

35th meeting

Wednesday, 8 July 1987, at 10.45 a.m.

President: Mr. Eugeniusz NOWORYTA (Poland)

E/1987/SR.35

AGENDA ITEM 2

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

1. The PRESIDENT submitted, on behalf of the Bureau of the Council, the draft decision entitled "Participation of intergovernmental organizations in the work of the Economic and Social Council" (E/1987/L.45).

The draft decision was adopted (decision 1987/161).

AGENDA ITEM 3

General discussion of international economic and social policy, including regional and sectoral developments (*continued***)

2. Mr. BADAWI (Egypt) (Vice-President of the Council) submitted the draft decision entitled "Report of the Secretary-General on a concept of international economic security" (E/1987/L.46), prepared on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution E/1987/L.37, submitted at the 32nd meeting (para. 7).

The draft decision was adopted (decision 1987/162).

3. Mr. JØNCK (Denmark), speaking on behalf of the EEC and its member States, said that their support for the consensus approach to the text adopted in no way implied their acceptance of a concept of international economic security.

4. Mr. TANIGUCHI (Japan) said that his delegation's agreement to join in the consensus by no means implied acceptance of the concept referred to, which it continued to regard as vague. His delegation would reiterate its position on the subject in the General Assembly.

5. Ms. DANIELSEN (Norway) said that her delegation's agreement to the consensus approach did not imply recognition of that hitherto undefined concept or approval of the report (E/1987/77). Preparation of the report had involved an unfortunate use of scarce resources and a duplication of similar texts prepared elsewhere in the United Nations system.

6. Mr. WANG BAOLIU (China) said that his delegation reiterated the position it had explained when abstaining on General Assembly resolutions 40/173 and 41/184 relating to a report on a concept of international economic security.

7. Mr. MULLER (Australia) said that his delegation had been prepared to share in the consensus adoption of what was a mainly procedural text, but still had doubts about the concept in question and the need for the com-

* Resumed from the 22nd meeting.

** Resumed from the 33rd meeting.

prehensive analysis called for in General Assembly resolution 40/173.

8. Mr. SHABAN (Egypt) said that his delegation had joined in the consensus approach since it had voted in favour of General Assembly resolutions 40/173 and 41/184. Although the report contained no clear-cut definition of the concept, it outlined many of the factors of international economic instability which had a direct bearing on the developing countries' problems. His delegation looked forward to discussing the subject further in the General Assembly.

9. The PRESIDENT said that, in view of the adoption of draft decision E/1987/L.46, he took it that draft resolution E/1987/L.37 was withdrawn.

It was so agreed.

10. The PRESIDENT drew attention to paragraph 64 of the CDP report (E/1987/23) in which the Committee recommended the inclusion of Burma in the list of the least developed countries. He invited the Council to consider a draft decision reading:

“The Economic and Social Council decides:

“(a) To endorse the conclusion and recommendation of the Committee for Development Planning regarding the inclusion of Burma in the list of the least developed countries;

“(b) To recommend that the General Assembly at its forty-second session approve the inclusion of Burma in the list of the least developed countries.”

The draft decision was adopted (decision 1987/163).

11. Mr. MAUNG MAUNG GYE (Observer for Burma) said that his delegation welcomed the unanimous decision just taken and thanked the Council and all Member States for their co-operation and support, which reflected the good will and friendship shown towards Burma.

AGENDA ITEM 7

Effective mobilization and integration of women in development

REPORT OF THE FIRST (ECONOMIC) COMMITTEE

12. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the draft resolution entitled “Strengthening the work of the United Nations in integrating women effectively in economic development programmes and activities”, contained in paragraph 13 of the report (E/1987/120).

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 1987/65).

13. Ms. NIEMANN (Canada) said that her delegation welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution, which would add to the information the Council needed for action to integrate women in the work of United Nations programmes and projects. Her delegation looked forward to the additional information to be provided for consideration by the General Assembly at its forty-second session.

14. The PRESIDENT said that the Council had concluded its consideration of agenda item 7.

AGENDA ITEM 8

Regional co-operation

REPORT OF THE FIRST (ECONOMIC) COMMITTEE

15. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the recommendation by the Chairman of the Committee, made after informal consultations and reproduced in paragraph 19 of part I of the report (E/1987/121), under which the Council would take note of the report of the Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Europe (E/1987/108) and defer consideration of draft decision E/1987/L.32 to the Council's second regular session in 1988. He asked whether the Council wished to adopt that recommendation.

The recommendation was adopted (decision 1987/164).

