

1873rd meeting

Tuesday, 24 July 1973, at 3.30 p.m.

President: Mr. S. A. FRAZÃO (Brazil)

E/SR.1873

AGENDA ITEM 3

General discussion of international economic and social policy, including regional and sectoral developments (continued) (E/L.1561/Rev.1)

1. Mr. FACK (Netherlands) said he had listened with great interest to the statements by the Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs and the representative of Brazil at the previous meeting. His delegation would like to give them further study, but could already support the Brazilian representative's proposal that, in the course of 1974, the Economic and Social Council should consider two questions in depth, the first being a viable process of industrialization which could be proposed to developing countries as a means of attacking the problems of mass poverty and unemployment, and the second, the general question of aid and technical assistance of those countries.
2. The representative of Chile had submitted a draft resolution (E/L.1561/Rev.1) in which he had highlighted three major problems which should engage the Council's attention: the international monetary crisis, the trade negotiations under GATT and the world food shortage. Those problems must be solved as speedily as possible, as they were preventing the harmonious development of international trade and monetary relations and were furthermore the main stumbling blocks to the implementation of the International Development Strategy.
3. In his statement during the general debate (1861st meeting) to which the representative of Chile had referred, the Netherlands Minister for Development Co-operation had emphasized the need to reform the structural relations between the rich and the poor countries; otherwise no progress would be possible in the international division of labour and incomes. The Chilean draft resolution referred to three areas in which reforms should be carried out. Such reforms should be preceded by policy measures at the national and international level, and the Economic and Social Council should assert its role in the matter.
4. In his delegation's opinion, the problems mentioned in the draft resolution were inextricably linked to the review and appraisal of progress in implementing the International Development Strategy. The Council should therefore refer the draft resolution to the Economic Committee, which was at present dealing with various aspects of the evaluation. The Council could then study that Committee's report in plenary. That procedure was in accordance with established practice and had the additional advantage of enabling members of the Economic Committee who were not members of the Council to express their views on the Chilean delegation's very interesting proposals.
5. Referring to the statement of the representative of New Zealand at the 1872nd meeting, he reminded the Council of his delegation's position on all nuclear testing. The Netherlands was a party to the Moscow Treaty¹ which provided for a partial nuclear test-ban, and it was anxious that all States, especially nuclear-weapon States, should accede to that treaty. It therefore deplored and not only from the environmental point of view, the continuation of nuclear testing, both in the atmosphere and underground.
6. Mr. BARTON (Canada) regretted that at a time when the spirit of *détente* was growing stronger and the tenth anniversary of the Moscow Treaty was about to be celebrated, the air of the planet should be polluted by atmospheric tests carried out by two permanent members of the Security Council.
7. As his delegation had pointed out on 3 July 1973 in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament,² nuclear weapon tests could not be considered in isolation because their effects were cumulative; each atmospheric test must be considered in the light of the previous build-up of radioactivity. For those reasons, no nuclear Power could plead that atmospheric tests were so small and so infrequent that they presented no identifiable danger to human health or to the environment. The world's population derived a corresponding benefit from such exposure, as in the case of nuclear power reactors or the use of radiation for medical purposes. His delegation failed to see what benefits mankind could possibly derive from nuclear weapon tests by any State.
8. On 14 May 1973, the Canadian House of Commons had adopted a resolution calling on all the nuclear Powers to cease their tests, and calling on the French Government in particular to cancel its tests in the Pacific Ocean. The text of that resolution had been transmitted to the French Government and to the Governments of the other Powers which carried out nuclear tests. On 22 June 1973, the House of Commons adopted a second resolution endorsing the position of the International Court of Justice and urging the French Government to delay the proposed tests. The text of that resolution had also been transmitted to the French Government. Following the explosion in the atmosphere of a nuclear device by China on 27 June 1973, the Canadian Ambassador in Peking had made written representations to the Chinese Government.
9. His delegation associated itself with those delegations which had called on the Powers concerned to halt nuclear testing in the atmosphere and to accede to the Moscow

¹ Treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water, signed at Moscow on 5 August 1963.

² See CCD/PV.609.

