

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

OFFICIAL RECORDS, 1982

UN LIBRARY

PLENARY MEETINGS

NY

UN/SA COLLECTION

VOLUME I

*Summary records of the meetings held during
the organizational session for 1982
and the first regular session of 1982*



UNITED NATIONS

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم - استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى الأمم المتحدة، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

OFFICIAL RECORDS, 1982

PLENARY MEETINGS

VOLUME I

*Summary records of the meetings held during
the organizational session for 1982
and the first regular session of 1982*



UNITED NATIONS

New York, 1983

NOTE

The *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, 1982* consist of the summary records of *Plenary Meetings*, incorporating corrections requested by delegations and any necessary editorial modifications, the *Supplements* (Nos. 1-12) and the *Lists of Delegations*.

The present volume contains the final summary records of the plenary meetings held by the Council during its organizational session for 1982 (New York, 2-5 February) and its first regular session of 1982 (New York, 13 April-7 May).

*
* *

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

*
* *

In 1982, the Economic and Social Council was composed of the following fifty-four Member States: ARGENTINA, AUSTRALIA, AUSTRIA, BAHAMAS, BANGLADESH, BELGIUM, BENIN, BRAZIL, BULGARIA, BURUNDI, BYELORUSSIAN SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLIC, CANADA, CHILE, CHINA, COLOMBIA, DENMARK, ETHIOPIA, FIJI, FRANCE, GERMANY, FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GREECE, INDIA, IRAQ, ITALY, JAPAN, JORDAN, KENYA, LIBERIA, LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA, MALAWI, MALI, MEXICO, NEPAL, NICARAGUA, NIGERIA, NORWAY, PAKISTAN, PERU, POLAND, PORTUGAL, QATAR, ROMANIA, SAINT LUCIA, SUDAN, SWAZILAND, THAILAND, TUNISIA, UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS, UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND, UNITED REPUBLIC OF CAMEROON, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, VENEZUELA, YUGOSLAVIA and ZAIRE.

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>		<i>Page</i>
Abbreviations	vii	the Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights	4
Agenda of the organizational session for 1982..	viii	AGENDA ITEM 4:	
Agenda of the first regular session of 1982	ix	Revitalization of the Economic and Social Council	4
Check list of documents	x	AGENDA ITEM 3:	
ORGANIZATIONAL SESSION FOR 1982		Basic programme of work of the Council for 1982 and 1983 (<i>continued</i>).....	5
Summary records of the 1st to 4th plenary meetings		3rd meeting	
1st meeting		<i>Friday, 5 February 1982, at 11.10 a.m.</i>	
<i>Tuesday, 2 February 1982, at 11.15 a.m.</i>		AGENDA ITEM 2:	
OPENING OF THE SESSION	1	Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters (<i>continued</i>)	5
STATEMENT BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL	1	(b) Action by intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations with respect to Namibia	5
AGENDA ITEM 1:		AGENDA ITEM 3:	
Election of the Bureau	2	Basic programme of work of the Council for 1982 and 1983 (<i>concluded</i>)	5
AGENDA ITEM 2:		AGENDA ITEM 4:	
Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters.....	3	Revitalization of the Economic and Social Council (<i>concluded</i>).....	6
AGENDA ITEM 3:		4th meeting	
Basic programme of work of the Council for 1982 and 1983.....	3	<i>Friday, 5 February 1982, at 3.25 p.m.</i>	
2nd meeting		AGENDA ITEM 5:	
<i>Thursday, 4 February 1982, at 3.10 p.m.</i>		Elections to subsidiary bodies of the Council and confirmation of representatives on the functional commissions	7
AGENDA ITEM 1:		AGENDA ITEM 2:	
Election of the Bureau (<i>concluded</i>).....	4	Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters (<i>concluded</i>)	8
AGENDA ITEM 2:		(b) Action by intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations with respect to Namibia	8
Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters (<i>continued</i>):		(e) Appointment of members of the Sessional Working Group of Governmental Experts on the Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights	8
(a) Request for the inclusion of Equatorial Guinea, Liberia, Sao Tome and Principe and Djibouti in the list of the least developed among the developing countries;			
(b) Action by intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations with respect to Namibia;			
(c) Economic Commission for Africa: regional institutes for population studies;			
(d) Second Intergovernmental Conference on Strategies and Policies for Informatics;			
(e) Appointment of members of the Sessional Working Group of Governmental Experts on			

	<i>Page</i>		<i>Page</i>
AGENDA ITEM 6:		9th meeting	
Provisional agenda for the first regular session of 1982 and organizational matters	8	<i>Friday, 16 April 1982, at 3.25 p.m.</i>	
CLOSURE OF THE SESSION	8	APPLICATIONS FOR HEARINGS BY NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS	19
FIRST REGULAR SESSION, 1982			
Summary records of the 5th to 29th plenary meetings			
5th meeting		AGENDA ITEM 1:	
<i>Tuesday, 13 April 1982, at 11.20 a.m.</i>		Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters (<i>continued</i>)	19
OPENING OF THE SESSION	9	(a) Membership of Namibia, represented by the United Nations Council for Namibia, in the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (<i>concluded</i>)	19
STATEMENT BY THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL FOR DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION	9	10th meeting	
AGENDA ITEM 1:		<i>Monday, 19 April 1982, at 3.15 p.m.</i>	
Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters	10	AGENDA ITEM 2:	
6th meeting		Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination	21
<i>Tuesday, 13 April 1982, at 3.40 p.m.</i>		11th meeting	
AGENDA ITEM 13:		<i>Tuesday, 20 April 1982, at 10.50 a.m.</i>	
Elections	13	APPLICATIONS FOR HEARINGS BY NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS	23
AGENDA ITEM 1:		AGENDA ITEM 2:	
Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters (<i>continued</i>)	13	Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (<i>continued</i>)	24
7th meeting		12th meeting	
<i>Wednesday, 14 April 1982, at 10.45 a.m.</i>		<i>Wednesday, 21 April 1982, at 10.45 a.m.</i>	
AGENDA ITEM 1:		AGENDA ITEM 2:	
Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters (<i>continued</i>)	16	Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (<i>continued</i>)	29
8th meeting		AGENDA ITEM 1:	
<i>Thursday, 15 April 1982, at 10.50 a.m.</i>		Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters (<i>continued</i>)	35
AGENDA ITEM 1:		13th meeting	
Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters (<i>continued</i>)	17	<i>Thursday, 22 April 1982, at 10.45 a.m.</i>	
(a) Membership of Namibia, represented by the United Nations Council for Namibia, in the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees	17	AGENDA ITEM 3:	
(c) Inclusion of Arabic among the official languages of the Economic and Social Council	17	Special economic, humanitarian and disaster relief assistance	36
AGENDA ITEM 5:		AGENDA ITEM 2:	
International Year of Peace and International Day of Peace	18	Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (<i>continued</i>)	38
		AGENDA ITEM 1:	
		Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters (<i>continued</i>)	41
		(b) Control and limitation of documentation	41

	<i>Page</i>		<i>Page</i>
14th meeting		AGENDA ITEM 4:	
<i>Friday, 23 April 1982, at 10.50 a.m.</i>		Convening of an International Conference on Population in 1984 (<i>continued</i>)	63
AGENDA ITEM 2:		19th meeting	
Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (<i>continued</i>)	41	<i>Friday, 30 April 1982, at 10.55 a.m.</i>	
AGENDA ITEM 3:		AGENDA ITEM 4:	
Special economic, humanitarian and disaster relief assistance (<i>continued</i>)	42	Convening of an International Conference on Population in 1984 (<i>concluded</i>)	63
15th meeting		AGENDA ITEM 12:	
<i>Monday, 26 April 1982, at 10.45 a.m.</i>		Narcotic drugs (<i>continued</i>)	63
AGENDA ITEM 4:		20th meeting	
Convening of an International Conference on Population in 1984.	45	<i>Monday, 3 May 1982, at 10.50 a.m.</i>	
AGENDA ITEM 1:		Narcotic drugs (<i>continued</i>)	66
Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters (<i>concluded</i>)	50	AGENDA ITEM 5:	
(d) Consideration of the rules of procedure of the Committee for the United Nations Population Award	50	International Year of Peace and International Day of Peace (<i>continued</i>)	68
16th meeting		AGENDA ITEM 8:	
<i>Monday, 26 April 1982, at 3.20 p.m.</i>		Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.	68
AGENDA ITEM 3:		21st meeting	
Special economic, humanitarian and disaster relief assistance (<i>continued</i>)	50	<i>Monday, 3 May 1982, at 3.25 p.m.</i>	
17th meeting		AGENDA ITEM 7:	
<i>Tuesday, 27 April 1982, at 10.45 a.m.</i>		Revitalization of the Economic and Social Council	68
AGENDA ITEM 6:		AGENDA ITEM 12:	
Strengthening of the co-ordination of information systems	51	Narcotic drugs (<i>concluded</i>)	69
AGENDA ITEM 12:		AGENDA ITEM 8:	
Narcotic drugs	52	Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (<i>continued</i>)	69
AGENDA ITEM 3:		22nd meeting	
Special economic, humanitarian and disaster relief assistance (<i>continued</i>)	56	<i>Tuesday, 4 May 1982, at 10.50 a m</i>	
18th meeting		AGENDA ITEM 5:	
<i>Wednesday, 28 April 1982, at 10.45 a.m.</i>		International Year of Peace and International Day of Peace (<i>concluded</i>)	70
AGENDA ITEM 12:		AGENDA ITEM 2:	
Narcotic drugs (<i>continued</i>)	57	Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (<i>continued</i>)	70
AGENDA ITEM 3:		AGENDA ITEM 8:	
Special economic, humanitarian and disaster relief assistance (<i>concluded</i>)	61	Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (<i>continued</i>)	72

	<i>Page</i>		<i>Page</i>
AGENDA ITEM 10:		AGENDA ITEM 8:	
Activities for the advancement of women: United Nations Decade for Women: Equality, Development and Peace		Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (<i>continued</i>)	84
Report of the Second (Social) Committee . .	73		
TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF MR. MOHAMED BENYAHIA, MINISTER FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF ALGERIA	74	26th meeting	
		<i>Thursday, 6 May 1982, at 10.50 a.m.</i>	
23rd meeting		AGENDA ITEM 13:	
<i>Tuesday, 4 May 1982, at 3.20 p.m.</i>		Elections (<i>continued</i>)	87
AGENDA ITEM 10:		27th meeting	
Activities for the advancement of women: United Nations Decade for Women: Equality, Development and Peace (<i>concluded</i>)		<i>Thursday, 6 May 1982, at 3.45 p.m.</i>	
Report of the Second (Social) Committee (<i>concluded</i>)	75	AGENDA ITEM 13:	
AGENDA ITEM 11:		Elections (<i>concluded</i>)	92
Social development questions		AGENDA ITEM 8:	
Report of the Second (Social) Committee . .	76	Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (<i>concluded</i>)	93
24th meeting		28th meeting	
<i>Wednesday, 5 May 1982, at 10.45 a.m.</i>		<i>Friday, 7 May 1982, at 10.55 a.m.</i>	
AGENDA ITEM 2:		AGENDA ITEM 9:	
Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (<i>continued</i>)	77	Human rights questions	
AGENDA ITEM 8:		Report of the Second (Social) Committee . .	99
Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (<i>continued</i>)	80	29th meeting	
25th meeting		<i>Friday, 7 May 1982, at 3.20 p.m.</i>	
<i>Wednesday, 5 May 1982, at 3.15 p.m.</i>		AGENDA ITEM 9:	
AGENDA ITEM 2:		Human rights questions (<i>continued</i>)	
Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (<i>concluded</i>)	81	Report of the Second (Social) Committee (<i>concluded</i>)	104
AGENDA ITEM 7:		AGENDA ITEM 14:	
Revitalization of the Economic and Social Council (<i>concluded</i>)	82	Consideration of the provisional agenda for the second regular session of 1982	107
		AGENDA ITEM 9:	
		Human rights questions (<i>concluded</i>)	108
		CLOSURE OF THE SESSION	109

ABBREVIATIONS

ANC	African National Congress (South Africa)
ECA	Economic Commission for Africa
ECE	Economic Commission for Europe
ECLA	Economic Commission for Latin America
ESCAP	Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
ILO	International Labour Organisation
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
OAU	Organization of African Unity
PLO	Palestine Liberation Organization
SWAPO	South West Africa People's Organization
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNDRO	Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNFPA	United Nations Fund for Population Activities
UNHRC	Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
WFP	World Food Programme
WFTU	World Federation of Trade Unions
WHO	World Health Organization

AGENDA OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL SESSION FOR 1982

Adopted by the Council at its 1st plenary meeting, on 2 February 1982

1. Election of the Bureau
2. Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters
 - (a) Request for the inclusion of Equatorial Guinea, Liberia, Sao Tome and Principe and Djibouti in the list of the least developed among the developing countries
 - (b) Action by intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations with respect to Namibia
 - (c) Economic Commission for Africa: regional institutes for population studies
 - (d) Second Intergovernmental Conference on Strategies and Policies for Informatics
 - (e) Appointment of members of the Sessional Working Group of Governmental Experts on the Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
3. Basic programme of work of the Council for 1982 and 1983
4. Revitalization of the Economic and Social Council
5. Elections to subsidiary bodies of the Council and confirmation of representatives on the functional commissions
6. Provisional agenda for the first regular session of 1982 and organizational matters

AGENDA OF THE FIRST REGULAR SESSION OF 1982

Adopted by the Council at its 5th plenary meeting, on 13 April 1982

1. Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters
 - (a) Membership of Namibia, represented by the United Nations Council for Namibia, in the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
 - (b) Control and limitation of documentation
 - (c) Inclusion of Arabic among the official languages of the Economic and Social Council
 - (d) Consideration of the rules of procedure of the Committee for the United Nations Population Award
2. Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination
3. Special economic, humanitarian and disaster relief assistance
4. Convening of an International Conference on Population in 1984
5. International Year of Peace and International Day of Peace
6. Strengthening of the co-ordination of information systems
7. Revitalization of the Economic and Social Council
8. Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
9. Human rights questions
10. Activities for the advancement of women: United Nations Decade for Women: Equality, Development and Peace
11. Social development questions
12. Narcotic drugs
13. Elections
14. Consideration of the provisional agenda for the second regular session of 1982

CHECK LIST OF DOCUMENTS

NOTE. Listed below are the documents pertaining to the work of the Council during its organizational session for 1982 and its first regular session of 1982.

<i>Document number</i>	<i>Title or description</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Observations and references</i>
Organizational session for 1982			
E/1982/1	Draft basic programme of work of the Council for 1982-1983	3	
E/1982/2 and Add.1	Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters	2	
E/1982/5 and Add.1 and 2	Elections to subsidiary bodies of the Council and confirmation of representatives on the functional commissions: note by the Secretary-General	5	
E/1982/6	Second Intergovernmental Conference on Strategies and Policies for Informatics: note by the Secretariat	2	
E/1982/8	Appointment of a member of the Committee for Development Planning: note by the Secretary-General	5	
E/1982/9	Interim election to fill one vacancy on the International Narcotics Control Board: note by the Secretary-General	5	
E/1982/INF.1	Calendar of conferences and meetings for 1982: note by the Secretariat	2	
E/1982/INF.2	Rationalization of the symbol series of the documentation of the subsidiary bodies of the Economic and Social Council. note by the Secretariat		
E/1982/INF.3	Decisions adopted by the Economic and Social Council at its organizational session for 1982		For the printed text, see <i>Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, 1982, Supplement No. 1 (E/1982/82)</i> , decisions 1982/100-1982/109
E/1982/INF.4 and Corr.1	List of representatives to the organizational session for 1982		
E/1982/L.9	Revitalization of the Economic and Social Council. note by the Secretariat	4	
E/1982/L.10	Burundi, Ethiopia, Saint Lucia, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Swaziland, United Republic of Cameroon and Zaire. draft decision	2	
E/1982/L.11	President of the Council. draft decisions	3	
E/1982/L.12	<i>Idem</i>	4	
E/1982/L.13	<i>Idem</i>	2	
E/1982/L.14	<i>Idem</i>	3	
E/1982/L.15	Draft provisional agenda for the first regular session of 1982 and organizational matters. note by the Secretary-General	6	
E/1982/SR.1-4	Provisional summary records of the plenary meetings held by the Council during its organizational session for 1982		The final texts of the records are to be found in the present volume
First regular session of 1982			
A/36/7/Add.11	Twelfth report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, on Arabic language services	1 (c)	See <i>Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-sixth Session, Supplement No. 7A</i>
A/37/178	Report of the Secretary-General on the situation of refugees in the Sudan	3	
A/C.5/36/54 and Corr.1 and 2	Report of the Secretary-General on Arabic language services	1 (c)	
E/1978/8/Add.32-35	Reports submitted in accordance with Council resolution 1988 (LX) by States parties to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights concerning rights covered by articles 6 to 9	8	
E/1980/6/Add.27-29	Reports submitted in accordance with Council resolution 1988 (LX) by States parties to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights concerning rights covered by articles 10 to 12	8	
E/1982/3 and Add.1-15, Add.15/Corr.1 and Add.16	Note by the Secretary General and reports submitted in accordance with Council resolution 1988 (LX) by States parties to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights concerning rights covered by articles 13 to 15	8	

<i>Document number</i>	<i>Title or description</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Observations and references</i>
E/1982/7	Report of the Panel of the Fact-Finding and Conciliation Commission on Freedom of Association appointed by the Governing Body of the International Labour Office to examine the complaints of alleged infringements of trade union rights in the United States/Puerto Rico: note by the Secretariat	9	
E/1982/10	Note by the Secretary-General transmitting the first report of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization submitted in accordance with Council resolution 1988 (LX)	8	
E/1982/11	Report of the Board of Trustees of the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women on its second session	10	
E/1982/12 and Corr.1	Report of the Commission on Human Rights on its thirty-eighth session (1 February-12 March 1982)	9	<i>Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, 1982, Supplement No. 2</i>
E/1982/13	Report of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs on its seventh special session	12	<i>Ibid., Supplement No. 3</i>
E/1982/14	Report of the Commission on the Status of Women on its twenty-ninth session (24 February-5 March 1982)	10	<i>Ibid., Supplement No. 4</i>
E/1982/23	Status of ratifications or accessions to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and submission of reports under the first, second and third stages of the programme established by Economic and Social Council resolution 1988 (LX): note by the Secretary-General	8	
E/1982/24 and Add.1	Report of the Secretary-General prepared in accordance with subparagraph 18 (f) of the Programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination	2	
E/1982/25 and Add.1	Report of the Secretary-General prepared in accordance with subparagraph 18 (e) of the Programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination	2	
E/1982/26	Report of the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination on its first session	2	
E/1982/27	Report of the Secretary-General of the International Conference on Population	4	
E/1982/28	Revitalization of the Economic and Social Council: note by the Secretary-General	7	
E/1982/30 and Add.1	Annotated provisional agenda for the first regular session of 1982	1	
E/1982/31	Allegations regarding infringements of trade union rights: note by the Secretariat	9	
E/1982/33	International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women: report of the Secretary-General	10	
E/1982/34 and Corr.1 and Add.1 and 2	Background information regarding existing procedures on communications within the United Nations system: note by the Secretary-General	10	
E/1982/35	The feasibility and programme, co-ordination and resource implications of the main recommendations of the <i>Ad Hoc</i> Working Group on the Social Aspects of the Development Activities of the United Nations: note by the Secretary-General	11	
E/1982/36	Co-ordination and information in the field of youth: report of the Secretary-General	11	
E/1982/37 and Add.1 and Add.1/Rev.1	Preparations for the Seventh United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders: report of the Secretary-General	11	
E/1982/38	Summary of the report of the International Narcotics Control Board for 1981 (E/INCB/56)	12	
E/1982/39 and Rev.1	Committee on Crime Prevention and Control: note by the Secretariat	13	
E/1982/40 and Corr.1	Assistance to refugees in Somalia: report of the Secretary-General	3	
E/1982/41	Note by the Secretary-General transmitting the fifth report of the International Labour Organisation submitted in accordance with Council resolution 1988 (LX)	8	
E/1982/43 and Add.1	Letters dated 30 March and 2 April 1982 from the President of the Economic and Social Council to the Secretary-General	13	
E/1982/44 and Add.1	Letters dated 30 March and 14 April 1982 from the representative of Madagascar to the Secretary-General	3	
E/1982/45 and Rev.1	International Year of Peace: note by the Secretary-General	5	
E/1982/47	Allegations regarding infringements of trade union rights: note by the Secretariat	9	
E/1982/48	Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters	1	
E/1982/49	Letter dated 12 April 1982 from the representative of the Philippines to the Secretary-General	2	
E/1982/50 and Add.1	Report of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations		

<i>Document number</i>	<i>Title or description</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Observations and references</i>
E/1982/51	Letter dated 16 April 1982 from the representative of Viet Nam to the Secretary-General	9	
E/1982/53	Letter dated 19 April 1982 from the representative of Democratic Yemen to the Secretary-General	3	
E/1982/54	Letter dated 19 April 1982 from the Chairman of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations to the President of the Economic and Social Council	2	
E/1982/55	Letter dated 21 April 1982 from the Chairman of the Executive Board of the United Nations Children's Fund to the President of the Economic and Social Council	1	
E/1982/56 and Corr.1	Report of the Sessional Working Group (of Governmental Experts) on the Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Cultural and Social Rights	8	
E/1982/57	Report of the Second (Social) Committee	10	
E/1982/58	<i>Idem</i>	11	
E/1982/59	<i>Idem</i>	9	
E/1982/60	Letter dated 20 April 1982 from the acting Chairman of the Committee on Conferences to the President of the Economic and Social Council	7	
E/1982/63	Letter dated 30 April 1982 from the representative of the Lao People's Democratic Republic to the Secretary-General	9	
E/1982/68	Letter dated 29 April 1982 from the representative of the Philippines to the Secretary-General	2	
E/1982/C.2/L.1	Preparations for the Seventh United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders: note by the Secretariat	11	See E/1982/58
E/1982/C.2/L.2	Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Colombia, Djibouti, Egypt, France, Greece, India, Indonesia, Japan, Madagascar, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Romania, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Venezuela, Yugoslavia and Zaire: draft resolution	11	<i>Idem</i>
E/1982/C.2/L.3	Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Colombia, Denmark, Egypt, France, India, Morocco, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Yugoslavia and Zaire: draft resolution	10	See E/1982/57
E/1982/C.2/L.4	Bulgaria and Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic: draft decision	10	<i>Idem</i>
E/1982/C.2/L.5	Algeria, Bangladesh, India, Italy, Nigeria, Romania and Yugoslavia: draft decision	11	See E/1982/58
E/1982/C.2/L.6	France: amendments to draft resolution IV contained in document E/1982/14	10	See E/1982/57
E/1982/C.2/L.7	Draft decision proposed by a Vice-Chairman of the Second (Social) Committee	10	<i>Idem</i>
E/1982/C.2/L.8	Programme budget implications of the Commission on Human Rights resolution 1982/17 contained in chapter XXVI, section A, of its report: note by the Secretary-General	9	See E/1982/59
E/1982/C.2/L.9	Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic: amendments to draft resolution II contained in document E/1982/C.2/L.1	11	See E/1982/58
E/1982/C.2/L.10	Australia, Belgium, Canada, Fiji, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Japan, Malaysia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Pakistan, Philippines, Portugal, Singapore, Sudan, Thailand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Zaire: draft decision	9	See E/1982/59
E/1982/C.2/L.11	France and Zaire: draft resolution	9	<i>Idem</i>
E/1982/C.2/L.12	Benin, Bulgaria, Costa Rica, India, Kenya, Liberia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Sudan and Yugoslavia: draft resolution	9	<i>Idem</i>
E/1982/INF.5	List of representatives to the first regular session of 1982		
E/1982/INF.6	List of resolutions and decisions adopted by the Economic and Social Council at its first regular session of 1982		
E/1982/INF.7	Resolutions and decisions adopted by the Economic and Social Council at its first regular session of 1982		For the printed text, see <i>Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, 1982, Supplement No. 1</i> (E/1982/82), resolutions 1982/1-1982/40 and decisions 1982/110-1982/148
E/1982/L.1	Election of members of the functional commissions of the Council: note by the Secretary-General	13	
E/1982/L.2	Nomination of seven members of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination: note by the Secretary-General	13	
E/1982/L.3	Election of 19 members of the Committee on Human Settlements: note by the Secretary-General	13	
E/1982/L.4 and Rev.1	Election of 19 members of the Commission on Transnational Corporations: note by the Secretary-General	13	

<i>Document number</i>	<i>Title or description</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Observations and references</i>
E/1982/L.5 and Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1	Election of 21 members of the Executive Board of the United Nations Children's Fund. note by the Secretary-General	13	
E/1982/L.6	Election of 16 members of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme. note by the Secretary-General	13	
E/1982/L.7	Election of five members of the Committee on Food Aid Policies and Programmes. note by the Secretary-General	13	
E/1982/L.8 and Rev.1	Election of 31 members of the Committee on Natural Resources: note by the Secretary-General	13	
E/1982/L.16	Nominations of the Board of Trustees of the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women: note by the Secretary-General	13	
E/1982/L.17	Report on the state of preparedness of documentation for the session. note by the Secretariat	1	
E/1982/L.18	Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. note by the Secretariat	2	
E/1982/L.19	Consideration of the rules of procedure of the Committee for the United Nations Population Award. note by the Secretariat	1 (d)	
E/1982/L.20	Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters. note by the Bureau	1	
E/1982/L.21	Algeria, Benin, Burundi, Cuba, Djibouti, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Mali, Sierra Leone, United Republic of Cameroon, Viet Nam and Zaire. draft resolution	3	
E/1982/L.21/Rev.1	——— [same sponsors], Bahamas, Bangladesh, China, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, France, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Senegal, Somalia, United States of America and Yugoslavia: revised draft resolution	3	
E/1982/L.22	Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ethiopia, India, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mauritania, Morocco, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates and Yugoslavia: draft resolution	3	
E/1982/L.23	Algeria, Benin, Ethiopia, Kenya, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Nigeria, Sudan, Yugoslavia and Zaire: draft resolution	2	
E/1982/L.24	Bangladesh, China, Djibouti, Egypt, Italy, Jordan, Kenya, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United States of America, Yugoslavia, Zaire and Zambia: draft resolution	3	
E/1982/L.25	Bangladesh, Benin, Burundi, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Nigeria, Pakistan, Sierra Leone, Swaziland, Tunisia, Zaire, Zambia and Zimbabwe. draft resolution	3	
E/1982/L.26	Bangladesh, Benin, Burundi, China, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Italy, Jordan, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Pakistan, Qatar, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Swaziland, Tunisia, Zaire and Zimbabwe. draft resolution	3	
E/1982/L.26/Rev.1	——— [same sponsors], Nigeria, United States of America, United Republic of Cameroon and Yugoslavia: revised draft resolution	3	
E/1982/L.27	Bangladesh, Benin, Burundi, China, Djibouti, Egypt, Jordan, Kuwait, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritania, Morocco, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United States of America, Yemen, Zaire and Zambia: draft resolution	3	
E/1982/L.28	Australia, Bangladesh, China and Pakistan. draft resolution	4	
E/1982/L.28/Rev.1	——— [same sponsors], Japan and Mexico. revised draft resolution	4	
E/1982/L.29	Bangladesh, China, India, Nepal and Pakistan: draft decision	2	
E/1982/L.30	Bahamas, Bangladesh, Chile, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Malawi, Nepal, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Peru, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Venezuela and Zaire. draft resolution	5	
E/1982/L.30/Rev.1	——— [same sponsors], Bolivia, Colombia, Nigeria, Sudan, Swaziland and Yugoslavia. revised draft resolution	5	
E/1982/L.31	Bangladesh, Ghana, India, Kenya, Liberia, Nigeria, Pakistan and Zaire. draft resolution	2	
E/1982/L.32 and Corr.1	Programme budget implications of the draft resolution contained in document E/1982/L.23. note by the Secretary-General	2	
E/1982/L.33	Programme budget implications of the draft decision contained in document E/1982/L.29. note by the Secretary-General	2	

<i>Document number</i>	<i>Title or description</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Observations and references</i>
E/1982/L.34	Argentina, Bahamas, Bolivia, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, France, Italy, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Portugal, United States of America and Yugoslavia: draft resolution	12	
E/1982/L.35	France: draft resolution	8	
E/1982/L.35/Rev.1	_____ [<i>same sponsor</i>], Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Japan, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Netherlands, Norway, Peru, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Venezuela: revised draft resolution	8	
E/1982/L.36	Bangladesh, Bulgaria, Cuba, Ethiopia, India, Iraq, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Syrian Arab Republic, Yugoslavia and Zimbabwe: draft resolution	2	
E/1982/L.37	Programme budget implications of the draft resolution contained in document E/1982/L.36: note by the Secretary-General	2	
E/1982/L.38	Programme budget implications of the draft resolution contained in document E/1982/L.35/Rev.1: note by the Secretary-General	8	
E/1982/L.39	Consideration of the provisional agenda for the second regular session of 1982: note by the Secretariat	14	
E/1982/NGO/1	Statement submitted by the International Indian Treaty Council, a non-governmental organization in consultative status, category II	9	
E/1982/SR.5-29	Provisional summary records of the fifth to twenty-ninth plenary meetings, held by the Council during its first regular session of 1982		The final texts of the records are to be found in the present volume
E/1982/WG.1/L.1 and Rev.1	Programme of work for 1982 prepared by the Bureau of the Sessional Working Group (of Governmental Experts) on the Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights	8	
E/1982/WG.1/L.2 and Add.1	Draft report of the Sessional Working Group (of Governmental Experts) on the Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights	8	
E/1982/WG.1/SR.1-24 and corrigendum	Summary records of the meetings of the Sessional Working Group (of Governmental Experts) on the Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights	8	
E/AC.68/1982/L.5/Add.3	Chapter IV of the draft report of the Preparatory Sub-Committee of the Council for the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, dealing with the draft rules of procedure for the Conference	2	
E/CN.7/674	Note by the Secretary-General on countermeasures against the illicit traffic	12	
E/INCB/52/Supp	Special report relating to the demand and supply of opiates for medical and scientific needs prepared by the International Narcotics Control Board	12	
E/INCB/56	Report of the International Narcotics Control Board for 1981	12	
* * * *			
A/37/3 (Part I)	Mimeographed version of those parts of the report of the Economic and Social Council relating to the organizational session for 1982 and to the first regular session of 1982		For the printed text, see <i>Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-seventh Session, Supplement No. 3</i>
E/1982/82	Resolutions and decisions of the Economic and Social Council (organizational session for 1982 and first regular session of 1982)		<i>Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, 1982, Supplement No.1</i>

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

ORGANIZATIONAL SESSION FOR 1982

Summary records of the 1st to 4th plenary meetings, held at Headquarters, New York, from 2 to 5 February 1982

1st meeting

Tuesday, 2 February 1982, 11.15 a.m.

Temporary President: Mr. Javier PEREZ DE CUELLAR (Secretary-General of the United Nations).

President: Mr. Miljan KOMATINA (Yugoslavia).

E/1982/SR.1

Opening of the session

1. The TEMPORARY PRESIDENT said that, in declaring open the organizational session of the Economic and Social Council for 1982, he would like to extend a warm welcome to all present and wish them all success in the important tasks entrusted to them in the field of international economic and social co-operation. He was sure he was voicing the sentiments of all present in paying a special tribute to Mr. Paul J. F. Lusaka of Zambia, President of the Council for 1981, for the exemplary manner in which he had conducted the work of the Council. That had come as no surprise to those who had known Mr. Lusaka for many years and were familiar with his contributions to the United Nations in many fields. Although Zambia was no longer a member of the Council, he was sure that the Council would continue to benefit from Mr. Lusaka's experience.

Statement by the Secretary-General

2. The SECRETARY-GENERAL said that it gave him great pleasure to have the opportunity, so soon after assuming his responsibilities as Secretary-General of the United Nations, to address the Economic and Social Council. The grave and difficult issues confronted by the world today in the economic and social fields demanded not merely urgent but also bold initiatives by the international community. More than ever before, there was a need to give priority attention to the intensification of mutual co-operation among Member States and to the promotion of concerted action in order to redress socio-economic imbalances. That was an essential prerequisite for international peace and security.

3. The current economic crisis had serious implications for all countries; however, it was particularly adverse in its consequences for most developing countries. Debt problems, balance-of-payment difficulties, inflation, unemployment, poverty and undernourishment had combined to deny,

in many instances, the fulfilment of the legitimate aspirations of the people. Those trends were accompanied by an unfortunate but progressive erosion of trust and confidence in multilateralism. That phenomenon impaired the effective functioning of multilateral institutions, which were necessary for concerted action to be effected, co-ordinated and sustained. It was essential that those trends should be reversed and that a new impetus should be given to co-operative efforts to promote development.

4. As he had stated before the General Assembly at the 98th plenary meeting of the thirty-sixth session on 15 December 1981, he attached the utmost importance and priority to the success of the ongoing consultations regarding global negotiations. The organizational session of the Council was not the occasion to go into that matter at any length and he would merely say that, in the context of the gravity of the problems faced by the international community, the Council had a key role to play. Under the authority of the General Assembly, the Council should serve as a central forum for consideration of global economic and social policies and issues, and should ensure the overall co-ordination and harmonization of the activities of the organizations of the United Nations system in areas within its competence. Indeed, without the Council to play that role, any sort of revamping of the international economic order would be unrealistic. He wished to pledge, both on his own behalf and on behalf of his colleagues in the Secretariat, their full and sincere commitment and support to the work of the Council.

5. With a view to rationalizing and improving its agenda and programme of work, the Council had requested the Secretary-General to submit to it at its current session proposals relating to the periodicity of consideration of some items, and suggestions for ensuring a better distribution of issues between the General Assembly and the Council, with an indication of the implications thereof. He regretted very much that it had not been possible to provide the Council with the requested assistance. He would like to

assure the Council that, with the assistance of the newly appointed Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation, he planned to respond to its request as soon as possible, taking into account the results of its current deliberations.

6. He wished, however, in that connection, to inform the Council that he had already taken certain initiatives to rationalize and streamline documentation. Since that matter had a direct bearing on the organization of the work of the Council, he was requesting the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation to apprise the Council of the details.

7. He was confident that, through their joint efforts, all concerned would succeed in enabling the Council to undertake its responsibilities effectively. He wished all delegations success in their endeavors.

AGENDA ITEM 1

Election of the Bureau

8. Mr. PLECHKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking on behalf of the group of Eastern European States, nominated Mr. Miljan Komatina (Yugoslavia) for the office of President.

Mr. Miljan Komatina (Yugoslavia) was elected President by acclamation.

Mr. Komatina (Yugoslavia) took the Chair.

9. The PRESIDENT thanked the members of the Council for the confidence placed in him and his country. He welcomed the statement made by the Secretary-General, which reflected a profound perception of the significance of the problems dealt with by the Council, and paid a tribute to the outgoing President.

10. The problems facing all countries in the economic, social and humanitarian fields were multiplying and becoming more serious. In most cases economic problems were at the root of the difficulties, irrespective of the forms in which the latter were manifested. Inequities in economic as in all other relations among peoples and countries were no longer acceptable, and solutions to urgent problems must be found as soon as possible. The uncertain state of the dialogue between developed and developing countries was a serious cause for concern. The stalemate with respect to the launching of global negotiations, if continued, would not only have a very negative impact on the relations between developed and developing countries but would very seriously affect international co-operation in general.

11. The Council could not be satisfied with the situation in which it found itself, since that situation was at variance with the spirit and the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations concerning the Council's role in international economic relations. Instead of being the centre for considering global economic problems, the Council was continuously pushed to the periphery. A way had to be found to enable it to play its proper role as intended by the founding fathers of the United Nations. He hoped that substantial progress could be made in that regard in 1982, in order that the Council might play its role as the principal organ of the United Nations for international co-operation and, as such, make a contribution to the overall endeavours.

12. He urged the Council, in view of budgetary limitations, to act with a full sense of economy in regard both to documentation and to the rationalization of its work, with particular attention to punctuality in beginning its meetings.

13. Mr. LUSAKA (Observer for Zambia) thanked the Secretary-General and the President for their kind words.

He wished the President great success in his office and assured him that he could count on his co-operation.

14. Among the conclusions he had drawn from his year as President of the Council, he would mention that, despite continued frustrating difficulties in the political field, it seemed to him that in the economic and social field the United Nations was building a new and better world. The more the new interdependent, co-operative world succeeded, the more the old, antiquated political conflicts and divisions would be diminished. The United Nations system was concerned with practically every problem facing mankind. Its vast range of activities, together with the development of a fine international civil service, was a solid pillar supporting the United Nations.

15. Although the North-South negotiations were not before the Council because of its limited membership, the Council was a most essential organ, since it monitored and co-ordinated the vast United Nations system, including the regional commissions. The Council had been quite innovative in launching a series of unprecedented world conferences and international years which had had a deep impact on human affairs and on the public. It had never shirked taking up new subjects, as was evidenced by its work on transnational corporations. That was why he was so concerned with the revitalization of the Council, which should produce each year a major statement on the world economic situation, over and above those issued by alliances and more limited geographical groups.

16. Mr. RIPERT (Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation) assured the Council and its President of his full support.

17. Upon assuming office, the Secretary-General had resolved to tackle the problem of the proliferation of documentation and, on the recommendations of an inter-departmental working group set up for the purpose, he had already taken a number of decisions to control the volume of documents and ensure their timely distribution. First, the limit on the size of reports produced by the Secretariat had been reduced from 32 to 24 pages and all special rapporteurs and expert groups were being urged to limit their reports to a maximum of 32 pages. Subsidiary bodies would be reminded of the desirability of reducing the size of their reports in a similar manner. Secondly, the Secretary-General had invited all heads of departments and offices systematically to review the documentation emanating from their departments, particularly documentation issued regularly, and to assess its value to the programmes under their jurisdiction. They had been asked to submit recommendations by 15 February 1982 on the possibility of cutting down and consolidating the documents issued. The Secretary-General would, on the basis of the replies received, make recommendations to the intergovernmental bodies concerned. In addition, the guidelines on cut-off dates for the preparation and issue of documents by the Secretariat had been strengthened. The Secretary-General would inform permanent representatives in detail of the steps he had taken, and would request their full co-operation and support in the intergovernmental bodies.

18. In conclusion, he assured members that he would give priority to assisting the Council in its discussions on how to rationalize and improve its agenda and programme of work.

19. The PRESIDENT said that, under rule 18 of its rules of procedure, the Council was required to elect four Vice-Presidents. He was informed that, on the basis of informal consultations among the regional groups, Mr. Uddhav Deo Bhatt (Nepal), Mr. John Reid Morden (Canada) and Mr. Gilberto Coutinho Paranhos Velloso (Brazil) had been nominated to serve as Vice-Presidents for 1982.

Mr. Uddhav Deo Bhatt (Nepal), Mr. John Reid Morden (Canada) and Mr. Gilberto Coutinho Paranhos Velloso (Brazil) were elected Vice-Presidents by acclamation.

20. The PRESIDENT said he understood that consultations on the nomination for the remaining post of Vice-President were still in progress. The election would accordingly be deferred until another meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 2

Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters (E/1982/2 and Add.1, E/1982/6)

The agenda of the organizational session for 1982 (E/1982/2 and Add.1) was adopted.

21. The PRESIDENT suggested that, after the Secretary's introductory statement on item 3, the Council should consider its basic programme of work for 1982 and 1983 in informal meetings, as had been the practice in the past. The Council might also wish to consider item 4 (Revitalization of the Economic and Social Council) together with the basic programme of work.

22. Lastly, he suggested that item 5, concerning elections, and item 6, relating to the provisional agenda for the first regular session of 1982, should be taken up towards the end of the week in order to allow time for the regional groups to complete their consultations.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 3

Basic programme of work of the Council for 1982 and 1983 (E/1982/1)

23. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Council) said that no meetings of the First (Economic) Committee were planned for the first regular session of 1982. In order to streamline the agenda, the Secretariat felt that the report of the *Ad Hoc* Group of Experts on International Co-operation in Tax Matters, which should have been referred to the First Committee at the first regular session, might best be considered under item 7 (Public administration and finance matters) of the proposed agenda for the second regular session.

24. The item entitled "Special economic, humanitarian and disaster relief assistance" appeared on the agenda for both regular sessions. To rationalize its programme of work, the Council might decide to consider the item only once a year, at its second regular session. Reports under the item would be made orally, with the exception of the report on Uganda originally requested for submission to the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session, which for reasons beyond its control the Secretariat had been unable to submit in time. The annotations to the programme of work of the Council (E/1982/1, sect. II) inadvertently listed under item 3 (c), (d) and (e) for the first regular session in 1982 reports which in fact would be made orally. Item 3 (a) (Assistance to the drought-stricken areas of Ethiopia) should be deleted, in accordance with paragraph 8 of General Assembly resolution 36/221, that question would be included in the agenda of the second regular session.

25. In accordance with Council resolution 1623 (LI), the report of the United Nations High Commissioner for

Refugees was transmitted directly to the General Assembly without debate, unless the Council decided otherwise at the request of one or more of its members or of the High Commissioner. In a recent communication to the Secretariat, the High Commissioner had requested that, owing to the increasing interest shown by Member States in specific refugee problems, and in order to make a distinction between the refugee situation and other types of emergencies considered in the past under a single heading—"Special economic, humanitarian and disaster relief assistance"—all refugee questions should be grouped under a single distinct and separate item, that such questions should normally be considered once a year at the second regular session and that the Council's practice of transmitting the High Commissioner's report to the General Assembly without debate should be continued.

26. For a number of years, the items relating to trade and development, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the United Nations University had been listed in the agenda of the resumed second regular session. Despite complaints by delegations about the difficulties of holding resumed sessions of the Council in the middle of General Assembly sessions, no practical steps had in fact been taken to find a solution to the problem of consideration of the reports of intergovernmental bodies which met after the second regular session of the Council. A way out of those difficulties had been a decision to transmit those reports directly to the Assembly without consideration by the Council.

27. With regard to section IV of document E/1982/1, he noted that in the past the relevant paragraphs of the resolutions suggested for referral to the Council's subsidiary bodies had been reproduced for easy reference. In view of the constant need to reduce documentation, it had been decided not to include those texts, which would have taken 21 pages, but copies would be available for delegations to consult upon request.

28. On the basis of information received to date, it had been estimated that 109 reports would be issued for consideration by the Council in 1982, with at least 24 additional reports to be made orally. Those figures did not include the 25 reports already submitted to the Secretariat for consideration by the Sessional Working Group of Governmental Experts on the Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Even at 32 pages per report, the Council would have before it over 4,180 pages of documentation in 1982. The Council was also to take a decision at its current session on whether to discontinue summary record coverage for its sessional committees. It was estimated that, over the course of a year, the cost of summary records for the three committees amounted to more than \$350,000.

29. The second session of the Committee on Crime Prevention and Control had been postponed and would be held from 15 to 24 March 1982. Joint meetings of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination and the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination would be held at Geneva on 5 and 6 July 1982, immediately preceding the opening of the second regular session of the Council. The dates for the meeting of the Interim Committee on New and Renewable Sources of Energy were still being negotiated, but the Committee's report would in any event be submitted to the Council at its second regular session.

30. As delegations must be aware, the draft basic programme of work had been issued late. When deciding how to organize its work, the Council might consider the

possibility of holding its organizational session one or two weeks later in the year, since preparing the draft programme in the short time available between the close of the General Assembly session and the opening of the organizational session of the Council put the Secretariat under tremendous

pressure. The delay would allow more time for both delegations and the Secretariat to prepare thoroughly for the organizational session.

The meeting rose at 12.10 p.m.

2nd meeting

Thursday, 4 February 1982, at 3.10 p.m.

President: Mr. Miljan KOMATINA (Yugoslavia).

E/1982/SR.2

AGENDA ITEM 1

Election of the Bureau (*concluded*)

1. The President said that he had been informed that the group of African States had nominated Mr. Kamanda wa Kamanda (Zaire) for the office of Vice-President of the Council for 1982.

Mr. Kamanda wa Kamanda (Zaire) was elected Vice-President by acclamation.

AGENDA ITEM 2

Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters (*continued*) (E/1982/2 and Add.1, E/1982/6, E/1982/L.10 and L.13):

- (a) Request for the inclusion of Equatorial Guinea, Liberia, Sao Tome and Principe and Djibouti in the list of the least developed among the developing countries;
- (b) Action by intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations with respect to Namibia;
- (c) Economic Commission for Africa: regional institutes for population studies;
- (d) Second Intergovernmental Conference on Strategies and Policies for Informatics;
- (e) Appointment of members of the Sessional Working Group of Governmental Experts on the Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

2. The PRESIDENT drew the attention of the Council to the two draft decisions in document E/1982/L.13. Draft decision I, entitled "Request for the inclusion of Equatorial Guinea, Liberia, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone and Djibouti in the list of the least developed among the developing countries", took into account draft decision E/1982/L.10, distributed previously. Accordingly, if he heard no objection, he would take it that draft decision E/1982/L.10 was withdrawn by its sponsors and the Council wished to adopt draft decision I.

It was so decided (decision 1982/106).

3. The PRESIDENT said that he would take it, if he heard no objection, that the Council wished to adopt draft decision II, contained in document E/1982/L.13, entitled "Economic Commission for Africa: regional institutes for population studies".

It was so decided (decision 1982/107).

4. The PRESIDENT said that under agenda item 2, the question of granting membership to Namibia, represented by the United Nations Council for Namibia, in the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees was to be considered. The matter would be taken up by the Bureau at its first meeting, and he would report its recommendations to the Council.

5. Another question under item 2 of the agenda was the Second Intergovernmental Conference on Strategies and Policies for Informatics. He drew attention to the text of a decision on the matter taken by the Executive Board of UNESCO which was reproduced in document E/1982/6. The question had already been included in the agenda of the Council's second regular session of 1982 under item 18 of the draft basic programme of work of the Council for 1982-1983 (E/1982/1).

AGENDA ITEM 4

Revitalization of the Economic and Social Council (E/1982/L.9 and L.12)

6. The PRESIDENT drew the Council's attention to the text of the draft resolution annexed to General Assembly decision 35/439, which was reproduced in document E/1982/L.9, and to draft decisions I and II in document E/1982/L.12, entitled, respectively, "Revitalization of the Economic and Social Council" and "Rationalization of the agenda and programme of work of the Economic and Social Council". The Council had been invited to give particular attention at the current session, when considering the latter decision, to the criteria to be used in rationalizing its work, with particular reference to better distribution of questions between the General Assembly and the Council.

7. Mr. KAABACHI (Tunisia) said that the Secretariat should be asked to provide exhaustive documentation on all aspects of that fundamental question before the Council took it up.

8. Mr. LAZAREVIĆ (Yugoslavia) said that it would be useful for the Council to have, for its further consideration of the item in question at both regular sessions of 1982, all the available documentation on the exhaustive discussions that had taken place in the General Assembly on the implementation of Assembly resolution 32/197.

9. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Council) said that he took it that the representatives of Tunisia and Yugoslavia meant that there was no need for further documentation, since all the documents they had referred to, with the exception of a few working papers, had already been distributed to the Council.

10. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to adopt draft decisions I and II (E/1982/L.12).

It was so decided (decisions 1982/102 and 1982/103).

The meeting was suspended at 3.25 p.m. and resumed at 3.35 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 3

Basic programme of work of the Council for 1982 and 1983 (*continued*) (E/1982/1, E/1982/L.11)

11. The PRESIDENT drew the Council's attention to draft decisions I and II, contained in document E/1982/L.11.

12. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Council) said that the Secretariat was in some difficulty with regard to the item entitled "Special economic, humanitarian and disaster relief assistance", which was listed for consideration at both the first and the second regular sessions of 1982. Footnote 1 in document E/1982/L.11 implied that the item would probably be taken up at the second regular session; however, some delegations were insisting that at least some of the reports by the Secretary-General listed in the draft basic programme of work (E/1982/1) under that item should be considered at the first regular session. In order to plan the

documentation on the item, the Secretariat needed instructions from the Council as to which, if any, of those reports it wished to discuss at the first regular session of 1982. One possibility might be for the Council not to make the change referred to in the footnote effective until 1983.

13. He read out an explanatory footnote, to be added to item 5 under section B of draft decision I (E/1982/L.11), concerning the procedure for the transmission of the report in question to the General Assembly. With regard to paragraph 3 (*h*) under section C of draft decision I, Assembly resolution 36/29 should be added to the list of resolutions to be referred to the regional commissions.

14. The PRESIDENT said that he would take it, if he heard no objection, that the Council wished to adopt draft decision II, entitled "Discontinuance of summary records for the sessional committees of the Economic and Social Council", contained in document E/1982/L.11.

It was so decided (decision 1982/105).

15. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should meet informally with a view to resolving the remaining questions regarding its basic programme of work.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 3.45 p.m.

3rd meeting

Friday, 5 February 1982, at 11.10 a.m.

President: Mr. Miljan KOMATINA (Yugoslavia).

E/1982/SR.3

AGENDA ITEM 2

Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters (*continued*) (E/1982/2 and Add.1)

1. The PRESIDENT stated that after the appropriate consultations, the Bureau had agreed that the Vice-Presidents of the Council would exercise the following functions during 1982: Mr. Velloso (Brazil) would serve as Chairman of the First (Economic) Committee, Mr. Morden (Canada) as Chairman of the Second (Social) Committee and Mr. Bhatt (Nepal) as Chairman of the Third (Programme and Co-ordination) Committee. Mr. Kamanda wa Kamanda (Zaire) would perform other functions as required by the Council and would co-ordinate informal consultations.

(b) Action by intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations with respect to Namibia

2. The PRESIDENT informed the members of the Council that consultations were still in progress concerning the question of the membership of Namibia, represented by the United Nations Council for Namibia, in the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. The Bureau hoped to report an agreed position at the afternoon meeting.

Mr. Morden (Canada), Vice-President, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 3

Basic programme of work of the Council for 1982 and 1983 (*concluded*) (E/1982/1, E/1982/L.14)

3. The PRESIDENT drew the attention of the Council to document E/1982/L.14, containing two draft decisions, I and II, which he proposed on the basis of informal consultations held the previous day on document E/1982/L.11. He requested the Secretary of the Council to read out for the record the revisions agreed upon for incorporation into the basic programme of work of the Council for 1982 and 1983.

4. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Council) drew attention to the changes for incorporation in the draft basic programme of work of the Council for 1982-1983 (E/1982/1). For the first regular session of 1982 the changes were the following: item 3 (a), entitled "Assistance to the drought-stricken areas of Ethiopia" was to be deleted in view of General Assembly resolution 36/221, on assistance to the drought-stricken areas in Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, the Sudan and Uganda. The last paragraph of the annotations to proposed item 4 (see E/1982/1, sect. II), which read: "The Population Commission, meeting as the Preparatory Committee for the Conference... will report to the Economic and Social Council at the first regular session of 1983", would be deleted from the annotations to the provisional agenda of the first regular session of 1982. With regard to proposed item 6, "Strengthening of the co-ordination of information systems", an oral progress report would be made at the Council's first regular session of

1982. That question would also be incorporated into the agenda proposed for the second regular session of 1982 under item 18 (International co-operation and co-ordination within the United Nations system). Subitem (e) under the item entitled "Human rights questions" would remain as it stood in document E/1982/1 on the understanding that the annotations to the item would make reference to the title of General Assembly resolution 36/162. For technical reasons, the item entitled "Human rights and scientific and technological developments" should be deleted from the basic programme of work; the report called for under that subitem was to be submitted to the General Assembly at its thirty-eighth session. In the item entitled "Narcotic drugs", the question "Maintenance of a world-wide balance between the supply of narcotic drugs and the legitimate demand for those drugs for medical and scientific purposes" would be incorporated into the question entitled "Report of the International Narcotics Control Board".

5. With regard to the draft basic programme of work of the Council for the second regular session of 1982, under item 5, "Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees", the report had already been placed on the proposed agenda for the second regular session, with an explanatory footnote. Both items 5 (a), "International Conference on Assistance to Refugees in Africa", and 5 (b), "Assistance to student refugees in southern Africa", would be considered under agenda item 4, "Special economic, humanitarian and disaster relief assistance", of the proposed agenda for the second regular session of 1982. The item entitled "Strengthening the capacity of the United Nations system to respond to natural disasters and other disaster situations" (previously item 17, see E/1982/1) would be included in the consideration of the proposed item 18, "International co-operation and co-ordination within the United Nations system". In the annotations to proposed item 14, "Science and technology", the following headings which appeared in document E/1982/1 would be deleted: "Questions integrated into this item: (a) Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development" and "(b) United Nations Financing System for Science and Technology for Development". The title of the report listed under "Documentation" for that item should be replaced by the title "Report of the Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development on its fourth session".

6. With reference to the item proposed for the first regular session of 1982, entitled "Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Second Half of the United Nations Decade for Women", instead of preparing another report which would contain basically the same information contained in document A/36/564, the Secretary-General would submit to the Council at its first regular session document A/36/564, which had been submitted to the Assembly at its thirty-sixth session.

7. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt draft decision I, on the basic programme of work of the Council for 1982 and 1983, contained in document E/1982/L.14 bearing in mind the revisions read out by the Secretary of the Council.

It was so decided (decision 1982/100).

8. The PRESIDENT said that if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt draft decision II, on special economic, humanitarian and disaster relief assistance.

It was so decided (decision 1982/101).

AGENDA ITEM 4

Revitalization of the Economic and Social Council (concluded)

9. The PRESIDENT recalled that at the previous meeting, the Council had decided to request the President of the Council to continue consultations with the regional groups on the revitalization of the Economic and Social Council and to report to the Council at its first regular session of 1982 (decision 1982/102). The President intended to have informal consultations with the Chairmen of the regional groups and with the members of the Council as soon as possible. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council agreed to that procedure.

It was so decided.

10. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) said that every effort should be made to speed up progress in the revitalization of the Economic and Social Council in the interest of all States Members of the United Nations. His delegation was prepared to assist the President of the Council in the consultations which were to take place.

11. Mr. RUMECI (Burundi) inquired whether footnote 1 of document E/1982/L.14 implied that delegations would not be able to comment on the report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees before the report was transmitted to the General Assembly.

12. The PRESIDENT said that there would be a debate on the report in question if one or more of the members of the Council so requested. All members, of course, would be free to make such a request.

13. Mr. SUEDI (Observer for the United Republic of Tanzania) said, with regard to item 7, entitled "Regional co-operation", of the proposed agenda of the second regular session of 1982, that one of the topics the Council would be discussing was the implications of the restructuring process for the regional commissions. The list of documents to be before the Council on the restructuring question included the comments of the Secretary-General on the Joint Inspection Unit report on the relationships between the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation and entities of the United Nations Secretariat.¹ He asked the Secretariat to indicate whether, in view of the changes that had occurred in the offices of both the Secretary-General and the Director-General in the meantime, delegations could expect a revision of that document.

14. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Council) said that the documents were listed pursuant to Assembly resolution 36/187. The Assembly in that resolution had specifically transmitted to the Council, for consideration at its second regular session of 1982, the report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of General Assembly resolution 35/203² and the comments of the Secretary-General on the report of the Joint Inspection Unit on the relationships between the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation and entities of the United Nations Secretariat.¹ Of course, it would be redundant to state that at the time those reports were considered by the Council, the Secretary-General might wish, if he deemed it necessary, to provide the Council with supplementary information.

The meeting rose at 11.35 a.m.

¹ A/36/419/Add.1

² A/36/477

4th meeting

Friday, 5 February 1982, at 3.25 p.m.

President: Mr. Miljan KOMATINA (Yugoslavia).

E/1982/SR.4

In the absence of the President, Mr. Kamanda wa Kamanda (Zaire), Vice-President, took the chair.

AGENDA ITEM 5

Elections to subsidiary bodies of the Council and confirmation of representatives on the functional commissions (E/1982/2, E/1982/5 and Add.1 and 2, E/1982/8, E/1982/9)

COMMITTEE FOR DEVELOPMENT PLANNING (E/1982/8)

1. The PRESIDENT said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to appoint Mr. Robert Cassen (United Kingdom), the candidate nominated by the Secretary-General in document E/1982/8 as a member of the Committee for Development Planning for a term beginning on the date of appointment and expiring on 31 December 1983.

*It was so decided.**

INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL BOARD (E/1982/9)

2. The PRESIDENT said that if there was no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to waive the requirement of setting up a Committee on Candidatures and to elect by secret ballot a member of the International Narcotics Control Board for a period beginning on the date of the election and ending on 1 March 1985.

It was so decided.

3. The PRESIDENT said that, in response to the invitation by the Secretary-General,¹ the World Health Organization had nominated two candidates for election to the Board, Professor John C. Ebie (Nigeria) and Dr. Hamdy El-Hakim (Egypt).

At the invitation of the President, Miss Ford (Canada) and Miss Zanabria (Peru) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

<i>Number of ballot papers:</i>	52
<i>Invalid ballots:</i>	0
<i>Number of valid ballots:</i>	52
<i>Abstentions:</i>	2
<i>Number of members voting:</i>	50
<i>Required majority:</i>	26
<i>Number of votes obtained:</i>	
Mr. Ebie	26
Mr. El-Hakim	24

*Having obtained the required majority, Mr. John C. Ebie was elected a member of the International Narcotics Control Board.**

COMMITTEE ON NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS (E/1982/2)

4. The PRESIDENT said that in the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations there were vacancies for one member from the group of Asian States, two members from the group of Latin American States and three members from the group of African States. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to elect Cyprus and Nicaragua and postpone the elections to fill the remaining vacancies to the first regular session for 1982.

*It was so decided.**

COMMISSION ON TRANSNATIONAL CORPORATIONS (E/1982/2)

5. The PRESIDENT said that in the Commission on Transnational Corporations there were vacancies for three members from the group of Asian States. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to elect the Republic of Korea and postpone the elections to fill the remaining vacancies to the first regular session for 1982.

*It was so decided.**

COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES (E/1982/2)

6. The PRESIDENT suggested that since there were no candidates for the vacancies in the Committee on Natural Resources, the election of four members from the group of Asian States should be postponed to the first regular session for 1982.

*It was so decided.**

Ad Hoc INTERGOVERNMENTAL WORKING GROUP OF EXPERTS ON INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS OF ACCOUNTING AND REPORTING

7. The PRESIDENT suggested that, since there were no candidates for the vacancies in the Ad Hoc Intergovernmental Working Group of Experts on International Standards of Accounting and Reporting, the election of two members from the group of Eastern European States should be postponed to the first regular session for 1982.

*It was so decided.**

CONFIRMATION OF REPRESENTATIVES ON THE FUNCTIONAL COMMISSIONS (E/1982/5 AND ADD.1 AND 2)

8. The PRESIDENT said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to confirm the appointment of the representatives on the Statistical Commission, the Population Commission, the Commission for Social Development, the Commission on Human Rights and the Commission on the Status of Women listed in document E/1982/5 and Add.1 and 2.

*It was so decided.**

* See decision 1982/108.

¹ See E/1981/119.

PREPARATORY SUB-COMMITTEE FOR THE SECOND WORLD CONFERENCE TO COMBAT RACISM AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

9. The PRESIDENT said that with regard to the letter of 15 December 1981 from the President of the Council for that year to the Secretary-General,² he would continue his efforts with a view to completing the membership of the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, if possible before its first meeting, scheduled to be held in New York from 15 to 26 March 1982.

AGENDA ITEM 2

Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters (concluded) (E/1982/2 and Add.1)

10. The PRESIDENT urged, on behalf of the Council, that the session of the Interim Committee on New and Renewable Sources of Energy should be held during the first half of June in order to enable the Secretariat to have the report prepared and issued in time for consideration by the Council at its second regular session of 1982.

(b) Action by intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations with respect to Namibia

11. The PRESIDENT said that the Bureau, having held further consultations concerning the membership of Namibia, represented by the United Nations Council for Namibia, in the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, recommended to the Council the following draft decision:

"The Economic and Social Council decides to defer until its first regular session of 1982, for final consideration and decision, the question concerning the membership of Namibia, represented by the United Nations Council for Namibia, in the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, in pursuance of the request made by the General Assembly in its resolution 36/121 D of 10 December 1981."

If there was no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt that draft decision.

It was so decided (see decision 1982/104).

12. The PRESIDENT suggested that the question be examined in relation to item 1 (Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters) of the provisional agenda for the first regular session of 1982.

It was so decided (see decision 1982/104).

² E/1981/120.

(e) Appointment of members of the Sessional Working Group of Governmental Experts on the Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

13. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Council) said that the President would inform members of the Council of his appointments of members of the Sessional Working Group of Governmental Experts on the Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights after he had received the nominations from all regional groups.

14. Mr. KAABACHI (Tunisia) said that the group of African States had completed consultations on the matter and had informed the Secretariat of its candidates.

15. Mr. PLECHKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the group of Eastern European States had also completed consultations and informed the Secretariat of its candidates. He requested the Council to proceed in the same way as it had done in filling vacancies in other bodies.

16. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Council) said that the Secretariat had received nominations from the group of Eastern European States, the group of African States and the group of Western European and other States. However, since no elections were involved, there should be no problem in waiting a little longer so that the President could inform the Secretary-General of all his appointments in a single letter. He hoped that there would be no objections to that procedure.

AGENDA ITEM 6

Provisional agenda for the first regular session of 1982 and organizational matters (E/1982/L.15)

17. The PRESIDENT recalled the Council's decision at its second regular session of 1981 to allocate to the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, from the resources available to the Council, six meetings during the first regular session of 1982 for the purpose of reviewing the quadrennial reports of non-governmental organizations. The Council might accordingly wish to hold one meeting on 13 April 1982 for the consideration and adoption of its agenda and other organizational matters and resume its work on 19 April.

18. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Council approved the list of questions on the provisional agenda for its first regular session of 1982 (E/1982/L.15).

It was so decided (decision 1982/109).

Closure of the session

19. The PRESIDENT declared the organizational session of the Council for 1982 closed.

The meeting rose at 4 p.m.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

FIRST REGULAR SESSION, 1982

Summary records of the 5th to 29th plenary meetings, held at Headquarters, New York, from 13 April to 7 May 1982

5th meeting

Tuesday, 13 April 1982, at 11.20 a.m.

President: Mr. Miljan KOMATINA (Yugoslavia).

E/1982/SR.5

Opening of the session

1. The PRESIDENT declared open the first regular session of the Economic and Social Council for 1982.

Statement by the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation

2. Mr. RIPERT (Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation) said that the current recession in the world economy was, in its severity and length, unprecedented in the post-war period. Decelerating since 1978, the growth of world output had been a mere 1.3 per cent in 1981. In the developed market countries, slow economic growth, rising unemployment and persistently high inflation had led to restrictions on trade and investment and on the transfer of resources abroad. Many developing countries, confronted with the increasing cost of imports, diminishing export incomes, escalating debt burdens and a tight reserve situation, had no alternative but to reduce their overall economic activity. For the first time since the wave of decolonization and political independence, the per capita gross domestic product of developing countries had fallen in 1981, and it was likely to decline further in 1982.

3. Such adverse economic trends had an immediate and direct bearing on the social situation. Although affluence did not by itself ensure social well-being, scarcity made it still more difficult to attain. Poverty, in both absolute and relative terms, was probably increasing as real wages stagnated or declined and public expenditures and resources for social services were reduced. The inability of many developing countries to invest adequate resources in basic infrastructure and essential services adversely affected their prospects for growth and development. Many of those countries were forced to limit their imports to such basic items as food and energy commodities, and encountered serious difficulties in mobilizing resources for investment in priority economic sectors. As a result, investment in social areas would tend to receive much less attention.

4. The likelihood of achieving the goals of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations

Development Decade¹ was seriously compromised by the world economic crisis. It was estimated that, in the developing countries alone, 300 million young people were seeking jobs. There was the prospect that 16 per cent of all young people aged 15 to 24 in the area of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development would be jobless by the summer of 1982—3.5 per cent more than in 1981 and 5.7 per cent above the 1979 youth unemployment level.

5. Although slow growth had had an adverse impact on the economies of the world, the structural problems affecting trade, raw materials, energy, money and finance would not be dispelled by more rapid growth alone.

6. Concerted efforts to reverse the trend towards erosion of international co-operation and new approaches to reform of the existing international economic system were necessary if the developing countries were to expand fast enough to provide a modest increase in per capita income over the coming decade. An important step would be the launching of global negotiations, in which it was to be hoped that both interdependence among groups of countries and interrelationships among various sectors of international co-operation would be taken into account. It was indeed unfortunate that the will to co-operate had been flagging at a time when the need and scope for it had increased. The Economic and Social Council would consider those issues at its second regular session of 1982 with a view to assessing the situation and recommending possible approaches and solutions.

7. It was essential that the difficulties caused by the magnitude of the economic recession and the limitations of policies adopted in the effort to control it should not be a justification of the *status quo*, and should not lead to an attitude of helplessness towards the marginalized and underprivileged. There was a real danger that such difficulties would encourage an existing tendency to look exclu-

¹ General Assembly resolution 35/56, annex, sect. II

sively at the economic dimension of development. Experience had shown that an important aspect of self-sustained development was the development of human resources. Income, distribution and employment were not products but determinants of growth, and there was every indication that gains from economic growth could not be sustained or consolidated if unaccompanied by efforts to promote equal distribution of its benefits. Improved levels of health and nutrition, education and training, science and technology, urban and rural housing were not only important in their own right, but were also key factors throughout the production process.

8. The issues of participation and institutional development were increasingly important. There was a growing demand for participation by groups and individuals in the decisions that shaped the distribution of power and the evolution of societies. Such a trend was exemplified by the extraordinary revolution which was changing perceptions of the status of women and thus altering all forms of social organization.

9. Although the responsibility for promoting development rested with national Governments, it was the task of the United Nations system to mobilize resources and expertise to enable countries to resolve the numerous problems associated with development. An important aspect of that responsibility was the organization of international years and conferences and the analysis of trends and issues of international concern in the effort to arouse public awareness and to promote international co-operation, particularly among developing countries.

10. It was in the context of such issues that efforts to "revitalize" the Council and to provide a more effective focus for the Council's deliberations acquired considerable significance. The Secretary-General had stated at the organizational session for 1982 (1st meeting, para. 4) that he was determined to assist the Council in enhancing the effectiveness of its operations, and had already taken measures to limit and streamline documentation with that aim in view.

