalf of Canada, Iran, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, the United States of America and Argentina, his delegation recommended that the Council should adopt the following draft decision:

"The Economic and Social Council:

"(1) Takes note of the report of the Committee on Negotiations with Intergovernmental Agencies (E/5924);
(2) Endorses the draft relationship agreement between the United Nations and the International Fund for

* Resumed from the 2058th meeting.

² See A/CONF.73/15.

Agricultural Development proposed by the Committee on Negotiations with Intergovernmental Agencies and decides to transmit it to IFAD for approval."

30. With respect to the concern expressed by Algeria, his delegation hoped that it would not bring about a delay in adopting the agreement.

31. Mr. MADEY (Yugoslavia), after thanking the Chairman and the members of the Committee on Negotiations with Intergovernmental Agencies for having undertaken the difficult task of amending the original text and adjusting it to the *modus operandi* of the United Nations system, said that there was no need to stress the importance of creating IFAD, which was one of the outstanding achievements of the World Food Conference, convened at the initiative of the non-aligned countries and proposed at the Algiers summit conference. Yugoslavia had been the first country in category III to fulfil its promise to contribute to the Fund and had signed the Agreement. It nevertheless wanted the final text to deal with all the points which were considered important. Since Yugoslavia was not a member of the Committee on Negotiations, it had not had time to study the draft agreement thoroughly and therefore was unable to make any commitment. It reserved the right to take a final position on the draft agreement at a later stage.

32. With respect to the amendment proposed by Algeria, his delegation felt that the draft relationship agreement was seriously deficient in comparison with similar texts and therefore supported the proposal as a matter of principle. Whatever decision the Council adopted on the matter, his delegation would certainly have difficulty in endorsing the proposed agreement and reserved the right to clarify its position at a later time, especially on the draft decision proposed by Argentina.

33. Mr. KHALEF (Iraq) shared the view of the representatives of Algeria and Yugoslavia on the amendment to article XI of the draft agreement.

34. Mr. KINSMAN (Canada) stressed that the question posed by Algeria had been discussed extensively during the negotiations in the Committee, which in view of the highly specialized nature of the questions discussed had been extremely complicated and difficult. The texts had been legal in nature and had referred to a banking mechanism which in turn raised difficulties of its own. The other complicating factor had been that the Committee had had to start negotiations with the Chairman of the Preparatory Commission for IFAD, a commission which had included a number of delegations that had also been members of the Committee on Negotiations. The Committee had therefore had to strive to reach agreements which would not be mutually contradictory and to reconcile the various interests represented - an exceedingly difficult task.

35. While appreciating the arguments in favour of the Algerian proposal, and respecting the sovereign right of that delegation to express its disagreement, his delegation hoped the Council would adopt the draft agreement in its existing wording so as not to delay the beginning of the Fund's operations.

36. Mr. PARS (Iran) said that he shared the views expressed by the representative of Canada. Iran attached great importance to the creation of the Fund and, as the second largest contributor, wanted it to start operating as soon as possible for the benefit of the developing countries. Iran, as a member of the Committee on Negotiations, could attest to the complexity of the negotiations which had produced the draft agreement prepared at Rome, and agreed with the delegation of Yugoslavia that it was a considerable improvement over the original text. He recalled that the General Assembly, in its resolution 3503 (XXX), had requested the Economic and Social Council to arrange for the negotiation with the Preparatory Commission for IFAD of an agreement with the Fund and, which was more important, that it should enter into such an agreement: it should be noted that the General Assembly had provided for the provisional application of the agreement.

37. Recalling that Iran had been one of the first supporters of the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, that it had submitted resolution 1514 (XV) in the General Assembly, and that as a member of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration it had subsequently continued to maintain that the United Nations must give assistance to non-self-governing territories, he noted that the questions raised by the representative of Algeria were dealt with in article XI, since it provided that the Fund should render such assistance as the United Nations might request under its Charter, particularly for the accomplishment of the principles and purposes set forth in Article 55, one of which was in fact self-determination.