Treaty. That would, however, only be a first step. The need was greater than ever to move from a partial to a comprehensive ban on nuclear tests, as urged in the preamble to that treaty. In conclusion, he again called on all the nuclear Powers to embark forthwith on negotiations for a complete ban on all nuclear tests.

10. Mrs. THORSON (Sweden) said that Sweden had consistently condemned nuclear tests and her delegation wished to join previous speakers in expressing concern and regret at the recent nuclear explosion in the Pacific. Sweden had voted for resolution 3 (I) of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment³ condemning nuclear weapon tests, and for General Assembly resolution 2934 A (XXVII) urging all States to adhere to the Moscow Treaty and to refrain from testing in the environments covered by the Treaty. For more than 11 years, Sweden had been consistently pursuing a policy in favour of disarmament and had joined other countries in calling for an end to nuclear weapon tests, both in the atmosphere and underground.

11. Mr. SINGH (Malaysia) said that his delegation had also fully supported General Assembly resolution 2934 (XXVII). That was why it regretted that, in disregard of that resolution and of other decisions by various United Nations bodies, the French Government should have seen fit to carry out a further nuclear test in the Pacific, despite the opposition of a great many countries and particularly of the countries of that region. He hoped that General Assembly resolution 2934 (XXVII) would be scrupulously applied.

12. Mr. YAMADA (Japan) said that his Government had lodged a protest against the planned tests and had sincerely hoped that they would be cancelled. It was therefore with the greatest regret that the Japanese Government and people had learned that the first series of explosions had just taken place in the South Pacific, in spite of the opposition and the growing apprehension of the whole world and in particular of the peoples of the Pacific area.

13. Not only did atmospheric nuclear tests run counter to international efforts towards a comprehensive nuclear test ban, but they polluted the environment and, by raising the level of radioactivity in the atmosphere, presented a danger to the health of present and future generations. The Economic and Social Council could not remain silent in the face of that situation. His delegation also deplored the fact that those tests had been carried out in spite of the interim injunction recently granted by the ICJ.

14. His Government, which was strongly opposed to all nuclear weapon testing by any Power, urged all those States which were not yet parties to the Moscow Treaty to desist immediately from all nuclear testing in the atmosphere and to accede to the Treaty.

15. M. AWUY (Indonesia) said that his delegation had been one of the sponsors of a text which had been adopted almost unanimously and had become General Assembly resolution 2934 A (XXVII), calling for the cessation of all

nuclear weapon testing. It therefore regretted that such tests were still being held. His delegation reiterated its opposition to all tests and urged the countries which were carrying out tests to halt them immediately.

16. It associated itself with the appeal made by the New Zealand delegation at the preceding meeting that the funds hitherto appropriated for nuclear tests should henceforth be devoted to economic expansion, particularly that of the developing countries.

17. Mr. RAMOS (Peru) condemned the resumption of nuclear testing and deplored the fact that the French Government had not only failed to respond to the appeal of many peaceful and friendly countries but had also disregarded the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, the World Health Assembly and the International Labour Conference, the order made by the ICJ and the protests made by a number of French groups. Peru was not convinced by the French Government's assertions that the tests did not endanger human health or the human environment. If that were true, he questioned whether France would have carried out its tests so far from its metropolitan territory. Those tests were a threat to the populations of the areas bordering the Pacific. It might also be asked what political significance should be attached to the tests, which ran counter to efforts at international co-operation and the present atmosphere of political *détente*.

18. For those reasons, his Government, conscious of its responsibilities towards its people whose health was thus threatened, had been compelled to break off its diplomatic relations with France. That decision did not reflect any hostility towards the French people; its sole purpose was to dissuade the French Government from continuing its testing.

19. Mr. VALDERRAMA (Philippines) said that the people of his country greatly admired France, whose ideas of freedom and independence had always been an inspiration to them. The world had for too long been witnessing the stockpiling of weapons of mass destruction, whose production absorbed resources which would be better spent on promoting the well-being of mankind. The peoples of the Pacific wished to express anxiety at France's persistence in carrying out nuclear tests in the Pacific to the danger of the health and well-being of the inhabitants of the region. His country did not question France's sovereign right to strengthen its independence, but merely the fact that that right should be exercised in defiance of that of the peoples of the Pacific.