11. Some of the practical difficulties were indicated in the note submitted by the Secretary-General (E/1982/28) pursuant to paragraph 4 of Council resolution 1981/83 and decision 1982/103. It was generally recognized that, despite several resolutions and decisions to the contrary, the number of items on the Council's agenda and the number of documents before it had continued to proliferate. The note by the Secretary-General contained some proposals for consideration by the Council as an initial step towards progressively enhancing the efficiency of its work.

12. It was suggested, for example, that all reports on subjects within the purview of an established subsidiary body should, in the first instance, be submitted to that body. Subsidiary bodies should draw the attention of the Economic and Social Council and/or the General Assembly to specific issues requiring their consideration. The documentation and programme of work of subsidiary bodies or those of the Council and the Assembly should also be streamlined to enable them to perform their functions effectively. The task of streamlining the agenda and documentation should be continued in the coming months as a co-operative effort by the Council and the Secretariat. Some existing legislative mandates concerning the cycle of meetings, reporting procedures and requests for documentation would therefore have to be reviewed.

AGENDA ITEM 1

Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters (E/1982/30 and Add.1, E/1982/44, E/1982/L.17, E/1982/L.20)

13. The PRESIDENT drew the Council's attention to a letter dated 30 March 1982 from the Permanent Representative of Madagascar addressed to the Secretary-General (E/1982/44) concerning a request for the inclusion of a supplementary item in the agenda of the first regular session of the Council in 1982, entitled "Measures to be taken following the cyclones and floods which have affected Madagascar". As indicated in paragraph 4 of the note by the Bureau (E/1982/L.20), it was recommended that this question should be considered under item 3 of the provisional agenda (Special economic, humanitarian and disaster relief assistance).

14. Mrs. CASTRO de BARISH (Observer for Costa Rica) said that her delegation had submitted the item on the International Year of Peace and International Day of Peace for consideration at the current session of the Council. Time was needed for consultations with other delegations on the question, and she therefore suggested that its discussion in the Council should be postponed until the third week of the session.

15. The PRESIDENT said that the timetable for consideration of items would be discussed in connection with the question of the organization of the Council's work, but that the Costa Rican delegation's request had been duly noted.

16. Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation attached great importance to questions relating to the organization of the Council's work, in that proper organization would determine the success of the session. The matter had already been carefully considered at the organizational session, at which Council decision 1982/100, on the basic programme of work for 1982 and 1983, had been adopted. His delegation had supported that decision, and was therefore disturbed to see from the note by the Bureau (E/1982/L.20) that it was proposed to replace item 8 of the provisional agenda (Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights), by two new subitems entitled "Consideration of the report of the Sessional Working Group of Governmental Experts on the Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights" and "Review of the composition, organization and administrative arrangements of the Sessional Working Group".

17. As was indicated in document E/1982/30, the two latter questions were already covered by the item on implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. It was therefore necessary to amend item 8 as presented in document E/1982/L.20 in order to bring its wording into line with Council decision 1982/100.

18. His delegation did not believe that the item on narcotic drugs should be allocated to the plenary meetings. The item had traditionally been considered by the Second (Social) Committee, as was envisaged in Council decision 1982/100, and his delegation took the view that existing practice should be adhered to in that respect.

19. He did not agree with the suggestion in paragraph 18 of document E/1982/L.20, as it failed to conform to the provision in General Assembly resolution 36/132 stating that the report should be submitted to the Assembly through the Economic and Social Council, rather than directly.

20. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt the provisional agenda contained in document E/1982/30 and Add.1, on the understanding that the question relating to the proposed supplementary item, concerning measures to be taken following the cyclones and floods which had affected Madagascar, would be considered under item 3 (Special economic, humanitarian and disaster relief assistance).

It was so decided.

21. The PRESIDENT pointed out that, in accordance with Council resolution 1979/69 of 2 August 1979, the Secretariat had circulated as document E/1982/L.17 a note on the state of preparedness of documentation for the session and invited the Secretary of the Council to provide supplementary information concerning the availability of documentation.

22. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Council) said that, out of a total of 54 documents before the Council, 24 were to be considered by the Council itself and 30 by the Sessional Working Group of Governmental Experts on the Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. The 30 documents for consideration by the Working Group included 11 documents issued previously in 1978 and 1980, and 19 new documents. As far as the 24 documents for consideration by the Council itself were concerned, 22 documents had not been issued six weeks before the opening of the session, 10 of which were reports of intergovernmental or expert bodies; as those bodies had only just concluded their work, their documents were still in the processing stage. A total of eight documents for consideration by the Council still remained to be issued: (a) report on assistance to refugees in Somalia, to be issued on 15 April; (b) report on the situation of refugees in the Sudan, which had been submitted only in the last 24 hours, to be issued before item 3 came up for consideration by the Council; (c) report of the Commission on Human Rights on its thirty-eighth session, to be issued on 22 April, although the note by the Secretary-General submitting a draft Plan of Action on the provision of expert services in the field of human rights to Equatorial Guinea, originally intended to be circulated under the symbol E/1982/29, would not be issued separately, and the initial draft submitted by the Secretary-General to the Commission on Human Rights would be made available to the Council; (d) report of the Secretary-General on measures to be taken against all totalitarian or other ideologies and practices, being sent by pouch from Geneva; (e) report of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group of Experts of the Commission on Human Rights on allegations of infringements of trade union rights in the Republic of South Africa, only received in the past 24 hours from the Division of Human Rights; (f) report of the Commission on the Status of Women on its twenty-ninth session, to be issued on 15 April; (g) comments of the Secretary-General in connection with the report of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on the Social Aspects of the Development Activities of the United Nations, to be issued on 14 April; (h) report of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs on its seventh special session, to be issued on 16 April.

23. Mr. LOUET (France) said that he wished to convey his delegation's grave misgivings over paragraph 12 of document E/1982/L.20. The decision taken by the Bureau to authorize the Secretariat to suspend the rule for the simultaneous distribution of documents with effect from 5 April was absolutely contrary to a resolution which had been sponsored by all the language groups and adopted by consensus by the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session. He was referring to resolution 36/117 B, which stipulated that "documents shall be given effective simulta-

neous distribution in sufficient time in the official and working languages of the organs of the United Nations". In view of the conclusions to be drawn from any failure to comply with a General Assembly resolution which was binding on the Council, France would be reluctant to take part in any discussions or proceedings for which the necessary documents were not available simultaneously in the official and working languages of the Council.

24. Mr. KAABACHI (Tunisia) said that, while it welcomed the fact that the question regarding the inclusion of Arabic among the official languages of the Council had been placed on the agenda for the current session as part of item 1, his delegation shared the concern expressed by the representative of France and considered that the decision taken by the Bureau to suspend the rule for the simultaneous distribution of documents in all the required languages should be reviewed. However, an acceptable though temporary solution to the difficulties experienced by the Secretariat in producing all documents within the required time-limits in the official and working languages would be for documents to be distributed simultaneously in French and English, provided it was regarded as an exceptional measure pending more detailed consideration of the matter by the Council.

25. Mr. STEVENS (Belgium) said that his delegation wished to associate itself with the stand taken by the representatives of France and Tunisia over the Bureau's decision. Failure to comply with General Assembly resolution 36/117 B on the issuing of documents in the working and official languages of the United Nations constituted a breach of the principle of equal access to documents and facilities, whose purpose was to ensure that all delegations could participate on the same footing in the proceedings and thereby defend their legitimate interests.

26. Mr. SHEDOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that his delegation endorsed the opposition of earlier speakers to, on the one hand, the proposal made in paragraph 1 of document E/1982/L.20 for item 12 (Narcotic drugs) of the provisional agenda to be considered in plenary meeting and, on the other, the decision taken by the Bureau, as stated in paragraph 12 of the same document, to waive the simultaneous distribution of documents in all the required languages of the Council. Not only did the Bureau's decision run counter to the decisions of both the Council and the General Assembly, but moreover it had already become effective on 5 April without the necessary approval of the Council. Since the effectiveness of the Council's work depended to a large extent on delegations being able to study the documents before each meeting, the Secretariat should take all the necessary steps to overcome the difficulties that hampered the simultaneous distribution of documents in the required languages.

27. Mr. CALLE y CALLE (Peru) said that his delegation fully shared the misgivings expressed by previous speakers, particularly since Peru had been one of the sponsors of General Assembly resolution 36/117 B on the simultaneous distribution of documents in the different languages of the United Nations and since the Spanish-speaking countries, in conjunction with other language groups, appeared to be placed at a disadvantage as a result of not only careless translation but also delays in the distribution of documents. The decision of the Bureau must therefore be opposed and the Secretariat should make every effort to issue the pre-session documentation at the same time in all the official and working languages of the Council.

28. Mr. MI Guojun (China), observing that the work of his delegation had in the past been affected by difficulties

similar to those mentioned by the representative of Peru, trusted that the decision of the Bureau not to comply with the decisions of the Council or the General Assembly would be reversed and that the Secretariat would solve current problems which interfered with the distribution of documents.

29. The PRESIDENT said that the Bureau, while being fully aware of the necessity of complying with General Assembly resolution 36/117 B and the decisions of the Council, had come to an internal agreement, not to be equated with a formal decision, designed to overcome the serious practical difficulties encountered by the Secretariat, with the sole purpose of assisting delegations in their work and on the strict understanding that no agenda items would be discussed until all the necessary documents were made available simultaneously in all the required languages.

30. He proposed that discussion of the matter should be deferred to the informal consultations to be held by the Council on the control and limitation of documentation and on the revitalization of the Council in the hope that by then a clearer picture would have emerged of the measures needed to overcome the difficulties facing the Secretariat.

It was so decided.

31. The PRESIDENT asked if there were any further comments on the organization of the work of the session and, in particular, on the proposals made by the representatives of the Soviet Union and Costa Rica.

32. Mr. CLARK (United States of America) said that since there had been a number of suggestions, he wondered if they could first be discussed by the Bureau, without delaying the work of the Council.

33. The PRESIDENT said that the Bureau had submitted its suggestions in document E/1982/L.20 and could not make other recommendations, although it was able and willing to confer with interested parties. It was now for the Council to decide.

34. Mr. KASEMSRI (Thailand) said that if item 12 was allocated to the Second (Social) Committee, as proposed by the Soviet representative, it was not clear how its consideration would fit into the timetable. He wondered if the President or the Soviet representative could clarify matters.

35. Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the item on narcotic drugs had always been considered in the Second Committee and not in plenary meeting. In his delegation's view, that was totally justified. There was no reason whatsoever to change the established practice. If it was a question of it being inconvenient for any official to attend at a given time, it should be remembered that the Council also had its problems and officials should arrange their time to fit in with its schedules.

36. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Council) said that, as he recalled, the names of the committees had been changed in the early 1970s to enable the work of the Council to proceed more flexibly. Agenda items were not always allocated in the same way but could be considered either in plenary meeting or in committee. The item on narcotic drugs had been allocated to the Second (Social) Committee but had not always been discussed there, if his memory was correct.

37. Mr. KAABACHI (Tunisia) wondered if there was any particular importance in having the problem considered in plenary meeting.

38. The PRESIDENT said that there was no political background to the change and only the time factor was involved.

39. Mr. CLARK (United States of America) said that, in view of the practical problem of completing the Council's work in the time available, he was sure that the need to allocate that time as efficiently as possible was uppermost in everybody's mind. He hoped that sufficient time could be found to ensure the proper examination of all items on the agenda.

40. The PRESIDENT said it had been agreed that consideration of the question raised by Costa Rica should remain open so as to allow consultations before a decision was taken. He understood that the Soviet Union was insisting on its proposal that the item on narcotic drugs should be considered in the Second Committee. Unless there was any objection, he would take it that the Council agreed, on the understanding that the Bureau and Council would make every effort to ensure full discussion of the item in the Second Committee.

41. Mr. CLARK (United States of America) asked for time for consultation.

42. The PRESIDENT agreed to allow time for consultation and asked the Soviet representative meanwhile to explain once again his position on the point concerning consideration of agenda item 8 (Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights).

43. Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that at earlier sessions the Council had decided to discuss an item entitled "Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights", and that wording was used in the provisional agenda for the current session. It followed logically that in documents referring to the organization of the Council's work the agenda item should be formulated in the same way; his delegation could see no cause for changing the wording.

44. Mr. STEVENS (Belgium) said he gathered that the Soviet delegation had difficulty in accepting the wording used by the Bureau in its note on the organization of the work of the session (E/1982/L.20). But the agenda and the organization of work were not precisely the same thing. While the title of the agenda item was clear, the Bureau sometimes used documents on the organization of work to indicate what the Council needed to do. This time, for example, agenda item 1 was broken down into a number of subitems while items 9 to 11 were grouped together. So far as item 8 was concerned, its division into two separate headings in the organization of work indicated the Bureau's view that, while the Sessional Working Group of Governmental Experts had a clear mandate to help the Council in its consideration of the item on the implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the question of reviewing the composition, organization and administrative arrangements of the Sessional Working Group itself was a matter for the Council in plenary meeting. His delegation had no problem in accepting that point of view.

45. Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation could not understand why the subject for discussion under agenda item 8 in the note on the organization of work (E/1982/L.20) should be formulated differently from the Council agenda item itself. All other agenda items were worded identically in the paper on the organization of work and that was the generally accepted practice in the United Nations. If the wording of agenda items was changed when they were referred to committees for consideration, there could be far-reaching implications.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.

6th meeting

Tuesday, 13 April 1982, at 3.40 p.m.

President: Mr. Miljan KOMATINA (Yugoslavia).

E/1982/SR.6

AGENDA ITEM 13

Elections

1. The PRESIDENT said that four vacancies existed in the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations for a term beginning on the date of election and expiring on 31 December 1982: one from the group of Latin American States and three from the group of African States. The group of Latin American States had proposed Costa Rica and the group of African States had proposed the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Nigeria and Zaire to fill the vacancies.
2. He suggested that those States should be elected members of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations by acclamation for the term he had mentioned.

It was so decided (decision 1982/126).

AGENDA ITEM 1

Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters (*continued*) (E/1982/30 and Add.1, E/1982/L.20)

3. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to resume consideration of the organization of its work and drew attention to the schedule of work proposed for the first regular session of 1982. The representative of the Soviet Union had proposed that item 12 (Narcotic drugs) should be considered in the Second (Social) Committee and not in plenary meeting as recommended by the Bureau. He asked whether there were any comments on that proposal.
4. Mr. CLARK (United States of America) said the Bureau had recommended that item 12 should be considered in plenary meeting because it had felt that that was the quickest and most efficient way of dealing with it.
5. He appreciated the Soviet delegation's point that, as the item was traditionally considered in the Second Committee, it should once again be allocated to that Committee. However, his delegation wished to point out that the question of narcotic drugs had already been considered in plenary meeting at some previous sessions and that the Council was responsible for deciding what was the most appropriate and efficient way of performing its work. As the Bureau had opted for consideration in plenary meeting, he felt that the Council should do the same. He therefore urged the Soviet delegation to bear in mind that the Bureau had been trying to facilitate the Council's work and make it more efficient.
6. Mr. MORDEN (Canada) pointed out that the Second Committee's schedule of work was extremely heavy and it would therefore be very difficult to allocate the narcotics item to it, as proposed by the Soviet delegation. As a member of the Bureau, he had helped to draft the recommendation that item 2 should be considered in plenary meeting, which he considered a reasonable decision.
7. Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said it would not be the first time that the Second Committee and the Council had considered the question of narcotic drugs when their schedules of work were already

overloaded. The Second Committee had considered the item on narcotics in 1980 and 1981 and had performed its task competently and efficiently. There was therefore no reason to depart from established practice.

8. The PRESIDENT noted that the Council was deadlocked and urged delegations to find a compromise solution.

9. Mr. KOSTOV (Bulgaria) said that he too attached great importance to the efficiency of the Council's work; nevertheless, he wished to make a few comments. He had himself been Chairman of the Second Committee in 1980, when it had had a heavier schedule of work than it currently had but had had no difficulty in finishing by the established deadline.

10. A decision to transfer an item from a subsidiary organ to plenary meetings of the Council should be taken only for compelling reasons and not merely on grounds of efficiency in the Council's work or availability of personnel. In the present case, his delegation saw no justification for allocating the item on narcotic drugs to plenary meetings and proposed that the Council should maintain the established practice.

11. The PRESIDENT noted the Soviet proposal that the report of the Secretary-General on the international campaign against traffic in drugs should be submitted to the General Assembly through the Council at its second regular session, and suggested that the matter should be taken up by the Second (Social) Committee during its consideration of item 12.

It was so decided.

12. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the Soviet proposal that the wording of item 8, as it appeared in the proposed schedule of work annexed to document E/1982/L.20, should be replaced by the following title: "Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights".

13. Mr. BORCHARD (Federal Republic of Germany) said that he supported the statements made by the representative of Belgium at the preceding meeting on the Soviet delegation's suggestions regarding item 8.

14. However, he would like to mention a few points. In its decision 1981/162 of 8 May 1981, the Council, having considered the report of the Sessional Working Group of Governmental Experts on the Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, had decided to review the composition, organization and administrative arrangements of the Group at its first regular session of 1982, because it had not been completely satisfied with the recommendations made by the Working Group in that regard in 1981. Accordingly, in its decision 1981/160, the Economic and Social Council had adopted the provisional agenda for 1982 of the Sessional Working Group without renewing its mandate with regard to the review process.

15. The basic programme of work for 1982 had been approved by the Council at its organizational session for 1982 (decision 1982/100). In that programme, the item "Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights" had been allocated to

the Sessional Working Group of Governmental Experts. That, however, did not mean that the review of the composition, organization and administrative arrangements of the Working Group should be considered again by the Group. That would be pointless, and the subject should be discussed by the Council in plenary meeting, as indicated in the note by the Bureau (E/1982/L.20). In fact, there was no specific mandate in that regard for the Group, whose only mandate was to assist the Council in the consideration of the reports submitted by States parties to the Covenant in accordance with Council resolution 1988 (XL).

16. His delegation did not consider it appropriate to change the wording of item 8 as it appeared in the proposed schedule of work for the first regular session of 1982, because in its current form it clearly outlined the two tasks the Council had before it in plenary meeting, namely, consideration of the report of the Sessional Working Group and review of the composition, organization and administrative arrangements of the Group.

17. Mr. FLAKSTAD (Norway) said that essentially he approved of the ideas expressed by the representatives of the Federal Republic of Germany and Belgium. He was in favour of retaining the wording of item 8 as currently set forth in the proposed schedule of work, i.e. divided into two subitems, in accordance with Council decisions 1981/160 and 1981/162.

18. It was clear from decision 1981/160, on the provisional agenda for 1982 of the Working Group, that at the current session the Group should confine itself to considering reports submitted by States parties to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

19. Mr. ZUCCONI (Italy) said that while sharing the views expressed by the representatives of the Federal Republic of Germany and Norway, he felt that the adoption of the agenda should not prevent the Council itself, when considering the schedule of work, from clarifying the items on the agenda.

20. In the case of item 8, it should be remembered that in paragraph 6 of resolution 36/58, the General Assembly had taken due note of Council decision 1981/162 concerning the future review of the composition, organization and administrative arrangements of the Sessional Working Group on the Implementation of the Covenant and stated that it was looking forward to further results in that regard at the first regular session of the Council in 1982.

21. Having regard to that resolution, his delegation felt that the proposal of the Bureau to split item 8 into two subitems was appropriate. It would therefore prefer to retain the wording of item 8 as it currently stood in the proposed schedule of work. It was important to make specific mention of the review of the composition, organization and administrative arrangements of the Working Group, since the Council was to report on that subject to the General Assembly.

22. Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) reaffirmed that it was essential to maintain the wording of item 8 as it appeared in the provisional agenda of the Council (E/1982/30), i.e.: "Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights". A title already approved by the Council could not be changed.

23. He recalled that all the previous decisions and resolutions concerning the composition, organization and administrative arrangements of the Sessional Working Group had been adopted by the Council on the basis of recommendations by the Working Group itself. That was the most rational and appropriate procedure: it should

therefore be followed, and the consideration of that question should be entrusted to the Working Group, which would report to the Council.

24. Mr. BOUFANDEAU (France) said that it was the wording of item 8 appearing in document E/1982/L.20 which corresponded most closely to the spirit and letter of the decisions and resolutions mentioned by the representatives of the Federal Republic of Germany, Norway and Italy. His delegation considered that the Council should fulfil its responsibilities and that it was fitting that the Council itself should discuss the question of the composition, organization and administrative arrangements of the Working Group it had established.

25. Mr. LAZAREVIĆ (Yugoslavia) said that, for reasons of principle, there was no need to change the schedule of work adopted at the organizational session, and that in particular the wording of item 8 appearing in the original agenda (E/1982/30) should be retained.

26. The Council should nevertheless take account of its previous decisions and especially decision 1981/162, which stated very clearly that the Council had decided to review the composition, organization and administrative arrangements of the Working Group at its first regular session of 1982.

27. In order to enable the Council to escape from the current impasse and reach a consensus, he proposed that the wording of item 8 adopted at the organizational session should be retained, but that at the same time it should be indicated in the official records of the current session that under that item the Council would consider the report of the Sessional Working Group of Governmental Experts on the Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and review the composition, organization and administrative arrangements of that Group. Furthermore, the agenda which the Council had established for the Sessional Working Group the previous year in its decision 1981/160 did not indicate that the Group should undertake the review of its own composition, organization and administrative arrangements.

28. Mr. LAGOS (Chile) agreed with the Yugoslav delegation that the wording of the items as given in the agenda should be retained, but if the original wording of item 8 was retained, the question of the composition, organization and administrative arrangements of the Sessional Working Group would have to be considered in plenary meeting; that would make it possible to respect the resolutions adopted the previous year by the Council.

29. Referring to Council decision 1981/162, he observed that it was pointless to request the Working Group to submit new proposals on its composition and organization; that should be done by the Council itself.

30. Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted that according to the proposal put forward by the representative of Yugoslavia, the question of the review of the composition, organization and administrative arrangements of the Working Group would be undertaken by the Group itself. In that case, his delegation, in a spirit of compromise, would support the Yugoslav proposal.

31. Mr. LAZAREVIĆ (Yugoslavia) observed that that specific question was not on the agenda of the Working Group. However, he saw no reason why the Working Group, if it had time, should not express its views on that question before the latter was considered in plenary meeting. Nevertheless, the most important thing was to consider the matter in plenary meeting, as provided in Council decision 1981/162.

32. Mr. KOSTOV (Bulgaria) considered that the proposal of the representative of Yugoslavia would make it possible to reach agreement. It would seem important and logical that the question should be studied first by the Working Group itself. Otherwise, it would be difficult to consider in plenary meeting a question which had not been examined by the Working Group, despite the fact that the latter was directly concerned. However, the Working Group was not currently empowered to examine the question. The situation must therefore be clarified: if the Council decided that the question should first be examined by the Working Group, that point should be embodied in the agreement.

33. Mr. AKAO (Japan) said that the Working Group, of which he was a member, had devoted many hours to the examination of the question currently under consideration. He therefore hoped that the Council would be able to decide quickly what the Working Group was to do. The basic problem seemed to arise from the difference of interpretation of decision 1981/162 and documents E/1982/30 and E/1982/L.20. He therefore wondered whether an opinion from the Legal Counsel might not clarify the situation.

34. Mr. SHELDON (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said he wished to approach the question from the angle of the efficiency of the work and ways of enhancing that efficiency. The title of agenda item 8 as adopted by the Council was very precise. There could therefore be no question of expressing a preference for one form of wording or another: the wording in the annex to document E/1982/L.20 could not differ from that in the agenda adopted by the Council.

35. With regard to the consideration of the question itself, i.e. the implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, it would be interesting to hear the views of the governmental experts who were members of the Sessional Working Group, an authoritative body, on the questions raised at the current meeting. If the Council did not take account of the views of those experts it would undoubtedly waste a great deal of time.

36. That being so, his delegation considered that the proposed agenda should be retained and that the Council could consider under agenda item 8 the questions deriving from earlier decisions. He recalled that in his statement at the preceding meeting the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation had stated that the Council must be efficient; that was indeed the crux of the matter.

37. Mr. MORDEN (Canada) considered that the suggestion of the Yugoslav delegation, which was quite clear, provided a way of escaping from the impasse in which the Council was currently trapped.

38. In 1981, his delegation had participated in the formulation of what had become Council decision 1981/162 because it considered that the recommendations submitted by the Working Group were inadequate.

39. It was interesting to note that although the Working Group had been given no mandate to review its composition, organization and administrative arrangements under decision 1981/162, it had devoted a great deal of time to that question, time which could more usefully have been devoted to helping the Council to monitor the implementation of the Covenant.

40. His delegation would nevertheless agree, in a spirit of compromise, that the Working Group should submit additional comments to the Council. It would have ample time to do so, since according to document E/1982/L.20 the question of the composition, organization and administrative arrangements of the Working Group would not be taken

up until the fourth week of the session. It should be emphasized, however, that it was for the Council, and not the Working Group, to study that aspect of agenda item 8, and that although the Council might decide to consider the comments of the Group it was none the less necessary for the Council itself to examine the question, whether the Group submitted comments or not.

41. Mr. LAZAREVIĆ (Yugoslavia) thought that the Council was getting closer to a solution and that the last part of the Canadian representative's remarks to the effect that the Working Group should submit its comments to the Council before the latter took up the question of the Group's composition and organization in accordance with decision 1981/162 was along the same lines as the Soviet delegation's suggestion.

42. The PRESIDENT, summarizing the discussion, said that he saw no problem in reinserting the title of agenda item 8 ("Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights"), which appeared in document E/1982/30, in the annex to document E/1982/L.20. Moreover, the title which appeared in document E/1982/L.20 could be made into subitems (a) and (b).

43. There was a third point in the Yugoslav proposal, namely that when the Sessional Working Group had concluded consideration of the items on its agenda given in Council decision 1981/162, it could also go ahead to discuss its composition, organization and administrative arrangements.

44. To make allowance for all those factors, the Council might decide to take up the question of the International Covenant in plenary meeting beginning on 3 May.

45. Replying to a question from the representative of Japan, he explained that after the Working Group had completed its programme of work, it could also submit recommendations.

46. Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the idea introduced by the word "after" had not been in the Yugoslav and Canadian proposals. There was of course no reason why the Council could not discuss the recommendations of the Sessional Working Group, but it would complicate matters to establish a time schedule.

47. The PRESIDENT said that the Council would take up agenda item 8 in plenary meeting beginning on 3 May. Prior to that date, the Working Group, if it had time, could make recommendations on its composition, organization and administrative arrangements, as proposed by the representative of Yugoslavia.

48. Mr. LAZAREVIĆ (Yugoslavia) said that the two questions, namely consideration of the report of the Working Group and consideration of its composition, organization and administrative arrangements should be considered under item 8. If it had time, the Working Group should make recommendations to the Council before 3 May.

49. The PRESIDENT suggested that the title of item 8 ("Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights") should be placed on the agenda and that the Council should consider in relation to this item the questions mentioned in document E/1982/L.20, it being understood that if it had time, the Working Group would submit to the Council its views on the Group's composition, organization and administrative arrangements. The Council would then take up item 8, in accordance with Council decision 1981/162, the week of 3 to 7 May.

50. Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he did not think the Council was close to a consensus which would enable it to get ahead with its work.

The phrase "if it had time" was not conducive to a consensus. The Bureau could perhaps hold consultations with a view to reaching a decision acceptable to all delegations.

51. The PRESIDENT said that if the phrase "if it had time" was the only problem the Soviet delegation had with the proposal, it could be deleted in the interest of arriving at a consensus.

52. Mr. BORCHARD (Federal Republic of Germany) pointed out that the country reports would be considered by the Working Group on specific dates and that the countries concerned had already sent or were going to send experts to present the reports. Consequently, the consensus in the Council on the President's suggestion should not affect the Working Group's schedule of work.

53. Mr. FURLAND (United Kingdom) said that if the phrase "if it had time" presented insurmountable difficulties for some delegations, it could be replaced by a clause reading: "On the understanding that this should not prejudice or interfere with the Working Group's completion of its established agenda".

54. Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he was not entirely satisfied because he felt that the question the Working Group was to consider was extremely important. However, he had no objections to the United Kingdom proposal.

55. Mr. BORCHARD (Federal Republic of Germany) also endorsed the United Kingdom proposal.

56. The PRESIDENT said he would consider that the Council approved his suggestion, along with the modification proposed by the representative of the United Kingdom.

It was so decided.

57. Mr. LAZAREVIĆ (Yugoslavia), referring to item 12 (Narcotic drugs), said that the Second (Social) Committee, which already had quite a heavy agenda, should not be overburdened. However, the Yugoslav delegation attached great importance to the item and proposed that the President and the Bureau should consult with the representatives of the regional groups to resolve the issue, on the understanding, however, that the Council should have enough time, either in plenary meeting or in the sessional Committees, to consider that important question.

58. Mr. HEPBURN (Bahamas) recalled that his Government was very concerned about the question. Since the Council had already taken a decision on item 12, he saw no reason to revert to it. It would be best for item 12 to be considered in plenary meeting.

59. Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said, in response to a question from the President, that a compromise formula was still required and he therefore agreed with the suggestion of the delegation of Yugoslavia.

60. The PRESIDENT said that, according to its schedule of work, the Council was to consider item 2 (Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination) on 19 April. The Bureau had noted that the established practice was to alternate plenary meetings and those of the Second (Social) Committee during consideration of that item. In view of the heavy agenda of the Second Committee, and with a view to fully utilizing available services, the Council might wish to consider item 2 in plenary meeting without interrupting the work of the Second Committee.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.

7th meeting

Wednesday, 14 April 1982, at 10.45 a.m.

President: Mr. Miljan KOMATINA (Yugoslavia).

E/1982/SR.7

In the absence of the President, Mr. Morden (Canada), Vice-President, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 1

Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters (continued) (E/1982/30 and Add.1, E/1982/L.20)

1. The PRESIDENT recalled that, at the previous meeting, the matter of the Bureau's recommendation regarding agenda item 12 (Narcotic drugs), as contained in paragraph 1 of document E/1982/L.20, had been left open, pending further consultations with the regional groups, members of the Bureau and interested delegations. Agreement had now been reached to deal with item 12 in the plenary meetings.

2. Mr. CORTI (Argentina) said that at the previous meeting his delegation had been unable to express its views on the consideration of item 2 (Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination), which the Bureau had proposed should be dealt with in plenary meeting at the same time as the Second (Social) Committee

was considering item 10 (Activities for the advancement of women).

3. In that connection, everyone was aware of the efforts being made by the United Nations and the international community to eradicate the scourge of racial discrimination, the most deep-rooted and odious manifestation of any violation of human rights. At its thirty-fifth session, the General Assembly, in resolution 35/33, had proclaimed, *inter alia*, that the elimination of all forms of racism and racial discrimination was a matter of high priority for the international community, and had decided to hold in 1983, as an important event of the Decade, the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. The item was thus of the utmost importance. According to the proposed schedule of work, the Second Committee would be commencing its consideration of the question of the advancement of women, another extremely important item, at the same time. His delegation therefore requested that the tradition observed by the Council in the past should not be changed and that, during the consideration of item 2 in plenary meeting, some means should be found of allowing all delegations to participate actively in the

consideration of an item which should be of the utmost concern to the international community.

4. The PRESIDENT recalled that, in connection with the Council's schedule of work, he had drawn delegations' attention to footnote (c) in the annex to document E/1982/L.20 which indicated that, during the week from 19 to 23 April, the Second (Social) Committee would alternate its meetings with those of the Council, as consideration of item 2 (Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination) would take place in the plenary meetings in accordance with earlier practice. Since various delegations, including that of Argentina, had indicated a preference for the Bureau's suggestion as contained in footnote (c) in the annex to document E/1982/L.20, if he heard no objections,

he would take it that the Council adopted the schedule of work including footnote (c).

It was so decided.

5. The PRESIDENT drew the Council's attention to paragraphs 13 and 14 of the note by the Bureau (E/1982/L.20) regarding statements in explanation of vote and in exercise of the right of reply. The Bureau and delegations were expected to use those proposals as guidelines in order to speed up the Council's work. As a result, if he heard no objections, he would take it that those guidelines were accepted.

The meeting rose at 11 a.m.

8th meeting

Thursday, 15 April 1982, at 10.50 a.m.

President: Mr. Miljan KOMATINA (Yugoslavia).

E/1982/SR.8

In the absence of the President, Mr. Morden (Canada), Vice-President, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 1

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

1. The PRESIDENT asked those delegations wishing to make statements on agenda item 2 (Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination) to notify the Secretariat so that the debate could begin on Monday, 19 April, in the afternoon.

(a) Membership of Namibia, represented by the United Nations Council for Namibia, in the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

2. The PRESIDENT said that, in pursuance of General Assembly resolution 36/121 D, the Council had already had before it the question dealt with as current agenda item 1(a) during the organizational session, at that session under subitem 2(b). By its decision 1982/104, of 5 February 1982, the Council had deferred the question until its first regular session for 1982, for final consideration and decision. He suggested that, since no one had requested to speak on subitem 1(a), its consideration should be postponed until the afternoon of the following day.

It was so decided.

3. Mr. LAZAREVIĆ (Yugoslavia) expressed his concern that no one wished to speak on subitem 1(a), and said he hoped that the sponsors of the question of the membership of Namibia would speak on the matter.

4. The PRESIDENT said that the Council's decision to defer consideration of the item until the current session had been adopted after extensive consultations among interested groups.

(c) Inclusion of Arabic among the official languages of the Economic and Social Council (A/36/7/Add.11, A/C.5/36/54 and Corr.1 and 2)

5. The PRESIDENT said that, in its decision 1981/135, the Council had agreed to pursue all the necessary arrangements to respond fully to the request contained in General Assembly resolution 35/219 A of 17 December 1980 concerning the inclusion of Arabic among the official languages of the Economic and Social Council, no later than 1 January 1983. At its thirty-sixth session, the General Assembly had approved the appropriation of the necessary funds to provide Arabic services to the Council as of 1 January 1983. He drew attention to the documents considered by the General Assembly in connection with the question at its thirty-sixth session, namely, the report of the Secretary-General (A/C.5/36/54 and Corr.1 and 2) and the twelfth report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/36/7/Add.11).

6. Mr. AL-GEWAILY (Qatar) referred to the great importance of the question, in view of the possible contributions which the use of Arabic as an official and working language of the Economic and Social Council would permit. In resolution 3190 (XXVIII) of 18 December 1973, the General Assembly had decided to include Arabic among the official and working languages of the General Assembly and its Main Committees. Subsequently, Arabic had been adopted as an official language of many United Nations bodies, and that had increased the effectiveness of the contribution of some 20 delegations and had redounded to the benefit of Arab and non-Arab States Members of the United Nations. Nevertheless, despite the great interest shown by the Arab States in the mission and role of the Economic and Social Council and the active participation of various Arab delegations in its work, Arabic was still not an official and working language of the Council. In resolution 35/219 A of 17 December 1980, the General Assembly had requested the Economic and Social Council to include Arabic among its official languages no later than 1 January 1983 and, at its thirty-sixth session, it had approved the necessary appropriations to that end. Having established the

legislative and financial basis, it was now necessary to implement the General Assembly resolutions with a view to ensuring the use of Arabic on an equal footing with the other official languages of the Council.

7. The PRESIDENT submitted for the Council's approval the following draft decision on the subitem concerning the inclusion of Arabic among its official languages: "The Economic and Social Council, in pursuance of General Assembly resolution 35/219 A of 17 December 1980, decides to include Arabic among its official languages effective 1 January 1983, and to amend rule 32 of its rules of procedure accordingly".

It was so decided (decision 1982/147).

8. Mr. KAABACHI (Tunisia) thanked all members of the Council for the unanimous adoption of the draft decision on the inclusion of Arabic among the official languages of the Council.

9. The PRESIDENT said that the subitem concerning the inclusion of Arabic among the official languages of the Council had thus been concluded.

AGENDA ITEM 5

International Year of Peace and International Day of Peace (E/1982/45 and Rev.1)

10. Mr. SUTTERLIN (Director, Political Affairs Division) drew attention to the note by the Secretary-General on the proposed International Year of Peace (E/1982/45 and Rev.1) and General Assembly resolution 36/67 of 30 November 1981. In the resolution, the Assembly had declared that the third Tuesday of September, the opening day of the regular session of the General Assembly, should be officially dedicated and observed as the International Day of Peace and should be devoted to commemorating and strengthening the ideals of peace both within and among all nations and peoples. To that end, the Secretary-General had invited Member States and the specialized agencies to provide information on the activities envisaged and suggestions for the programme to be initiated by the United Nations. Special efforts were also being made within the international academic community to emphasize the importance of education in the promotion of peace.

11. In resolution 36/67, the General Assembly also referred to an International Year of Peace and invited the Council to submit its recommendations to the Assembly at its thirty-seventh session, taking into account the urgency and special nature of such an observance as well as the guidelines for international years and anniversaries adopted by the General Assembly in its decision 35/424 of 5 December 1980. The note by the Secretary-General contained a list of the international years previously proclaimed. The Secretary-General pointed out that, as the guidelines for international years provided that every effort should be made to ensure an interval of at least two years between international years, the earliest possibility would be the year 1989. Taking into account the special urgency of the observance of an International Year of Peace, the Secretary-General indicated that the Council and the Assembly might wish to consider the possibility of declaring the International Year of Peace at an earlier date, perhaps relating the observance to the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations. It should be borne in mind that the maintenance of peace had been one of the fundamental objectives in establishing the United Nations.

12. Sir Anthony PARSONS (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had joined the consensus in adopting General Assembly resolution 36/67, which, *inter alia*, invited the Council to consider the possibility of declaring an Interna-

tional Year of Peace at the first practicable opportunity. Human ingenuity had developed weapons of terrifying potential. There was no task more important or pressing for the international community than that of arousing public interest in the cause of peace. The world was today more dangerous than ever. That truth had forcibly been brought home to the United Kingdom earlier that month with the invasion of part of its territory.

13. In resolution 36/67, the General Assembly had rightly noted that the promotion of peace was among the main purposes of the United Nations, in conformity with the Charter. Indeed, Article 2, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Charter provided that all Members should settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, were not endangered; and that all Members should refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations. By virtue of Articles 24 and 25 of the Charter, the Member States conferred on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, and committed themselves to accepting and carrying out its decisions. In recent years, however, certain Member States had defied the Charter and the Security Council by resorting to armed force; by denying or suppressing the right of peoples to self-determination; and by refusing to accept or carry out mandatory resolutions of the Security Council. That seriously undermined the principles and credibility of the United Nations and threatened the security of the entire international community. On 2 April 1982, the Government of Argentina had undertaken a military invasion of the Falkland Islands in an unprovoked act of aggression. That action had flown in the face of the Charter and the basic principles of the United Nations regarding the non-use of force, the self-determination of peoples and the peaceful settlement of disputes. It had also been carried out in defiance of the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council, who had called on the parties to show the utmost moderation. The President of the Security Council had urged them to refrain from the use or threat of force. Whereas the Government of the United Kingdom had reiterated its desire to continue the search for a diplomatic solution by peaceful means through negotiations held within the framework of the relevant United Nations resolutions, the response of the Government of Argentina had been to send an armed invasion force of 4,000 men to the Falkland Islands. Its response to a mandatory Security Council resolution which called for the immediate withdrawal of the Argentine troops had been to send strong reinforcements to the occupying forces.

14. He expressed the hope that the delegation of Costa Rica and the other delegations would understand that, although the United Kingdom shared the goals of the initiative they had taken, it was somewhat sceptical about the effectiveness of such a measure. It doubted that countries like Argentina, prepared to defy the Charter and the Security Council in order to achieve their military objectives, were likely to be restrained by such measures as Years and Days of Peace.

15. Mr. PIZA ESCALANTE (Observer for Costa Rica) recalled that his delegation had been the one to put forward the idea of an International Year of Peace and an International Day of Peace, when it had conveyed a proposal adopted by more than 500 university representatives at the Sixth Triennial Meeting of the International Association of University Presidents, held in San José, Costa Rica, in July 1981.

16. Costa Rica had requested the Bureau to set a later date for consideration of the item, perhaps around 26 or 27 April, so as to allow time for the consultations needed to arrive at a consensus. The President had granted the request and had proposed that at the current meeting the item should merely be introduced by the representative of the Secretariat. Consequently, he himself would not deal with substance but would simply report that the consultations were already under way with members of the Council and the Secretariat and would, he hoped, soon be successfully concluded.

17. The problem raised by the United Kingdom representative, combined with all other current problems, underscored the importance of declaring an International Year of Peace and an International Day of Peace. That was the case not because such declarations would automatically restore peace but because it was necessary to start a world movement, primarily in the field of education, that would set about creating a climate of peace and a positive attitude towards peace, which did not at the moment exist. Only thus could peace cease to be regarded as an interval between two wars.

18. The PRESIDENT confirmed that it had indeed been agreed during the discussions on the organization of work to postpone consideration of the item on the International Year of Peace and the International Day of Peace, so as to allow for consultations. He suggested that the item should be deferred until a later date.

19. Before giving the floor to the representative of Argentina, he drew attention to the guidelines for statements made in exercise of the right of reply, adopted the previous day in document E/1982/L.20.

20. Miss GUEVARA-ACHAVAL (Argentina), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said she deplored the fact that the United Kingdom had chosen to bring up the question of the Malvinas Islands in the Council. Argentina could not accept, and indeed rejected, the United Kingdom representative's assertion that British territory had been invaded.

21. The international community was familiar with the United Nations resolutions on decolonization and on Argentine rights with regard to the sovereignty of those islands.

22. Furthermore, Argentina could not countenance the accusation that it was threatening international peace and security. It was the British armada heading towards Argentine territory that posed a threat to international peace and security, as did the presence of British nuclear weapons on Argentine territory.

23. It was not worth entering into details on the question, since Argentina had expounded its view in successive letters to the Security Council. She regretted having to take the time of the Economic and Social Council to respond to the representative of the United Kingdom.

The meeting rose at 11.30 a.m.

9th meeting

Friday, 16 April 1982, at 3.25 p.m.

President: Mr. Miljan KOMATINA (Yugoslavia).

E/1982/SR.9

Applications for hearings by non-governmental organizations (E/1982/50)

1. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider, in accordance with rule 84 of its rules of procedure, the recommendation contained in the report of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations (E/1982/50) regarding the requests of organizations in category I consultative status to be heard by the Council or its committees in connection with various items on the agenda of the current session. In that connection, the President pointed out an error in the Chinese version of document E/1982/50: International Planned Parenthood had asked to be heard under agenda item 9 of the Second (Social) Committee and not in plenary meeting as indicated.

2. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council adopted the recommendation of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations as it appeared in its report (E/1982/50).

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 1

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

(a) **Membership of Namibia, represented by the United Nations Council for Namibia, in the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations Commissioner for Refugees (concluded)**

3. Mr. KAMANDA wa KAMANDA (Zaire) reminded members that the General Assembly had requested the Economic and Social Council to consider granting membership in the Executive Committee of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to Namibia, represented by the United Nations Council for Namibia. It was therefore a matter of the Economic and Social Council complying with a General Assembly resolution and enabling the United Nations Council for Namibia, the legal Administering Authority, to be properly represented in the Executive Committee so that it might effectively defend the interests of Namibians who had been forced to leave their territory as a result of its illegal occupation by South Africa and of the repression which was rampant there

4. Namibia was already a full member of a number of United Nations bodies and specialized agencies. The Council was therefore not creating a precedent in deciding to grant Namibia membership in the Executive Committee. For that reason, the group of African States, which attached great importance to the question, had submitted the following draft decision:

"The Economic and Social Council, pursuant to the request made by the General Assembly in paragraph 7 of its resolution 36/121 D of 10 December 1981, decides:

"(a) To enlarge the membership of the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to forty-one members so as to enable Namibia, represented by the United Nations Council for Namibia, to participate in the Committee as a full member;

"(b) To grant membership in the Committee to Namibia, represented by the United Nations Council for Namibia."

He asked all Member States to vote for that draft decision.

5. Ms. ROSER (Federal Republic of Germany), speaking on behalf of her own Government and the Governments of Canada, France, the United Kingdom and the United States, recalled that the Governments of the contact group countries had contributed constructively to a solution in Namibia by providing material aid and by pursuing consultations with the parties to the negotiations on Namibia with a view to reaching a settlement on the basis of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). However, they could not support the proposal before the Council, namely, to enlarge the membership of the Executive Committee by granting a seat to the United Nations Council for Namibia. The members of the contact group opposed the precedent inherent in admitting an organization which was not a State under international law. The Executive Committee had always been composed of States Members and States not members of the United Nations. There were sound practical reasons for awarding full membership to States which had the authority and resources to contribute to the world-wide activities of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. Other directly concerned countries or organizations could participate in United Nations activities as observers.

6. The delegations which had submitted the proposal had failed to provide adequate justification for granting Namibia full membership in the Executive Committee. They had adduced reasons which were explicitly political. It would be a regrettable development if the granting of full membership to the Council for Namibia served to politicize the operations of UNHCR, which had been established for purely humanitarian and social purposes.

7. In that connection, she observed that the Council had already made appropriate arrangements in 1980 when it invited the United Nations Council for Namibia to participate in the meetings of the Executive Committee as an observer. She noted that the United Nations Council for Namibia had rarely taken up that invitation. She therefore failed to understand why it now thought it necessary to seek full membership.

8. The continued effectiveness of UNHCR was a fundamental issue. Would expansion of the Executive Committee contribute to that effectiveness? Was the United Nations Council for Namibia the most appropriate choice for an additional seat? Questions such as those should be fairly addressed before the Council took a decision.

9. Mr. DJIGO (Observer for Senegal) said he recognized that the contact group, encouraged by the great majority of Member States, was making commendable efforts to solve

the problem of Namibia. As for the absenteeism with which it reproached the United Nations Council for Namibia, that was an argument which had already served on many occasions, but if the participation of members were to be made dependent upon the regularity of their attendance at meetings, the participation of some States in the Council would also have to be re-examined. Furthermore, if the objections raised by the contact group had been accepted, the United Nations Council for Namibia would have been unable to participate in the work of specialized agencies such as the International Labour Organisation. The question of Namibia was both a legal and a political one and the United Nations could not lose sight of the political aspect of the matter. For the reasons mentioned by the representative of Zaire, he did not think that it was necessary to open a debate on the matter. He supported the statement of the delegation of Zaire and requested that the draft decision submitted by the group of African States should be adopted by consensus. He also requested that the declaration of the contact group should be reproduced in the summary record.

10. Mr. JOHNSON (Benin) said he supported the view expressed by the representatives of Zaire and Senegal and therefore supported the admission of the United Nations Council for Namibia to the Executive Committee.

A vote was taken on the draft decision proposed by the representative of Zaire.

The draft decision was adopted by 25 votes to 2, with 12 abstentions (decision 1982/110).

11. Mr. NOWAK (Poland) said that there had been an error during the voting. His delegation wished to vote for the draft decision.

12. Mr. DA CRUZ (Portugal), speaking in explanation of the vote, recalled that his Government's position had been clearly stated at the eighth special session and at the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly. He stressed that his country supported unconditionally Namibia's right to self-determination and the pursuit of a peaceful solution to that problem. The decision just adopted by the Council, however, raised legal questions which should have been clarified beforehand. In the light of the reservations which it had already stated during the adoption of Assembly resolution 36/121 D concerning the broadening of the mandate of the United Nations Council for Namibia, his delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft decision.

13. Mrs. ZACHAROPOULOS (Greece) said that her country had always attached great importance to the international protection of all refugees, including the Namibians who had fled to neighbouring countries because of the tragic situation in their country. It was therefore the right of Namibia to protect its people. Since UNHCR was the only international body entrusted with the protection of refugees, close co-operation between Namibia and UNHCR was essential in order to solve that problem. Her delegation had therefore voted for General Assembly resolution 36/121 D and for the draft decision which had just been adopted.

14. Mr. MASSOT (Brazil) said that he had voted for the draft decision but stressed that Brazil was against giving an organization the status of equality with a State Member of the United Nations. He wanted it to be understood that the decision which the Council had just adopted could not be regarded as creating a legal or political precedent because the case in question was *sui generis*.

15. Mr. TREHOLT (Norway), speaking on behalf of the Danish and Norwegian delegations, recalled that Denmark and Norway had always unconditionally supported the cause of the freedom and independence of Namibia and that they had also supported the negotiations initiated by the

Western contact group. However, the question of granting membership in the Executive Committee of UNHCR to the United Nations Council for Namibia created an awkward precedent, particularly since the United Nations Council for Namibia had already been invited to the Executive Commit-

tee as an observer. The Danish and Norwegian delegations had therefore abstained in the vote on the decision which had just been adopted.

The meeting rose at 4.05 p.m.

10th meeting

Monday, 19 April 1982, at 3.15 p.m.

President: Mr. Miljan KOMATINA (Yugoslavia).

E/1982/SR.10

AGENDA ITEM 2

Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (E/1982/24 and Add.1, E/1982/25, E/1982/26, E/1982/49, E/1982/L.18, E/AC.68/1982/L.5/Add.3)

1. Mr. NYAMEKYE (Deputy Director, Division of Human Rights) recalled that, under the four-year programme of activities adopted by the General Assembly in its resolution 34/24 of 15 November 1979 and which was contained in the annex to that resolution, the Commission on Human Rights had been requested to undertake, in co-operation with the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, a study on ways and means of ensuring the implementation of the United Nations resolutions on *apartheid*, racism and racial discrimination and to submit its conclusions to the Assembly at its thirty-seventh session through the Economic and Social Council. When the Sub-Commission had discussed that matter at its thirty-fourth session, it had been suggested that such a study could be a new point of departure in combating racism and racial discrimination through economic, political and other measures, and it had therefore been decided that a working group of the Sub-Commission should be established to look into the modalities for the study.
2. Two other studies requested in the annex to the resolution, one on the links between the struggle against racism and the struggle for self-determination in southern Africa and the other on the links between racial discrimination and inequalities in the fields of education, nutrition, health, housing and cultural development, were in progress.
3. In addition, the Commission on Human Rights had prepared for its thirty-eighth session a document on the modalities of the study on transnational corporations requested in paragraph 18 of the four-year programme of activities.
4. He also drew attention to Economic and Social Council resolution 1980/28, authorizing the Sub-Commission to undertake a study on the question of racial discrimination in the administration of criminal justice. The Sub-Commission at its thirty-third session had adopted resolution 4 (XXXIII), in which it had requested Justice Chowdhury to prepare a report on methods of action for combating discrimination in the administration of criminal justice. A preliminary report had been submitted to the Sub-Commission at its thirty-fourth session.¹
5. In its resolution 4 B (XXXIII), the Sub-Commission had decided to consider, at its thirty-fourth and subsequent sessions, the question of political, economic, cultural and other factors underlying situations leading to racism and racial discrimination and methods of action for the eradication of such causes. A note on that question had been prepared by the Secretary-General.
6. At its thirty-sixth session, the General Assembly had continued its consideration of the implementation of the Programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, contained in the annex to its resolution 3057 (XXVIII), and had adopted resolution 36/8, in which it had once more proclaimed the elimination of all forms of racism and of discrimination based on race as matters of high priority for the international community and invited all Member States, United Nations organs and other international and non-governmental organizations to support the objectives of the Programme for the Decade.
7. In 1981, in accordance with the programme of activities for the second half of the Decade, the Secretariat had organized a seminar on recourse procedures available to victims of racial discrimination and activities to be undertaken at the regional level (for the ECE region), a seminar on political, economic, cultural and other factors underlying situations leading to racism, including a survey of the increase or decline of racism and racial discrimination (for the ECA region), a seminar on effective measures to prevent transnational corporations and other established interests from collaborating with the racist régime of South Africa and a seminar on recourse procedures and other forms of protection available to victims of racial discrimination and activities to be undertaken at the national and regional levels (for the ECLA region). The reports of those seminars had been published.
8. The Secretariat had also organized a round-table of university professors and directors of race relations institutions on the teaching of problems of racial discrimination and a UNITAR (United Nations Institute for Training and Research) colloquium on the prohibition of *apartheid*, racism and racial discrimination and the achievement of self-determination in international law. The reports of those meetings were also available. Further, a study had been submitted to the General Assembly on education activities and activities of the mass media in the fight against racism and racial discrimination.
9. Turning to the report of the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (E/1982/26), he described the historical background to the Conference and recalled that, on the recommendation of the Council, the General Assembly had

¹ E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.766

decided at its thirty-sixth session that the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination should hold its first session in New York during the first quarter of 1982 and should report to the Council at its current session.

10. The General Assembly had further requested the Secretary-General to appoint, in 1982, after consultation with the regional groups, a Secretary-General for the Second World Conference who would have the rank of Assistant Secretary-General and would be responsible for the organization of the Conference and co-ordination with Member States, organs and bodies of the United Nations, specialized agencies and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations.

11. He drew the Council's attention to the main issues which would be considered by the World Conference, namely, the review and evaluation of the work undertaken during the second half of the Decade, the initiation of new measures to combat racism and racial discrimination and the formulation of measures aimed at ensuring the full and universal implementation of United Nations decisions and resolutions on racism, racial discrimination and *apartheid*.

12. The Preparatory Sub-Committee had recommended to the Economic and Social Council a draft provisional agenda and draft provisional rules of procedure for the Conference. Its recommendations regarding participation in the Conference were contained in paragraph 4 of the report. In paragraphs 7 and 8 of its report the Sub-Committee had also made recommendations regarding documentation for the Conference. In that connection, it had specifically recommended that the seminar planned for the ESCAP region under the Programme for the Decade should be held well in advance of the World Conference in order for its results to be made available to participants. The Sub-Committee had been guided by resolution 1982/11 of the Commission on Human Rights, in which the Commission had recommended to the Sub-Committee that the Second World Conference should pay particular attention to the findings of the various seminars, round-tables and studies conducted during the second half of the Decade. In response to that request, the Secretariat had been in touch with ESCAP headquarters, which had informed it that facilities could be made available for the holding of the seminar during the first half of August.

13. The Sub-Committee had also recommended that the Secretariat should prepare a draft plan of action containing proposals for activities to be undertaken after the Conference as a follow-up to the Programme of Action adopted by the first World Conference and that the Council should approve the convening of a second session of the Sub-Committee to consider the preparation of a draft programme of action and to consider also outstanding matters pertaining to the ongoing preparations for the Second World Conference. The Sub-Committee had recommended that its second session should be held from 21 to 25 March 1983.

14. In view of the cost of the Conference, the Sub-Committee had recommended that it should preferably be held in a developing country, in which case the formula adopted by the General Assembly in its resolution 31/78 concerning the defraying of the cost involved in holding the first World Conference would apply. He recalled that the Philippines had offered to host the Conference.

15. Finally, he drew attention to the need to include a draft final document among the basic working documents of the Conference.

16. Mr. BHATT (Vice-Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*) paid a tribute to the Economic and Social Council and to the Commission on Human Rights,

which at its recent session had again condemned the inhuman system of *apartheid* and reiterated its support for the struggle against *apartheid* being waged by the peoples of southern Africa, under the leadership of their national liberation movements.

17. Despite such condemnation, the *apartheid* régime continued to violate the Charter of the United Nations, the principles of international law, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international instruments concerning human rights. South Africa continued to show the greatest contempt for General Assembly and Security Council resolutions. In particular, it persisted in its attacks on the Republic of Angola, the aim of which was to destabilize the neighbouring States and which seriously jeopardized international peace and security.

18. That contempt for the United Nations was also apparent in the repression inflicted by the Pretoria Government on the black population of South Africa. Repressive measures included the refusal of the Court of Appeal in Pretoria to commute the death sentence imposed on 15 November 1980 on three freedom fighters (Lubisi, Mashigo and Manana) members of the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC), despite the appeal for clemency made by the Security Council on 9 April 1982 in its resolution 503 (1982). Furthermore, the Pretoria Government had recently, for no apparent reason, ordered the transfer to Cape Town of four ANC leaders who had been held on Robben Island.

19. As part of that policy, the Pretoria régime had embarked in the last few months on a campaign of systematic repression aimed at trade union leaders and various opposition groups. He need only mention the death in custody, following torture by the police, of the secretary of the Transvaal union of workers in the food and canning industry. In addition, a number of prisoners who had been kept in solitary confinement had been admitted to mental hospitals. In March, 56 people in Cape Town had gone on hunger strike for the right to work and live there. All those events gave some idea of the repressive actions resorted to by the Pretoria Government to suppress the anti-*apartheid* movement.

20. The United Nations had repeatedly declared that *apartheid* was an affront to the conscience of mankind and a threat to peace and security in southern Africa and throughout the world. Giving the black population of South Africa all the support it needed was the only way of destroying that inhuman system. Any collusion with the *apartheid* régime was bound to strengthen the racist order and encourage the Pretoria Government to continue its acts of aggression against neighbouring countries.

21. In conclusion, he wished to reaffirm the support of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* for the resolutions of the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Commission on Human Rights concerning *apartheid* and its confidence in the success of the struggle of the black population of South Africa.

22. Mr. YANGO (Observer for the Philippines) said that, at the last meeting of the Preparatory Sub-Committee, his delegation had expressed an interest in hosting the Second World Conference, although it had not at that time been in a position to make a specific offer to do so. After a thorough study of the costs involved, his Government had decided to host the Conference, on condition that the formula adopted by the General Assembly in its resolution 31/78 regarding the cost involved in hosting the first World Conference would apply to the offer.

23. At its last meeting, the Preparatory Sub-Committee had recommended that the Conference should preferably be

held in a developing country and that the above-mentioned formula should apply.

24. The desire of the Philippines to host the Conference was a manifestation of its commitment to the elimination of racism, *apartheid* and racial discrimination in all their forms. The Philippines had adequate facilities in Manila for the Conference, but its financial resources would not allow it to meet the cost of the Conference unless the formula he had mentioned was applied. He therefore hoped that the Council would accept the offer from the Philippines as an exception to General Assembly resolution 2609 (XXIV) on the pattern of conferences.

25. Mr. GIUSTETTI (France) said that France fully appreciated the importance of the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, at which conclusions could be drawn from the Decade and the main lines of future action could be decided upon. Moreover, a world conference was undoubtedly the most appropriate forum for combating racism because it was the most solemn kind of assembly of the international community.

26. However, the convening of such a conference was not an automatic guarantee of success, and it was particularly regrettable that a large number of countries had refused to join in adopting the final acts of the first World Conference, held in 1978. Consequently, the international community had not succeeded, in 1978, in agreeing on the ends and the means of combating racism. That was a serious set-back and a particularly regrettable one, in view of the encouraging fact that racism was universally condemned and a consensus existed on some of the means, methods and modalities for combating it. In that connection, the Declaration adopted by the first Conference contained the main elements on which all delegations had agreed. In the view of his delegation, the Second World Conference would therefore be worthwhile if it resulted at least in a partial consensus on some essential elements. To achieve that end, it was necessary, first, to define those elements and, secondly, to find a way of setting them apart from the others. The term "racism" must not be used as a slogan for political purposes. The meaning of the term had been precisely defined by UNESCO after long years of work which had begun in 1950 and had resulted in the Declaration on Race and Racial Prejudice and the Declaration on Fundamental Principles concerning the Contribution of the Mass Media to Strengthening Peace and International Understanding, to the Promotion of Human Rights and to Countering Racialism, *Apartheid* and Incitation to War, both adopted at the twentieth session of the General Conference. In keeping with that definition, the elimination of racism called for a dual approach involving both general and case-by-case action. General action was

universal in scope, since its aim was to eradicate racism from the minds of all men. However, it was a long-term action and, while each State had a duty to undertake it, the approach must be international.

27. Once the elements of a possible consensus had been determined, they could be incorporated in a first final document identifying the causes of racism and the obstacles to its elimination. The document would go on to describe the modalities, means and norms for the action which each State should take in its own territory in the fields of education, information, legislative action and criminal justice. It could also affirm that it was the duty of States not only to eliminate racism within their own frontiers but also to make a contribution to the international action for the elimination of racist systems. It should therefore mention *apartheid* as the typical racist system and condemn it once again, but it could not go further than that because opinions were deeply divided on the definition of racist situations and on the kind of international action that could deal with them. The document would nevertheless have the advantage of providing a link to a subsequent document, the purpose of which would be to define the international action to be taken in situations of systematic racism.

28. In his delegation's view, the draft agenda submitted by the Preparatory Sub-Committee (E/1982/26, annex) contained some dubious elements, particularly item 10 (d) and (e). France's position on that matter was well known, and it would therefore do its best to turn the Conference away from improper objectives, so that it could give expression to the consensus that already existed on a number of basic elements of the struggle against racism.

29. He reiterated France's commitment to the cause of combating racism and recalled that the French Minister for Foreign Affairs had given expression to that commitment in his statements on the occasion of the last International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, when he had stated that France would make the declaration provided for in article 14 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (General Assembly resolution 2106 A (XX), annex).

30. His delegation would spare no effort to ensure that the preparations for the Conference were conducive to the widest participation and to a cordial consensus.

31. The PRESIDENT suggested that the deadline for the submission of draft proposals under agenda item 2 should be 6 p.m. on Wednesday, 21 April.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 4.10 p.m.

11th meeting

Tuesday, 20 April 1982, at 10.50 a.m.

President: Mr. Miljan KOMATINA (Yugoslavia).

E/1982/SR.11

In the absence of the President, Mr. Bhatt (Nepal), Vice-President, took the Chair.

Applications for hearings by non-governmental organizations (E/1982/50 and Add.1)

1. The PRESIDENT announced that, in addition to the applications for hearings by various non-governmental organizations approved at the 9th meeting, the Council had

before it an application from the International Federation of Business and Professional Women (E/1982/50/Add.1), an organization in category I consultative status. The Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations had recommended that the Council should grant a hearing to that organization.

2. If there were no objections, he would take it that the Council approved the recommendation.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 2

Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (continued) (E/1982/24 and Add.1, E/1982/25, E/1982/26, E/1982/49, E/1982/L.18, E/AC.68/1982/L.5/Add.3)

3. Mr. SILWAL (Nepal) recalled that, as early as 1952, the General Assembly had emphasized, in resolution 532 B (VI), adopted at its sixth session, that "the full application and implementation of the principle of non-discrimination recommended in the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights are matters of supreme importance, and should constitute the primary objective in the work of all United Nations organs and institutions". The designation of the 10-year period starting 10 December 1973 as the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (General Assembly resolution 3057 (XXVIII)) and the adoption in 1979 of a four-year programme of activities as called for in General Assembly resolution 34/24 reflected the concern of the international community for that issue. The Council had made its contribution towards the realization of those objectives by co-ordinating the various programmes and evaluating the activities undertaken in the course of the Decade. It was also to be hoped that the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination would be able to work out concrete ways of ensuring that United Nations resolutions on combating racism were implemented.

4. Racism must be combated at the national, regional and international levels. At the national level, legislative, judicial and administrative measures alone were not enough—education and the news media must be used so that the message reached as wide a segment of the population as possible. In that connection, the work done by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the International Labour Organisation, the World Health Organization, the United Nations Institute for Training and Research and other organizations and bodies within and outside the United Nations was to be commended. Racism and racial discrimination were not going to disappear overnight; a long-term, sustained effort with as broad participation as possible was essential for their final elimination.

5. The concepts of racism and racial discrimination were unknown in the history of Nepal. As a State party to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (General Assembly resolution 2106 A (XX), annex) and the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid* (General Assembly resolution 3068 (XXVIII), annex), and also as a founding member of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, Nepal was fully alive to its responsibilities.

6. The Special Committee against *Apartheid* and the Centre against *Apartheid* had done commendable work as a follow-up to the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa held in Paris in 1981. 1982 has been declared the International Year of Mobilization for Sanctions against South Africa and Nepal believed that South Africa's flouting of the numerous resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council called for the adoption of mandatory sanctions.

7. His delegation also noted with appreciation the continued efforts of the United Nations Council for Namibia to secure South African withdrawal from that Territory. At the same time, the efforts made by the contact group of five Western Powers must take into account the genuine aspira-

tions of the Namibian people, as represented by the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO).

8. His delegation wished to conclude by expressing its appreciation for the useful work done by the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination and to endorse the recommendations contained in document E/1982/26.

9. Mr. BOLE (Fiji) said that many of the atrocities committed during the Second World War had been motivated by racial prejudice. It was not surprising therefore that one of the guiding principles of the United Nations, which had come into being at the end of the War, should be "faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person" as established in the preamble to the Charter. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international instruments adopted in that field were all based on the idea of prohibiting discrimination on any grounds, including race.

10. Fiji had given and would continue to give full support to the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination and to the Programme for the Decade (General Assembly resolution 3057 (XXVIII), annex). It none the less believed that the outcome of the first World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination had been a disappointment to many. It hoped therefore that the Second World Conference to be held in 1983 would direct all its attention to the implementation of the Programme for the Decade and would contribute to a profound evaluation of the state of racial discrimination in the world, as provided for in the draft resolution which the Council had before it (E/1982/L.18). Fiji had read the report of the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the Second Conference most attentively and welcomed the offer of the Philippines to host the Conference.

11. As a young nation, Fiji was fully aware of the need to educate its multiracial population to show appreciation and sensitivity towards the cultures and values of others. Its Constitution and laws reflected that position.

12. At the international level, Fiji appealed to all nations to increase their efforts to promote the objectives of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. Racism and racial discrimination must be combated at the national and international levels in order to achieve national and international harmony.

13. Mr. ZAYAS-QUIALA (Observer for Cuba) said that his delegation was speaking for the first time in the Council and reiterated his country's unswerving support for the just struggle of all those peoples of the world who were oppressed by different forms of domination, exploitation and racial discrimination engendered by imperialism.

14. Racism, racial discrimination, zionism and *apartheid* threatened friendly relations among peoples, co-operation among nations and international peace and security, as had been proclaimed at the first World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. His delegation therefore reiterated its full understanding and support for measures aimed at ensuring that the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid* was ratified by those countries which had yet to become parties to it. It also believed that it was only by replacing the present discredited and spurious system of international relations and ending the complicity of the imperialist Powers with the racist régimes that those evils could be eliminated. Cuba pledged its unconditional support for any action which the international community might take to mobilize public opinion against the racist régime of South Africa, its imperialist allies and the transnational corporations which supported and propped up that system.