38. His delegation hoped that the Council would adopt the draft agreement, since it was a compromise text.

39. Mr. BERG (Norway) fully supported the basic arguments put forward by the two preceding speakers. His delegation was concerned that the operations of IFAD might be unduly delayed. Exhaustive deliberations had taken place in the Committee on Negotiations, and he felt that the text which the Council had before it was far better than the first one had been. An extremely delicate question was involved and the Council must try to reach an agreement to support the draft agreement and submit it to the Preparatory Commission for IFAD for early adoption.

40. Referring to the proposal of the representative of Algeria, he said that, as had been demonstrated by its action, his delegation was concerned over some of the points made by the representative of Algeria, but it considered that the basic idea which he had expressed was fully covered by the reference to Article 55 of the Charter.

41. Mr. MOUSKY (United States of America) associated himself with the views expressed by the representatives of Canada and Iran and emphasized that the Agreement had been signed by 91 countries, and not simply delegations. One of the points on which the Committee on Negotiations had reached full agreement was that no delegation should reopen the debate on the draft agreement. It was in the interests of all that IFAD should begin operations as soon as possible as a specialized agency.

42. His delegation could not accept the Algerian proposal to replace the words "Article 55" in article XI of the draft agreement with the words "Chapters IX, XI and XII". While the United States supported the basic concepts established in Chapters IX, XI and XII of the United Nations Charter, it did not consider it appropriate to refer to those Chapters in an agreement on relations between the United Nations and IFAD. Furthermore, before the articles of the agreement with IFAD had been considered or adopted, the 91 signatory States had taken a clear decision that IFAD loans should be limited to developing countries which were members of the Fund or to intergovernmental organizations to which those members belonged. For those reasons, his delegation had a decided preference for the wording of article XI as contained in document E/5924 and was confident that the Economic and Social Council would deem it appropriate to support the agreement in its present form and to transmit it to IFAD so that it could enter into effect provisionally as soon as possible.

43. Mr. MAHGOUB (Sudan), Chairman of the Committee on Negotiations with Intergovernmental Agencies, read out a telegram which he had received from the Chairman of the Preparatory Commission for IFAD, in which the latter expressed the hope that, at its current session, the Economic and Social Council would endorse what had been agreed upon in negotiations between the Preparatory Commission for IFAD and the Committee. He said that the telegram had been sent in response to his own request asking the Chairman of the Preparatory Commission to inform him as soon as possible of the Commission's reaction to the agreed text.

44. Mr. MADEY (Yugoslavia) said that there was no doubt that all delegations attached the greatest importance to the procedures establishing the Fund's functions. However, the procedures had to ensure the best possible co-operation between the Fund and the United Nations. Therefore, each Government had the right to analyse carefully the draft submitted by the Committee on Negotiations. For that reason, he disagreed with the views expressed by the representative of the United States, who had referred to a provisional implementation of the agreement, in other words to the existence of a certain understanding that would in some way preclude the possibility of reviewing the agreement in the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly. He proposed in consequence that the draft decision submitted by Argentina should not include the endorsement by the Council of the proposed draft agreement.

45. Mr. KABORE (Upper Volta) said that while the draft, which was the result of arduous negotiations, was a fairly comprehensive document, it nevertheless contained a number of deficiencies which the representative of Algeria, for very sound reasons, was endeavouring to remedy. In his view, the proposal of the representative of Algeria did not conflict with the text of article XI as it appeared in document E/5924. Perhaps the Council could endeavour to accept that position, to which his delegation would agree.

46. Mr. KHAMIS (Algeria) said that he did not see how his amendment could create difficulties for the Council. Nor did he understand how the signature and ratification of the Agreement establishing IFAD could raise problems as had

been stated. The principle of decolonization was a basic element in the work of the United Nations, and the Economic and Social Council, as a United Nations organ, should comply fully with the relevant provisions of the Charter and the General Assembly resolutions on the matter.

47. In view of the fact that many delegations had been unable to participate thus far in the negotiations on the draft agreement and that those delegations might have some suggestions to make in that regard, and bearing in mind the fact that the draft which the Council had before it was in no way a final text, he proposed that the Council should adopt the Yugoslav proposal that it should simply take note of the report of the Committee on Negotiations and transmit it to the Preparatory Commission for IFAD for its consideration. For its part, his delegation would submit its amendments again at a later stage in the process of negotiation between the United Nations and IFAD.