20. United Nations efforts to improve the quality of life would remain in vain if the environment was threatened by nuclear tests conducted in the atmosphere despite hostile public opinion. If those tests were really harmless, as France claimed, why conduct them in the Pacific? His Government was a signatory to the Moscow Treaty and had for long been opposed to all tests of any kind, wherever they were carried out. It hoped that one day atomic energy would be used solely for peaceful purposes to improve the quality of life, particularly in the developing countries and

³ A/CONF.48/14 and Corr.1, chap. IV.

that the resources being devoted to arms would be used for combating mass poverty and hunger in the world. The peoples of the Pacific were no longer willing to serve as guinea-pigs. The Council's discussions on the International Development Strategy would be meaningless if the object of the Strategy, man himself, was threatened with destruction.

21. His delegation urged France to apply General Assembly resolution 2934 (XXVII), and all other Powers concerned to halt their nuclear weapon tests.

22. Mr. CORKERY (Observer for Australia), speaking at the invitation of the President, said that, by tradition, the Council's primary concern was with the betterment of life for all peoples. The protection of human well-being, and particularly of the environment, was one of its universally recognized objectives at which all States were bound to aim. That was why his country profoundly regretted that the French Government, in conducting nuclear tests at Mururoa, had shown so little consideration for the vital interests of the inhabitants of the Pacific region. Various technical and scientific bodies had stressed the harmful effects of ionizing radiation released into the atmosphere; authorities such as the General Assembly, the World Health Assembly and the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment had categorically condemned nuclear tests – particularly those conducted in the atmosphere – and had called for a halt to them. Latterly, the ICJ had called upon France to suspend its tests pending a ruling on the substance of the matter.

23. The Prime Minister of Australia had recently affirmed the resolve of the Australian Government, in company with like-minded Governments, to continue to work for a cessation of nuclear tests, by France or any other country, through all proper means available to it.

24. Mr. NANDAN (Observer for Fiji), speaking at the invitation of the President, said that his country regretted having to reiterate its protests against the nuclear tests conducted in the atmosphere by France at Mururoa. The General Assembly had repeatedly called for the cessation of all nuclear tests; various international bodies had studied the question and had on many occasions stressed the dangers of such tests not only to mankind but also to the land, water and air environment. Those views had been reiterated over and over again at conferences held under the auspices of the United Nations and its specialized agencies and had been the subject of no less than six reports by the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation.

25. On learning that the French Government intended to carry out further tests despite the opposition of all the countries of the region, Fiji had applied to the ICJ for permission to intervene in cases brought before it by Australia and New Zealand. When the Court granted interim measures of protection requiring France to postpone its tests pending a decision on their legality, his country had hoped to enjoy at least a respite from further contamination of its environment. France's recent nuclear explosion, which was only the first of a series, had dashed those hopes, particularly since the cumulative effects of

explosions on human health were now known. If, as the French Government contended, those tests did not have the contaminating effect which many other countries and their scientific advisers believed them to have, why could it not wait until the question had been impartially examined by the judicial organ of the United Nations? The answer was obvious: France knew that its contentions were wrong and that the fears expressed by the countries of the South Pacific were well founded. His delegation could only express profound sorrow at France's attitude and plead with the French Government to refrain from conducting further tests at least until the ICJ had pronounced on their legality.

26. Mr. BREITENSTEIN (Finland), replying to a statement by the New Zealand representative at the preceding meeting, said his Government had always opposed nuclear weapon tests regardless of where or by whom they were conducted. It much regretted that, after 10 years, the Moscow Treaty had not yet been signed by all the nuclear Powers, and that some of them were continuing to hold such tests in defiance of it. His Government profoundly hoped that a new international agreement relating to underground testing would be reached to complement the 1963 treaty.

27. Mr. UTHEIM (Observer for Norway), speaking at the invitation of the President, read out a statement by the Norwegian Government concerning the recent nuclear explosion in the Pacific. His country's authorities deplored the fact that the explosion should have been carried out despite the representations made by so many countries, and hoped that all countries would sign the Moscow Treaty.

