



President: Mr. Rachid DRISS (Tunisia).

AGENDA ITEM 9

Transport development (*continued*):

- (a) Establishment of a United Nations transport centre (*continued*)* (E/4964 and Add.1-4, E/4989, chap. VIII, E/L.1381);
- (b) Preparation for a United Nations/IMCO Conference on International Container Traffic (*continued*)** (E/4963, E/L.1380, E/L.1388, E/L.1391/Rev.1/Add.1, E/L.1391/Rev.2, E/L.1393/Rev.1, E/L.1394, E/L.1398)

1. The PRESIDENT said that since no draft resolutions relating to the establishment of a United Nations Transport Centre had been submitted as yet, there did not seem to be any reason to continue the debate.

2. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil), supported by Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya), said that the representatives of the developing countries had said they favoured the establishment of the proposed centre and should be given more time to prepare a draft resolution.

3. The PRESIDENT suggested that 6 p.m. on Tuesday, 11 May, should be set as the deadline for the submission of draft resolutions on the item.

It was so decided.

4. The PRESIDENT said that the general debate on the preparation for a Conference on International Container Traffic had been concluded and invited members of the Council to state their views first on the amendments and then on the text of the draft resolution itself (E/L.1391/Rev.2). The Council should begin by considering the amendments submitted by the United Kingdom (E/L.1393/Rev.1).

5. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) said that the scope of the proposed TCM Convention was much broader than that of the United Nations/IMCO Conference on International Container Traffic. Moreover, the proposed study would deal with extremely varied aspects of the economic implications which the TCM Convention would have for the developing countries. His delegation could not therefore accept the amendments submitted by the United Kingdom (E/L.1393/Rev.1) any more than it could accept the one submitted by the Soviet Union (E/L.1398).

6. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) said that the new paragraph proposed by his delegation for the end of the

preamble contained only a factual statement. The new operative paragraph was designed to prevent the Conference from being hampered by delay in the preparation of the study on the economic implications of the proposed TCM Convention.

7. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the draft resolution dealt with a question of substance that was important for international co-operation: the Conference on International Container Traffic which the Council had decided to organize by a unanimous decision of all its members, including the USSR. Container traffic was a technological innovation that was important for international co-operation. Draft resolution E/L.1391/Rev.2 did not take account of the opinion expressed by two important bodies, UNCTAD and IMCO. In view of the importance of the TCM Convention, those two organizations had said that there was an urgent need for a study of the economic implications of the Convention. They had also stressed that the study was necessary in connexion with the preparations for the Conference. His delegation supported that point of view.

8. The amendments proposed by the United Kingdom were intended precisely to eliminate any tendentious or one-sided aspects of the draft resolution and took account of the wishes of UNCTAD and IMCO. If those amendments were adopted, his delegation was prepared to withdraw its amendment. The draft resolution submitted by Brazil, the United States of America and New Zealand did not seem to provide an adequate basis for the preparations for the Conference.

9. His delegation also wished to point out that the submission of the draft resolution had given rise to a flagrant violation of the rules of procedure. In accordance with rule 75 of the rules of procedure of the Economic and Social Council, any Member of the United Nations, invited to participate in the deliberations of the Council on any matter which the Council considered was of particular concern to that Member, could submit proposals which could be put to the vote by request of any member of the Council. The rules of procedure of the Economic and Social Council did not, however, contain provisions giving observers the right to join in sponsoring draft resolutions of any kind.

10. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) recalled that, at the 1749th meeting when the decision had been taken to request the Legal Counsel's opinion on the question, he had expressed the wish that the views of the Secretary-General should be communicated in writing to the Council. His delegation favoured the active participation of observers in the work of the Council, but in the present instant it shared the view of the Soviet representative. It would be inconvenient now to change the heading of the draft, but the

* Resumed from the 1752nd meeting.

** Resumed from the 1755th meeting.

Council should reconsider the matter later. His delegation endorsed the amendments proposed by the United Kingdom. The Brazilian representative seemed to go too far in his defense of the draft which he had joined in sponsoring. It was not a vital matter for the developing countries if changes were made in a few paragraphs. The first United Kingdom amendment merely stated a fact, while the proposed new operative paragraph made a proposal which a number of delegations regarded as logical and sensible.

11. Mr. PATAKI (Hungary) endorsed the United Kingdom amendments and said that the reasons advanced for deferring consideration of the preliminary draft of a Convention on the International Combined Transport of Goods did not seem convincing. Moreover, adoption of the draft resolution without change would set a dangerous precedent.

12. The PRESIDENT invited the members of the Council to vote on the United Kingdom amendments (E/L.1393/Rev.1).

The United Kingdom amendments (E/L.1393/Rev.1) were rejected by 9 votes to 8, with 3 abstentions.

13. Mr. KOEHRING (United States of America) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote because, unlike other delegations, it did not see a direct relation between the study on the economic implications of the TCM Convention and the Conference. However, that did not mean that it wished the study to be delayed in any way; it hoped that it would be completed as soon as possible.

14. The PRESIDENT invited the members of the Council to vote on the amendment submitted by the Soviet Union (E/L.1398).

The USSR amendment (E/L.1398) was rejected by 8 votes to 7, with 3 abstentions.