16. Mr. ELIAV (Observer for Israel) said that his delegation reaffirmed Israel's right, according to the principle of the Charter of the United Nations of sovereign equality of Member States, to full membership in one of the United Nations regional economic commissions. Although Israel, because of its location, should be in the ESCWA, it had opted in 1986, for well-known reasons and on a temporary and provisional basis, to request admission to the ECE. The decision had been based on the very strong economic links between Israel and the ECE member States, on the Free Trade Agreement with the EEC signed in July 1975, and on the Free Trade Agreement with the United States signed in September 1985. A further factor was Israel's full membership of practically all the European regional groups within the specialized agencies and other international organizations, including its recent admission, without challenge, to the European regions of WHO and ILO. It was highly incongruous, therefore, that the United Nations itself should remain the only organization where international equity on the issue, reaffirmed in Council resolution 1986/67 of 23 July 1986, was still lacking. His delegation, having agreed not to press for action for a further year, hoped that admission would be accorded at the Council's second regular session of 1988.

17. Mr. NORRIS (United States of America) said that one of the United Nations fundamental strengths was the right of all States Members to participate fully and equally in the work of its institutions. Without that fundamental right, the Organization would have had great difficulty in surviving successfully for over 40 years. Unless the principle of universality were reaffirmed at every opportunity, the future usefulness of the United Nations family of institutions would be placed in doubt. The principle allowed no question about Israel's right to join a regional economic commission. His delegation, while recognizing Israel's decision to defer its applica-

tion for membership in the ECE for one year, recorded its support for that membership and its conviction that Israel would prove to be a valuable member, as it had in the European groupings of other United Nations agencies. His delegation looked forward to positive action by the Council at its second regular session of 1988, in upholding the principle on which all nations depended.

18. Mr. DAOUDY (Syrian Arab Republic) said that the statement reported in paragraph 19 of part I of the report (E/1987/121) called for some clarification. As all members and observer delegations of the Council were aware, many members had been opposed to the request that Israel should be admitted to membership of the ECE. He noted that the General Assembly, in paragraph 9 of its resolution 40/168 B, of 16 December 1985, had deplored any political, economic, financial, military and technological support to Israel that encouraged Israel to commit acts of aggression and to consolidate and perpetuate its occupation and annexation of occupied Arab territories and that the Eighth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-aligned Countries, meeting at Harare (Zimbabwe) from 1 to 6 September 1986, had adopted a resolution opposing any attempt to enable occupying authorities to become members of any United Nations regional economic commission.¹ The members of the Non-Aligned Movement had reaffirmed that decision at their most recent meeting and had urged its implementation.

19. Postponement of a decision on the draft decision contained in the note by the Secretariat (E/1987/L.32) would not change his country's determination to oppose the application for membership until Israel implemented the United Nations resolutions calling on it to withdraw from the occupied Arab territories and recognize the Palestinian people's right to self-determination.

20. Mr. TURBANSKI (Poland), speaking also on behalf of the delegations of the Byelorussian SSR, Bulgaria, the German Democratic Republic and the USSR, said that those delegations had not opposed adoption without a vote of the procedural decision taken relating to acceptance of Israel's application for membership of the ECE. In doing so, they reiterated their position, reflected in the report of the Executive Secretary of the ECE on that matter, and their view that any decisions relating to membership of regional commissions should be adopted only by consensus.

21. Mr. ABU-KOASH (Palestine Liberation Organization) recalled that in its resolution 181 (II), of 29 November 1947, the General Assembly had provided for the creation of a Palestinian State and that Israel had been admitted to United Nations membership on condition that it abided by the terms of that resolution. It was time for Israel and the United States of America, which had consistently blocked implementation of the resolution, to realize that the matter of utmost priority was for the Palestinian people to have its own sovereign

State. Once Palestine was able to take its place in United Nations forums as a sovereign member, it would be time to consider the membership in regional commissions of States that abided by General Assembly resolutions and the principles of international law. Far from that being the case, however, Palestinian refugees were still being prevented by Israel, with the support of the United States of America from returning to their homeland, as called for by the General Assembly as long ago as 1948. It should be recalled that South Africa had been expelled from membership of the ECA until the peoples of South Africa and Namibia were enabled, through their sole legitimate representatives, ANC and SWAPO, to exercise sovereign membership of international forums.

22. It was hard to see how the world community could accept such an application from Israel while the latter continued to occupy not only Palestinian territory but the Syrian Golan Heights, southern Lebanon and even a part of Egyptian territory. With regard to Israel's opting to apply for membership of the EEC, everyone was aware, of course, of the influence in Israel of immigrants from Europe. It might be asked, however, what consideration Israel ever gave to the Palestinian people there. In any event, it was quite clear from the deliberations that the vast majority of Council members were opposed to Israel's membership as long as that country continued to defy United Nations resolutions.

23. Mr. UTHEIM (Norway) said that he wished to record his Government's strong support for the principle of universality in regard to States Members of the United Nations, pursuant to the Charter and for the right of all Members to participate fully and equally in all United Nations bodies, including one of the regional economic commissions, a principle that should be applied also to Israel. His delegation looked forward to a decision by the Council at its second regular session of 1988.

24. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to take a decision on draft resolution I, entitled "Integration of women in development in Africa", contained in paragraph 31 of part I of the report (E/1987/121).