28. Mr. JAIN (India) recalled that on 6 June 1973 the Australian and Indian Prime Ministers had published a joint communiqué reiterating their opposition to nuclear tests carried out in any environment, but particularly in the atmosphere. That communiqué reflected the concern of the Government and people of India, which associated themselves with the appeals for a halt to such tests.

29. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) said that his country had addressed a note of protest to France following the recent nuclear explosion in the Pacific. It was with regret that Chile had had to take that decision with regard to a country which it greatly esteemed and whose great influence in the world rested much less on its military power than on its cultural importance and sense of universality. It was precisely because of those qualities that the international community had spontaneously expressed its solidarity with France when that country had passed through difficult times; the international community was entitled in turn to expect that France would show it the same respect and the same sense of solidarity.

30. Mr. OLIVIERI (Argentina) read out a communiqué published by his Government following the French nuclear explosion in the Pacific. In that communiqué, the Argentine Government maintained that all countries should help in transforming international relations so that the principle of co-operation would triumph over the will for power. In that spirit, the prime concern of States should be to protect mankind against risks of environmental pol-

lution, and France's decision to proceed with nuclear tests in the Pacific could only be deplored. Argentina was opposed to the continuation of nuclear experiments which were contrary to the ideals of peace, caused justifiable apprehension to neighbouring peoples and contravened an order of the ICJ.

31. Mr. DUMAS (France) said he first wished to point out that disarmament matters did not come within the competence of the Council, whose task was rather to address itself to the causes of war, such as attacks upon the integrity of countries and inequalities among peoples. His delegation, however, had too much respect for the countries whose representatives had just spoken to refrain from providing some information on the subject which was disturbing them.

32. The tests conducted by France had been few and relatively weak in comparison with those carried out by other countries; indeed, they accounted for only 1.8 per cent of all the aerial explosions that had taken place in the world. The test site had been chosen for the following reasons: the territory was French, uninhabited, situated in an area little used by air or shipping lines and very remote from populated regions; it should be noted that some Australian nuclear testing grounds met those requirements less satisfactorily. Furthermore, the devices exploded had been suspended from balloons at a sufficient altitude to avoid any interaction between the fire-ball and the surface of the earth or the sea, in other words under optimum safety conditions. Moreover, radioactivity was strictly controlled in the area and the results of measurements were communicated annually to the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation. The Committee had clearly indicated in 1969, and even more clearly in 1972, that radioactive contamination resulting from the French tests had not significantly altered the situation created by previous experiments. Consequently, countries need have no fear: the radioactive elements produced by the French experiments were so small as to be scientifically negligible; for instance, there was five times less strontium on Australian soil than in France, and only a tenth of it had been derived from French nuclear tests. Radioactivity due to French explosions was very low in relation to that produced by natural sources.

33. From the political point of view, it was because of a concern to preserve its independence that France wished to perfect its nuclear armoury and was therefore compelled to carry out tests; many countries should appreciate that aspect of the problem. The Charter of the United Nations proclaimed the equality of all; to invoke international law against the continuation of the French tests would be contrary to the purposes of the Charter, since it would help to strengthen the military superiority of a few super-Powers.

35. Lastly, from a legal point of view, the ICJ had not yet dealt with the substance of the matter and, moreover, France had always excluded from its competence disputes relating to matters of national defence.

35. France was pursuing its present defence policy solely because there was no world disarmament policy, which it wholeheartedly desired.

36. Mr. WANG Jun-sheng (China), referring to the Canadian representative's comments on the nuclear tests carried out by China, said that his country had consistently advocated the prohibition and total destruction of nuclear weapons. For the time being, however, the threat posed by the super-Powers compelled it to equip itself with nuclear weapons for its own protection. The day when the use of such weapons was absolutely prohibited, China would stop manufacturing them and destroy its stock-piles. His Government took the view that the sole purpose of the Moscow Treaty was to enable the super-Powers to increase and perfect their nuclear armoury while tying the hands of other countries. China had stated that it would never be the first to use nuclear weapons.