48. Mr. VAN BUUREN (Netherlands) appealed to the delegation of Algeria, and to other delegations which had supported the latter's amendment, to bear in mind the fact that a great deal had been achieved in the Committee on Negotiations, whose deliberations had made it possible to satisfy practically all the wishes of the members of the Council represented in the Committee. To reopen negotiations on the draft agreement as a whole would serve no useful purpose, and might actually delay the initiation of the operations of IFAD.

49. Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) said that his delegation had no objection to the inclusion, in article XI of the draft agreement, of a reference to chapters of the Charter and to the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, as the delegation of Algeria had proposed. In any event, the Council must above all take account of the fact that the Preparatory Commission for IFAD had indicated its provisional agreement to the draft, since it was desirable that the Council should endorse a text which was actually acceptable to IFAD. It was imperative not to take any action which might jeopardize the unity of the United Nations system when the aim was precisely to make the new organization a part of that system.

50. Mr. MAHGOUB (Sudan), Chairman of the Committee on Negotiations with Intergovernmental Agencies, said it should be clearly understood that, while there was of course no direct link between the agreement between the United Nations and IFAD and the commencement of the Fund's activities, it was also true that any delay in reaching a consensus on the agreement would, in practice, delay the signature and ratification of the Agreement establishing the Fund. In any event, any decision taken by the Council on the question at the current stage would not be final, since the draft agreement would have to be considered by the Preparatory Commission for IFAD, and the Council would be able to take up the question again at its following session.

51. His delegation agreed with the substance of the amendment proposed by the representative of Algeria. Nevertheless, as Chairman of the Committee on Negotiations, he hoped that the Council would bear in mind that the Committee's deliberations had made it possible to solve

a number of very difficult problems and had ensured respect for the authority of the United Nations in its relations with the new specialized agency. He was afraid that, if the discussion on the draft agreement as a whole was reopened, the consensus reached on other highly controversial questions might be jeopardized. He expressed the hope, therefore, that the Council would find a solution which would preserve the agreements already reached, without prejudicing the position of any delegation.

52. Mr. LEMP (Federal Republic of Germany) said that the text of the draft agreement appearing in document E/5924 constituted a delicate compromise solution. It should be remembered that, during the deliberations of the Committee on Negotiations, the spokesman for the Group of 77 had been in constant touch with the various members of that Group and had made many suggestions in the Committee; all interested delegations had also had an opportunity to participate directly in the work of the Committee.

53. Since there was reason to believe that IFAD would be able to accept the draft agreement appearing in document E/5924, which would avoid prolonging negotiations indefinitely, his delegation was firmly of the view that the Economic and Social Council should endorse the draft agreement. He would be grateful if the representative of Algeria would not press his amendment since, for the reasons already given by other delegations, it would be very difficult for his delegation to accept it.

54. Mrs. DERRE (France) said that IFAD had already decided that its loans would be granted solely to its member countries. If some delegations in the Economic and Social Council wished the Fund's activities to be broader in scope, they should have expressed that view in IFAD and not in the Council.

55. Her delegation could not accept the amendment proposed by the representative of Algeria, because of the position which it had already adopted in the deliberations leading to the establishment of IFAD. The delegations represented in the Committee on Negotiations with Intergovernmental Agencies, as well as the representatives of IFAD, had already made many concessions, as a result of which a delicate balance had been achieved. The basis of that balance must be respected fully, particularly in view of the fact that the agreement had always been considered as constituting an indivisible whole.

56. Mr. KHAMIS (Algeria) said that, in the light of the last three statements, a number of clarifications were called for. First, it should be understood that at no time had negotiations been concluded, and he reminded members of the Committee on Negotiations that his delegation had emphasized at the time that it attached such importance to the question that it could not adopt a final decision in that Committee. He also recalled that other delegations, too, had expressed reservations regarding the article in question.

57. Although his delegation had certainly stated that it would not ask for its amendment to be put to a vote in the belief that it would be adopted unanimously—that did not mean that it did not continue to insist on it.