15. The Cuban delegation viewed with favour the efforts made by the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination but regretted that the countries in the group of Western European and other States had repeatedly refused to participate in its work, despite the many appeals for their participation. His delegation also regretted that the States belonging to that regional group continued to provide various forms of assistance to the infamous *apartheid* régime. The Preparatory Sub-Committee had adopted a Cuban proposal for the establishment of national preparatory committees in the various countries; those committees would participate in the Second World Conference so that they could give it the necessary publicity and thus promote the struggle against discriminatory practices. He asked the members of the Council to adopt a resolution to that end.

16. The end of the first Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination was the right time to give fresh impetus to the implementation of all measures aimed at eliminating that moral scourge. To achieve that end, maximum efforts should continue to be focused on the implementation of every aspect of the four-year programme of activities (General Assembly resolution 34/24, annex), which represented an inescapable obligation for all progressive forces and for the international community as a whole.

17. Ms. RADIĆ (Yugoslavia) said that, as the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination drew to a close, it was more indispensable than ever to assess the international community's efforts.

18. Despite the intense activity of the United Nations, the situation was still far from satisfactory. The goals set for the Decade had not been met, nor had the most urgent provisions of the Programme for the Decade been carried out, as was best illustrated by the persistence of the policy of *apartheid* in South Africa. However, the situation in Namibia and in the occupied Arab territories should also be a continuing concern.

19. The previous February, during the thirty-eighth session of the Commission on Human Rights in Geneva, Yugoslavia had sponsored four resolutions concerning the struggle against racial discrimination. Those resolutions, together with the resolution concerning the right to self-determination of the peoples of Namibia and of the occupied Arab territories, reflected Yugoslavia's concern and constant commitment.

20. Yugoslavia had also taken an active part in the first session of the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, held from 15 to 26 March. Her delegation was satisfied with the results described in the report on that session (E/1982/26) and hoped that the report would be endorsed by the Council. The Second World Conference was an event of the utmost importance, and its success was the responsibility of the international community as a whole.

21. Furthermore, Yugoslavia believed that the presence and participation of all the regional groups in preparing for the Conference were necessary to ensure its full success. The absence of the countries from an important regional group was regrettable, and she expressed the hope that those countries would reconsider their position.

22. In conclusion, her delegation believed that the Second World Conference should be held in a developing country, and it therefore welcomed the recent offer made by the Government of the Philippines.

23. Mr. SHELDON (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the elimination of colonialism had changed the

political map of the world. The strengthening of the struggle of peoples for their liberation, especially in southern Africa, showed that the days of colonialism, in its "classic" form, were numbered. However, imperialism was trying to recover the positions it had lost and to deprive liberated peoples of their gains. Therefore, the struggle to eliminate the last vestiges of colonialism and the scourge of racism and racial discrimination was still a burning problem of the movement.

24. The General Assembly, in a series of decisions, particularly in the Programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, the programme of activities to be undertaken during the second half of the Decade and for subsequent resolutions, had defined the objectives and tasks of the international community as well as the principal methods and time schedule for their completion.

25. He emphasized the importance of the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa and the necessity of implementing the decisions it had taken. It should also be noted that the United Nations had proclaimed 1982 as the International Year of Mobilization for Sanctions against South Africa and that the provisions of General Assembly resolution 36/8 were very important for the implementation of the Programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination.

26. His delegation supported the report submitted by the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (E/1982/26), but found it regrettable that certain Western countries had decided to boycott the work of the Sub-Committee. Although that position was significant, the course of history was irreversible; it should be a matter of gratification that the efforts of the United Nations and the specialized agencies, as summarized in document E/1982/24, and the efforts of the international community had encouraged the struggle of oppressed peoples for their independence and self-determination.

27. The Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination to be held in 1983 would no doubt help to promote that lofty cause.

28. The activities of the *apartheid* régime justified the concern and indignation of all people of good faith. The South African racists were violating the fundamental rights of 20 million Africans. Their goals were filled with political prisoners, and the number of people sentenced to death was the highest in the world.

29. The General Assembly and the Security Council had repeatedly called for an end to that criminal policy. However, the racist régime of South Africa continued cynically to disregard the just demands of the United Nations and of the international community and to pursue its policy of *apartheid* and bantustanization.

30. The Pretoria régime was also continuing its oppression against Namibia, especially against the members of SWAPO, and was using the territory of Namibia as a marshalling ground for aggression against neighbouring African States, particularly Angola.

31. The United Nations, the Organization of African Unity and the movement of non-aligned countries had condemned the policy of *apartheid* and the aggressive acts of South Africa as being incompatible with human rights and dignity and with the Charter of the United Nations and as constituting a serious threat to international peace and security.

32. The Pretoria authorities could not have continued to enforce their criminal policy without the constant and

increasingly broad co-operation of the Western members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and their monopolies. With the direct participation of the Western Powers and Israel, the economic and military power, including the nuclear capability, of the *apartheid* régime was being strengthened.

33. Foreign investments in South Africa amounted to more than \$35 billion, and foreign trade totalled many millions. The banks of Western countries, especially those in the United States, the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany, as well as a few other States, continued to finance the racist régime.

34. He stressed that the major NATO countries and Israel, as well as dozens of their monopolies, were co-operating with South Africa.

35. In numerous resolutions, the General Assembly had condemned those countries primarily for their support of South Africa, which undermined United Nations efforts to take effective measures against the Pretoria racists.

36. He added that the statements made by high-level members of the current United States Administration and the measures adopted by Washington to develop "friendly" relations with South Africa were cause for concern. Towards the end of February 1982, the United States Government had taken concrete steps to continue to develop its relations with the Pretoria régime.

37. The General Assembly, in resolution 36/172 A, had stressed that "*apartheid* cannot be reformed but must be totally eliminated". It was his delegation's view that measures to put an end to the policy of *apartheid* already existed in the relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions and in the decisions of the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa.

38. All States should fully comply with Security Council sanctions against South Africa. The Security Council should adopt comprehensive sanctions against South Africa in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter.

39. A policy of racial discrimination and oppression was also being practised by Israel in the occupied Arab territories. It was being practised against a whole people, the Arab people of Palestine. In recent months Israel had launched new acts of aggression and expansion as part of a policy of annexation.

40. Based on the separate Camp David agreement, the so-called "strategic co-operation" agreement with the United States, Israel continued to consolidate and accelerate its conquest of the occupied Arab territories and to drive out the indigenous inhabitants. Those Israeli actions had been condemned time and again by the Security Council and the General Assembly of the United Nations and progressive public opinion.

41. The position of principle of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic with regard to the struggle against racism and racial discrimination was rooted in its socialist system; the Constitution provided for and fully guaranteed the equality of all citizens without distinction as to race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinions, national or social origin, economic status, birth or any other social factor.

42. On the basis of the need to give renewed impetus to the efforts of the international community in the struggle against racism and racial discrimination, the racist ideology of fascism, neo-nazism and zionism, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic reiterated its full support for the Programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination and the programme for the second half of the Decade. All States, without exception, should

fully comply with the provisions of those documents adopted by the United Nations.

43. Mr. MI Guojun (China) said that in the eight years since the inauguration of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination in December 1973, the United Nations and other related international organizations had held many meetings, adopted a series of important resolutions and taken a number of actions reflecting the sentiment and demand of the international community for the elimination of racism and racial discrimination.

44. The Council was going full speed ahead in its preparatory work for the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination to be held in 1983. His delegation believed that the Conference should undertake a comprehensive review and assessment of the achievements of the Decade and of the experience gained, and, in the light of the grave situation existing today, adopt more forceful and effective measures for continuing the struggle in the future.

45. The reactionary authorities in South Africa were intensifying their racist policies in the country and continuing the ruthless suppression and persecution of the black masses fighting for their legitimate rights and liberation. The so-called "bantustanization" plans were nothing more than new ploys by the South African racists for practising racial discrimination and *apartheid*.

46. In its foreign relations, the South African régime was obstinately pursuing a policy of racism, aggression and expansion. In total disregard of United Nations resolutions and world public opinion, the South African authorities were persisting in their illegal occupation of Namibia and were doing everything possible to obstruct and undermine Namibia's independence movement. At the same time, they were engaging in continual aggression against the front-line States which had already achieved national independence. Not long ago there had been a number of serious incidents, including the invasion of the Republic of Seychelles by mercenaries based in South Africa, and attacks on Angola by troops of the South African racist régime. The South African régime was the last reactionary bastion of colonialism and racism remaining in Africa. It would not be so arrogant and unrepentant if it were not being aided and abetted by a super-Power.

47. However, the national liberation movement manifested an irresistible historical trend. The independence won by Zimbabwe two years earlier had marked a new victory of the African people in their struggle against racism and for national liberation.

48. The Government and people of China had always supported the South African people in their just struggle against racial oppression and for national liberation, and firmly supported the Namibian people who were fighting against colonial domination by the South African racists and striving to build their own independent nation under the leadership of SWAPO. China also strongly condemned the acts of aggression and sabotage perpetrated by the South African authorities against the front-line States, and supported the adoption of effective sanctions by the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity against the South African régime.

49. His delegation trusted that the current regular session of the Council would contribute greatly to the attainment of the objectives of the Decade and to preparations for the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination.

50. Mr. DYRLUND (Denmark) said that he had asked for the floor to present the views of Finland, Iceland, Norway,

Sweden and Denmark in connection with the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination.

51. The Nordic Governments and peoples had over the years rejected and condemned all forms of racial discrimination and any ideology based on such discrimination, in accordance with their commitment to justice, freedom and democracy and their belief in the equality and dignity of all human beings.

52. One of the most important issues before the United Nations with regard to racism was the violation of human rights in southern Africa. South Africa's policy of *apartheid* was particularly objectionable because it represented an institutionalized and systematic practice of racism and racial discrimination. Without increased and more effective pressure from the international community, the South African Government was unlikely to start the process necessary to eliminate *apartheid*. The Nordic Governments had therefore worked actively to secure the adoption by the Security Council of mandatory economic sanctions against South Africa as early as possible.

53. The Nordic Governments were participating in a joint programme of action against South Africa which involved, among other measures, prohibiting or discouraging new investment in that country and recommendations for discontinuing sports and cultural contacts with South Africa. In addition the Nordic countries intended to continue and increase their humanitarian and educational assistance to victims of oppression in southern Africa.

54. Discrimination on grounds of race, colour or ethnic origin was a sad reality in many parts of the world. Implementation of the human rights principles embodied in the Charter of the United Nations and subsequently developed in a number of important international conventions should be further strengthened.

55. With regard to racial discrimination, the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination had a special and significant role to play in giving effect to the provisions of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

56. The General Assembly, in resolution 3057 (XXVIII), had designated the 10-year period beginning 10 December 1973 as the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. The Nordic countries were continuing to give their full support to the goals and objectives of the Programme for the Decade, contained in the annex to that resolution.

57. In its resolution 35/33, the General Assembly had decided to hold in 1983 the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. At the first regular session of the Council in 1981 the Nordic countries had expressed the hope that the preparations for the 1983 Conference could be conducted on the basis of the provisions of resolution 3057 (XXVIII) and that the divisive issues could be avoided.

58. It was with those views in mind that the Nordic countries had studied the report of the first session of the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the 1983 World Conference. On examining the draft provisional agenda for the Conference, they had noted that certain new items relating to the situation in the Middle East had been added. The Nordic countries had previously strongly opposed the equation of zionism with racism. They feared that the inclusion of items dealing with the Middle East would revive the confrontation which had occurred at the first World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. In the interests of a constructive and positive outcome to the Conference, they therefore believed that those items should be omitted from the agenda.

59. Mr. KHALIFA (Sudan) said that his country's stand on racial questions had always been consistent and well defined. It respected the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, supported the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination and strongly condemned all policies of *apartheid*, racism and racial discrimination practised in South Africa, Namibia and the occupied Arab territories, including the denial of the right of peoples to self-determination and independence. It also fully supported the national liberation struggle for self-determination and independence in South Africa by all available means including armed struggle. In that context, the international conference in support of the liberation movements in southern Africa and of solidarity with the front-line States, to be convened in Portugal, would provide the international community with an opportunity to review, assess and step up support to those States in all fields and in particular to the national liberation struggle in southern Africa.

60. As a member of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, his country was unstinting in its participation in the international campaigns designed to combat the *apartheid* policies of the racist régime of South Africa. No major progress had yet been made in that area during the Decade. It would appear that the white racists of South Africa had not yet learned anything from the example of Zimbabwe. However, it was not the United Nations and its organs but the attitude of some Member States and their disrespect for the resolutions adopted that were to blame. The International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, held in Paris in May 1981, together with the proclamation of 1982 as the International Year of Mobilization for Sanctions against South Africa, had been landmarks in the mobilization of the world public on the question.

61. His country fully supported all international efforts aimed at the convening of the Second World Conference in 1983 to review and appraise the activities and achievements of the Decade and to formulate specific measures to ensure the full and universal implementation of United Nations decisions and resolutions on racism, racial discrimination and *apartheid*.

62. His country regretted that the appointment of the members of the Preparatory Sub-Committee had not yet been completed, and it was also profoundly concerned that the group of Western European and other States had not taken part in the work of the Sub-Committee at its first session. His delegation appealed to that group to nominate their representatives for the forthcoming session of the Preparatory Sub-Committee, to be convened in March 1983.

63. Lastly, he emphasized the importance of the early appointment of the Secretary-General for the Second World Conference so that the preparations for the Conference might be started. In that context, his delegation supported the proposal concerning the proclamation at the Second World Conference of a second decade of action to combat racism and racial discrimination.

64. Mr. KOSTOV (Bulgaria) said that, since its creation, the United Nations had devoted major attention to the elimination of racism and racial discrimination, adopting numerous resolutions and instruments for that purpose, including the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid* and the International Covenants on Human Rights (see General Assembly resolution 2200 A (XXI), annex). One of the major steps taken by the international community in that regard had been the launching in 1973 of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination.

65. The United Nations had achieved significant results in the promotion of international co-operation and the mobilization of world public opinion against racism, racial discrimination and *apartheid*. Unfortunately, those anachronisms still persisted in the world and, together with social inequality, were the main causes of the current flagrant mass violations of human rights.

66. The most abhorrent form of racism and racial discrimination was undoubtedly to be found in southern Africa, where it had been raised to the status of official ideology and State policy. The theory and practices of *apartheid*, categorized under international law as a crime against humanity, were employed in order to trample upon the inalienable right of the peoples of Namibia and South Africa to self-determination and independence. In order to perpetuate the system of *apartheid*, the racist régime of South Africa was resorting to the farce of "bantustanization" and, with the aid of its allies, had developed a nuclear capability and practised aggression against the neighbouring independent countries of Angola, Mozambique and Zambia.

67. The racist régime of South Africa continued to exist mainly because of the massive political, diplomatic, economic and military support and assistance which it received from certain Western States. It was deplorable that those countries should violate the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations and oppose the imposition of sanctions provided for under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

68. Furthermore, South Africa continued to occupy Namibia illegally and, despite the will of the international community, to deny to the Namibian people their right to self-determination and independence. The problem of Namibia was further complicated by the manoeuvres of certain Western States, aimed at maintaining the Western positions in the region by imposing a neo-colonialist settlement of the Namibian problem.

69. Racism and racial discrimination were not confined geographically to southern Africa and the Middle East. Racial discrimination, closely interlinked with social discrimination and injustice, was very much a part of daily life in many Western capitalist countries; its multiple manifestations were well known. His Government condemned all manifestations of racism and racial discrimination and considered the eradication of those specific forms of imperialist and colonialist ideology and political practice to be a prerequisite for the realization of the inalienable rights to self-determination and independence. For that reason, his country maintained no relations whatsoever with South Africa, firmly supported the imposition of sanctions against Pretoria and, in conformity with the provisions of the resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly, would continue to render political, moral and material assistance to the struggle of the oppressed peoples of South Africa and Namibia under the leadership of their national liberation movements.

70. His delegation hoped that the World Conference would make a significant contribution to the endeavours of the international community and, above all, would formulate specific measures aimed at ensuring the full and universal implementation of the United Nations resolutions and decisions on racism, racial discrimination and *apartheid*. In that connection, his delegation shared the serious concern expressed by the Preparatory Sub-Committee about the fact that the Western States had not participated in the work of the first session of that body. It hoped that those States would take part in the international co-operation to combat racism, racial discrimination and *apartheid* by

contributing in a positive manner to the future work of the Sub-Committee and the Second World Conference.

71. Mr. ESAN (Nigeria) said that, as the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination was drawing to a close and preparatory work was beginning for the Second World Conference, it was disturbing that, despite every effort, the Preparatory Sub-Committee had had to be established without the full representation of all regional groups at its first session. The problem of racism was a universal phenomenon; hence the critical importance of the Second World Conference, and the imperative need for co-operation by all States in that connection. He strongly urged the countries concerned to reconsider their position and join in the work of the Preparatory Sub-Committee at its next session.

72. Although the problem of racism existed the world over, nowhere else was it more blatant than in South Africa, since in that country racism had been institutionalized and a clique of racists continued to deny the masses which constituted the majority of the population their inalienable rights. It was clear that the situation in South Africa and Namibia was a serious affront to the dignity and worth of the human person and a challenge to the conscience of mankind as a whole. Moreover, it was contrary to the principles and purposes of the United Nations and to all norms of civilized behaviour. Virtually every Member State, with the exception of South Africa, had, publicly at least, at one time or another condemned racism and racial discrimination and the denial of the inalienable right of peoples to self-determination. Thus, the struggle of the people of Namibia was a struggle for the realization of the objectives of the United Nations and the values upheld by the international community, and vigorous intervention on the part of the latter was the only means left to force compliance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. The continued defiance by the racist Pretoria régime of the relevant resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council constituted a serious affront which must be checked with all the means at the disposal of the Organization.

73. The non-governmental organizations were to be commended for the role they were playing and the efforts they were making in the drive to end racism and racial discrimination. However, it appeared that the activities of one or two of those organizations could be construed as collaboration with the racist régime in South Africa. A report should therefore be prepared on that subject and submitted to the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations at its next session. In conclusion, he noted with appreciation the offer by the Government of the Philippines to host the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination.

74. Mr. OTT (Observer for the German Democratic Republic) said that the current situation in a number of countries and areas, such as southern Africa, the Middle East, Chile and Central America, showed that the complete elimination of all forms of racist exploitation and oppression, an objective formulated in the relevant United Nations documents, continued to be of vital importance. In many parts of the world human dignity continued to be trampled upon and racism was being practised in its most brutal form.

75. For years southern Africa had been one of the most explosive hotbeds of international tension. The Fascist *apartheid* régime in Pretoria defied all humanist norms. Any resistance was crushed by recourse to the most bestial methods, including assassination. Hardly had word of the death of trade union leader Neil Aggett been received when the Security Council had found itself compelled to intervene

again in connection with the death sentences passed upon three patriots of the African National Congress. His country added its voice to the urgent appeal made by the supreme body of the United Nations to save the lives of Ncimbithi Johnson Lubisi, Naphali Manana and Petrus Tsepo Mashigo. At the same time it demanded freedom for Nelson Mandela and the other imprisoned freedom fighters.

76. South Africa was continuing its illegal occupation of Namibia, applying imperialist and colonialist policies. Totalitarianism and rampant terrorism were accompanied by the craving for aggression and occupation beyond its borders. Recurrent acts of military provocation by South Africa against sovereign neighbouring States such as Angola and the use of mercenaries and counterrevolutionary bands were designed to destabilize the internal order of those States. In numerous documents, for instance in General Assembly resolution 36/172 E, the United Nations had pointed out that the close collaboration that existed between Pretoria and the United States, Israel and some other Western States and corporations served to encourage South Africa in its aggressive policy. As a result of that interplay, the racists possessed an increasingly menacing arsenal of modern weapons. His country joined the overwhelming majority of States in demanding that effective measures should be taken against the Pretoria régime pursuant to Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. In the current International Year of Mobilization for Sanctions against South Africa, his country would redouble its efforts to achieve that goal.

77. As for the situation in the Middle East, terrorist practices such as deportation and expulsion, large-scale arrests and inhuman treatment of Arab citizens were a consequence of the occupation and annexation of alien territories by Israel. His country condemned the Israeli policy of aggression and associated itself with the recommendations to impose sanctions on Israel made at the ninth emergency special session of the General Assembly.

78. Another form of racist policy was that pursued by the totalitarian and Fascist régimes in Chile, El Salvador and other Latin American countries. Although guilty of brutally oppressing their peoples and arbitrarily deporting and killing tens of thousands of them, those régimes were continuing to enjoy aid and support from imperialist Powers. It was common knowledge that the police and

secret service agents of the totalitarian régimes in Latin America were undergoing special training in imperialist training centres in an effort to bolster the dictatorships against popular movements.

79. The General Assembly, prompted by the historical experience that fascism was the most monstrous product of racist oppression, had repeatedly called upon all States to take measures against Fascist ideologies and practices and to ban neo-Nazi and Fascist organizations. Obviously, the imperialist policies of competitive armament, intensified psychological warfare and confrontation left more scope to the proponents and apologists of fascism. The German Democratic Republic, itself born of the struggle against fascism and war, was pursuing the implementation of United Nations decisions condemning Nazi and Fascist practices and calling upon States and international organizations to take appropriate countermeasures.

80. The Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination scheduled for 1983 would be a highlight in the struggle against racism and colonialism. His delegation supported the recommendations made by the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the Conference in document E/1982/26. The recommendations offered the opportunity to engage in a wide-ranging discussion of all aspects of racism and to plan steps going beyond the current Decade. The fact that representatives of the group of Western European and other States had not participated in the work of the Preparatory Sub-Committee illustrated once again how little their human rights declarations were worth.

81. The people and Government of his country would continue to extend solidarity and support to all who were fighting against racism, fascism and war. A humanist concern was a principle of socialist foreign policy. During the recent visits to the German Democratic Republic by the President of SWAPO, Sam Nujoma, and the Executive Committee Chairman of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), Yasser Arafat, that active solidarity had again been corroborated. His country supported the just struggle of all peoples still labouring under racist and colonialist oppression, and the full attainment of the objectives of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination.

The meeting rose at 12.30 p.m.

12th meeting

Wednesday, 21 April 1982, at 10.45 a.m.

President: Mr. Miljan KOMATINA (Yugoslavia).

E/1982/SR.12

AGENDA ITEM 2

Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (*continued*) (E/1982/24 and Add.1, E/1982/25, E/1982/26, E/1982/49, E/1982/L.18, E/AC.68/1982/L.5/Add.3)

1. Mr. KIBANDA (Observer for the Central African Republic) said that the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination would help to restore the underrated dignity of the human person and to re-establish a scale of values which would enable future generations to live in peace and harmony.

2. Racism and racial discrimination were two terms with tragic overtones; they were as old as the hills and were nurtured and perpetuated by ambition to dominate. Merely to mention them evoked memories of bloody conflict and indescribable tragedy, and they had their roots in the serious conflicts that had created turmoil in the world. As early as the eighteenth century, Montesquieu had stressed their immorality, their aggressive nature and their revolting characteristics.

3. Nevertheless, the problem remained, and all over the world men, women and children were the victims of prejudice and discrimination. In South Africa, that bastion

of cynical colonialism, prejudice had become law. The theory of *apartheid* could not be justified or defended, and it must be most strongly condemned by the international community.

4. The struggle was undoubtedly hard and the forces to be confronted were strong and possessed great destructive power. The Programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (General Assembly resolution 3057 (XXVIII), annex) provided for a number of measures the implementation of which would result in better conditions of life and a new order of relations between States.

5. However, any such action needed the support of all the States Members of the United Nations, its organs, its specialized agencies and non-governmental organizations.

6. The approaching end of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination provided a suitable occasion for making a thorough evaluation of the progress achieved. That task was primarily one for the Economic and Social Council and, if necessary, the declaration of another Decade should be proposed to the General Assembly.

7. Mr. BELL (Canada) said that the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination was one of the most important initiatives of the United Nations in the human rights field. The results of the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination and the work of its Preparatory Sub-Committee would be judged against the original objectives of the Decade.

8. The declaration of the Decade in 1973 had been a response to a series of especially regrettable social phenomena which increased in intensity in the 1960s and an effort to support the provisions of Article 1 of the Charter of the United Nations relating to human rights and fundamental freedoms.

9. The realization of so ambitious a goal had demanded the full participation of the international community. From the outset, Canada had participated actively in the special programmes for the Decade. Most Member States had done likewise, although some had wondered whether sufficient political will really existed to bring about the desired change within so short a period. Others, including Canada, had emphasized that the success of the Decade would depend to a great extent on the ability to avoid the peripheral and divisive issues which often intruded in international discourse.

10. Those doubts had proved to be valid. The programmes of the Decade had not ended injustice in southern Africa and it had proved necessary to support its goals by additional measures. In addition, the enthusiastic consensus which had marked the inauguration of the Decade had been lost. Serious divisions had developed over the inclusion of contentious concepts extraneous to the originally agreed purposes. Those issues had seriously marred the work of the first World Conference for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination and had prevented a number of delegations, including that of Canada, from supporting the Programme of Action.

11. It was ironic that a basic issue of concern to all should have divided rather than united. The possibility of ending that situation depended on the will of Member States. Canada had therefore kept an open mind on the question of the Second World Conference, despite its disappointment with the previous Conference. For that reason, it had studied the report of the Preparatory Sub-Committee (E/1982/26) with interest and found that it contained a number of useful proposals which could provide a groundwork for the Conference.

12. However, Canada regarded as controversial the proposal in section III.E of the report (*ibid.*) that General Assembly resolution 31/78, which made exceptions to the general United Nations financial guidelines for the holding of United Nations conferences away from Headquarters, as laid down in Assembly resolution 2609 (XXIV), should apply. Subitems 10 (d) and 10 (e) of the draft provisional agenda (*ibid.*, annex) also raised matters of serious concern because they related to precisely those extraneous political issues which had caused dissension and prevented consensus at the 1978 Conference. They were issues that had been and continued to be examined in the greatest detail in the General Assembly and the Security Council, which were the appropriate forums for the consideration of such issues.

13. His delegation did not put forward those concerns in a spirit of negativism. On the contrary, it wanted the Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination to end, as it had begun, in a spirit of enthusiastic consensus. That meant that full advantage must be taken of the opportunity provided by the forthcoming Conference, leaving aside extraneous issues which contributed nothing to the attainment of its goals. The attitude of Canada to the Second World Conference would depend on its assessment of the possibilities for a realistic and balanced outcome which addressed the real problems of racism and racial discrimination on the basis of consensus.

14. Mr. RANGACHARI (India) said that the Second World Conference would provide an opportunity for reviewing the progress that had been made during the Decade and for assessing the problems and obstacles which remained so that the necessary action could be taken. The problems of racism and racial discrimination would not disappear with the end of the Decade. History showed that in periods of economic distress there was a recrudescence of discriminatory measures, and in the multiracial societies of the present day the immigrants, the non-natives, the migrant workers became the unfortunate victims. Each society where racial discrimination existed would, of course, have to decide for itself how to combat racial discrimination. While there were manifestations of racial discrimination in several places, the policy of *apartheid* remained the worst of all. In that context, one must agree with the delegation of France that there was a distinction between institutionalized racism and other instances of racial discrimination. The case of South Africa was therefore unique and had to be dealt with as such. The entire international community had an obligation to put an end to that evil system, and the only way to achieve that goal was by the imposition of comprehensive sanctions. Regrettably, there were some countries which refused to join in imposing such sanctions, and it was even more regrettable that that refusal did not appear to be based on any consideration of principle.

15. In the case of Namibia, 16 years after the termination of South Africa's mandate (see General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI)) and four years after the adoption of the plan for the independence of Namibia (see General Assembly resolution S-9/2), the international community was still being told to wait patiently while negotiations were completed. The people of Namibia could not wait indefinitely to achieve their inalienable right, and they would undoubtedly put an end to the oppression and exploitation of the minority racist régime. The problem of *apartheid* in South Africa was not a problem of definitions but of lack of political will.

16. His delegation regretted that not all regional groups had been represented in the Preparatory Sub-Committee, but there was still time for goodwill and co-operation from all sides to ensure a successful outcome of the forthcoming Conference. In connection with the preparatory work, particularly the regional seminars which were part of the

programme for the second half of the Decade, he noted that the region of the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) was the only one where no seminar had been held and hoped that one could be arranged later in the year. Where administrative and organizational measures were concerned, the appointment of the Secretary-General of the World Conference was still pending and he hoped that a decision in that regard would be taken as soon as possible.

17. He would like to refer to the discussions in the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, whose Chairman had written to the President of the Council in that regard. The issue was one of principle which needed to be considered in greater detail. The work done by a number of non-governmental organizations in exposing the evils of *apartheid* and the consequences of the policies of the racist minority régime in Pretoria merited appreciation. However, there was a need to ensure that no action was taken by non-governmental organizations which could be construed as support for the racist régime or its policy of *apartheid*. He hoped that that question could be discussed at the next session of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, and he also hoped that non-governmental organizations would provide the necessary information which could form the basis of the discussion in the Committee.

18. The PRESIDENT confirmed that he had received a letter from the Chairman of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, which would be issued the following day.

19. Mr. POZZO (Venezuela) reiterated his country's firm rejection of racism, racial discrimination and *apartheid*, which still existed despite the constant efforts of the great majority of Member States. History showed that the origin of racism and racial discrimination lay in the colonizing practices of the imperialist Powers, which were still being carried on in new and arrogant forms of colonialism and neo-colonialism. Venezuela believed that colonialism must be eliminated, and those who persisted in maintaining, reimposing or strengthening it must be made to understand that the process of decolonization was irreversible.

20. With regard to the Decade, it was to be hoped that the objectives established at the outset would be attained. However, the objectives of the Programme of Action adopted at the first World Conference¹ had encountered obstacles which he hoped would not be insurmountable because of a lack of will on the part of some countries. Venezuela fully supported the convening of the Second World Conference, scheduled for 1983, and hoped that all Member States would lend their assistance and participate actively in order to ensure the full discharge of the international community's commitment to eliminate racism, racial discrimination and *apartheid*.

21. Mr. CHOWDHURY (Bangladesh) said that the international community was once again engaged in the debate on the subject of racism and racial discrimination to find ways of effectively combating that crime against humanity, the cruellest expression of which was found in the policies pursued by the South African régime against its majority population. These policies had meant denial of political representation to more than four fifths of the population, economic discrimination and exploitation on an unprecedented scale, transfer of millions of Africans and dismemberment of the country through the creation of white enclaves and bantustans. The aim of the policy of "separate development" was to maintain the exclusive power of the white minority. That not only was a gross violation of

human rights but also had a destabilizing effect on the peace and security of the region. Unfortunately, the international community had failed to live up to its responsibility. Today the situation in southern Africa was one of the most serious sources of crisis, endangering international peace and security. By its intransigence and arrogance, the racist régime in South Africa was obstructing a just solution to the problem of the independence of Namibia and the exercise of the right of self-determination by its people. The international community could neither ignore that brutal and audacious challenge nor leave it without an appropriate response.

22. In 1973, the General Assembly had approved the Programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. As the end of the Decade approached, the results must be assessed and the efforts of the international community to achieve its objectives in their entirety must be redoubled. Bangladesh was opposed to all forms of colonialism, racism and racial discrimination and believed that universal accession to and strict implementation of the provisions of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (General Assembly resolution 2106 A (XX), annex) were vital to the successful realization of the objectives of the Decade. It also fully supported the holding of the Second World Conference in 1983 and the launching of a second decade to put a total stop to the monstrous system of discrimination. The Secretary-General of the Second World Conference must be appointed as early as possible so that the necessary preparations could be undertaken. His delegation fully endorsed the recommendations and the draft provisional agenda contained in the report of the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the Second World Conference (E/1982/26). In addition to a general introductory paper for the Conference, introductory papers should be prepared for each of the main substantive items of the agenda. The Commission on Human Rights, the United Nations Institute on Training and Research (UNITAR) and the secretariat of the relevant United Nations organs should be involved in the preparation of those papers. Each Government should be invited to present a national report on the activities undertaken in implementation of the objectives of the Decade and Programme of Action. His delegation would request the Secretary-General to take the necessary steps for holding the scheduled seminar for the ESCAP region in August 1982. Lastly, he noted that the Philippines had generously offered to host the Second World Conference, thus fulfilling the desire of the developing countries that the Conference should be held in one of those countries.

23. Mr. AL-GEWAILY (Qatar) said that racial intolerance was a crime against humanity and a threat to international peace and security, and policies and practices of racial discrimination and *apartheid* constituted a serious impediment to economic and social development. The Arab world was not surprised to see the *apartheid* régime in South Africa enjoying the friendship and close co-operation of those who were practising the Zionist philosophy in Arab territories.

24. Fortunately, the conscience of the international community could not tolerate racism and racial discrimination in the world, and in 1973 the General Assembly had proclaimed the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. A high point in the international activities carried out during the Decade had been the World Conference in 1978. The Conference had adopted the Programme of Action and had recommended that at the end of the Decade another World Conference should be held to review and evaluate the work undertaken.

¹ See A/CONF.92/40, chap. II

25. The Second World Conference in 1983 would mark the beginning of the second and most decisive stage in the fight against racism and racial discrimination; for the world could not afford to continue the current slow pace of progress. The reprehensible *apartheid* régime in South Africa and the expansionist Zionist régime in occupied Arab lands had no place among civilized nations. The Second World Conference must take concrete measures, including mandatory sanctions in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

26. Mr. MASSOT (Brazil) said that his country, formed by ethnic and cultural elements from many different origins living in perfect harmony and integration, totally rejected racism.

27. His delegation believed in the importance of reiterating in every possible forum its commitment to racial harmony and denouncing any manifestation of racism in other countries, thereby fighting for the accomplishment of the goals established for the Decade. Brazil had voted in favour of the resolutions adopted by the United Nations to that end, which welcomed the seminars, round-tables and studies conducted during the second half of the Decade and urged that the Secretary-General of the Second World Conference should be appointed without delay.

28. *Apartheid* was the most repulsive manifestation of racism. Attention should therefore be focused on that issue, so as to avoid any dispersion of efforts. In compliance with the relevant resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, Brazil contributed regularly to international funds to combat *apartheid* and racial discrimination, condemned the policy of "bantustanization", participated in international conferences held under the auspices of the United Nations to intensify the struggle against *apartheid*, racism and racial discrimination, and had taken part in the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa in 1981.

29. Great importance was attached in Brazil to the celebration of the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination and the Week of Solidarity with the Colonial Peoples of Southern Africa Fighting for Freedom, Independence and Equal Rights. At the last session of the Commission on Human Rights, Brazil had supported the resolutions on violations of human rights and *apartheid* in South Africa and Namibia.

30. Mr. NOWAK (Poland) drew attention to the close relation between racism, *apartheid*, racial discrimination, colonial aggression and the right of peoples to self-determination. Despite the progress achieved by the international community in eradicating colonialism, racism, racial discrimination and *apartheid*, the situation of the population of South Africa had remained unchanged for many years. Poland had fully supported the objectives of General Assembly resolution 3057 (XXVIII), proclaiming the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. The Polish parliament, reacting to Nazi genocidal policies in the occupied territories, had long since adopted legislation in which the question of non-discrimination and equality had a special place.

31. The Decade had helped to mobilize the international community against racism, although it remained a problem which could not be solved in a mere 10 years. Furthermore, the United Nations was not to be blamed for failure to achieve all the objectives of the Decade. It was obvious that the South African régime would never be able to defy world public opinion and the resolutions of the United Nations unless it could count on the political, economic and military assistance of some Western Powers. The representatives of those Powers made declarations condemning the policy of

racism and *apartheid*, but it was not possible, in his delegation's view, to be against *apartheid* and at the same time to render political, military and economic support to a Government whose policy was based precisely on racism and *apartheid*.

32. The international community should intensify its struggle against violations of human rights and against those who helped to maintain, directly or indirectly, the racist régime of South Africa. Stricter adherence to international legal instruments was necessary in order to combat racism, racial discrimination and *apartheid*. It was to be hoped that at the Second World Conference a detailed evaluation would be made of the state of racial discrimination in the world on the basis of the findings of the seminars and meetings conducted during the second half of the Decade. From the organizational point of view, it would be highly desirable for the Secretary-General of the Second World Conference to be appointed as soon as possible so that practical preparations for the Conference could start without undue delay.

33. His delegation would spare no effort to ensure the success of the Second World Conference and hoped that Member States which had so far shown indulgence to the racist régime in South Africa would join with the international community in its efforts to eradicate racism, racial discrimination and *apartheid* in southern Africa.

34. Mr. O'DONOVAN (Observer for Ireland) said that, by identifying certain human beings as inferior, racial discrimination took away an essential element for the recognition and respect of human rights, namely, the equal moral value of all human beings. No human society was perfectly free from feelings of exclusiveness and superiority and, in consequence, from the impulse to discriminate. For that reason, as well as for the need to promote peace and respect for human rights, the struggle against racial discrimination must be an international one.

35. The international community had recognized the *apartheid* laws of South Africa not merely as the worst case of racism but as a practice institutionalized, perpetuated and developed as a State system. That explained the strength of feeling against *apartheid* and justified the insistent and sustained concern of the world community. It was necessary to state again and again that *apartheid*, in addition to violating human rights, was a conceptual challenge to the very basis of such rights and controverted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

36. Although it had persisted for a long time, the system of *apartheid* would eventually collapse because the international community recognized that it was a threat to the peace of the region and of the world. His country supported the adoption of such measures against South Africa as the arms embargo, the oil embargo and the banning of new investments and loans. Further, it participated in the cultural and sports boycott of South Africa and supported efforts to promote international solidarity against South Africa, such as the designation of 1982 as International Year of Mobilization for Sanctions against South Africa, and the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination.

37. Ireland had supported most of the proposals made at the first World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, held in 1978.

38. He referred to the report of the first session of the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the Second Conference (E/1982/26) and regretted that it had not been possible for all regional groups to participate fully in the session. The Sub-Committee's recommendation to include the question of the Middle East in the agenda of the Conference ran the risk of endangering the work of the Conference and the

successful conclusion of the Decade. The Council should therefore leave the adoption of the Conference's draft provisional agenda to its first regular session of 1983, when it would be able to consider all of the recommendations of the Sub-Committee.

39. As to the question of preparing a draft final document for the Conference, the Sub-Committee had recommended that the Secretariat should prepare a draft programme of action containing proposals for activities to be undertaken after the Conference. His delegation supported that proposal and believed that it would be desirable for the Secretary-General of the Conference to be appointed as soon as possible.

40. Mr. BENA (Romania) said that the documents presented by the Secretariat painted too optimistic a picture of the status of the struggle to eradicate racism, racial discrimination and *apartheid* and of the work involved, both now and in the future, in the full implementation of the Programme for the Decade. His delegation's opinion on that matter was guided by the fact that it had consistently favoured the adoption and implementation of all United Nations resolutions supporting the struggle for national liberation and against racism, racial discrimination, *apartheid*, colonialism, neo-colonialism and foreign domination.

41. The eradication of racial discrimination and full equality of rights of all human beings were indispensable to the modern age. In accordance with that belief, his country had continued to give full support to the struggle of the people of Namibia under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) to terminate the illegal occupation of its territory and to exercise without delay its right freely to determine the course of its future development. Similarly, his country had vigorously condemned and continued to condemn the racist and *apartheid* policy of South Africa towards the African population and its armed attacks on neighbouring countries, and had fully complied with the resolutions adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly in connection with the practical measures to be applied to colonial and racist régimes in southern Africa.

42. At the current session the Council was called upon to play an important part in the process of preparing for the Second World Conference planned for 1983. His delegation appreciated the efforts which were being made in the Council to make effective progress in the preparations for the World Conference and welcomed the offer made by the Government of the Philippines to host that important world assembly.

43. He drew the attention of all members to paragraph 12 of General Assembly resolution 36/8 which called upon all States to adopt measures to combat the dissemination of ideas based on racial superiority or hatred and to outlaw organizations based on racial hatred and prejudice.

44. On a more general level, his delegation believed that the United Nations and all Governments had the duty constantly to encourage and promote humanist education, in a spirit of peace and understanding, freedom and social justice, friendship and mutual respect.

45. Mrs. ZACHAROPOULOS (Greece) said that the Decade had been proclaimed in order to put an end to one of the ugliest scourges bedevilling the so-called civilized world but that the practices of racism had not been eliminated. It was therefore of the utmost importance that the action undertaken should be continued with even greater determination until the goal was reached. The Second World Conference was directed towards that end, and one of its tasks would be to review and evaluate the work of the Decade and to formulate specific measures aimed at

ensuring the full and universal implementation of the United Nations decisions and resolutions on racism, racial discrimination and *apartheid*. The issue was of crucial importance in the struggle against all forms of racial discrimination and required a spirit of goodwill and the co-operation of all Member States.

46. Greece had always implemented the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations and had faithfully complied with the provisions of the international instruments to which it was a party.

47. Although racial discrimination was unknown in Greece, the Government had none the less deemed it proper, as a matter of principle, to enact special legislation establishing penalties for any person or group of persons who committed acts or engaged in activities conducive to racial discrimination and had, moreover, enshrined the principle of equality in its Constitution of 1975.

48. The violation of human rights in South Africa was one of the most important issues involving racial discrimination. The institutionalized policy of *apartheid* in South Africa was a flagrant violation of human rights. Greece deplored the practices of the Government of Pretoria, both in South Africa and in Namibia, and supported the international community in its efforts to restore fundamental rights in those two countries.

49. The Greek delegation therefore attached great importance to the work of the Second World Conference. It was to be hoped that in the preparations for the Conference due account would be taken of the views of all geographical groups so that the broadest possible agreement could be achieved. In that spirit, the Greek Government intended to participate in the next session of the Preparatory Sub-Committee in the hope of contributing to the success of preparations for the Second World Conference.

50. Miss GUEVARA ACHAVAL (Argentina) said that at the outset, the period of 10 years decreed by the General Assembly as the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination had seemed a long enough time-span for mankind to root out the sinister theories on which racist and discriminatory practices were founded. As that decade was drawing to a close, however, there were scant grounds for optimism in the results so far achieved.

51. For that reason, Argentina believed that it was necessary to hold the Second World Conference not only to evaluate the achievements of the Decade but also and particularly to work out future plans of action. That would require the participation of all Member States. Argentina therefore enclosed the appeal of the Preparatory Sub-Committee for its membership to be completed at its next session.

52. The Argentine delegation also considered that if possible the Second World Conference should be held in a developing country. Accordingly, it welcomed the offer made by the Government of the Philippines for the Conference to be held in Manila and trusted that the Council would recommend acceptance of that offer. Argentina also supported the Sub-Committee's recommendation to the effect that, if the Conference were held in a developing country, the formula adopted in General Assembly resolution 31/78 regarding the cost involved in hosting the first World Conference should be applied.

53. On the subject of documentation, the Argentine delegation shared the opinion of the Sub-Committee on the volume and quantity of pre-session documents. It was essential for Member States to receive the documents well in advance since they could not be expected to know what was in them if they received them only when they arrived at the Conference. Finally, the Argentine delegation consid-

ered that in order to ensure the continuity of its achievements, the World Conference must be given the widest possible publicity. To that end, it was necessary not only to harness the resources of the United Nations information services but also to strengthen the role of the media in general.

54. Mr. ZUCCONI (Italy) said that the struggle against racism and *apartheid* was a fundamental task of the United Nations and even though some headway had been made, much remained to be done. Member States should therefore join forces to make further progress along the course they had mapped out together when the Programme for the Decade had been approved.

55. However, the Italian delegation would not support the proposal to convene the Second World Conference if its deliberations were to be based on the agenda contained in the annex to the report of the Preparatory Sub-Committee (E/1982/26). Its position was motivated by the same considerations which had led Italy, together with other countries, to dissociate itself from the Declaration adopted by the first World Conference.

56. None the less, Italy trusted that it would be possible to reach a solution permitting the broadest possible participation in the Second World Conference.

57. Mr. LAGOS (Chile) emphasized that his country had always strongly condemned all forms of discrimination, particularly its most odious manifestation, namely racism.

58. Throughout nearly two centuries of independence, Chile had never spared any effort, both in its legal order and in its domestic and foreign policy, in upholding the fundamental principle that all men were born free and equal in dignity and rights.

59. Chile had ratified the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and had periodically submitted the required reports. It had also supported without reservation the proclamation of the Decade in 1973 and the convening of the Second World Conference. In that connection, it welcomed the offer made by the Government of the Philippines to host such an important event.

60. However, Chile could not but express its concern over the risk that achievement of the lofty goals of the Council might be aborted by injecting issues which, far from contributing to a pooling of efforts for the struggle against racism, racial discrimination and *apartheid*, would prove divisive.

61. That concern had moreover been voiced by other delegations. The Second World Conference must deal with racism, racial discrimination and *apartheid* to the exclusion of other topics which had no direct bearing on the Council's goals.

62. In the course of the discussion, the Chilean delegation had noted with amazement that one particular delegation had been intent on diverting the attention of the Council to issues irrelevant to its work, thus confirming that the concerns expressed were well-founded. Particularly notable in that connection had been the statement made by the Observer for the German Democratic Republic against certain Latin American countries. His delegation would not attempt to address the substance of the so-called arguments put forward by the representative of the German Democratic Republic; it was firmly convinced that to use the Council as a platform for political statements absolutely unrelated to the item under discussion would not make any contribution whatsoever towards strengthening the struggle against racism and racial discrimination.

63. The situation in South Africa and Namibia, where the most odious forms of discrimination and *apartheid* were practised, was extremely grave and constituted a breach of the most fundamental principles recognized by the international community through the United Nations. Chile wished to reiterate its unwavering support both for the people of Namibia and for its just cause.

64. Much remained to be done before mankind could rid itself of the scourge of racial discrimination; efforts must be made and above all common ground must be found to turn the Second World Conference into an effective instrument for eradicating, perhaps for ever, racism and racial discrimination, a task to which the Chilean delegation was wholeheartedly committed.

65. Mr. HUSAIN (Pakistan) said that it was time to evaluate the results achieved during the Decade. The first World Conference and the Declaration and the Programme of Action which had been adopted had been milestones in the struggle against racism and racial discrimination and had given fresh impetus to the efforts of the international community, which had led to the adoption of the four-year programme of activities in 1979 (General Assembly resolution 34/24). There were also grounds for optimism in the reports of the Secretary-General on the various related measures taken by United Nations bodies and international organizations (E/1982/24 and Add.1 and E/1982/25).

66. The sad fact remained, however, that racism and racial discrimination had still not been entirely eradicated. Their most abominable and revolting manifestation was the régime of *apartheid* which continued to prevail in South Africa and Namibia, despite the fact that the United Nations had declared it a crime against humanity.

67. Pakistan wished to express its concern at the fact that the South African authorities had still not commuted the death sentences on three young freedom fighters, despite the unanimous request made by the members of the Security Council in its resolution 503 (1982) of 9 April. The disregard by some countries of the General Assembly's appeals to put an end to co-operation with South Africa was an attitude which promoted and encouraged the policy of *apartheid*.

68. The disparity between the objectives and the results of the Decade made it necessary to intensify the struggle against racism. The General Assembly (resolution 36/172) had accordingly declared 1982 the International Year of Mobilization for Sanctions against South Africa and had requested the Security Council urgently to consider various declarations and reports with a view to the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against the *apartheid* régime of South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

69. In that context, his delegation welcomed the forthcoming Second World Conference. Pakistan had taken active part in the deliberations of the Preparatory Sub-Committee and supported its recommendations (see E/1982/26), particularly the recommendation that the Conference should be held in a developing country. It therefore welcomed the offer of the Philippines to host the Conference. On the other hand, it regretted that, despite the efforts that had been made, there had not been full participation in the Preparatory Sub-Committee.

70. Pakistan hoped that at the Second World Conference special attention must be given to the conclusions of the various seminars and round-tables held during the second half of the Decade. In that connection, his delegation proposed that the seminar for the ESCAP region scheduled for the second half of the Decade, in accordance with the four-year programme, should be held in August 1982.

71. Racism and racial discrimination were contrary to the Islamic faith. For that reason, there were no practices, laws or policies in Pakistan which could be viewed as inciting to racial prejudice. Pakistan had been one of the first countries to sign the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and had from the outset contributed to the various funds for assisting the families of opponents of the *apartheid* régime such as the United Nations Fund for Namibia and the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa, and to the budget of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination.

72. Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the declaration of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination and the programmes and activities of recent years in that field were a positive contribution to the efforts of the international community. Through them, many peoples and regions had been able to free themselves from the yoke of racism and colonialism.

73. Racism was now being condemned with increased vigour, and that condemnation found expression in the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid* (General Assembly resolution 3068 (XXVIII), annex). Nevertheless, racism, colonialism and discrimination continued to exist and the international community must intensify its action to combat those evils, the most hateful and repulsive expression of which was the system of *apartheid*, termed by the United Nations a crime against humanity.

74. Despite the resolutions of the General Assembly, the Pretoria Government continued to occupy Namibia and had intensified the hostility displayed in its foreign policy, as was evidenced by its acts of aggression against Angola and Mozambique and its involvement in the Seychelles *coup d'état*.

75. The situation was aggravated by the support given by the imperialist monopolies and the NATO countries, especially the United States, which turned a deaf ear to the resolutions of the General Assembly and invented excuses for not participating in the work of the Preparatory Sub-Committee.

76. The American press itself had reported on the political rapprochement between the United States and South Africa, and official statements had been issued describing the Pretoria Government as a traditional ally and a friend. Political circles in Washington insisted that that political support should be intensified.

77. Such an attitude only encouraged racism and had accordingly been denounced at the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly, which had proclaimed the year 1982 International Year of Mobilization for Sanctions against South Africa.

78. The expansionist policy of Israel also constituted a form of racism. Israel's actions in the occupied territories were aimed at driving the Palestinian Arabs from their homeland. For that purpose, the Israelis had not hesitated to resort to acts of vandalism.

79. The latest examples of such actions by the Israeli occupation forces, the acts of vandalism committed against the holy places in Jerusalem and the bombings of Palestinian refugee camps in Lebanon showed Zionism for what it was: a policy of genocide against the Arab peoples. United Nations decisions had repeatedly emphasized that the various forms of racism and racial discrimination had their

origin in social conditions and were a means for the exploitation of man by man, which was one of the main reasons for the existence of racism. Everyone knew about the exploitation of and discrimination against national minorities and foreign workers in the capitalist countries, whose rulers talked hypocritically of respect for human rights. In those countries there were Fascist and racist organizations which advanced theories of racial supremacy and sowed hatred among peoples. Clearly, one of the major prerequisites for eradicating racism was that the dissemination of racist ideas should be declared punishable by law and organizations based on racial intolerance and hatred, including neo-Nazi and Fascist organizations, should be prohibited.

80. The current year was the sixtieth anniversary of the creation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. From the historical standpoint that was a short time, but the achievements of the Soviet State were impressive because they were based on the fraternal unity of citizens throughout the country.

81. In keeping with its peace-loving foreign policy, the Soviet Union had always supported and continued to support the national liberation movements in southern Africa and fully endorsed the programme for the second half of the Decade. It condemned the policies of the Pretoria régime and supported proposals for sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

82. The Soviet Union supported the holding of the Second World Conference in 1983, which would greatly encourage all States to comply with the resolutions and decisions on racism and racial discrimination so as to achieve the complete isolation and a world-wide boycott of the racist régime of South Africa. Finally, since the objectives of the first Decade had not been accomplished, the Soviet Union supported the proposal that a second decade for action to combat racism and racial discrimination should be proclaimed in order to mobilize the entire international community for the eradication of all forms of racism.

83. The PRESIDENT said that if there was no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to extend the deadline for the submission of draft proposals under the item relating to the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination to 6 p.m. on Friday, 23 April.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 1

Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters (*continued*) (E/1982/53)

84. The PRESIDENT said that, in accordance with the approved programme of work, the Council would begin its consideration of item 3 (Special economic, humanitarian and disaster relief assistance) at the next meeting. In view of the heavy schedule of work, he wondered whether delegations would like plenary meetings of the Council and meetings of the Second (Social) Committee to be held concurrently.

85. Mr. RANGACHARI (India) said that since there were only seven speakers on the list for item 2, the usual practice of alternating meetings should be continued.

86. The PRESIDENT said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Council decided to continue the usual practice of alternating the meetings of the Council and

of the Second (Social) Committee during the consideration of item 2.

It was so decided.

87. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the letter dated 19 April 1982 from the Permanent Representative of Democratic Yemen to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (E/1982/53) and said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Council decided to

consider the measures to be taken following the floods which had affected Democratic Yemen under agenda item 3, entitled "Special economic, humanitarian and disaster relief assistance".

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.

13th meeting

Thursday, 22 April 1982, at 10.45 a.m.

President: Mr. Miljan KOMATINA (Yugoslavia).

E/1982/SR.13

In the absence of the President, Mr. Velloso (Brazil), Vice-President, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 3

Special economic, humanitarian and disaster relief assistance (E/1982/40, E/1982/44 and Add.1, E/1982/53, A/37/178)

1. The PRESIDENT said that as agreed, the Council would also, in connection with item 3, consider measures to be taken following the cyclones and floods which had affected Madagascar (E/1982/44 and Add.1) and measures to be taken following the heavy floods which had affected Democratic Yemen (E/1982/53).
2. Mr. SMYSER (United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Refugees) said that the grave situation of refugees or displaced persons in the Horn of Africa and the Sudan had been the subject of several resolutions of the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly in which the Secretary-General had been requested to report to the Council at its first regular session on the efforts of the international community to assist the affected persons.
3. While, very often, disaster relief must be provided, there was also a need to find lasting solutions: voluntary repatriation, local integration or resettlement. To that end, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) co-operated closely with the Governments concerned, enlisted the support of the United Nations system and drew on the resources of numerous non-governmental organizations.
4. In Somalia, the immediate difficulties had been surmounted by the end of 1981 and the state of emergency that had characterized the first three years of operations had been contained. In 1982, UNHCR's programme would continue to satisfy refugees' basic needs and to emphasize longer-term, income-generating projects. The Council had before it a detailed account of the mission sent to Somalia in January 1982 (see E/1982/40).
5. In Djibouti, refugees had constituted 10 per cent of the population by the end of 1981. In view of the difficulty of establishing self-reliant rural settlements and other types of local integration, UNHCR had continued to provide mainly relief assistance in 1981. Refugees now in camps who chose not to return to their country of origin would ultimately have to be involved in productive activities which would contrib-

ute to their self sufficiency and to the development of Djibouti.

6. With regard to the Sudan, it should be noted that, despite its economic difficulties as a least developed country, the Sudan had maintained a generous policy of welcoming refugees. The Government had estimated that there had been 550,000 refugees in the Sudan in 1981 to which UNHCR had continued to provide assistance. Various missions had been sent to the Sudan, including an interagency mission sent in June 1980, a joint ILO/UNHCR interdisciplinary mission sent at the end of 1982 and an interagency mission, led by ECA and including representatives of UNICEF, UNESCO and UNHCR, sent in January 1982 (see A/37/178). UNHCR had committed over \$19.8 million for assistance to refugees in the Sudan. In that connection, the contribution of voluntary agencies and other organizations of the United Nations system, especially WFP and the ILO, had been invaluable.

7. With regard to Ethiopia, a special programme of assistance to returnees to Ethiopia had been undertaken in 1980. Since many refugees had continued to return, a decision had been taken following consultations with the Ethiopian authorities and a high-level UNHCR mission in February 1982, to continue the programme into 1982 and to expand it.

8. Voluntary repatriation remained the ideal solution and the key to resolving any refugee situation. That was particularly true of the Horn of Africa and the Sudan, given the magnitude and complexity of the problem which called for a reasonable approach and also for flexibility on the part of UNHCR.

9. Mr. JENSEN (Director, Office for Special Political Questions) said that, at the request of the General Assembly (resolution 36/153), a mission had been dispatched to Somalia to review the overall needs of the refugees in that country. The report of that mission was contained in document E/1982/40. In 1981 the influx of refugees into Somalia had declined but, for a variety of reasons, it was very difficult to estimate the actual number of refugees in the camps at any one time. For the planning of relief efforts during 1982, however, the mission had recommended that the number of refugees in the camps should be taken to be approximately 700,000. The most important requirements of those refugees were for basic food items. While pledges would cover most needs, a deficit of 15,000 tonnes of food remained. It should be noted that WFP was ready to channel food assistance from bilateral and multilateral sources.

10. The Government of Somalia and non-governmental organizations were providing basic health care. International assistance was needed, however, to strengthen the health service infrastructure at the camps. In all, it was estimated that over \$138 million would be needed in 1982, for the main relief efforts for the refugees in Somalia.

11. Since many refugees would like to see an increase in self-help activities, programmes aimed at self-reliance for a temporarily settled refugee population must be planned and implemented. In that connection, the mission had suggested to the Government that it should entrust its functional ministries with the implementation of refugee projects and programmes. That would allow refugee self-reliance programmes to be co-ordinated with, and in some cases integrated into, international development plans. The National Refugee Commission should have the primary responsibility for planning, co-ordinating and supervising such programmes. The Government had agreed to those recommendations. None the less, international assistance was urgently required to organize and operate an improved refugee administration. In that connection, the Government had emphasized that it would welcome joint planning with the international donor community of refugee projects and programmes.

12. Since the refugee influx had begun in 1978, a number of voluntary agencies had provided valuable and timely assistance. The number of such agencies had increased and their activities had multiplied. Currently, some 30 voluntary agencies were participating in the relief effort.

13. Mr. LUTEM (Director, Liaison Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator) recalled that, in May 1980, the Government of Ethiopia had requested the Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator (UNDRO) to lead a multiagency and donor mission to identify and estimate the immediate assistance needs of displaced persons in Ethiopia. The \$8 million received from various donors had not been sufficient to cover even the most urgent needs. Subsequently, UNDRO had organized a second interagency mission on which it had presented a report to the Third Committee of the General Assembly in November 1980. In its resolutions 35/91 and 35/183, the Assembly had requested the Secretary-General urgently to mobilize humanitarian assistance for displaced persons and voluntary returnees in Ethiopia. In its resolution 1981/32, the Council had appealed once more to all donors to provide prompt and generous assistance to the displaced persons in Ethiopia on the basis of the recommendations of the interagency mission. At its thirty-sixth session, the General Assembly had requested the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to continue his efforts in favour of the large number of voluntary returnees to Ethiopia.

14. The Government of Ethiopia, for its part, had undertaken a project to settle displaced persons in the province of Bale. Famine and the effects of internal conflict continued in northern Ethiopia but significant improvements had taken place in the southern provinces. It was estimated that there were 4.8 million people seriously affected throughout the country. In March 1981, the United Nations Co-ordinating Committee for Relief and Rehabilitation, in collaboration with the Relief and Rehabilitation Commission of Ethiopia, had published a report identifying the most urgently needed relief and rehabilitation assistance for about 1.5 million people within a time frame of 18 months.

15. According to the report, food needs were the most pressing. Food assistance required for an 18-month period had been estimated at 192,000 tons of grain, 17,600 tons of supplementary food and 14,400 tons of edible oil. Rainfall in some parts of the country in March and June 1981 and

January 1982 had not been sufficient to end the drought. In 1981, rains had come late in the area, which normally provided 90 per cent of grain production. Gross national availability of cereals and pulses had been only 328.5 grams per capita per day for 1981 and was expected to be lower in 1982; the United Nations survival ration was 400 grams. Consequently, the estimated shortfall in production for 1981/82 would be approximately 350,000 tons of cereals.

16. The shortage of trucks to distribute relief items had been a perennial problem for the Relief and Rehabilitation Commission, which had to hire trucks to supplement the services of its own vehicles. The Swedish Government had contributed funds for the purchase of new trucks. The old planes belonging to the Commission also needed to be replaced by turbo-prop aircraft that could land on short, rough runways.

17. The health care activities in the short-term programme had two main components: improvement of services, including the provision of medicaments and supplies, and restoration of health infrastructure through the repair and reconstruction of damaged facilities. In May 1981, the members of WHO had requested the Director-General to mobilize, on an emergency basis, health and medical assistance for the Government of Ethiopia. The total cost of the health programmes was estimated at \$215 million, but so far contributions for the period 1980-1981 amounted to only some \$43 million. In July 1980, the League of Red Cross Societies had started operations in Ethiopia consisting of two components, relief operations and development programmes. The health and nutrition relief operations initiated by the League had been continued by the Ethiopian Red Cross Society, while the League had shifted its emphasis towards development programmes.

18. On behalf of the Secretary-General, he appealed to the international community to contribute generously towards the implementation of the programmes that were necessary for the survival of the displaced and drought-affected people in Ethiopia.

19. With regard to the measures to be taken following the cyclones and floods which had affected Madagascar, he drew attention to the letters dated 30 March and 14 April 1982 from the Permanent Representative of Madagascar to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (E/1982/44 and Add.1). After the floods of 1981-1982, UNDRO had offered to help the Government of Madagascar in co-ordinating relief assistance. On 26 January 1982, UNDRO had launched an appeal for emergency assistance to Madagascar and had seconded one of its staff members to the UNDP office in Antananarivo to assess the damage and co-ordinate international relief. In the Antananarivo area, more than 100,000 people had been rendered homeless and cyclones had caused serious damage to roads, bridges and railways. Those circumstances had aggravated an already serious situation with regard to food and fuel supplies. As sanitation facilities had been disrupted, the danger of epidemics had arisen, intensified by the shortage of medicines. It should be noted that as a result of the preventive measures which had been taken, the flooding had been less extensive and less destructive in 1982 than in 1959. UNDRO had recently stepped up its disaster preparedness and prevention activities. After the floods, the Government of Madagascar had promptly initiated relief operations, which had been complemented by those of Caritas, Catholic Relief Services and the Red Cross Society.

20. The priority emergency requirements were food, reconstruction materials, air-lifting of relief supplies to outlying regions, medicines and disinfectants to prevent the outbreak of epidemics and further international assistance

for the reconstruction of infrastructure and for recouping losses in agricultural production.

21. The contributions received thus far by UNDR0 amounted to approximately \$9 million, far below the country's emergency needs, although further contributions were expected. It should be noted that contributions had come from countries of different regions and economic systems, thus demonstrating that the plight of the Malagasy people had brought about a world-wide feeling of solidarity.

22. Finally, the recurrence of meteorological hazards threatening Madagascar and the effectiveness of the prevention and preparedness measures had stimulated the Government into taking such measures as the creation of a National Relief Council under the Ministry of the Interior. Co-operation at the local level with the international community had also been effective, and constant contacts were maintained with the Resident Co-ordinator of UNDP.

23. As to the measures to be taken following the heavy floods which had affected Democratic Yemen, he drew attention to the letter dated 19 April 1982 from the Permanent Representative of Democratic Yemen to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (E/1982/53). UNDR0 had been actively involved and, together with the UNDP representative, had led a multi-agency team to assess the situation in Democratic Yemen. In the reports it had circulated on 7 and 14 April 1982, UNDR0 had assessed the flood damage and indicated the emergency requirements and contributions and pledges by the United Nations system, Governments and national voluntary agencies. A third report would be circulated that day.

24. Mr. RABETAFIKA (Observer for Madagascar) thanked the Council for including in item 3 the measures to be taken following the cyclones and floods which had affected Madagascar in recent months. Although the current state of scientific knowledge made it possible to detect the formation of cyclones and predict their path, tropical cyclones were natural disasters against which mankind was totally powerless.

25. The explanatory note submitted by his delegation (E/1982/44/Add.1) described the magnitude of the damage and the difficulties of every kind which Madagascar would have to overcome in the very near future, if not immediately. The Director of the UNDR0 Liaison Office had added to the information contained in the explanatory note.

26. He stressed that at least one third of the people currently in distress would remain in that state almost indefinitely, with no hope of returning to their homes; that many towns and villages had suffered 80 per cent damage or been completely destroyed by floods or landslides; that, on the average, 80 per cent of all sectors of agricultural activity (for food and for export) had been affected; and that public works, communication and supply infrastructures had also suffered damage.

27. A provisional initial estimate of material damage was \$250 million, and a final count of the number of people affected had not yet been possible.

28. In the face of those problems, the international community had already provided assistance or had pledged substantial aid to Madagascar. His Government wished once again to express its appreciation to the States, the international and regional organizations and the associations which had helped his country at that difficult time.

29. There remained the problem of capital reconstruction and restoration of infrastructures, which would require resources that Madagascar certainly did not have. His Government therefore hoped that the States and internation-

al agencies concerned would participate in the reconstruction programme, and that the United Nations would do everything possible to establish an international natural disaster relief fund.

AGENDA ITEM 2

Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (*continued*) (E/1982/24 and Add.1, E/1982/25, E/1982/26, E/1982/49, E/1982/54, E/1982/L.18, E/AC.68/1982/L.5/Add.3)

30. Mr. JOHNSON (Benin) said that his country actively supported all peoples struggling for their liberation, both in the Organization of African Unity and the non-aligned movement and in the United Nations. The struggle for national liberation could not be isolated from the struggle against racism and racial discrimination in any form.

31. In 1977 and 1978, Benin had organized important international conferences, which had evaluated the ways of strengthening the struggle of peoples for liberation from foreign domination and the struggle against racism and racial discrimination in all its forms, against *apartheid*, against mercenaries and against zionism.

32. In OAU, Benin had always participated in the formulation of strategies, the adoption of resolutions and the taking of relevant decisions with a view to strengthening and radicalizing the struggle of peoples for their liberation.

33. In the United Nations, it had fully supported the relevant decisions and resolutions of the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and the Commission on Human Rights.

34. His delegation had seen from the reports submitted to the Council on the item under consideration how seriously the Secretary-General, the Economic and Social Council, the Commission on Human Rights and the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination were taking their combined efforts to carry out the tasks entrusted to them by the General Assembly.

35. Combating racism and racial discrimination was the duty of the entire international community, and the negative attitude of the Western countries which had boycotted the work of the Preparatory Sub-Committee was incomprehensible.

36. He appealed to the sense of responsibility of the Western countries, urging them to abandon that deplorable attitude and agree to co-operate in the preparations for the Second World Conference. Some of those countries were directly or indirectly responsible for the perpetuation of *apartheid* and zionism as forms of racial discrimination.

37. Benin welcomed the offer by the Government of the Philippines to host the Conference and recommended the application, if necessary, of the formula contained in General Assembly resolution 31/78 relating to the costs incurred by the host country during the first World Conference.

