

14th meeting

Tuesday, 26 May 1987, at 10.55 a.m.

President: Mr. Eugeniusz NOWORYTA (Poland)

E/1987/SR.14

AGENDA ITEM 2

Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Second Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (*concluded*)* (E/1987/L.23)

DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME OF ACTION (E/1987/L.23)

1. The PRESIDENT said, at the request of the sponsors of draft resolution E/1987/L.23, that the phrase "in complying with the above request" should be deleted from paragraph 4. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council decided to adopt the draft resolution, as revised, by consensus.

It was so decided (resolution 1987/2).

* Resumed from the 10th meeting.

2. Mr. REINBOTHE (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation fully supported the Decade's goals and welcomed the adoption by consensus of draft resolution E/1987/L.23. However, the Federal Republic of Germany continued to consider it inappropriate to refer to migrant workers in the context in question. There was no connection between the status of migrant workers and racial discrimination.

3. Mr. STERLING (United States of America) said that his delegation had not joined the consensus that had led to the adoption of draft resolution E/1987/L.23. The United States had supported the proclamation by consensus of the first Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination but had not participated in any activities under either that Decade or the following one since 1975—the year in which the General Assembly had adopted resolution 3379 (XXX), which equated zionism with racism.

4. Mr. YAKOVLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that at the beginning of May the Soviet Union had ratified the International Convention against *Apartheid* in Sports.¹¹ That was a basic step towards consolidating the juridical foundation laid by the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid*.¹⁰ All States must support that important instrument with a view to promoting the struggle against one of the worst scourges of mankind. The Soviet Union welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution and would ensure its effective implementation.

5. Mr. BIFFOT (Gabon) said that he welcomed the adoption by consensus of draft resolution E/1987/L.23. All analyses of the issue of racial discrimination should take account of a fundamental factor—"ethnolinguism". When the Western countries referred to what they called "primitive" peoples they were accustomed to using the term "tribalism". It would also be appropriate to speak of ethnolinguism—the influence of a language on a given ethnic group and its relations with other social groups. If that parameter was taken into account in the analysis of *apartheid*, States' attitudes would be better understood. Naturally, that was not the only factor relevant to the issue of *apartheid*, but it was of such great importance that it should be taken into account.

6. The PRESIDENT announced that the Council had concluded its consideration of agenda item 2.

AGENDA ITEM 4

Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (*concluded*)* (E/1987/L.20, E/1987/L.27)

DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE CONVENTION (E/1987/L.27)

7. Mr. GOLEMANOV (Bulgaria) said that his delegation fully supported draft resolution E/1987/L.27. At the same time, it would like to place on record its concern about paragraph 8, which gave rise to procedural problems. In decision 1 contained in the report of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (E/1987/L.20,¹⁶ para. 580) the Council was requested to recommend to the General Assembly the adoption of a resolution that was reproduced in the same paragraph of the report. That was the first instance in which a body established under a treaty submitted a draft resolution to the Council in the manner in which subsidiary organs normally did. If such an approach was taken, the differences between treaty-based bodies in the field of human rights and the Council's subsidiary bodies would be eliminated. Moreover, articles 17 to 22 of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women¹⁴ regulated various aspects of the Committee's functions and no provision was made for any possibility for the Committee to submit draft resolutions to the Council for adoption. In accordance with article 21, paragraph 1, of the Convention, the Council should simply take note of the report as a whole or point out in an appropriate way that the procedure followed in making the request was unacceptable.

8. His delegation supported draft resolution E/1987/L.27, on the understanding that any future reading of its provisions would be consistent with the relevant provisions of the Convention and with established United Nations practice with respect to the functions of treaty-based bodies in the field of human rights.

9. Bulgaria, which had been one of the first countries to ratify the Convention, attached great importance to the Committee's work and wished to announce that it was joining the sponsors of draft resolution E/1987/L.27.

10. Mr. KAMAL (Pakistan) said that his delegation did not wish to stand in the way of a consensus, but Pakistan had not ratified the Convention since many of its provisions were in conflict with the principles upon which Islam and Islamic society were based.

11. Mr. AL-HAGRI (Oman) said that he wished to reaffirm his previous position and to enter reservations about the report of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, particularly the unnecessary references to Islam and Islamic society. However, he did not wish to stand in the way of a consensus. The Omani authorities were giving the Convention close consideration and would take the necessary steps.

12. Mr. YAKOVLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation supported the work of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women and was in favour of draft resolution E/1987/L.27. The Soviet Union hoped that the draft would be adopted by consensus and that all States would heed the appeal that they should accede to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women¹⁴ and comply with all of its provisions.