25. Mr. BARNETT (Jamaica), speaking as Chairman of the First (Economic) Committee, in reply to an observation by Mr. AFOLADI (Nigeria) relating to the fourth preambular paragraph, agreed that the words "which by" should read "by which", but said that the phrase "some positions" was correct and should not be "senior positions".

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 1987/66).

26. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft resolution II, entitled "International mobilization of financial and technological resources for food and agriculture in Africa", contained in paragraph 31 of part I of the report (E/1987/121).

27. Mr. SHABAN (Egypt) said that, as had been agreed during informal consultations, the word "the"

¹ A/41/697, annex, sect. II, para. 153.

at the end of the second preambular paragraph should be deleted.

The draft resolution, as orally amended, was adopted (resolution 1987/67).

28. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft resolution III, entitled "Human and financial resources: vacancies in the secretariat of the Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia", contained in paragraph 31 of part I of the report (E/1987/121).

29. Mr. SHABAN (Egypt) said that his delegation valued the consensus approach in the negotiations on the text. It hoped, however, that General Assembly resolution 39/243, on staff and administrative questions of ESCWA, would be fully implemented in the near future.

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 1987/68).

30. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft resolution IV, entitled "Europe-Africa permanent link through the Strait of Gibraltar" contained in paragraph 31 of part I of the report (E/1987/121).

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 1987/69).

31. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft decision I, entitled "Venue of the forty-fourth session of the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific", contained in paragraph 32 of part I of the report (E/1987/121).

The draft decision was adopted (decision 1987/165).

32. Mr. SWETJA (Observer for Indonesia) expressed his delegation's appreciation of the Council's decision to accept Indonesia's offer to host the forty-fourth session of ESCAP at Djakarta in 1988, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 31/140, section I, paragraph 5.

33. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft decision II entitled "Venue of the twenty-second session of the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean", and draft decision III, entitled "Venue of the fourteenth meeting of the Conference of Ministers of the Economic Commission for Africa and the twenty-third session of the Commission", both contained in paragraph 32 of part I of the report (E/1987/121).

The draft decisions were adopted (decisions 1987/166 and 1987/167).

34. The PRESIDENT invited the Commission to consider draft decision IV, entitled "Report of the Secretary-General on the Transport and Communications Decade in Africa", contained in paragraph 32 of part I of the report (E/1987/121).

35. Mr. BARNETT (Jamaica), speaking as Chairman of the First (Economic) Committee, said that the last four lines of the text should be replaced by the words: "implementation of all the resolutions previously adopted by the Conference of African Ministers of Transport, Communications and Planning within the

framework of the Transport and Communications Decade in Africa, which achievements will continue to be included among the accomplishments of the Decade, in accordance with Council resolution 1986/62 of 22 July 1986".

The draft decision was adopted (decision 1987/168).

36. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Council), in reply to a question by Mr. LAVROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), said that neither draft decision IV nor draft decision V had any financial implications.

37. Mr. BENMOUSSA (Morocco) paid tribute to the Chairman of the First (Economic) Committee for having made possible the consensus reached on draft decision IV. The Transport and Communications Decade in Africa was drawing to a close, and the coming year would provide the last opportunity to make good the wrong done to his country. In the course of the work of the First (Economic) Committee, it had been stated that the attention of the Executive-Secretary of the ECA would be drawn to the fact that the next report should list all the accomplishments of the Decade of all the African countries, in conformity with the decision just adopted.

38. Mr. DELMI (Observer for Algeria) expressed his delegation's thanks to the Chairman of the First (Economic) Committee for his contribution to the consensus achieved on draft decision IV.

39. The African Ministers of Transport, Communications and Planning, meeting at Harare in March 1986, had decided that all the projects submitted by Morocco that related to sovereignty over Western Sahara should be excluded from the Decade. That decision was reflected in the report of the Conference of Ministers and confirmed by resolution 563 (XXI) of 19 April 1986. It had also been confirmed by ECA resolution 604 (XXII), adopted by the Conference of Ministers of the ECA, meeting at Addis Ababa on 24 April 1987. The reason the ECA secretariat had not submitted a report on the matter was that a statement had been made by the Moroccan Minister of Transport, Communications and Planning at Harare, asking that all Moroccan projects be withdrawn from the Decade. There was, therefore, a clear logic in the behaviour of the secretariat. Nothing in the resolution could be interpreted as reopening the question of the Harare decision asking that all the Moroccan projects relating to Western Sahara be withdrawn from the Decade. The draft decision just adopted in no way contradicted that text since it referred to Council resolution 1986/62.