38. Benin would do all it could to ensure the attainment of the objectives assigned to the Second World Conference, which it hoped would enjoy the goodwill of Member States. However, the success of the Second World Conference was not totally assured. Some Western countries with a stake in protecting their economic interests and maintaining their strategic position in southern Africa and elsewhere might adopt a hypocritical attitude which would be prejudicial to the objectives of the Conference.

39. In that case, there would be no alternative but armed struggle. In view of that, Benin was convinced that the international community would not deny material aid to the struggling countries, with the aim of radicalizing and intensifying the struggle against racism and racial discrimination.
40. Mr. OKWARO (Kenya) said that, as preparations for the Second World Conference proceeded, it was important for all States Members of the United Nations to reflect on the contributions they intended to make in the future to achieving the objectives cherished by all, since it was apparent that racism and racial discrimination continued in many parts of the world.
41. Of particular concern to Kenya was the institutionalized racism and racial discrimination practised by the *apartheid* régime of South Africa. It was necessary to eliminate the *apartheid* system and create a new democratic system under which Africans would participate equally in all political, economic and social activities.
42. The pressure exerted on the South African régime during the Decade had not caused it to change its policies.
43. Those countries that had economic and military influence over South Africa should look for new ways of exerting pressure and bring about change. The struggle of the liberation movements in South Africa and Namibia must also continue to be supported more substantially. The lack of co-operation on the part of transnational corporations should be publicized, especially in their home countries. Collaboration in the development of South Africa's military and nuclear capability had also made that régime more self-reliant and more defiant.
44. His delegation joined others in calling on certain non-governmental organizations planning to participate in activities which might be deemed to constitute collaboration with the South African régime not to undertake such activities. It supported any decision which would facilitate further examination of the matter in the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations.
45. He regretted that some States had not participated in the Work of the Preparatory Sub-Committee, because they had valuable contributions to make to the achievement of the objectives of the Decade; he therefore hoped that they would participate in future.
46. Lastly, his delegation welcomed the offer of the Government of the Philippines to host the Second World Conference.
47. Mr. FARIS (Jordan) reiterated his country's firm opposition to racism and racial discrimination. The Jordanian Constitution stipulated that all citizens were equal before the law, thus reflecting Arab religious and cultural values.
48. The crimes of *apartheid* and racial discrimination perpetrated by the Pretoria régime could be compared to the situation in the occupied Arab territories. As a result of Israeli policies, the indigenous Arabs of Palestine were being uprooted and replaced by immigrants from abroad. Intimidation was taking the form of infamous massacres, such as the recent bombing of refugee camps in southern Lebanon.
49. Other examples of racist discriminatory behaviour were the confiscation of lands, the proliferation of illegal settlements, the deportation of native Palestinian Arabs, the dismantling of the municipal council in the West Bank, the killing of unarmed demonstrators, the illegal annexation of territories and the sacrilegious acts against Moslem and Christian sanctuaries.
50. The General Assembly had equated zionism with racism because it denied the self-determination of the Palestinian people and their legitimate inherent rights.
51. Jordan, which supported and upheld the objectives of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, considered that the United Nations must take effective action under Chapter VII of the Charter by imposing sanctions on the racist régimes in Tel Aviv and Pretoria.
52. Mr. HASSOON (Iraq) said that his country had adopted legislative, judicial, administrative and other measures to prevent any manifestation of racism or racial discrimination, and its Constitution stipulated that all citizens were equal before the law.
53. Iraq was a party to the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid* (General Assembly resolution 3068 (XXVIII), annex), did not maintain any relations whatsoever with the racist régimes and advocated action to isolate them, and had participated in numerous activities for the Decade.
54. Despite world opinion, the racist régimes remained in flagrant violation of the principles of the Charter. The United Nations must exert greater efforts to bring about an end to the illegal occupation of Namibia. South Africa was using the Territory for constant acts of aggression against neighbouring African States.
55. It was no accident that the South African régime and the Zionist régime in Palestine were close allies and collaborators. Both faced world-wide condemnation, both refused to recognize national liberation movements like SWAPO and PLO, and both opposed genuine endeavours to reach a comprehensive settlement.
56. Iraq supported the recommendations of the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the Second World Conference. It regretted that a number of Western countries had refused to take part and hoped that they would reconsider their attitude. Lastly, Iraq welcomed the offer by the Government of the Philippines to host the Conference.
57. Mr. ALMOSLECHNER (Austria) stressed the destabilizing effect of South Africa's policy of *apartheid* on the situation in southern Africa.
58. Despite common efforts, the *apartheid* system was counteracting all attempts to find a peaceful solution to the Namibian question. In view of the inflexible position of the Pretoria Government, the international community must take stronger measures.
59. The Austrian Government had urged the South African authorities to extend leniency to the three ANC freedom fighters who had been sentenced to death, thus responding to the appeal made by the Secretary-General pursuant to Security Council resolution 503 (1982). That was also in keeping with Austria's well-known position on the death penalty.
60. With regard to the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, he noted that items relating to the Middle East had been included in the provisional agenda. Austria had always opposed the equation of zionism with racism, and it hoped that the debates during the Second World Conference would not lead to a confrontation which would hinder its proceedings.
61. Mr. ADOSSAMA (International Labour Organisation) said that he wished to report, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 2785 (XXVI) and Council resolution 1588 (L), on the activities carried out by the International Labour Organisation (ILO) in the field of racial discrimination.

62. The annual report of the International Labour Office contained detailed information on the application of the policy of *apartheid* in the labour field and the updating of the 1964 Declaration concerning the Policy of *Apartheid* of the Republic of South Africa. In addition, the Director-General had described in a special report the measures adopted by Governments, employers' and workers' organizations, and by the ILO itself to combat *apartheid*. In June 1981 the International Labour Conference had considered that special report and the conclusions of the International Tripartite Meeting on Action against *Apartheid*, which had been held in Zambia one month earlier.

63. In close co-operation with OAU and the front-line States and with the financial support of UNDP and the Office of the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia, the ILO had organized training courses for African national liberation movements recognized by OAU. ILO assistance to those movements related primarily to vocational training, labour administration and legislation, workers' education and manpower planning.

64. In the latter field, the International Labour Office had established the Southern African Team for Employment Promotion (SATEP) in April 1980, for the purpose of developing indigenous manpower in an independent Namibia. In collaboration with SWAPO, it had also been studying priority aspects of the Nationhood Programme for Namibia, initiated pursuant to General Assembly resolution 31/153.

65. Despite such efforts, there had been little improvement in the living conditions of black and Coloured workers. Low wages, unjustified dismissals and the non-recognition of black trade unions had given rise to movements of workers' resistance.

66. In the 1964 Declaration, which had been brought up to date and adopted on 18 June 1981, the International Labour Conference had reaffirmed its determination to further and promote the freedom and dignity of the peoples of southern Africa.

67. The Conference had also confirmed the Director-General's mandate with respect to the situation in South Africa, established a permanent committee on *apartheid*, recommended the establishment of a voluntary fund and called upon the International Labour Office to increase its technical assistance to liberation movements, black workers and their independent trade unions, and to establish a training institute for South Africa.

68. Various missions of senior officials of the International Labour Office to southern Africa had had encouraging results. A number of countries had already pledged financial support for the preparation of programmes of technical assistance. With a view to eliminating racial discrimination, the ILO had continued to co-operate with the United Nations and other organizations, and had participated, in particular, in the activities of the Commission on Human Rights and the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, within the framework of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. In addition, the ILO had been represented at the International Seminar on Loans to South Africa, held in Zurich from 5 to 7 April 1981, in the consultations among representatives of specialized agencies held under the auspices of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, and at the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa.

69. Mr. LEVIN (Observer for Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he felt obliged to speak, given the liberty which had been taken by a number of representatives in speaking of *zionism* during the discussion. *Zionism* was the national liberation movement of the Jewish people.

Unfortunately, it was clear that racial prejudice against the Jewish people persisted in many countries whose representatives had been delivering statements against racism. He wondered how many Jews had been allowed to visit the Jewish holy places in Jerusalem between 1948 and 1977, or who had expelled tens of thousands of Shiites from Iraq solely because they were of Iranian origin. It had not been Israel.

70. He did not find surprising the accusations leveled by Arab delegations. However, when the representatives of the communist bloc spoke in the same manner as the Arab representatives, it was clear that there was a concerted campaign to prevent the Council from dealing in its discussion with the question of action to combat racism and racial prejudice. The meaning of genocide should be well-known to the warders of the Gulag Archipelago, the followers of Stalin, whose memory was still linked with the millions of Soviet citizens who had perished in labour camps and as a result of political persecution.

71. The work of the Council would be more meaningful and much more valuable if, instead of pointless attacks against *zionism* and Israel, more positive efforts would be made by some delegations whose countries were well known for their excesses in many areas. For its part, in the 34 years of its existence, Israel had been steadfast in the practice of tolerance and pluralism in the most perilous of circumstances.

72. Mr. FARIS (Jordan), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that at the very moment that the Zionist representative had been speaking, Israel's aircraft had been bombing and killing Palestine refugees in southern Lebanon in pursuance of one of the tenets of *zionism*, namely, the elimination of the Arabs from Palestine. The Israeli Minister of Defense had stated that the Jews had no intention of relinquishing the occupied Arab territories. Mr. Begin had said that there would never be another holocaust. However, the holocaust had been perpetrated by the Zionists against the Palestinian Arabs in southern Lebanon. If *zionism* was the liberation movement of the Jews, it should be recalled that not all Jews were Zionists.

73. Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that it was obvious that the security of the State of Israel could not be guaranteed by a policy of aggression, the annexation of territory, the violation of the legitimate rights of neighbouring States and a policy of genocide against the Palestinian people. Such conduct was political suicide and was inadmissible in international affairs.

74. Mr. AL-GEWAILY (Qatar), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that it was ironic that the statement of the Israeli representative had come only hours after the bombing of Beirut. A glance at the items on the agendas of United Nations organs showed the extent of the inhumanity of the so-called liberation movement of the Jewish people: the bombing of Beirut, the aggression against Iraq, the annexation of the Golan Heights—the list was endless. Nevertheless, a distinction should be made between the Jewish people, who deserved the respect of the people of Qatar, and the Zionist philosophy, which Qatar abhorred.

75. Mr. HASSOON (Iraq), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that Iraq had decided to expel Iranian citizens because it had been discovered that they had links with the Khomeini régime. It was preferable not to make any reference to the practices of *zionism* and of the racist régime within and outside of Palestine, the West Bank, Jerusalem, southern Lebanon and elsewhere.

AGENDA ITEM 1**Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters (continued) (E/1982/55)**

76. The PRESIDENT drew the attention of the Council to a letter dated 21 April 1982, from the Chairman of the Executive Board of UNICEF addressed to the President of the Council concerning the expansion of the Board's membership (E/1982/55). Annexed to the letter was a recommendation to the Economic and Social Council, which had been adopted by consensus as a result of more than two years of difficult negotiations in which not only Board members had participated but also countries belonging to the various regional groups.

77. He had been informed informally that the President of the General Assembly intended to include consideration of the draft resolution contained in the annex to document E/1982/55, assuming that the decision to recommend it

would be adopted by the Economic and Social Council, among the matters to be dealt with by the Assembly the following week during its resumed thirty-sixth session.

78. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Economic and Social Council wished to adopt the draft decision contained in the annex to document E/1982/55.

It was so decided (decision 1982/111).

(b) Control and limitation of the documentation

79. The PRESIDENT recalled that no documentation on subitem 1(b) had been submitted and no delegation wished to speak on that subject.

80. If there were no objections, he would take it that no measures in connection with the control and limitation of the documentation would be taken at the current session.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

14th meeting

Friday, 23 April 1982, at 10.50 a.m.

President: Mr. Miljan KOMATINA (Yugoslavia).

E/1982/SR.14

In the absence of the President, Mr. Bhatt (Nepal), Vice-President, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 2

Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (continued) (E/1982/24 and Add.1, E/1982/25, E/1982/26, E/1982/49, E/1982/54, E/1982/L.18, E/AC.68/1982/L.5/Add.3)

1. Mr. KAMANDA wa KAMANDA (Zaire) said that the activities carried out by the United Nations in the context of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination and the Programme for the Decade adopted by the General Assembly (resolution 3057 (XXVIII), annex) constituted an invitation to all Member States to assist in the attainment of one of the primary objectives of the Charter, namely, universal and effective respect for the dignity of the human person, without any distinction whatever. His delegation shared the view that strong measures would have to be adopted to that end at the national, regional and international levels.
2. In the Republic of Zaire it was the firmly held belief that all human beings were born free and equal in dignity and in law and that all, without distinction, could assert their rights and fundamental freedoms, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Zaire had lived through the bitter experience of threats to its dignity, honour and right to self-determination on account of the colour of the skin of its inhabitants and other racial considerations. Accordingly, its constitution, the manifesto of its national party and the international instruments which it had signed all emphasized the implementation of the relevant provisions of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (General Assembly resolution 2106 A (XX), annex).
3. It was natural, whenever the problem of combating racism and racial discrimination was discussed, to think of

the victims of *apartheid* and racial segregation in South Africa and Namibia. His delegation appealed to all Governments, all peoples and all just men of conscience to restore to the martyred peoples of South Africa and Namibia their full rights to human dignity, freedom, equality and independence. Despite some progress, the exercise by peoples of the right to self-determination and independence continued to encounter obstacles of every kind in southern Africa and in other parts of the world, especially the occupied Arab territories.

4. To be successful, the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination would require genuine assistance from the international community. It was regrettable that certain countries belonging to one, extremely important, regional group had not participated in the proceedings of the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the Conference. His delegation urged the countries which had consistently declared their commitment to the values upheld in the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to take an active part in the Preparatory Sub-Committee's work. The effective implementation of every part of the Programme for the Decade would help to promote and further respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all. Racism, racial discrimination and *apartheid* were serious obstacles to any further progress and to the strengthening of international peace and security.
5. It was important to hold the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination in order to assess the progress made and outline future joint activities. It was even more important to participate in the Conference in a spirit of dedication to the objectives of the Decade, as evidence of the general commitment to step up efforts aimed at eliminating once and for all every type of racism and racial discrimination.

6. The PRESIDENT said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Council had concluded the general

discussion on the item on Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 3

Special economic, humanitarian and disaster relief assistance (*continued*) (E/1982/40, E/1982/44 and Add.1, E/1982/53, E/1982/L.21, E/1982/L.22, A/37/178)

7. Mr. ASHTAL (Observer for Democratic Yemen) said that, for a small country with meagre resources like Democratic Yemen, the extensive damage caused by the recent floods was certainly catastrophic. Besides the loss of lives, the extent of the damage to the agricultural infrastructure and communication system was so severe that it had wiped away all that had been patiently constructed over the past 10 years. Even more alarming was the loss of fertile soil, which had been washed away to sea by the floods. The cumulative effect of the floods on the economy of Democratic Yemen was most severe.

8. The Government of Democratic Yemen had mobilized all the available human and other resources to alleviate the suffering of the displaced families. Every effort had been made to avert outbreaks of malaria and other diseases. Schools had been evacuated to shelter the homeless and volunteers were working round the clock to restore communications. His delegation expressed its gratitude to the States and international agencies that had responded promptly by flying in foodstuffs, medicine and tents. Yet the extent of the damage was so great that large-scale assistance was urgently needed. Accordingly, his delegation hoped that the members of the Council would adopt draft resolution E/1982/L.21 with a view to mobilizing the assistance needed.

9. Mr. ADUGNA (Ethiopia) thanked the United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Refugees and the Director of the Liaison Office of UNDRP for their reports to the Council, in which they had adequately underlined the plight of the displaced persons and returnees in his country. He also expressed his appreciation to the Governments, voluntary agencies and United Nations bodies and specialized agencies which had responded to the needs of the Ethiopian people. The hardship suffered by his people had been described by the United Nations interagency mission which had visited Ethiopia in July 1980¹ and by other eminent personalities, including Dr. Zaki Hasan, the former Chairman of the Executive Board of UNICEF, and Miss Liv Ullman, UNICEF's Special Ambassador to East Africa. It should, however, be observed that there had not been an adequate response to the mission's appraisal and all its recommendations.

10. He reminded the Council that for almost a decade his people had been the victim of natural calamities such as drought, pests and floods, which had occurred with increasing frequency and intensity. Before the country had overcome the effects of those natural disasters, it had been stricken by the war, which had affected a sizable portion of its population and led to the displacement of some 2.4 million people. That man-made calamity had left millions of people on the edge of survival and had created an urgent need for substantial assistance.

11. The situation of the people displaced within their country was as agonizing as that of the refugees, and the

magnitude and complexity of their problem warranted equal attention. In Africa there were about 17 million displaced persons who had been uprooted from their homes and natural habitat. About 2.5 million of that unfortunate multitude were in his country. The provision of humanitarian assistance to rehabilitate the war victims imposed a very heavy burden on Ethiopia, which was one of the least developed countries and had the lowest official development assistance figure per capita. His Government had been forced to divert development funds to save the lives of many of its citizens. For that reason, Ethiopia had been forced to appeal to the international community for urgent humanitarian assistance. Unfortunately, the response of the international community had not been commensurate with the needs. His delegation considered that that situation was probably due to the fact that there was no organ in the United Nations system responsible for displaced persons and sufficiently equipped to handle such a gigantic task. The Council and the General Assembly should consider creating such a mechanism. Any delay in the provision of the assistance recommended would mean a prolongation of the misery of the people of Ethiopia. The international community must act promptly, for tomorrow might be too late. He therefore made an urgent appeal to the Council in that regard.

12. With regard to returnees, he said that the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) had initiated a multiyear project in the amount of \$14 million to facilitate the rehabilitation of some 250,000 returnees. His Government would have to provide relief and rehabilitation for the large number of people who were returning to the country and therefore found it necessary to call once again upon the international community to assist it. His Government believed that the most effective solution for the refugee problem was voluntary repatriation to the country of origin; it was discussing with the Government of Djibouti the most appropriate procedure for voluntary repatriation and hoped that UNHCR would co-operate in that process.

13. Mr. ALAHMADI (Sudan) recalled that some citizens of the Sudan had been refugees for a considerable amount of time. Pursuant to the Addis Ababa agreement of 1972, and with the support of the international community, about a million refugees had been repatriated, resettled and rehabilitated. The Sudan was therefore thoroughly familiar with the problem of being a refugee and the complex situation of many refugees.

14. The policy of the Sudan towards refugees was based on its humanitarian and legal commitments. It had acceded to all the international instruments relating to the status of refugees, in particular to the Convention on the Status of Refugees of 1951, the Protocol of 1967 and the Convention of the Organization of African Unity of 1969. The spirit and principles of those conventions were embodied in its national legislation, in the asylum law of 1974. Similarly, in compliance with the Charter of the United Nations and the charter of the OAU, settlements for refugees had been established at places away from the borders and refugees were not allowed to engage in political activities or hostile actions against their country of origin.

15. The Sudan's association with the problems of refugees from neighbouring countries dated back to the early 1960s. The influx of refugees into the southern Sudan had resumed when thousands of Ugandans had requested asylum. In fact, during the past few weeks 10,000 Ugandan refugees had crossed the borders, bringing the total to 110,000. The outcome of those successive waves of refugees throughout the past two decades was a refugee population of more than half a million.

¹ See E/1980/104.

16. With the assistance of UNHCR, donor countries and governmental and non-governmental organizations, his Government had established a number of settlements with the objective of helping the refugees to become self-supporting. However, the resources of the Sudan were limited and, like other least developed countries, it was facing critical economic problems as a result of the international economic crisis. The situation had been further aggravated by severe drought and floods in various parts of the country.

17. The Sudan was looking forward to long-term plans and programmes that went beyond relief assistance and would enable the refugees to become self-supporting. However, such programmes required income-generating activities for the refugees. The fact was that in Africa refugees were not a transient phenomenon and more durable solutions were therefore necessary. That had also been the recommendation of the inter-agency follow-up missions which had visited the Sudan recently. That approach viewed the refugee problem in a wider context within national and regional development plans, introduced the concept of refugee-affected areas and proposed certain projects for their training, education and social activities. It also called for supplementing national resources and capacities already strained by the presence of refugees.

18. His delegation wished to express its thanks and appreciation to UNHCR, donor countries and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations for their continuous support of national efforts to provide all necessary assistance to the refugees. Those efforts were based on the Government's policy, adopted at the International Congress on Refugees in the Sudan, held at Khartoum in June 1980.

19. In that respect, his delegation wished to thank the Secretary-General of the United Nations for the measures he had taken in conformity with General Assembly resolution 35/81 and Economic and Social Council resolution 1981/5 to send follow-up missions to the Sudan to carry out feasibility studies with a view to strengthening the capability of the Government to pursue cost-effective strategies and to plan new settlements as an integral part of an overall rural and urban development.

20. The Government of the Sudan supported fully the recommendations contained in the report of the United Nations Interagency Mission on Education and Social Development/Welfare Services for Refugees in the Sudan (see A/37/178), an example of co-operation among different United Nations agencies and bodies.

21. Although the Sudan was committed to the principle that free education must be provided to all children, economic realities had made that principle very difficult to put into practice. At present, only approximately 50 per cent of Sudanese children had access to primary school. It was not surprising therefore that, with the number of refugees in the Sudan, it was becoming increasingly difficult for the provincial educational system in areas of greatest refugee concentration to provide even the most basic educational facilities to the refugees' children.

22. The International Conference on Assistance to Refugees in Africa (ICARA), held at Geneva in April 1981, had succeeded in providing reasonable financial and material assistance to refugees in Africa. In his delegation's view, however, the Conference's most important achievement had been in generating international awareness, wide support and recognition of the magnitude of the plight of the refugees in Africa. The group of African States had stated that the impact of those activities should be the subject of continuous international review, including the possibility of holding a further international conference by 1983.

23. Unfortunately, the refugees in Africa had so far received no additional assistance as a result of the Conference. His delegation appealed to all donor countries and financial institutions to fulfil their announced pledges. It also called on UNHCR and other development and funding agencies to inform the steering committee of ICARA as soon as possible, preferably before July 1982, of their current or planned programmes for providing assistance to African countries of asylum to enable them to strengthen their economic and social infrastructure and to cope with the increasing burden of care and settlement of refugees.

24. Mr. DUGGAN (United States of America) said that the Government of Somalia deserved the praise of the international community for the hospitality that it had shown to hundreds of thousands of refugees and for the efforts it had made, together with the Office of the High Commissioner, to provide assistance to those refugees. The United States Government for its part had contributed more than \$45 million in assistance to the refugees in Somalia during the 1981 fiscal year and was continuing to contribute substantially to the international relief effort during the 1982 fiscal year. Many individual Americans also continued to show great personal generosity in that connection.

25. It was now appropriate that the international community should support programmes to promote greater self-reliance on the part of the refugees until they could return safely to their homes. The Government of the Sudan also deserved praise for its exemplary policy and practice of granting asylum to the hundreds of thousands of refugees in its country.

26. During the 1981 fiscal year, the United States Government had contributed more than \$10 million to assist refugees in the Sudan and in 1982 was continuing to provide substantial support to the relief programme in that country. Generous United States citizens were contributing to the work of voluntary organizations in seeking to better the lives of the refugees in both Somalia and the Sudan.

27. Mr. ASTAFIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) expressed sympathy for peoples and countries such as Madagascar and Democratic Yemen which had suffered losses as a result of natural disasters. The Soviet people was also aware of the problems confronting Ethiopia as a result of drought. The Soviet Union had provided special assistance to the three countries, over and above the economic co-operation which it had been giving them over a number of years, particularly in agriculture.

28. The Soviet Union would support the two draft resolutions on assistance to Democratic Yemen and Madagascar which envisaged appropriate measures to overcome the effects of the disasters in those countries.

29. Mr. QUINLAN (Australia) reiterated the general view of his delegation that the item under discussion should normally be considered at the second regular session of the Council. In expressing that view earlier, his delegation had been careful to note that the Council should maintain sufficient flexibility to allow it to consider emergency situations as and when they arose. The situations it was now considering regarding the problems faced by Ethiopia, Somalia, Djibouti and the Sudan and, more recently, the situation in Democratic Yemen and Madagascar, indicated that the Council must ensure that it maintained that flexibility in the future structuring of its agenda.

30. His delegation wished to thank the United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Refugees, the Director of the Liaison Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator and the Director of the Office for Special Political Questions for the oral reports they had made at the 13th meeting.

31. He wished to stress that, in assessing assistance needs, the Council must be certain that agencies, in particular UNHCR and the World Food Programme, co-ordinated their efforts so that a realistic assessment could be made.

32. Traditionally, Australia's efforts to assist refugees, displaced persons and the victims of natural disasters had been concentrated on those countries of Asia and the Pacific that were geographically closest to it. Australia recognized the global aspects of the problem, however, and had been increasingly concerned about affected countries throughout the world and particularly in Africa.

33. In the past 12 months, that concern had been reflected in the fact that Australia had provided some \$40 million in humanitarian assistance to affected African countries, in addition to its approximately \$11 million in bilateral development assistance to those countries. Australia would continue to respond generously to the needs of refugees.

34. Mr. MIHALJEVIĆ (Yugoslavia) said that his country attached great importance to the problem of refugees and to humanitarian assistance in cases of disaster. In view of the current refugee situation in the Horn of Africa and the Sudan, the countries concerned needed international solidarity and assistance.

35. His country greatly appreciated the work done by the United Nations and other organizations in the United Nations system in dealing with those problems. The documents and the reports submitted in that connection made it clear, however, that assistance was far from meeting actual needs and that UNHCR in particular must provide greater and more sustained assistance.

36. The refugee problem, like that of assistance in cases of disaster, should be accorded greater attention by the international community, as had been illustrated most recently by the cases of Madagascar and Democratic Yemen.

37. Dr. MALAFATOPOULOS (World Health Organization) indicated with reference to document E/1982/44/Add.1, entitled "Measures to be taken following the cyclones and floods which have affected Madagascar", and to the statement by the representative of Madagascar, that WHO had acceded to the request of the Government of Madagascar by providing medical supplies and equipment through the WHO Regional Office for Africa.

38. The WHO Programme Co-ordinator, together with two medical officers and a sanitary engineer stationed in Madagascar, were at present studying the priorities in the Government's list of requested medicines and supplies and also inquiring into a breakdown of vaccination programmes.

39. The WHO Programme Co-ordinator was in constant contact with Madagascar's Ministry of Health and also with the resident representative of the United Nations Development Programme, and the Director of the WHO Regional Office for Africa was following the situation closely.

40. Mr. ZHANG Zifan (China) said that in connection with item 3, the main subjects to be examined were the question of the refugees in Somalia, the Sudan and Djibouti, the question of the displaced persons in Ethiopia, and the question of natural disasters suffered by Madagascar and Democratic Yemen.

41. His delegation had read carefully the reports of the Secretary-General and the explanatory notes of the affected countries and had also listened to the statements of the senior officials of the United Nations who were concerned with the subject. China wished to express its sympathy for those peoples in the difficult situation in which they found themselves and its appreciation for the humanitarian work done in the United Nations.

42. It was necessary to adopt, at the current session of the Council, resolutions which gave full expression to the support of the international community for the refugees. Any resolution in which that humanitarian principle was contained would receive the support of his delegation.

43. Mr. KHALAF (Observer for Somalia) said that it had been possible to mitigate the sufferings experienced by his country as a result of the tragic effects of natural or man-made disasters through the efforts of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and various agencies within and outside the United Nations. He wished to pay a tribute to and express gratitude for that work.

44. The report of the Secretary-General on assistance to refugees in Somalia (E/1982/40) had the merit, common to all reports of that kind, of making possible a vital assessment of short-term and long-term needs and bringing them to the attention of the international community.

45. His delegation appreciated the Secretary-General's prompt response to the request of the General Assembly in its resolution 36/135 to dispatch a mission to make a comprehensive review of the overall needs of the refugees.

46. His Government had done everything possible to facilitate the work of the mission and was in general agreement with its report and recommendations (*ibid.*, annex).

47. It had been difficult to keep fully abreast of the changes which were taking place in the number of the inhabitants of the refugee camps. It had therefore been necessary to make a reassessment. In November 1981, his delegation had invited representatives of donor countries and of organizations within and outside the United Nations to participate in the work of a committee which it had established to assess the situation as precisely as possible.

48. On the basis of the conclusions of that committee, his delegation took note of paragraphs 34 and 35 of the report of the mission (*ibid.*) where the figure for the refugee population in the camps was estimated at 700,000 for planning purposes.

49. The persistence of the refugee problem required that the international community should realize the need to attend not only to the basic requirements of the population but also to the education of refugee children and the training of adults for self-reliance.

50. The Government of Somalia had made great efforts in that regard, but the resources required far surpassed the means available. There was therefore a need for substantial support from the international community. There had been improvements in some areas, but much more needed to be done.

51. The tremendous strain that had been imposed on Somalia's economy was not generally recognized. That was proved by the fact that, at the International Conference on Assistance to Refugees in Africa, held at Geneva, it had not been possible to raise funds for the strengthening of the infrastructures of the host countries. Development assistance was essential, not only in order to sustain the ongoing protection of the refugees but also to avoid the complete disruption of services in the host countries. For that, international co-operation was again needed.

52. In that connexion, his delegation noted with satisfaction that the mission had devoted several sections of its report to the developmental needs of the country, and he hoped that there would be a generous response to the recommendations in paragraphs 20 and 94 to 102 (*ibid.*).

53. The Government of Somalia was studying carefully the co-ordination of refugee self-reliance programmes with

national development plans and the possible inclusion of the programme in those plans. However, those projects could not provide a fundamental solution. The only permanent solution was the voluntary return of the refugees to their countries of origin on acceptable conditions based on the exercise of the right to self-determination. There was every reason to believe that that was the desire of the refugees themselves.

54. Meanwhile, Somalia would continue to discharge its international obligations towards the refugees, and for that it relied on the generous co-operation of the international community.

55. Mr. FARAH DIRIR (Observer for Djibouti) said that, in spite of the progress achieved, a great effort was still needed to improve the situation of the refugees in his country. He therefore fully supported the appeal of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees for international solidarity and co-operation.

56. Djibouti had always co-operated with UNHCR and had opened its doors to an influx of refugees whose number was currently estimated at between 50,000 and 55,000. The Government had endeavoured to resolve the problems raised by the presence of those refugees through the establishment of self-reliance and self-help programmes. However, the current situation in the country was aggravated by the harsh consequences of the prolonged drought, which had displaced one third of the total population and had created a need for a permanent assistance programme for the nomads.

57. A considerable number of refugees were reluctant to stay in the rural camps and created an unofficial population increase in the urban areas. Those unregistered refugees had contributed to the deterioration of living conditions and the increase of unemployment in the cities.

58. In order to deal with that problem, the National Assistance Committee was seeking to implement, in collaboration with all UNHCR, resettlement programmes in the countries of first and second asylum. The majority of the

refugees from rural areas were still housed in shelters that were inadequate for the climatic conditions of the country. Although efforts were being made to satisfy their basic needs, an improvement was required in all areas of assistance. The chances of the adult refugees becoming self-reliant and self-supporting were remote. It was, however, necessary to attain that objective, particularly since the international assistance programme would not last indefinitely.

59. Apart from international assistance, it was necessary also for all interested parties to create the necessary conditions for the initiation of voluntary repatriation. In general, that was the best solution to the refugee problem.

60. In Djibouti an experimental agriculture project was under way, in which 12 refugee families and 12 national families were participating and the purpose of which was the promotion of self-support and integration. Similar experimental projects had been studied in the areas of fisheries, small handicrafts and vocational training. All required technical and financial assistance from the international community.

61. In conclusion, he wished to place on record his gratitude to all the Member States, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and United Nations organs and specialized agencies which had made it possible to continue the assistance and programmes for the disaster victims.

62. Mr. PETERS (UNHCR Co-ordinator for the Horn of Africa and the Sudan) expressed appreciation for the support shown for the work to assist refugees, which would continue on a fundamentally regional basis, in view of the complexity of the problems faced by that area.

63. The PRESIDENT announced the conclusion of the general debate on agenda item 3 and reminded the Council that the deadline for the submission of draft proposals on that item was 6 p.m. the same day.

The meeting rose at 12.20 p.m.

15th meeting

Monday, 26 April 1982, at 10.45 a.m.

President: Mr. Miljan KOMATINA (Yugoslavia).

E/1982/SR.15

AGENDA ITEM 4

Convening of an International Conference on Population in 1984 (E/1982/27)

1. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to discuss item 4 of its agenda entitled "Convening of an International Conference on Population in 1984". In pursuance of its resolution 1981/87 of 25 November 1981, the Council had before it a report by the Secretary-General of the International Conference on Population (E/1982/27).
2. He invited the Secretary-General of the Conference to make a statement in accordance with paragraph 6 of his report.
3. Mr. SALAS (Secretary-General of the International Conference on Population), reporting orally to the Council on pledges made for financing the Conference, stated that in the population field some encouraging results had been

achieved inasmuch as fertility rates had declined throughout the world; that was proof of the international community's response to that crucial problem. The United Nations was playing an important role in that sphere and United Nations bodies had been striving for 15 years to find a solution. The world target was to achieve some degree of stabilization during the twenty-first century; it was important to view the population problem within that time-frame.

4. The Council had wisely decided to convene an International Conference on Population because it was essential to review the programmes and policies applied by countries periodically, to analyse the problems that they were currently facing and to evaluate the results they had achieved.

5. In pursuance of Council resolution 1981/87, the Secretary-General had designated him as Secretary-General of the Conference at the beginning of the year. On taking over his functions, his first task had been to seek financial support from external sources for the Conference, and he

had been in touch with the representatives of many Governments to that end. A number of countries had already made pledges for that purpose, and he thanked Australia, the most generous contributor so far. The developing countries too had shown great interest in the Conference and had pledged their full support to it.

6. On the basis of the information he had received, he proposed to allocate the amount of \$US 1.5 million from the proposed budget for the Conference—that being the amount to be raised from extrabudgetary resources—as follows: 1982, \$300,000; 1983, \$700,000; and 1984, \$500,000.

7. It should be noted that the 1984 Conference would be of much smaller dimensions than that held at Bucharest in 1974 and would cost less: \$2.3 million, as against \$3.4 million for the Bucharest Conference. With regard to the site for the Conference, he said that two Governments had already indicated their willingness to serve as host; as soon as he had more definite information on the subject, he would report to the Council.

8. As for the preparatory activities, there were to be four meetings of expert groups in 1982 and 1983 at Geneva and New York, in accordance with Council resolution 1981/87. The Steering Committee, under the chairmanship of Mr. Ripert, had already met once; an Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (ACC) Task Force on the Conference, made up of representatives of the United Nations agencies concerned, would hold its first meeting at Geneva in May 1982. Consultations were also in progress with the regional commissions in order to ensure their full involvement in the Conference preparations and he was also in touch with non-governmental organizations which were involved in population activities.

9. He stressed that the Conference would have to be organized with the utmost economy in size, duration and other cost factors. Given the status of the preparations, he was confident that those objectives were compatible with the success of the Conference.

10. Mr. BUCKINGHAM (Australia) said that his delegation fully supported the idea of a further International Conference on Population; although significant progress had been made since the Bucharest Conference in 1974, the population issue continued to be of concern to many countries and it was important to impart new momentum to the population activities executed since then. The Conference should be carefully prepared; it should be devoted to the discussion of selected issues of the highest priority, giving full recognition to the relationship between population and social and economic development, with the aim of appraising the World Population Plan of Action adopted at the 1974 Conference.

11. His Government would make a contribution of \$US 105,000 in 1982 towards the cost of the Conference. Moreover, there was every chance that Australian academics specializing in population problems would participate in the preparatory work.

12. The Secretary-General of the Conference had said in his statement that his contacts with various Governments led him to hope that they would make special contributions. He had also proposed that he should report regularly on the subject to the Council. His delegation endorsed that approach. Since the specific commitments of individual countries were not yet certain, he proposed that consideration of the financial implications of the Conference, which had been planned for the current session of the Council, should be deferred until the resumed regular session of 1982.

13. Mrs. ZHANG Zongan (China) said that only five months had elapsed since the adoption by the Council of

resolution 1981/87 on convening an International Conference on Population in 1984. Nevertheless, the United Nations Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA), the Population Division and other organs of the United Nations had already started the preparatory work and Mr. Salas was making vigorous efforts to secure the necessary extrabudgetary funds. Her delegation was deeply grateful to them.

14. Since the 1974 Conference at Bucharest, the public had become more aware of the importance of population questions. However, while progress in that sphere was by no means negligible, serious problems remained, and considerable effort would be required to solve them.

15. The proposed Conference would highlight the importance of population problems and give the general public a better understanding of the role that population could play in economic and social development and of the relationships between population problems and other development factors. It would also facilitate the exchanging of information on population matters and strengthen technical co-operation in that sphere.

16. Her Government was in favour of convening the Conference and, in response to the appeal made by its Secretary-General, pledged a contribution of \$25,000.

17. Mr. MIYAKAWA (Japan) said that the 1974 Bucharest Conference had made the international community aware of the extreme importance of population problems. A number of programmes had been initiated by Governments and the United Nations system, particularly UNFPA.

18. Nevertheless, the question continued to be of concern to countries, especially developing countries; it had manifold aspects, notably family planning, maternal and child health, malnutrition and rural development, and much remained to be done in all those spheres. The 1984 Conference would make it possible to continue the endeavours to find a solution to the problem and to formulate specific guidelines for the years to come.

19. With regard to the financial arrangements, it had been agreed that the costs should be financed from extrabudgetary funds to the extent possible. In that connection, his delegation expressed its thanks to Mr. Salas for his untiring efforts to assemble the necessary funds. His Government was at the moment considering the possibility of making an appropriate contribution to the Conference.

20. Mr. HUSAIN (Pakistan) emphasized the crucial importance of planning and the management of human resources to the well-being and advancement of mankind. People supplied the most important element in production: the work force. There was a very close correlation between population questions and economic development: to be viable, every economic development plan had to take account of the importance of planning and of the management of human resources. Conversely, an effective population plan was only conceivable as part of an economic development plan.

21. His country had always given unreserved support to the activities of the United Nations system in the field of population planning. The decision to hold an International Conference on Population in 1984 was a constructive step and would advance the implementation of the World Population Plan of Action adopted at Bucharest in 1974. The Conference would also give the international community the opportunity to consider selected issues of the highest priority and to bring out the relationship between population and social and economic development, the objective of the Conference being a review and appraisal of the World Population Plan of Action.

22. Given the importance of the 1984 Conference, everything possible must be done to ensure that it was successful. In that context, his delegation had noted with satisfaction the information given by the Secretary-General of the Conference in his statement concerning the preparations under way.

23. His Government would do everything in its power to contribute to the success of the Conference; it hoped that the Member States would respond generously to the appeal for funds made by the Secretary-General of the Conference. For its part, it had decided to increase its contribution to UNFPA for the financial year 1981/82 by 10 per cent. The amount earmarked for 1982/83 would rise from \$275,000 to \$300,000. It was also considering making a special contribution to the financing of the Conference, but no decision had yet been taken on that question.

24. His Government attached great importance to the relationship between population planning and development activities. It was currently executing a social programme intended to increase the prosperity of the population by encouraging families to limit the number of their children. It was also taking measures to improve social services, in particular in the areas of education, nutrition and employment for women. The programme was an integral part of the country's national development efforts aimed at raising the standard of living of the masses.

25. He drew attention to the particularly difficult circumstances of the developing countries, where population growth rates were extremely high and poverty was widespread. In view of the interdependence of national economies, it behoved the developed countries to provide appropriate financial and technical assistance to the developing countries, in order to help them to overcome their problems. Only a world-wide programme of international economic co-operation offered mankind any hope of a future of peace and progress.

26. Mr. RUSO (Observer for Finland), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries, said that it was the view of the Nordic countries that the population factor had an important role to play in the development process. The close correlation between the two had also been underlined at the Conference held at Bucharest in 1974. The principles laid down in the World Population Plan of Action had assisted Governments in translating the population factor into action in a constructive manner. Population issues, which had been very controversial in 1974, were much less so at the present time.

27. In view of that positive trend, the Nordic countries believed that a review and appraisal of the Plan of Action might be useful, given that the Plan of Action had not lost its value. The 1984 Conference should, however, take up only those population issues which had political implications for future action. The delegations of the Nordic countries supported the recommendations of the Population Commission in that respect. They also endorsed the view of the Commission that the Conference should be well prepared, and stressed the importance of the work of the scientific groups. Those groups should study the four sets of issues identified by the Population Commission and submit clearly defined recommendations to the Conference.

28. The delegations of the Nordic countries believed that the Conference should contribute to a better understanding of how economic, social, political and demographic factors influenced health, mortality and fertility in various countries and regions. It should also give fresh impetus to the work on the relationships between population, resources, environment and development, an area in which international action had recently been initiated.

29. Lastly, the Nordic countries wished to emphasize that the Conference should be kept within reasonable proportions and to reiterate the view that conferences which were decided on by bodies within the United Nations system should be financed, in principle, entirely from the regular budget of the United Nations.

30. Miss COURSON (France) thanked the Secretary-General of the Conference for the useful information which he had provided on the subject of the preparations for the Conference and the action which he had taken with a view to obtaining the necessary funding. Her country considered population questions to be of crucial importance in that they played a decisive role in economic and social development. For that reason it had always given its support, in all forums, to the holding of an International Conference on Population in 1984.

31. Although it was not yet in a position to announce the amount of its contribution to the funding of the International Conference, her country wished to assure the Council that it would take an active part in its preparation and its activities.

32. Mr. CHATSUWAN (Thailand) said that his country had supported Council resolution 1981/87 concerning the convening of an International Conference on Population in 1984 under the auspices of the United Nations. It believed that it was opportune to hold such a conference at that time, not only to appraise the results of the World Population Plan of Action adopted by the Conference at Bucharest, but also in order to help developing countries to overcome the difficulties which they were encountering in their family planning and human resources development programmes.

33. It had taken less than three and a half decades for the world population to double, rising from 2 billion to 4 billion, and in the next 25 years it was likely to rise to 6 billion. Action taken between the present day and the year 2000 would determine whether the population of the world stabilized at about 8 billion in the twenty-first century or continued to grow more rapidly to as much as 11 billion. That would depend, in part, on actions taken by Governments during the adjustment period, and in particular on whether they could maintain and expand programmes designed to slow down population growth.

34. According to a recent report of the World Bank, the rate of population growth in the developing countries as a whole had passed its peak, falling from 2.4 per cent in 1965 to 2.2 per cent in 1981. Only in Africa had population growth accelerated in the 1970s.

35. Poverty was one of the causes of population growth, while rapid population growth, conversely, contributed to poverty. There was also a clear relationship between population and social and economic development. The availability of family planning services was therefore significant.

36. One of the major goals of the five-year plan, 1982-1986, currently being implemented by his Government was to reduce the population growth rate to 1.5 per cent by 1986. In order to attain that goal, family planning programmes, development projects and activities designed to control migration to urban areas were being promoted at considerable cost, with the assistance of various multilateral agencies such as UNDP, UNFPA and WHO, as well as bilateral agencies.

37. His delegation had therefore welcomed the fact that the Council, in resolution 1981/87, had decided that the 1984 Conference should be convened with the utmost economy in cost factors. It hoped that many countries would respond positively to the appeal made by the Secretary-General of the Conference.

38. Mr. ZIMMERMAN (United States of America) welcomed the results obtained by the Secretary-General of the Conference as well as the growing participation by the developing countries. It was a well-known fact that the United States was in the vanguard of action being taken with regard to population; it was in fact financing about 50 per cent of the international assistance provided, within the framework of bilateral or United Nations programmes.

39. He reiterated his support for the Conference, but underscored the fact that it should be of brief duration and limited in size and should deal with basic problems of population growth. Further, the Conference should be financed as far as possible from voluntary contributions so as not to burden the United Nations regular budget.

40. The United States endorsed the Australian proposal to defer until the summer or autumn, for the resumed second regular session of the Council, consideration of the financial implications of the Conference, since in the meantime it would be possible to have an exact idea of the contributions. It was to be hoped that the cost estimates submitted by the Secretary-General to the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session¹ would be confirmed as final. The United States stood ready to support the Conference provided it absorbed no more than \$800,000 from the regular budget of the United Nations.

41. Mr. BENA (Romania) said that the item under consideration was of particular interest to his delegation and that, as host country for the Conference held in 1974, Romania had supported from the outset the idea of convening another population conference in order to foster international co-operation in that particularly complex field.

42. In his opening address to the 1974 Conference, the President of Romania had highlighted the importance of population questions for the future of mankind and civilization and had called attention to the fact that population policies and, in general, issues having to do with population trends should be studied against the background of the historical, national, economic and social situation of each country.² That idea had been fully reflected in the World Population Plan of Action,³ which had been recognized by the General Assembly (resolution 3344 (XXIX), para. 4) as an instrument for the promotion of economic development and quality of life within the broader context of strategies for national and international progress.

43. Without going into the details of the World Population Plan of Action, his delegation wished to reaffirm the great importance it attached to the sovereign right of every State to formulate and promote its own population policies without external interference; it was equally essential to integrate population policies into overall social and economic development programmes.

44. The World Population Plan of Action also underscored the need to increase food production and, therefore, to improve methods of production, to develop new sources of food and to make more effective and rational use of existing sources.

45. During the debates which had followed the Bucharest Conference, many countries had stressed the fact that every national population policy was a strategic long-term weapon, and the 1984 Conference was being convened against that background.

46. The preparatory activities, directed by the Secretary-General of the Conference, would undoubtedly be crowned with success. Those organizing the Conference should,

however, pay the greatest attention to economy and endeavour, wherever possible, to utilize extrabudgetary resources to finance it.

47. Mr. CRUZ (Portugal) thanked the Secretary-General of the Conference for his statement on the preparatory work and stressed the significance his country attached to the preparation and success of the Conference.

48. As the Portuguese representative had recently stated in Geneva to the ILO Governing Body, Portugal thought it advisable for the secretariat of the Conference to collaborate with the ILO, particularly in connection with studies on international migrations.

49. Portugal was prepared to co-operate fully in the preparations for the Conference, especially by taking part in the preparatory meetings.

50. Mr. ZIMMERMAN (Federal Republic of Germany) said that population was an essential aspect of development and that a great many Governments were aware of its importance. It was therefore completely justified for Governments to meet once again, 10 years after the first World Population Conference, to evaluate the results of the World Population Plan of Action, which had been adopted unanimously in 1974. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany had been helping the developing countries for years to solve their population problems by providing them with bilateral aid and especially by making contributions since 1970 to the United Nations Fund for Population Activities.

51. He was aware of the current economic climate and was convinced that the Secretary-General of the Conference would do everything in his power to limit the costs of the Conference and to make use as far as possible of extrabudgetary resources to finance it, as called for in Council resolution 1981/87. He therefore welcomed the contributions that had already been pledged to finance the Conference. His Government was studying the possibility as well of contributing to the preparatory work of the Conference and he would, at the appropriate time, inform the Secretary-General of the Conference of the outcome of its deliberations.

52. Mr. CHOWDHURY (Bangladesh) thanked the Secretary-General of the Conference for his statement on the preparations under way and noted with satisfaction his success thus far in that area. Bangladesh particularly welcomed the organization of the meetings of groups of experts which were expected to be held during the current and the following year. In that connection, his delegation felt very strongly that the regional commissions should be closely associated with the preparations of the Conference.

53. It was encouraging that the Secretary-General of the Conference had already obtained pledges of contributions from various countries and it was to be hoped that the developing countries as well could contribute to financing the Conference. Bangladesh, for its part, was actively studying the possibility of contributing to it and would inform the Secretary-General of the Conference as soon as possible of the outcome of its deliberations. Bangladesh would do everything in its power to contribute to the success of the Conference.

54. Mrs. BALI (India) said that her Government had always attached the greatest importance to population problems—which it took into account in its economic planning—since they were at the same time a cause and a consequence of poverty.

55. The Indian Government therefore welcomed the population activities carried out by United Nations bodies, UNFPA in particular, and it was in favour of convening a

¹ See A/C.5/36/33/Add.1

² See E/CONF.60/19, part three, para. 28

³ *Ibid.*, part one, chap. I

second population conference, which would underscore the most important population issues.

56. After stating her delegation's willingness to contribute in every possible way to the success of the Conference, she expressed the hope that, by the Council's second regular session, a clearer picture of the budgetary and extrabudgetary funds would have emerged.

57. Miss ZANABRIA (Peru) thanked the Secretary-General of the Conference for his efforts in preparing the Conference and endeavouring to ensure its success. Bearing in mind the recommendations made by the Council in resolution 1981/87 regarding the size and financing of the Conference, Peru was currently studying the question of its support to the Conference. Certainly, population problems had a high priority for Peru, which felt that they should be dealt with as part of economic and social programmes. Her delegation was already in a position to pledge a contribution of \$25,000 for the financing of the Conference; Peru would also take part in the preparation and work of the Conference.

58. Mr. ASTAFIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thanked the Secretary-General of the Conference for the efforts he was making to mobilize extrabudgetary resources so that the Conference could be convened. His delegation endorsed the proposal of the representative of Australia to defer consideration of the financial implications of the Conference to the second regular session or the resumed second regular session, when more precise information would be available on the extrabudgetary funds at hand.

59. Ms. FORD (Canada) said that her country had long been active in population matters and, in particular, had provided UNFPA with support. The Canadian delegation had therefore associated itself with the delegations which had proposed the convening of the International Conference on Population in 1984 at which questions of particular importance would be considered. In that connection, she welcomed the organization of meetings of groups of experts as part of the preparatory work for the Conference.

60. With regard to the financing of the Conference, Canada, like the Nordic countries, considered that it should be financed mainly from the regular budget of the United Nations.

61. Mr. DITZ (Austria) also underlined the importance of population questions for development and welcomed the Conference. In that connection, the Austrian delegation wished to express its gratitude to Mr. Salas for the efforts he was making to prepare the Conference and to provide for its financing. His appointment as Secretary-General of the Conference was in itself an assurance of success. In view of the constantly increasing cost of conferences, the Austrian delegation endorsed the remarks made by other delegations regarding the need to convene a conference whose size would be limited and which would deal with basic questions and work out specific recommendations. Austria was prepared to co-operate fully with the Secretary-General of the Conference in order to ensure that its objectives were achieved.

62. Mr. ESAN (Nigeria) said that, following the long discussions which had taken place throughout the previous year, it had been decided to organize another population conference in order to settle questions which had not yet been resolved under the World Population Plan of Action. Nigeria had supported that idea from the outset and he felt that steps should be taken immediately in order to organize the preparatory work for the Conference.

63. With regard to the financing of the Conference, he welcomed the contributions pledged by a number of

countries but felt that the cost of the Conference should also be covered in part from the regular budget of the United Nations. He proposed that the question of financing the Conference should be considered by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions at its next session. The Nigerian delegation was ready to co-operate fully in the work of the Conference and, as soon as it had received instructions from its Government, it would inform the Secretary-General of the Conference of them.

64. Mr. STEVENS (Belgium) felt that the Council was being realistic in its desire to limit significantly the number of questions considered at the 1984 Conference. It was important that the Conference should reach concrete conclusions and result in specific activities at all levels—national, regional and world-wide. Since the Conference was being convened primarily to consider population problems, he felt it was reasonable to finance it as far as possible by voluntary contributions and endorsed the American proposal to fix the amount of the costs to be covered out of the regular budget at \$800,000.

65. Mr. SAAD (Observer for Egypt) said that the Egyptian Government, having always recognized the value of UNFPA activities, fully supported the idea of convening another population conference in 1984. He hoped that all countries would provide it with the financial support necessary for its success.

66. Mr. KAMANDA wa KAMANDA (Zaire) said that the 1984 Conference would allow an assessment to be made of the progress achieved by each country in population matters. He hoped that the Conference would achieve the objectives set it, whatever the size of its budget.

67. Mr. TUAN (Liberia) stressed the social and economic importance of population questions for developing countries and appealed to all Governments to support the Conference and contribute generously towards it. The Liberian Government would do all it could in that regard.

68. Mr. JOHNSON (Benin) said that the Beninese Government, aware that population problems hindered development, was ready to lend its support to the preparation of the Conference.

69. Mr. BAKALOV (Bulgaria) endorsed the idea put forward by a number of delegations that the financial implications of the Conference should be studied at the second regular session of the Council in 1982, or at the resumed second session.

70. Mr. ADUGNA (Ethiopia) said that he fully supported the International Conference on Population which was currently being prepared. It would provide all those who were genuinely concerned about the problems of developing countries with an excellent opportunity to help those countries achieve the objective of good population management, a key element in their development. He appealed to all potential donors to contribute generously to the financing of the Conference.

71. Mr. SALAS (Secretary-General of the International Conference on Population) said that the assurances of moral and financial support which he had received during the meeting—and, in particular, the contributions pledged by Australia, China and Peru, amounting to a total of \$155,000, which would cover more than half the expected 1982 expenditure on preparing the Conference—were a good sign; there was every reason to believe that the Conference would be suitably prepared.

72. Taking note of the question raised, he recalled that, as provided for in Council resolution 1981/87, the Conference would limit itself to high priority issues of concern to all countries. The Conference would have before it only two

documents, which would contain an account of the work of the four groups of experts. It would last only six days, not counting the two days of preliminary discussion. In the light of the many assurances of voluntary contributions made at the meeting, it would be preferable if he reported on the state of extrabudgetary resources allocated to the Conference during the second regular session of the Council, and, as the representative of Australia had proposed, he felt that the consideration of the financial implications of the Conference should be postponed until that session.

AGENDA ITEM 1

Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters (concluded) (E/1982/30/Add.1, E/1982/L.19)

(d) Consideration of the rules of procedure of the Committee for the United Nations Population Award

73. Mr. SALAS (Secretary-General of the International Conference on Population) announced that the Trust Fund for the United Nations Population Award, established in pursuance of General Assembly resolution 36/201, had received voluntary contributions from the following countries: Japan, \$200,000; Mexico, \$100,000; China, \$100,000. The resources of the Trust Fund thus totalled \$400,000.

74. Mr. SHIBUYA (Japan) said that, on the whole, he supported the draft rules of procedure (E/1982/L.19, annex). However, with regard to rule 4, he considered it essential that the Secretary-General of the United Nations

and the Executive Director of the United Nations Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA), who would be *ex officio* members of the Committee for the United Nations Population Award, should participate as much as possible in the work of the Committee, so that the Award would lose none of its authority and moral value. He also proposed that the words "if necessary" should be inserted after the word "may".

75. With regard to rule 7, paragraph 2, it was his understanding that, when the laureates were selected, the Committee would first decide whether the Award should be made to an institution rather than an individual. He himself would prefer no distinction to be made between the two categories. Accordingly, paragraph 2 of rule 7 should be redrafted to read: "The Committee shall decide to make an award to either an institution or to an individual or individuals; unless it decides otherwise, no more than two individuals shall be selected."

76. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Council) said that the draft rules of procedure made no arrangements for providing the meetings of the Committee for the Award with language services. If that was duly taken into account, the draft had no financial implications.

77. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt the draft rules of procedure of the Committee for the United Nations Population Award (E/1982/L.19, annex) as orally amended by the representative of Japan (see paras. 74 and 75 above).

It was so decided (decision 1982/112).

The meeting rose at 12.20 p.m.

16th meeting

Monday, 26 April 1982, at 3.20 p.m.

President: Mr. Miljan KOMATINA (Yugoslavia).

E/1982/SR.16

AGENDA ITEM 3

Special economic, humanitarian and disaster relief assistance (continued)* (E/1982/40, E/1982/44 and Add.1, E/1982/53, A/37/178, E/1982/L.21, E/1982/L.22, E/1982/L.24-E/1982/L.27)

1. Mr. KAMANDA wa KAMANDA (Zaire), after referring to the special situation of African refugees, introduced five draft resolutions on behalf of the sponsors, as follows: E/1982/L.21, concerning the measures to be taken following the cyclones and floods in Madagascar; E/1982/L.24, concerning the situation of refugees in the Sudan; E/1982/L.25, concerning assistance to displaced persons in Ethiopia; E/1982/L.26, concerning humanitarian assistance to refugees in Djibouti; E/1982/L.27, concerning assistance to refugees in Somalia. In all those draft resolutions, it was recommended that the international community provide assistance.

2. Referring to the operative part of draft resolution E/1982/L.24, he said that in paragraph 5, the word "mission" should be replaced by "missions".

3. Referring to the operative part of draft resolution E/1982/L.26, he said that in paragraph 4, the words "other victims" should be replaced by "the victims". In paragraph 6, the words "to send an inter-agency mission to Djibouti to evaluate" should be replaced by "to evaluate".

4. Referring to draft resolution E/1982/L.21, he said that the words "and the statement of the Director of the Liaison Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator" should be added at the end of the second preambular paragraph. In the seventh preambular paragraph, "specialized agencies" should be added after "international and regional organizations". The same should be done in operative paragraph 3.

5. Mr. ABDULLAH (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), on behalf of the sponsors, introduced draft resolution E/1982/L.22, on measures to be taken following the heavy floods which had affected Democratic Yemen, and commented briefly on some of its operative paragraphs.

6. The PRESIDENT announced that the draft resolutions which had been introduced would be considered on Tuesday, 27 April, since some delegations were encountering problems with them. It was necessary, moreover, to ascertain whether the draft resolutions had any financial implications.

* Resumed from the 13th meeting

7. Mr. KAMANDA wa KAMANDA (Zaire), announcing the names of the additional sponsors of the draft resolutions, said that Nigeria had become a sponsor of draft resolutions E/1982/L.24, L.26 and L.21. Benin, Egypt, Liberia,

Malawi, Nigeria and Zambia had become sponsors of draft resolution E/1982/L.27.

The meeting rose at 3.50 p.m.

17th meeting

Tuesday, 27 April 1982, at 10.45 a.m.

President: Mr. Miljan KOMATINA (Yugoslavia).

E/1982/SR.17

AGENDA ITEM 6

Strengthening of the co-ordination of information systems

1. The PRESIDENT invited the Assistant Secretary-General for Programme Planning and Co-ordination to make an oral report on the question as requested by the Council in its resolution 1981/63.
2. Mr. HANSEN (Assistant Secretary-General for Programme Planning and Co-ordination) said that the Council, during its second regular session of 1981, had reviewed the question of the Inter-Organization Board for Information Systems and its effectiveness in co-ordinating the informational systems of the United Nations family in the light of the recommendations of the Joint Inspection Unit and the subsequent decision of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination to terminate the operational functions of the Board and to abolish its secretariat.
3. Pursuant to paragraph 5 of the Council's resolution, the Secretary-General had engaged two independently recognized experts to prepare recommendations on methods of enhancing the effectiveness of the co-ordination of the information systems in the United Nations system. The experts had begun their work in November 1981 and it had been hoped that they would be able to submit their report by the end of February 1982 for consideration by the Council. The experts had concluded, however, that the problem was so vast that it would not be possible to prepare a serious study in so short a time, particularly in view of the need to consult Governments regarding the requirements which the latter considered should be met. The report would be submitted by the end of April 1982, but in the meantime, the experts had discussed the issue of the co-ordination of information systems at an interagency meeting held in Geneva early in 1982 as well as with the North-American-based organizations towards the end of 1981.
4. The experts had decided to visit nine countries to get an impression of their informational requirements and expectations. By the end of February 1982 the experts had prepared a preliminary report for further discussion. They had reached the preliminary conclusion that member States were the most important users of information emanating from the agencies and, with that in mind, would include in their report: a description and analysis of systems co-ordination and a definition of the overall framework for the future activities of the Inter-Organization Board. As the Inter-Organization Board had always regarded the intergovernmental organizations as the main users of the information systems of the United Nations, the approach of the experts represented a departure from the past. The experts were currently in New York for final consultations prior to the submission of their report. In the light of the experts' report, the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination would consider the issue and would submit its conclusions for consideration by the Economic and Social Council at its second regular session of 1982.
5. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) said that, according to the Joint Inspection Unit, approximately \$2 billion had been allocated by agencies of the United Nations family to over 100 information systems. Most of those were mutually incompatible. Moreover, approximately \$200 million annually was spent on the maintenance of those systems. It was hardly surprising therefore that member States should seek ways to make the system efficient.
6. The Administrative Committee on Co-ordination had never expressed great enthusiasm for the co-ordination of information systems. In fact there were agencies which seemed to wish to keep statistical information to themselves and were reluctant to provide access to such information, especially in relation to the functions of the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation.
7. His delegation looked forward to reading the report of the experts. There was a need for the experts to provide precise information on their contacts with member States and to give careful consideration to the effectiveness of the system within the United Nations Secretariat. The means for co-ordinating information activities within the United Nations system should be enhanced. It was not appropriate to eliminate the small co-ordinating secretariat which had encountered difficulties in making agencies understand the need to have mutually compatible information systems.
8. Mrs. WALDER-BRUNDIN (Observer for Sweden), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries, welcomed the new approach to data processing in the information systems of the United Nations family. The study should cover the full range of activities involved in the policies and planning of the system, including those of the specialized agencies, in terms both of methodology and technology; the issue should be approached from both the administrative and the substantive angles.
9. She had noted with interest the view of the experts that the requirements of member States should be the primary consideration in the elaboration of an enhanced system of co-ordination. Nevertheless that should not be the only consideration. The requirements both of member States and of the agencies must be considered. In that connection, consideration might be given to a pilot project before a final decision was taken. The Nordic countries attached importance to the establishment of a central informational function, which should also facilitate advance planning and the development of information systems.
10. The PRESIDENT proposed the following draft decision for consideration by the Council:

“The Economic and Social Council takes note of the oral progress report made by the representative of the Secretary-General pursuant to Council resolution 1981/63 of 23 July 1981, on the strengthening of the co-ordination of information systems.”

11. If there were no further comments, he would take it that the council wished to adopt the text of the draft decision.

It was so decided (decision 1982/113).

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

AGENDA ITEM 12

Narcotic drugs (E/1982/13, E/1982/38, E/INCB/52/Supp)

13. Mrs. OPPENHEIMER (Director, Division of Narcotic Drugs), introducing the report of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs on its seventh special session (E/1982/13), said that illicit use of drugs had further increased both for traditional narcotic drugs and for psychotropic substances, whether illicitly produced or diverted from licitly manufactured drugs. The resulting negative effects on health, as well as on the social and economic development of many Member States, constituted a major threat to the well-being of the international community.

14. The amount of cocaine hydrochloride and cocaine sulphate (*pasta de coca*) available for illicit consumption, as well as the illicit production and widespread abuse of cannabis in all major regions of the world, had also continued to increase alarmingly during 1981. Cannabis seized from the illicit traffic showed evidence of increasingly potent varieties, with a greater content of tetrahydrocannabinol (SIN SEMILLA). In addition, several major consumer countries had become producers.

15. The increased availability and abuse of psychotropic substances also represented a threatening trend. Stimulants, depressants and hallucinogens such as PCP (“angel dust”), methaqualone, lysergic acid (LSD) and other dangerous substances had continued to be manufactured illicitly as well as to be diverted from licit sources.

16. The enormous profits reaped by the drug traffickers had been used to corrupt public officials and had been disruptive of the internal stability of some Member States, leading to the adoption of internal remedial measures in several States at the highest governmental levels. Drug-related deaths had continued to reach very high levels, particularly in Western Europe. Escalating drug-related criminality constituted a larger part of all criminal activities throughout the world.

17. National Governments were reacting to the threat by enacting new legislation with stricter controls, by imposing longer prison sentences for drug-related offences and by launching and strengthening prevention campaigns. Programmes for treatment and rehabilitation were also being stepped up although the results had not so far been encouraging. The total resources allocated to those endeavours were, however, inadequate as a response to the problems involved and were quite insignificant in terms of the resources available to traffickers and of the harm done to societies affected by the illicit use of drugs.

18. In its resolution 36/168, the General Assembly had adopted the International Drug Abuse Control Strategy as well as the basic five-year programme of action recommended by the Commission on Narcotic Drugs in its resolution 1 (XXIX), which had been endorsed by the Economic and Social Council in its decision 1981/113. In

response to that request, the Commission, at its seventh special session, had created a task force, whose deliberations were reflected in document E/1982/13.

19. The Commission had approved by consensus the implementation of 18 projects during the second year of the five-year programme of action: 11 had been suggested for regular budget financing and seven for extrabudgetary financing. Another resolution of the Commission involved streamlining the procedures to be followed in matters of scheduling of narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances: that resolution would have far-reaching effects in improving the existing system of review of substances for inclusion in the various schedules contained in the drug control treaties.

20. The Commission had also adopted seven draft resolutions for consideration by the Council (E/1982/13, chap. I, sect. A). Draft resolution I related to measures to improve international co-operation in the interdiction of illicit drug traffic. Draft resolution II related to concerted action against the illicit drug traffic in Central and South America and in the Caribbean. Draft resolution III concerned the question of strategy and policies for drug control and requested, *inter alia*, that the Council recommend to the General Assembly the adoption of a draft resolution approving the projects recommended by the Commission in its resolution 1 (S-VII) for implementation in 1983. Draft resolution IV concerned the question of duration and periodicity of the sessions of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs. Draft resolution V reflected a proposal of the International Narcotics Control Board for an International Year against Drug Abuse. Draft resolution VI related to co-operation with the International Narcotics Control Board concerning Schedule II of the 1971 Convention on Psychotropic Substances in order to facilitate a more effective control of the international trade in the substances contained in Schedule II. Draft resolution VII related to the question of demand and supply in the case of opiates for medical and scientific needs and, in particular, to over-supply of opiate raw materials.

21. The three principal functions of the Division of Narcotic Drugs were: to enable the secretariat of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs to carry out on behalf of the Secretary-General the various functions assigned to him by the international drug control treaties; to advise the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control on the feasibility and timeliness of projects; and to act as executing agency for those projects which fell within its area of expertise. The Division looked forward to working closely with the secretariat officials of the International Narcotics Control Board and of the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control in carrying out treaty mandates and the instructions of the various policy-making bodies of the United Nations in that field.

22. Ms. GOUGH (Vice-President, International Narcotics Control Board), introduced the Board's report for 1981 (E/INCB/56), a summary of which was contained in document E/1982/38, as well as a special report concerning the demand for and supply of opiates for medical and scientific needs (E/INCB/52/Supp), which had been published in December 1981. The latter report had been prepared in accordance with the Board's responsibility under the treaties and in response to the Council's request in its resolution 1980/20.

