

| | |
|-----------------------|----|
| 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