

1898th meeting

Friday, 17 May 1974, at 11.25 a.m.

President: Mr. Aarno KARHILO (Finland)

E/SR.1898

AGENDA ITEM 10**Human rights questions:**

- (a) Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination;
- (b) Report of the Commission on Human Rights;
- (c) Question of slavery and the slave trade in all their practices and manifestations, including the slavery-like practices of *apartheid* and colonialism;
- (d) Allegations regarding infringements of trade union rights

REPORT OF THE SOCIAL COMMITTEE (E/5514)

1. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the report of the Social Committee (E/5514).

2. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted that the report had only just been circulated and proposed that consideration of the item should be deferred until the afternoon meeting in order to give delegations time to study the report.

3. After a brief discussion in which Mr. TRAVERT (France), Mr. BERLIS (Canada) and Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) took part, the PRESIDENT suggested that the item should be deferred until the afternoon meeting, on the understanding that it would be taken up as the first item and that the meeting should begin promptly at 3 p.m. so that the Council would be able to conclude the work of the session.

*It was so decided.**The meeting rose at 11.35 a.m.***1899th meeting**

Friday, 17 May 1974, at 3.30 p.m.

President: Mr. Aarno KARHILO (Finland)

E/SR.1899

AGENDA ITEM 10**Human rights questions (concluded):**

- (a) Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination;
- (b) Report of the Commission on Human Rights;
- (c) Question of slavery and the slave trade in all their practices and manifestations, including the slavery-like practices of *apartheid* and colonialism;
- (d) Allegations regarding infringements of trade union rights

REPORT OF THE SOCIAL COMMITTEE (concluded) (E/5514)

1. The PRESIDENT suggested that members of the Council should first take a decision on the 11 draft resolutions and 5 draft decisions which the Social Committee recommended to the Council for adoption (E/5514, para. 53), and then explain their votes.

2. He said that if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council agreed to that procedure.

It was so decided.

3. The PRESIDENT noted that the Social Committee had adopted draft resolution I without a vote. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council also wished to adopt it without a vote.

Draft resolution I (E/5514, para. 53) was adopted without a vote [resolution 1863 (LVI)].

4. The PRESIDENT noted that the Social Committee had adopted draft resolution II after a vote. He invited the Council to vote on the draft resolution.

A non-recorded vote was taken.

Draft resolution II (E/5514, para. 53) was adopted by 36 votes to none, with 12 abstentions [resolution 1864 (LVI)].

5. The PRESIDENT noted that the Social Committee had adopted draft resolutions III, IV, V and VI without a vote. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council also wished to adopt them without a vote.

Draft resolutions III, IV, V and VI (E/5514, para. 53) were adopted without a vote [resolutions 1865 (LVI), 1866 (LVI), 1867 (LVI) and 1868 (LVI)].

6. The PRESIDENT noted that the Social Committee had adopted draft resolution VII by a roll-call vote. He invited the Council to vote on the draft resolution.

A non-recorded vote was taken.

Draft resolution VII was adopted by 40 votes to 1, with 7 abstentions [resolution 1869 (LVI)].

7. The PRESIDENT noted that the Social Committee had adopted draft resolutions VIII, IX and X without a vote. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council also wished to adopt them without a vote.

Draft resolutions VIII, IX and X (E/5514, para. 53) were adopted without a vote [resolutions 1870 (LVI), 1871 (LVI) and 1872 (LVI)].

8. The PRESIDENT said that if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt the draft resolution XI, entitled "Protection of human rights in Chile", without a vote.

9. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that the draft resolution had been adopted by the Social Committee by means of a vote.

10. The PRESIDENT said that the Social Committee had in fact adopted that draft resolution after putting it to the vote, but the Council was not necessarily bound by a decision of the Social Committee. Thus, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution XI without a vote.

Draft resolution XI (E/5514, para. 53) was adopted without a vote [resolution 1873 (LVI)].

11. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on draft decisions A to E (E/5514, para. 53). He noted that the Social Committee had adopted draft decision A after a vote.