58. IFAD granted loans only to member developing countries and to intergovernmental organizations of which those countries were members. His delegation was not proposing that the Fund should grant loans to liberation movements or Trust Territories. In view of the many restrictions which article XI placed on the granting of assistance by the Fund—restrictions which, moreover, were intended to prevent the Fund from making loans to liberation movements, Namibia, Rhodesia, and Namibian and Rhodesian refugees—he could not understand why his amendment was being interpreted as meaning that his delegation wished the Fund to grant loans to PLO, SWAPO, ZAPU or ZANU, among others. His delegation simply felt that the Fund, as a specialized agency and in the context of item 23 of the provisional agenda for the sixty-third session (E/L.1757), entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations", should co-operate with the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council in implementing that Declaration.

59. Mr. AL-HUSSAMY (Syrian Arab Republic) endorsed the Algerian amendment without reservation; he also shared the concern expressed by the delegation of Yugoslavia, since he felt that all countries which were not members of the Committee should have an opportunity to consult with their Governments, and that the draft agreement could not be adopted until it had been carefully examined. He therefore proposed that the Argentine text should be amended to state that the Economic and Social Council endorsed the draft agreement "in principle" or "provisionally". A third paragraph might be added which would "request the Secretary-General to transmit the draft relationship agreement to Governments for their comments", emphasizing that the General Assembly should adopt it at its thirty-second session.

60. Mr. OLIVERI LOPEZ (Argentina) read out the following new text which had been drafted in a spirit of compromise:

"The Economic and Social Council takes note with appreciation of the report of the Committee on Negotiations with Intergovernmental Agencies (E/5924) and decides to transmit the draft relationship agreement between the United Nations and the International Fund for Agricultural Development proposed by the Committee on Negotiations with Intergovernmental Agencies to IFAD for adoption".

61. Mr. BARCELO (Mexico) supported the Argentine proposal since it made due allowance for his country's concern, namely, that the negotiations were not finally closed.

62. Mr. KHAMIS (Algeria) requested that, if the Argentine proposal was adopted by consensus, the Algerian amendment should be included in the material to be transmitted to IFAD.

63. Mr. NAKAMURA (Japan) said that, inasmuch as the draft relationship agreement which the Committee had before it was the result of extensive negotiations and was a compromise text, he hoped that the Council would approve

it, while recognizing the right of the members of the Council to take whatever final position they might wish to take on the draft agreement and the amendment proposed by the Algerian delegation at a later stage. He also suggested that the Argentine delegation should endeavour to arrive at a text acceptable to all delegations.

64. Mr. PATTISON (United Kingdom) said that his country, which was not a member of the Committee on Negotiations, hoped that the Council would take note of the relationship agreement and transmit it to IFAD for its approval. He could accept the proposal by the Argentine delegation.

65. Mr. VAN BUUREN (Netherlands) endorsed the remarks of the United Kingdom representative and said that the text proposed by Argentina was entirely acceptable to his delegation.

66. The PRESIDENT read out the text submitted by Argentina, with a slight addition:

“The Economic and Social Council

“Takes note with appreciation of the report of the Committee on Negotiations with Intergovernmental Agencies (E/5924) and decides to transmit to the International Fund for Agricultural Development:

“(a) For its approval, the draft relationship agreement between the United Nations and the International Fund for Agricultural Development proposed by the Committee on Negotiations with Intergovernmental Agencies;

“(b) The summary record of the Council’s discussion of the matter.”

67. Mr. PARSI (Iran) pointed out that, technically speaking, the Committee on Negotiations had approved the text; he therefore proposed that in the text just read out the word “proposed” should be replaced by “approved”.

68. Mr. AL-HUSSAMY (Syrian Arab Republic) supported that proposal.

69. Mr. MADEY (Yugoslavia) said that he endorsed the Argentine text as well as the text read out by the President. However, he totally disagreed with the Iranian delegation that the draft agreement had been approved, since every member of the Committee had reserved its right to take a final position at a later stage. He therefore considered the text read out by the President to be a good compromise solution.

70. Mr. KHAMIS (Algeria) expressed full agreement with the remarks of the representative of Yugoslavia.

71. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt the draft decision in the form he had just read out.

The draft decision proposed by the President was adopted (decision 241 (LXII)).

72. Mr. AMIRDZHANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring to the decision which had just been

adopted, said he wished to point out that the Soviet Union did not participate in IFAD and that its position with regard to the Fund had been stated on several occasions in other relevant forums of the United Nations system. If a vote had been taken on the draft, his delegation would have abstained.