23. In most parts of the world the drug abuse situation had deteriorated and had never been more serious. The number of persons abusing drugs remained substantial, involved many countries, and affected youth and even children. Against that background, the Board had drawn Governments' attention to weaknesses in control and in treaty compliance and had made suggestions for improvement at

both the national and international levels. It had once again appealed to the international community for renewed awareness and co-ordinated action. One way to mobilize such action on a global scale, which would involve not only governments but all sectors of society, might be for the United Nations to declare as early as feasible an International Year against Drug Abuse. That suggestion was the subject of a draft resolution recommended by the Commission on Narcotic Drugs for adoption by the Council.

24. The operation of the international system to control the licit trade in narcotic drugs remained generally satisfactory. During the last crop year there had, however, been a significant increase in the already vast illicit production of opium, notably in parts of the Near and Middle East, as well as in East and South-East Asia. That in turn had aggravated the menace of heroin, which was now illicitly manufactured in a growing number of countries and geographic regions. The Board continued to believe that, in the long term, progress towards containing and reducing illicit production of narcotic raw materials could be made only if poppy farmers were afforded alternative means of earning their living, such as growing essential food crops. Such measures, however, must necessarily move hand in hand with effective and progressive poppy eradication if drug control objectives were to be achieved. Simultaneous efforts to diminish illicit demand for drugs were also essential and the Board had stressed the need for Governments to take action to prevent drug abuse and to treat and rehabilitate drug-dependent persons. For such action to be successful, the participation of all segments of society was necessary, including the family, schools, religious institutions and community organizations.

25. In many parts of the world cannabis consumption was rampant. That was the more disturbing since steadily accumulating scientific evidence showed that hazards to human health caused by such consumption could be serious. The Board drew the particular attention of Governments to the experience of some countries which had found that the widespread dissemination of information concerning health hazards, particularly to high-risk populations, could be beneficial in preventing and reducing cannabis use.

26. Efforts designed to contain and reduce the enormous and expanding production of coca leaves and cocaine in certain parts of South America, notably in Bolivia, Colombia and Peru, had been initiated from time to time. Firm and sustained political commitment was indispensable if further deterioration was to be avoided. The Board believed that the countries afflicted with cocaine-abuse problems should themselves make determined efforts to allocate high priority to demand reduction and prevention measures. Such countries also had a special interest in collaborating closely with producer countries in activities aimed at the eradication of illicit production and trafficking.

27. One main difficulty in controlling psychotropic substances, apart from the illicit manufacture of certain substances, was the large-scale diversion from legitimate manufacture into the illicit traffic. On the positive side, concerted action by a number of Governments, working together with the Board, had resulted in the adoption of measures which should significantly improve the situation in respect of the diversion of methaqualone, a substance controlled under Schedule II of the 1971 Convention. Those measures included the decision on the part of one country to curtail manufacture, of another to enact comprehensive legislation, and of several to ban imports pursuant to article 13 of the 1971 Convention.

28. The Board welcomed the positive replies of Governments to its recommendations, endorsed by the Council in 1981, concerning voluntary control measures designed to

buttress those already specified in the 1971 Convention in regard to Schedule II substances. The information received should enable Governments, as well as the Board, to have a better understanding of the actual world requirements for Schedule II substances, thus facilitating the adjustment of manufacture to licit requirements and minimizing diversions into illicit channels. In that connection, she invited the Council's attention to draft resolution VI, contained in section A of chapter I of the Commission's report (E/1982/13).

29. It was gratifying that the number of parties to the 1971 Convention continued to grow and currently included most manufacturing-exporting countries. The number of countries, both parties and non-parties, which reported regularly to the Board had risen to 120, even though some countries still supplied incomplete information. The Board considered it imperative that all Governments should resolutely apply all the provisions of the 1971 Convention.

30. During 1981 the Board had continued to pursue diplomatic dialogues with several Governments, in particular those of Pakistan, Turkey, the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany. The Federal Republic of Germany had enacted a new comprehensive law under which psychotropic substances were submitted to the same measures of control as opiates. The necessary administrative regulations applied in particular to the free port of Hamburg through which certain Schedule II substances had passed in transit and subsequently been diverted to illicit channels. The Board had also been represented at a number of international conferences, including the third travelling seminar in the Soviet Union on the safe use of psychotropic and narcotic substances.

31. At the invitation of the Attorney-General of Mexico and with the Fund's financial support, the Board and the Division of Narcotic Drugs had organized a seminar for drug control administrators and law enforcement officers in Latin America and the Caribbean. Participants had been able to gain a better understanding of the operation of the international drug control system and Governments' responsibilities for reporting and other matters, while the secretariats of the Board and participating organizations had learnt much about the specific problems of controlling drugs in the region. The participants had also been able to see at first hand the successful campaign conducted by the Government of Mexico to eradicate the opium poppy and cannabis. Other countries with illicit poppy and cannabis cultivation might consider using the technical innovations and eradication methods used by Mexico. Later in the year the Board would review the statistics and estimates supplied by Latin American and Caribbean countries participating in the seminar, and hoped to make a positive assessment of the impact achieved. In the light of its experiences the Board would respond positively to requests for other seminars, if funds could be made available.

32. With regard to the supply of and demand for opiates for medical and scientific needs, the problem of over-supply had arisen because of unco-ordinated national measures to overcome temporary interruptions in the supply of raw materials in the early 1970s. Those unco-ordinated measures had led to a reduction in demand and an increase in supply and a consequent accumulation of stocks, mainly in India and Turkey. In seeking a solution the Board had consulted the Governments mainly concerned with production, manufacture and consumption; all 16 Governments involved had voluntarily supplied information which formed the basis of the study and analysis before the Council in the special report (E/INCB/52/Supp). She appreciated the help which the Governments had given, and the frankness with which they had discussed matters, but bilateral

consultations between the Board and individual countries were no substitute for wider discussions involving the main producers, manufacturers and consumers of opiates. If it was to continue monitoring the situation, the Board needed more comprehensive information from Governments, and the report contained recommendations to that effect (*ibid.*, paras. 341-359). The recommendations also mentioned the need to amend the 1961 Convention to bring *Papaver bracteatum* under international control.

33. The Board would keep Governments informed of major developments in supply and demand, and would maintain its dialogue with the countries principally concerned. Governments were invited to consider the suggestions set forth in the Board's special report with a view to concerted action to maintain a world-wide balance between the supply of and the demand for opiates.

34. Mr. DI GENNARO (United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control) said that during the 11 years since its foundation, the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control had investigated ways to contain drug abuse and had designed techniques to operate effectively in developing countries. It had achieved a remarkable amount of work despite its small administrative and operational structure, designed to keep costs to a minimum.

35. The Fund's programme for 1982, budgeted at \$9.2 million, proposed to allocate 80 per cent of available resources to country programmes and the balance for such activities as training programmes and seminars, research, and support of the United Nations Narcotics Laboratory. In the 13 country programmes, 39 per cent of the funds was allocated to reducing the production of illicit narcotics through rural development, 31 per cent to law enforcement, and the balance to health and treatment, rehabilitation and preventive education. Two new research activities in Thailand and Malaysia were being financed. United Nations bodies working in the various fields of concern to the Fund were commonly used as executing agencies for such programmes, though the technical capabilities of government agencies were also brought into play. That had the advantage of raising the interest and involvement of the concerned countries and thus reinforcing United Nations efforts.

36. The Fund's programmes were in accordance with the guidelines set forth in General Assembly resolution 36/168 on the International Drug Abuse Control Strategy, and also conformed to that part of the basic five-year programme for action which had been proposed for extrabudgetary support. That plan had been refined during the seventh special session of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs.

37. However, the problems ahead gave cause for anxiety. Abuse of natural narcotics and psychotropic substances had continued unabated in developed countries, while developing countries were beginning to face similar problems. The Fund had not at first appreciated the fact that economic development itself, if not properly planned and controlled, could lead to various forms of social deviation. Moreover, especially among the youth of developing countries, there was a striking correlation between drug abuse and crime.

38. The first step in counteracting the kind of economic development that led to drug abuse was to make the affected countries and the international community aware of the problem, while the development process itself must include programmes designed to prevent drug abuse. Intensive education programmes were required for the youth of developing and developed countries alike, and programmes of health and rehabilitation must be undertaken or expanded. Assistance to the bodies responsible for law enforcement must be so directed as to enhance the development

process. The costs of such programmes must be regarded as costs of development and should be included in all development programmes, however financed. Each institution concerned should review its methods in the light of changing situations.

39. The Fund must make United Nations organizations and Member States aware of the drug problems directly related to development, and must convince Member States and other donors that it was in a unique position to assess needs world-wide. The Fund could help to define priorities and give advice on the investment of financial and human resources. It could provide co-ordination from a politically neutral standpoint, so that initiatives at present carried out under bilateral assistance could be channelled through the Fund, to the benefit both of donors and of recipients and without losing the donors' identity; indeed, the donors could continue to select recipient countries and the programmes to be financed.

40. The Fund had been conceived as a flexible instrument able to adapt to continuous changes in needs and resources. In that connection, the Secretary-General had stated in 1973 that, as the Fund's resources increased, the Executive Director should plan to establish regional representatives at a few strategic locations world-wide to maintain contact with Governments of the region and stimulate the preparation of new projects.

41. In addition to its traditional role, the Fund should endeavour to attract and co-ordinate a variety of financial and other contributions and should encourage the international community to co-operate with small organizations in joint ventures, since small contributions might one day result in a substantial accumulation of resources, thereby enhancing the success of the programmes while involving national and local communities; the participation of the public in the fight against drug trafficking and abuse would benefit not only the cause, but the donors themselves.

42. Mr. ORTIZ SANZ (Observer for Bolivia) said that the aim of the Bolivian Government was to promote a planned and sustained international effort to eliminate the evils of drug abuse, which increasingly threatened the international community. It must be realized that in the Andean countries in which the coca leaf was harvested, the local population customarily regarded it as a dietetic supplement and its use was permitted, just as the use of tea or tobacco. It was therefore difficult to prohibit coca cultivation and any prohibition must be balanced by the substitution of other suitable crops. In any case, the traditional use of coca was harmless, and the Government of Bolivia saw no reason to stop its cultivation. The trouble began when cocaine, originally used for medicinal purposes, became the subject of international traffic. The resources obtained from the sale of drugs in richer communities were used to finance over-production of coca leaf, the organization of distribution networks and the rise of a drug market in large urban centres. Hundreds of millions of dollars were poured into the economies of producing countries, creating abnormal conditions and disrupting control mechanisms. It was, however, emphatically not the people of the producing countries who were responsible for criminal activities; the drug traffic was organized and carried out by international criminal groups. In Bolivia one kilogram of coca leaf fetched \$2, whereas that kilo converted into cocaine was worth \$1,000 in the United States or in Europe. It was estimated that 20,000 hectares were under coca shrub in Bolivia and produced 35,000 tons of coca leaf, of which 15,000 tons represented traditional and non-harmful consumption, while the remaining 20,000 tons were used for the illicit preparation of cocaine. A total of \$20 billion was involved, a sum 10 times greater than the gross domestic

product of Bolivia, a country whose total foreign debt was only \$3 billion.

43. It was thus obvious that the problem was not a domestic one but a vast international problem affecting a number of developing countries, while the crime syndicates which it threw up threatened some of the most powerful nations on earth. Even the developing countries were often threatened by acts of subversion and terrorism and there was a possible connection between drug traffic and international violence. Drug addiction was less visible than firearms but just as deadly when it became a means of corrupting and debilitating democratic societies.

44. However, the international community could not do much with the resources now available to it, and the provision of the large funds required was primarily a matter for the rich countries. Bolivia had done much in the way of destroying illicit cocaine supplies and equipment for manufacturing it.

45. The Government had prepared a new and much more stringent narcotics law, while the Ministries of Planning and Agriculture were collecting statistics on the extent and location of areas where narcotic drugs were cultivated, with a view to substituting other crops.

46. At the request of the Government of Bolivia, the United Nations had sent an expert whose recommendations were being implemented with determination, and the Government had asked the Secretary-General to speed up the negotiations for the dispatch of a high-level committee. However, Bolivia was not seeking aid to solve merely a national problem; it wished to use events in Bolivia to demonstrate the seriousness and universal nature of the problem and to suggest to Governments that the evil should be fought, not in drug rehabilitation centres, but at its source, on the plantations themselves.

47. For those reasons, Bolivia had taken an active part in the adoption of General Assembly resolution 36/168 on the International Drug Abuse Control Strategy. That Strategy should be put into effect as soon as possible, and the task force referred to in paragraph 3 of the resolution should be constituted forthwith in order to evaluate the position and co-ordinate the work to be undertaken. Bolivia would be particularly interested in joining the task force.

48. However, success would depend on Member States initiating or increasing their contributions to the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control. The sum required was likely to be some \$100 million or \$150 million if crop substitution was to be undertaken and the national and international scientific, supervisory and enforcement agencies were to have modern and effective means of action, including a world campaign against drug abuse at all levels of ordinary education and health education. The developing countries were not in a position to provide funds on the scale required. They were already making a contribution by destroying crops, establishing expensive control mechanisms in the most inaccessible parts of their territories, and setting up legislation to combat the illicit manufacture of cocaine. It was for the developed States to provide the necessary funds. There were admittedly many competing causes, such as refugees, children, the handicapped, the abolition of hunger and so on, but drug addiction was an equally deserving cause. It was a grave problem and the credibility of the industrialized nations was at stake. He did not believe that they would grudge the cost of a few long-range bombers to make the control of narcotic drugs a reality.

49. Mr. BAKALOV (Bulgaria) said that the prompt and effective implementation by Governments, United Nations bodies and other international organizations of the International Drug Abuse Control Strategy and the basic five-year programme of action adopted by the General Assembly in its resolution 36/168 would help to create a comprehensive set of measures to combat the dangerous spread of drug abuse in the world.

50. There was a close connection between the abuse of narcotic or psychotropic substances and the general socio-economic conditions in a given country, notably in certain Western States. Very often in those countries, the problems of big business and organized crime took precedence over questions of health, social welfare and the future of society as a whole, which should be any Government's top priorities. Article 12 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (General Assembly resolution 2200 A (XXI), annex) referred to the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health; States parties to that Covenant had a moral obligation to ensure, by providing proper social, economic and political conditions, that everyone could live a full and worthy life from which he would not seek to escape by taking refuge in drug addiction.

51. Such conditions did exist in Bulgaria, and consequently there was no drug abuse problem in that country. At the same time Bulgaria was conscious of the seriousness of the drug problem in other countries and determined to contribute to international endeavors to combat it. At the seventh special session of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs the importance of the problems related to psychotropic substances had been stressed, especially those enumerated in Schedule II of the 1971 Convention on psychotropic substances. Efforts should obviously be directed towards finding a solution to those problems. The adherence of a growing number of countries to the Convention was in itself encouraging, but his delegation wished to underline the obligation of the States parties to put the provisions of the Convention into effect in a constructive manner. The strict application of the authorized import and export system would greatly help to limit the manufacture, distribution and use of psychotropic substances for other than medical and scientific purposes. Information on international trade in those substances, submitted quarterly, would enable the Board to control their movement more effectively and to take appropriate action. The voluntary submission of reports on the real need of countries for psychotropic substances would help in achieving balance of supply and demand. The current over-production of opium and its derivatives was a disturbing fact universally recognized. The relevant provisions of the 1961 Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs should, of course, be strictly observed.

52. His delegation believed that action to prevent the use of narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances must comprise broad medical and social measures emphasizing, first, the creation of effective national control systems, and then the undertaking of complementary international measures. Any aspect of the medical use of narcotic and psychotropic substances required an extremely thorough and careful scientific approach, aimed first and foremost at preserving human health. WHO had carried out some useful research into and assessment of various substances and preparations used in therapy, including the extent and likelihood of their abuse. The implementation of the United Nations five-year programme of action and the International Drug Abuse Control Strategy would contribute significantly to the fight against drug abuse and its harmful effects on society.

AGENDA ITEM 3

Special economic, humanitarian and disaster relief assistance (continued) (E/1982/L.21/Rev.1, E/1982/L.22, E/1982/L.24, E/1982/L.25, E/1982/L.26/Rev.1, E/1982/L.27)

53. The PRESIDENT said he wished to inform the Council that no financial implications were foreseen in the draft resolutions before it. He invited members to comment first on the draft resolution contained in document E/1982/L.24, noting that the United States had now joined the list of sponsors.

54. Mr. STEVENS (Belgium) observed that operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution E/1982/L.24, and also of the draft resolution in document E/1982/L.22, requested the Secretary-General to report on the implementation of the resolutions and that the latter asked him to report to the Council at its second regular session of 1982. He drew attention to paragraph 10 (f) of document E/1982/28, in which the Secretary-General proposed that reports on progress of work for the information of the Council should, as a general rule, be presented orally. He appealed for the strict application of that proposal, and suggested that the two reports in question should be submitted at the resumed second session in October; there would then still be time for the issues concerned to be discussed at the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly.

55. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Council) said it was the Secretariat's understanding that any report given to the Council at its second regular session would be oral. It had been decided, in order to rationalize the work of the Council, that the question to be discussed would be taken up at the second regular session; there would be no point in submitting a report on it at the resumed second regular session because by that time the written report to the General Assembly, if there was one, would already be available.

56. Mr. JENSEN (Office for Special Political Questions) said that the Secretary-General would be making an oral report on the Special Economic Assistance Programme and could, in that context, also report on the situation in Somalia to the Council at its second regular session. He wished members to understand, however, that it would be only an interim report on measures which were being taken to implement the various programmes and recommendations.

57. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt the draft resolution contained in document E/1982/L.24.

It was so decided (resolution 1982/1).

58. The PRESIDENT drew the Council's attention to the draft resolution in document E/1982/L.25. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt it.

It was so decided (resolution 1982/2).

59. The PRESIDENT drew the Council's attention to the draft resolution in document E/1982/L.26/Rev.1.

60. Mr. DUGGAN (United States of America) said that his delegation was pleased to co-sponsor the draft resolution in document E/1982/L.26/Rev.1 as well as those in documents E/1982/L.24 and L.27. His country had contributed substantial amounts of aid to refugees in all the three countries concerned. It looked forward to a continued improvement in Djibouti's record of protection, particularly with respect to involuntary repatriation.

61. The PRESIDENT said that if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt the draft resolution in document E/1982/L.26/Rev.1.

It was so decided (resolution 1982/3).

62. The PRESIDENT drew the Council's attention to the draft resolution in document E/1982/L.27, noting that the United States had joined the list of sponsors. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt that draft.

It was so decided (resolution 1982/4).

63. Mr. WORKU (Ethiopia) said that he wished to comment on all the draft resolutions before the Council. His delegation sympathized deeply with the peoples of Democratic Yemen and Madagascar regarding the natural calamities which had befallen them and which had left the economies of their countries in critical condition. Ethiopia also had been the victim of natural disasters and understood the catastrophic effect they could produce. He therefore appealed to the international community to help in restoring the infrastructures of those countries and in providing relief and rehabilitation for their peoples. Ethiopia, which had itself received generous assistance from the international community, was also willing to help others; it did not, however, wish to be used to further Somalia's economic and political objectives. He drew attention to the report of the Secretary-General on assistance to refugees in Somalia (E/1982/40), which clearly revealed the acute economic problems which Somalia suffered as a result not only of the natural calamities but also of its own inherently weak economic structure. In the light of that information, it could not truthfully be said that Somalia's problems arose from the presence of so-called refugees in the country. The number of those refugees had, moreover, been reduced considerably, and it was therefore all the more regrettable that the recent interagency mission had once again failed to establish their numbers with any certainty. He stressed the importance of ascertaining the size and nature of the refugee population, drawing attention to paragraph 36 of the Secretary-General's report, in which it was stated that more young men were in evidence in the camps than in previous years. He asked who those young men could be. His delegation had its suspicions, and left the Council to draw its own conclusions.

64. The international community must try to stop the diversion of international aid which, although widely reported in the press, had been overlooked in the Secretary-General's report. In his country's view, repatriation was the best solution to the refugee problem, and it had accordingly offered a general amnesty to its people living abroad, invited them to come home and offered them the maximum financial help it could afford. Many people had in fact returned to Ethiopia, and he rejected the insinuation in paragraphs 51 and 52 of the Secretary-General's report that Ethiopians were reluctant to leave the camps in Somalia. He advised the United Nations not to interfere in such matters in future.

65. He wished to express the thanks of his Government and people to those who organized and gave aid which had helped to save the lives of 2 to 4 million displaced persons. He also thanked the sponsors of draft resolution E/1982/L.25, and the Council for adopting it unanimously.

66. Mr. KHALAF (Observer for Somalia) said he was surprised and shocked at the statement just made by the Ethiopian representative and categorically rejected the allegations contained in it.

67. Mr. WORKU (Ethiopia) said that his delegation had shown restraint in raising no objection to the adoption of the

draft resolution on Somalia (E/1982/L.27), and had made it clear that his Government would not oppose the granting of material assistance to any country, including Somalia.

68. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the draft resolution contained in document E/1982/L.21/Rev.1, noting that France and the United States of America had now joined the list of sponsors.

69. Mr. DUGGAN (United States of America), supported by Ms. FORD (Canada), suggested that the decisions on the draft resolutions in documents E/1982/L.21/Rev.1 and L.22 should be postponed until the following day in order to allow time for informal negotiations on them to be completed.

It was so decided.

70. Mr. HOUFFANÉ (Observer for Djibouti) said he wished to thank the Council for its unanimous adoption of the draft resolution on Djibouti (E/1982/L.26/Rev.1).

71. Mr. AL-AHMADI (Sudan) expressed his delegation's gratitude to all the members of the Council for the unanimous adoption of the draft resolution on the Sudan (E/1982/L.24), and particularly to those countries which had sponsored it. An interagency technical follow-up mission had visited the Sudan in January, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 35/181 and he hoped that the report which the Secretary-General was to submit at the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly on the implementation of the recommendations of the interagency mission would show that considerable progress had been made. He appealed to all donor countries to offer the necessary financial assistance for the implementation of humanitarian projects.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.

18th meeting

Wednesday, 28 April 1982, at 10.45 a.m.

President: Mr. Miljan KOMATINA (Yugoslavia).

E/1982/SR.18

AGENDA ITEM 12

Narcotic drugs (*continued*) (E/1982/13, E/1982/38, E/INCB/52/Supp)

1. Mr. BELL (Canada) said, with reference to draft resolutions I to VII contained in the report of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs on its seventh special session (see E/1982/13, chap. I, sect. A), that Canada lent its full support to draft resolutions I and VI, which contained constructive recommendations to strengthen international co-operation in drug abuse control. It also supported draft resolution III, but thought that the task force which had been made responsible for reviewing, monitoring and co-ordinating the implementation of the International Drug Abuse Control Strategy and the programme of action should not take upon itself too rigid a schedule of work in the early stages.
2. With regard to resolution 2 (S-VII), which dealt with the scheduling of narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances, contained in section A of chapter VIII of the report, he expressed the hope that Member States and the World Health Organization would adopt the very useful recommendations contained in it.
3. The special report of the International Narcotics Control Board (E/INCB/52/Supp) contained sound suggestions for solving the difficult problem of the over-supply of opiates and the accumulation of stocks. His delegation looked forward to the full and timely implementation of those recommendations. It also thought that serious consideration should be given to the recommendations in the report dealing with amendments to the 1961 Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, which would cover lacunae with respect to poppy straw and *Papaver bracteatum*.
4. Canada would comply with the recommendation in the Board's report that Governments should voluntarily report their long-term projections of estimated needs for opiates.
5. Mr. JOSEPH (Australia) said that the overall situation regarding the illicit traffic in drugs remained highly disturb-

ing. Considerable quantities of opiates had been stockpiled in certain parts of the Middle East, and the situation had been exacerbated by increased harvests of opium poppies in South-East Asia in 1980 and 1981. Traffickers from both regions had been seeking new outlets for their products, with the result that a number of countries previously unaffected by the problem had now become involved.

6. Counter-measures could be taken in three areas. First, in connection with training, international, regional and bilateral meetings between various drug control authorities were extremely useful, because they provided a channel for the exchange of both general technical information and information concerning particular operations. As for law enforcement, Australia was convinced that severe penalties must be imposed for drug offences. Conspiracy provisions could usefully be invoked, as Australia had found, to prosecute persons involved in drug trafficking. Finally, there was a need to seek at the international level some means of identifying financial transactions connected with the illicit drug traffic in order to deprive the traffickers of the proceeds of their criminal activities.

7. The work of the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control was focused on law enforcement, health services and agricultural alternatives. His delegation laid particular stress on the need for law enforcement, and, in that regard, was pleased to note that the Government of Thailand had taken steps to close down illegal narcotics operations in the border areas between Thailand and Burma. The Australian Government had been happy to provide direct financial assistance to the Government of Thailand to help it in that task, and to provide bilateral assistance for training courses sponsored by the United Nations. His country's contribution to the Fund for the current financial year had been increased by 25 per cent.

8. Where the demand and supply of opiates for licit purposes was concerned, the problem of over-production was, in his view, structural. His delegation was not convinced that that question had been confronted with adequate frankness in the special report on the subject

prepared by the International Narcotics Control Board (E/INCB/52/Supp). It needed to be recognized that the increase in the hectareage of poppies planted and the building up of excess stocks had taken place primarily in those countries which were defined as traditional producers. According to the INCB's own estimates, over the past five years the two traditional producers had accumulated at least 500 tons of morphine. As for the three countries which had more recently become producers, of which Australia was one, their total production over the same period had been less than 200 tons. A comparison of the two figures showed that over-production by the two traditional producers had been in excess of 300 tons of morphine, which was a substantial amount.

9. The problem was also compounded by the acknowledged fact that one of the traditional producers was now bringing into production a major new plant. Australia suggested that arrangements should be made immediately for a meeting of all the interested parties, including experts responsible for national control measures and commercial experts concerned with the legal manufacture of, and trade in, poppy straw and opium products. Such discussions could lead to decisions aimed at an orderly reduction of production levels and equitable stockholding arrangements during the period of apparent over-supply. Other solutions might also be considered, for example the establishment of buffer stocks. It might likewise be useful to think about an international commodity agreement.

10. Finally, with reference to the task force called for in General Assembly resolution 36/168, his delegation agreed that its composition should be limited, but only on condition that it would be reviewed by the Commission at its next session. His delegation thought that the composition of the task force should really be expanded, perhaps to include other States members of the Commission which had been sponsors of the text adopted as resolution 36/168.

11. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Council) pointed out that the subsidiary bodies of the Council normally met every two years. However, in paragraph 2 of draft resolution III (see E/1982/13, chap. I, sect. A), the Commission was requested to review the report of its task force and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its thirty-eighth session "and annually thereafter". Moreover, if draft resolution IV on the periodicity of sessions of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs were adopted, that would mean that the Commission would meet annually in a regular session of not less than eight working days. There was a contradiction there, which could be resolved in one of two ways: either the Council could modify the biennial pattern of meetings of its subsidiary bodies, or the Commission could alter paragraph 2 of draft resolution III by deleting the words "and annually thereafter". No attempt could be made to examine the calendar of meetings of each body separately. The Commission should therefore defer any decision on draft resolution III until the second regular session of the Council, when the whole calendar of meetings of the subsidiary bodies of the Council would be studied.

12. Mr. ALI (Pakistan) commended the Commission on Narcotic Drugs and the International Narcotics Control Board for the zeal with which they carried out their mandate. As part of its determined struggle against drug trafficking and drug abuse, the Government of Pakistan had promulgated legislation formally outlawing the cultivation, production, processing, use and possession of all narcotic drugs. It had also introduced more severe penalties for such crimes. Those measures had made it possible to break up the network of opium retail outlets and to reduce substantially the illicit production of drugs.

13. In order to continue the fight against drug trafficking and abuse in an effective manner, it was imperative that Pakistan and other developing countries facing the same problem should receive financial and technical assistance. Since the growing demand for illicit drugs originated in the developed countries of the West, it was reasonable that those countries should not only take effective measures to reduce the demand, but also increase their aid to the developing countries to assist them in combating that scourge.

14. His delegation was convinced that the problems of drug trafficking and drug abuse could be resolved only through the concerted efforts of all countries, both at the bilateral and at the multilateral level.

15. His delegation supported the call made in draft resolution I, aimed at making law enforcement agencies better aware of the problem. It also supported the proposal in draft resolution III that the Council should approve the projects recommended by the Commission on Narcotic Drugs for implementation in 1983, and the call for increased contributions from Member States to the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control. Many plans and programmes had in the past failed to materialize for lack of resources; it was for that reason, for example, that an educational project prepared by UNESCO at the request of the Fund had not been implemented.

16. In view of the growing seriousness of the problem, his delegation fully endorsed the proposal in draft resolution IV that the Commission on Narcotic Drugs should meet annually in a regular session of not less than eight working days. It was also in favour of the proclamation of an International Year against Drug Abuse, as recommended in draft resolution V; the activities undertaken in such a Year would give much needed impetus to the struggle to control the problem. His delegation also supported the appeal made in draft resolution VI for Governments to exercise control over the importing and exporting of psychotropic substances. Lastly, it supported draft resolutions II and VII, concerning the illicit drug traffic in Central and South America and the Caribbean, and the demand and supply of opiates for medical and scientific needs, respectively.

17. His delegation wished to make three suggestions in connection with the problem of narcotic drugs. First, it would be useful for the Division of Narcotic Drugs to establish regional offices so as to co-operate more closely with Member States on all issues connected with drug trafficking and abuse. Secondly, high allocations of their own budget resources should be made by such United Nations bodies as UNDP, WHO, ILO and UNESCO for action to combat drug abuse. Thirdly, since the problem of controlling the production of narcotic drugs could not be tackled independently from efforts to improve the socio-economic conditions of the areas of production, the local population had to be provided with alternative sources of income. Only given a more co-operative attitude on the part of the developed countries would there be any hope of solving a problem which threatened to have grave consequences for future generations.

18. Mr. CLARK (United States of America) said that drug abuse continued to plague the world community; it was an area which caused his country grave concern and in which it was determined to take vigorous measures. It was encouraging to see the competent United Nations agencies and bodies pursuing significant programmes aimed at combatting the problem.

19. His delegation was pleased, for the most part, with the resolutions and decisions adopted by the Commission on Narcotic Drugs and with the draft resolutions submitted to

the Council for consideration. Draft resolution III, entitled "Strategy and policies for drug control", and Commission resolution 2 (S-VII), entitled "Procedures to be followed by the Commission on Narcotic Drugs in matters of scheduling of narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances", were particularly important.

20. Draft resolution III (Strategy and policies for drug control) and Commission resolution 1 (S-VII) on the same question were the culmination of years of planning and reflected the world community's commitment to well-organized action against drug abuse. He hoped that the Division of Narcotic Drugs and the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control would translate the Commission's wishes into action.

21. Commission resolution 2 (S-VII), on the procedure to be followed in matters of scheduling of narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances, and resolution EB.69.R 9, adopted by WHO on the same question in January 1982, would together enable all drug scheduling issues to be comprehensively reviewed at both the national and the multinational level, in accordance with the international conventions.

22. A revitalized campaign against drug abuse must be mounted. That task would be facilitated by the implementation of those new procedures and of the new International Drug Abuse Control Strategy, and also by the fact that extremely competent people had been appointed to the leadership of a number of specialized agencies in the field. The Commission currently had at its disposal an arsenal of institutional weapons which it could use in its difficult struggle against drug abuse.

23. His delegation warmly commended the International Narcotics Control Board on the two reports submitted to the Council. It had already made specific comments on those reports at the February session of the Commission. It also fully endorsed the Board's call for more Member States to accede to the 1961 Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs and the Convention on Psychotropic Substances and emphasized the importance of the implementation of those conventions by the countries which were already parties to them. Only through world-wide co-operation in law enforcement and crop production control could the problems of drug abuse and opiates supply be solved.

24. He reiterated his Government's absolute commitment to the control of drug abuse. Both the executive and legislative branches were mounting aggressive campaigns to combat domestic drug problems. His country looked to the other nations of the world and the competent United Nations agencies to join in the international battle against drug abuse.

25. Mr. ALMOSLECHNER (Austria) said that, although his country was not a member of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, it had followed the activities of the Commission at its seventh special session with great interest.

26. The competent authorities in his country were very carefully studying the possibility of ratifying the 1971 Convention on Psychotropic Substances. His country had already been co-operating for a long time with all the bodies responsible for the supervision and implementation of that Convention and had always taken great care to enact legislation that would ensure implementation of the objectives set out in the Convention.

27. However, his Government was concerned by the fact that in 1981 there had been a record supply of narcotic substances with no corresponding increase in the demand for those substances for medical and scientific needs. It was obvious that that imbalance would lead to an increase in the

abuse of narcotic and psychotropic substances. His delegation therefore welcomed the efforts made by the Commission to overcome those difficulties.

28. On the question of the development of preventive and treatment measures to reduce the illicit demand for drugs and of specific countermeasures against illicit trafficking, his delegation whole-heartedly supported the conclusions of the Commission and associated itself with the criteria worked out on the subject.

29. As to the future work of the Commission, he supported draft resolution IV, submitted in the report of the Commission on the duration and periodicity of its sessions. With a few exceptions, the Committee had in fact always met every year. The adoption of a resolution on the matter by the Council would be a constructive step in view of the ever-growing workload of the Commission.

30. On the question of the proclamation of an International Year against Drug Abuse (draft resolution V), his delegation welcomed all initiatives aimed at making the public aware of the serious drug situation in many parts of the world. For its part, it was a long-standing policy to stimulate national and international preventive action as part of the battle against drug abuse and illicit traffic. However, it was a question which needed to be studied very carefully; the United Nations had already proclaimed too many years and too many decades, with the result that many programmes, well-intentioned at the outset, had lost a large part of their original momentum. The guidelines governing the proclamation of international years, as set out in the annex to Council resolution 1980/67, should be followed meticulously.

31. Ms. RADIĆ (Yugoslavia) said that she wished to make some observations on the draft resolutions contained in section A of chapter I of the report of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs on the work of its seventh special session (E/1982/13).

32. Before that, however, she wished to voice her delegation's concern at the continued deterioration in the international situation in relation to illicit drug trafficking and the production of narcotic drugs. The unlawful consumption of narcotics was the driving force behind supply and trafficking. In order to find a way out of the situation, the international community should strive to reduce demand and should therefore take preventive measures.

33. With regard to the allocation of the resources of the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control, Yugoslavia would like the Fund to participate in setting up customs posts on its borders with Greece and Bulgaria. She wished to recall in that connection that the main drug traffickers' routes from South-East Asia passed through Yugoslavia and that 12 per cent of the volume of total international drug seizures and 20 per cent of the volume of drug seizures in European countries were made in Yugoslavia.

34. Her delegation was ready to support all the draft resolutions recommended by the Commission for adoption by the Council at its current session. Draft resolution IV on the periodicity of sessions of the Commission simply ratified existing practice by proposing annual sessions.

35. Mr. Byung Yong SOH (Observer for the Republic of Korea) said that his country was fully aware of the magnitude of the problem of drug abuse and that concerted international co-operation was needed to combat it. In order to participate more directly in international efforts to that end, the Republic of Korea had the previous year sought membership in the Commission on Narcotic Drugs and was grateful to the Council for having elected it.

36. The problem of narcotic drugs was not as serious in his country as in other countries of the world. The Government had taken stringent measures and enacted numerous laws to combat the problem. As a result, there had been a drastic decrease in the number of drug-related crimes in recent years.

37. The increase in the number of people travelling between North America and South-East Asia by way of Seoul was, however, encouraging international drug traffickers to use that route. In its annual report for 1981, the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific had observed that favourable weather conditions had greatly boosted yields of opium in Asia, especially in the Golden Triangle, and that the Republic of Korea seemed to have suddenly become an important staging post in the flow of opium from South-East Asia to North America and Western Europe. Although the competent Korean authorities had no precise information to support that observation, they were exerting great efforts to prevent any illicit movement of drugs through Korean territory. To that end, they would continue to rely on governments in the producing area and such international bodies as the International Narcotics Control Board, to provide them with relevant information. His Government, for its part, would support all international activities to combat drug abuse and illicit drug trafficking.

38. Mrs. RODRIGUEZ (Venezuela) commended the work of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs and the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control and recalled that, according to the report of the International Narcotics Control Board for 1981 (E/INCB/56), drug abuse and illicit drug trafficking were increasing steadily throughout the world and neither the International Drug Abuse Control Strategy adopted by the General Assembly in its resolution 36/168 nor the countermeasures announced by the Secretary-General in his note (E/CN.7/674) had so far been able to curb them. She welcomed the creation of a task force to assist the Commission but hoped that its composition would not be limited. In view of the importance of the matters to be dealt with by the task force, it would be advisable, as some delegations had already suggested, to draw up a programme of work at an early date so that all interested countries could co-operate in its activities.

39. Her Government, for its part, was following the drug problem very closely and to that end had set up a high-level technical and administrative unit, the National Co-ordinating Bureau of the Commission Against Drug Abuse, which performed various tasks: staff training, prevention, control, treatment and re-education, research and information in the field of drug dependency. The Bureau had designed a number of sub-programmes for that purpose.

40. The co-ordination sub-programme was responsible for technical co-operation with national and international institutions specializing in drug dependency, formulated national drug policy, helped to implement the Commission's programmes and co-ordinated efforts by Venezuelan agencies and institutions to eliminate drug dependency.

41. The training sub-programme helped to develop human resources and, through special programmes, co-operated in staff training in other countries, particularly in Latin America. Its main aim was to encourage public and private institutions to set up programmes to reduce drug use and the illicit supply of drugs by means of effective controls on drug distribution and stricter regulations and penalties against offenders. It was also designed to keep officials responsible for regulating, curbing and controlling drug trafficking systematically informed about the situation.

42. In that connection, the work done in co-operation with the Ministry of Education was particularly important. As part of the programme set up, Ministry officials and Venezuelan teachers learned how to tackle the drug problem and a comprehensive strategy involving classes, seminars and workshops served to train supervisory and advisory staff. Such efforts generated new programmes for the prevention of drug abuse by education and also helped to improve existing programmes. They also provided a means of helping other Latin American countries to train staff. The Bureau centralized requests for assistance through the following mechanisms or organizations: the South American Agreement on Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances, UNESCO, WHO, ILO, the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control and the Organization of American States (OAS), but the Governments concerned could also go directly to the Bureau.

43. The research sub-programme helped to develop scientific knowledge about the problem of drug use and abuse and publicized work done in that connection in Venezuela and throughout the world. In that way it helped to keep up to date the information which served as the theoretical basis for devising experimental projects and contributed to the formulation of new theories. The sub-programme also evaluated the effectiveness of ongoing programmes and, where necessary, recommended new approaches. It participated in critical discussion of the drug problem and of the treatment of drug abuse in Venezuelan society. It was responsible for such ongoing projects as the computerized file for the systematic centralization and recording of drug abuse information (analysis of drug use curves, characteristics of drug users, magnitude of the phenomenon and fluctuations in time and space).

44. The information and documentation sub-programme was responsible for compiling bibliographical material and documentation gathered at national and international levels. It filed, processed and stored information and communicated data broken down according to the various sectors covered (treatment, re-education, prevention, regulation and control, etc.). It exchanged information with the different networks covered by the national scientific and technological system and implemented conventions, agreements and treaties on the exchange of information concluded with national and international institutions and organizations. Venezuela was very concerned at the traffic in marijuana and methaqualone (mandrax), which was difficult to control and caused serious short-term disorders. It therefore attached particular importance to prevention and welcomed the South American Agreement which, through its various mechanisms, facilitated bilateral and multilateral co-operation in curbing drug trafficking. Venezuela made available to the Treaty its information and documentation system on drug dependency, as well as its training and research resources.

45. Her delegation endorsed the report of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs (E/1982/13).

46. Mr. MATHEWSON (United Kingdom) said that he shared the views of the Secretary of the Council regarding the periodicity of the sessions of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs. That was a general problem which should be considered within the context of the Council's programme of work and calendar of meetings. Draft resolution IV, which proposed that the Commission should hold annual sessions, should moreover be considered at the Council's second regular session and the words "and annually thereafter" should therefore be deleted from paragraph 2 of draft resolution III.

47. Dr. MALAFATOPOULOS (World Health Organization) said that WHO had participated in the work of the seventh special session of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, particularly concerning the development of prevention and treatment measures.

48. At the request of the Division of Narcotic Drugs, WHO had submitted at the seventh special session of the Commission a document summarizing its activities and projects regarding the development of technologies related to the prevention and treatment of drug dependence.

49. WHO had implemented a number of drug dependency control programmes in various countries of Latin America and Asia, with financial support from the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control.

50. It collaborated closely with national authorities and with various international bodies and agencies, such as the Division of Narcotic Drugs, ILO and UNESCO, in planning and implementing those programmes. WHO also helped countries to develop strategies for the treatment and prevention of drug dependence and to increase the effectiveness of their health and social systems by developing effective and low-cost methods of treatment and rehabilitation.

51. The current country projects were concerned mainly with incorporating operational research into treatment programmes in order to optimize the use of resources. They also sought to develop national and local management systems to reduce and prevent the use of drugs for non-medical purposes. Training activities were being organized within the countries. epidemiological services were being set up in urban and rural communities and systematic evaluation systems were being established. Those activities increased the effectiveness of treatment methods and resulted in a better understanding of drug problems. WHO would continue to co-operate closely with the Division of Narcotic Drugs and the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control in that important field.

52. Miss ZANABRIA (Peru) said that problems related to drug abuse had increased throughout the world and had reached an alarming level; it was no longer simply the consumers—particularly young people—who were the victims, but the whole of society.

53. In the case of Peru, the problem of expanding coca cultivation was reaching disturbing proportions owing to the sharp increase in the consumption of cocaine, the traffic in which currently was one of the worst existing evils: The coca leaf had been grown from time immemorial in Peru; currently, however, output was not restricted to a few tons of coca leaves for local consumption in their natural state, but it was also processed into cocaine, a product which had a high market value and was a major source of revenue, and was far in excess of legitimate world consumption. In 1981, coca leaf production in Peru had reached some 60,000 tons, including 4,000 for medical uses and approximately 10,000 for local consumption (chewing), leaving a surplus of 46,000 tons of coca leaves, representing 196,000 kilograms of cocaine hydrochloride, for illicit export and processing into drugs. World therapeutic requirements for cocaine were, however, only 2,000 kilograms per annum. That dramatic increase in production was a result of the poverty and the backwardness of regions in the interior of the country, which were typical of a developing country, and natural conditions which suited the cultivation of coca, whose yield was 10 times higher than that of other crops because of the traffic in it. The Public Prosecutor's Office, which, in accordance with the Peruvian Constitution, was responsible for suppressing drug trafficking, had taken appropriate measures and were being extremely strict,

particularly in punishing officials found guilty of active or passive complicity.

54. However, while the measures taken had resulted in an increase in the number of traffickers imprisoned and the quantities of drugs seized, the Peruvian Government was well aware that repression could be effective only if a veritable crusade was launched to eliminate the fundamental causes of the problem by achieving integrated development—particularly agro-industrial development—in the rural areas affected by the traffic in narcotics.

55. Peru could not undertake such a development effort alone; it needed international co-operation to implement programmes to reduce coca production and to expand the agro-industrial sector. The General Assembly had, moreover, shown that it was fully aware of those problems by adopting resolution 36/132, in which it recognized the need for an effective international campaign against traffic in drugs, with particular emphasis on the strengthening of regional efforts, with due regard to the specific problems and needs of each region and the provision of technical and financial assistance to countries, particularly developing countries, whose limited resources were strained by their efforts to implement drug abuse control programmes. Given those factors, the Peruvian Government intended to submit, along with other countries seeking a fundamental solution to the problem, a proposal to establish a regional body to assist in the formulation and implementation of policies, programmes and measures to prevent and combat the traffic in narcotics and, in particular, cocaine.

56. The Peruvian delegation called upon all Member States to provide the support necessary for carrying out the International Drug Abuse Control Strategy and the five-year programme of action and to increase their contributions to the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control, upon which the success of an international campaign against drug trafficking was largely dependent.

AGENDA ITEM 3

Special economic, humanitarian and disaster relief assistance (*concluded*) (E/1982/L.21/Rev.1, E/1982/L.22)

57. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Council) said that the sponsors of draft resolution E/1982/L.21/Rev.1 on measures to be taken following the cyclones and floods in Madagascar proposed to revise the text by removing the fifth preambular paragraph and the final phrase of operative paragraph 3 from "taking into account", by inserting the word "concerned" after "all other international financial institutions" in paragraph 4, and in the same paragraph, by replacing the word "favourable" with the word "sympathetic" and the words "any request for assistance" with the words "requests for assistance".

58. Mr. STEVENS (Belgium) pointed out that paragraph 5 of the two draft resolutions under consideration (E/1982/L.21/Rev.1 and E/1982/L.22) was contrary to the recommendation in paragraph 10 of the report of the Secretary-General on the revitalization of the Economic and Social Council (E/1982/28) in so far as it requested the Secretary-General to report to the Economic and Social Council at its second regular session of 1982 on the implementation of resolutions adopted at its first regular session. Moreover, the Secretary-General could report directly to the General Assembly without going through the Economic and Social Council. Nevertheless, given that both cases involved disaster situations and that the reports requested would be oral ones which would not overburden the document publication services, the Belgian delegation would not object to the intention of the paragraph.

59. Mr. ASTAFIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he did not understand the purpose of the remarks made by the representative of Belgium and that his delegation had no objection to draft resolution E/1982/L.21/Rev.1 as revised by its sponsors.

60. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt by consensus draft resolution E/1982/L.21/Rev.1, as orally revised.

It was so decided (resolution 1982/5).

61. Mr. DUGGAN (United States of America) said that he had joined in the consensus on draft resolution E/1982/L.21/Rev.1 and stated that the United States had made available to the Malagasy Government a sum of \$8 million in food aid and more than \$160,000 for other assistance to the victims of the cyclones and floods which had ravaged Madagascar. The United States delegation wished to associate itself with the appeals for generosity and co-operation made by the international community on their behalf.

62. Mr. RAKOTONAIVO (Observer for Madagascar) expressed the gratitude of the Malagasy people for the measures taken by the international community in response to his country's appeal. The Malagasy delegation thanked all members of the Council and, in particular, Zaire, which had submitted draft resolution E/1982/L.21/Rev.1, and all the countries that had supported it including Ethiopia, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, China and the United States of America, which had shown their sympathy for the Government and people of Madagascar.

63. The Government of Madagascar welcomed the adoption of the resolution, which gave the country important encouragement in its efforts to ensure the rehabilitation and reconstruction of the areas affected by the disasters. The Government of Madagascar hoped that all States and all the international and regional organizations concerned would respond favourably to the appeal made by the Council in that resolution.

64. Finally, he expressed his deepest sympathy for the victims of the floods in Democratic Yemen and supported all the assistance measures which would be taken on behalf of the refugees of Ethiopia, Djibouti, the Sudan and Somalia.

65. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Council) announced that Cuba and Yugoslavia had become sponsors of draft resolution E/1982/L.22 and said that the sponsors had submitted the following revisions: to delete the fourth preambular paragraph; in paragraph 3, to insert the words "including the specialized agencies" after the words "international and regional organizations and voluntary agencies" and to delete the words "taking into account . . ." to the end of the paragraph; and, in paragraph 4, to insert the word "concerned" after "international financial institutions" and to replace the words "any requests for assistance" by the words "requests for assistance".

66. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt draft resolution E/1982/L.22, as orally revised, by consensus.

It was so decided (resolution 1982/6).

67. Mr. BASALEH (Observer for Democratic Yemen) thanked all those who had expressed sympathy and support for the victims of the floods which had devastated his country. He was especially grateful to the delegation of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya for submitting the draft resolution which had just been adopted by consensus and which would undoubtedly give valuable encouragement to the afflicted populations of Democratic Yemen.

68. Mr. WORKU (Ethiopia), speaking on a point of order, said he did not object to allowing the Somali delegation to speak provided it confined its comments to the agenda.

69. Mr. KHALAF (Observer for Somalia), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he rejected categorically the false accusations against his Government and the United Nations interagency mission which had visited Somalia made by the Ethiopian delegation at an earlier meeting of the Council. The international community well knew that it was the Ethiopian Government's policy of repression which had been the cause of the massive exodus of refugees.

70. Mr. WORKU (Ethiopia), speaking on a point of order, said that in addition to departing from the agenda item under consideration, the representative of Somalia had not advanced any argument which really refuted the justified accusations made by his country.

71. The PRESIDENT recalled that every delegation had the right to exercise its right of reply and that it was for the Council to decide if a delegation was abusing that right.

72. Mr. KHALAF (Observer for Somalia) said that, notwithstanding the statements of the Ethiopian delegation, that country must be held responsible for the problem of the refugees until the latter could return to their homes in full security and had received guarantees of being allowed to exercise their fundamental rights, including the right to self-determination.

73. With regard to the number of Ethiopian refugees, he recalled that he had officially invited the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the donor countries and the voluntary agencies, in co-operation with the National Refugee Commission, to make a full census of persons residing in the camps in his country.

74. Somalia also had to respond to the false insinuations of the Ethiopian delegation to the effect that it was misusing international funds provided as humanitarian assistance. In fact, it was under the supervision of the United Nations High Commissioner that the Somali Government had unloaded, transported and distributed the assistance it had received. Ethiopia had done no such thing for its "displaced persons" and its "drought victims". It was for that reason that the Somali delegation hoped that a United Nations mission would be sent to Ethiopia to ensure the effective distribution of assistance given to that country. Finally, he reserved the right to exercise his right of reply again.

75. Mr. WORKU (Ethiopia) said that the arguments made by the Somali delegation were totally groundless. Specifically, that delegation had forgotten to mention that the Somali Government had entrusted to an independent body the responsibility of distributing the humanitarian assistance it had received precisely because it had been accused, notably in the West, of using that assistance for illegal purposes.

76. With regard to the allegation that Ethiopia had not co-operated with the international community with respect to the distribution of assistance and the verification of the number of displaced persons, he recalled that his country had frequently invited the international community to see for itself the number of refugees and to monitor the way in which assistance was distributed to them.

77. Ethiopia had no intention of preventing Somalia from benefiting from international assistance, but it had a duty to denounce the lies of that country. In particular, it had to point out that, in contrast to what was stated in the resolution adopted at the 17th meeting (resolution 1982/4) concerning assistance to refugees in Somalia, the number of refugees could not have increased because none had crossed

the border separating the two countries during the preceding six months.

78. The so-called Ethiopian "refugees" who were living in Somalia were simply a propaganda tool for that country and a means of obtaining funds to support an economy which threatened to collapse. Many reports had indicated that Somalia passed off its own citizens as refugees in order to extort funds from the international community. Furthermore, the report of the United Nations mission had stated that an estimate of 650,000 to 700,000 refugees was what had to be used for the allocation of humanitarian assistance, rather than the absurd figure of 1.3 million refugees, sometimes inflated to 2 million, which had been submitted by the Somali delegation.

79. His delegation thought that the international community had to determine the actual number of Ethiopian refugees living in Somalia. It should also be aware that the camps which were meant to house the Ethiopian refugees served not only as shelters for drought victims but also as bases for agents sent by Somalia to neighboring countries for the purpose of sowing subversion and engaging in sabotage.

80. With regard to the repatriation of the refugees, it would have taken place long ago were Somalia not keeping them as hostages for propaganda purposes. The Mogadiscio Government wanted to make Ethiopia the scapegoat for its own economic and political difficulties.

81. Mr. KHALAF (Observer for Somalia) said that the representative of Ethiopia had simply paraphrased the same false accusations he had made the day before against Somalia. With regard to the number of refugees, Somalia reaffirmed that it was willing to invite the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to take a comprehensive

census in its territory, something which Ethiopia had never done. Finally, with regard to the allegations that Somalia was misusing international assistance, it was sufficient to point out that the country was prepared to authorize international agencies to supervise the distribution of the humanitarian assistance it received, something which Ethiopia had always refused to do.

82. The PRESIDENT said that the Council had concluded its consideration of item 3.

AGENDA ITEM 4

Convening of an International Conference on Population in 1984 (*continued*)* (E/1982/L.28)

83. The PRESIDENT said that informal consultations were still being held on a draft resolution (E/1982/L.28) submitted under item 4, as a result of which a revised text would probably be submitted. He gave the floor to the representative of Mexico concerning that matter.

84. Mr. ROZENTAL (Mexico) thanked the President for allowing him to inform the Council that the Mexican Government wished to host in Mexico City the International Conference on Population planned for 1984. Since it was aware of the importance of that event, the Mexican Government had decided to make a substantial financial contribution towards the financing of the Conference.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.

* Resumed from the 15th meeting

19th meeting

Friday, 30 April 1982, at 10.55 a.m.

President: Mr. Miljan KOMATINA (Yugoslavia).

E/1982/SR.19

AGENDA ITEM 4

Convening of an International Conference on Population in 1984 (concluded) (E/1982/L.28/Rev.1)

1. Mr. BUCKINGHAM (Australia), speaking on behalf of Australia, Bangladesh, China, Japan, Mexico and Pakistan, introduced draft resolution E/1982/L.28/Rev.1, which he said reflected the content of the Council's debate on the subject and thanked the Government of Mexico for its offer to host the Conference in 1984.

2. Mr. STEVENS (Belgium) asked whether the Population Commission, acting as the preparatory committee for the Conference, would meet specially to review the work of the four expert groups or whether it would simply do so at its regular session, scheduled for 1983. If it was to hold a special session, he wished to know what the financial implications would be and whether they would be added to the budget of the Conference (A/C.5/36/33/Add.1).

3. Mr. TABAH (Director, Population Division) said that the Population Commission would meet only in regular session. After disposing of its agenda, it would spend the

rest of its session on preparations for the Conference; there would therefore be no financial implications. The dates of the Commission's session had not yet been set.

4. The PRESIDENT said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt the revised draft resolution (E/1982/L.28/Rev.1).

It was so decided (resolution 1982/7).

AGENDA ITEM 12

Narcotic drugs (continued) (E/1982/13, E/1982/38, E/INCB/52/Supp)

5. Mr. DYRLUND (Denmark), speaking on behalf of Finland, Iceland, Sweden, Norway and Denmark, said that, despite the international community's efforts, drug abuse had increased. More and more countries, both developing and developed, were afflicted, and drugs of greater potency were now widely available. In the Nordic countries, abuse of cannabis was the most extensive. In some of those countries the abuse of heroin was a grave problem, while

the abuse of cocaine was still relatively limited. In general the abuse of narcotics had negative social and medical effects, and crimes due to it were a cause of concern. While the supply of illegal narcotic drugs came from outside the Nordic countries, drugs were produced to some extent in the area itself. International co-operation was therefore essential, and the Nordic countries accordingly participated actively in the work of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs and were among the main donors to the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control.

6. At a meeting in February 1982, the Nordic Governments had agreed to strengthen their co-operation by organizing exchanges of personnel between the police and customs authorities, co-ordinating their education and information programmes and conducting a thorough study on the illicit import and distribution of narcotic drugs. They had also agreed that narcotic liaison officers stationed overseas by individual countries would also take care of the interests of the other Nordic countries. Being concerned about the tendency towards increasing social acceptance of the use of cannabis, the Governments had agreed to counter all attempts to legalize cannabis and to harmonize their legislation prohibiting its cultivation. The public would also be informed of the negative effects of the abuse of cannabis. With regard to the treatment of drug dependence, attention was being directed particularly at developing methods of treatment for those with a long history of dependence and with serious criminal records, the Nordic contact committee was to arrange seminars for persons working on the treatment of drug dependence. Consideration was being given to allowing specialized personnel from each country to serve for a time in another Nordic country, and research concerning social groups which were particularly affected by drug abuse would be encouraged. It was clear from the special issue of the *Bulletin on Narcotics* dealing with drugs and youth that the prevention of drug abuse required action involving information and education as well as the activities of law enforcement agencies and medical and social services. Furthermore, national and international initiatives aimed at putting an end to drug abuse should be reflected in concerted policies relating to employment, leisure time, education and housing.

7. The International Drug Abuse Control Strategy and five-year programme of action adopted by the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session were realistic, and the Nordic countries supported them. One pre-condition for the realization of the programme was that the Narcotics Division and the secretariat of the International Narcotics Control Board should be given the resources they needed. That called for an increase in the regular United Nations budget for drug control activities.

8. The Nordic countries supported draft resolution III, entitled "Strategy and policies for drug control" (E/1982/13, chap. I, sect. A). International co-operation offered the only hope of success, and all States must discharge the obligations they had undertaken in legally binding international instruments.

9. Mr. HEPBURN (Bahamas) said that the persistence and worsening of the problems caused by drug abuse called for radical action. Although there was now an international consensus—evidenced by the Strategy and basic five-year programme of action—the inadequacy of contributions to drug programmes, insufficient attention by Governments to their treaty obligations and the shortcomings of international institutions, such as the Narcotics Division and the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control, accounted for the fact that more had not been achieved. Those two bodies, which admittedly operated with inadequate funding and under pressure from Governments, had not measured up to

their task. In future, they should endeavour to place greater emphasis on overall evaluative and catalyst activities at all levels, instead of remaining on the defensive.

10. With regard to the concrete proposals contained in the report of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs (E/1982/13) or made during the debate, he believed that the Fund's role would be enhanced if it co-operated more closely with the Division, the International Narcotics Control Board and the proposed task force and allocated more resources to research projects in order systematically to promote the prevention of drug-related problems at the regional and subregional levels. That would require better evaluation of the situation and firmer direction of international efforts, and would ensure more effective project implementation and more responsive counter and preventive measures for a wider cross-section of countries. The Fund, in co-operation with the Division and the Board, should therefore provide advisory services to Governments and promote regional and subregional meetings and seminars so that individuals and organizations actively engaged in the campaign against drug abuse could exchange information and acquire specialized training.

11. The proposed task force would truly meet the demands of the Strategy if its composition, while being limited, reflected equitable geographical distribution on the basis of the importance of the contributions of Member States to the international drug control effort and if its membership included eminent persons having the required knowledge and experience.

12. The specialized agencies should take into account in their programmes the need for integrated development and should expand their eligibility criteria for development assistance to include such variables as social dislocation and improved administrative infrastructure for drug control. In that context, it would be good if the specialized agencies were to apprise the Commission annually of their proposed budget estimates for drug control programmes.

13. Governments could benefit from technical assistance programmes and expertise provided by the Fund and the Board in order to establish or improve institutional arrangements for drug control. His delegation therefore attached the greatest importance to the adoption of draft resolution II in the Commission's report.

14. As an archipelago of unevenly populated islands whose economies, and in some instances whose Governments, were fragile, the Caribbean region was vulnerable to all aspects of the drug problem: illicit cultivation, trade, demand and traffic and the associated social and criminal "fall-outs". His delegation hoped that the seminar called for in draft resolution II would take place not later than June 1983. It also hoped that the Governments of the Caribbean would soon have a permanent co-ordinating body. With regard to the proposal to establish a global network of regional liaison officers, it would perhaps be more effective to designate in the regional commissions liaison officers who would have a mandate encompassing all aspects of drug control at the regional level. In the final analysis, however, the capacity to implement international recommendations was to be found at the national or government level.

15. With respect to the periodicity of the Commission's meetings, his delegation believed that, in view of the work load of the Commission and the worsening of the problem of drug abuse, involving particularly the activities of crime syndicates, there should be an annual evaluation of the implementation of the international Strategy. Regarding the proposed International Year against Drug Abuse, his delegation felt that the objectives of such an International Year

would be better served by the establishment of a vigorous, balanced task force and the convening of an international conference to make an evaluative review at the mid-point of the five-year programme of action.

16. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to take action on draft resolutions I to VII in section A of chapter I of the report of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs (E/1982/13) which the Commission recommended to the Council for adoption.

DRAFT RESOLUTIONS I, II, VI AND VII

Draft resolution I (Measures to improve international co-operation in the interdiction of illicit drug traffic) was adopted without a vote (resolution 1982/8).

Draft resolution II (Concerted action against the illicit drug traffic in Central and South America and the Caribbean) was adopted without a vote (resolution 1982/9).

Draft resolution VI (Co-operation with the International Narcotics Control Board concerning Schedule II of the 1971 Convention on Psychotropic Substances) was adopted without a vote (resolution 1982/11).

Draft resolution VII (Demand and supply of opiates for medical and scientific needs) was adopted without a vote (resolution 1982/12).

DRAFT RESOLUTIONS III AND IV

17. The PRESIDENT recalled that a number of delegations had proposed the deletion of the words "and annually thereafter" in operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution III (Strategy and policies for drug control).

18. Mr. ALI (Pakistan) said that that proposal was in fact linked to the consideration of draft resolution IV, on the duration and periodicity of sessions of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs. The Council could therefore take up that question after considering draft resolution IV.

19. The PRESIDENT said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Council agreed to that suggestion.

It was so decided.

20. The PRESIDENT said that the statement of the financial implications of draft resolution IV were contained in annex I to the Commission's report (E/1982/13). A number of delegations had proposed that consideration of the draft resolution should be postponed until the second regular session of the Council.

21. Mr. ALI (Pakistan) said he would like to explain the reasons why his delegation supported draft resolution IV. There was, for instance, the fact that the problem of drug abuse required continuous vigilance on the part of the Commission. The workload of the Commission had increased substantially over the years with the adoption by the General Assembly of numerous resolutions relating to drug abuse control. The Commission was required by international treaties on drug abuse control and Assembly and Council resolutions to consider a number of items on an annual basis. The Secretary-General was also obliged to report annually to the Assembly under Assembly resolution 34/177. Finally, the Commission had since its inception in 1946 met annually with only two exceptions, thus establishing the real need for annual sessions. Special sessions involved the same expenditure without the benefit of careful advance planning. Moreover, as stated in the penultimate preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, the present system of regular biennial sessions sometimes interspersed with special sessions placed serious constraints on the Commission in carrying out its functions.

22. In the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, a large majority had supported draft resolution IV, under which the Commission would meet annually, and he hoped that the Council would be able to approve it at its current session.

23. Mr. WINDMULLER (United States of America) said that although he was sure that draft resolution IV was well-intentioned, he was not sure that it held any advantages for the Council or the Commission.

24. He recalled that in 1982 the Commission on Narcotic Drugs had met in special session for five days and that the session had been adequate and efficient, since every agenda item had been thoroughly covered within the limits of normal working hours.

25. His delegation considered that the Commission should meet only when necessary and that the length of its sessions should be determined by their specific agendas and not based on a predetermined minimum. He believed that that was the sentiment of the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly as well. In 1973, the Council had decided, in its resolution 1768 (LIV) that all subsidiary bodies should meet biennially. In 1980, the Assembly, in its resolution 35/10 A, had requested the Committee on Conferences to propose the shortening of sessions of subsidiary bodies and to recommend, if appropriate, bodies that could begin to meet on a biennial basis. The Assembly had re-endorsed those goals in its resolution 36/117 A in 1981 and had invited the Committee on Conferences to submit concrete proposals on that subject to it at its thirty-eighth session. Since the Committee's report was not due until 1983 and the Commission on Narcotic Drugs was to meet in regular session in the same year, he did not see any need for the issue to be addressed at the current stage.

26. It should not be deduced from that, however, that his delegation was opposed as a matter of principle to a system of annual sessions. It believed that the current system of regular biennial sessions, with special sessions in alternate years, as necessary, was both adequate and in conformity with the guidelines set by the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly. Furthermore, he believed that the financial implications of draft resolution IV had not been scrutinized closely enough, both in terms of the costs of the sessions of the Commission and in terms of the precedent that the holding of annual sessions could set for other subsidiary organs of the United Nations. Obviously, the funds saved could be used for programme activities aimed at controlling drug abuse directly.

27. With those facts in mind, his delegation proposed that the decision on the draft resolution under consideration should be deferred until a later session of the Council, after the Committee on Conferences had submitted relevant recommendations to the General Assembly.

28. Mr. QUINLAN (Australia) said that at the seventh special session of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, his country had demonstrated clearly that it was keenly aware of the problems relating to drug abuse at the international level and of the need to establish a more rigorous system in order to control illicit drug traffic. He observed that at the regional level, Australia was one of the most active countries in that regard and was taking forceful measures to combat that traffic.

29. The Council should continue its efforts to rationalize its work as far as possible and to control the proliferation of meetings; that was an essential aspect of its revitalization. His delegation believed that consideration of draft resolution IV should be deferred until a later stage. It would be advisable to allow more time so that the question could be considered more thoroughly. That in no way signified,

however, that Australia called in question the motives of the sponsors of the draft.

30. Mr. LAZAREVIĆ (Yugoslavia) said that he shared the views expressed by the delegation of Pakistan at the current meeting. Nevertheless, he agreed with the United States representative that an effort should be made to apply the General Assembly resolutions concerning the periodicity of the sessions of subsidiary bodies of the Economic and Social Council.

31. In view of the importance of the drug abuse problem and illicit drug traffic, the members of the Council should seek to reach an agreement acceptable to all—producer countries, transit countries and consumer countries. Given the differing views of delegations, he proposed that the consultations should continue and that, if the Council did not reach a compromise at the current session, the consideration of draft resolution IV should be deferred until the second regular session.

32. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Council) urged the Council to do its best to overcome the difficulties so that a decision could be taken the following week; at all costs an effort must be made to avoid overloading the programmes of work and time-tables of subsequent sessions.

33. Mr. ALI (Pakistan) said he supported the proposal of the Yugoslav delegation, according to which consideration of the question would be suspended so that consultations could continue.

34. The PRESIDENT suggested that the consideration of draft resolutions III and IV should be deferred until a later date.

It was so decided.

DRAFT RESOLUTION V

35. Mr. SVIRIDOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that the Commission on Narcotic Drugs had adopted draft resolution V (International Year against Drug Abuse) by putting it to the vote. He felt it would be advisable for the Council to follow the same procedure.

At the request of the representative of the Soviet Union, a vote by show of hands was taken on draft resolution V.

Draft resolution V was adopted by 32 votes to none, with 11 abstentions (resolution 1982/10).

36. Mr. SVIRIDOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), reverting to draft resolution II, adopted previously by consensus, said that his delegation had not opposed the adoption of that text without a vote. However, that should not be construed as indicating that it had changed its position with regard to the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control.