12. Mr. OCHIRBAL (Mongolia) said that his delegation would like to introduce a minor procedural amendment before the draft decision was put to the vote. His delegation had considered, when the draft decision had been discussed, that it was based on General Assembly resolution 3069 (XXVIII); it therefore proposed that the words "without prejudice to General Assembly resolution 3069 (XXVIII)" should be inserted after the words "recommends to the General Assembly".

13. The PRESIDENT said that if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council accepted the amendment proposed by the representative of Mongolia.

It was so decided.

14. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on draft decision A, as orally amended.

A non-recorded vote was taken.

Draft decision A, as orally amended, was adopted by 43 votes to 4, with 2 abstentions [decision 14 (LVI)].

15. The PRESIDENT noted that the Social Committee had adopted draft decision B after a vote. He invited the Council to vote on the draft decision.

A non-recorded vote was taken.

Draft decision B was adopted by 42 votes to 5, with 2 abstentions [decision 15 (LVI)].

16. The PRESIDENT noted that the Social Committee had adopted draft decisions C, D and E without a vote. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council also wished to adopt them without a vote.

Draft decisions C, D and E were adopted without a vote [decisions 16 (LVI), 17 (LVI) and 18 (LVI)].

17. Mr. TRAVERT (France) recalled the consistent opposition of his Government to the philosophy and policy of *apartheid* and its deep aversion to racism and racial discrimination. That was a position of principle which, despite certain reservations, justified his delegation's participation in the consensus reached concerning draft resolution I, "Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination". The draft resolution covered some points which seemed to fall within the competence of other bodies and his delegation wished to point out that it had reservations on some of the possible legal and political implications of the resolution.

18. Mr. WANG Tzu-chuan (China) said that his delegation had expressed reservations in the Social Committee on some of the draft resolutions which had been adopted without a vote, namely draft resolutions V, VIII, IX and XI. His delegation had on that occasion explained the reasons why it had not taken part in the consensus on those draft resolutions. It wished to inform the Council that it maintained its initial position.

19. Mr. BAZAN (Chile), referring to draft resolution XI, said that the Economic and Social Council, by dealing with the situation in Chile and not that in countries which for decades had consistently perpetrated massive violations of human rights, had acted in a discriminatory manner. There was no comparison between the situation in Chile and that which prevailed in such countries. He refused to believe that the Council had lost its sense of reality and wished to encourage those who in fact violated human rights, and preferred to think that the Council had decided to consider Chile because it knew that human rights could be discussed with that country. Whatever the case might be, there was scarcely any doubt that the enduring silence of the Council concerning violations committed in some other countries could only undermine its moral authority.

20. He was not opposed to the resolution, because its sponsors belonged to countries where human rights were respected. He therefore understood that they should be concerned, as stated in the first preambular paragraph, by the alarmist reports concerning Chile that were part of a vast political campaign designed to distort the truth. The Council requested the Chilean Government "to restore and safeguard" human rights; that was a request that the Chilean Government could not oppose, since that was precisely what it wanted: to restore and safeguard human rights which had been violated in Chile as a result of foreign interference. His Government was in that respect in agreement with enlightened international public opinion, which did not include all the countries which had voted for the resolution. Among the latter were a bloc of countries whose only aim was to create conditions conducive to further interference, which would be fatal to all human rights in Chile.

21. He wished to point out that that request for the restoration and safeguarding of human rights in Chile came somewhat late. It was precisely to restore those rights that the great majority of Chileans, supported by the armed forces, had overthrown the Government of Popular Unity the previous year. The Council had not previously adopted any resolution designed to protect the rights of Chileans. It had been the Chileans themselves, with their strong attachment to liberty, democracy and fundamental human rights, who had determined to preserve their independence and had decided to continue their efforts to rebuild Chilean society on the basis of representative democracy and respect for all human rights.

22. Mr. YAMADA (Japan) said that his delegation had voted for draft resolution VII concerning the report of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group of Experts. However, he wished to make a number of observations with regard to paragraphs 1 and 4. With regard to paragraph 1, he sincerely believed that the new Portuguese Government would immediately begin to seek a just solution in Africa. Referring to paragraph 4, he recalled that at the twenty-eighth session, in the Third Committee, the Japanese delegation had expressed legal reservations on certain provisions of the International Convention on

the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid*. His delegation held the same view with regard to paragraph 5 (b) of draft resolution I, in which reference was made to that Convention. However, despite those reservations, there should be no doubt as to his Government's resolute opposition to the policy of *apartheid*.