13. Some delegations, including Greece, had put forward interesting ideas during the discussions in the Committee. For example, it had been proposed that a United Nations seminar on the implementation of the provisions of the Convention should be held. The Soviet Union supported that initiative and was willing to consider, together with the Secretariat, the possibility of holding such a seminar in Moscow in 1989 or at any time considered appropriate. The meeting would be financed from the Soviet Union's contribution to the United Nations technical assistance programme.

14. During the discussion of the Committee's report, comments had been made on the new trends in the Committee's work, and the issue of the relationship between the Council and bodies based on international treaties in the field of human rights had arisen. The Committee's terms of reference had been exceeded in the debate in question. The Council could not assume the role that must be played by States and by the body based on the Convention in order to ensure implementation of the Convention. The principles upon which the relationship between the Council and the bodies established under treaties was based were delicately balanced. The Committee must therefore comply strictly with the provisions of the Convention and not arrogate to itself powers that the Convention did not give it.

15. Mrs. ZOGRAFOU (Observer for Greece) expressed her delegation's appreciation for the proposal made by the Soviet Union to hold in Moscow a United Nations seminar on the implementation of the Conven-

* Resumed from the 12th meeting.

tion on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.¹⁴ However, her Government's offer to hold the seminar in Greece, referred to in paragraph 125 of the report before the Council (E/1987/L.20¹⁶), still stood. The authorities were considering the technical aspects involved in hosting the seminar.

16. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt draft resolution E/1987/L.27.

It was so decided (resolution 1987/3).

17. Mr. ZARIF (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that his delegation did not wish to oppose the adoption by consensus of the draft resolution, but wished to place on record that Iran had serious reservations with respect to the Convention and was not a party to it.

18. Ms. NIEMANN (Canada), referring to comments on the mandate of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, pointed out that it was empowered to make suggestions and general recommendations under article 21 of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women¹⁴ and that it could also take decisions with respect to the organization of its own work. Nevertheless, the two functions should be clearly separated. It was regrettable that in the report on the sixth session (E/1987/L.20¹⁶), the Committee's conclusions on its work had been presented in the form of decisions. She hoped that that situation would be rectified at the seventh session.

19. The PRESIDENT drew the attention of the Council to decision 1 adopted by the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, contained in document E/1987/L.20,¹⁶ and the financial implications of that decision.

20. Mr. GOLEMANOV (Bulgaria) reiterated that, for procedural reasons, the Council should not take a separate decision on decision 1, but should merely take note of the Committee's report as a whole. If delegations insisted on the Council taking a vote on the matter, his delegation would propose that, in accordance with rule 67, paragraph 2, of its rules of procedure, the Council should not take a decision on the proposals contained in decision 1. That motion did not imply criticism of the Committee's work, but sought to avoid creating a precedent as to the Council's working methods with regard to bodies established under human rights treaties.

21. The PRESIDENT announced that, in accordance with the rules of procedure of the Council, two representatives could speak in favour and two against the motion proposed by the representative of Bulgaria.

22. Mr. QUINN (Australia), speaking on a point of order, said that there seemed to be some confusion about the relationship between the resolution, which the Council had just adopted, and decision 1 contained in the report of the Committee. As a sponsor of draft resolution E/1987/L.27, the Australian delegation understood that paragraphs 7 and 8 of that resolution replaced decisions 1 and 4 proposed by the Committee, and that the two remaining decisions were covered by the wording "takes note of the report" in paragraph 5 of the resolution which was just adopted. Although it was perhaps formally necessary for the Council to agree

not to vote on those decisions, the matter should not cause any controversy.

23. Miss EMARA (Egypt) endorsed the comment made by the representative of Australia.

24. Mr. GOLEMANOV (Bulgaria) said that if the interpretation of the delegations of Australia and Egypt was shared by the Council, his delegation was prepared to withdraw its motion.

25. Mr. YAKOVLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) remarked that there had been no formal proposal that the Council should consider decision 1 and take action on it. The Council's long-standing practice indicated that bodies established under treaties had no functional links to the Council. Therefore, the recommendations and the decisions of such bodies were to be directed to the States parties concerned, provided that they did not fall outside their competence. However, if it was a question of the United Nations or the Council taking some sort of measures relating to events that occurred within the Committee or in the context of the Convention, the initiative of raising the issue belongs, from the legal standpoint, not to that Committee but to a State member of the Council. In other words, the initiative should come from the members of the Council, and only if a State proposed a recommendation or draft resolution should the Council consider it and take a decision. Since that was not the case, there was no need for the Council to take action on a decision contained in the report of the Committee. Had such a course been proposed, his delegation would have opposed it. However, that had not happened and the issue had been completely resolved with the adoption of draft resolution E/1987/L.27.