40. Mr. BENMOUSSA (Morocco) said that the statement that Morocco had withdrawn the projects relating to the Decade was out of date since the projects had in fact been subsequently reinstated. His delegation had absolutely no knowledge of any decision or resolution adopted by the ECA expressly requesting the withdrawal of the part of the programme entrusted to Morocco in the implementation of the Decade. If such documents existed, he asked that they should be produced and that it should be stated on what occasion they

had been adopted. It was perhaps the case that the ECA, in order to avoid sterile polemics over a matter which opposed one African country to its neighbour had decided to omit any specific reference to those matters, but no such attitude had ever been embodied in a formal resolution. In any event, the matter was now being discussed in the Council, which was the parent body of the ECA and had the right to pronounce on the implementation of the Decade, established by a General Assembly resolution, in which reference was made to the parts of the programme entrusted to Morocco. Morocco had never wanted to make politics out of those matters. It had merely wanted to carry out the commitment it had assumed.

41. Mr. DELMI (Observer for Algeria) said that Africa had not entrusted Morocco with any projects relating to Western Sahara, and the admission of the Saharawi Arab Democratic Republic at New York was a clear refutation of that claim.

42. Mr. BENMOUSSA (Morocco) said that the so-called question of Western Sahara was being extensively discussed in other United Nations forums. The Council was not competent to discuss or to decide it. The Decade had begun in 1978 and the conflict concerning Western Sahara had begun in 1974, but in all the years from 1978 to 1985 inclusive the implementation of the Decade, including the part of its programme entrusted to Morocco, had raised no political problem. It was not until 1986 that the problem had become a political one.

43. Mr. DELMI (Observer for Algeria) said that his delegation contested that statement. Algeria had always disputed Moroccan sovereignty over Western Sahara, whether on the political level or on the level of the Decade, and since 1975 it had constantly emphasized that it did not accept Moroccan sovereignty over Western Sahara.

44. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft decision V, entitled "Report of the Secretary-General on regional co-operation", contained in paragraph 32 of part I of the report (E/1987/121).

The draft decision was adopted (decision 1987/169).

45. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider part II of the report (E/1987/121/Add.1) and, in particular, the draft resolution entitled "Industrial Development Decade for Africa", contained in paragraph 22 of the report.

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 1987/70).

46. Mr. TURBANSKI (Poland), speaking also on behalf of the Byelorussian SSR, the German Democratic Republic and the USSR, said that they had not opposed the adoption of the resolution on the Industrial Development Decade for Africa, but they did wish to put on record their views on operative paragraphs 4 and 10.

47. UNIDO was a specialized agency and, as such, reached its own independent decisions on its budget and

the allocation of its resources. Accordingly, for the Council to make recommendations to the Industrial Development Board on the structure of the UNIDO budget, as was done in paragraph 4 of the resolution, was improper and a distortion of the Council's role in the United Nations system.

48. Paragraph 10, relating to the new orientation being given to UNIDO's activities in Africa, was unbalanced in that no mention was made of co-operation by UNIDO in developing the public sector. That approach was not in accordance with the decisions reached at the General Assembly's thirteenth special session on the critical economic situation in Africa or with UNIDO's Charter, in which it was clearly laid down that the agency would co-operate in the development and formulation of industrialization programmes and plans in the State and co-operative sectors. Neglect of those tasks would not, in the view of the delegations for whom he was speaking, contribute to the successful implementation of the programme for the Industrial Development Decade for Africa.

49. Mr. SHABAN (Egypt) recalled that his delegation (33rd meeting) had emphasized the importance of the Council's role in ensuring the overall co-ordination of the economic, social and related activities of organizations within the United Nations system, and, to that end, ensuring the implementation of the priorities established by the General Assembly. After the adoption of Council resolution 1986/63 on the Industrial Development Decade for Africa, his delegation had expressed the hope that the appeal to the UNIDO Programme and Budget Committee and the Industrial Development Board to increase the allocation for the Decade over the 1988-1989 biennium would receive a favourable response.²

50. The Council should, in his delegation's view, have at least expressed its regret that that appeal had not been heeded. It should have asked UNIDO to report on the reasons for the reduction in the allocation for the 1986-1987 biennium to \$2.7 million, instead of the originally approved \$8.6 million. The Council would thus have been in a position to draw the General Assembly's attention to the explanations offered for the failure of some countries to meet their obligations to implement General Assembly resolutions. The Secretary-General (20th meeting) had expressed his concern that the international community had failed to provide adequate support, particularly financial, for the structural adjustment efforts of African Governments, a statement in line with the assessments made in the reports and surveys of multilateral and financial organizations and institutions. His delegation would, therefore, have preferred to see the Council pronounce itself strongly on the importance and the priority African countries accorded to the industrial sector and to translate verbal support into deeds.

² *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, 1986, Plenary Meetings, vol. II, p. 162, 38th meeting, para. 113.*

51. Mr. BENMOUSSA (Morocco) referred to resolutions 1987/67 and 1987/70, which had just been adopted, and asked the Office of Legal Affairs of the Secretariat to reply to the two questions which his delegation had posed in its letter dated 6 July 1987 to the President of the Council (E/1987/129):

“In the event of a joint meeting between the Economic Commission for Africa, a subsidiary organ of the Economic and Social Council, and a regional intergovernmental organization, which rules and procedures should apply? Which rules and procedures should apply in regard to participation in the work of such joint meetings when the membership of the universal organization and that of the regional organization are not identical?”