23. Mr. JACHEK (Czechoslovakia) said that he greatly appreciated all the efforts of the Commission on Human Rights and all the measures taken by the bodies within the United Nations system which assisted in the struggle against racism and racial discrimination. Consequently, his delegation had supported without reservation the adoption of draft resolutions I to VII. Furthermore, although he had voted for draft resolution X, he wished to point out that his delegation considered the text of that resolution to be a compromise solution. His delegation felt that firm measures were needed to deal with the situation prevailing in Chile, where brutal and massive violations of human rights were being perpetrated and where the criminal policy of the military junta threatened the lives of members of the former Government of Popular Unity and of eminent artists and intellectuals.

24. He had voted against draft decision A because he felt the question was already dealt with satisfactorily in General Assembly resolution 3069 (XXVIII). He considered that draft decision B conflicted with Economic and Social Council resolution 1503 (XLVIII).

25. Mr. WILDER (Canada) said that his delegation had voted for draft resolution VII for the reasons explained by the representative of Canada during consideration of the question in the Social Committee.

26. Mr. AKÉ (Ivory Coast) said that his delegation had voted for draft resolution VII. He wished, however, to recall that, during the vote on the draft resolution in the Social Committee, his delegation had abstained on paragraph 1 and had explained that its abstention was prompted more by the circumstances surrounding the vote than by the content of the draft resolution. He asked that the summary record should show that his delegation had intended to vote for that paragraph.

27. As far as the substance of that paragraph was concerned, he was aware of the changes that had taken place in Portugal and of the fact that the country's new leaders were prepared to begin an era of dialogue with the authentic representatives of the populations of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau. He expressed the hope that the new Portuguese authorities would embark with courage and determination on a policy of decolonization and would thus help to lay the foundation for fruitful co-operation with the whole of Africa. For its part, his Government was prepared to assist in seeking such a solution.

28. Miss ILIĆ (Yugoslavia) said that in the Social Committee her delegation had voted for draft resolution XI, concerning the protection of human rights in Chile. Her delegation had, on several occasions, stated its position on that question and had joined with other delegations in requesting the Secretary-General and the General Assembly to appeal to the Chilean authorities to put an end to the persecution in which they were engaged. The resolution which had just been adopted was made all the more necessary by the daily information showing that the situation in Chile remained unchanged and that torture was still rife in that country.

29. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had had no difficulty in joining with other delegations to adopt draft resolution I, which it supported without reservation. That resolution constituted an important step towards the implementation of the Programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. It was both dynamic in its form and substantial in its content. All Member States must faithfully implement the resolution, which urged them to terminate immediately all policies and activities favourable to the racist régimes of southern Africa, to assist the victims of *apartheid* and racial discrimination, to support the liberation movements and to sign and ratify *inter alia*, 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*. The latter Convention constituted a particularly important step towards the attainment of the objectives of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. Furthermore, his delegation had voted for draft resolutions II and VII, which complemented draft resolution I and served the same noble cause—to put an end to the violation of human rights in southern Africa.

30. Draft resolution XI, which had been adopted without a vote by the Council, had been put to the vote in the Social Committee and his delegation had enthusiastically supported it, since it felt that, despite its shortcomings, it would help to reveal in their true light the flagrant violations of human rights committed by the Chilean junta; furthermore, it clearly asked the junta to put an end to such violations. In the General Assembly, in the Commission on Human Rights and in the Council, many delegations had quoted numerous facts which proved beyond all doubt that democrats and patriots had been massacred and that thousands of innocents had been subjected to torture. There was no need to recall the inhuman conditions currently prevailing in the prisons, the fate of the members of the previous Government and the most prominent representatives of the Popular Unity Party, the banning of trade unions, or the dismissal of thousands of workers. All those crimes had been condemned by world public opinion and by all men of honour, regardless of their political and religious convictions. The junta was using various manoeuvres in the absolutely futile hope that it would not have to accept the responsibility for those crimes. No one was deceived, and the Council, by adopting the draft resolution by consensus, had shown clearly that it expected the junta to put an end to the reign of terror. Those delegations which had abstained during the vote on that draft resolution in the Social Committee could only be condemned, since, by their action, they had shown their lack of concern at the flagrant violations of the most fundamental human rights in Chile. They were encouraging the junta to continue along the criminal path which it had chosen, with contempt for justice and humanity.