26. The PRESIDENT said that, from the statements and clarifications made, he understood that the Council did not wish to take a decision on decision 1. Its consideration of agenda item 4 was therefore concluded.

AGENDA ITEMS 5 AND 6

International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (*concluded*)* (E/1987/L.24/Rev.1)

International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (*concluded*)* (E/1987/L.19, E/1987/L.24/Rev.1, E/1987/L.25)

DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE INTERNATIONAL COVENANTS ON HUMAN RIGHTS (*concluded*) (E/1987/L.24/Rev.1)

27. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to take action on the revised draft resolution (E/1987/L.24/Rev.1)

Draft resolution E/1987/L.24/Rev.1 was adopted (resolution 1987/4).

28. Mr. STERLING (United States of America) said that, in the view of his delegation, paragraph 3 of the adopted text came within the scope of the rights set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.⁸

29. With regard to paragraph 8, his delegation considered that the use of uniform standards in the implementation of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, as expressed in the general comments of the Human Rights Committee on the work of other bodies dealing with questions of human rights, in

no way reduced States' obligation to respect civil and political rights.

DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE INTERNATIONAL COVENANT ON ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND CULTURAL RIGHTS (concluded) (E/1987/L.25)

30. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft resolution E/1987/L.25 and announced that the delegations of France, Italy and Spain had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

31. Mr. LIU (Assistant Secretary of the Council) read out the revised text of paragraph 6 of the draft resolution, submitted by Australia on behalf of the sponsors. The paragraph read:

"Invites non-governmental organizations in consultative status with the Council to submit to it written statements that might contribute to full and universal recognition and realization of the rights contained in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, and requests the Secretary-General to make those statements available to the Committee in a timely manner."

32. Mr. QUINN (Australia) said that, while draft resolution E/1987/L.25 had been supported by many delegations, the original text of paragraph 6 had given rise to some legal difficulties concerning the question of whether the new Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights was a treaty body independent of the Council or whether it was a subsidiary body of the Council. Although the question had not yet been resolved, wide-ranging consultations had been held with the aim of achieving a consensus, the result of which was the new text of paragraph 6. Basically it reaffirmed the fact that non-governmental organizations in consultative status should submit written statements to the Council relating to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. The only new element was that such statements should be made available to the new Committee. Apart from that, the general purpose of the draft resolution was to give greater importance to the Committee and thus promote the enjoyment of economic, social and cultural rights, to which adequate attention had not been given within the United Nations. The sponsors were confident that the new wording would make it possible for the draft resolution to be adopted by consensus.

Draft resolution E/1987/L.25, as orally revised, was adopted (resolution 1987/5).

PROCLAMATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL LITERACY YEAR (E/1987/L.19)

33. The PRESIDENT drew the Council's attention to the note by the Secretariat (E/1987/L.19) and suggested that the Council should adopt a draft decision along the following lines:

"The Economic and Social Council, having considered the note by the Secretariat, decides to consider the question of the proclamation of the international literacy year, pursuant to General Assembly resolution 41/118 and Council decision 1987/111, at its second regular session of 1987 under item 15 of the provisional agenda, entitled 'International co-opera-

tion and co-ordination within the United Nations system'."

34. He would take it, if he heard no objection, that the Council wished to adopt the draft decision he had just read out.

It was so decided (decision 1987/116).

AGENDA ITEM 11

Statistical questions (E/1987/19, E/1987/91)

REPORT OF THE FIRST (ECONOMIC) COMMITTEE (E/1987/91)

35. The PRESIDENT drew the attention of the Council to the report of the First (Economic) Committee on agenda item 11 (E/1987/91). In paragraph 14 of the report, the Committee recommended to the Council the adoption of a draft resolution entitled "Indicative patterns of consumption: qualitative indicators of development".

36. If he heard no objections, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt the draft resolution.

It was so decided (resolution 1987/6).

37. Mr. BENMOUSSA (Morocco) said that, by adopting the draft resolution by consensus, the Council and the international community had reaffirmed the need to determine indicative patterns of consumption that promoted the well-being of the population. That would make it possible to evaluate the degree to which people's basic economic and socio-cultural needs were being satisfied. His delegation was pleased that, despite the Organization's financial crisis, there was still room for new ideas such as the one that had just been introduced, which had given rise to a new statistical analysis tool. Morocco shared the view of the Statistical Commission that, in order to identify indicative patterns of consumption, a long-term view should be taken in order to address issues that would be relevant well into the twenty-first century. Man had a permanent need to free himself from material limitations, take part in laying the foundations for his own existence and thus contribute to the world's future. His delegation hoped that the points he had mentioned would be taken into account in the preparation of the developing countries' national monographs.