52. Mr. DELMI (Observer for Algeria), speaking on a point of order, asked the Secretariat to say what was the status of document E/1987/129, and whether the present was the appropriate occasion on which to discuss its content.

53. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Council) replied that E/1987/129 was an official document, issued in accordance with the established practice by which official letters addressed to the President of the Council were reproduced and circulated. With regard to the second question just raised by the Moroccan representative, he had been advised by the Office of Legal Affairs as follows:

“In the case of joint meetings between ECA and a regional intergovernmental organization, ECA, as a subsidiary organ of the United Nations, must be guided by the decisions of principal organs, including the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council. With regard specifically to participation in a joint meeting where discrepancy exists in the membership of the convening organizations, the question must be resolved by reference to United Nations rules, practice and procedures if the United Nations is to be a co-convenor. If such a question cannot be resolved, the meeting would have to be convened under the authority of the other organization, and the United Nations could not go beyond providing assistance and co-operation to such a meeting.”

54. Mr. DELMI (Observer for Algeria) commented that the problem raised by questions posed in document E/1987/129 went beyond purely legal considerations. His Government wished to confirm the opinion it had expressed in New York and Addis Ababa regarding the legitimacy of participation by the Saharawi Arab Democratic Republic in the meetings of all bodies at which OAU was also represented. The Saharawi Arab Democratic Republic was a member of OAU, and it was logical that it should participate in meetings jointly organized by the ECA and OAU.

55. Mr. BENMOUSSA (Morocco) requested that the legal opinion read out by the Secretary of the Council should be circulated to all members of the Council. The answers to the questions his delegation had asked were quite clear cut: in the case of a joint meeting between the

ECA and any regional intergovernmental organization, the rules and procedures to be followed were those of the United Nations, and, with regard to participation in the work of such joint meetings, the rules and procedures that should prevail were again those of the United Nations. It followed that, at future joint meetings, Morocco would participate as a matter of right in virtue of its membership of the United Nations, whereas an entity belonging only to the regional organization concerned would have no right to a seat. That was indeed the understanding of his delegation based on a legal study by the Moroccan authorities; it also followed from Article 103 of the Charter of the United Nations, which affirmed, in the case of a conflict of obligations, the primacy of obligations under the Charter over obligations under any other international agreement. The legal basis, therefore, existed to avoid any repetition in the future of the juridical monstrosities perpetrated at some joint meetings when at least one of the participating organizations belonged to the United Nations system. He appealed to all concerned to unite in ensuring that the mistakes of the past were not repeated. In doing so, they would be helping to establish the viability and credibility of the United Nations, the universal Organization, on a sound and lasting basis. He hoped the questions asked and the legal opinion given in reply would appear *in extenso* in the summary record.

56. On 30 June 1987, his delegation had explained in the First (Economic) Committee the circumstances in which it had felt compelled to express reservations with regard to resolutions 588 (XXII) and 598 (XXII), adopted by the ECA Conference of Ministers on 24 April 1987. It had stated categorically that it regarded the African struggle as its own by definition, whether the struggle was for the recovery and development of Africa or to ensure the respect and dignity of that continent. The Industrial Development Decade for Africa and the Transport and Communications Decade in Africa, and the international mobilization of financial and technological resources for food and agriculture in Africa were causes which Morocco regarded as its own. It could hardly be otherwise in view of the Declaration made by the King of Morocco on the occasion of his country's painful decision to withdraw from OAU. The Declaration stated that all Moroccans would remain in the service of Africa, in the League of Arab States on behalf of African-Arab co-operation, in the Non-Aligned Movement in order to defend the legitimacy and sovereignty of Africa, and in the Organization of the Islamic Conference in order to promote cohabitation and mutual aid between the revealed religions, and, finally, in the United Nations in order to serve the dignity of the African citizen and respect for the African continent.

57. Resolutions 588 (XXII) and 598 (XXII) raised no objection on the part of the Moroccan delegation. It was the context of their adoption that gave rise to his delegation's reservations because of the illegal participation in the joint ECA-OAU meetings of an illegitimate

entity, unqualified to appear in an international forum governed by the rules and procedures of the United Nations. The legal opinion the Council had just heard spoke for itself. The ECA leadership had, most regretably, failed to discharge its responsibilities to ensure respect for international legality. That was why his delegation had a duty to maintain its reservations with regard to the two resolutions, and, since, in the case of joint meetings, the budgetary resources of the United Nations were involved, his delegation reserved the right to submit the matter to the Special Commission. Now that the position had been fully clarified, Morocco wished to reaffirm the importance of United Nations rules in the very existence of the organization. Respect for them was an overriding duty in all places and all circumstances, particularly at a time when the universal Organization was passing through the gravest crisis in its history.