37. Mr. de SEYNES (Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs), replying to certain observations made by the Chilean representative at the 1872nd meeting, recalled his own comment at that meeting that the Economic and Social Council lacked methods and information to play a part in the solution of problems such as inflation, monetary instability and the general economic imbalance, on which attention was at present focussed. The proposals submitted in that respect by the Chilean representative were completely in line with his own thinking. What the Council needed was an analysis of the situation, bringing out the relationships between national policies and the requirements of an increasingly open world economy, having regard to United Nations objectives as defined, *inter alia*, in the International Development Strategy. The Council, whose anticipatory function should be emphasized, could make a contribution, in particular, by defining the objectives and procedures which should be followed by an international monetary system. It was also necessary to define the rules of conduct applicable to different types of situation, particularly those of creditor and debtor countries.

38. The Chilean representative had referred to the 1949 report on measures for full employment. Perhaps the method followed at that time could be improved and the group of experts to be set up would be able to hold broader consultations, similar to those it was hoped to hold on the subject of multinational corporations.

39. According to the Chilean representative, he (Mr. de Seynes) had thought it possible to claim that there was perhaps no international monetary "crisis" since there had been no decline in trade, although he had recognized that the crisis might pose a threat to the forthcoming multi-lateral trade negotiations. He wished to make it clear that he had not expressed a personal opinion on that point, but had merely quoted the views of those who, owing to the monetary crisis, were casting doubt upon the opening of the GATT negotiations.

40. Lastly, the Chilean representative had referred to the speculative movement of short-term capital. That question was difficult to deal with, because it was almost impossible to obtain reliable information on the subject. He had tried to obtain such information when the report on multinational corporations was being drafted. The Economic and Social Council, which was to examine the question in 1974, would have to consider how it could obtain fuller, more

accurate and more reliable information on a number of phenomena, including that mentioned by the representative of Chile.

41. Mr. DUMAS (France) said that his delegation had no objection to draft resolution E/L.1561/Rev.1, although he might propose some amendments on points of detail. In addition, the representative of Chile might perhaps wish to hold consultations before the draft resolution was referred to the Economic Committee.

42. If the Economic Committee succeeded in adopting by consensus both that proposal and the draft resolution on the review and appraisal of progress in implementing the International Development Strategy, which was now in preparation, it would undoubtedly be contributing to the solution of the major economic and social problems of the present time.

43. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) said that, like the delegation of France, his delegation was in basic agreement with draft resolution E/L.1561/Rev.1, but thought that the text could be improved. In section B, for example, an effort should perhaps be made to present the problems more clearly. It would also be preferable to amend the wording of paragraph 1 of section C, since consultation machinery had already been established by the international community.

44. He supported the Netherlands proposal that the Chilean draft resolution should be referred to the Economic Committee for consideration in the context of the International Development Strategy. The Council had already adopted that procedure in the past, in particular with regard to multinational corporations, and, in the opinion of his delegation, the task of attempting to improve the text was one for the Economic Committee.

45. Mr. JAIN (India) supported the Netherlands proposal that the draft resolution submitted by Chile should be referred to the Economic Committee for consideration. The text could thus be improved and, possibly, supplemented by the draft resolution which the Economic Committee adopted on the review and appraisal of progress in implementing the International Development Strategy.

46. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) said that he was puzzled by the Netherlands representative's proposal, since the Council had hardly begun to consider the draft resolution. Since the present composition of the Council was insufficiently representative, it was certainly necessary to refer any important question to one of its committees. Moreover, the question dealt with in the draft resolution formed part of a whole and could not be dissociated from the review and appraisal of progress in implementing the International Development Strategy. But was it wise, at the present stage of the Council's work, to consider all those questions together? The draft resolution did not yet seem to have aroused as much interest as he had hoped. He therefore requested that, before taking a decision on the Netherlands proposal, the Council should wait until he had had an opportunity of holding consultations, as the representative of France had suggested. Then, when the text had been improved, he would have no objection to its being referred

to the Economic Committee. But it would certainly prefer to withdraw it rather than submit it to the Economic Committee in its present form, since it had not been the subject of a general debate.

47. Mr. NESTERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he supported the text of draft resolution E/L.1561/Rev.1 and the suggestion that the representative of Chile should hold consultations. The Council could then decide on the procedure to be followed but it did not need to decide at the present stage that the draft resolution must be referred to the Economic Committee.

48. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should give the representative of Chile an opportunity to hold consultations and that, when these consultations had been concluded, it should take a decision on the procedure to be followed.