38. The PRESIDENT recalled that the text of the second recommendation of the First (Economic) Committee (E/1987/91, para. 15) was contained in the report of the Statistical Commission (E/1987/19, chap. I, sect. A). It concerned a draft decision entitled "Report of the Statistical Commission on its twenty-fourth session and provisional agenda and documentation for the twenty-fifth session of the Commission".

39. If he heard no objections, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt that draft decision.

It was so decided (decision 1987/117).

40. The PRESIDENT said that the Council had concluded its consideration of agenda item 11.

AGENDA ITEM 14**Natural resources (E/1987/21, E/1987/94)****REPORT OF THE FIRST (ECONOMIC) COMMITTEE
(E/1987/94)**

41. The PRESIDENT drew the attention of the Council to the report of the First (Economic) Committee on agenda item 14 (E/1987/94). In paragraph 15 of the report, the Committee recommended to the Council the adoption of seven draft resolutions proposed by the Committee on Natural Resources (E/1987/21, chap. I, sect. A), namely: I, "Water resources and progress in the implementation of the Mar del Plata Action Plan"; II, "Trends and salient issues in mineral resources"; III, "New techniques, including remote sensing, for identifying, exploring for and assessing natural resources"; IV, "Application of microcomputer technology in the assessment and development of natural resources and energy"; V, "United Nations Revolving Fund for Natural Resources Exploration"; VI, "Permanent sovereignty over natural resources"; VII, "Co-ordination of programmes within the United Nations system in the field of natural resources".

42. In paragraph 16 of its report (E/1987/94), the First (Economic) Committee recommended to the Council the adoption of a draft decision entitled "Report of the Committee on Natural Resources on its tenth session and provisional agenda and documentation for the eleventh session of the Committee" (E/1987/21, chap. I, sect. B).

43. He invited the Council to take action on the seven draft resolutions and the draft decision.

DRAFT RESOLUTIONS I, II, III, IV, V, VI AND VII

Draft resolutions I, II, III, IV, V, VI and VII were adopted (resolutions 1987/7, 1987/8, 1987/9, 1987/10, 1987/11, 1987/12 and 1987/13).

DRAFT DECISION

The draft decision was adopted (decision 1987/118).

44. The PRESIDENT said that the Council had thus concluded its consideration of agenda item 14.

AGENDA ITEM 15**Desertification and drought****REPORT OF THE FIRST (ECONOMIC) COMMITTEE
(E/1987/95)**

45. The PRESIDENT said that the First (Economic) Committee, in paragraph 7 of its report on agenda item 15 (E/1987/95), recommended to the Council the adoption of a draft resolution entitled "Assistance to the drought-stricken areas of Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, the Sudan and Uganda".

46. He invited the Council to take action on the draft resolution.

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 1987/14).

47. The PRESIDENT said that the Council had thus concluded its consideration of agenda item 15.

AGENDA ITEM 16**Special economic, humanitarian and disaster relief assistance****REPORT OF THE FIRST (ECONOMIC) COMMITTEE
(E/1987/96)**

48. The PRESIDENT said that the First (Economic) Committee, in paragraph 18 of its report on agenda item 16 (E/1987/96), recommended to the Council the adoption of three draft resolutions, namely: I, "Assistance for reconstruction in Vanuatu"; II, "Assistance to El Salvador"; III, "Assistance to Ecuador".

49. He invited the Council to take action on the draft resolutions.

DRAFT RESOLUTION I

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 1987/15).

DRAFT RESOLUTION II

50. Mrs. VIOTTI (Brazil) said that her delegation wished to join the sponsors of the draft resolution.

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 1987/16).

DRAFT RESOLUTION III

51. Mrs. VIOTTI (Brazil) said that her delegation was joining the sponsors of the draft resolution.

52. Mr. FONTAINE-ORTIZ (Observer for Cuba) said that his delegation also wished to become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 1987/17).

DRAFT DECISION ON ASSISTANCE TO SOLOMON ISLANDS

53. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council adopt a draft decision along the following lines:

"The Economic and Social Council takes note of the oral report on assistance to Solomon Islands made before the First (Economic) Committee of the Council on 4 May 1987 by the representative of the United Nations Development Programme, pursuant to General Assembly resolution 41/193.

54. If he heard no objections, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt the draft decision he had just read out.

It was so decided (decision 1987/119).