AGENDA ITEM 1

Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters (concluded)*

PARTICIPATION OF AN INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION IN THE WORK OF THE COUNCIL (E/5983)

73. The PRESIDENT drew the Council’s attention to the note by the Bureau (E/5983) concerning the application by the Latin American Faculty of Social Sciences for designation by the Council in accordance with rule 79 of the rules of procedure and said that the Bureau recommended that that organization be designated to participate, without the right to vote, on an *ad hoc* basis in the deliberations of the Council on questions within the scope of the activities of the organization. If there were no objection, he would take it that the Council decided to approve the recommendation of the Bureau.

It was so decided (decision 239 (LXII)).

Research within the United Nations system on the role and position of women in development (E/5914)

74. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to take note of the progress report of the Secretary-General on research within the United Nations system on the role and position of women in development and on ways and means to organize and finance further research (E/5914).

It was so decided (decision 240 (LXII)).

AGENDA ITEM 16

Consideration of the provisional agenda for the sixty-third session (E/L.1757)

75. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) said that, as a result of decisions adopted by the Council at its current session and in view of other actions it had taken, certain changes should be made in the provisional agenda submitted by the Secretariat (E/L.1757). First, a foot-note should be added to item 9, entitled “United Nations University”, indicating that the item would be taken up at the resumed session in order to conform with the cycle of meetings of the Council of the United Nations University which was to meet after the sixty-third session of the Economic and Social Council. Secondly, and in view of the decisions adopted with respect to the agreement with IFAD, it would be necessary to change the title of item 26 back to the original version agreed upon at the organizational session before it had been decided to divide the consideration of the item between the sixty-second and

* Resumed from the 2048th meeting.

sixty-third sessions. Consequently, the title should again read "Agreements between the United Nations and inter-governmental organizations". When it took up that item, the Council would examine the agreements with IFAD and the World Tourism Organization.

76. At its current session, the Council had before it a letter addressed to the President of the Economic and Social Council by the Chairman of the Human Rights Committee (E/5929) indicating that the Committee, which was to report to the General Assembly through the Economic and Social Council, had decided to schedule its second session for 11-31 August 1977. Consequently, it would be necessary to add an item for consideration at the resumed sixty-second session entitled "International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights: report of the Human Rights Committee".

77. Mr. ALFONSO MARTINEZ (Cuba) considered the first and third of the changes to document E/L.1757 suggested by the Secretary of the Council to be appropriate. With regard to the amendment to item 26 of the provisional agenda, he wondered whether the reasons which had prompted the Secretariat to suggest those changes were sufficiently weighty to justify including two questions of such importance in a single item. He wished to know what practical advantages the proposal could have for the Council.

78. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) said that when the programme of work for the entire year had been adopted at the organizational session, the Council had decided that the agenda of the sixty-third session would include a single item covering both agreements. It had subsequently been decided that the agreement with IFAD would be taken up at the sixty-second session and,

consequently, that item had been included in the agenda for that session and the provisional agenda for the sixty-third session had been amended on the assumption that only the agreement with the World Tourism Organization would be considered at that time. Bearing in mind that, in accordance with action taken at its sixty-second session, the Council would have to consider both agreements at its sixty-third session, the Secretariat had been of the view that the Council would wish to revert to the original title of item 26 adopted in January.

79. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objection, he would take it that the Council decided to adopt the draft provisional agenda for the sixty-third session (E/L.1757), with the changes made by the Secretariat.

It was so decided.³

80. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objection, he would take it that the Council decided to adopt the document on organization of the work of the sixty-third session (E/L.1766) provisionally, on the understanding that a final decision would be taken at the beginning of the session, as had been done at the sixty-second session.

It was so decided.

Closure of the session

81. The PRESIDENT declared the sixty-second session of the Economic and Social Council closed.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.

³ The provisional agenda for the sixty-third session was subsequently circulated as document E/5990.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة
يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم. استعلم منها مركز الكتب التي تتعامل معها
أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو جنيف

如何取得联合国出版物

联合国出版物在世界各地的书店和经销处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences de vente dans le monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций. Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.