The meeting rose at 11.55 a.m.

20th meeting

Monday, 3 May 1982, 10.50 a.m.

President: Mr. Miljan KOMATINA (Yugoslavia).

E/1982/SR.20

AGENDA ITEM 12

**Narcotic drugs (continued) (E/1982/13, E/1982/38,
E/1982/L.34, E/INCB/52/Supp)**

DRAFT RESOLUTIONS III AND IV AND OTHER PROPOSALS

1. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft resolutions III and IV and draft decisions I and II, contained respectively in sections A and B of chapter I of the report of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs (E/1982/13).
2. He recalled that at the 19th meeting the Council had decided to defer action on draft resolutions III and IV in order to enable delegations to hold further consultations on those texts.
3. Mr. WINDMULLER (United States of America) said that as a result of consultations held with a large number of delegations there seemed to be a consensus that the Council should defer consideration of draft resolution IV until its first regular session of 1983. The request contained in General Assembly resolution 36/168 that the Commission on Narcotic Drugs should report annually was not in keeping with the general practice of the Council that functional commissions should report on a biennial basis whenever possible. He therefore proposed that the Council should defer action on draft resolution IV until its first regular session of 1983 and that it should adopt draft resolution III with the deletion of the phrase "and annually

thereafter" from operative paragraph 2. It would then be the responsibility of the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session to consider the questions of annual as opposed to biennial reporting, planning and rationalization.

4. Mr. ALI (Pakistan) said that his delegation did not agree that consideration of draft resolution IV should be deferred because of the overall review of periodicity of meetings which was taking place. Each session of the Council was sovereign. Any decision taken at the current session of the Council could be changed at a subsequent session on the basis of the information emerging from the review. Furthermore, the Commission on Narcotic Drugs required annual regular sessions because of the nature of its work. When that matter had been discussed at the seventh special session of the Commission, only one delegation had been opposed to annual regular sessions. The same delegation was now opposing that arrangement again, and he wondered whether that delegation would not also oppose it in 1983. His delegation would support the consensus to defer consideration of draft resolution IV but only because a regular session of the commission was already scheduled for 1983.

5. Mr. WINDMULLER (United States of America) expressed satisfaction at the willingness of the representative of Pakistan to join in the consensus to defer consideration of draft resolution IV. Although he was unable to say what his delegation's position with regard to that draft resolution would be in 1983, his delegation would not oppose its adoption at the first regular session of the Council

in 1983 because a session of the Commission was scheduled for February 1983. The position of his delegation with regard to the draft resolution under consideration would be formed on the basis of what occurred at that session and at the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly.

6. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council adopt a draft decision worded along the following lines: "The Economic and Social Council decides to defer consideration of draft resolution IV, entitled 'Duration and periodicity of sessions of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs', contained in the report of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs on its seventh special session (E/1982/13), until its first regular session of 1983 with a view to taking a decision on the matter in the context of the Council's consideration of the report of the Commission on its thirtieth session". He said that if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt that draft decision.

It was so decided (decision 1982/114).

7. The PRESIDENT said that there seemed to be agreement with regard to the deletion of the words "and annually thereafter" from operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution III entitled "Strategy and policy for drug control". If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt draft resolution III, as orally amended, without a vote.

It was so decided (resolution 1982/13).

8. Mr. ALI (Pakistan) inquired whether the words "and annually thereafter" could be reintroduced if draft resolution IV was adopted at the first regular session of the Council in 1983.

9. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Council) said that in the light of the decision to be taken the following year on draft resolution IV, it could also be decided that the Commission should submit a report to the Council and to the General Assembly on an annual basis.

10. Mr. SVIRIDOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had not opposed the adoption of draft resolution III as amended without a vote on the understanding that the draft resolution would not entail any increase in the regular budget of the United Nations.

11. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt draft decision I, entitled "Report of the International Narcotics Control Board".

It was so decided (decision 1982/115).

12. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt draft decision II, entitled "Report of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs".

It was so decided (decision 1982/116).

13. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the recommendation made by the Bureau in paragraphs 16 to 18 of document E/1982/L.20 concerning the report of the Secretary-General called for under General Assembly resolution 36/132 on the international campaign against traffic in drugs. He suggested that the Council should adopt a draft decision worded along the following lines: "The Economic and Social Council decides to authorize the Secretary-General to submit the report on an international campaign against traffic in drugs, requested by the General Assembly in its resolution 36/132 of 14 December 1981, directly to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session". He said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt that draft decision.

It was so decided (decision 1982/117).

14. Mr. CALLE y CALLE (Peru), introducing on behalf of the sponsors draft resolution E/1982/L.34 on the establishment of a regional office in Lima for co-ordinating narcotics control, said that Portugal had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution. He drew attention to a number of corrections: Peru should be listed among the sponsors, and in operative paragraph 1 the word "cocaine" should be replaced by "narcotic drugs" and the word "including" should be inserted before "particularly".

15. The preambular part of the draft resolution mentioned the relevant resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, referred to the linkages between drug trafficking and serious problems of a socio-economic nature, and drew attention to the need for those developing countries which were producers of narcotic drugs to receive more assistance from Governments and international organizations concerned so that they would be able to facilitate drug abuse control by implementing policies of crop substitution and programmes of industrial and rural development. Operative paragraphs 1 to 4 outlined the specific steps which were necessary to ensure the efficient functioning of a regional office in Lima for co-ordinating narcotics control. The draft resolution had no financial implications because it would be implemented on the basis of voluntary contributions made for that purpose to the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control. Lastly, he expressed the hope that the members of the Council would have no difficulty in adopting the draft resolution.

16. Mr. WINDMULLER (United States of America) suggested that the phrase in operative paragraph 1 of the English text of draft resolution E/1982/L.34, as orally revised by the representative of Peru, would be clearer if it read "abuse of narcotic drugs in the Andean subregion, including in particular coca". In paragraph 2, the last phrase should read: "as agreed to in General Assembly resolution 36/168;".

17. Mr. STEVENS (Belgium) said that, in the French text, the concluding phrase of paragraph 2 did not seem to be completely consistent with the English text.

18. The PRESIDENT said that the Secretariat would harmonize the English and French texts with the original Spanish text of the draft resolution. If there were no objections, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt draft resolution E/1982/L.34 as orally revised, without a vote.

It was so decided (resolution 1982/14).

19. Mr. SVIRIDOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had no objection to the adoption of the draft resolution without a vote, bearing in mind that its adoption involved no financial implications for the regular budget and that the implementation of the measures contemplated would be financed from the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control. His delegation's agreement that the draft resolution should be adopted without a vote should not be construed as representing any change in the position of the Soviet Union in regard to the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control.

20. Mr. CALLE y CALLE (Peru), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, thanked the Council for adopting draft resolution E/1982/L.34, which would assist Governments in their campaigns to eliminate the sources of narcotics and to implement policies for the economic and social development of the areas where narcotic drugs were produced. The regional office in Lima would do useful work in helping to solve the serious and escalating problem of drug abuse which affected all Members.

AGENDA ITEM 5

International Year of Peace and International Day of Peace (continued)* (E/1982/45/Rev.1, E/1982/L.30/Rev.1)

21. Mr. PIZA ESCALANTE (Observer for Costa Rica), introducing draft resolution E/1982/L.30/Rev.1, on behalf of the sponsors, said that the draft resolution was the result of consultations with a number of delegations. He expressed the hope that it would be adopted by consensus.

22. The draft resolution was linked to the purpose of the United Nations itself and its intention was that nations should be requested to devote a year to reflecting on the concept and definition of peace. There was much talk of peace but the concept of peace had never been exhaustively explored. The only point on which there was agreement was that peace represented a lack of conflict.

23. The International Year of Peace should be observed at both the international and national levels and should be implemented both through formal education and through the news media. The thrust should be that peace was much more than the mere absence of war. The goal must be peace with freedom and justice. Peace without freedom and justice was the peace of the grave. Peace must be viewed in a positive sense.

24. The fourth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution requested a derogation from the guidelines for international years and anniversaries adopted by the General Assembly in its decision 35/424; if the guidelines were observed strictly, it would not be possible to hold the International Year of Peace until 1989. In view of the increasing urgency of the issue, the sponsors had suggested that 1986 should be established as the International Year of Peace and that the Year should be proclaimed on 24 October 1985, the date of the observance of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations.

25. Mr. MIHALJEVIĆ (Yugoslavia) said that his delegation wished to become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

26. Ms. FORD (Canada) requested that further consideration of the draft resolution should be postponed as its text had only just become available.

It was so decided.

* Resumed from the 8th meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 8

Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (E/1982/56 and Corr.1)

27. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the report of the Sessional Working Group (of Governmental Experts) on the Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (E/1982/56 and Corr.1). In paragraph 25 of its report, the Working Group had recommended to the Council the adoption of two draft decisions.

28. Draft decision I was entitled "Provisional agenda for 1983 of the Sessional Working Group (of Governmental Experts) on the Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights". If there were no objections, he would take it that the Council adopted the provisional agenda for 1983 as contained in draft decision I.

It was so decided (decision 1982/118).

29. The PRESIDENT said that draft decision II was entitled "Bureau for 1983 of the Sessional Working Group (of Governmental Experts) on the Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights". If there were no objections, he would take it that the Council adopted draft decision II.

It was so decided (decision 1982/119).

30. The PRESIDENT said that, in its decision 1981/162 of 8 May 1981, the Council, having considered the report of the Working Group submitted during the first regular session for 1981 (E/1981/64 and Add.1), had decided to review the composition, organization and administrative arrangements of the Working Group at the current session. In that connection, he drew attention to paragraph 23 of the report of the Working Group which the Council had before it (E/1982/56 and Corr.1) and to the report of the Secretary-General submitted during the organizational session for 1981 (E/1981/6 and Add.1 and 2) on the future composition, organization and administrative arrangements of the Working Group.

The meeting rose at 11.55 a.m.

21st meeting

Monday, 3 May 1982, at 3.25 p.m.

President: Mr. Miljan KOMATINA (Yugoslavia).

E/1982/SR.21

AGENDA ITEM 7

Revitalization of the Economic and Social Council (E/1982/28, E/1982/60, Working Paper No. 1982/1, Conference Room Papers 1982/3 and 1982/4)

1. The PRESIDENT said that fruitful informal consultations on the subject of the council's revitalization had already taken place. Everyone now appreciated that unless steps were taken to rationalize the Council's agenda,

documentation and calendar of meetings, current difficulties would be exacerbated until the Council became completely paralysed.

2. A practical and gradual approach to the revitalization of the Council was necessary. The draft resolution contained in the President's note in Conference Room Paper 1982/4 represented areas on which a decision could be taken during 1982. The questions contained in annex II of the same document required further consideration. Informal consulta-

tions should continue at the second regular session with a view to preparing the draft resolution.

3. The revitalization of the Council was a continuing process. With determination, goodwill and a spirit of compromise, the Council would be able to take measures that would enable it to effectively exercise the functions and powers entrusted to it under the Charter of the United Nations and by the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council.

AGENDA ITEM 12

Narcotic drugs (*concluded*)

4. Mr. MASSOT (Brazil), referring to draft resolution III (E/1982/13, chap. I, sect. A) adopted at the 20th meeting, said that his delegation was not opposed to the consensus which had emerged on that text, and supported the humanitarian elements it contained. It could not, however, support the establishment of the task force; the work in question could be done by the Commission on Narcotic Drugs. Moreover, the composition of the task force proposed in resolution I (S-VII) of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs appeared discriminatory. It was to be hoped that adoption of that resolution would not lead to any increase in expenditure for 1983.

AGENDA ITEM 8

Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (*continued*) (E/1982/56 and Corr.1)

5. Mr. BORCHARD (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his country attached great importance to the full implementation of the civil and political rights and the economic, social and cultural rights contained in the International Covenants on Human Rights (see General Assembly resolution 2200 A(XXI), annex).

6. The Sessional Working Group (of Governmental Experts) on the Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights had made laudable efforts, as had reporting States. The assistance of the specialized agencies had greatly facilitated the Working Group's difficult task. At the suggestion of its Chairman, the Working Group had included in its report (see E/1982/56 and Corr.1, para. 20) a number of suggestions aimed at improving the quality of the reports submitted under the relevant articles of the Covenant.

7. In the past, the purely procedural nature of the Working Group's reports had rightly been criticized. Current methods of work did not allow any other type of reporting or a more detailed examination of country reports. Moreover, constitutional difficulty had arisen, since the Covenant declared the Economic and Social Council to be responsible for considering country reports. Unless the Council was informed of how the Working Group had examined certain country reports, it could not fulfil those obligations.

8. As had been agreed by the Council, the Working Group had discussed the question of its composition, organization and administrative arrangements, but had failed to reach consensus on all the aspects. Indeed, the question of how to best ensure that the Council could fulfil its obligations under articles 21 and 22 of the Covenant had not been considered.

9. There seemed to have been agreement in the Working Group that restriction of membership to States parties to the Covenant which were also members of the Council meant that only very few countries qualified. It had been pointed

out that many developing countries were unable to send representatives to meetings of both the Working Group and the Council. There was a general view that it would be desirable to extend membership of the Working Group to all States parties to the Covenant, regardless of membership of the Council. It had also been suggested that the Group should begin its meetings at least two weeks before the Council opened its session and that members of the Group should be appointed or elected for two to three years in order to ensure continuity. His delegation supported those proposals.

10. His Government would like the Working Group's methods of work to be modelled on those of the Human Rights Committee and accordingly believed that the Group should be composed of independent experts. It nevertheless considered that every effort should be made to reach consensus on elements acceptable to all delegations, while striving for significant improvements.

11. His delegation therefore proposed that the 15 members of the Working Group should be elected by the Council from among the States parties to the Covenant, in conformity with the principle of equitable geographical distribution reflected in Council decision 1978/10. Those members should be elected for a three-year term and should be immediately eligible for re-election at the end of that term. One third of the membership of the Group (i.e. one member from each regional group) should be renewed each year. The Group should hold a three-week session each year, beginning two weeks prior to the opening of the first regular session of the Council; that session could be extended by Council decision if so desired. At the end of each session the Group should submit to the Council a report on its activities, making suggestions and recommendations of a general nature based on its consideration of the reports submitted by States parties to the Covenant and on observations by the specialized agencies. Such a report would assist the Council to fulfil its responsibilities, particularly those under articles 21 and 22 of the Covenant. The Group should be provided with summary records of its proceedings, which should be submitted to the Council in order to facilitate the latter's consideration of the Group's report.

12. Such changes would significantly improve the system and would be acceptable to all delegations.

13. Mr. CHATTERJIE (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had appreciated the contribution made by the specialized agencies, as well as the Bureau, members and secretariat of the Working Group, during consideration of the United Kingdom's report.

14. The Working Group was clearly facing some difficulties in carrying out its mandate. It had been unable to agree unanimously on a revision of its procedures. But there was some common ground, notably in the perceptions that the Working Group should be open to all States parties to the Covenant, regardless of whether they were members of the Council; that it should consist of experts appointed for perhaps three years to provide a greater level of expertise and to ensure continuity; that its operating and reporting procedures should be reviewed, in his delegation's view, by bringing them into line with the Human Rights Committee; and that a summary record should be available, to enable it to make recommendations to the Council.

15. If agreement could be reached on some improvements in the current year, a further review would have to take place within a few years, given that the situation was constantly changing and the number of States parties increasing.

The meeting rose at 4.05 p.m.

22nd meeting

Tuesday, 4 May 1982, at 10.50 a.m.

President: Mr. Miljan KOMATINA (Yugoslavia).

E/1982/SR.22

AGENDA ITEM 5

International Year of Peace and International Day of Peace (concluded)* (E/1982/L.30/Rev.1)

1. The PRESIDENT drew attention to draft resolution E/1982/L.30/Rev.1, which had been introduced the previous day by the observer for Costa Rica, and said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt the draft resolution without a vote.

It was so decided (resolution 1982/15).

2. Ms. FORD (Canada) said that her delegation had not opposed the adoption of draft resolution E/1982/L.30/Rev.1 without a vote because of the importance many delegations attached to the adopted text. However, Canada was not convinced that an international year was the best way to promote peace, and her delegation regretted that the guidelines for international years and anniversaries (see General Assembly decision 35/424), which had been agreed to by all Member States, had not been strictly followed. Moreover, her delegation felt that there should be a period of at least two years between the declaration of an international year and the celebration of the year itself and that all organizational and financial arrangements should be completed before the year was declared.

3. Mr. QUINLAN (Australia) said that the fact that his delegation had not opposed the adoption of draft resolution E/1982/L.30/Rev.1 by consensus should not be construed as sanctioning future derogations from the relevant guidelines.

4. Mr. SVIRIDOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had not objected to the adoption of the draft resolution, on the understanding that the measures it contained would be implemented through a reallocation of existing budgetary resources and through appropriate savings and would thus not entail any serious financial implications for the United Nations budget.

5. Ms. RITTERHOFF (United States of America) said that her delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution because peace was an extremely important issue for all countries. However, her delegation did not think that peace should be treated in the same manner as other, albeit worthy, subjects of international years or that the relevant guidelines should be changed for other such years.

6. Mr. PIZA ESCALANTE (Observer for Costa Rica) thanked the members of the Council for adopting the draft resolution, despite their reservations, and reiterated that the sponsors were aware of the importance of the guidelines for international years and anniversaries, as was indicated in the fourth preambular paragraph of the adopted text.

7. As his delegation understood it, in addition to the recommendations contained in the draft resolution, the Secretary-General would continue to obtain views and proposals for the celebration of the Year, in close co-operation with the University for Peace. In conclusion, he suggested that, at the editing stage, the title of the draft resolution should be amended to read only "International Year of Peace".

* Resumed from the 20th meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 2

Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (continued)** (E/1982/L.23, E/1982/L.29, E/1982/L.31-E/1982/L.33, E/1982/L.36)

8. The PRESIDENT pointed out that the programme budget implications of draft resolutions E/1982/L.23 and E/1982/L.29 were contained in documents E/1982/L.32 and E/1982/L.33 respectively and that those of draft resolution E/1982/L.36 would be contained in document E/1982/L.37, to be issued subsequently.

9. Mr. NGUAYILA MBELA KALANDA (Zaire), introducing draft resolution E/1982/L.23, observed that it was entirely consistent with General Assembly resolution 3057 (XXVIII) and with the reasons that had prompted the Assembly to adopt resolution 35/33, in which it had decided to hold in 1983 a Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination so as to assess the activities undertaken and to decide on future action. The adoption of draft resolution E/1982/L.23 by consensus would reflect a renewed common commitment to intensify efforts with a view to attaining the goals of the Decade as quickly as possible. The draft resolution was self-explanatory, and he expressed the hope that the Council would adopt it by consensus, especially since it was very similar to a resolution adopted the previous year by consensus.

10. The PRESIDENT announced that the Sudan had joined the sponsors of draft resolution E/1982/L.23.

11. Mr. DYRLUND (Denmark) suggested that, since both draft resolution E/1982/L.23 and draft resolution E/1982/L.36 contained a decision relating to meetings of the Preparatory Sub-Committee for the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (paras. 15 and 6 respectively), the consideration of draft resolution E/1982/L.23 should be postponed so that the two draft resolutions could be dealt with together.

12. Mr. VERKERCKE (Belgium) and Mr. ALMOS-LECHNER (Austria) supported the comments made by the representative of Denmark, particularly since the postponement would enable delegations to consider the programme budget implications of draft resolution E/1982/L.36, which were not yet available, together with those of draft resolution E/1982/L.23.

13. Mr. NGUAYILA MBELA KALANDA (Zaire), supported by Mr. OKWARO (Kenya), Mr. ABDULLAH (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. TUAN (Liberia) and Mr. JOHNSON (Benin), stressed that draft resolution E/1982/L.23 concerned the implementation of the Programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, while draft resolution E/1982/L.36 concerned the Second World Conference. Moreover, the financial implications of meetings of the Preparatory Sub-Committee had already been calculated for draft resolution E/1982/L.23 and would surely be the same for that aspect of draft resolution E/1982/L.36. There was therefore no reason to delay action on the former draft resolution.

** Resumed from the 14th meeting.

14. Mr. ESAN (Nigeria), supported by Ms. RADIĆ (Yugoslavia) and speaking as a sponsor of both draft resolutions, suggested that action on both draft resolutions should be postponed, that the sponsors should hold consultations and that the two draft resolutions should be dealt with simultaneously at a later date.

15. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Council) drew attention to the fact that the Secretariat had received draft resolution E/1982/L.36 only the previous evening; however, he hoped that the programme budget implications relating to it would be available by the morning of the following day.

16. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objections, he would take it that the Council wished to defer action on draft resolutions E/1982/L.23 and E/1982/L.36 until the programme budget implications of the latter were available.

It was so decided.

17. The PRESIDENT invited the representative of Pakistan to introduce draft decision E/1982/L.29, which related to the holding of a seminar for the ESCAP region in connection with the Programme for the Decade.

18. Mr. HUSAIN (Pakistan) briefly summarized the draft decision and observed that, as the sponsors understood it, the relevant seminars had already been held for the other regions. Moreover, at its twenty-eighth session, the Commission on Human Rights (resolution 1982/11, para. 1) had urged that the results of those seminars should be taken into account in preparations for the Second World Conference. Accordingly, he expressed the hope that the draft decision would be adopted by consensus.

19. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objections, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt draft decision E/1982/L.29 without a vote.

It was so decided (decision 1982/120).

20. The PRESIDENT invited the representative of India to introduce draft resolution E/1982/L.31, which referred to the activities of non-governmental organizations.

21. Mr. RANGACHARI (India) drew attention to the fact that the question of the activities of the non-governmental organizations in relation to South Africa had been discussed only briefly by the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations at its latest session. As his delegation had indicated at that time, many non-governmental organizations were useful in exposing the evils of *apartheid*, but it was also necessary to ensure that no action taken by them could be construed as collaboration with or support for South Africa. He stressed that the draft resolution was not intended in any way to limit the activities of the non-governmental organizations but was merely aimed at ensuring that the issues involved were examined in greater detail when the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations met the following year. The draft resolution should be viewed in the context of Council resolution 1981/44 concerning a review of the future activities of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations. In conclusion, he observed that the draft resolution was the result of extensive consultations held since the session of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations and he therefore expressed the hope that it would be adopted without a vote. He also indicated that Bangladesh and Liberia had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

22. Mr. NGUAYILA MBELA KALANDA (Zaire) said that his delegation also wished to become a sponsor of draft resolution E/1982/L.31.

23. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objections, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt draft resolution E/1982/L.31 without a vote.

It was so decided (resolution 1982/16).

24. Mr. GERSHMAN (United States of America) said that, although his delegation had not wished to prevent the adoption of draft resolution E/1982/L.31 by consensus, it did wish to dissociate itself from that consensus, because the draft resolution was a step towards the application of political restrictions on non-governmental organizations in a manner inconsistent with Council resolution 1296 (XLIV). He stressed that resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Economic and Social Council were no more binding on non-governmental organizations than they were on Member States. Moreover, one of the greatest values of non-governmental organizations was the independent point of view they could bring to the Council and to other United Nations bodies. His delegation was therefore opposed to any form of pressure or harassment that might restrict their independence.

25. Like Member States, non-governmental organizations were required to act in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. His delegation would therefore oppose any interpretation of draft resolution E/1982/L.31, or of any subsequent proposal, which might go beyond that single requirement.

26. Mr. VERKERCKE (Belgium) said that, although his delegation had joined the consensus on draft resolution E/1982/L.31, he wished to make it clear that paragraph 2 should not be interpreted as affecting the current relationship between non-governmental organizations and the United Nations, in terms of respect for their independence, provided that they duly complied with the provisions of the Charter.

27. Mr. FURSLAND (United Kingdom) welcomed the adoption of draft resolution E/1982/L.31 without a vote and expressed appreciation for the sponsors' efforts in that connection. His delegation considered the adopted text to be a compromise between two considerations, namely, the obnoxious nature of the *apartheid* system, which had prompted delegations to raise that question in the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations and in the Council, and the unique contribution non-governmental organizations made to the United Nations, for which their political independence was essential and had to be maintained and protected. His delegation had joined the consensus on draft resolution E/1982/L.31, given that the text imposed no requirements on the non-governmental organizations. In introducing the draft resolution, the representative of India had said that it was not intended to put non-governmental organizations in a strait-jacket or to prescribe to them what they should do. The Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations should bear this strongly in mind when it considered the question at its next session.

28. Mr. ORDZHONIKIDZE (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation supported the draft resolution as the minimum which should be done to put an end to the links between the non-governmental organizations and the racist régime of South Africa. The non-governmental organizations must support the objectives of the United Nations and the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly, the Security Council and other United Nations bodies.

29. Mr. BELL (Canada) said that his delegation had been able to join the consensus on the draft resolution only on the understanding that the draft resolution was not intended to restrict the independent views and actions of the non-governmental organizations, which had always stimulated the work of the United Nations in the development of human rights programmes. As long as the non-governmental organizations acted in compliance with the Charter, his delegation would be opposed to any attempt to restrict their freedom of action and opinion.

AGENDA ITEM 8

Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (continued)
(E/1982/56 and Corr.1, E/1982/L.35)

30. The PRESIDENT drew attention to draft resolution E/1982/L.35, submitted by France.

31. Mr. TREHOLT (Norway) said that the Sessional Working Group (of Governmental Experts) on the Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights had not made an effort to agree on common comments on each of the national reports submitted for its consideration, but had presented certain general comments on those reports. Some of the latter comments could guide Governments in preparing future national reports. There was obviously room for considerable improvement in the Group's working methods. While some improvements could be made without changing the current organizational framework, others required decisions by the Council concerning the composition, organization and administrative arrangements of the Working Group. At the current session it had only been possible to appoint 13 members of the Working Group, which should have consisted of 15 members, three from each region. The requirement in Council decision 1978/10 that members of the Working Group should be appointed from States that were members of the Council which were also States parties to the Covenant seemed too strict. His delegation was in favour of appointing any State party to the Covenant as a member of the Working Group. Furthermore, the members of the Working Group should be elected for a longer period than one year in order to assure more continuity. A rotation system of membership similar to that used by the Human Rights Committee should be seriously considered. The members of the Working Group should be experts with broad experience in the field of human rights. His delegation was in favour of adopting a procedure whereby the Council would have to approve the candidates designated by States elected to the Working Group; in other words, the arrangement for appointing the members of the Working Group should be the same as that used for appointing members of the functional commissions of the Council. His delegation hoped that at a later stage the members of the Working Group could be appointed as independent experts with a status similar to that of the members of the Human Rights Committee. Lastly, the Working Group would in future require additional time in order to be able to examine the increasing number of national reports that would be submitted.

32. Mr. SOFINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation attached great importance to the implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and would continue to co-operate actively with a view to the attainment of that objective. The Covenant was a set of legal norms which were binding on all States parties, but unfortunately the rights covered by the Covenant were not always implemented. Much work therefore remained to be done in that regard.

33. It was regrettable that the work of the Sessional Working Group was constantly being obstructed by the attempts of certain States to discuss and propose changes in its composition, organization and administrative arrangements. The main task of the Working Group was to consider the reports submitted by States parties to the Covenant, and the procedure to be used had already been defined in the Covenant itself. It was a mistake to insist that the composition, organization and administrative arrangements of the Working Group should be the same as those of the Human

Rights Committee, for the two bodies were different and functioned under two different Covenants. It was necessary to work within the framework of each Covenant. Moreover, no further changes should be made in the organization of the Working Group until those already effected had been tested in practice over the course of several years. Furthermore, any changes which entailed financial implications, would probably be unacceptable to the majority of Member States. It would be advisable to develop the procedures already adopted rather than proposing additional changes each year.

34. Mr. MARDOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights was one of the most important international legal documents in the field of human rights, and he therefore welcomed the increasing number of States parties to the Covenant and the continuing improvement of the mechanism for considering national reports. It was unfortunate that a number of States completely ignored the international agreements on fundamental social and economic rights, without which there could be no enjoyment of political and other rights. The imperialist policy of aggravating international tension and stepping up preparations for war was a direct threat to human rights, particularly the right to life. The Byelorussian SSR had already submitted three reports to the Sessional Working Group describing the measures it had taken to fulfil its obligations under the Covenant and to provide its population with a material basis for the genuine enjoyment of political rights and freedoms.

35. The report of the Working Group (E/1982/56 and Corr.1) demonstrated clearly that the work of that body was fully in keeping with the provisions of the Covenant and the relevant decisions of the Council. Most of the proposals made in the review of the composition, organization and administrative arrangements of the Working Group merited further attention. His delegation supported the idea that it should be possible for States parties to the Covenant which were not members of the Council to become members of the Working Group. It also supported the proposals that the term of office of members of the Working Group should be increased from one to three years, that the Group should draft a more detailed report on its work similar to the reports of the Human Rights Committee and the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, and that the Group should begin its work two weeks before the sessions of the Council. Those proposals, which were the result of a collective effort, should enhance the effectiveness of the Group's work. Furthermore, the search for additional measures of a similar nature should be conducted on the basis of mutual agreement in order to safeguard the results which the Working Group had already achieved. His delegation was therefore not in favour of the proposal contained in subparagraph (e) of the operative paragraph of draft resolution E/1982/L.35. It seemed that a certain group of States were attempting to make the review of the composition, organization and administrative arrangements of the Group a permanent task in order to impede the effectiveness of its work. His delegation was prepared to support the reconsideration of that question in 1986. That would provide the opportunity to try the proposals out in practice and arrive at well-founded conclusions on the basis of consensus.

36. Ms. BOZHKOVA (Bulgaria) said that, as a State party to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and a current member of the Sessional Working Group, Bulgaria attached great importance to both the Covenant and its proper implementation.

37. In her delegation's view, the composition, organization and methods of work of the Group were appropriate

and there was no need for a radical alteration of current arrangements; the Group needed time in which to gain experience. Moreover, it had been transformed into a group of governmental experts only one year earlier. Her delegation was, however, ready to consider any reasonable suggestions which would improve the Group's effectiveness. Her delegation regretted that, owing to lack of time and many different points of view, the Working Group had been unable to reach consensus on all aspects of the issue.

38. The view that identical machinery should be adopted to monitor the implementation of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, with its Optional Protocol, and of the Covenant the implementation of which was now being considered (for the texts, see General Assembly resolution 2200 A (XXI), annex) would imply a revision of those instruments. Article 16 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights provided that the Economic and Social Council should consider the reports submitted by States parties; on the other hand, article 28 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights provided for the establishment of the Human Rights Committee to implement the provisions of that Covenant.

39. Some delegations had expressed the view that the Group should be composed of experts appointed in their personal capacity. However, such a solution might not only fail to improve the situation but might even worsen it, since it would be difficult for an individual to specialize in more than one or two of the areas covered by the Covenant.

40. Her delegation therefore believed that the decision to transform the Group into a Sessional Working Group (of Governmental Experts) should be retained, because it ensured a high level of expertise and preserved the authority and prestige given to the Group by virtue of its intergovernmental character. Moreover that solution had not involved an undue increase in operating costs.

41. The PRESIDENT said that since informal consultations were still being held, the consideration of draft resolution E/1982/L.35 would continue at a later date.

AGENDA ITEM 10

Activities for the advancement of women: United Nations Decade for Women: Equality, Development and Peace

REPORT OF THE SECOND (SOCIAL) COMMITTEE (E/1982/57)

42. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the report of the Second (Social) Committee on item 10 (E/1982/57). In paragraph 33 of the report, the Second Committee recommended to the Council the adoption of draft resolutions I to XI which were contained therein. Paragraph 34 of the report contained draft decisions I to IV, the adoption of which was also recommended to the Council. He invited the Council to take action on the proposals.

DRAFT RESOLUTION I

43. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt draft resolution I, on the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, without a vote.

It was so decided (resolution 1982/17).

DRAFT RESOLUTION II

44. Mr. VERKERCKE (Belgium), speaking on behalf of the States members of the European Community which were members of the Council, reaffirmed the great importance which the 10 countries attached to all questions concerning the rights of the population of the occupied Arab territories, particularly the freedom and rights of women and children. Nevertheless, the 10 countries could not support draft resolution II, on the situation of women and children in the occupied Arab territories, because the third preambular paragraph, which established an implicit link between fascism, racial discrimination and zionism, was unacceptable to them.

45. Mr. TOBON-URIBE (Colombia), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that, although his delegation supported many of the ideas expressed in the draft resolution, it would abstain from voting because it could not support some parts of the text.

46. Ms. RITTERHOFF (United States of America) said that the position of her Government with regard to draft resolutions which equated zionism with such abhorrent phenomena as those mentioned in the draft resolution was well known. Her delegation found the assertion that thousands of persons, including women and children, were held arbitrarily in Israeli prisons totally unacceptable. The linking of zionism with fascism was totally abhorrent to the American people in general. It was noteworthy that the chief sponsor of the draft resolution at the Commission on the Status of Women had not participated in any other work of the Commission apart from introducing that obnoxious draft resolution, which was detrimental to the cause of peace.

47. Mr. ROZENTAL (Mexico) said that his delegation would abstain from voting because it could not support the statement contained in the third preambular paragraph of the draft resolution. Furthermore, the draft resolution exceeded the limits of the agenda item under which it was being considered.

48. Mr. MORDEN (Canada) said that his delegation would be unable to support the draft resolution since it could not accept the implications of the third preambular paragraph for reasons which it had stated on a number of previous occasions.

49. Mr. ALMOSLECHNER (Austria) said that, although his delegation supported the general thrust of the draft resolution, it would abstain from voting because it did not agree with the statement made in the third preambular paragraph.

50. Mr. LAGOS (Chile) said that his delegation, too, would abstain from voting because it felt that the statement made in the third preambular paragraph linking fascism and zionism was inappropriate and contrary to fact. Nevertheless, that in no way modified his Government's traditional position censuring the acts committed in the occupied Arab territories.

51. Miss FRANCO (Portugal) said that her delegation could not support the draft resolution because it did not agree with the statement made in the third preambular paragraph linking fascism, zionism and racial discrimination.

52. Mr. CORTI (Argentina) said that his delegation supported the profoundly humanitarian purpose of the draft resolution and would vote in favour of it. Nevertheless, it did not agree with the statement made in the third preambular paragraph.

At the request of the representative of Jordan, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution II

In favour: Argentina, Bangladesh, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Ethiopia, India, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mali, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Sudan, Tunisia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Cameroon, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Norway, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Bahamas, Chile, Colombia, Fiji, France, Greece, Japan, Liberia, Malawi, Mexico, Portugal, Saint Lucia, Thailand, Venezuela.

Draft resolution II was adopted by 28 votes to 9, with 15 abstentions (resolution 1982/18).

53. Mr. MASSOT (Brazil), speaking in explanation of vote, said that while his delegation supported the draft resolution, it did not agree with the language used in one of its preambular paragraphs, which was not in keeping with the general thrust of the draft resolution.

54. Mr. GHIKOS (Greece) said that the repressive practices carried out by the Israeli authorities against women in the occupied Arab territories since 1967 constituted a flagrant violation of human rights and of the principle of the inadmissibility of territorial acquisition through force. His delegation had abstained from voting only because it did not agree with the statement made in the third preambular paragraph linking Zionism with *apartheid*.

55. Mr. BENA (Romania) said that his delegation's vote in favour of draft resolution II expressed its position of principle on the human rights situation in the occupied Arab territories. Nevertheless, his delegation wished to emphasize that it had reservations regarding the wording of parts of the preamble.

56. Miss LUANGHY (Zaire) said that her delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution II because her country subscribed fully to the principles expressed therein. Her delegation nevertheless wished to emphasize that it had reservations regarding the third preambular paragraph, which had attempted to assimilate racism, *apartheid* and Zionism.

57. Mr. BERGTHUN (Norway) said that his delegation had voted against draft resolution II for reasons which his delegation had made clear when the text had been considered by the Commission on the Status of Women.

58. Mr. TUAN (Liberia) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on the draft resolution. It was well aware of the situation in the occupied Arab territories and was totally opposed to *apartheid*, but found it difficult to live with the wording of the third preambular paragraph.

59. Mr. LEVIN (Observer for Israel) said that, at a time when the Council was dealing with one of the most important subjects in the field of social advancement, it was astonishing that it should lump together Zionism, the national liberation of the Jewish people, and almost all the ills of humanity. The fact that all possible sins were being attributed to Zionism reflected in large measure the seriousness with which the detractors of Zionism viewed the duties of the Commission on the Status of Women. It was clear that the Council was attempting to politicize important social activities to further political ends.

60. When it had begun its pioneering activities in Palestine at the beginning of the century, the Zionist movement

had been instrumental in ameliorating the primitive conditions which had prevailed in the area; great impetus had been given to mother and child care and to the promotion of sanitation and health in general among women. Such services were not given exclusively to the Jewish population but were also open to the Arabs. The exemplary way in which Jewish Zionist organizations had discharged their humanitarian tasks had been carried over into the days of the State of Israel. The years between 1948 and 1967 had seen far-reaching change, not only in the health of Arab women and children but also in the political status of the Arab woman in general. The results of those endeavours had been clear for the Arabs themselves to see when the two Arab communities, in Israel and in Judea, Samaria and the Gaza Strip, had met in 1967 after long years of separation. Israeli Arabs could then see for themselves the very great difference in the status of women between the two Arab communities.

61. Draft resolution II, which the Council had just adopted, had clearly been used by Arabs as an instrument to combat Israel, rather than discrimination against women. It could not be regarded as being seriously related to the question under consideration; its purpose had been to vilify and obstruct and consequently should be considered detrimental to the cause it purported to defend. That element had been injected into the work of the Council by Arab countries, most of which accorded women a demeaning social status, practised polygamy, did not grant women their political rights, including the right to vote, and did not grant them equal status under the law, including the right of inheritance.

62. In draft resolution II no mention had been made of the fact that tens of thousands of Palestinian Arabs had been allowed to return to join their families while hundreds of thousands of Jewish women had been forced to flee Arab lands which they had inhabited for many centuries.

Tribute to the memory of Mr. Mohamed Benyahia, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Algeria

On the proposal of the President, the members of the Council observed a minute of silence in tribute to the memory of Mr. Mohamed Benyahia, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Algeria.

63. Mr. KAABACHI (Tunisia), Mr. TUAN (Liberia), Mr. ROZENTAL (Mexico), Mr. CHOWDHURY (Bangladesh), Mr. RODRÍGUEZ (Venezuela), Mr. HUSAIN (Pakistan), Mr. ABDULLAH (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. VERKERCKE (Belgium), speaking also on behalf of the members of the European Community, Mr. ZHANG Zafan (China), Mr. JOHNSON (Benin), Mr. ORDZHONIKIDZE (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking also on behalf of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Poland, Romania, the German Democratic Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Mr. WORKU (Ethiopia), Mrs. DEVAUD (France), Mr. BELL (Canada), Ms. RADIC (Yugoslavia), Mr. HERNIDA (Nicaragua), Mr. ZUCCONI (Italy), Mr. SANGARE (Mali), Ms. RITTERHOFF (United States of America), Mr. O'DONOVAN (Observer for Ireland), Mr. CRUZ (Portugal), Mr. CORTI (Argentina), Mr. ESAN (Nigeria), Mr. SILWAL (Nepal), Mr. BERGTHUN (Norway), Mr. MASSOT (Brazil), Ms. ROSER (Germany, Federal Republic of), Mr. GOMEZ (Observer for Ecuador), Mr. AL-GEWAILY (Qatar), Mrs. CARMENAFF PEREZ (Observer for Cuba), Mr. GHIKAS (Greece), Mr. WIESNER (Austria), Mr. BALA (United Republic of Cameroon), Mr. FURSLAND (United King-

dom), Miss LUANGHY (Zaire), Mr. SALLU (Observer for Sierra Leone), Mr. RUMECI (Burundi), Mr. RANGACHARI (India), Ms. SUZUKI (Japan), Mr. DYRLUND (Denmark), Mr. LIGAIRI (Fiji), Mr. OKWARO (Kenya), Mr. MOUSHOKTAS (Observer for Cyprus), Mr. CHATSUWAN (Observer for Thailand), Mr. KHAWFA (Sudan), Mr. OLAMINI (Swaziland), Mr. EL-ALI (Observer for the Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. LUTFI (Jordan), Mr. GARCIA (Observer for Philippines), Mr. BADJI (Observer for Senegal), Mr. QUINLAN (Australia), Mr. ST. AIMEE (St. Lucia), Mr. NGAIZA (Observer for the United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. HASOON (Iraq), Mr. BENA (Romania) and

Mr. NTAMBI (Observer for Uganda) paid a tribute to the memory of Mr. Mohamed Benyahia and requested the observer for Algeria to convey their sympathy to the Government and people of Algeria and to Mr. Benyahia's family.

64. Mr. BOUYOUCHEF (Observer for Algeria) thanked the members of the Council for their tribute to the memory of Mr. Mohamed Benyahia and said that their expressions of sympathy would be conveyed to his Government and people and to the family of Mr. Benyahia.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.

23rd meeting

Tuesday, 4 May 1982, at 3.20 p.m.

President: Mr. Miljan KOMATINA (Yugoslavia).

E/1982/SR.23

In the absence of the President, Mr. Bhatt (Nepal), Vice-President, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 10

Activities for the advancement of women: United Nations Decade for Women: Equality, Development and Peace (concluded)

REPORT OF THE SECOND (SOCIAL) COMMITTEE
(concluded) (E/1982/57)

1. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to continue its consideration of the draft resolutions and decisions contained, respectively, in paragraphs 33 and 34 of the report of the Second (Social) Committee (E/1982/57).

DRAFT RESOLUTION III

2. The PRESIDENT said that draft resolution III, entitled "Role of women in economic development", had been adopted by the Second Committee without a vote. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished likewise to adopt it without a vote.

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 1982/19).

DRAFT RESOLUTION IV

3. The PRESIDENT said that draft resolution IV, entitled "Suppression of the traffic in persons and of the exploitation of the prostitution of others", had been adopted by the Second Committee without a vote. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished likewise to adopt it without a vote.

Draft resolution IV was adopted (resolution 1982/20).

DRAFT RESOLUTION V

4. The PRESIDENT said that draft resolution V, entitled "Action to be taken to ensure the recovery abroad of maintenance", had been adopted by the Second Committee without a vote. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished likewise to adopt it without a vote.

Draft resolution V was adopted (resolution 1982/21).

DRAFT RESOLUTION VI

5. The PRESIDENT said that draft resolution VI, entitled "Abuses against women and children", had been adopted by the Second Committee without a vote. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished likewise to adopt it without a vote.

Draft resolution VI was adopted (resolution 1982/22).

DRAFT RESOLUTION VII

6. The PRESIDENT said that draft resolution VII, entitled "Elderly women and the World Assembly on Aging", had been adopted by the Second Committee without a vote. If he heard no objection he would take it that the Council wished likewise to adopt it without a vote.

Draft resolution VII was adopted (resolution 1982/23).

DRAFT RESOLUTION VIII

7. The PRESIDENT said that draft resolution VIII, entitled "Women and children under apartheid", had been adopted by the Second Committee by a recorded vote of 38 to 1, with 7 abstentions. He invited the Council to take a vote on it.

Draft resolution VIII was adopted by 35 votes to 1, with 6 abstentions (resolution 1982/24).

8. Ms. RITTERHOFF (United States of America) said that her delegation deeply regretted the necessity of having to vote against that draft resolution. The United States fully sympathized with the situation of women in South Africa and Namibia who lived under the system of *apartheid*. It opposed *apartheid* and was working to change it; it hoped, moreover, that the negotiations now in process, in which the United States was involved along with other members of the contact group, would soon lead to success, so that Namibia would speedily take its rightful place among the family of nations. It did not believe, however, that draft resolution VIII advanced that cause; the intemperate language which it contained, might, indeed, have the reverse effect. The United States was consequently obliged to vote against it.

9. Mr. RODRIGUEZ (Venezuela), Mr. St. AIMEE (Saint Lucia), Mrs. ARANA (Peru), Mr. SANGARE (Mali), Mr. RANGACHARI (India), Mr. BALA (United Republic

of Cameroon), Mr. ESAN (Nigeria), Ms. RADIĆ (Yugoslavia) and Mr. JOHNSON (Benin) said that if they had been present for the vote they would have voted in favour of the draft resolution.

10. Miss FRANCO (Portugal) said that if her delegation had been present for the vote it would have abstained.

DRAFT RESOLUTION IX

11. The PRESIDENT said that draft resolution IX, entitled "Women and children refugees", had been adopted by the Second Committee without a vote. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished likewise to adopt it without a vote.

Draft resolution IX was adopted (resolution 1982/25).

12. Mr. ORDZHONIKIDZE (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, in view of the reference in draft resolution IX to so-called Democratic Kampuchea, his delegation felt obliged to state its view that the only true representative of the Kampuchean people was the Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea. To mention in the draft resolution a genocidal régime which had carried out a campaign of mass extermination not only went against the principles of international law but was an outrage to the memory of the people who had been murdered by the Pol Pot clique.

13. Mrs. BOZHKOVA (Bulgaria) said she also wished to record her delegation's strong reservation regarding the reference in draft resolution IX to so-called Democratic Kampuchea; Bulgaria considered the Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea to be the only legitimate representative of the Kampuchean people.

14. Mr. MARDOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) and Mr. RANGACHARI (India) said that their delegations shared the views expressed by the two previous speakers.

DRAFT RESOLUTION X

15. The PRESIDENT said that draft resolution X, entitled "Preparations for the 1985 World Conference to Review and Appraise the Achievements of the United Nations Decade for Women", had been adopted in the Second Committee without a vote. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished likewise to adopt it without a vote.

Draft resolution X was adopted (resolution 1982/26).

16. Mr. ORDZHONIKIDZE (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had not objected to the adoption of the draft resolution without a vote, on the understanding that the cost of the Conference in question would be met from the budgetary resources already available for it.

DRAFT RESOLUTION XI

17. The PRESIDENT said that draft resolution XI, entitled "International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women", had been adopted in the Second Committee without a vote. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished likewise to adopt it without a vote.

Draft resolution XI was adopted (resolution 1982/27).

DRAFT DECISION I

18. The PRESIDENT said that draft decision I, entitled "International Conference on Women and Apartheid", had

been adopted in the Second Committee without a vote. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished likewise to adopt it without a vote.

Draft decision I was adopted (decision 1982/121).

DRAFT DECISION II

19. The PRESIDENT said that draft decision II, entitled "Communications on the status of women", had been adopted in the Second Committee without a vote. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished likewise to adopt it without a vote.

Draft decision II was adopted (decision 1982/122).

20. Mr. MARDOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) drew attention to the appearance on page 27 of the Russian text of document E/1982/57 of a page of superfluous text, between draft decisions II and III. That page should be removed before the final text of the draft decisions was published.

21. Mr. FURSLAND (United Kingdom) welcomed the adoption by consensus of draft decision II. The Council should take a final decision on handling communications on women next year. That was most important for the credibility and effectiveness of the United Nations in the promotion of women's rights, and particularly of the Commission on the Status of Women.

DRAFT DECISION III

22. The PRESIDENT said that draft decision III, entitled "Provisional agenda and documentation for the thirtieth session of the Commission on the Status of Women", had been adopted by the Second Committee without a vote. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished likewise to adopt it without a vote.

Draft decision III was adopted (decision 1982/123).

23. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Council) said that the documentation referred to in draft decision III comprised an impressive number of documents. He hoped that in future the Council might have more time to consider the reports requested by its subsidiary bodies, pursuant to resolution 1979/41, in which it had decided to continue to review that documentation. Bearing in mind that the Commission on the Status of Women would be meeting for only eight working days, it was to be hoped that during the second regular session of the Council, action would be taken to reduce the number of documents submitted to it.

DRAFT DECISION IV

24. The PRESIDENT said that draft decision IV, entitled "Report of the Commission on the Status of Women", had been adopted in the Second Committee without a vote. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished likewise to adopt it without a vote. The Council would then have concluded its consideration of agenda item 10.

Draft decision IV was adopted (decision 1982/124).

AGENDA ITEM 11

Social development questions

REPORT OF THE SECOND (SOCIAL) COMMITTEE (E/1982/58)

25. The PRESIDENT said that the Second (Social) Committee, in its report on agenda item 11 (E/1982/58),

recommended to the Council the adoption of draft resolutions I to III (*ibid.*, para. 22) and a draft decision (*ibid.*, para. 23). He invited the Council to take up those recommendations one by one.

DRAFT RESOLUTION I

26. The PRESIDENT said that draft resolution I, entitled "Co-ordination and information in the field of youth", had been adopted in the Second Committee without a vote. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished likewise to adopt it without a vote.

27. Mr. BENA (Romania) said he wanted to place on record the fact that his delegation wished to join the list of sponsors of draft resolution I before it was adopted by the Council.

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 1982/28).

DRAFT RESOLUTION II

28. The PRESIDENT said that draft resolution II, entitled "Preparations for the Seventh United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders, with special reference to its agenda", had been adopted by the Second Committee by 41 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

29. Mr. CHOWDHURY (Bangladesh) said that he had requested that the words "including temporary staff" should be inserted into the English text after the words "additional resources" in operative paragraph 8 of draft resolution II. In the text before the Council, the word "assistance" appeared in place of the word "staff".

30. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Council) said he thought that in that context "assistance" was understood to include staff.

31. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt draft resolution II without a vote.

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 1982/29).

32. Mr. ORDZHONIKIDZE (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had acquiesced in the adoption of the draft resolution without a vote even though it thought that the estimated financial implications of the Congress, as submitted by the Secretariat, were excessive. As his delegation and others had said in the Second Committee, it was to be hoped that the Secretariat would be able to review those estimates and reduce them.

33. He noted that in paragraph 8 of the Russian text the Russian equivalent of the word "staff", rather than of "assistance", had been used.

DRAFT RESOLUTION III

34. The PRESIDENT said that draft resolution III, entitled "Enhancement of the functioning of the Committee on Crime Prevention and Control in relation to the preparation of United Nations congresses on the prevention of crime and the treatment of offenders", had been adopted in the Second Committee without a vote. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished likewise to adopt it without a vote.

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 1982/30).

DRAFT DECISION

35. The PRESIDENT said that the draft decision entitled "Report of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on the Social Aspects of the Development Activities of the United Nations" had been adopted in the Second Committee without a vote. If he heard no objection he would take it that the Council wished likewise to adopt it without a vote. The Council would then have concluded its consideration of agenda item 11.

The draft decision was adopted (decision 1982/125).

The meeting rose at 4 p.m.

24th meeting

Wednesday, 5 May 1982, at 10.45 a.m.

President: Mr. Miljan KOMATINA (Yugoslavia).

E/1982/SR.24

AGENDA ITEM 2

Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (*continued*)* (E/1982/L.23, E/1982/L.32 and Corr.1, E/1982/L.36, E/1982/L.37)

1. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to continue consideration of the draft resolutions before it and announced that Ethiopia should be added to the list of sponsors of draft resolution E/1982/L.23.
2. Mr. NGUAYILA MBELA KALANDA (Zaire), said that, in view of the feeling expressed by various delegations

that there was a certain amount of unnecessary duplication between draft resolution E/1982/L.23 and draft resolution E/1982/L.36, the sponsors had decided to revise draft resolution E/1982/L.23 by replacing the word "*Approves*" in operative paragraph 9 by the phrase "*Reaffirms the decision approving*" and by deleting operative paragraphs 15 and 21. Operative paragraph 22 had been corrected to read "at its thirty-eighth session", instead of "thirty-seventh". Those modifications had been introduced with the aim of avoiding any further delay and giving a free hand to the sponsors of other draft resolutions, especially E/1982/L.36. He hoped that the members of the Council would respond to that generous gesture in the same spirit and adopt the draft resolution without any further delay.

3. Mrs. ROSER (Federal Republic of Germany) requested that draft resolution E/1982/L.23 be put to the vote.

* Resumed from the 22nd meeting.

4. Mr. VERKERCKE (Belgium), speaking in explanation of vote, said that, despite the importance which it attached to the elimination of all forms of racism and racial discrimination and to efforts to combat the *apartheid* régime in South Africa, and notwithstanding its strong support for the aims of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination as set out in General Assembly resolution 3057 (XXVIII), his delegation intended to vote against draft resolution E/1982/L.23 because it contained the same disturbing elements which his delegation had already found unacceptable in General Assembly resolution 36/8. The introduction of the problem of the Middle East into the context of the Decade was quite inappropriate; far from contributing to the achievement of a just and lasting peace in that region, it would serve only to jeopardize the successful outcome of the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination scheduled for 1983. The explicit endorsement given to armed struggle in operative paragraph 3 was also unacceptable, since it ran counter to one of the main objectives of the United Nations, that of promoting the peaceful settlement of disputes. His delegation also rejected the idea expressed in operative paragraph 10 that maintaining relations with South Africa was tantamount to encouragement or approval of the policies of its régime.

Draft resolution E/1982/L.23 was adopted by 31 votes to 11, with 4 abstentions (resolution 1982/31).

5. Mr. ROZENTAL (Mexico), speaking in explanation of vote, said that, had a separate vote been taken on individual paragraphs of the draft resolution, his delegation would have abstained from voting on operative paragraph 10.

6. Mr. SATELER (Chile) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it wished to associate itself fully with the objectives of the Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination and supported efforts to eliminate all forms of racism and racial discrimination, wherever they might occur. However, it had found the wording of certain paragraphs regrettable; had there been a separate vote on individual paragraphs, his delegation would not have been able to support operative paragraph 3, owing to its opposition to any advocacy of armed struggle, operative paragraph 8, because the matter dealt with in that paragraph was entirely the responsibility of the Security Council, or operative paragraph 10, because it was unacceptable to single out any particular State for condemnation.

7. Mr. LIGAIRI (Fiji) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it approved of the general approach involved, but wished to place on record its strong reservations with regard to operative paragraphs 2, 3 and 10.

8. Miss FRANCO (Portugal) said that, despite its absolute condemnation of all forms of racism and racial discrimination, her delegation had been obliged to abstain from voting on the draft resolution because it could not accept certain of its provisions. It especially rejected the idea of isolating South Africa as a means of resolving the situation. A peaceful solution was, in her delegation's view, still possible and should continue to be pursued. She wished to record her delegation's reservations with regard to the ninth, tenth, eleventh and twelfth preambular paragraphs and operative paragraphs 3, 8, 10 and 11.

9. Mr. WINDMULLER (United States of America) said that his delegation had voted against the draft resolution. Despite his country's policy of not participating in debates relating to the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, it felt that it was important to register its opposition to the financial implications of the

draft resolution as set out in document E/1982/L.32 and Corr.1.

10. Mr. BOUFFANDEAU (France) said that, despite its consistent rejection of all forms of racism and racial discrimination, particularly the policy of *apartheid*, and its support for the aims of the Decade, his delegation had found it necessary to vote against draft resolution E/1982/L.23 because of a number of unacceptable elements contained therein which it had already opposed in the context of General Assembly resolution 36/8.

11. Ms. ZONICLE (Bahamas) said that, had her delegation been present during the voting, it would have voted in favour of the draft resolution.

12. Mr. WIESNER (Austria) said that his delegation regretted the necessity of voting against draft resolution E/1982/L.23; while it fully supported the aims of the Decade, it had difficulty in accepting the approach taken by the sponsors of the text.

13. Mr. CORTI (Argentina) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it supported the objectives of the Decade and on account of its long-standing condemnation of *apartheid*. However, it was regrettable that the text should have included a number of quite inappropriate expressions which had prevented consensus being achieved on so important an issue. Had a separate vote been taken on individual paragraphs, his delegation would have voted against operative paragraphs 3, 8 and 10.

14. Mr. OKWARO (Kenya) regretted that his delegation, a sponsor of the draft resolution, had been unable to be present during the voting; its vote would have been cast in favour of the draft resolution.

15. Mr. FARIS (Jordan) said that, had he been present during the voting, he would have voted in favour of the draft resolution.

16. Mr. ORDZHONIKIDZE (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution. However, it wished to draw the Council's attention to paragraph 3 of document E/1982/L.32 and Corr.1 concerning the financial implications of the draft resolution, which mentioned the possibility of appointing a person from outside the Secretariat to serve as Secretary-General of the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. He urged the Secretariat to find a suitable candidate from among its own highly qualified officials; the considerable saving involved would be an effective contribution to the United Nations budget.

17. Ms. ROSER (Federal Republic of Germany) said that her delegation had felt obliged to vote against the draft resolution despite its profound concern with the issues involved. While basically endorsing the objectives of the Decade, it found a number of the elements of the draft resolution unacceptable. Since her delegation was absolutely committed to the promotion of the peaceful settlement of disputes as one of the primary justifications for the existence of the United Nations, it could not accept a resolution which explicitly advocated armed struggle. Further, continuing dialogue was essential if peaceful settlement were to be achieved and was possible only if some relations with South Africa were maintained. It could not therefore support the sweeping condemnation of all forms of co-operation. Also, while the problem of the Middle East was one of intense concern to her delegation, it strongly believed that it should be dealt with in the appropriate forums and not in the context of the Decade.

18. Mr. FURLAND (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had voted against the draft resolution. Its reasons for doing so had been similar to those expressed by the representative of Belgium. His delegation also endorsed the comments of the representatives of the United States and the Soviet Union with regard to aspects of the financial implications of the draft resolution.

19. Mr. SANGARE (Mali) said that, had he been present during the voting, he would have cast his delegation's vote in favour of the draft resolution.

20. Mr. LEVIN (Observer for Israel) said that the sponsors of draft resolution E/1982/L.23 seemed determined to bring the issue of the Middle East and the status of Israel into absolutely any question. The mention of racism and racial discrimination in southern Africa in the same breath as the territories currently administered by Israel was quite unacceptable; it was simply a ploy to continue the warfare against his country by any possible means. The draft resolution did not represent a serious approach to the problem of racism in the world but was merely an attempt to exploit a laudable activity for the purposes of a sordid political exercise. His delegation particularly objected to operative paragraphs 2, 3 and 10.

21. Mr. NGUAYILA MBELA KALANDA (Zaire), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, thanked all those delegations which had supported the adoption of draft resolution E/1982/L.23.

22. The PRESIDENT announced that Ethiopia, Zimbabwe and Bangladesh had joined the sponsors of draft resolution E/1982/L.36, and said that the sponsors had decided to add the words "and to submit its report to the Council at its first regular session of 1983" at the end of operative paragraph 6.

23. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Council) referred to footnote 1 to document E/1982/L.37, setting forth the programme budget implications of draft resolution E/1982/L.36. He pointed out that the programme of activities and related costs referred to did not appear as an item on the agenda of the second regular session of the Council in 1982. Furthermore, the financial implications involved had not so far been fully assessed. He suggested either that the Secretariat should be given more time in which to consider the question, in which case the Council might take a decision on it at a later stage, or that the costs mentioned in that footnote should be submitted as financial implications directly to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session, without first being considered by the Council.

The meeting was suspended at 11.25 a.m. and resumed at 11.40 a.m.

24. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Council) said that in the light of the informal consultations he had just held, he would suggest that the matter of the costs referred to in footnote 1 to document E/1982/L.37 should be referred directly to the General Assembly.

It was so decided.

25. The PRESIDENT said that a separate vote had been requested on paragraph 1 of draft resolution E/1982/L.36; he invited delegations to explain their vote before the vote.

26. Mr. ZUCCONI (Italy) said that his delegation had participated in the informal consultations which had been held to consider the possibility of postponing a decision on the draft provisional agenda for the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination because certain items on that agenda had nothing to do with the struggle to combat racism and racial discrimination and involved a pointless duplication of effort. The Conference should focus on racial discrimination and should neither

exclude nor single out any country or territory. His delegation therefore could not support the draft resolution and hoped that a better one would emerge. It also had reservations regarding paragraph 10 because it felt that the financial implications had to be examined carefully on the basis of the estimates made by the Secretary-General.

27. Mr. BOUFFANDEAU (France) said that his delegation had participated actively in the efforts to produce a draft resolution which would be acceptable to everyone and regretted that those efforts had failed. It would therefore have to abstain from voting on the draft resolution. Nevertheless, his Government attached great importance to the elimination of racism and racial discrimination and would be prepared to contribute to preparations for a conference organized with a view to achieving that goal.

28. Mr. DYRLUND (Denmark) said that his delegation had often stated its support for General Assembly resolution 3057 (XXVIII) and for all United Nations efforts aimed at combating racial discrimination in all its forms. Draft resolution E/1982/L.36, however, included approval of a draft provisional agenda to which it objected because of its specific reference to the situation in the Middle East. His delegation could therefore not support the draft resolution and regretted that the consultations held with a view to reaching agreement on the draft provisional agenda had not been successful. It hoped that the time remaining before the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly would be used for further efforts to reach consensus in accordance with the original aims of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination.

29. Mr. VERKERCKE (Belgium) said that in recent years divisive tendencies had undermined the spirit of universality behind General Assembly resolution 3057 (XXVIII) and the International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination. His delegation regretted that the consultations on draft resolution E/1982/L.36 had failed because of those divisive tendencies and would therefore have to abstain from voting, but at the same time hoped that consensus would eventually be restored.

30. Mr. BELL (Canada) said that his delegation would abstain from voting on the draft resolution. His country had participated in programmes to implement the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination and regretted that the initial consensus which had marked the Decade had been lost because of divisiveness and because of the emergence of such tendentious elements and issues as those which appeared in items 9 and 10 of the draft provisional agenda (E/1982/26, para. 28). His delegation hoped that the draft resolution would be reconsidered with a view to achieving consensus in order to avoid a repetition of the divisiveness which had marked the first World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination in 1978. It objected to paragraph 1 of the draft resolution and had reservations regarding any derogation from General Assembly resolution 2609 (XXIV) and its financial guidelines for conferences held away from Headquarters. It hoped that consensus would be restored and was prepared to participate in any conference held on that basis.

31. Mr. FURLAND (United Kingdom) said that through the Commonwealth and other links, his country had relations with many countries of different races and was itself a multiracial society. It therefore had the strongest possible interest in combating racism and racial discrimination, and in international efforts, including the forthcoming World Conference, to mobilize world opinion against those evils. His delegation therefore deeply regretted that irrelevant political elements, particularly the equation of Zionism with racism, had been introduced. If the forthcoming World

Conference was to be effective, it must attract maximum support and participation. Most, but apparently not all, delegations shared the view that the preparations for it should therefore reflect a consensus. The current draft resolution, however, particularly operative paragraph 1, was clearly unacceptable to many delegations and reflected a divisive trend which must be reversed if it was not to undermine the credibility of the Conference. He therefore urged the delegations concerned to reconsider that divisive approach. His delegation deeply regretted that it would have to abstain from voting on a draft resolution dealing with an issue of such great concern, but the formulation of the text, and especially paragraph 1, left it no option.

32. Mr. LIGAIRI (Fiji) said that his delegation would support the draft resolution as a whole but would abstain from voting on paragraph 1 because it felt that the inclusion of controversial issues in the draft provisional agenda would not help to solve the problems of racism and racial discrimination.

33. Mr. BERGTHUN (Norway) said that his delegation would abstain from voting on the draft resolution and hoped that the General Assembly would make the final arrangements for the World Conference with a view to achieving consensus.

34. Miss FRANCO (Portugal) said that her country, conscious of the great importance of efforts to eliminate racism and racial discrimination, had always supported the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, but her delegation would regretfully have to abstain from voting on draft resolution E/1982/L.36 because it objected to the introduction of so extraneous an element as the equation of zionism with racism. It urged delegations to make every effort to reach the consensus necessary on so vital a question.

35. Ms. ROSER (Federal Republic of Germany) said that the fundamental goal of the forthcoming World Conference was to combat racism, racial discrimination and *apartheid*, but that that goal had been obscured by the introduction of controversial issues which could only hinder co-operation. The draft provisional agenda referred to in paragraph 1 of the draft resolution included unacceptable items and she therefore hoped that a decision on it could be postponed until a consensus could be reached; otherwise her country's participation in the Conference would be affected. She also reserved the right to make further observations regarding the financial implications of the draft resolution, which her delegation would be unable to support.

36. Mr. WIESNER (Austria) said that his country's support for the objectives of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination was well known. However, United Nations conferences required careful preparation and broad support. His delegation had therefore supported all efforts to produce a consensus on the current draft resolution and regretted that they had failed. It hoped that the General Assembly would be able to restore the necessary consensus.

The meeting was suspended at 12.10 p.m. and resumed at 12.30 p.m.

37. The PRESIDENT announced that further consideration of draft resolution E/1982/L.36 would be postponed.

38. He further announced that Cuba had become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

AGENDA ITEM 8

Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (*continued*)* (E/1982/L.35/Rev.1)

39. Mr. BOUFFANDEAU (France) introduced draft resolution E/1982/L.35/Rev.1 on behalf of the sponsors, which were France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Japan, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, the Netherlands, Norway, Peru and the United Kingdom.

40. The sponsors had wished to keep the text as simple as possible. All were in agreement that the reporting system established under the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights was an essential element for the implementation of that instrument. Unlike the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights was not buttressed by an interstate or individual recourse procedure. There was therefore a need to ensure that the reports of States parties were examined in a manner which would lead to constructive recommendations. In that connection, the sponsors had paid particular attention to the provisions of articles 17, 21 and 22 of the Covenant.

41. So that the Council could perform its supervisory role effectively, it had been deemed necessary to enhance the effectiveness of the Sessional Working Group, which would be renamed "Sessional Working Group of Governmental Experts on the Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights" (abbreviated as "Group of Experts"). The revised draft resolution provided that the character and composition of the Group would remain unchanged; its members would continue to be States, which would be represented by governmental experts. The number of members would remain at 15 and there would be three members from each regional group. The Group would continue to be a sessional organ. The following changes would, however, be made. In future, the members would be elected by the Council; all States parties to the Covenant would be eligible, whether or not they were members of the Council; the sessions of the Group would last for three weeks but could be prolonged if necessary; they would begin two weeks, rather than one week, before the beginning of the first regular session of the Council. Members would be elected for three years instead of being nominated every year by the President on the basis of recommendations by the regional groups; it was hoped that States members would appoint specially competent persons as representatives and would keep them in office as long as possible. The Group would then consist of highly qualified individuals who could, in the course of a term of office of three years and perhaps longer, acquire experience which would qualify them to carry out the difficult task of examining the reports of States parties and making recommendations thereon.