55. The PRESIDENT said that the Council had thus concluded its consideration of agenda item 16.

AGENDA ITEM 19**Advancement of Women (E/1987/15, E/1987/44,
E/1987/99, E/1987/L.26)****REPORT OF THE SECOND (SOCIAL) COMMITTEE
(E/1987/99)**

56. The PRESIDENT drew the attention of the Council to the report of the Second (Social) Committee on agenda item 19 (E/1987/99). In paragraph 30 of the report, the Committee recommended to the Council

the adoption of nine draft resolutions, namely: I, "Monitoring and review and appraisal of the implementation of the Nairobi Forward-looking Strategies for the Advancement of Women"; II, "Improvement of the status of women within the United Nations"; III, "Future world conferences on women"; IV, "Improving the ability of the Commission on the Status of Women to carry out its mandate"; V, "Measures to strengthen the role and functions of the Commission on the Status of Women"; VI, "Enlargement of the Commission on the Status of Women"; VII, "Long-term programme of work of the Commission on the Status of Women to the year 2000"; VIII, "International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women"; IX, "Observance of the tenth anniversary of the United Nations Development Fund for Women" (E/1987/99, para. 30). Members had before them the texts of draft resolutions I to VII in the report of the Commission on the Status of Women on its 1987 session (E/1987/15, chap. I, sect. A), in which they were originally recommended to the Council for adoption as draft resolutions II to VIII.

57. He invited the Council to take action on draft resolutions I to IX recommended to the Council for adoption by its Second (Social) Committee.

DRAFT RESOLUTIONS I, II AND III

Draft resolutions I, II and III were adopted (resolutions 1987/18, 1987/19 and 1987/20).

DRAFT RESOLUTION IV

58. The PRESIDENT drew the attention of the Council to the programme budget implications of draft resolution IV, which were contained in document E/1987/L.26.

Draft resolution IV was adopted (resolution 1987/21).

59. Mr. TROUVEROY (Belgium) said that his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution, but continued to have reservations about having the Commission on the Status of Women meet annually. Belgium had consistently supported the work of the Commission and had taken an active part in the World Conference at Nairobi. Furthermore, it understood the need to put into effect the recommendations in the Forward-looking Strategies, which required that Governments work closely with the parties concerned. Nevertheless, his delegation believed that the decision to have the Commission meet annually was premature and had hoped that the Council would defer consideration of the matter until such time as delegations had available to them the results of the study of the Special Commission of the Council. As it was, the decision just adopted would only further complicate the work of the Special Commission.

60. Miss BARKER-HARLAND (United Kingdom) said that her delegation believed that the Commission on the Status of Women had a difficult task to perform and one which had expanded since it had been entrusted with promoting and monitoring the implementation of the Forward-looking Strategies adopted at the Nairobi Conference. The General Assembly had adopted by consensus resolution 41/213 recommending, *inter alia*, a study of measures to improve the working of the intergovernmental machinery. Pursuant to that resolution, the Council had established

a Special Commission to study the functioning of the Council and its subsidiary bodies, which would not be submitting its report until 1988. Her delegation would have regarded it as more appropriate to defer a decision on annualization of the sessions of the Commission on the Status of Women. However, it had joined the consensus because it supported the view that women's issues must be accorded high priority in the United Nations system and because it recognized the wish of the majority that the Commission should meet annually and that a decision to that effect should be taken immediately.

61. Mr. FRIEDRICH (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation had hesitations about joining the consensus on the adoption of the report of the Commission on the Status of Women. In its resolution 41/213, the General Assembly had given the Economic and Social Council a mandate to review its programme and calendar of meetings with a view to reducing the frequency and duration of meetings. It therefore seemed untimely to decide on an increase in the frequency of meetings of a subsidiary body of the Council before the conclusion of the work of the Special Commission. The Federal Republic of Germany had always supported the activities of the Commission on the Status of Women, but the reforms which had been adopted on the basis of recommendations approved by the General Assembly should apply without exception to all United Nations activities in the economic and social fields. Perhaps it would have been more appropriate to provide for special meetings of the Commission on an *ad hoc* basis. His delegation welcomed the decision to transmit the report of the most recent session of the Commission on the Status of Women to the Special Commission, which would have an opportunity to examine the agenda and schedule of meetings of the Commission on the Status of Women. His delegation had joined the consensus in favour of the draft resolution in order not to break the spirit of unity, which it considered indispensable for the advancement of women. However, that position should not be considered as a precedent for other subsidiary bodies of the Council.

62. Mr. BERGTHUN (Norway) said that his delegation would have preferred that the question of annual sessions of the Commission on the Status of Women be considered by the Special Commission of the Economic and Social Council on the In-depth Study of the United Nations Intergovernmental Structure and Functions in the Economic and Social Fields, since any other procedure would not be in accordance with the decisions taken by the Council with the aim of reorganizing and improving its work.