31. Mr. NEUGEBAUER (German Democratic Republic) welcomed the adoption of draft resolution I, which contained concrete measures that would make an effective contribution to the struggle against racism and racial discrimination. It was right to emphasize, in paragraph 4, the legitimacy of the struggle of oppressed peoples to liberate themselves from racism, racial discrimination, *apartheid*, colonialism and alien domination, and also to urge States to terminate immediately

all measures, policies and activities which enabled racist régimes in southern Africa to continue the repression of the African people. His Government had already acceded to the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid*, and it was to be hoped that other States would respond as soon as possible to the appeal made to them in that connexion in paragraph 5 (b). His delegation had supported all the draft resolutions before the Council and welcomed the fact that they illustrated so clearly the links between the guarantee of international peace and security, respect for human rights and the right of peoples to self-determination, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations; the German Democratic Republic, whose people, by the decision taken once for all in favour of the socialist order, had exercised the right of self-determination, based all its political action on the existence of those links. His delegation approved, in particular, of the resolution on the protection of human rights in Chile and was glad that the systematic violations of human rights in that country had been condemned in the course of the discussions.

32. Mr. WIGGINS (United States of America) said that he did not wish to reiterate the reasons for his delegation's opposition to draft resolution VII, since they had already been explained on other occasions. However, he wished to emphasize once again that there had been a change of Government in Portugal and that the new Government had obviously begun a total reappraisal of the policies of the previous Government. Under such conditions, it was justifiable to wonder whether the condemnation contained in draft resolution VII would contribute to the achievement of the objectives of that resolution or would have the opposite effect. Although his delegation had voted against the draft resolution, that in no way signified that his country approved of the doctrine of *apartheid*, which was absolutely contrary to its humanitarian principles.

AGENDA ITEM 19

Consideration of the provisional agenda for the fifty-seventh session (E/L.1589, E/L.1596)

33. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council), introducing the provisional annotated agenda (E/L.1589), said that, in addition to items included in the Council's basic programme of work for 1974 (paragraph 1 (b) of decision 1 (LIV)), which were marked with an asterisk, the provisional agenda for the fifty-seventh session contained a number of items the inclusion of which had been requested by the General Assembly at its sixth special session and by the Council at its current session. They were: items 4, 5, 12, 13, 18—which should also have been marked with an asterisk because it was one of the items on the Council's basic programme of work for 1974—and 20, the item which the Council had decided, at its 1892nd meeting, to defer until the fifty-seventh session. Should the Council adopt draft decision II recommended by the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Rationalization of the Work of the Council in its report (E/5515, para. 50), item 21 (c) would read: "Report on the Joint Meetings of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination and the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination", and a new subitem (f) would be added reading: "Priorities in the economic, social and human rights fields".

34. He drew the Council's attention to the fact that there would be a delay in distributing some of the reports, partly because the sixth special session had been

given priority in the preparation of documents and partly because it had been necessary to take decisions of the sixth special session into account in the basic documents. The World Economic Survey—for item 3—would not be published until the beginning of June. The first of the two reports to be submitted for item 4, the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Special Programme, would be issued as soon as possible after the end of the Committee's session; the Secretary-General's report would be submitted orally. The report on the sixth special session of the General Assembly (item 6) was one of the documents the issue of which had been held up because it had been necessary to take account of the decisions taken at the special session; it would not be issued until the beginning of June. The same applied to the report to be prepared for item 7. The Secretary-General's report on the impact of multinational corporations on the development process and on international relations would be available later than had been planned, because some members of the Council had been absent from the previous session; it had therefore been necessary to write to them asking for their comments. The report would be distributed in final form once all their replies had been received. The report of the Preparatory Committee of the World Food Conference on its second session (item 9) would be issued in Geneva as soon after the end of the session as possible; the Secretary-General's report on emergency measures in regard to the supply of fertilizers and pesticides would be submitted orally.