15. The PRESIDENT invited the members of the Council to vote on the draft resolution (E/L.1391/Rev.2).

16. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution, in view of its importance, but with the reservations which it had already indicated.

The draft resolution (E/L.1391/Rev.2) was adopted by 19 votes to 2.

17. Mr. HEDEMANN (Norway) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the United Kingdom and USSR amendments because it was afraid that there might be a delay in the study on the economic implications of the TCM Convention which had been requested by UNCTAD and IMCO. Since the sponsors had agreed to take certain amendments into account in their draft resolution, his delegation had voted in favour of it. The convening of the Conference should help to increase the efficiency of international transport and to promote international relations.

18. Mr. PRAGUE (France) said that the fact that India and Chile were among the sponsors of draft resolution

E/L.1391/Rev.2 could not be interpreted as resulting from a decision of the Council based on the provisions of rule 75 of the rules of procedure. It had merely been decided to accede to the wishes of those two delegations to become sponsors.

19. His delegation had supported the draft resolution without enthusiasm because it considered that the financial implications were excessive and were out of proportion to the usefulness of the results that the proposed procedure could be expected to yield. His delegation had taken note of the assurance given to the Council by the Secretariat that the study would be ready by March 1972 at the latest.

20. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) fully shared the views expressed by the representative of Norway speaking in explanation of vote. Despite the defects in the draft resolution, his delegation had deemed it essential to vote in favour of it in view of the importance of the question.

21. On the other hand, in the view of his delegation, the mention of Chile and India in the subheading of the draft resolution could not be regarded as constituting a precedent.

22. Mr. QUARONI (Italy) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution but that it objected to the inclusion of Chile and India in the list of sponsors. His delegation associated itself with those delegations which had emphasized that it involved no decision of principle by the Council which could be invoked as a precedent.

23. The PRESIDENT invited the members of the Council to state their views on paragraphs 7 and 8 of the note by the Secretary-General (E/4963) relating to potential participants in the United Nations/IMCO Conference.

24. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), noting that some very important international conferences, including the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, would be held shortly, said that it was important that all interested States without exception should be able to participate in those conferences and that it was therefore time that the Council and other United Nations organs considered the question realistically and refrained from any discriminatory practices. That would mark a decisive step towards international co-operation. Paragraph 7 of the note of the Secretary-General (E/4963) was discriminatory in the sense that it excluded from the potential participants in the Conference a State such as the German Democratic Republic which played a very important role in the industrial field. That view was held not only by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and it was based on current realities.

25. Mr. PATAKI (Hungary) said that his delegation, which had already explained its position on the problem during the general debate, could not accept the tenor of paragraph 7.

26. Mr. PRAGUE (France) said that he had no comment to make regarding the suggestions in paragraph 7.

27. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece), observing that the USSR and Hungarian delegations objected to paragraph 7 because

it did not take account of the principle of universality, said he thought it was for other organs and not the Economic and Social Council to solve the question since it was a political question. He was in favour of the formula proposed by the Secretary-General.

28. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) and Mr. KOEHRING (United States of America) subscribed to the views expressed by the representatives of France and Greece.

29. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to adopt the recommendations of the Secretary-General, taking into account the reservations formulated by some delegations.

30. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked for a separate vote on paragraph 7 which contained a discriminatory formula.

31. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that it was the Council's practice to take note of notes by the Secretary-General and not to adopt them. The purpose of the note in question was to guide the Council in its consideration of the matter.

32. The PRESIDENT pointed out that in paragraph 7 the Council was expressly invited to "take a decision" on the question.

33. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) drew the attention of the representative of Greece to the tenor of paragraph 7 and asked for a separate vote on that paragraph. The Council had to take a decision since it was important that the illogical attitude shown by some delegations towards the German Democratic Republic should be clearly demonstrated.

34. The PRESIDENT wondered whether it would not be better if the Council took a decision on the basis of a specific text. He asked the Secretary for his views on that point.

35. Mr. AHMED (Secretary of the Council) said that the Council was free to take a decision on the matter. The Council could vote on a text which might state that all States Members of the United Nations or members of the specialized agencies or the International Atomic Energy Agency and, in an advisory capacity, the specialized agencies and also, as observers, interested intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations having consultative status with the Council or having consultative status or special working arrangements with IMCO, should be invited to the Conference.

36. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he would like to have the Secretariat's formula submitted to the Council in writing.

37. The PRESIDENT asked whether or not the Council was prepared to take a decision.

38. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that in his view the best solution would be for the Council to take note of the note by the Secretary-General and for delegations which had formulated objections to submit a draft resolution.

39. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that at the following meeting his delegation would submit a draft resolution relating to paragraph 7.

✓ 40. Mr. KOEHRING (United States of America), referring to operative paragraphs 6 and 7 of draft resolution E/L.1391/Rev.2, which the Council had just adopted, said he wished to draw attention to and endorse the earlier statement of the representative of the Secretary-General, in connexion with the financial implications of those paragraphs, in which he said the Secretariat would do everything possible to provide the services within available resources.

The meeting rose at 4.35 p.m.