42. The sponsors had not lost sight of the fact that it was the Council itself which retained the responsibility for supervising the implementation of the Covenant. The summary records and report of the meetings of the Group would therefore be transmitted to the Council with a view to facilitating discussion of the issues in the Council.

43. The revised draft resolution also made provision for the first elections to the Group and for re-examination of its composition, organization and administrative arrangements.

44. The revised draft resolution was the result of wide consultations and the sponsors hoped that it would be adopted by consensus.

45. Mr. MASSOT (Brazil) said that Brazil was not a party to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights; his delegation had not participated in the debate nor would it vote on draft resolution E/1982/L.35/Rev.1.

46. Mr. VEITIA (Venezuela) said that his delegation wished to become a sponsor of draft resolution E/1982/L.35/Rev.1.

47. Mr. RANGACHARI (India) said that, as a member of the Sessional Working Group in both 1980 and 1981, he was aware of the difficulties which it had encountered with particular reference to the proper processing of reports. The revised draft resolution was a move in the right direction. His delegation nevertheless had some doubts concerning subparagraph (b) (iii) of the operative paragraph. Not all the members of the Council were States parties to the Covenant. Supervisory bodies of international instruments normally consisted of States parties. In the case of the Sessional Working Group, the President of the Council had appointed members in the past but in future members were to be elected. During informal discussions it had been suggested that membership should be restricted to those members of the Council which were also States parties to the Covenant. That approach had, however, been regarded as too restrictive. The issue which had to be clarified therefore was whether responsibility for elections to the Group should be entrusted to the Council, bearing in mind that not all the members of the Council were States parties. His delegation was nevertheless not opposed to the basic concept of the revised draft resolution.

48. Mr. BOUFFANDEAU (France) said that it was the Council itself which supervised the Covenant. The intent of the revised draft resolution was to establish a subsidiary organ which would exercise the responsibilities of the Council under article 16 of the Covenant. There was no question of creating a body which would replace the Council itself. The intention was to find an instrument which would enable the Council to enhance the performance of its responsibilities. The Council was master of the manner in which members would be appointed to the Group. In proposing candidates for the Group, the Council would remain within the framework of the Covenant.

49. Mr. ORDZHONIKIDZE (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, in his view, the issue called for a cautious approach. He agreed with the representative of India regarding subparagraph (b) (iii) of the operative paragraph, which would introduce substantial change.

50. The Council had not yet received a statement of the financial implications of the revised draft resolution. Such implications might well be important to members and, in particular, to those members which were not States parties to the Covenant; they too would be bearing part of the financial burden. The change in procedure which would involve commencing the sessions of the Group a week earlier would involve additional costs. The provision in subparagraph (c) of the operative paragraph for an extension of the sessions of the Group hardly seemed justified. It had already proved possible for the Working Group not only to consider all the country reports which had been submitted to it but also to waste considerable time in discussing organizational and administrative matters during the period currently at its disposal.

51. Subparagraph (f) provided that the Council would review the composition, organization and administrative arrangements of the Group at its first regular session of 1985. The result would be that the Council would be repeating the current operation in three years' time. It was inappropriate that a United Nations body should revise its membership every three years.

52. The issue required further discussion and, for that purpose, a statement of financial implications was required.

53. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Council) said that a statement of financial implications was in course of preparation.

54. Mr. RANGACHARI (India) said that the Covenant contained no provision for elections by the Council. He suggested that the opinion of the Legal Counsel might be sought on the issue.

55. Mr. ORDZHONIKIDZE (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested that the statement of financial implications should be submitted in writing, as the Ministers of Finance of member States would have to be consulted.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

25th meeting

Wednesday, 5 May 1982, at 3.15 p.m.

President: Mr. Miljan KOMATINA (Yugoslavia).

E/1982/SR.25

AGENDA ITEM 2

Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (concluded) (E/1982/L.36, E/1982/L.37)

1. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to continue its consideration of draft resolution E/1982/L.36, on the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, and reminded the Council that, according to the revision of the text proposed by the sponsors, the words

“and to submit its report to the Economic and Social Council at its first regular session of 1983” would be added at the end of paragraph 6.

At the request of the representative of Denmark, a recorded vote was taken on paragraph 1 of draft resolution E/1982/L.36.

In favour: Argentina, Bangladesh, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Ethiopia, Greece, India, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mali, Mexico, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Sudan, Swaziland, Thailand, Tunisia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics,

United Republic of Cameroon, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of Italy, Norway, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Abstaining: Bahamas, Chile, Colombia, Fiji, Japan, Nepal, Portugal.

Paragraph 1 of draft resolution E/1982/L.36 was adopted by 32 votes to 10, with 7 abstentions.

Draft resolution E/1982/L.36 as a whole, as revised, was adopted by 38 votes to 1, with 12 abstentions (resolution 1982/32).

2. Mr. WINDMULLER (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had not participated in the vote on paragraph 1. As a rule, it did not participate in such votes because of past decisions concerning the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. If, however, it had decided to take part in the voting, it would have voted against paragraph 1, because it could not support certain aspects of the draft provisional agenda for the Second World Conference.

3. His delegation had voted against the draft resolution as a whole because of its financial implications. While the United States appreciated the desire of the less developed countries to host United Nations conferences, it believed that it was increasingly important for the United Nations to use its resources wisely and to adhere to the provisions of General Assembly resolution 2609 (XXIV).

4. Mr. YOACHAM (Chile) said that his delegation had abstained in the voting on paragraph 1 because of certain controversial aspects of the draft provisional agenda which could impede the attainment of the objectives of the Decade. However, it had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole because it supported the aims of the Second World Conference.

5. Mr. WIESNER (Austria) said his delegation regretted that its proposed amendments had not been accepted. It had voted against paragraph 1 and had abstained in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole.

6. Mr. FUJU (Japan) stressed that Japan continued to oppose racism and racial discrimination and to support United Nations efforts to eradicate those scourges. It believed, however, that the goals of the Decade would be achieved only when all Member States were convinced of the appropriateness of activities undertaken in the context of the Decade. The international community should strive to ensure that the Second World Conference lived up to its name as a world conference. His delegation hoped that the Preparatory Sub-Committee would work towards that end. It was regrettable that the Council had failed to reach a compromise on the questions relating to preparations for the Conference. His delegation had found it necessary to abstain in the voting on paragraph 1 and on the draft resolution as a whole.

7. Mr. TUAN (Liberia) said that, had his delegation been present during the voting, it would have voted in favour of paragraph 1 and in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

8. Mr. JOHNSON (Benin) said that his delegation would have liked to become a sponsor of draft resolution E/1982/L.36, which was consistent with its position regarding the Decade.

9. Mr. BERGTHUN (Norway) said that his delegation had voted against paragraph 1 of the draft resolution and hoped that, in the interests of consensus, the consequences

of that paragraph would be discussed further at the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly. His delegation's statement at the 24th meeting of the current session constituted an explanation of vote in respect of the draft resolution.

10. Mr. THWAITES (Australia) said that his delegation had voted against paragraph 1 and had abstained in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole. It was extremely important that the guidelines for the holding of United Nations conferences away from Headquarters should be upheld. Repeated departures from those guidelines and the resultant financial implications for the Organization could not be tolerated. While Australia appreciated the willingness of the Government of the Philippines to host the Second World Conference, it would have voted against paragraph 10 of the draft resolution, had there been a separate vote.

11. Mr. ESAN (Nigeria) said that had his delegation been present during the voting, it would have voted in favour of paragraph 1 and in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

AGENDA ITEM 7

Revitalization of the Economic and Social Council (concluded)* (E/1982/28, E/1982/60, Working Paper No. 1982/1, Conference Room Papers 1982/3 and 1982/4)

12. Mr. ALMOSLECHNER (Austria) said that, as early as 1954, the Council had recognized (see resolution 557 B (XVIII)) that its heavy agenda prevented adequate and thorough consideration of each item and had adopted a number of recommendations designed to rationalize its work. It was quite clear, however, that past attempts to reform the Council's procedures had not produced the desired results. His delegation attached great importance to the Council as the central forum for the promotion of human rights and for policy recommendations on issues related to the world economic and social situation. Austria still believed that General Assembly resolution 32/197 afforded a sound basis for renewed efforts to improve the functioning of the Council.

13. A number of valuable proposals had been made in the Secretary-General's note (E/1982/28) and in the course of informal meetings on the question of rationalization. His delegation was ready to proceed to a more detailed discussion of those proposals in order to arrive, as quickly as possible, at specific measures to rationalize the Council's work. It would be preferable, at the current stage, to focus on short-term measures which stood a reasonable chance of being implemented in the near future, instead of concentrating on longer-term issues which might involve a full restructuring of the Council and a possible redefinition of its role. While Austria was ready to address itself to those issues, it believed that it would not be very productive to link short-term and long-term measures too closely as long as no broad consensus existed on both sets of issues.

14. By placing fewer but carefully selected items on its agenda, the Council would be able not only to deal with the issues more thoroughly and effectively, but also to reduce duplication of work. His delegation would welcome a

* Resumed from the 21st meeting.

discussion on priority items for the agenda, taking into account the need for an improved division of work between the Council and the General Assembly. It was important to review carefully the periodicity of agenda items in order to avoid annual or even biannual debates of an often perfunctory nature. The General Assembly should avoid holding full-fledged debates on items which had been considered in depth by the Council at one of its preceding sessions.

15. Duplication of work could be further avoided if reports on subjects which were within the purview of an established subsidiary body were not considered by the Council, but were submitted directly to that body, as recommended in paragraph 10 (a) of the Secretary-General's note (E/1982/28). In such instances, the Council or the Assembly would simply take whatever action was required on specific recommendations.

16. Further streamlining of the Council's subsidiary machinery would involve a careful review of the required documentation and a more efficient programme of work for the subsidiary bodies. That should lead to a redefinition of their functions and of their correlation with the Council.

17. The conclusions emerging from the general economic debate held annually during the Council's second regular session should be incorporated in some form of document for submission to the Second Committee of the General Assembly and to the specialized agencies. That would help to reorganize and rationalize the debates in the Second Committee.

18. His delegation looked forward to a careful review of the comments and suggestions already made and to a detailed discussion of follow-up action, with a view to the adoption of concrete measures at one of the Council's forthcoming sessions.

19. Mr. BAZÁN (Chile) said that, for the most part, the Council had not been fulfilling the important mandate entrusted to it under Articles 62 to 66 of the Charter. Its meetings had fallen into the routine characteristic of other United Nations organs. The economic and social development issues of greatest concern to mankind were not receiving the in-depth consideration they deserved. The world public at large did not fully realize that 80 per cent of United Nations activities were in the economic, social and cultural spheres. The Council could play an important role in filling that gap in understanding.

20. The various criticisms of the Council's work had prompted short-term recommendations, as well as recommendations relating to the organization of the Council and its subsidiary bodies. Chile welcomed the initiative of the President of the Council in submitting, on a strictly informal basis, a draft resolution on the revitalization of the Council in a sessional document (Conference Room Paper 1982/4). Chile was also grateful for the efforts of the Brazilian delegation in organizing meetings of the group of Latin American States. Many of the ideas discussed by the Group were reflected in the draft resolution. It was extremely important that the Council should focus its attention on a limited number of major policy issues. At each of its regular sessions, it should review the programme of work for its ensuing session and identify issues which would require its priority consideration. At the end of its discussion of international economic and social policy, the Council should formulate, by consensus, conclusions and policy recommendations for submission to the General Assembly and organs and organizations of the United Nations system. That would be crucial to the performance of the task before the Council, which would thus be able to promote an awareness that the focus of United Nations activities was on

international co-operation in the economic, social and cultural spheres.

21. The suggestions concerning the scheduling of sessions, the recommendations for restraint in further requests for reports and studies and the various other proposals contained in the President's note distributed as a sessional document (Conference Room Paper 1982/4) were, on the whole, acceptable to his delegation. Chile also believed that the recommendations of the Secretary-General concerning the revitalization of the Council (*ibid.*, annex I) should be implemented as soon as possible. The list of other questions relating to the revitalization of the Council (*ibid.*, annex II) included important proposals, which his delegation had already endorsed in supporting General Assembly resolution 32/197. The provisions of that resolution had not been fully implemented. The time was ripe for members of the Council to seek agreement on ways of reviving neglected aspects of the resolution.

22. It was proposed in annex II, paragraph 4, of the document in question that the Council should convene one annual session, alternately in New York and Geneva, with all three sessional committees meeting concurrently. Such an arrangement would greatly facilitate administrative activities, the preparation of documents and the preparation of the calendar of meetings of subsidiary bodies. It could also lead to substantial savings. In that connection, it should be recalled that, at the thirty-eighth session of the Commission on Human Rights, some delegations had suggested that the Commission's report should be formally considered by the Council at its second regular session, in order to allow more time for pre-sessional examination of the report. Since the Commission's report was one of the major items considered at the first regular session every year, the possible adoption of that suggestion would justify a review of the practice of convening two annual sessions of the Council.

23. Mr. THWAITES (Australia) said that the draft resolution contained in Conference Room Paper 1982/4 represented an important step forward. The President had succeeded in focusing attention on practical measures by which the Council might streamline and render more manageable much of its work. His delegation supported the President's effort to steer the Council towards more efficient organization of its work.

24. The Australian approach to the restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system was predicated on the need to improve the functioning of the Council. The objective would be to restore the Council to the central position in the United Nations system that it had occupied in the early years of the Organization. Australia had welcomed General Assembly resolution 32/197 and continued to believe that its proposals for reform of the structure and workings of the Council should be put into effect. Although there would probably be no early, general acceptance of mechanisms to make the Council more representative, and although there was not yet any willingness to abolish or redefine its less effective subsidiary bodies, such steps would ultimately be necessary if genuine authority and credibility were to be restored to the Council.

25. His delegation would agree that something must immediately be done to put an end to the desultory, unproductive and largely irrelevant pattern of activity which, unfortunately, had become the hallmark of the Council in recent years. Accordingly, Australia believed that careful consideration should be given to suggestions for subject-oriented sessions, for the development of an effective division of labour between the Council and the General Assembly, for an action-oriented debate on international

economic and social policy, and for the effective exercise of the Council's co-ordinating function. While such suggestions and many of the others before the Council were essentially procedural in character, their implementation could contribute significantly to an improved working of the Council. Australia, for its part, would be studying those suggestions most carefully and looked forward to whatever opportunity there would be, prior to the next session, to consider with other delegations the full implications of what was being proposed.

26. Mr. MILLER (United States of America) said that the President's note (Conference Room Paper 1982/4) contained a number of useful suggestions and would provide a good basis for further discussion, in which his delegation would willingly take part. A few of the proposals, however, appeared likely to cause duplication of effort rather than streamline the work of the Council: in particular, some seemed to conflict with the mandate of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination. His delegation was also dubious about the suggestion that the Council should formulate conclusions and policy recommendations on the basis of its annual general discussion of international economic and social policy; to comply with that suggestion might require almost impossibly difficult negotiations, because of the complexity of the issues involved. Finally, the various suggested changes in the schedule of meetings of the Council and its subsidiary bodies needed further study. His delegation did not object to them in principle, but wondered how far they would disrupt the whole calendar of conferences and meetings.

27. Mr. BERGTHUN (Norway) said that his delegation had found the recommendations made by the Secretary-General in document E/1982/28 very valuable, and would like to see more of them incorporated into the draft resolution contained in the President's note (Conference Room Paper 1982/4). That draft resolution also contained other new and useful ideas, to which he wished to draw attention. First, the suggestion in paragraph 1 (a) that the Council should focus its attention on a limited number of carefully selected major policy issues, to be studied in depth with a view to elaborating concrete action-oriented recommendations, expressed the very essence of revitalization. His delegation was all in favour of it, but thought a good deal of political will would be required to implement it. Secondly, his delegation likewise welcomed the suggestions in subparagraphs 1 (d) and 1 (g); it was important that the Council should carry out its responsibility for co-ordinating the operational activities of the United Nations systems. Thirdly, with regard to paragraphs 1 (k) and 1 (l), the date for the opening of the Council's first regular session might require further discussion, but experience had shown that there was a real need to ensure that meetings of subsidiary bodies ended well before the Council session at which their reports were to be considered.

28. The recommendations in the draft resolution were relatively short-term measures, which could be adopted in the current year; they did not cover many of the important points raised in General Assembly resolution 32/197, and his delegation was therefore pleased to note that paragraph 3 of the draft resolution made provision for continuing consultations on other questions relating to the revitalization of the Council.

29. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) said he thought that on the basis of the recommendations contained in the President's note (Conference Room Paper 1982/4) it should have been possible for the Council at least partially to resolve the question of revitalization in the time available. The document was very sound, if perhaps not as hard-hitting as it

might have been. He suggested that in paragraph 1 (a) of the draft resolution a reference should have been made to the need for a more rational distribution of agenda items and a distribution over two years of the customary items on the Council's agenda. In paragraph 1 (d) there appeared to be a discrepancy between the French and the English texts, and he thought that the French version, which spoke of suitable recommendations of a general nature, rather than policy recommendations, was more flexible and hence less likely to cause difficulties.

30. Assuming that the substantive debate on the subject of revitalization was to be postponed until the second regular session of the Council, he felt it was important to decide before the end of the current session exactly when that debate would be held. If the item was not taken up early in the session, the Council might find that it did not have time to complete its work on it.

31. Mr. BOYD (United Kingdom) said he thought that the Council was making genuine progress on the question of revitalization, and in a direction which his delegation could largely support. He hoped that the subject would be pursued energetically at the second regular session of the Council. It would be important to consider carefully how best to draw conclusions from the work of that session so as to benefit the Council's work. The points raised in paragraphs 1 (e) to 1 (h) of the draft resolution would also need more detailed discussion than they had received so far.

32. Mr. ASTAFIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) welcomed the President's note (Conference Room Paper 1982/4) but noted that it was being circulated on a strictly informal basis, and felt that time should have been allowed for informal consultations on it before it was taken up in the Council. As there were only two working days left, he saw little chance of a full debate on it at the present session. The Conference Room Paper had been sent to Moscow to be examined by the Soviet Government; in the meantime his delegation had studied it as far as possible in the time available and just wished to say that it saw a number of problems with regard to annex II. It hoped that at the second regular session in Geneva the Council's work would be organized so as to allow time for informal consultations on the sessional document in question, which would give members an opportunity to state their positions on the various proposals contained in it and perhaps supplement them.

33. The PRESIDENT said that before the end of the current session, the Council would approve its provisional agenda and take a decision on its programme of work for the second regular session. The Belgian representative's suggestion and the need to dedicate sufficient time and energy to the question of revitalization would be borne in mind. He thanked members for the useful comments they had made on his note (Conference Room Paper 1982/4), on the basis of which he hoped to submit a revised version of the document at the next session.

AGENDA ITEM 8

Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (*continued*) (E/1982/L.35/Rev.1)

34. The PRESIDENT said some delegations believed that consideration of draft resolution E/1982/L.35/Rev.1

should be deferred until the statement of financial implications became available.

35. Mr. GIUSTETTI (France) said that the draft resolution appeared to raise certain legal questions on which the sponsors would like the Office of Legal Affairs to give an opinion.

36. Mr. SZASZ (Office of Legal Affairs) said he was not sure quite what legal doubts had been raised by the proposal in subparagraph (b) of the operative paragraph of the draft resolution regarding the election by the Council of a Group of Experts to assist it in its functions in connection with the implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Since the Group in question would be a subsidiary organ of the Council, chapter V of the rules of procedure would apply to it. Rule 25 provided that unless the Council decided otherwise, the members of any body or organ of limited membership, other than those subsidiary to a regional commission, should be elected by the Council. The election procedure described in the draft resolution was therefore legally acceptable.

37. Mr. RANGACHARI (India) said that three questions had arisen in the debate at the previous meeting. The first was whether it would be appropriate for the Council, the members of which were not all States parties to the Covenant, to elect the members of the Group of Experts; the normal procedure was for the members of such bodies to be elected by States parties alone. The second question concerned the difference between the customary procedure of appointment by the President of the Council and the procedure of election envisaged in the draft resolution. The third question was whether it would be permissible for the Council to recommend that the election of the membership of the Group of Experts should be carried out by the States parties to the Covenant and not by the Council itself.

38. Mr. SZASZ (Office of Legal Affairs) said that he would answer the first and third questions together. As the Indian representative had rightly pointed out, it was normal for a body concerned with the implementation of a covenant to be elected by the States parties, as was the case, for example, with the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The difference between that and the Covenant of which the Council was considering the implementation was, however, that in the former case, the establishment of a supervisory body for the States parties was specifically provided for within the Covenant, whereas in the International Covenant on Economic, Cultural and Social Rights it was laid down that the Council itself should be the supervisory body. The Council could of course establish a subsidiary organ to carry out those functions, but it could not reject the role assigned to it and recommend that the task be carried out by some other body altogether.

39. The Indian representative's second question had recalled that supervisory bodies of the kind in question had previously been appointed by the President of the Council; that would still be possible, since rule 25 of the rules of procedure provided that the members should be elected by the Council unless the Council decided otherwise.

40. Mr. RANGACHARI (India) noted that article 16, paragraph 2 (a), of the Covenant provided that all reports should be submitted to the Secretary-General, who should transmit copies to the Economic and Social Council for consideration. In the past four years, however, recognizing that many members of the Council were not States parties to the Covenant, the Council had tended to delegate the consideration of the reports to a Sessional Working Group composed of representatives of countries which were States parties. In the past the members of that Group had been

appointed by the President, in accordance with Council decisions 1978/10 and 1981/158. It appeared from the draft resolution in document E/1982/L.35/Rev.1, however, that in future they were to be elected by the Council, which would mean that they were elected partly by countries which were not themselves States parties to the Covenant. It was even possible that in some years no States parties to the Covenant would be represented in the Council.

41. He asked whether it would be in order for the Council to specify in the draft resolution that the election of the members of the Group of Experts should be carried out by States parties. Alternatively, he suggested that the members of the Group of Experts might simply be appointed by the President, as in the case of the Sessional Working Group in the past. He noted the provision in subparagraph (f) of the operative part of the draft resolution to the effect that the Council should review the composition, organization and administrative arrangements of the Group of Experts in 1985; perhaps at that stage it would be in a better position to decide whether elections should be held, and if so, of what kind. For the present, since there had not been time for extensive consultations on the matter, he wondered whether it would not be best for the Council to continue the practice which it had followed since 1978.

42. Mr. SZASZ (Office of Legal Affairs), replying to the question raised by the representative of India as to whether the Council could entrust to States parties the election of members of the Sessional Working Group, said that it could do so under rule 25 of the rules of procedure, which allowed it to decide on some procedure other than election by the Council itself. The number of States which were both members of the Council and parties to the Covenant varied and would continue to change in the future. If the draft resolution's purpose was to enlarge the electorate to include all States parties to the Covenant, whether or not they were members of the Council, there could be serious difficulties. The Council allowed States which were Members of the United Nations but not members of the Council to participate in its work, but he was not sure if it could delegate the election of the members of a subsidiary body to a group which included non-members.

43. Mr. BURWIN (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) requested clarification as to whether a President of the Council who was from a State which was not a party to the Covenant had the right to appoint members of the Sessional Working Group.

44. Mr. SZASZ (Office of Legal Affairs) said that if the Council entrusted that function to the President, then he did have the right to appoint members of the Sessional Working Group. He would then be acting not as a representative of the State, but as a representative of the Council.

45. Mrs. ARANA (Peru) said she thought that the interpretation given by the representative of India to the draft resolution was unjustified, and requested him to refrain from pressing his point.

46. Mr. SOFINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the representative of India had raised his question in order to determine the intention of the authors of the Covenant; his concern was justified, and the Soviet Union shared it. The representative of the Office of Legal Affairs had said nothing to dispel the doubts expressed by the representative of India, and further clarification was needed, because a draft resolution like the one contained in document E/1982/L.35/Rev.1 could not be adopted without a consensus.

47. Mr. FAREED (Pakistan) said that his country was not a State party to the Covenant but, as a member of the Council, wished to contribute to the discussion. The representative of the Office of Legal Affairs had pointed out that the Council could not change the provisions of the Covenant. The only question that remained, therefore, was whether the Council should continue to authorize its President to appoint the members of the Sessional Working Group or, alternatively, should itself elect the members of the Sessional Working Group and allow States which were not parties to the Covenant to participate in that election. His delegation had no difficulties with subparagraph (b) of the operative paragraph of the draft resolution and thought that the draft resolution as a whole could be discussed in the light of the explanations given by the representative of the Office of Legal Affairs pending a response to a question raised earlier by the representative of the Soviet Union regarding the budget.

48. Mr. CHATTERJIE (United Kingdom) said that the representative of the Office of Legal Affairs had satisfactorily answered the question of whether the provisions of the draft resolution were legally sound. Especially important was his statement that the Council's normal procedure was to elect the members of its subsidiary bodies and that the draft resolution instituted that procedure for the Sessional Working Group.

49. Mr. MARDOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the question of the legal status of the proposals made in the draft resolution not only had been raised by the representative of India but had also given rise to concern within the Sessional Working Group. That concern was valid, and he did not understand why the sponsors of the draft resolution had not taken it into consideration.

50. Mr. ZUCCONI (Italy) observed that, if the Council could authorize its President to appoint the members of the Sessional Working Group, it must surely have the right to exercise that power directly.

51. Mr. RANGACHARI (India) said that it was not a question of whether the Council had the right to do something, but of whether a given procedure was proper. The rules of procedure provided for elections and the Covenant stated that reports would be considered by the Council. The question was, however, whether it was proper for States which were not parties to the Covenant to elect the members of a working group which was to consider the reports of States submitted in accordance with the Covenant. Since 1978, the trend had been to emphasize the role of States parties to the Covenant and to diminish the role of States which were not parties to the Covenant, since the strength of all covenants came from the number of States which had ratified them. That trend should be continued.

52. Mr. ROZENTAL (Mexico) said that his delegation fully endorsed the explanation given by the representative of the Office of Legal Affairs. There was no doubt about the intentions of the authors of the Covenant when they had given the responsibility for certain tasks to a body whose membership was limited, the Economic and Social Council,

and had been even smaller when the Covenant had been drawn up, consisting of 27 members at the time. It was for each delegation to make its own decision concerning the question of the propriety of the procedure being proposed. If any delegation thought it should not participate in the election of the members of the Sessional Working Group, it could simply decline to do so. His delegation did not wish to go against the intentions of the authors of the Covenant, and it supported the draft resolution.

53. Mr. FAREED (Pakistan) said that the argument that States which were not parties to the Covenant had less right to express their views on the appointment of members of the Working Group did not stand up to analysis, especially since the Working Group had been established by the Council itself. Members of the Council had every right to take part in the discussion and in the process of election. There was no question of propriety, only a question of legality, and that subject had been aptly covered by the representative of the Office of Legal Affairs. Clarification was needed, however, on the question raised by the representative of Italy.

54. Mr. ALMOSLECHNER (Austria) said that one question which had not been answered by the representative of the Office of Legal Affairs related to the legal status of members of the Council which had not yet ratified the Covenant but would do so in the future and would then have not only the right but the obligation to vote.

55. Mr. RANGACHARI (India) observed that the Council had expressly stipulated in its decision 1978/10 that members of the Working Group must also be States parties to the Covenant. That provision meant that some members of the Council were not eligible to be members of the Working Group. If the draft resolution in document E/1982/L.35/Rev.1 was adopted, however, it would mean that States which were not parties to the Covenant could participate in the election of the members of the Working Group even though they themselves could not be members of it. Instead of reversing the trend of the past four years, the Council should be working towards the day when elections would be held by the States parties themselves.

56. Mr. SZASZ (Office of Legal Affairs) said that the Council itself could legally elect the members of the Working Group. However, when an instrument such as a covenant referred to an organ, it was understood that the organ could also act through an agent, for example, through the Secretary-General. In the present case, a function had been assigned to the Council but the Council did not necessarily have to carry it out in plenary meeting. In reply to the question of the representative of Austria, he said that the Council's composition changed every year; moreover, the Council's membership had been enlarged to 54 members since the adoption of the Covenant. Since, however, the Covenant related to the Council as a living organ, the Council as it was today was what had to be taken into consideration.

The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.

26th meeting

Thursday, 6 May 1982, at 10.50 a.m.

President: Mr. Miljan KOMATINA (Yugoslavia).

E/1982/SR.26

In the absence of the President, Mr. Velloso (Brazil), Vice-President, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 13

Elections (continued)* (E/1982/L.1, E/1982/L.2, E/1982/L.3, E/1982/L.4/Rev.1, E/1982/L.5/Rev.1 and Add.1, E/1982/L.7, E/1982/L.8/Rev.1, E/1982/L.16, E/1982/L.39/Rev.1)

1. Mr. SOBHAN (Bangladesh) said that his delegation attached the highest priority to its candidatures from the Commission on Human Rights and the Executive Board of the United Nations Children's Fund. It would therefore withdraw its candidature from the Committee on Crime Prevention and Control with a view to facilitating an agreed slate for the group of Asian States for that Committee.

COMMISSION FOR SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT (E/1982/L.1)

2. The PRESIDENT announced that 11 members were to be elected to the Commission for Social Development for a four-year term beginning on 1 January 1983.

3. Ms. CONDEVAUX (Assistant Secretary of the Council) said that there were four vacancies for African States; the group of African States had endorsed the candidatures of the Central African Republic, Ghana, Liberia and Togo. The group of Asian States had endorsed Cyprus and India to fill the two vacancies for that region. There were two vacancies for Western European and other States and that group had endorsed the candidatures of Austria and Finland. The group of Eastern European States had endorsed the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic to fill the vacancy for that region.

4. The PRESIDENT observed that the number of candidates nominated by the group of African States, the group of Asian States, the group of Western European and other States and the group of Eastern European States was equal to the number of vacancies in each case and invited the Council to declare those candidates elected.

*Austria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Central African Republic, Cyprus, Finland, Ghana, India, Liberia and Togo were elected members of the Commission for Social Development by acclamation for a four-year term beginning on 1 January 1983.***

5. The PRESIDENT suggested that since there were no candidates from the group of Latin American States, the elections of two members from that group should be postponed until a later stage.

*It was so decided.***

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS (E/1982/L.1)

6. The PRESIDENT announced that 14 members were to be elected to the Commission on Human Rights for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1983.

7. Ms. CONDEVAUX (Assistant Secretary of the Council) said that there were three vacancies for African States; the group of African States had endorsed the candidatures of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mozambique and the United Republic of Tanzania. The Eastern European States had endorsed the candidatures of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to fill the two vacancies for that region.

8. There were five candidates—Bangladesh, Cyprus, India, Iraq and the Syrian Arab Republic—for the three vacancies for Asian States. There were three vacancies for Latin American States and four candidates, namely: Colombia, Costa Rica, Jamaica and Nicaragua. In the case of the Western European and other States there were three vacancies and four candidates, namely: Finland, Greece, Ireland and the Netherlands.

9. The PRESIDENT observed that the number of candidates nominated by the group of African States and the group of Eastern European States was equal to the number of vacancies in each case and invited the Council to declare those candidates elected by acclamation.

*The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mozambique, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United Republic of Tanzania were elected members of the Commission on Human Rights by acclamation for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1983.***

10. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect by secret ballot three members from the group of Asian States, three members from the group of Latin American States and three members from the group of Western European and other States.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Kaabachi (Tunisia) and Mr. Grecu (Romania) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

<i>Number of ballot papers:</i>	53
<i>Invalid ballots:</i>	0
<i>Number of valid ballots:</i>	53
<i>Abstentions:</i>	0
<i>Number of members voting:</i>	53
<i>Required majority:</i>	27
<i>Number of votes obtained:</i>	
<i>Asian States:</i>	
India	43
Bangladesh	40
Cyprus	30
Iraq	27
Syrian Arab Republic	15
<i>Latin American States:</i>	
Colombia	35
Costa Rica	34
Nicaragua	34
Jamaica	31
<i>Western European and other States:</i>	
Finland	43
Ireland	38
Netherlands	35
Greece	34

Bangladesh, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Finland, India, Ireland, the Netherlands and Nicaragua, having

* Resumed from the 6th meeting.

** See decision 1982/126.

obtained the required majority and the largest number of votes, were elected members of the Commission on Human Rights for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1983.**

COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN
(E/1982/L.1)

11. The PRESIDENT said that 11 members were to be elected to the Commission on the Status of Women for a four-year term beginning on 1 January 1983.

12. Ms. CONDEVAUX (Assistant Secretary of the Council) said that the following candidates had received the support of their respective regional groups: Kenya, Liberia and Sierra Leone to fill the three seats being vacated by members of the group of African States; Mexico for the seat vacated by a member of the group of Latin American States; and Czechoslovakia and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for the two seats vacated by members of the group of Eastern European States.

13. The PRESIDENT said that the number of candidates nominated by the group of African States, the group of Latin American States and the group of Eastern European States was equal to the number of seats for the respective groups. He therefore invited the Council to declare those candidates elected by acclamation.

*Czechoslovakia, Kenya, Liberia, Mexico, Sierra Leone and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics were elected members of the Commission on the Status of Women by acclamation for a four-year term beginning on 1 January 1983.***

14. The PRESIDENT said that there were more candidates from the group of Asian States and the group of Western European and other States than there were vacancies for those groups. He therefore invited the Council to elect by secret ballot two members from the group of Asian States and three members from the group of Western European and other States.

At the invitation of the President, Ms. Moncada Bermúdez (Nicaragua) and Mr. Galka (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

Number of ballot papers:	53
Invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	53
Abstentions:	0
Number of members voting:	53
Required majority:	27
Number of votes obtained:	
Asian States:	
Philippines	41
Indonesia	37
Cyprus	25
Western European and other States:	
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	40
United States of America	40
Australia	36
Sweden	28

*Australia, Indonesia, the Philippines, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America, having obtained the required majority and the largest number of votes, were elected members of the Commission on the Status of Women for a four-year term beginning on 1 January 1983.***

COMMITTEE FOR PROGRAMME AND CO-ORDINATION
(E/1982/L.2)

15. The PRESIDENT said that, in accordance with its resolution 2008 (LX), the Council was required to nominate seven members for election by the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session to fill vacancies in the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination which would occur at the end of 1982. The term of office was for three years, beginning on 1 January 1983.

16. Ms. CONDEVAUX (Assistant Secretary of the Council) said that the following candidates had received the support of their respective regional groups: Ethiopia and Nigeria to fill the two seats being vacated by members of the group of African States; Argentina and Chile to fill the two vacancies for the group of Latin American States; the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to fill the vacancy for the group of Eastern European States; and France and the United States of America to fill the two seats being vacated by members of the group of Western European and other States.

17. The PRESIDENT noted that the number of candidates was equal to the number of vacancies for all the groups. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to nominate the seven candidates mentioned.

*Argentina, Chile, Ethiopia, France, Nigeria, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America were nominated as candidates for the elections to be held at the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly to fill the vacancies which would occur at the end of 1982 in the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination.***

COMMISSION ON HUMAN SETTLEMENTS (E/1982/L.3)

18. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect 19 members of the Commission on Human Settlements for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1983.

19. Ms. CONDEVAUX (Assistant Secretary of the Council) said that the following candidates had received the support of their respective regional groups: Algeria, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Nigeria, Sierra Leone and Uganda to fill the five seats being vacated by members of the group of African States; Indonesia and Papua New Guinea to fill two of the four seats being vacated by members of the group of Asian States; Colombia, Cuba and Peru to fill the three seats being vacated by members of the group of Latin American States; Canada, France, the Netherlands, Norway and Sweden to fill the five seats being vacated by members of the group of Western European and other States; and the German Democratic Republic and Hungary to fill the two seats being vacated by members of the group of Eastern European States.

20. The PRESIDENT said that in the case of the African States, the Latin American States, the group of Western European and other States and the group of Eastern European States, the number of candidates was equal to the number of vacancies. He therefore invited the Council to elect the candidates proposed by each group by acclamation.

It was so decided.

21. Mr. KASEMSRI (Thailand), speaking as the Chairman for the current month of the group of Asian States, said that the group had tried to fill the four available seats but had not yet been able to find candidates for the remaining two seats. He hoped that the group would be in a position to propose candidates in due course.

*Algeria, Canada, Colombia, Cuba, France, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Indonesia, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Sierra Leone, Sweden and Uganda were elected members of the Commission on Human Settlements by acclamation for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1983.***

COMMITTEE ON NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

22. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect 19 members of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations for a four-year term beginning on 1 January 1983. In accordance with rule 80 of the rules of procedure of the Council, as amended by Council resolution 1981/50, the members would be elected according to the following pattern: five from African States, four from Asian States, four from Latin American States, four from Western European and other States and two from Eastern European States.

23. Ms. CONDEVAUX (Assistant Secretary of the Council) said that the following candidates had received the support of their respective regional groups: Ghana, Kenya, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Nigeria and Rwanda to fill the five seats allocated to African States; Cyprus, India, Pakistan and Thailand to fill the four vacancies for Asian States; Chile, Costa Rica, Cuba and Nicaragua to fill the four vacancies for Latin American States; France, Sweden, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America to fill the four seats allocated to the group of Western European and other States; and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Yugoslavia to fill the two seats for members of the group of Eastern European States.

24. The PRESIDENT said that since the number of candidates in each group was equal to the number of vacancies, he would take it that the Council wished to elect by acclamation the candidates proposed by each Group.

*Chile, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, France, Ghana, India, Kenya, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Rwanda, Sweden, Thailand, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Yugoslavia were elected members of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations by acclamation for a four-year term beginning on 1 January 1983.***

COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES (E/1982/L.8/REV.1)

25. The PRESIDENT announced that 27 members were to be elected to the Committee on Natural Resources for a four-year term beginning on 1 January 1983. Thereafter the Council would proceed to the election of four members from Asian States to fill the vacancies postponed from previous sessions.

26. Ms. CONDEVAUX (Assistant Secretary of the Council) said that there were six vacancies for African States; the group of African States had endorsed the candidatures of Algeria, the Central African Republic, Liberia, Uganda, Upper Volta and Zimbabwe. The Asian States had endorsed Pakistan to fill one of the six vacancies for that region; the Latin American group had endorsed Bolivia and Mexico for the two vacancies for that region. There were nine vacancies for Western European and other States and the group of Western European and other States had endorsed the candidatures of Australia, Denmark, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Norway, Spain, Turkey and the United States of America. There were four vacancies for

Eastern European States and the Eastern European group had endorsed the German Democratic Republic and Yugoslavia to fill two of the vacancies.

27. The PRESIDENT said that the number of candidates nominated by the African States, the Latin American States and the group of Western European and other States was equal to the number of vacancies in each case and invited the Council to declare those candidates elected.

*Algeria, Australia, Bolivia, the Central African Republic, Denmark, France, the German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Liberia, Mexico, Norway, Pakistan, Spain, Turkey, Uganda, the United States of America, Upper Volta, Yugoslavia and Zimbabwe were elected members of the Committee on Natural Resources by acclamation for a four-year term beginning on 1 January 1983.***

28. The PRESIDENT said that the number of candidates proposed by the group of Asian States and by the group of Eastern European States had been less than the number of vacancies. He would take it that the Council would be prepared to postpone to a later date the election of the remaining five members from the Asian States and two members from the Eastern European States.

*It was so decided.***

29. Mr. KASEMSRI (Thailand) said that, in due course, the group of Asian States would submit candidates for the remaining five vacancies. The Committee on Natural Resources dealt with an issue which was very important for the Asian States.

COMMISSION ON TRANSNATIONAL CORPORATIONS (E/1982/L.4/REV.1)

30. The PRESIDENT announced that 16 members were to be elected to the Commission on Transnational Corporations for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1983.

31. Ms. CONDEVAUX (Assistant Secretary of the Council) said that the African States had endorsed the candidature of the Central African Republic, Kenya, Nigeria and Uganda to fill the four vacancies for that region. The group of Asian States had endorsed Indonesia and Thailand to fill two of the three vacancies for the Asian States. The Latin American States had four vacancies and had endorsed the candidature of the Bahamas, Brazil, Cuba and Mexico. The Western European and other States had endorsed the Netherlands, Norway, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America to fill the four vacancies for that group. The Eastern European States had endorsed the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to fill the vacancy for that group.

32. The PRESIDENT said that, since the number of candidates proposed by the five groups was equal to or—in the case of the group of Asian States—less than the number of vacancies, he would take it that the Council wished to elect the candidates proposed by the groups and to postpone to a later stage the election of the remaining member from the group of Asian States.

*It was so decided.***

*The Bahamas, Brazil, the Central African Republic, Cuba, Indonesia, Kenya, Mexico, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Thailand, Uganda, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America were elected members of the Commission on Transnational Corporations by acclamation for a three-year term, beginning on 1 January 1983.***

33. The PRESIDENT said that three members from the group of Asian States remained to be elected to fill vacancies postponed from earlier sessions, namely, one vacancy for a term beginning on the date of election and expiring on 31 December 1982, and two vacancies for a term beginning on the date of election and expiring on 31 December 1983. Since no candidates had been proposed for those remaining vacancies from the Asian States, he suggested that those elections should be postponed until a later stage.

*It was so decided.***

34. Mr. KASEMSRI (Thailand) said that he wished to reaffirm the determination of the group of Asian States to fill all vacancies in due course.

The meeting was suspended at 11.35 a.m. and resumed at 11.50 a.m.

EXECUTIVE BOARD OF THE UNITED NATIONS CHILDREN'S FUND (E/1982/L.5/REV.1 AND ADD.1)

35. The PRESIDENT said that the Council was required to elect for the Executive Board of the United Nations Children's Fund 10 States members of the United Nations or members of specialized agencies or of the International Atomic Energy Agency to the Executive Board of UNICEF to fill vacancies occurring on 31 July 1982. In addition, the General Assembly, by its resolution 36/244, had decided to enlarge the membership of the Executive Board from 30 to 41 members and had requested the Economic and Social Council to elect the additional 11 members at its current session. The Council was therefore called upon to elect 21 members for the Executive Board for a three-year term beginning on 1 August 1982.

36. Ms. CONDEVAUX (Assistant Secretary of the Council) read out the list of candidates in each regional group for membership of the Executive Board: for the African States: Algeria, the Central African Republic, Chad, Madagascar, Somalia, Swaziland and Upper Volta; for the Asian States: Bangladesh, Bahrain, Iraq, Japan, Lebanon, Nepal and the Syrian Arab Republic; for the Eastern European States: Hungary and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; for the Latin American States: Chile, Honduras, Mexico and Panama; for the Western European and other States: Australia, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Spain, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America. She announced that Indonesia had withdrawn its candidature as an Asian State.

37. The PRESIDENT suggested that, since the number of candidates proposed by the group of African States and the group of Eastern European States was equal to the number of vacancies for those groups, the Council should elect the candidates proposed by those groups by acclamation.

*Algeria, the Central African Republic, Chad, Hungary, Madagascar, Somalia, Swaziland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Upper Volta were elected members of the Executive Board of the United Nations Children's Fund by acclamation for a three-year term beginning on 1 August 1982.***

38. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect by secret ballot four members from the group of Asian States.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Bena (Romania) and Mr. Kaabachi (Tunisia) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

Number of ballot papers:	54
Invalid ballots:	0

Number of valid ballots:	54
Abstentions:	0
Number of members voting:	54
Required majority:	28
Number of votes obtained:	
Japan	48
Bangladesh	41
Nepal	34
Bahrain	27
Iraq	26
Lebanon	20
Syrian Arab Republic	12
Indonesia	2

*Having obtained the required majority and the largest number of votes, Bangladesh, Japan and Nepal were elected members of the Executive Board of the United Nations Children's Fund for a three-year term beginning on 1 August 1982.***

39. The PRESIDENT said that a second ballot would be held between Bahrain and Iraq to elect the remaining member for the group of Asian States.

40. Mr. ZIADA (Iraq) said that his delegation was happy to withdraw its candidature in favour of Bahrain.

*Bahrain was elected a member of the Executive Board of the United Nations Children's Fund for a three-year term beginning on 1 August 1982.***

41. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect by secret ballot three members from the group of Latin American States.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Bena (Romania) and Mr. Kaabachi (Tunisia) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

Number of ballot papers:	54
Invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	54
Abstentions:	0
Number of members voting:	54
Required majority:	28
Number of votes obtained:	
Mexico	43
Panama	43
Chile	28
Honduras	20

*Having obtained the required majority and the largest number of votes, Chile, Mexico and Panama were elected members of the Executive Board of the United Nations Children's Fund for a three-year term beginning on 1 August 1982.***

42. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect by secret ballot five members from the group of Western European and other States.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Bena (Romania) and Mr. Kaabachi (Tunisia) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

Number of ballot papers:	54
Invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	54
Abstentions:	0
Number of members voting:	54
Required majority:	28
Number of votes obtained:	
Italy	45
France	41
United States of America	41

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	36
Netherlands	33
Australia	29
Spain	19

*Having obtained the required majority and the largest number of votes, France, Italy, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America were elected members of the Executive Board of the United Nations Children's Fund for a three-year term beginning on 1 August 1982.***

COMMITTEE ON FOOD AID POLICIES AND PROGRAMMES
(E/1982/L.7)

43. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect five members of the Committee on Food Aid Policies and Programmes for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1983. The candidates were Upper Volta for the group of African States; Colombia and Mexico for the group of Latin American States; and Sweden and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland for the group of Western European and other States. Since the number of candidates in each group was in each case equal to the number of vacancies, he suggested that the Council should elect the candidates as members of the Committee by acclamation.

*Colombia, Mexico, Sweden, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Upper Volta were elected members of the Committee on Food Aid Policies and Programmes by acclamation for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1983.***

BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH AND
TRAINING INSTITUTE FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF WOMEN
(E/1982/L.16)

44. The PRESIDENT said that, in his note (E/1981/L.16), the Secretary-General had recommended the reappointment for a second term of membership, expiring on 30 June 1985, of the following four members of the Board of Trustees of the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women: Gulzar Bano (Pakistan), Ester Boserup (Denmark), Vilma Espín de Castro (Cuba) and Vida Tomsic (Yugoslavia). If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to reappoint those members.

*It was so decided.***

COMMITTEE FOR THE UNITED NATIONS
POPULATION AWARD

45. The PRESIDENT said that the Council had not yet determined the criteria to be used for the election of the 10 members of the Committee for the United Nations Population Award. Since negotiations were scheduled to take place at the Council's second regular session of 1982, he suggested that the question of the elections should be postponed until that time.

It was so decided.

COMMITTEE ON CRIME PREVENTION AND CONTROL
(E/1982/39/REV.1)

46. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect 14 members of the Committee on Crime Prevention and

Control, to fill vacancies occurring on 31 December 1982. General Assembly resolution 32/60, paragraph 4, required the members of the Committee to be elected by the Council for a term of four years, on the basis of the principle of equitable geographical distribution, from among experts who possessed the necessary qualifications and professional or scientific knowledge in the field and were nominated by Member States. In accordance with the pattern laid down in Council resolution 1979/30, the Council was required to elect three members from the African States, three from the Asian States, three from the Latin American States, three from the Western European and other States and two from the Eastern European States.

47. The names of the candidates submitted by Governments were given in document E/1982/39/Rev.1. The Secretariat had been informed that the group of African States had endorsed the candidates nominated by the Governments of Egypt, Mauritania and Zambia, the group of Latin American States had endorsed the candidates nominated by the Governments of Barbados, Bolivia and Costa Rica and the group of Eastern European States had endorsed the candidates nominated by the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Yugoslavia.

48. Mr. ALLAFI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that in view of the endorsement given by the group of African States to the candidates nominated by Egypt, Mauritania and Zambia, his Government wished to withdraw its nominated candidate from the election.

49. The PRESIDENT recalled that the representative of Bangladesh had announced at the beginning of the meeting his Government's withdrawal of its candidate for the Committee. As a result, in the case of the African States, the Asian States, the Latin American States and the Eastern European States, the number of candidates nominated by Governments and endorsed by their respective regional groups corresponded to the number of vacancies in those groups. He therefore suggested that the Council should elect the candidates of those groups by acclamation.

*Mr. Stanislav Vladimirovich Borodin (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. Dušan Cotič (Yugoslavia), Mr. Ahmad M. Khalifa (Egypt), Mr. Manuel López-Rey y Arrojo (Bolivia), Mr. Charles Alfred Lunn (Barbados), Mr. Jorge Arturo Montero Castro (Costa Rica), Mr. Mphanza Patrick Mvunga (Zambia), Mr. Amadou Racine Ba (Mauritania), Mr. Yoshio Suzuki (Japan), Mr. Mervyn Patrick Wijesinha (Sri Lanka) and Mr. Wu Han (China) were elected members of the Committee on Crime Prevention and Control by acclamation for a four-year term beginning 1 January 1983.***

50. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to proceed to elect by secret ballot three members from among the candidates nominated for the vacancies for the group of Western European and other States.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Galka (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) and Ms. Bellorini de Parrales (Nicaragua) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

<i>Number of ballot papers:</i>	54
<i>Invalid ballots:</i>	0
<i>Number of valid ballots:</i>	54
<i>Abstentions:</i>	0
<i>Number of members voting:</i>	54
<i>Required majority:</i>	28
<i>Number of votes obtained:</i>	
Mr. A. Bissonnette (Canada)	32
Mr. R. Linke (Austria)	25

Mrs S. A. Rozes (France)	22
Mr. E. Corves (Federal Republic of Germany)	20
Mr. E. J. H. Frencken (Belgium)	15
Mr. B. Svensson (Sweden)	15
Mr. M. A. Lopes Rocha (Portugal)	13
Mr. M. Cobo del Rosal (Spain)	10

Having obtained the required majority, Mr. Bissonnette (Canada) was elected a member of the Committee on Crime Prevention and Control for a four-year term beginning on 1 January 1983.**

51. The PRESIDENT said that, in accordance with rule 70, paragraph 2, of the rules of procedure of the Council, a special ballot would be held to break the tie between Mr. Frencken and Mr. Svensson.

At the invitation of the President, Mr Galka (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) and Ms. Moncada Bermúdez (Nicaragua) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

Number of ballot papers:	54
Invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	54
Abstentions:	1
Number of members voting:	53
Required majority:	27
Number of votes obtained:	
Mr. Svensson (Sweden)	27
Mr. Frencken (Belgium)	26

52. The PRESIDENT said that Mr. Svensson, having obtained the larger number of votes, would join the three other candidates who had previously obtained the greatest number of votes in a third ballot to elect two members from among the four.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

Number of ballot papers:	54
Invalid ballots:	0

Number of valid ballots:	54
Abstentions:	1
Number of members voting:	53
Required majority:	27
Number of votes obtained:	
Mr. Linke	29
Mrs. Rozes	24
Mr. Corves	22
Mr. Svensson	22

Having obtained the required majority, Mr. Linke (Austria) was elected a member of the Committee on Crime Prevention and Control for a four-year term beginning on 1 January 1983.**

53. The PRESIDENT said that, in accordance with rule 70, paragraph 2, of the Council's rules of procedure, a further special ballot would be held to break the tie between Mr. Corves and Mr. Svensson.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

Number of ballot papers:	53
Invalid ballots:	1
Number of valid ballots:	52
Abstentions:	4
Number of members voting:	48
Required majority:	25
Number of votes obtained:	
Mr. Corves	24
Mr. Svensson	24

54. The PRESIDENT said that, since both candidates had once again obtained the same number of votes, he had drawn lots in order to break the tie. As a result, Mr. Svensson would join Mrs. Rozes (France) in a fourth ballot to elect one member to fill the remaining vacancy. However, owing to the lateness of the hour, that final ballot would be deferred until the beginning of the following meeting.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.

27th meeting

Thursday, 6 May 1982, at 3.45 p.m.

President: Mr. Miljan KOMATINA (Yugoslavia).

E/1982/SR.27

In the absence of the President, Mr. Velloso (Brazil), Vice-President, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 13

Elections (concluded) (E/1982/39/Rev.1, E/1982/L.6)

COMMITTEE ON CRIME PREVENTION AND CONTROL (E/1982/REV.1)

1. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect one member to the Committee on Crime Prevention and Control from the group of Western European and other States for a four-year term beginning on 1 January 1983 on a third ballot, restricted to the candidates nominated by France and Sweden.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Galka (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) and Miss Moncada Bermúdez (Nicaragua) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

<i>Number of ballot papers:</i>	54
<i>Invalid ballots:</i>	0
<i>Number of valid ballots:</i>	54
<i>Abstentions:</i>	2
<i>Number of members voting:</i>	52
<i>Required majority:</i>	27
<i>Number of votes obtained:</i>	
<i>Mrs. Rozes (France)</i>	28
<i>Mr. Svensson (Sweden)</i>	24

*Having obtained the required majority, Mrs. Rozes (France) was elected to the Committee on Crime Prevention and Control for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1983.**

* See decision 1982/126.

AGENDA ITEM 8

2. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect one member to fill the seat vacated by Mr. Di Gennaro (Italy) and drew attention to document E/1982/39/Rev.1, paragraph 6, which indicated that the Government of Italy had nominated Mr. Gioacchino Polimeni for that seat. In the absence of other nominations and if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to elect Mr. Gioacchino Polimeni for a term beginning on the date of election and expiring on 31 December 1984.

*It was so decided.**

GOVERNING COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS
DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (E/1982/L.6)

3. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect 16 members to the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1983.

4. Ms. CONDEVAUX (Assistant Secretary of the Council) said that the candidates from the group of African States were the Central African Republic, Chad, Lesotho, Mauritania and the United Republic of Tanzania; in the group of Asian States and Yugoslavia, the candidates were Lebanon, Nepal, the Philippines, Thailand and Yugoslavia; in the group of Latin American States, the candidate was Brazil; in the group of Western European and other States, the candidates were Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland and France; and in the group of Eastern European States, the candidate was the German Democratic Republic.

5. The PRESIDENT said that the number of candidates in the groups of African States, Latin American States, Western European and other States and Eastern European States being equal to the number of vacancies for those groups, if he heard no objection he would take it that the Council wished to elect by acclamation the States belonging to the groups which had just been read out by the Assistant Secretary of the Council.

*It was so decided.**

6. The PRESIDENT said that a secret ballot would be taken to elect three members from the group of Asian States and Yugoslavia.

At the invitation of the President, Mrs. Ravn (Norway) and Miss Zanabria (Peru) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

<i>Number of ballot papers:</i>	54
<i>Invalid ballots:</i>	0
<i>Number of valid ballots:</i>	54
<i>Abstentions:</i>	0
<i>Number of members voting:</i>	54
<i>Required majority:</i>	28
<i>Number of votes obtained:</i>	
Yugoslavia.....	40
Nepal.....	34
Philippines.....	30
Thailand.....	28
Lebanon.....	23

Having obtained the required majority and the largest number of votes, Yugoslavia, Nepal and the Philippines were elected to the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1983.

7. The PRESIDENT said that the Council had concluded its consideration of item 13.

Mr. BHATT (Nepal), Vice-President, took the Chair.

Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (concluded)**
(E/1982/L.35/Rev.1, E/1982/L.38)

8. Mr. CHATTERJIE (United Kingdom) said that his delegation was grateful for the statement of financial implications (E/1982/L.38) of draft resolution E/1982/L.35/Rev.1, but felt that some points still needed to be clarified. In 1982, the Sessional Working Group's meetings had started one week before the Council's first regular session. He wondered if that had entailed additional expenditure, and, if not, whether additional expenditure would be involved if the Group began its meetings two weeks prior to the Council's session. He also wondered whether the statement of financial implications was an estimate of maximum expenditure, and if that amount might not actually be required.

9. Mr. SOFINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring to document E/1982/L.38, asked whether the travel expenses of the staff member of the Division of Human Rights had been unintentionally omitted. When the Sessional Working Group had met in the current year for a period beginning one week before the Council's session, \$US 336,900 had been required to service it. Document E/1982/L.38 indicated that the cost of the Group's beginning its meetings two weeks before the Council's session was estimated at \$US 274,400, in other words, at approximately \$US 100,000 less. He wondered whether that was the real cost or only an accounting figure. In a document of 1981 it was stipulated that the Sessional Working Group would not give rise to additional resource requirements for travel and subsistence of its members,¹ and he wondered if that statement could be reproduced in document E/1982/L.38.

10. Mr. FAREED (Pakistan) said he had understood that, in view of the proposal to have the period of overlap between the meetings of the Sessional Working Group and of the Council reduced to one week instead of two, the question was whether travel and other expenses would change, and, if so, how. What the Council was asking for was a comparison between expenditure under the existing system and expenditure under the new proposal, and document E/1982/L.38 did not respond to that request adequately.

11. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Council) said that the additional temporary assistance requirements for the 1983 session of the Working Group had not yet been approved by the General Assembly. At each session of the Assembly, it was customary for the Secretary-General to submit for approval the estimated temporary assistance requirements of the Department of Conference Services for the following calendar year. The total was based on the established schedule of meetings, the additional meetings requested and other departures from the calendar of meetings. The expenditure actually incurred did not necessarily correspond to the estimates.

12. Under draft resolution E/1982/L.35/Rev.1 the Working Group would begin its 1983 session only one week earlier than usual. Although the funds for that session had not yet been made available, they would be requested at the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly. The estimates had been prepared on a full-cost basis because, under the draft resolution, two weeks of meetings of the Working Group would be held before the first regular session of the

** Resumed from the 25th meeting.

¹ E/1981/64/Add.1, para. 6.

Council. In the event that the Council wished to have the meetings of the Working Group start a week before the Council's session, the Secretariat would provide the estimates for one week.

13. Mr. FAREED (Pakistan) said that the Council should bear in mind that the Working Group's 1983 session, like previous sessions, would last only three weeks. He wished to know what the difference would be, in terms of actual financial cost, between the existing arrangement for sessions of the Working Group and the change proposed in the draft resolution. The question of obtaining additional resources was a different matter altogether.

14. Mr. SCHLAFF (Department of Conference Services) said that the programme budget implications in document E/1982/L.38 had been prepared on the basis of two assumptions: first, that, in 1983, the Working Group would begin its meetings two weeks before the first regular session of the Council, instead of one week before, as in 1982; secondly, that Arabic would become an official language of the Working Group. The Council had been given an estimate, on a full-cost basis, of what the meetings of the Working Group would theoretically cost if no conference servicing facilities were available from the Department's permanent resources. At each session of the General Assembly, the Department and the Budget Division, in the light of the Department's permanent resources and on the basis of a calendar reflecting all United Nations meetings scheduled for the following year, submitted estimates of temporary assistance requirements.

15. The estimates submitted to the Council could be described as "opportunity costs". They would not necessarily correspond to the actual cost of the Working Group's meetings. In many similar cases, some of the services were provided by the permanent staff of the Department.

16. Mr. UY (Budget Division) said it had been expected that, in 1983, the Working Group would begin its three-week session one week before the first regular session of the Council. One staff member of the Division of Human Rights would normally assist in the preparation of the Working Group's report and follow the Council's discussion of the report. Under the draft resolution, the staff member would have to be in New York one week earlier. There would be no additional travel costs; provision had already been made for one staff member of the Division to travel to New York. On the other hand, the subsistence costs would be higher because of the extra week in New York.

17. Mr. CHATTERJIE (United Kingdom) said that, although the estimates represented opportunity costs based on the assumption that no conference facilities were available from the permanent resources, it was common knowledge that such facilities were available. He was interested to learn whether any opportunity costs had actually been incurred when the Working Group had begun its three-week session one week before the Council. If not, he wondered whether such costs could again be averted in 1983.

18. Mr. SOFINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether additional resources would be required under, or would be available from, the regular budget, if the Working Group were to begin its 1983 session two weeks before the Council.

19. Mr. FAREED (Pakistan) inquired what would be the comparative costs of a three-week session of the Working Group beginning one week before the first regular session of the Council and a session of the same duration beginning two weeks before the Council.

20. Mr. SCHLAFF (Department of Conference Services) replied that, if the Working Group began its 1983 session one week before the Council, the subsistence costs indi-

cated in paragraph 2 (a) of document E/1982/L.38 would not be incurred, while the conference servicing costs would be halved. With the co-operation of the Council, the current arrangement was to make available for meetings of the Working Group held during the session of the Council resources that would normally have been set aside for the Council itself. Needless to say, such an arrangement would not be possible when the Council was not in session.

21. With respect to the point raised by the United Kingdom representative, when the Working Group had begun its session one week before the first regular session of the Council, additional costs had been incurred. It was difficult to say, however, whether that was entirely due to that one week of meetings. Between early March and early June, the Department of Conference Services usually required temporary assistance because of the heavy schedule of meetings. Even if the Working Group did not meet during that period, temporary assistance would still be required. Because of the arrangement to which he had already referred, additional costs were not incurred when the Working Group met during the session of the Council; by the same token, however, such costs would be incurred if the Working Group met for a longer period before the session of the Council than in the past.

22. In reply to the Soviet representative, he stated that, for the time being, there were no additional resources available for 1983. Such resources would not become available until the total package of additional conference servicing requirements had been submitted to the General Assembly and it had been demonstrated to the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and to the Fifth Committee that the permanent resources were inadequate to meet the requirements.

23. Mr. BERGTHUN (Norway) inquired whether it was correct to say that no additional expenditure would be incurred if the Working Group met outside the peak periods.

24. Mr. SCHLAFF (Department of Conference Services) said it was possible that, if the Working Group met at Headquarters between the first week of January and the middle of February—normally a slack period in New York—no additional expenditure would be incurred. That might also be true for some periods during the summer. However, there were fewer and fewer periods at Headquarters and elsewhere when it was safe to say that additional resources would not be required for additional meetings scheduled.

25. Mr. UY (Budget Division) said that, whenever the Working Group met, certain substantive services had to be provided by the Division of Human Rights. If the Working Group met in New York at a time when staff members of the Division were not normally in New York, additional travel and subsistence requirements, of the order of \$3,000 to \$5,000, would have to be taken into account.

26. Mr. SOFINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether it was fair to conclude that the adoption of draft resolution E/1982/L.35/Rev.1 would necessitate additional resources which were not currently available.

27. Mr. FAREED (Pakistan) inquired whether the fact that resources were not currently available meant that they could not subsequently be made available by the General Assembly.

28. Mr. SCHLAFF (Department of Conference Services) said that, when the total package of conference servicing requirements was submitted to the General Assembly, it was hoped that the appropriations for the required services would be approved.

29. Mr. CHATTERJIE (United Kingdom) asked whether the costs indicated in document E/1982/L.38 represented the maximum theoretical costs, which could exceed the actual costs.

30. Mr. VEITIA (Venezuela) said that, according to paragraph 2 of document E/1982/L.38, the costs of two weeks of meetings of the Working Group before the start of the first regular session of the Council were estimated at \$274,400. In the past, the Working Group had begun its session one week before the Council. In other words, under the draft resolution, there would be one additional week of meetings before the session of the Council. It therefore appeared that the estimated cost for that additional week of meetings was \$137,200.

31. Mr. SCHLAFF (Department of Conference Services) said that the estimates represented the maximum costs, though he would hesitate to predict that the actual costs would be much lower, given the heavy schedule of meetings during the period in question.

32. If the Working Group began its session one week before the Council, the conference servicing costs would be \$136,800. If, however, the proposal in draft resolution E/1982/L.35/Rev.1 was adopted, the estimate of \$273,600 would remain valid.

33. Mrs. ARANA (Peru) asked whether the additional resources for one week of meetings of the Working Group would be \$137,200 or \$136,800. The latter figure represented one half of the conference servicing costs, and did not include subsistence costs.

34. Mr. VEITIA (Venezuela) asked whether it was safe to say that the real financial implications of the draft resolution amounted to \$137,200. It still appeared to him that the additional one week of meetings before the first regular session of the Council should not cost \$274,400.

35. Mr. MARDOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that it was perhaps inappropriate to use the terms "minimum" and "maximum" in relation to the estimated costs. An examination of past expenditure figures raised certain questions regarding the accuracy of the current estimates. The latter apparently failed to take into account such relevant factors as the decline in the value of the United States dollar and the rate of inflation. He called on the representative of the Department of Conference Services to give his views on the accuracy of the current estimates.

36. Mr. WINDMULLER (United States of America) said he understood that the conference servicing costs indicated in paragraph 2 (b) of document E/1982/L.38 were opportunity costs, which could be reduced if the Working Group met early in the year or only during the session of the Council. He asked when the busy period normally started, and whether the opportunity costs would be \$136,800 if the Working Group began its session one week before the Council.

37. He understood that the subsistence costs for one staff member of the Division of Human Rights might be greater if the Working Group met earlier in the year. It might be possible, however, for the Division's New York Office to provide the services that would have been provided by that staff member. The subsistence component in paragraph 2 (a) of document E/1982/L.38 would thereby be eliminated.

38. Mr. SOFINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he was glad to note that the United Kingdom representative and the representative of the Budget Division both thought that the financial implications in document E/1982/L.38 represented the maximum possible cost of the Group's meetings. He would share their optimism but for

the fact that Russian had been omitted from the list of languages in paragraph 2 (b) (ii). Under rule 32 of the rules of procedure Russian was an official language of the Council, and he was sure that Russian speakers in the Group of Experts would wish to have summary records in Russian. To provide them would obviously involve additional expense, and the total figure in E/1982/L.38 would thereby be increased.

39. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Council) replied that, although the Council had five official languages, and in 1983 would have six, summary records were issued only in the working languages, which were English, French and Spanish.

40. Mr. CORTI (Argentina) said that the draft resolution had been under discussion for three days, and he thought the Council was wasting time. In any case, in the debate on revitalization of the Council (agenda item 7) suggestions had been made regarding the possibility of relocating the session of the Commission on Human Rights and even of holding it concurrently with the second regular session of the Council; it might therefore be better to postpone further consideration of the draft resolution until it could be taken up in conjunction with the draft resolutions relating to those other meetings.

41. Mr. SCHLAFF (Department of Conference Services) said that, since the Council was responsible for reviewing the organization and administrative arrangements of the Group, it must take a decision on the timing of the Group's session. If the Group started its meetings one week before the Council session it would cost \$137,200; if it started two weeks before, it would cost \$274,400, as shown in document E/1982/L.38. As the representative of the Byelorussian SSR had pointed out, both figures were lower than that given previously for a three-week session which did not coincide with the Council's session; that was because when the Group met during the Council's session, it was able to share the conference facilities provided for the Council without extra cost.