35. The report on the Sudano-Sahelian region (item 10) would not be issued until the beginning of June, because the latest developments in the situation would be awaited. The same would be the case for the reports requested on items 11 and 12. The supplementary report requested by the Council for item 13 was being prepared and would be issued in a very concise form in early June. The first report requested for item 14 would be issued before the usual six-week deadline, as would the report that the Secretary-General had been requested to prepare by Council resolution 1754 (LIV) and the report that he was to draw up under General Assembly resolution 3174 (XXVIII). The report required for the consideration of item 14 (c) would be issued at the end of May. The Secretary-General's report required for the consideration of item 14 (d) would not be issued until the beginning of June, because replies had not been received from all Governments. The Secretary-General's report for item 15 (a) would be issued at the end of May, and the reports of the other United Nations bodies would be distributed as and when the Secretariat received them. The report of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (item 15 (b)) would be issued as soon as the Governing Council of UNDP had taken a decision on it; the Governing Council's report on its eighteenth session would be distributed at Geneva immediately after the session, which would be held from 5 to 24 June; the report on the United Nations Capital Development Fund would be issued at the same time. The report of the United Nations Children's Fund would be distributed as soon as possible after the Executive Board's session, from 13 to 24 May. The report on the World Food Programme (item 15 (g)) would be distributed before the end of May at Geneva and the report on the United Nations Volunteers Programme would be distributed before 22 May.

36. The report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme, required for the con-

sideration of item 16 (a), was already available, and the report that the Council at its 1892nd meeting had requested the Secretary-General to prepare would be issued in mid-June. As to item 16 (b), information on development and the environment from various sources had been very difficult to collect and the report would not be ready in time for the fifty-seventh session; he accordingly suggested that consideration of the matter should be deferred until 1975. As to item 17, the Industrial Development Board had met at the beginning of May and its report would be distributed as soon as possible; the report of the Executive Director of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization would take account of the Board's report and would be issued as soon as possible. As to item 18, the report of the Economic Commission for Europe, which had met in Bucharest from 18 to 29 April, would be available shortly, as would the report of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East which had met in late March and early April. The Economic Commission for Africa and the Economic Commission for Latin America had had no sessions in 1974 and would make their reports directly at Geneva; the same went for the reports on the meetings of the Executive Secretaries. The reports needed for the consideration of item 19 (a) and item 20 would be issued before 21 May.

37. The reports of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the Universal Postal Union, the International Telecommunication Union, the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) (item 21 (a)) were already available. The report of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (ACC) would be distributed at the end of May, the ACC report on the use of electronic computers was already available, and the report on the Joint Meetings of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination and ACC would be distributed at Geneva. As to the review of the agreements between the United Nations and the specialized agencies and IAEA, a number of the specialized agencies' reports had already been distributed; the Secretary-General's report would be issued at the beginning of June. The report of the World Intellectual Property Organization would be issued as soon as possible after its session, which was to be held in New York from 28 May to 1 June. A report for item 22, which could not be prepared in time for the current session, would be distributed in time for the fifty-seventh session of the Council at Geneva. The report needed for the consideration of item 23 would be issued at the beginning of June, as would the report needed for the consideration of item 24. The draft calendar of conferences (item 25) was taking final shape in the light of decisions taken by the Council at the current session and would be distributed at the end of the month.

38. With reference to the organization of work at the fifty-seventh session, he said that the Secretariat would do its best to ensure that the two sessional committees and the Council could meet simultaneously. The cost of interpretation and other language services worked out at \$800 a day, to which should be added the cost of interpretation into Chinese.

39. The PRESIDENT, replying to a question from the representative of the United Kingdom, said that the information given by the Secretary on the distribution

dates of documents would be issued in an official document the following week.¹

40. Mr. PANYARACHUN (Thailand) asked the Secretariat to include the symbols of the documents already distributed in the report on documentation to be prepared for the fifty-seventh session.

41. Mr. OLIVERI LÓPEZ (Argentina) observed that the Secretary-General's report on the preparatory work for the United Nations Water Conference (E/5465), which had been distributed for information purposes, was too vague and too general to allow the Council to take a decision at the current session.