58. His delegation hoped that it would never again be obliged to make reservations with regard to texts which carried its full support but had been adopted in an illegal context. It was his delegation's wish that the legal opinion should be appropriately distributed to the States Members of the United Nations system, and that the Council would draw the attention of the leaders of all subsidiary bodies, particularly the Executive Secretary of ECA, to the need to abide strictly by the rules and procedures of the United Nations.

59. Mr. DELMI (Observer for Algeria) said that the legal opinion read out by the Secretary of the Council had long been known to the African countries, which had nevertheless agreed to the participation of the Saharawi Arab Democratic Republic in regional meetings, for example at Harare and, most recently, Addis Ababa. The opinion might have legal value but the problem was political. The best way of promoting the credibility of the United Nations was not to press for the withdrawal of the Saharawi Arab Democratic Republic from joint meetings of the OAU and ECA but to end the process of colonization that had been started by Morocco. If Morocco truly respected Africa, it would put African communal decisions into effect. The Saharawi Arab Democratic Republic was entitled to participate fully in joint meetings of the kind under discussion. The Moroccan representative had asked that the legal opinion should be widely publicized, but that had already been done, and the countries of the African region remained nevertheless in favour of the participation of the Saharawi Arab Democratic Republic.

60. The PRESIDENT said that the Council had thus concluded its consideration of agenda item 8.

AGENDA ITEM 10

International co-operation on the environment

REPORT OF THE FIRST (ECONOMIC) COMMITTEE

61. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft decisions I and II, entitled "Report of the Govern-

ing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme" and "Reports of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme on the implementation of the Plan of Action to Combat Desertification and the implementation of the Plan of Action to Combat Desertification in the Sudano-Sahelian region" respectively, contained in paragraph 7 of the report (E/1987/123).

The draft decisions were adopted (decisions 1987/170 and 1987/171).

62. The PRESIDENT said that the Council had thus concluded its consideration of agenda item 10.

AGENDA ITEM 11

International co-operation in the field of human settlements

REPORT OF THE FIRST (ECONOMIC) COMMITTEE

63. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft decision I, entitled "Report of the Commission on Human Settlements", contained in paragraph 7 of the report (E/1987/115).

The draft decision was adopted (decision 1987/172).

64. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft decision II, entitled "Report of the Secretary-General on the living conditions of the Palestinian people in the occupied Palestinian territories", contained in paragraph 7 of the report (E/1987/115).

The draft decision was adopted (decision 1987/173).

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

AGENDA ITEM 12

Population questions

REPORT OF THE FIRST (ECONOMIC) COMMITTEE

66. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft resolution I, entitled "Work programme in the field of population", contained in the report of the Population Commission on its twenty-fourth session (E/1987/16, para. 1), the adoption of which was recommended by the Committee in its report (E/1987/124, para. 15).

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 1987/71).

67. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft resolution II, entitled "Follow-up of the recommendations of the International Conference on Population, 1984", contained in the report of the Population Commission on its twenty-fourth session (E/1987/16, para. 1), the adoption of which was recommended by the Committee in its report (E/1987/124, para. 15).

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 1987/72).

68. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft decision I, entitled "Provisional agenda and documentation for the twenty-fifth session of the Population Commission", contained in the report of the Population Commission on its twenty-fourth session (E/1987/16, para. 2), the adoption of which was recommended by the Committee in its report (E/1987/124, para. 16).

The draft decision was adopted (decision 1987/174).

69. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft decisions II, III and IV, entitled respectively "United Nations Fund for Population Activities: change of title", "Reports considered by the Economic and Social Council in connection with population questions", and "Report of the Population Commission", and contained in the report of the Committee (E/1987/124, para. 16).

The draft decisions were adopted (decisions 1987/175, 1987/176 and 1987/177).

70. The PRESIDENT said that the Council had thus concluded its consideration of agenda item 12.

AGENDA ITEM 13

Special economic, humanitarian and disaster relief assistance

REPORT OF THE THIRD (PROGRAMME AND CO-ORDINATION) COMMITTEE

71. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft resolution I, entitled "Assistance to the drought-stricken areas of Somalia", contained in paragraph 13 of the report (E/1987/118).

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 1987/73).

72. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft resolution II, entitled "Assistance for the reconstruction and development of Lebanon", contained in paragraph 13 of the report (E/1987/118).

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 1987/74).

73. The PRESIDENT said that the Council had thus concluded its consideration of agenda item 13.

AGENDA ITEM 15

International co-operation and co-ordination within the United Nations system (*continued****)

74. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the draft resolution entitled "Prevention and control of

AIDS" (E/1987/L.35/Rev.1), which he had prepared on the basis of informal consultations.

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 1987/75).

75. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the draft resolution entitled "Fortieth anniversary of the World Health Organization, 1988" (E/1987/L.39), which he had submitted.