63. Ms. NIEMANN (Canada) said that her delegation had consistently supported the principle of an effective and efficient United Nations organization, and it fully endorsed the reform measures adopted by consensus in General Assembly resolution 41/213, in particular recommendation 2, which called for reduction in the number, frequency and duration of meetings without affecting the work of the Organization, and recommendation 8, which called for a structural reform of the intergovernmental machinery in the economic and social fields. However, her delegation believed that the work of the Commission on the Status of Women was an organic part of United Nations activities in general and was

linked to the work of most other intergovernmental bodies dealing with specific issues in the economic, social and political fields. Her delegation considered that the annualization of the Commission's meetings was consistent with the spirit of Assembly resolution 41/213 and the goals of the United Nations. The adoption by consensus of the Nairobi Forward-looking Strategies emphasized the priority which the international community had decided to give to the equality of women. Furthermore, in the introduction to the proposed programme budget for 1988-1989, the Secretary-General had proposed that Africa and women should constitute two priority areas in the biennium 1988-1989. Accordingly, Canada would continue to support all measures which would help to enhance the effectiveness of the United Nations system in dealing with issues relating to the status of women.

DRAFT RESOLUTIONS V, VI AND VII

Draft resolutions V, VI and VII were adopted (resolutions 1987/22, 1987/23 and 1987/24).

DRAFT RESOLUTION VIII

Draft resolution VIII was adopted (resolution 1987/25).

64. Mr. AMSELEM (United States of America) said, with regard to draft resolution VIII, that his country had firmly supported the establishment of the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women (INSTRAW), but that it had reason to question the quality and usefulness of the material published by the Institute.

65. Mr. HOPPE (Denmark) requested that the reference to Denmark in paragraph 24 of document E/1987/99 be deleted.

DRAFT RESOLUTION IX

Draft resolution IX was adopted (resolution 1987/26).

66. Mr. AMSELEM (United States of America) said that he wished to place on record his delegation's doubts about the usefulness of introducing yet another observance of an anniversary in the United Nations system, as was proposed in the resolution just adopted.

67. The PRESIDENT drew the attention of the Council to paragraph 31 of the report of the Second (Social) Committee (E/1987/99), in which the Committee recommended to the Council the adoption of four draft decisions, namely: I, "System-wide medium-term plan for women and development and system-wide co-ordination of the implementation of the Nairobi Forward-looking Strategies for the Advancement of Women"; II, "Proposed programme budget for the biennium 1988-1989"; III, "Report of the Commission on the Status of Women on its 1987 session and provisional agenda and documentation for the thirty-second session of the Commission"; IV, "In-depth study of the United Nations intergovernmental structure and functions in the economic and social fields". By draft decision I, the Committee recommended that the Council defer consideration of draft resolution I, of the same title, which the Commission on the Status of Women had recommended for adoption in its report (E/1987/15, chap. I, sect. A), until its second regular session of 1987. The texts of draft decisions II and III were contained in the report of the Commission (*ibid.*, chap. I, sect. B).

68. He invited the Council first to take action on draft decisions II and III.

DRAFT DECISIONS II AND III

Draft decisions II and III were adopted (decisions 1987/120 and 1987/121).

DRAFT DECISION I

Draft decision I was adopted (decision 1987/122).

DRAFT DECISION IV

69. Ms. NIEMANN (Canada) proposed that the Council consider an amendment which would clarify the position of the Commission on the Status of Women with regard to its own functioning. The proposed amendment would add to the text of the draft decision the following words: "and on the understanding that such action is without prejudice to any views and proposals which the Commission on the Status of Women may express at its thirty-second session regarding its own functioning."

70. Mr. SCHWANDT (Federal Republic of Germany) expressed surprise that an amendment should be proposed at the last minute, when the draft decision had already been adopted by the Second Committee. In his opinion, any recommendation which the Special Commission might make in pursuance of Council decision 1987/112 in no way affected future decisions of the Commission on the Status of Women. He therefore requested clarification from the representative of Canada.

71. Mrs. ALVAREZ (France) said that she had been surprised at Canada's oral proposal to amend the draft decision without having given prior notice to delegations. Further, she requested an explanation of the meaning of the proposed amendment and, lastly, pointed out a problem of timing: in conformity with its mandate, the Special Commission was scheduled to meet at the beginning of September 1987 in order to decide on a number of important issues and would thus not be able to hear the opinions of the Commission on the Status of Women.