42. As the host country, Argentina was particularly anxious that the Conference should be a success and was prepared to spare no effort, including financial effort, to have the Conference prepared properly. In a few weeks' time, a representative of the Secretary-General was to visit Buenos Aires to co-ordinate the steps to be taken with the authorities. The Secretary-General would therefore be able to submit at the resumed fifty-seventh session or, at the latest, at the fifty-eighth session, an interim report containing specific suggestions calling for a decision by the Council, particularly on the drafting of the action plan envisaged in paragraph 1 of document E/5465.

43. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objections, he would take it that the Council had adopted the provisional agenda for the fifty-seventh session (E/L.1589), as amended, (item 18) subject to the decision to be taken on the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Rationalization of the work of the Council (item 21), and taking into account the proposal to defer consideration of item 16 (b) and also the document on the organization of the work of the fifty-seventh session (E/L.1596).

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 11

Rationalization of the work of the Council:

- (a) **Review of the terms of reference of the subsidiary bodies of the Council;**
- (b) **Machinery for programme and co-ordination;**
- (c) **Review of the rules of procedure of the Council and its subsidiary bodies;**
- (d) **Strengthening of the capacity of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs in connexion with public finance and financial institutions**

REPORT OF THE *Ad Hoc* COMMITTEE ON THE RATIONALIZATION OF THE WORK OF THE COUNCIL (E/5515)

44. The PRESIDENT drew the Council's attention to paragraph 50 of the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee (E/5515), which contained four draft decisions recommended by the Committee to the Council for adoption. He noted that the Committee had adopted draft resolution I without a vote. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council also wished to adopt it without a vote.

Draft decision I (E/5515, para. 50) was adopted without a vote [decision 19 (LVI)].

¹ Subsequently circulated as document E/L.1598.

45. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) pointed out that paragraph 16 should be amended to read: "At its seventh meeting, the representative of Brazil introduced and orally revised the revised draft decision (document E/AC.60/L.2/Rev.1), which read as follows:"

46. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on draft decision II.

Draft decision II (E/5515, para. 50) was adopted by 37 votes to none, with 10 abstentions [decision 20 (LVI)].

47. Mr. BRITO (Brazil), explaining his vote, said that, despite the content of subparagraphs (a), (b) and (c), he had abstained because he considered it regrettable that the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (CPC), a technical body with a small membership which had not been set up to engage in policy-making, should be chosen to deal with such an important question as the role of the organizations of the United Nations system in the evolution of a new economic and social world order.

48. Mr. van GORKOM (Netherlands) said that he wholly endorsed the point of view of the representative of Brazil; he was dissatisfied with subparagraph (d) of the decision: a political question of such importance should be considered by the ACC and the Council itself. Nevertheless, he did not think that the Council should, as matters stood, contemplate such a drastic change in its procedure, because too little preparation had been made for replacing the Joint Meetings of ACC and CPC by meetings of ACC and the Council. His delegation was not entirely satisfied with the decision which had just been made, but it was the only one that the Council could make. It hoped that the Council at its fifty-seventh session would give careful consideration to the question of the dialogue between the Council and ACC.

49. Mr. FASLA (Algeria) said that his delegation abstained for the same reasons as the delegations of Brazil and the Netherlands. It held that CPC was a technical, not a policy-making body; policy-making was a function of the Council and ACC alone. He hoped that when the Council considered item 4 of the agenda at the fifty-seventh session, it would be able to discuss it with the members of ACC in Geneva at that time.

50. Mr. JAIN (India) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution II, although it was not entirely satisfied with its wording, especially that of subparagraph (d), which seemed to deal with both substantive and procedural questions: whether a subsidiary body of the Council should continue to perform its functions, and how to deal with the role of the United Nations in the evolution of a new economic and social world order.