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 1987/76).

AGENDA ITEM 17

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations

REPORT OF THE THIRD (PROGRAMME AND CO-ORDINATION) COMMITTEE

76. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft resolution I, entitled "Assistance to the Palestinian people", contained in paragraph 17 of the report (E/1987/119).

77. Mr. NORRIS (United States of America), speaking in explanation of his delegation's vote before the vote was taken on draft resolution I, said that his delegation was opposed to the adoption of the resolution. Nevertheless, the United States had consistently recognized and supported the need to improve the economic situation of the Palestinian people on the West Bank and in Gaza. That support had been substantial: over the past five years, United States contributions to UNRWA had amounted to \$343 million. That figure represented a regular contribution of \$67 million each year, plus an additional \$8 million in emergency assistance in 1985. The United States would continue to provide assistance to the Palestinian people when it was handled through appropriate channels. It would not vote for programmes which were implemented in close co-operation with the PLO. He urged those delegations which used United Nations resolutions for political purposes to focus instead on the true humanitarian needs of the Palestinian people.

The vote on draft resolution I was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Australia, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, China, Colombia, Denmark, Djibouti, Egypt, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guinea, Haiti, Iceland, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Morocco, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Union of Soviet Socialist

*** Resumed from the 31st meeting.

Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Against: United States of America.

The draft resolution was adopted by 48 votes to 1 (resolution 1987/77).

78. Mr. GONZALEZ (Uruguay), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation's vote in favour of the resolution was without prejudice to his Government's reservations in regard to certain aspects of paragraphs 3 and 5.

79. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft resolution II, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations", contained in paragraph 17 of the report (E/1987/119). Since the Committee had voted separately on the seventh and thirteenth preambular paragraphs and on operative paragraph 9, and by roll-call on the draft resolution as a whole, he suggested that the Council should do likewise.

A vote was taken by roll-call on the seventh preambular paragraph.

The United States of America, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Australia, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Colombia, Djibouti, Egypt, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Haiti, Iceland, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Morocco, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Against: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Japan, Spain.

The seventh preambular paragraph was adopted by 39 votes to 2 with 8 abstentions.

A vote was taken by roll-call on the thirteenth preambular paragraph.

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

In favour: Bangladesh, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Colombia, Djibouti, Egypt, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Haiti, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Morocco, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Norway, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The thirteenth preambular paragraph was adopted by 35 votes to 1 with 13 abstentions.

A vote was taken by roll-call on operative paragraph 9.

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

In favour: Bangladesh, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Colombia, Djibouti, Egypt, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Haiti, Iceland, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Morocco, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Norway, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Operative paragraph 9 was adopted by 35 votes to 1 with 13 abstentions.

A vote was taken by roll-call on the draft resolution as a whole.

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Bangladesh, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Colombia, Djibouti, Egypt, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Haiti, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Morocco, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 37 votes to 1 with 11 abstentions (resolution 1987/78).

80. Ms. DANIELSEN (Norway) said that her delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution II. Norway's abiding commitment to the process of decolonization was well known. With the exception of Namibia, that process had nearly run its course. Time was running out, however, for a possible peaceful solution there and it was high time that Namibia should be granted independence on the basis of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) without any pre-conditions.

Although it did not regard the situation inside South Africa as a question of decolonization, in accordance with its commitment to the abolition of *apartheid* and its efforts on behalf of a peaceful solution in that country, Norway had voted in favour of the draft resolution because of its main thrust.

81. As a consequence of the need to put pressure on the Government of South Africa to abolish *apartheid*, the Norwegian Parliament had adopted an Act imposing an economic boycott against South Africa and Namibia which would take effect on 20 July 1987. Norway urged other countries to take similar measures, in line with the adoption of comprehensive sanctions by the Security Council, in order to increase the international pressure.

82. She wished, however, to reaffirm her delegation's objections to the thirteenth preambular paragraph and paragraph 9. It regarded them as contrary to the established autonomy of the international financial institutions, which should not be compromised.

83. Mr. LABERGE (Canada) said that Canada had repeatedly put on record its condemnation of *apartheid* and had taken a number of concrete measures in support of that decision. It continued to follow the situation closely and to intensify those measures in order to exercise maximum pressure on the evolving situation in South Africa. Canada had also been one of the most active members of the United Nations seeking to secure the independence of Namibia through peaceful means. Nevertheless, it had been unable to support draft resolution II for two reasons. First, the current situation in South Africa was not, as the draft implied, a colonial situation. *Apartheid* was the result of a political choice by the minority group that held power in South Africa rather than of a colonial relationship. Second, the relationship between IMF and South Africa was technical in nature and subject to the rules and procedures of IMF. The political and polemical references to the relationship were therefore inappropriate. His delegation also regretted that no informal negotiations had been held on the draft in order to broaden the area of consensus on that important and pressing issue. For all those reasons, his delegation had been obliged to abstain on the draft resolution as a whole and to abstain in the separate votes on the seventh and thirteenth preambular paragraphs and on operative paragraph 9.