It was so decided.

49. The PRESIDENT, summing up the debate, said that it had revealed broad areas of agreement. Members had unanimously recognized the catalytic role of the Council in the sphere of economic development and social progress. They had emphasized that it must act both as an inspired and a critical analyst of the plans and programmes of its subsidiary bodies, without restricting their capacity for initiative, with a view to promoting collective action on a systematic basis and improving the performance of all United Nations bodies. For their part, many agencies and organizations had expressed their intention of deepening and broadening their dialogue with the Council in order to receive the advice and assistance which they needed to discharge their responsibilities successfully and to co-ordinate their activities. It was to be hoped that that trend would develop and would lead to close and fruitful collaboration. Economic and social problems could be solved only by the continuous harmonization of collective action for the benefit of all mankind. That concept contained the seeds of the idea of collective economic security achieved through negotiation and consensus and thus contributed to the establishment and maintenance of peace.

50. The members of the Council had also agreed that the present political climate was favourable to a *détente* among the major Powers, on which the fate of the world largely depended. However, that *détente* still had to be translated into international behaviour compatible with the purposes and principles of the Charter, and an international society of equal and sovereign States had yet to be established at the practical level, which would not be achieved through words alone. The Council could perform a decisive role in that respect by taking advantage of the present favourable climate in order to solve, in the evident interest of the international community and not merely for ethical reasons, the problem of under-development, since the stability, progress, peace and security of the world were undoubtedly incompatible with the present economic, social and financial situation. All the members of the Council appreciated that fact, and the debate had revealed the concern which delegations felt about the still unchecked monetary crisis and the divergent views on the

multilateral trade negotiations. Similarly, all delegations had expressed apprehension about the real impact of the proposed reforms of obsolete international trade practices and the disruptive effects of inflationary pressures on international co-operation for development. They had also expressed concern about the food crisis which was endangering life and social progress in vast areas of the developing world.

51. With regard to the multilateral trade negotiations and the monetary crisis, it had been pointed out that they provided an opportunity for eliminating the prevailing imbalances in the world economy. In the opinion of some delegations, the problem could be solved through innovative measures calculated to bring about a sustained increase in the export earnings of the developing countries and a rational international division of labour. International monetary reforms should be geared to those objectives. The question of a link between the monetary reserves to be created and development assistance should be settled promptly and the developing countries should play an effective part in the negotiations.

52. The agricultural situation in many countries was disturbing. Although the problem of crop failures had not assumed the same proportions as in the Sahelian region of Africa, it had had serious repercussions on the economies of many countries. Agriculture was the principal economic sector of most developing countries, and it was essential to strengthen it without slackening efforts to speed up industrialization, which was necessary for the expansion and modernization of agriculture. In considering those problems, the Council had asserted its rights to follow developments in the situation and to intervene as appropriate; it had also shown that it could function as a clearing-house where those problems could be considered in a global perspective.

53. No less importance had been attached to the problem of multinational companies. Several delegations had stressed the need for the United Nations to assess their impact on the international relations and economies of all countries, developed and developing; the report to be submitted by a group of eminent persons in 1974 was awaited with interest.

54. Despite the seriousness of those problems, there was no cause for pessimism: the world economy had emerged from the recession of 1970-1971 and was now experiencing a sustained upswing. Under the impetus of that economic recovery in the industrialized regions, international trade had experienced gains which were opening up new vistas for international co-operation. Admittedly, it was only too clear that much remained to be done, as was evident from the disappointment expressed by many developing countries concerning the appraisal of the results of the International Development Strategy. It would be for the Economic Committee to explain why the average rate of economic growth remained significantly short of the targets set in the Strategy, why the gap between *per capita* incomes in the developing and developed countries continued to widen, why growth was very uneven in different countries, why the net flow of financial resources remained inadequate, and so on. The gaps and shortcomings in the

implementation of the Strategy had been mentioned not only by the developing countries, but also by the executive heads of the specialized agencies and even by certain developed countries, a fact which showed that the process was not irreversible and gave some cause for optimism about the Council's opportunities of remedying the situation.