51. With regard to the first question, while CPC was certainly a technical body, it was also an intergovernmental body composed of representatives of member States and having certain functions. At its sixth special session, the General Assembly, in its resolution 3202 (S-VI) had affirmed that the Council should define the policy framework and co-ordinate the activities of all organizations, institutions and subsidiary bodies within the United Nations system which would be entrusted with the task of implementing the Programme of Action. At its fifty-seventh session the Council was to take into account the views of all those bodies and agencies, which were to submit progress reports, and would it-

self be able to say how Governments were applying the Programme of Action. On the basis of those reports the Council could draw up guidelines for the purpose of defining the policy framework of the Programme.

52. Mr. OLIVERI LÓPEZ (Argentina) explained that his delegation had abstained in the vote on draft decision II for reasons similar to those given by the delegations of Brazil and Algeria: CPC was essentially a technical body of small membership, and should not take over the Council's primary responsibility for such important questions as the changed role of the United Nations system in the establishment of a new economic order.

53. Mr. ČABRIĆ (Yugoslavia) associated himself with the views expressed by the representatives of Algeria, Argentina and Brazil with regard to subparagraph (d). His delegation had abstained because it considered that the problem of co-ordination and programming raised by the reorientation of the United Nations system could not be resolved in the manner suggested in the draft decision.

54. Mr. JAIN (India) drew attention to the wording of the last line of the draft decision, and pointed out that it would be advisable to keep the wording used at the sixth special session in order to avoid any confusion.

55. Mr. BRITO (Brazil) pointed out that, in submitting the original text of the draft decision, his delegation had merely reproduced a suggestion made by ACC.

56. Mr. WILDER (Canada) pointed out that the Council had already adopted the draft decision.

57. Mr. JAIN (India) stressed that even though the draft decision spoke of "the evolution of a new economic and social world order", its intent was exactly the same as the General Assembly's decision.

58. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council), referring to draft decision III, explained the financial implications of subparagraphs (b) and (c) which provided for the establishment of an *ad hoc* working group which would hold up to three sessions of one week each before the fifty-eighth session of the Council. The estimated cost of interpretation services for a one-week session at Headquarters was \$4,000. Although the draft decision called for up to three one-week sessions, a view expressed in the *Ad Hoc* Committee had been that two one-week sessions should be sufficient, but that provision should be made for an additional one-week session. If the two sessions were held from 27 to 31 January and from 3 to 7 March 1975, they would not entail additional expenditure. The third session, should it take place, would cost \$4,000.

59. The PRESIDENT noted that the *Ad Hoc* Committee had approved draft decision III without a vote. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council also wished to adopt it without a vote.

Draft decision III (E/5515, para. 50) was adopted without a vote [decision 21 (LVI)].

60. Mr. MACKENZIE (United Kingdom) pointed out that the sponsors of the draft decision had proposed that the *ad hoc* working group should be set up by the President of the Council in the usual way, after consultations with the regional groups.

61. The PRESIDENT said that if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council decided to follow that procedure.

It was so decided.

62. Mr. BONNICK (Jamaica), referring to draft decision IV, pointed out that the Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs had given certain assurances which were to be reproduced between paragraphs 48 and 49 of the Ad Hoc Committee's report (E/5515). He asked what the wording of the proposed text was.

63. Mr. de SEYNES (Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs) reiterated the assurances he had given to the *Ad Hoc* Committee to the effect that no change was contemplated in the existing arrangements with regard to the question of public finance.

64. Mr. KABARITI (Jordan) requested that the views expressed by the representatives of Egypt and Jordan on item 11 (*d*) should be recorded in the report of the Council to the General Assembly.

65. The PRESIDENT noted that the *Ad Hoc* Committee had approved draft decision IV without a vote. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council also wished to adopt it without a vote.

Draft decision IV (E/5515, para. 50) was adopted without a vote [decision 22 (LVI)].

Appointment of the Chairman of the Committee on Negotiations with Intergovernmental Agencies

66. The PRESIDENT said that he had received from the Chairman of the Committee on Negotiations with Intergovernmental Agencies a communication stating that he would be unable to preside over the meeting of the Committee on 27 May. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council decided to appoint Mr. John Wilder, Vice-Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Rationalization of the Work of the Council, as Acting Chairman of the Committee on Negotiations with Intergovernmental Agencies.

It was so decided.

Closure of the session

67. Following the usual exchange of courtesies, the PRESIDENT declared the fifty-sixth session of the Economic and Social Council closed.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.