72. Ms. NIEMANN (Canada) said that it had not been her intention to hold up the work of the Council. With regard to the observations which had just been made, she pointed out that, when the Second (Social) Committee had adopted the decision in question, delegations had not had an opportunity to consider a written text. The purpose of the proposed amendment was to guarantee that the Special Commission would hear the opinions of the Commission on the Status of Women regarding its own functioning before producing a report, in conformity with Council decision 1987/112. With regard to the schedule of work, various subsidiary bodies of the Council, for example the Commission on Human Rights and the Committee on Social Development, had not yet expressed their views regarding their own functioning and, since they would not meet in 1987, could do so only in 1988.

73. Mr. TROUVEROY (Belgium) said that his delegation was perplexed at Canada's proposal, and proposed that, unless the amendment was of substantive importance, the draft decision should be approved as it

stood in order to expedite work and preserve the consensus.

74. Ms. NIEMANN (Canada) said that the amendment was of great importance. However, in the interest of expediting the Council's work, she suggested that the consideration of the item should be continued at another meeting.

75. The PRESIDENT suggested that the discussion of the item should be suspended.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 20

Narcotic drugs (A/CONF.133/PC/10 and Corr.1, E/1987/17, E/1987/27, E/1987/54, E/1987/102)

REPORT OF THE SECOND (SOCIAL) COMMITTEE (E/1987/102)

76. The PRESIDENT drew the attention of the Council to the report of the Second (Social) Committee on agenda item 20 (E/1987/102). In paragraph 25 of the report, the Committee recommended to the Council the adoption of eight draft resolutions, namely: I, "Preparation of an international convention against illicit traffic in narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances"; II, "Education and information on drug abuse and illicit traffic in narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances"; III, "Role of the drug control bodies of the United Nations at Vienna"; IV, "Improvement of the control of international trade in psychotropic substances listed in Schedules III and IV of the 1971 Convention on Psychotropic Substances"; V, "Demand and supply of opiates for medical and scientific needs"; VI, "United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control"; VII, "Special session of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs"; VIII, "Meeting of National Drug Law Enforcement Agencies, Latin America and Caribbean Region". The texts of draft resolutions I to VII were contained in the report of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs on its thirty-second session (E/1987/17, chap. I, sect. A), in which the draft resolutions were originally recommended to the Council for adoption. Draft resolution VIII (E/1987/102, para. 25) originated in the Second (Social) Committee.

77. In paragraph 26 of the report, the Second (Social) Committee recommended to the Council the adoption of six draft decisions, namely: I, "Provisional agenda and documentation for the thirty-third session of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs"; II, "Provisional agenda and documentation for the tenth special session of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs"; III, "Report of the International Narcotics Control Board"; IV, "Report of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs"; V, "Preparations for the International Conference on Drug Abuse and Illicit Trafficking"; VI, "Summary of the report of the International Narcotics Control Board for 1986 and note by the Secretariat on the international campaign against traffic in drugs". The texts of draft decisions I to IV were contained in the report of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs (E/1987/17, chap. I, sect. B). Draft decisions V and VI (E/1987/102, para. 26) originated in the Second (Social) Committee.

78. He invited the Council to take action on the draft resolutions and draft decisions recommended by the

Second (Social) Committee to the Council for adoption, beginning with those texts which were contained in the report of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs.

DRAFT RESOLUTION I

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 1987/27).

79. Miss ATTWOOD (United Kingdom) said that her delegation attached great importance to the drafting of an international convention against illicit traffic in narcotic drugs. However, she considered that the procedure recommended by the Commission on Narcotic Drugs was not necessarily the most efficient one and could delay the preparation of the convention. In addition, the proposal to hold two meetings of a group of intergovernmental experts placed an additional financial burden on the resources of the United Nations and of the Member States which might wish to attend. Her delegation suggested that the draft convention should be carefully prepared in order to avoid duplication and to ensure that the greatest number of countries ratified it as soon as possible.

DRAFT RESOLUTION II

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 1987/28).

DRAFT RESOLUTION III

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 1987/29).

80. Miss ATTWOOD (United Kingdom) reiterated her delegation's concern, expressed previously in other United Nations forums, that the Commission on Narcotic Drugs should be provided with sufficient financial data to enable it to evaluate the future work and priorities of United Nations drug control bodies adequately. It was essential that those bodies should co-ordinate their efforts as much as possible to prevent any overlapping of activities. Her delegation had been requesting further information regarding the budget and programming in that area for some time, but had received none to date. Her delegation hoped those bodies would submit such information in the future.

DRAFT RESOLUTION IV

Draft resolution IV was adopted (resolution 1987/30).

DRAFT RESOLUTION V

Draft resolution V was adopted (resolution 1987/31).