55. The general debate had also highlighted other questions of particular importance for development, including the accelerated transfer of technical and scientific knowledge, which played a decisive role in modern production. Moreover, economic growth could not be dissociated from social progress, protection of the environment and the conservation of natural resources, all of which called for careful and objective study. Economic growth should be the main factor in social justice. Several delegations had expressed concern about the nuclear weapon tests carried out by a major Power and, in that connexion, had referred to the Treaty of Moscow. The representative of the Power in question had explained its position on the point. Lastly, a constructive draft resolution on agenda item 3 had been submitted to the Council.

56. The debate had been particularly valuable because it had enabled the Council to reaffirm its right to consider all problems relating to international economic co-operation and it had revealed general agreement on the need for specific decisions in that field. If the Council proceeded with determination on that course and continued its efforts to reach agreement on purposeful action, peace, stability and economic security would be within reach.

AGENDA ITEM 21

Economic assistance to Zambia

REPORT OF THE CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE (E/5380)

57. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should, like the Co-ordination Committee, unanimously adopt the draft resolution contained in paragraph 5 of that Committee's report (E/5380).

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 18

Relations with the World Intellectual Property Organization

REPORT OF THE CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE (E/5383)

58. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the draft resolution which the Co-ordination Committee had recommended to it for adoption (E/5383, para. 8).

59. In accordance with the decision taken by the Council at its 1859th meeting, he proposed to nominate the representative of the following countries to serve on the Council Committee on Negotiations with Intergovernmental Agencies: Algeria, Barbados, Brazil, Chile, France,

Hungary, Japan, Kenya and Malaysia. He also proposed that Mr. Rabetafika (Madagascar) should be appointed Chairman of that Committee.

It was so decided.

60. The PRESIDENT invited the Secretary of the Council to make a statement on the financial implications of the draft decision recommended by the Co-ordination Committee.

61. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) said that the Council Committee on Negotiations with Intergovernmental Agencies would be able to hold five meetings during the current session, with interpretation, but without summary records. The provision of summary records would call for a specific decision by the Council. The total cost of such records would amount to \$9,000.

62. Replying to a question put by Mr. NESTERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) said that the Committee in question was not a new body, since it had been established by resolution 11 (I) in 1946. The Council would merely have to appoint its members for the purpose of negotiations with WIPO.

63. Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (Barbados) said that he agreed to participate in the work of the Committee on

Negotiations, which would probably meet in Geneva, but would like to know what arrangements would be made for subsequent sessions.

64. The PRESIDENT said that if the Committee was unable to conclude its work in five meetings, it would report to the Council, which would decide what action should be taken to enable the Committee to accomplish its task.

65. Summary records were not necessary if the Committee's report was sufficiently detailed. Moreover, the Committee's meetings would not lend themselves to the preparation of summary records, since they involved negotiations. He accordingly suggested that the Committee on Negotiations with Intergovernmental Agencies should not have summary records of its meetings.

It was so decided.

66. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the draft decision submitted by the Co-ordination Committee (E/5383, para. 8), paragraph 2 being completed by the insertion of the names he had proposed.

The draft decision was adopted by 21 votes to none.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.

1874th meeting

Monday, 30 July 1973, at 10.45 a.m.

President: Mr. S. A. FRAZÃO (Brazil)

E/SR.1874

AGENDA ITEM 3

General discussion of international economic and social policy, including regional and sectoral developments (*continued*) (E/L.1561/Rev.2)

1. The PRESIDENT announced that the Council could not, as planned, take up the revised draft resolution submitted by Chile (E/L.1561/Rev.2) immediately, because the Russian and Chinese translations had not yet been issued.

AGENDA ITEM 11

Industrial development co-operation

REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC COMMITTEE (E/5385)

2. The PRESIDENT drew the attention of members of the Council to the report of the Economic Committee on agenda item 11 and, in particular, to paragraph 4, in which

the Committee recommended that the Council should adopt the draft decision which it had itself adopted without objection.

3. In the absence of any objection, he would consider the draft decision adopted.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 23

Assistance to southern Sudanese returnees and displaced persons

REPORT OF THE CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE (E/5391)

4. The PRESIDENT drew the attention of members of the Council to the report of the Co-ordination Committee on agenda item 23 and, in particular, to paragraph 5, in which the Committee recommended that the Council