84. Mr. MULLER (Australia) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution II despite its strong abhorrence and condemnation of the policy of *apartheid*. That abstention should in no way be seen as a lessening of Australia's long-standing opposition to the system of *apartheid*. It had been able to support much of the text, as was indicated by its vote in favour of the seventh preambular paragraph. It regretted that it had been forced to abstain on the thirteenth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 9, as well as the resolution as a whole, largely because of the unacceptable references to IMF and other international financial institutions. His delegation had abstained for the

same reasons on the similar resolution adopted by the Council in 1986. He therefore urged the sponsors of the draft to consider, in any future text, that references to IMF and similar institutions did little to advance the possibility of consensus or to ensure that the Council or the General Assembly would speak with one voice on the critical substantive issues addressed in the greater part of the resolution.

85. Mr. VAGN NIELSEN (Denmark), speaking on behalf of the 12 member States of the EEC, said that the only acceptable basis for a peaceful and lasting solution to the question of Namibia was the implementation without any pre-conditions of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). The States members of the EEC had repeatedly condemned *apartheid* in all its forms and manifestations. It was an insult to the dignity of those whom it affected and a flagrant violation of the human rights and fundamental freedoms set out in the Charter of the United Nations and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, to which the member States of the EEC attached the highest importance. The objective of their policy towards South Africa remained the total dismantling of *apartheid* and its replacement by a genuinely democratic, non-racial system of government. To allow a genuine national dialogue to begin, the state of emergency must be lifted, all political prisoners must be unconditionally released, the banning of political parties must cease and press restrictions must be lifted.

86. In September 1985, the member States of the EEC had agreed on a series of measures designed to impress on the South African Government the inescapable need for fundamental reform. In the absence of any progress in that direction, they had agreed in September 1986 to adopt a further package of restrictive measures. In June 1987, the Foreign Ministers of the member States had reaffirmed that, in the absence of significant progress in abolishing *apartheid*, the attitude of the EEC to South Africa remained under constant review, in the light of their fundamental principles in regard to the development of South Africa. The EEC and its member States were continuing, furthermore, to support those in South Africa who were in favour of the peaceful dismantling of *apartheid*, while in the region as a whole they were devoting considerable resources to assistance to the neighbouring African countries suffering as a result of South Africa's policies.

87. The member States of the EEC did not, however, consider the situation in South Africa to be a problem of decolonization. They did not, therefore, believe that it should appear under item 17 of the Council's agenda. He also wished to reaffirm on behalf of the States of the EEC that the autonomy of the international financial institutions should not be compromised.

88. The PRESIDENT said that the Council had thus concluded its consideration of agenda item 17.

AGENDA ITEM 18**Calendar of conferences and meetings
for 1988 and 1989****REPORT OF THE THIRD (PROGRAMME AND
CO-ORDINATION) COMMITTEE**

89. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft decision I, entitled "Calendar of conferences and meetings for 1988 and 1989", contained in paragraph 9 of the report of the Committee (E/1987/125).

90. Ms. ESPINOSA DE RIVERA (Observer for Mexico) said that her delegation approved the provisional calendar of conferences and meetings for 1988 and 1989 annexed to document E/1987/L.22 and that, although her delegation was not opposed to the adoption of the provisional calendar, it wished to place it on record that such approval should be understood as being without prejudice to any changes which might be introduced at a later date in accordance with decisions taken as a result of the restructuring exercise currently being carried out by the Special Commission established under General Assembly resolution 41/213 of 19 December 1986.

The draft decision was adopted (decision 1987/178).

91. Mr. TURBANSKI (Poland), speaking also on behalf of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic and the German Democratic Republic, said that those countries had not objected to the adoption of the proposed calendar of conferences or to taking note of the information in item 78 of document E/1987/L.22, annex, regarding the holding of the Annual Meetings of the Boards of Governors of the World

Bank and IMF in West Berlin. He wished, however, to reaffirm their position regarding the need for strict observance of the Quadripartite Agreement in respect of those meetings. In choosing locations for meetings, all bodies in the United Nations system should avoid decisions that might introduce elements of political discord.

92. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft decision II, entitled "Summary records of sessional committees and subsidiary bodies of the Economic and Social Council", contained in paragraph 9 of the report of the Committee (E/1987/125).

The draft decision was adopted (decision 1987/179).

93. The PRESIDENT said that the Council had thus concluded its consideration of agenda item 18.

AGENDA ITEM 19**Public administration and finance****REPORT OF THE FIRST (ECONOMIC) COMMITTEE**

94. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the report (E/1987/116). Since no recommendations were being submitted to the Council under that item, he would take it, if he heard no objection, that the Council wished to take note of the Committee's report.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT said that the Council had thus concluded its consideration of agenda item 19.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.