42. In response to the United States representative's question, he said he was not sure whether the same arrangement would hold good if the entire three weeks of the Group's session were to be concurrent with the Council's session. The "busy season" at Headquarters currently ran from early March to early June, and from then until mid-August there was a heavy schedule of meetings at Geneva and elsewhere which generally necessitated transfers of conference servicing staff from New York.

43. Mr. RANGACHARI (India) said he had been looking into the history of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights to see how some of its provisions had evolved since the drafting process first began. What had emerged most clearly from his investigations was the long-standing lack of consensus on the best way of monitoring implementation. In the debate in 1966, when the Covenant had been formally adopted by the General Assembly in its resolution 2200 A (XXI), a number of different views had been expressed; it had even been suggested that a group of experts should be set up to perform the task. The decision requiring States parties to submit reports to the Secretary-General for transmission to the Council had been taken in the expectation, since unfulfilled, that most members of the Council would sign and ratify the Covenant.

44. He drew attention to three further Council decisions which had a bearing on the composition of the Group of Experts. First, it had been decided in 1976 in resolution 1988 (LX) that a sessional working group of the Council with appropriate representation of States parties to the Covenant, and with due regard to equitable geographical

distribution, should be established by the Council. He stressed the words "with appropriate representation of States parties". Secondly, in its decision 1978/10 the Council had amended that provision by deciding to establish a sessional working group composed of 15 members of the Council which were also States parties to the Covenant. That was a significant change. Thirdly, decision 1981/158 had confirmed and further elaborated the provisions of decision 1978/10.

45. The draft resolution in document E/1982/L.35/Rev.1 took a further step in the same direction: subparagraph (b) of the operative paragraph stated that the 15 members were to be elected by the Council from among the States parties, but did not say that they must be members of the Council. It was right that a distinction should be drawn between Council members who were States parties to the Covenant and those who were not, and his delegation thought that the distinction should extend also to those who elected the Group of Experts. He had understood from consultations with the sponsors of the draft resolution and with the representative of the Office of Legal Affairs that it would be legally acceptable for the Council to stipulate that those members who elected the Group of Experts must themselves be States parties to the Covenant. He therefore proposed that the first part of subparagraph (b) of the operative paragraph should be amended to read "The 15 members of the Group of Experts shall be elected by those members of the Economic and Social Council who are also States parties to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, from among the States parties to the International Covenant...".

46. Mr. BOUFFANDEAU (France) said that the sponsors of the draft resolution were prepared to accept the Indian representative's amendment.

47. Mr. SOFINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that before a final decision was taken on the draft resolution he would like to know which of the amendments suggested by his delegation had been accepted by the sponsors. They had been put forward in the course of consultations, and he had thought that the sponsors had agreed to them, but they did not seem to have been incorporated into the revised text. He was referring in particular to his delegation's proposal that the words "articles 21 and 22" in the first preambular paragraph and in subparagraph (d) of the operative paragraph should be replaced by the words "part IV". His delegation saw no reason to single out individual articles of the Covenant.

48. There was some confusion in the wording of subparagraph (b) of the operative paragraph. First, whereas subparagraphs (b) (i) and (b) (iv) referred to members of the Group of Experts, subparagraph (b) (vi) contained the words "Each member State elected to the Group of Experts". In his delegation's view "Member States" rather than "members" was correct. Secondly, subparagraph (b) (iii) stated that the first elections should take place during the resumed second regular session of 1982, but subparagraph (b) (vi) omitted to say at which session the Member States elected to the Group of Experts should designate persons to represent them. Thirdly, he thought that whereas there was a reference, in subparagraph (c), to the possibility of extending the session of the Group, it would be logical also to mention the possibility of shortening it. Finally, with reference to subparagraph (f), his delegation doubted whether it would be necessary for the Council to review the composition, organization and administrative arrangements of the Group of Experts as often as every three years.

49. Mr. FAREED (Pakistan) observed that if the Indian representative's amendment were adopted the Council

would be obliged to discriminate against 23 of its members which, like Pakistan, were not States parties to the Covenant. The question was whether the responsibility given to the Council as a whole under article 16 of the Covenant could be transferred by the Council to a limited number of its members. He would like the representative of the Office of Legal Affairs to give an opinion on that point.

50. The comments made by the Soviet representative seemed apt, and he thought that the sponsors of the draft resolution should respond to them before any action was taken.

51. Mr. SZEREMETA (Poland) said that judging from what he had heard some members were not ready to take action on the draft resolution. It might therefore be best to postpone further consideration of it and allow time for members to consult among themselves and clarify their positions. If necessary the whole question could be deferred until 1983.

52. Mr. FAREED (Pakistan) said that the Council would still face the same problems if it took the question up again at a later date. The explanations requested might be given at once in the interest of progress.

53. Mr. BORCHARD (Federal Republic of Germany) said that the sponsors of the draft resolution had done their best to accommodate the wishes of those who had submitted amendments, notably the Soviet delegation. They were, however, still prepared to consider further changes. He invited the Soviet representative to read out the text of his proposed amendments to subparagraphs (b) (i), (b) (iii) and (b) (vi) of the operative paragraph.

54. Mr. SOFINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he still wanted to know which of the oral amendments put forward by his delegation in the Working Group had been incorporated into the revised version of the draft resolution. So far as he could see, very few of them had been taken up. Nevertheless, the revised text was more generally acceptable than the earlier version, and his delegation thought that, if time were allowed for more consultations before any action was taken, it might eventually be adopted by consensus. He therefore supported the suggestion of the Argentine and Polish representatives that further consideration of the item should be postponed, perhaps until the next session.

55. Mr. BELL (Canada) thought that the draft resolution had been thoroughly discussed already. The Indian and Soviet representatives had each identified what they saw as problems in the text. The Indian representative had proposed an amendment which, it seemed, was acceptable to the sponsors, although the Canadian delegation had difficulties with it. If the Soviet representative was as dissatisfied with the text as he seemed to be, he should likewise submit specific amendments which could be considered by the Council.

56. Mr. FAREED (Pakistan), feeling some of the points he had raised had not been fully clarified, asked whether the members of the Council who were not parties to the Covenant were excluded from voting on the draft resolution.

57. Mr. SZASZ (Office of Legal Affairs), replying to questions raised, said that the amendment proposed by the representative of India was legally quite proper since the responsibility given to the Council under the Covenant could be discharged either by the Council itself or through subsidiary organs. There was, therefore, no legal objection to the Council delegating its responsibility to some of its members, thus excluding other members. However, when it came to the draft resolution and any future changes to the

procedure provided for in it, all members of the Council were entitled to vote. He stressed that the group of members to which responsibility would be delegated would be one of unpredictable size and geographical distribution because it was necessarily restricted to States which were both members of the Council and parties to the Covenant.

58. Mr. BORCHARD (Federal Republic of Germany) said that the representative of the Soviet Union should be well aware which of his concerns had been covered in the revised draft resolution: nearly all of them had been incorporated into the text. Some of the proposals he had made during the meeting were new and had not been raised in the informal consultations. In the interest of good procedure, the representative of the Soviet Union should read out a specific text containing those new proposals and, if he could not provide such a text, the Council should conclude that none existed and proceed accordingly.

59. Mr. FAREED (Pakistan) said that, if the original intention had been that implementation of the Covenant should be supervised by the parties to it, such a procedure would have been included in the Covenant itself. Despite the legal opinion given, he still had doubts concerning the amendment proposed by the representative of India since it would mean that members of the Council would have no right to discharge an obligation placed on them by the Covenant. He would, however, accept it.

60. In order to expedite the work, he proposed, under rule 51 of the rules of procedure, the closure of the debate on the revised draft resolution and requested a separate vote on the revisions to subparagraph (b) of the operative paragraph introduced orally by the sponsors.

61. The PRESIDENT read out rule 51 of the rules of procedure, under which permission to speak on the motion could be accorded only to two representatives opposing the closure, after which the motion was to be put to the vote immediately.

62. Mr. MARDOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the longer the debate had continued on the draft resolution, the more its deficiencies had become apparent and the greater the confusion and doubts surrounding it had become. For example, no reason was given as to why the Council should move away from the principle of appointing members of the Group to the completely new principle of electing them.

63. Mr. BELL (Canada), speaking on a point of order, said that, under rule 51, representatives speaking on the motion could only oppose it and could not go into the substantive aspects of the issue, as the representative of the Byelorussian SSR appeared to be doing.

64. Mr. SOFINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking against the closure of the debate, said that there were still many deficiencies in the text of the draft resolution and the debate on it should be allowed to continue so that amendments, including those of his delegation, could be submitted.

65. Mr. WINDMULLER (United States of America) said that it was too early to close the debate on the item since a number of delegations, including his own, still had suggestions to offer.

66. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the motion of the representative of Pakistan.

The motion for the closure of debate was adopted by 20 votes to 8, with 12 abstentions.

67. Mr. SOFINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that the vote on the draft resolution should be postponed since the text had not been sufficiently discussed.

68. The PRESIDENT asked the representative of the Soviet Union if he was requesting adjournment of the meeting, since the Council had no further business before it.

69. Mr. SOFINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) replied that he had proposed that the vote on the draft resolution should be postponed and, therefore, that the meeting should be adjourned.

70. Mr. FAREED (Pakistan) said that it was his understanding of the rules of procedure that delegations could still introduce amendments to the draft resolution.

71. After a procedural discussion in which the PRESIDENT, Mr. BORCHARD (Federal Republic of Germany), Mr. BELL (Canada), Mr. SOFINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) and Mrs. ARANA (Peru) took part, Mr. VERKERCKE (Belgium) proposed the suspension of the meeting under rule 49 of the rules of procedure.

The proposal to suspend the meeting was adopted by 26 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

The meeting was suspended at 6.50 p.m. and resumed at 7.05 p.m.

72. Mr. ESAN (Nigeria), feeling that the right atmosphere did not exist for the Council to take a decision on the draft resolution, proposed the adjournment of the meeting, under rule 49 of the rules of procedure.

The proposal to adjourn the meeting was rejected by 18 votes to 14, with 4 abstentions.

73. Mr. BORCHARD (Federal Republic of Germany) pointed out in the interest of clarity that the sponsors of the draft resolution had already agreed to change the phrase "Group of Governmental Experts" in subparagraph (a) of the operative paragraph to "Sessional Working Group of Governmental Experts".

74. He suggested that the Council should proceed to the vote immediately, as the debate had been closed.

75. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Council) recalled that the representative of Pakistan had requested a separate vote on the revisions introduced orally by the sponsors to subparagraph (b) of draft resolution E/1982/L.35/Rev.1, as orally revised.

76. Mr. THWAITES (Australia), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that, as Australia was a State party to the Covenant, the Australian delegation basically sympathized with the concerns expressed by the representative of India but felt that they were met by the fact that only States parties to the Covenant could participate in the Working Group. The proposed amendment would lead to an unpredictable situation and it would be safer to retain the original wording in the revised draft resolution. His delegation would therefore vote against the amendment.

77. Mr. VERKERCKE (Belgium) said that his delegation would abstain since, while it understood the concerns of the States parties to the Covenant, the situation might arise where no member of the Council was a party to the Covenant and, indeed, that possibility might influence the elections to the Council itself.

78. Mr. ESAN (Nigeria) said that his delegation would vote against the amendment because it was restrictive. In its opinion, the Covenant gave the Council the right to elect members of the Working Group. Furthermore, the principle of equitable geographical distribution might be jeopardized under the procedure provided for by the amendment.

79. Miss LUANGHY (Zaire) said that the right to elect members of the Group should not be restricted to States parties to the Covenant since, after all, the Group's report was submitted to the Council, which had to take a decision

on it. Her delegation would therefore vote against the amendment.

80. Mr. EKANEY (United Republic of Cameroon) said that his delegation would vote against the amendment since it would set a bad precedent by excluding some Council members from a decision which affected all of them. If the amendment was adopted, his delegation would abstain from voting on the draft resolution itself.

81. Mr. CORTI (Argentina) said that his delegation would vote against the amendment since, while it sympathized with the underlying intentions, it felt it would be better to change the Covenant itself.

82. Mr. JOHNSON (Benin) said that his delegation would vote against the amendment for the same reasons as those stated by the representatives of Zaire, the United Republic of Cameroon and Nigeria.

83. Mr. BELL (Canada) said that his delegation would vote against the amendment since it changed the intention of the drafters of the Covenant, who had assigned to the Council as a whole the responsibility for its implementation. His delegation supported the trend referred to by the representative of India towards giving States parties a more active role in monitoring the implementation of the Covenant but felt that the text of the revised draft resolution was consistent with it since the monitoring mechanism, the Working Group, was composed entirely of States parties.

84. Mr. ALI (Bangladesh) said that his delegation would vote against the amendment since it felt it would set a bad precedent. As all members of the Council could consider the report of the Working Group on its activities, it would be a contradiction to restrict their voting rights. Furthermore, the situation might arise where only a few, if any, of the States parties were members of the Council.

85. Mr. DYRLUND (Denmark) said that his delegation would vote against the amendment since it doubted whether it was in conformity with article 16 of the Covenant, which gave the Council responsibility for implementing the Covenant.

86. Ms. ZONICLE (Bahamas) said that the position of the sponsors of the draft resolution with respect to the amendment proposed by India had put her delegation, which was not a State party to the Covenant, in a very delicate position. However, given the clarification made by the representative of the Office for Legal Affairs concerning the powers of the Council and given the intentions of the States parties when the proposal for action by the Council had been made, her delegation would vote against the amendment and in favour of the text in document E/1982/L.35/Rev.1.

87. Mr. ORDZHONIKIDZE (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) sought clarification from the sponsors of the draft resolution regarding their position on the proposed amendment. Since the representative of France had accepted the amendment proposed by the representative of India on behalf of the sponsors, that amendment had become part of the draft resolution itself.

88. The PRESIDENT said that, before inviting the Council to vote on the amendment submitted by the Indian representative, he would ask the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution to read out the text of that amendment.

89. Mr. BORCHARD (Federal Republic of Germany) said that the first part of subparagraph (b) of the operative paragraph, as amended by India and agreed by the sponsors, would read: "The 15 members of the Group of Experts shall be elected by those members of the Economic and Social Council who are also States parties to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, from

among the States parties to the International Covenant, in accordance . . .".

At the request of the representative of India, a vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, India, Iraq, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Poland, Romania, Tunisia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

Against: Argentina, Australia, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Benin, Canada, Denmark, Japan, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Portugal, Thailand, United Republic of Cameroon, United States of America, Zaire.

Abstaining: Austria, Belgium, China, Fiji, Greece, Italy, Mexico.

The revisions to subparagraph (b) of the operative paragraph of the revised draft resolution introduced orally by the sponsors were rejected by 16 votes to 14, with 7 abstentions.

90. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to take action on the draft resolution contained in E/1982/L.35/Rev.1 as a whole, with the oral revisions which had not met with objections.

At the request of the representative of the United Kingdom, a vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Fiji, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, India, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Portugal, Romania, Tunisia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Abstaining: Argentina, Benin, China, Nepal, Poland, Thailand, United Republic of Cameroon.

Draft resolution E/1982/L.35/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted by 29 votes to 3, with 7 abstentions (resolution 1982/33).

91. Mr. ORDZHONIKIDZE (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, although his delegation had done its best to co-operate in the work on agenda item 8 and had hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus, it had found some of the provisions of the text ambiguous and had consequently had to vote against it.

92. Mr. BORCHARD (Federal Republic of Germany) said he regretted that it had not been possible to adopt the draft resolution without a vote. The sponsors had done everything possible to make it generally acceptable. He hoped that despite the difficulties encountered in adopting it the resolution would be used by the Council and the Group of Experts to guide them in their work in a spirit of understanding and co-operation.

93. Mr. MARDOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that his delegation had voted against the draft resolution because it provided for changes in the existing arrangements which, in its view, would not facilitate implementation of the Covenant.

94. The PRESIDENT announced that the Council had concluded its consideration of agenda item 8.

The meeting rose at 8 p.m.

28th meeting

Friday, 7 May 1982, at 10.55 a.m.

President: Mr. Miljan KOMATINA (Yugoslavia).

E/1982/SR.28

In the absence of the President, Mr. Morden (Canada), Vice-President, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 9

Human rights questions (E/1982/12 and Corr.1, E/1982/59, E/1982/63)

REPORT OF THE SECOND (SOCIAL) COMMITTEE (E/1982/59)

1. Mr. SRITHIRATH (Observer for the Lao People's Democratic Republic) said that despite the encouraging progress made in the advancement of human rights, particularly economic, social and cultural rights, since the establishment of the United Nations, the persistence of cynical human rights violations in such places as South Africa, the Israeli-occupied territories, Chile and the Republic of Korea had been justly condemned by peace-loving peoples everywhere despite the efforts of the responsible imperialist Powers to justify them. It was particularly ironic that certain imperialist Powers and certain countries of South-East Asia had submitted a draft decision to the Economic and Social Council (E/1982/C.2/L.10) in the Second (Social) Committee (see E/1982/59, para. 50, draft decision XVII) designed to ensure the persistence of a foreign occupation which prevented the people of Kampuchea from exercising its right of self-determination. It would also be unfortunate in that connection to overlook the violation of the right to self-determination of certain countries of Western Europe through the permanent stationing in them since the end of the Second World War of hundreds of thousands of foreign troops equipped with nuclear weapons which could destroy a whole continent. That applied equally to some of the countries of South-East Asia which had sponsored the aforementioned draft decision, the inconsistency and partisanship of which the Council should expose by conducting a comparative study of the situation in Kampuchea during and after the bloody Pol Pot régime. To impede the legitimate and natural process by which Kampuchea was now heroically overcoming the effects of the holocaust to which it had been subjected would be tantamount to countenancing the shameless violation of the most elementary human rights.

2. His delegation therefore rejected any wording relating to the so-called question of Kampuchea in that draft decision and whole-heartedly supported the rejection by the Government of Kampuchea of Commission on Human Rights resolution 1982/13 (see E/1982/12 and Corr.1, chap. XXVI, sect. A) on the grounds that the Commission had abused the confidence of the peoples who cared for peace and justice and had abandoned its own principles by serving the propaganda of the perpetrators of genocide who had martyred the Kampuchean people. Kampuchea had repeatedly rejected any resolution regarding it adopted by any conference without its participation and strongly condemned Commission resolution 1982/13 as an inadmissible interference in its internal affairs.

3. His delegation therefore appealed to all the countries concerned, particularly those of South-East Asia, to follow

the wise example of Indonesia on that question and to adopt a realistic attitude towards the martyred people of Kampuchea because the alternative was to perpetuate the existing impasse which prevented a solution that would benefit not only the people of Kampuchea but also the other peoples of the region who wanted to live in peace, friendship and co-operation.

4. Mr. ROMERO SANCHEZ (Observer for El Salvador) said that he wished to comment on Commission on Human Rights resolution 1982/28 (*ibid.*) and on draft decision VIII in the report of the Second (Social) Committee (see E/1982/59, para. 50).

5. Commission on Human Rights resolution 1982/28 went beyond the bounds of human rights and constituted a clearly prejudiced and politically motivated violation of the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of States. In stating that conditions in El Salvador for the effective exercise of civil and political rights, as contemplated by the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, did not currently exist, the resolution was completely unrealistic. The free and popular elections to the Constituent Assembly held recently in El Salvador were the clearest proof of the unrealistic nature of the premises underlying a resolution which, ironically, also ignored the reality of the violence and terror with which his country had to contend. An extremely high percentage of the electorate in El Salvador had bravely and civic-mindedly exercised its inalienable right to vote throughout the national territory in elections which had been witnessed by observers from many different countries and parties as well as by the international press. His Government therefore failed to understand how draft decision VIII, based on such an unrealistic resolution, could be adopted through simple inertia in a vote in the Council which reflected either bureaucratic routine or the urging of biased countries which wished to slander El Salvador.

6. Equally absurd in the resolution was the "appeal . . . to the Government of El Salvador to work together with all representative political forces in El Salvador towards a comprehensive negotiated political solution". A minority could never impose its will through force of arms on the will of the overwhelming majority of a people, particularly when it had been expressed in free, universal and democratic elections. National sovereignty could not be undermined by compromises or agreements with groups which had chosen to exclude themselves from the democratic electoral process, which was the only way for political groups to achieve representation. No joint declarations by third countries or United Nations resolutions inspired by them could take precedence over the legitimate expression of the will of the Salvadorian people.

7. The reports submitted by the Special Representative of the Commission were equally unbalanced and tendentious because they contained unfounded statements, partial judgments and distorted information and reflected an interventionist approach. His Government therefore could not accept such reports or recognize the legitimacy of the appointment of the Special Representative.

8. Even more important, resolution 1982/28 reflected concepts which ran counter to the political sovereignty of the State and presumed to impose decisions which were exclusively within the domain of the Government and people of El Salvador. His Government therefore attributed no legal or moral force to that resolution or to any other decision or resolution deriving from it.
9. Mrs. NGUYEN NGOC DUNG (Observer for Viet Nam) said that her delegation wished to express her country's formal disapproval of draft decision XVII, recommended by the Second (Social) Committee (*ibid.*) for adoption by the Council, as well as of Commission on Human Rights resolutions 1982/13, 1982/14 and 1982/26 (see E/1982/12 and Corr.1, chap. XXVI, sect. A), which constituted interference in the internal affairs of the States concerned, whose categorical objections her delegation supported.
10. Draft decision XVII reflected misinterpretations of the relevant resolutions adopted in previous years by the Commission on Human Rights and by the General Assembly at its International Conference on Kampuchea in 1981.
11. Everyone knew that the peoples of Viet Nam, Kampuchea and the Lao People's Democratic Republic wanted an end to the sufferings which had accompanied its long and bloody war of liberation and still awaited the peace and security they needed in order to rebuild their countries; and that their dearly bought independence and self-determination were threatened by the policy of revenge, encirclement, blockade and pressure being pursued on the political, economic and military levels by the United States and China in flagrant violation of the fundamental principles of the Charter of the United Nations.
12. Draft decision XVII and the resolutions which it mentioned gave a completely distorted version of who were the real perpetrators and who the victims of violations of the right to self-determination. Its call for the withdrawal of Vietnamese troops from Kampuchea was tantamount to a denial of the right of the victims of acts of destabilization and of threats of war to join in common defence, and it thereby prepared the way for a return of the perpetrators of genocide in Kampuchea while 400,000 Chinese troops remained permanently massed on the frontiers of Viet Nam. Her Government had repeatedly stated that its troops would be withdrawn immediately from Kampuchea as soon as the threat of war from China ceased to exist. The same countries which claimed to defend the right of self-determination of the Kampuchean people were the very ones which were trying to establish a loose coalition to choose their own leaders for the people of Kampuchea, a choice which only the Kampuchean people could make. Her Government supported the rejection by the Government of Kampuchea of all resolutions concerning that country which had been adopted without the participation of its representatives as an inadmissible interference in internal affairs. Viet Nam persisted in its determination not only to defend its own independence, sovereignty and right of self-determination but also to help the friendly neighbouring country of Kampuchea in its task of reconstruction and national defence in accordance with agreements between them and in accordance with the urgent requirements of collective security.
13. Her delegation strongly hoped that the members of the Economic and Social Council would show their respect for the right of self-determination by refusing to join in any decisions which encouraged the policy of revanchist and war-mongering Powers designed to undermine both the reconstruction efforts of the Kampuchean people and the peace and security of the countries of South-East Asia.
14. Mr. CASTILLO-ARRIOLA (Observer for Guatemala) said that, in recent years, his country had been deeply concerned at the escalation of violence throughout the world, a violence which his country had itself suffered as a result of social and economic imbalances, political strife, and national and international interests in the region, quite apart from actual criminality, all of which had led to the violation of human rights and the loss of human lives. Guatemala, like every other country, had been powerless to escape international terrorism, an infamous form of terrorist struggle that was seeking in vain to institutionalize itself throughout the world.
15. As a third world and Latin American country, Guatemala had always pursued the goals of economic and social development in co-operation with all democratic and peace-loving nations. As a sovereign, independent State, however, it could not accept interference in what were strictly its own internal affairs.
16. His delegation had participated as an observer in the work of the thirty-seventh session of the Commission on Human Rights, when the latter had dealt with the situation of human rights in Guatemala, and had co-operated with the Commission in every possible way, with the result that the Commission had adopted resolution 33 (XXXVII) which, in view of the deterioration of the human rights situation in Guatemala, had requested the Secretary-General to establish direct contacts with the Government of Guatemala on the human rights situation in that country and to report thereon to the Commission at its thirty-eighth session.
17. In July 1981, the Secretariat had chosen a representative of the Secretary-General to visit Guatemala. Since the person concerned was far from impartial, however, his Government had requested that another representative be appointed. When that had proved impossible, the Government had rejected the idea that any representative should visit Guatemala at the end of 1982, given the partiality of the Special Rapporteur who had been sent to neighbouring countries.
18. It was therefore understandable that, at its thirty-eighth session, the Commission should have been discouraged at the lack of information on Guatemala. In adopting its resolution 1982/31 and providing for a Special Rapporteur to visit that country, however, it had taken no account of the situation that had prevented the Secretary-General from fulfilling his mandate.
19. On 7 March 1982, the Guatemalan people had participated democratically in national elections. When, following accusations of electoral fraud, the Government's official candidate had none the less been elected President, junior officers of the Guatemalan Army had seized power in order to restore democratic institutions, eliminate administrative and political corruption and ensure the effective protection of human rights. A military junta had been set up which, in addition to fulfilling its international commitments and pledging respect for the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the charter of the Organization of American States, had given a solemn undertaking to respect human rights and fundamental freedoms.
20. Since then, the junta had taken effective steps to fulfil its promises, dissolving all the secret police and paramilitary organizations accused of crimes against the integrity and security of the human person and bringing many of their members, as well as numerous other officials, to trial. The junta had declared its readiness to open its doors to any international or private entity which might wish to investigate the human rights situation, in particular the Commission on Human Rights. The junta had nothing to hide and

was itself investigating the human rights violations perpetrated under the former régime.

21. Pending reform of the electoral system, the election of a national constituent assembly and the drafting of a new constitution, the junta would be guided by a political statute, the basic aim of which was the early restoration of constitutionality and democracy. Rules of conduct had already begun to be drafted for State institutions, the judiciary was being restructured and the electoral system was being reformed so that it operated democratically and made electoral fraud impossible. In taking such action, the junta enjoyed the support of the population and a climate of trust and tranquillity had been restored. The financial situation was becoming stable and violence had decreased dramatically, except in outlying areas where there were still armed confrontations between the army and guerrilla fighters. Finally, the Political Charter that had entered into force on 29 April and would operate until a new constitution was adopted contained express provisions for the safeguarding of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

22. He therefore requested that, before passing judgement on the implications of resolution 1982/31, the Council should consider the fact that, under the new Government, human rights were no longer violated in Guatemala but rather guaranteed by a new legal order, acts of violence had been all but eradicated, those responsible for human rights violations in the past were being brought to justice and *habeas corpus* and *amparo* were being strictly observed. The Council might therefore reconsider the advisability of appointing a Special Rapporteur to investigate the human rights situation in Guatemala. His Government, for its part, was prepared to co-operate fully with the Council and the Commission in their efforts to protect and defend human rights.

23. Mr. THIOUNN (Observer for Democratic Kampuchea) said he wished to thank all those members of the Second (Social) Committee that had voted in favour of draft decision E/1982/C.2/L.10, which the Council had before it as draft decision XVII. That vote had once again confirmed that the international community did not accept the *fait accompli* of the Vietnamese invasion of Kampuchea and offered new encouragement to the just struggle being waged by the people of Kampuchea under the leadership of the Government of Democratic Kampuchea. That Government had reiterated only recently that it would continue to do all it could to bring that war to an end and that, although the war was going increasingly in its favour, it did not wish to solve the problem of Kampuchea solely by armed struggle. It was always ready to consider any appropriate measures to resolve that situation, so long as they resulted in the full withdrawal of Vietnamese forces from Kampuchea and enabled the people of Kampuchea to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination.

24. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on draft resolutions I to VII and draft decisions I to XX, contained, respectively, in paragraphs 49 and 50 of the report of the Second (Social) Committee (E/1982/59).

Draft resolution I was adopted by 51 votes to none, with 1 abstention (resolution 1982/34).

25. Mr. MASSOT (Brazil) speaking in explanation of vote, observed that the working group established by paragraph 1 of draft resolution I was to review information provided annually by the Secretary-General on the basis of replies received from Governments. Such a provision established a system of annual reporting by Governments for which there was no legal basis. It was, moreover, premature to establish such a working group when the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protec-

tion of Minorities had yet to receive a full report on the question. His delegation had therefore abstained from voting on the draft resolution.

Draft resolutions II, III, IV and V were adopted without a vote (resolutions 1982/35, 1982/36, 1982/37 and 1982/38).

26. Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that draft resolution VI dealt with a particularly important issue at a time when the United States authorities were holding a 14-year-old Soviet child illegally on the grounds that he was seeking political asylum in the United States. Such action defied common sense and the United States had no legal authority to separate the child from his parents. Draft resolution VI condemned such cynical violations of the rights of children and their parents.

Draft resolution VI was adopted without a vote (resolution 1982/39).

Draft resolution VII was adopted without a vote (resolution 1982/40).

27. Mr. GERSHMAN (United States of America) recalled that, in earlier debate on the issues involved in draft resolution VII, his delegation had expressed the view that the report of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group of Experts regarding allegations of infringements of trade union rights in South Africa revealed a situation of great ferment which offered possibilities for peaceful change. While the draft resolution did not fully reflect his Government's views, in that it did not recognize the trade union gains made by blacks in South Africa, his delegation was pleased that it had nevertheless been possible for it to join in the consensus.

28. It was important to note that under current South African labour law, any person, regardless of race, was able to join or form a labour union. In 1980 there had been 12 registered trade unions, the majority of whose members were black; in 1981 that number had increased to 23, with over 126,000 members.

29. He noted that trade unionists were numbered among the persons detained in South Africa. His Government was naturally opposed to the arbitrary arrest and detention without trial of any person, and hoped that the persons concerned would soon be charged or released from detention.

30. His delegation strongly supported freedom of association and hoped that its further implementation in South Africa would help to make possible the peaceful resolution of the racial conflict in that country.

At the request of the representative of Iraq, a recorded vote was taken on draft decision I.

In favour: Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, China, Ethiopia, Fiji, Greece, India, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mali, Mexico, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Sudan, Swaziland, Thailand, Tunisia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Cameroon, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of Italy, Japan, Liberia, Malawi, Norway, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Draft decision I was adopted by 37 votes to 1, with 14 abstentions (decision 1982/127).

31. Mr. GERSHMAN (United States of America) speaking in explanation of vote, reiterated that the question of human rights in the occupied Arab territories could not be

divorced from the need for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. The Security Council resolutions calling for a peaceful settlement through negotiations continued to provide the only sound framework for resolving the conflict, involving withdrawal from occupied territory in exchange for peace. Neither Commission on Human Rights resolution 1981/1 A nor the seminar called for in draft decision I would help to resolve the conflict. On the contrary, they would only create further divisions and hinder the prospects for a negotiated peace.

32. Mr. ORON (Observer for Israel) expressed deep regret at the adoption of draft decision I. The holding of a seminar on so-called violations of human rights in the Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied by Israel had been proposed in Commission on Human Rights resolution 1982/1 A but that resolution, in condemning Israel's action in the occupied territories, prejudged the outcome of the seminar and made it clear that the latter would only add to the rhetoric of other United Nations bodies that had dealt with the issue. It would certainly not contribute to a better understanding of the situation and would therefore be a waste of time and valuable resources.

Draft decision II was adopted by 37 votes to 5, with 10 abstentions (decision 1982/128).

Draft decisions III, IV and V were adopted without a vote (decisions 1982/129, 1982/130 and 1982/131).

33. Ms. ZACHAROPOULOS (Greece), referring to draft decision V, emphasized the importance which her delegation attached to the work of the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances, especially in view of the considerable number of persons still missing in Cyprus. Since 1974, about 2,000 families had been desperately seeking information concerning their missing relatives. Their anxiety was absolutely justifiable and both humanitarian reasons and specific international obligations made it imperative that each individual case be investigated. However, in order to fulfil its mandate, the Working Group needed the co-operation of all sides involved and she regretted that such co-operation had not always been forthcoming from certain countries.

34. Draft decision X, on human rights and mass exoduses, was also highly relevant to that situation. Her Government was deeply concerned with the problem of refugees in all parts of the world and especially with the plight of the tens of thousands of Greek Cypriots who were refugees in their own country.

At the request of the representative of Mexico, a recorded vote was taken on draft decision VI (Question of human rights in Chile).

In favour: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Benin, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Denmark, Ethiopia, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, India, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Mali, Mexico, Nicaragua, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Sudan, Swaziland, Tunisia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

Against: Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Pakistan, United States of America.

Abstaining: Bahamas, Bangladesh, Burundi, China, Colombia, Fiji, Nepal, Nigeria, Peru, Qatar, Thailand, United Republic of Cameroon, Zaire.

Draft decision VI was adopted by 34 votes to 5, with 13 abstentions (decision 1982/132).

35. Mr. YOACHAM (Chile) reiterated his delegation's total rejection of the draft decision just adopted, which

sought to perpetuate the existence of a "special entity" to study the human rights situation in his country. The decision was based on Commission on Human Rights resolution 1982/25, which painted a totally false and misleading picture of conditions in his country.

36. For more than eight years the human rights situation in his country had been singled out for biased treatment, inspired above all by motives of political expediency. Despite the unprecedented co-operation which his country had shown to the United Nations from the outset in the field of human rights, that "special entity" had been kept alive in defiance of all considerations of justice and the universally applicable norms which governed the treatment of human rights in the United Nations.

37. His country had repeatedly made clear that it was prepared to co-operate with United Nations bodies only through the normal and generally applicable procedures, free from the type of discrimination implicit in the "special entity", whose mandate and conclusions had no legal validity.

38. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft decision VII.

39. Mr. NOWAK (Poland) said that the Charter of the United Nations, especially in its Article 2, paragraph 7, stressed the principle of internal jurisdiction. It was clear that a decision to introduce emergency regulations or martial law was within the internal jurisdiction of the State concerned. His country had not been the first to do so and would not be the last. The proclamation of martial law had been legal under the Constitution and called for no explanation in terms of international law. The emergency regulations took fully into account the provision of article 4 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights; some civil rights had been restricted or suspended, but only temporarily, and none of the measures taken involved discrimination on the ground of race, colour, sex, language, religion or social origin. The requirement of the notification of States Parties to the Covenant had also been fulfilled. Thus all his country's international obligations in the field of human rights had been respected.

40. Political considerations should also be taken into account. The crisis in his country was a fact, but it was being overcome despite all external pressures in the form of sanctions. His Government was determined to continue the process of reform and democratization and to strive towards national reconciliation and economic recovery. It was interested in the development of co-operation with all States, on equal terms and on the basis of the principles of sovereignty and non-interference in internal affairs, but could not accept the imposition of political conditions on the development of relations or the use of the Polish situation as a political weapon or an international ignition-point.

41. The difficult and sometimes painful political process of achieving national accord would be best served if left to the Polish people alone. Further stabilization of the situation would bring about a gradual lifting of existing temporary restrictions. The most important task was to rebuild the economy and feed the nation, and those who claimed interest in the situation should lift sanctions rather than put forward political conditions; such sanctions brought only suffering to the Polish people and harmed mutual relations with the countries concerned.

42. There had never been any legal grounds for the Commission on Human Rights to consider the so-called human rights situation in his country. Many other Governments shared that view as had been revealed by the fact that the unfounded resolution 1982/26 had been adopted by less

than 50 per cent of the members of the Commission. That resolution had been politically motivated; no one could produce any proof that in his country there were any mass or consistent gross violations of human rights, which alone would justify action by the Commission. As matters stood, the resolution violated Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter and exceeded the mandate of the Commission.

43. For all those reasons, it was clear that the resolution imposed on the Commission and the draft decision currently before the Council had neither legal nor moral justification.

At the request of the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, a recorded vote was taken on draft decision VII.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Denmark, Fiji, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Mexico, Norway, Peru, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela.

Against: Argentina, Benin, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ethiopia, India, Iraq, Jordan, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Nicaragua, Poland, Romania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia.

Abstaining: Bangladesh, Brazil, Burundi, Colombia, Liberia, Malawi, Mali, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Sudan, Thailand, Tunisia, United Republic of Cameroon, Zaire.

Draft decision VII was adopted by 21 votes to 14, with 15 abstentions (decision 1982/133).

44. Mr. MASSOT (Brazil), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had consistently held the view that a review of the human rights situation in any country should always follow the procedure established by Council resolution 1503 (XLVIII), except in very particular cases where the intervention of foreign armed forces appeared to prejudice the rights of a whole nation. That was not the case in Poland, although he agreed that events in the country had adversely affected human rights. It was for those reasons that his delegation had abstained from voting on both Commission on Human Rights resolution 1982/26 and draft decision VII just adopted.

45. Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) emphasized his delegation's categorical rejection of the slanderous falsehoods contained in Commission on Human Rights resolution 1982/26—the adoption of which had violated the Charter of the United Nations—and repeated in draft decision VII. Together the two texts constituted an attempt by the United States and several of its NATO allies to convert the Commission and the Council into instruments of unlawful interference in the internal affairs of Poland. It was a particular cause for indignation that those actions were being taken by the very Governments which were violating the most basic human rights in their own countries, putting down unions and the working population in general, openly denying the rights of peoples to self-determination in many regions of the world and sheltering the Israeli aggressor in its blatant annexation of Palestinian territories and its attempts to crush the struggle of the Palestinian people for their own existence and freedom, and to which the racist régime of South Africa was obliged for complicity in its crimes. The measures being taken in Poland were entirely a domestic decision and no one had the right to interfere in that country's internal affairs.

46. Mr. WYZNER (Poland) said that his Government had instructed him to state that Commission on Human Rights resolution 1982/26 and the decision just adopted by the Council constituted a violation of the Charter of the United Nations and of the principles of non-interference in the

internal affairs of States and of the sovereign equality of all States. Such decisions would not contribute to the promotion of human rights; on the contrary, they undermined international co-operation and proved that human rights questions were too often used to attain political goals. His delegation continued to believe that the effectiveness of United Nations activities in that field depended above all on its ability to contribute to such co-operation.

47. The decision just adopted had not changed the attitude of his Government towards Commission on Human Rights resolution 1982/26; that resolution was, in his Government's view, legally null and void as well as morally two-faced and politically harmful. His Government would not co-operate in the implementation of that resolution or of the Council's decision, or participate in any financial costs.

48. Mr. GERSHMAN (United States of America) said that recent events in a number of cities in Poland had lent new and urgent meaning to the decision just adopted by the Council. The renewed demonstrations, with scores injured and more than 1,300 persons arrested, were evidence of the Polish people's refusal to submit to martial law and to the harsh and repressive nature of the régime. It underscored the self-evident fact that the answer to the problems that beset Poland did not lie in continued repression. His delegation urged the Polish authorities to move towards meeting the three conditions set out in the NATO communiqué of 11 January. He hoped that the Polish authorities would decide to co-operate with the study recommended by the Commission on Human Rights and authorized by the Council; that would be a sign of their willingness to resume the process of renewal, which was becoming more vital than ever before.

49. Mr. SHELDON (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that his delegation had voted against the draft decision because it regarded it, together with the resolution of the Commission on Human Rights on which it had been based, as illegitimate. The provocative nature of those two texts was a further example of the unceasing campaign waged by the imperialist forces against the socialist countries and a brazen attempt on the part of the United States and other members of the NATO group to intervene in the internal affairs of independent States, in violation of the basic principles of international law. Some of the statements delivered at the current meeting had proved that certain countries continued to live in a world of unreality and to take an attitude that could only be harmful to the cause of human rights co-operation.

50. Mr. KOSTOV (Bulgaria) said that his delegation was deeply disturbed and concerned that the Council had let itself be drawn by a minority of its members into adopting a decision which, far from contributing to the promotion of international co-operation on human rights, represented a politically biased action and an illegal interference in the internal affairs of Poland. It was an integral part of the continuing campaign of psychological warfare waged by the forces of imperialism against the socialist community, aimed particularly at undermining the basis for socialism in Poland. It was precisely those who were shedding false tears for the population of Poland who were at the same time imposing severe economic sanctions.

51. Mr. NOWAK (Poland), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, expressed regret that the representative of the United States should have deviated so far from the agenda item and the subject of the discussion as to launch an isolated attack on the situation in Poland; such statements could only be harmful and counterproductive. He pointed out that all serious and responsible political forces in Poland, including the Catholic Church, had condemned the

recent riots in a number of Polish cities. As a reflection of his Government's attitude, he referred to a statement made by his Minister for Foreign Affairs at a recent meeting of Parliament in which he had expressed great respect for the American nation and regret that recent United States policies had taken a course harmful to co-operation and unacceptable to a self-respecting independent sovereign State such as Poland. The Minister had expressed the hope that the United States would revise its policy; his country was desirous of developing co-operation with the United States, but only on a basis of sovereign equality and respect for the principle of non-interference in internal affairs.

52. Mr. FARIS (Jordan), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the objections expressed by the representative of the Zionist entity to the seminar on violations of human rights in the Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied by Israel, decided on in draft decision I, had been an attempt to conceal the scandalous acts being committed

by the Zionist racist régime and to violate the human rights of the majority of members of the Council, who had voted in favour of that decision in the conviction that it would help, if only spiritually, to alleviate the plight of the oppressed Arab Palestinian inhabitants by showing them that humanity still existed in the world.

53. The Zionist representative continually alleged attacks by the Arab nations on the doctrines of his racist clique. However, such justified criticism was not confined to the Arab countries; documents recently published by the State Department of the United States of America, the Zionist entity's most sincere strategic ally, revealed very clearly and in detail the violations which Israel had for years committed, and continued to commit, against the inhabitants of the occupied territories, and the restrictions and repressions under which they were forced to live.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.

29th meeting

Friday, 7 May 1982, at 3.20 p.m.

President: Mr. Miljan KOMATINA (Yugoslavia).

E/4982/SR.29

In the absence of the President, Mr. Morden (Canada), Vice-President, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 9

Human rights questions (*continued*) (E/1982/12 and Corr.1, E/1982/59, E/1982/63)

REPORT OF THE SECOND (SOCIAL) COMMITTEE (*concluded*) (E/1982/59)

1. The PRESIDENT recalled that the Council had to take action on draft decisions VIII to XX, contained in paragraph 50 of the report of the Second (Social) Committee (E/1982/59). He invited the Council to vote on draft decision VIII, entitled "Question of the violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms in any part of the world, with particular reference to colonial and other dependent countries and territories: situation of human rights in El Salvador".

Draft decision VIII was adopted by 24 votes to 4, with 18 abstentions (decision 1982/134).

2. Mr. MASSOT (Brazil) said that, having voted against Commission on Human Rights resolution 1982/28 and General Assembly resolution 36/155, he had also voted against the draft decision. As his delegation had stated on the two previous occasions, Brazil considered that the internal affairs of El Salvador should be settled by the Salvadorians themselves, without any outside interference, and that it was for them to work out a democratic and pluralist final solution. In the view of his delegation, the provisions contained in the draft decision did not make a positive contribution to the achievement of that objective.

3. Mr. GERSHMAN (United States of America) said that, although in 1981 the United States had supported the

mandate of the Special Representative on the situation of human rights in El Salvador, it had abstained from voting on draft decision VIII because of the significant efforts made by the Government of El Salvador to comply with international standards for human rights. Its progress in that respect had been evidenced by the elections of 28 March 1982; the extraordinary turnout of voters, in the face of threats, had demonstrated the commitment of the Salvadorian people to democracy and their rejection of the guerrillas. Note should also be taken of the decision on 29 April by the elected Constituent Assembly to have Mr. Alvaro Magaña head a provisional government of national unity committed to economic recovery, continued reform and the restoration of peace.

4. A realistic evaluation of the current conditions in El Salvador might therefore lead one to conclude that there was no longer any reason for concern about the situation there. The United States considered that evaluating human rights conditions in any part of the world required an objective set of criteria; clearly there were many countries that were more deserving of attention than El Salvador but were ignored by the Commission on Human Rights and the Council.

5. None the less, the United States believed that the Special Representative could make a constructive contribution by substantiating the improved conditions in El Salvador and producing a report recommending the end of special attention for that country.

6. Mr. WIESNER (Austria), Mr. ALLAFI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) and Mr. THWAITES (Australia) said that, if their delegations had been present during the voting, they would have voted in favour of draft decision VIII.

At the request of the representative of Chile, a recorded vote was taken on draft decision IX (Question of the violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms in any part of the world, with particular reference to colonial and

other dependent countries and territories: situation of human rights in Guatemala).

In favour: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Benin, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, India, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Nicaragua, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Swaziland, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

Against: Argentina, Chile.

Abstaining: Bahamas, Bangladesh, Brazil, Burundi, China, Colombia, Fiji, Jordan, Liberia, Mali, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Qatar, Sudan, Thailand, Tunisia, United Republic of Cameroon, United States of America, Zaire.

Draft decision IX was adopted by 28 votes to 2, with 21 abstentions (decision 1982/135).

7. Mrs. UMAÑA (Colombia) said that her delegation was pleased to see that the concern which many delegations felt about discriminatory treatment in matters of human rights had had an impact in the Commission on Human Rights and the Second (Social) Committee of the Council. In the view of her delegation, the aim should be universality with respect to human rights and a convergence of views in defence of basic rights. That was the only way in which countries like Colombia, which respected those rights and had become parties to the Covenants on Human Rights, could receive from the United Nations the guidelines and assistance they needed in order to deal with human rights problems, and it was also the only way of restoring the prestige of United Nations recommendations and regaining the confidence of the peoples of the world in the work of the Organization. Her delegation had abstained from voting on draft decision IX because it involved selective treatment which placed political considerations first.

8. Mr. KBAIER (Tunisia) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on draft decisions VII, VIII and IX, but would have supported them if their titles had been simplified to read like the title of draft decision VI. Another reason why Tunisia had abstained on draft decision VIII was the new political situation in El Salvador. In short, Tunisia's main reason for abstaining on the three draft decisions was the way they had been presented, which gave the impression of prejudging the results of any study.

Draft decision X (Question of the violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms in any part of the world, with particular reference to colonial and other dependent countries and territories: human rights and mass exoduses) was adopted without a vote (decision 1982/136).

Draft decision XI (Question of the violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms in any part of the world, with particular reference to colonial and other dependent countries and territories: situation of human rights in Bolivia) was adopted without a vote (decision 1982/137).

Draft decision XII (Further promotion and encouragement of human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the question of the programme and methods of work of the Commission on Human Rights; alternative approaches and ways and means within the United Nations system for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms) was adopted without a vote (decision 1982/138).

Draft decision XIII (Advisory services in the field of human rights: assistance to Uganda) was adopted without a vote (decision 1982/139).

Draft decision XIV (General decision concerning the establishment of a working group of the Commission under Economic and Social Council resolution 1503 (XLVIII) and those situations of which the Commission is seized) was adopted without a vote (decision 1982/140).

Draft decision XV (Question of the realization in all countries of the economic, social and cultural rights contained in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, and study of special problems which the developing countries face in their efforts to achieve these human rights) was adopted without a vote (decision 1982/141).

9. Mr. FUJU (Japan) said that his delegation supported draft decision XV because it welcomed the efforts made by the Working Group of Governmental Experts on the Right to Development, the right to development being a very important question. However, it would like to draw attention to the financial implications of the draft decision. It was true that in 1981 the travel and subsistence expenses of the Working Group had been paid by the United Nations, but his delegation considered that the Group's expenses should be financed from other sources; otherwise, the statute of the Working Group should be amended accordingly. His delegation therefore had serious reservations on that point and reserved the right to speak on the question at the next session of the General Assembly.

Draft decision XVI (Report of the Commission on Human Rights) was adopted without a vote (decision 1982/142).

At the request of the representative of Thailand, a recorded vote was taken on draft decision XVII (The right of peoples to self-determination and its application to peoples under colonial or alien domination or foreign occupation).

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Denmark, Fiji, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Liberia, Malawi, Nepal, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Portugal, Saint Lucia, Sudan, Swaziland, Thailand, Tunisia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United States of America, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: Benin, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ethiopia, India, Nicaragua, Poland, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Abstaining: Burundi, Mali, Mexico.

Draft decision XVII was adopted by 38 votes to 8, with 3 abstentions (decision 1982/143).

10. Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking on behalf of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Bulgaria, Poland and his own country, as members of the Council, and of the observers for Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic and Hungary, said he expressly maintained his objections to draft decision XVII concerning human rights in Kampuchea, for it constituted inadmissible interference in the internal affairs of that country and was aimed at diverting the Council's attention from the real problems in the field of human rights. Currently, there were no longer any violations of human rights in Kampuchea, and the authorities were even endeavouring to protect such rights. It was the hegemonist and imperialist enemies of the Kampuchean people who wished to deny them the right to self-determination. The fact that the Pol Pot régime was still seated at the United Nations and the adoption of resolution 1982/13 on Kampuchea by the Commission on Human Rights were the political manifestation of the denial of the

right of self-determination of the Kampuchean people and of respect for human rights in that country. It was obvious that the sponsors of draft decision XVII wished to transform the noble idea of human rights into a tool of their foreign policy.

11. Those countries should first re-establish human rights in their own territories, where unemployment, racial discrimination and discrimination against indigenous populations were widespread. Their reactionary and imperialist attitude was also reflected in their foreign policy in the support they gave to *apartheid*, zionism and dictatorial régimes and in their refusal to grant the right to self-determination. His delegation and the other delegations he had mentioned therefore categorically rejected the draft decision on Kampuchea as having no legal value.

12. Mrs. ZHANG Zongan (China) said her delegation whole-heartedly supported draft decision XVII and had voted in favour of it because it was consonant with the real situation in Kampuchea. Human rights were violated in that country by foreign occupation; that was why the draft decision called for the withdrawal of all foreign troops so as to enable the Kampuchean people to exercise their right to self-determination.

13. The draft decision also reflected the hypocrisy of those who spread slander about human rights.

14. Mr. JOHNSON (Benin) said he had voted against draft decision XVII in accordance with the position adopted by his country during the debate on that question at the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly. He wished to make it clear, however, that his delegation's vote on the same question in the Second (Social) Committee had been cast in confused conditions and was not in keeping with his country's usual position.

15. Mr. WORKU (Ethiopia) said his delegation had been absent during the voting on draft decisions VIII and IX, but had it been present it would have voted for them.

Draft decision XVIII (Report of the Panel of the Fact-Finding and Conciliation Commission on Freedom of Association appointed by the Governing Body of the International Labour Office to examine the complaints of alleged infringements of trade union rights in the United States/Puerto Rico) was adopted without a vote (decision 1982/144).

16. Mr. GERSHMAN (United States of America) said that his delegation was pleased with the report of the Panel of the Fact-Finding and Conciliation Commission (E/1982/7), which had concluded that the allegations of infringements of trade union rights made by the World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU) were without foundation. It regretted that the complainant, WFTU, had been unable to assist the Commission by providing any further information after its initial complaint and had failed to acknowledge that its allegations were without foundation as soon as that had been proved. It should also be noted that the Panel, which had been appointed by the Governing Body of the ILO, had received the complete co-operation of the Puerto Rican authorities in its investigation. The home countries of some of the principal WFTU members would not have done the same.

17. His delegation noted that the next annual ILO conference would once again consider the continued violation of Convention 111 by Czechoslovakia, where numerous workers had been fired for signing the "Charter 77 Manifesto". It also noted that the ILO Conferences in 1974, 1976 and 1977 had cited the USSR for its failure to take measures to implement Convention 29, concerning forced or compulsory labour, and that the most recent report of the Com-

mittee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations highlighted the continued failure of the USSR to implement Convention 87, concerning freedom of association and protection of the right to organize.

18. In his letter of complaint, the Secretary of WFTU had requested the Director-General of the ILO to draw the attention of the Government of the United States to the importance attached by the ILO to the full exercise of human rights and trade union freedoms in all countries. The free trade unions of the United States did not need lectures on human rights and trade union freedoms from a federation of totalitarian labour fronts. The WFTU concept of trade unionism could be traced back to the Tenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, where Lenin had defined trade unions as "transmission belts", State instruments for the control and mobilization of labour, and not associations for the representation and defence of workers.

19. Mr. ORDZHONIKIDZE (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking on a point of order, requested the representative of the United States to confine himself to the item under consideration.

20. The PRESIDENT recalled that the Council had adopted the most flexible procedure possible, authorizing States not only to explain their votes but also to make general statements; he nevertheless associated himself with the representative of the Soviet Union in requesting the United States delegation not to stray too far from the issue under consideration, especially since the draft decision had been amended by the United States and then adopted by the Council without a vote.

21. Mr. GERSHMAN (United States of America) said that the Soviet delegation, in its own statement after the adoption of draft decision XVII, dealing with Kampuchea, had not hesitated to attack the racial policy of the United States, zionism and so on.

22. The PRESIDENT observed that if the representative of the United States wished to comment on the statement by the Soviet Union, he could exercise his right of reply when the Council had completed its examination of the items under consideration.

23. Mr. GERSHMAN (United States of America) said that he was not exercising his right of reply but only saying that his delegation had conducted itself like other delegations and requested the President to follow a consistent standard and allow him to complete his statement.

24. The PRESIDENT said he would give the floor once again to the representative of the United States.

25. Mr. GERSHMAN (United States of America) said that the next ILO Conference would once again address the question of the denial by the Soviet Union of the right of workers to establish trade unions of their choice and the provision of the USSR Constitution which maintained the hegemony of the Communist Party over the so-called trade unions in that country.

26. Mr. ORDZHONIKIDZE (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) insisted that the representative of the United States should confine himself to the question under consideration, namely draft decision XVIII, which related to alleged violations of trade union rights in Puerto Rico.

27. The PRESIDENT told the representative of the Soviet Union that, according to the practice in the Council, delegations had the right to speak as and when they wished before and after the vote and that, if the Soviet delegation objected to a statement by another member of the Council, it could also exercise its right of reply.

28. Mr. GERSHMAN (United States of America) concluded by saying that until the WFTU began to address the problem of the denial of trade union rights for workers in the Soviet bloc—a good place to begin, he noted, would be to protest the suppression of Poland's free trade union Solidarity—until that time, its unsubstantiated complaints about alleged infringements of trade union rights in free societies would have no credibility and did not deserve the serious attention they sometimes received.

Draft decision XIX (Scheduling of the annual session of the Commission on Human Rights) (decision 1982/145) and draft decision XX (Report of the Secretary-General on measures to be taken against Nazi, Fascist and neo-Fascist activities and all other forms of totalitarian ideologies and practices based on racial intolerance, hatred and terror) (decision 1982/146) were adopted without a vote.

29. Mr. ORDZHONIKIDZE (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) welcomed the adoption of draft resolution XX, which dealt with a very topical and important problem. For a number of years now, racist, Nazi and neo-Nazi organizations had prospered and multiplied in a large number of countries, particularly in the United States. According to a recent article in *The Christian Science Monitor*, in 1981 the Ku Klux Klan had in New York State alone committed over 320 crimes, three times more than in the previous year, a trend that seemed to be increasing from year to year. That was an insult to the countries which had fought against nazism and to the United Nations, which was fighting against racial discrimination. Abusing the right of freedom of speech, the Ku Klux Klan organized public demonstrations, with the blessing of the American authorities, in which it propagated its odious ideology, maintaining that blacks were inferior to whites not only for sociological reasons but inherently.

30. Moreover, as the representative of Florida to the United States House of Representatives had indicated, the United States provided a refuge for numerous Nazi war criminals who were not even brought to trial.

31. His delegation hoped that the numerous decisions taken by the United Nations against racism, nazism and neo-nazism would finally elicit a positive response from the United States.

32. Mrs. UMAÑA (Colombia) said that her delegation had been absent at the previous meeting when a vote had been taken on draft decision I and that, had it been present, it would have voted in favour of the draft decision.

33. The PRESIDENT announced that the Council had concluded its consideration of item 9.

AGENDA ITEM 14

Consideration of the provisional agenda for the second regular session of 1982 (E/1982/L.39)

34. The PRESIDENT said that, in accordance with rule 9 of the Council's rules of procedure, the Secretariat had drawn up a draft provisional agenda for the Council's second regular session (see E/1982/L.39), based on the draft basic programme of work for 1982 and 1983, approved in decision 1982/100 adopted by the Council at its organizational session for 1982, on the basis of the decisions adopted by the Council at the current session.

35. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Council) announced that, at its current session, the Council had adopted 40 resolutions, only 6 of which had been put to a vote, and 38 decisions, of which 24 had been adopted without a vote.

36. With regard to documentation, 32 documents had been requested for the next session, not counting the 18 documents the distribution of which had been approved by the Commission on the Status of Women and the Commission on Human Rights. He wondered whether the practice of drawing up a list of documents, which had been designed to encourage delegations to reduce the volume of documentation but had not had the desired effect, should be maintained. With regard to agenda item 14 and in particular to the note by the Secretariat on the consideration of the provisional agenda for the second regular session of 1982 (E/1982/L.39), it should be recalled that in connection with item 4 (Special economic, humanitarian and disaster relief assistance) the following questions would be considered: assistance to refugees in Somalia (Council resolution 1982/4); measures to be taken following the cyclones and floods in Madagascar (Council resolution 1982/5); measures to be taken following the heavy floods which have affected Democratic Yemen (Council resolution 1982/6). The reports on those questions would be made orally.

37. Under item 6 (Human rights questions) there should be added the consideration of the report to be submitted to the Council at its second regular session on the steps to be taken to implement the resolution on the situation in Equatorial Guinea. The Council would also have to consider under that item the question of the date of the annual session of the Commission on Human Rights, as decided by the Council under item 9 at the current meeting. In that connection, he believed that the scheduling of the session of the Commission on Human Rights could not be determined without first altering that of the Council's second session. New agenda items included item 8 (Convening of an International Conference on Population in 1984), included in the agenda in accordance with Council resolution 1982/7 and item 7 (Revitalization of the Economic and Social Council), which had been added in accordance with the decision taken by the Council at its organizational session. Regarding the latter item, a number of delegations had argued that the Council should consider the item as soon as possible and the President of the Council had to that end decided to call a meeting of the Bureau before the second regular session to formulate proposals regarding the organization of the debate on the item.

38. With regard to matters to be considered at the resumed second regular session of 1982, the Bureau had decided to amend item 27, entitled in Council decision 1982/100 "Nomination of members of the World Food Council", to read as item 29 in document E/1982/L.39 "Nominations and elections" and also to include under that item the election of members of the Sessional Working Group of Governmental Experts on the Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the election of the members of the Committee for the United Nations Population Award.

39. Mr. KASEMSRI (Thailand), referring to item 29 of the provisional agenda for the second session, asked whether the Council intended to hold elections at its second regular session to fill a number of posts which were still vacant, particularly in so far as the group of Asian States was concerned.

40. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) said that he hoped that the question of the revitalization of the Economic and Social Council (item 7) would be considered at the beginning of the second regular session and not in the third week, as indicated in the organization of work.

41. Mr. FLAKSTAD (Norway) endorsed the view expressed by the representative of Belgium and said that he hoped the Bureau would take that view into account when it drew up the final agenda for the second regular session.

42. Mr. ASTAFIEV (Union of Socialist Republics) endorsed fully the request made by the delegations of Belgium and Norway and said that every attempt must be made to prevent a repetition of the situation that had arisen at the Council's current session. Besides, the President had himself said that several weeks would be needed to draw up the programme for the revitalization of the Economic and Social Council. The Council must therefore consider that issue at the very beginning of its second regular session.

43. Mr. SZEREMETA (Poland) asked the Secretariat whether it planned to consider long-term economic development trends. That question had been referred from the thirty-sixth to the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly (decision 36/423) and appeared to be within the competence of the Economic and Social Council.

44. Mr. JOHNSON (Benin), referring to item 4 of the provisional agenda, recalled that his country was the recipient of a programme of special economic assistance and asked whether the Council intended to send a supervisory mission to his country which would then make an oral report to the Council. He would like to be sure that the Council, in addition to the resolutions adopted on assistance to refugees, would consider reports concerning that form of special assistance.

45. Mr. VELLOSO (Brazil), referring to the question raised by the representatives of Belgium and Norway, said he was sure that the President of the Council would address that question, which was covered under item 7 of the provisional agenda, as soon as possible. With regard to the question of the documentation mentioned by the Secretary of the Council, he requested that, at the Council's second regular session, delegations should not fail to consider the list of documents for subsequent sessions.

46. Mr. NGUAYILA MBELA KALANDA (Zaire) said that he endorsed the opinion expressed by the President concerning the revitalization of the Economic and Social Council. Referring to the question of special economic assistance, he asked if the cases of Madagascar and Democratic Yemen would be discussed under item 4 or separately.

47. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Council), replying to the question of the representative of Thailand, said that the elections had been postponed owing to the lack of candidates.

48. With regard to the question raised by the representative of Poland, he said that the draft provisional agenda listed only the titles of the various items, omitting annotations and not detailing the questions which would be considered under those items. For further information, the Council's basic programme of work for 1982 and 1983, contained in decision 1982/100, should be consulted.

49. Replying to the question of the representative of Poland concerning the study of long-term economic development trends, he said that the matter would certainly be considered under item 3, general discussion of international economic and social policy.

50. Finally, with regard to the questions concerning item 4, he explained that he had merely mentioned additional questions, it being understood that assistance to a great many countries, including Benin, would certainly be considered. With regard to the method of submitting reports under that item, he said it should be recalled that the Council had decided that they would be submitted orally.

51. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt the provisional agenda and the organization of work for the second regular session of 1982 (E/1982/L.39).

It was so decided (decision 1982/148).

52. The PRESIDENT said that the Council had completed its consideration of item 14. He gave the floor to the representative of Brazil, who wished to make a statement.

53. Mr. VELLOSO (Brazil) said that, in his capacity as future Chairman of the First (Economic) Committee for the Council's second regular session, he had endorsed the programme of work proposed for that session. Delegations would have adequate time to hold informal consultations and submit proposals relating to questions on the agenda.

54. In view of the heavy programme of work and the organization of work which the Council had just adopted, he urged members of the Council to do everything possible to contribute to the smooth progress of work at the second regular session and to comply with the established schedule. Informal consultations would be held on each agenda item in advance, background documents would be distributed to all delegations at the start of the session in order to facilitate their work and the necessary steps would be taken to allow them to submit their proposals as quickly as possible.

AGENDA ITEM 9

Human rights questions (*concluded*)

55. The PRESIDENT said that the Council would now hear statements from delegations that wanted to exercise their right of reply concerning matters relating to human rights.

56. Mr. KALINA (Observer for Czechoslovakia) said that the representative of the United States could hardly speak of violations of trade union rights in Puerto Rico; he had therefore preferred to mention alleged violations of human rights in Czechoslovakia.

57. He recalled that his country had a long-standing democratic tradition. The socialist structures which had been set up were the expression of the will of the people itself and fully reflected the fact that Czechoslovakia was a socialist State. It was that very fact which the representative of the United States had such difficulty in understanding.

58. His country did not hesitate to give unprecedented publicity to a handful of individuals who had betrayed the Czechoslovak people and to those who had left the country long ago in the hope that they would be able to undermine the smooth functioning of the socialist system.

59. Czechoslovakia had frequently stated that it would give no special protection to individuals who had violated its laws and regulations and that it would not yield to the pressure of certain countries which sought to reap advantages from the subversive activities of those individuals under the pretext of protecting human rights.

60. Mr. GERSHMAN (United States of America), referring to the comments made by the Czechoslovak delegation, said that he agreed on one point: Czechoslovakia did indeed have a democratic tradition, but it had been abruptly broken in 1948.

61. With regard to the false accusations against his country made by the representative of the Soviet Union, he believed that it would not be worth while to refute them one by one. He wished, nevertheless, to make a few comments. Given the fact that the Soviet Union was not a free society, it was natural that it could not understand what a truly free society was and how it operated. The United States tolerated the expression of the most divergent points of view, including those that were most odious and hateful; even Fascists, Nazis and Communists could express themselves there freely. The United States Government, for its part, had a profound aversion to that sort of extremist

ideology, but in the name of liberty it refused to impose any controls which would prevent individuals from expressing such opinions.

62. It was absurd to speak of nazism in referring to certain factions which had emerged in the United States and other countries, and if there were any parallels, they were with the Soviet Union. Indeed, that country was the principal expansionist and totalitarian Power of the world and the source of extremely virulent anti-Semitic propaganda. It also represented the most serious threat to freedom and peace and was attempting to divert attention from true problems by launching into inept diatribes and by distorting the truth.

63. Mr. ORDZHONIKIDZE (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the United States delegation had spoken at great length of liberty, stating that the United States was a model in that field. He agreed on that point: the United States was indeed a model in the field of freedoms—the freedom to be unemployed, the freedom to profess Fascist doctrines, the freedom to be killed by criminals, the freedom to take drugs and the like.

64. With regard to the comments of the representative of the United States concerning trade union freedoms, he noted that the United States had not acceded to the principal ILO conventions on that subject. He also recalled that during the strike of the air traffic controllers which had taken place in the United States the year before, the United States Government had ordered the trade union to disband, replaced strikers by soldiers and had dealt summarily with the trade union leaders involved. That was what the representative of the United States called a democratic society.

65. Mr. GERSHMAN (United States of America), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that while he did not want to dignify the Soviet statement by rebutting its baseless charges, he did want to clear up one matter regarding the air controllers' strike, a matter that had come before the ILO and was therefore a United Nations issue. He quoted from the report of the ILO Committee on Freedom of Association which had considered the complaint in the PATCO case and had concluded that "It can therefore not uphold the allegation that this action by the Government constituted a violation of the principles of freedom of association" and that "The Committee is unable to uphold the allegation that adequate procedures do not exist to safeguard the interest of workers not enjoying the right to strike".

66. Mr. KALINA (Czechoslovakia), referring to the comments of the representative of the United States concerning the democratic traditions which had prevailed in Czechoslovakia before 1948, noted that the Czechoslovak people had freely chosen a new democracy after the revolution of February 1948 and that they were deeply attached to the socialist system, thanks to which they knew neither unemployment nor racial discrimination.

Closure of the session

67. The PRESIDENT declared the first regular session of 1982 of the Economic and Social Council closed.

The meeting rose at 4.50 p.m.