81. Ms. BARUTÇU (Turkey) said that her delegation attached great importance to the adoption of draft resolution V on supply and demand of opiates for medical and scientific needs as well as to previous Economic and Social Council resolutions on that subject. Taking into account the position of the International Narcotics Control Board that opiates listed by it should not be considered ordinary commodities, the production, manufacture and distribution of which could be governed by normal economic considerations, Turkey held the view that economic and commercial interests must not override the fundamental need for international co-operation in that field. For that reason, her delegation fully supported the relevant recommendations of the Council aimed at providing special support to traditional supplier countries.

82. Mrs. MUKHERJEE (India) also stressed the importance of support for traditional supplier countries, such as Turkey and India, where poppy-growing had constituted a significant part of the economy since time immemorial. Prospects for crop substitution were limited, and measures adopted to that end had already had negative economic and social repercussions. International co-operation in the area of narcotics was not limited to solidarity devoid of any economic considerations. Attempts to change internationally established criteria in that regard ran counter not only to solidarity in the field of narcotic drugs, but also to the concept of an equitable international economic order.

83. Mr. QUINN (Australia), referring to the draft resolution which had just been adopted, said that it, like previous resolutions on licit opiates, had diverted the attention of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs from its primary objective, which was to combat drug abuse and illicit trafficking through international co-operation. Australia, which had joined with other delegations in voting against or abstaining on similar resolutions, had not altered its position. His delegation's decision to join in the consensus did not mean that Australia had modified the principles on which its position had been based since the late 1970s; specifically, it did not accept the concept of "traditional supplier countries" of illicit opiates. The Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs of 1961, as amended by the 1972 Protocol Amending the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs of 1961²⁴ did not recognize that category, nor did it sanction the notion of a group of countries enjoying a monopoly or quasi-monopoly on trade in those commodities. The subject was not one of priority, given that pressing problems existed in the area of drug abuse and illicit trafficking which were part of the Board's mandate.

DRAFT RESOLUTIONS VI AND VII

Draft resolutions VI and VII were adopted (resolutions 1987/32 and 1987/33).

DRAFT DECISIONS I, II, III AND IV

Draft decisions I, II, III and IV were adopted (decisions 1987/123, 1987/124, 1987/125 and 1987/126).

DRAFT RESOLUTION VIII

Draft resolution VIII was adopted (resolution 1987/34).

84. Mr. STERLING (United States of America), referring to draft resolution VIII, said that his delegation strongly supported co-operation in matters relating to narcotics at the national, bilateral, regional and international levels.

85. United Nations budget-cutting efforts should be directed towards a reordering of priorities and, given that the fight against drug abuse and illicit trafficking was a priority goal, must receive the necessary funds from the programme budget for 1988-1989, which was to be considered in the context of General Assembly resolution 41/213.

86. With regard to the financial implications of draft resolution VIII, his delegation expected that the travel and subsistence costs of participants would be covered

by extrabudgetary resources, as indicated in annex IV of the report of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs (E/1987/17). It was to be hoped that meeting participants would make effective use of conference services and produce documentation that was thorough but as concise as possible.

DRAFT DECISIONS V AND VI

Draft decisions V and VI were adopted (decisions 1987/127 and 1987/128).

87. The PRESIDENT announced that the Council had concluded its consideration of agenda item 20.

AGENDA ITEM 1

Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters (*continued*)

AMENDMENT TO THE RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE COMMITTEE FOR THE UNITED NATIONS POPULATION AWARD (E/1987/L.18)

88. The PRESIDENT drew the attention of the Council to the amendment proposed to article 7, paragraph 2, of the rules of procedure of the Committee for the United Nations Population Award contained in Council decision 1982/112. The text of the amendment, proposed by the Committee, was contained in a note by the Secretariat (E/1987/L.18).

89. If he heard no objections, he would take it that the Council adopted the amendment.

It was so decided (decision 1987/129).

AGENDA ITEM 9

Transport of dangerous goods (*continued*) (E/1987/37, E/1987/L.29)

90. Mr. FIELD (United Kingdom) introduced draft resolution E/1987/L.29, entitled "Work of the Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods", on behalf of the sponsors, who had been joined by Belgium, Spain and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. To a great extent, the draft resolution took up the ideas contained in Council resolutions 1985/9 and 1986/66, which had been adopted by consensus.

91. Member States and international bodies used the Committee's recommendations in drafting their own rules regarding the transport of dangerous goods; in view of the increasing volume of such traffic, it was important that recommendations should be coherent and co-ordinated and that rules should be kept up to date. For that reason, the draft resolution requested the Secretary-General to publish the new and amended recommendations as soon as possible and urged all bodies to take them fully into account when developing their own codes. It also requested the Secretary-General to facilitate the adequate servicing of the Committee of Experts. He expressed the hope that, as in previous years, the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

²⁴ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 976, No. 14152.