

the fact that the proposal before the Economic and Social Council was not entirely the same as the recommendation made by the Commission. First, the Council should consider whether it was asked to give the Commission more time to devote to its agenda as a whole or only to its work in relation to the World Conference in 1980 and the draft Convention. Secondly, it should consider the possibility of a resumed session in New York, if not in December 1976 then at another time, possibly concurrently with the spring session of the Economic and Social Council. Finally, the disadvantages of not having summary records available should be weighed; in that connexion, he tended to agree with the representative of Brazil. With reference to the final sentence of paragraph 2 of E/L.1740, he asked whether the costs in question could be expected to be absorbed regardless of when a resumed session was convened and whether temporary assistance would be required.

26. Mrs. SIPILA (Assistant Secretary-General for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs) said that it was important for several reasons that the resumed

session of the Commission be held in 1976. For one thing, the existing membership of the Commission was familiar with the draft Convention, and one third of the members were due to be replaced in January 1977.

27. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to defer further discussion of the recommendation until the meeting on Wednesday, 27 October, as suggested by the representative of the Soviet Union.

It was so decided.

Report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of the medium-term and long-term recovery and rehabilitation programme in the Sudano-Sahelian region (A/31/259)

28. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to take note of the report of the Secretary-General (A/31/259) and transmit it to the General Assembly at its thirty-first session.

It was so decided (decision 194 (LXI)).

The meeting rose at 12.25 p.m.

2035th meeting

Wednesday, 27 October 1976, at 3.45 p.m.

President: Mr. Siméon AKE (Ivory Coast).

E/SR.2035

AGENDA ITEM 4

Regional co-operation (concluded)* (E/5845, E/L.1738 and Corr.1, E/L.1738/Add.1, E/L.1739)

1. Mr. GHORRA (Observer for Lebanon), speaking at the invitation of the President, said that he had been unable to complete consultation with his Government or receive final instructions. However he had no desire to delay any further the Council's decision on the location of the headquarters of the Economic Commission for Western Asia, but he wished the following reservation on the part of his Government to be included in the record:

"The Lebanese Government has submitted a detailed financial and technical plan for the establishment of ECWA in Lebanon (E/ECWA/38/Add.1). The offer still stands. The Lebanese Government regrets that the conditions that have prevailed in Lebanon for one and a half years have prevented the normal and needed exchanges of view about its plan and the exploration of its possibilities. Therefore the Lebanese Government registers its reservation at the present time regarding recommendation 35 (S-II) adopted by ECWA at Doha during its session of 22-23 August 1976, as well as its right to reconsider the question at a later stage should it decide to do so."

2. The Lebanese Government welcomed the maintenance of the temporary headquarters of ECWA at Beirut and was ready to meet its obligations in that regard.

3. Mr. KITTANI (Observer for Iraq), speaking at the invitation of the President, expressed his appreciation of the Lebanese representative's statement to the effect that there would be no more attempts to delay a decision by the Council concerning the recommendation of ECWA. With reference to the Lebanese reservation, it must be understood that once the Council had taken a decision, the work on the establishment and construction of the headquarters must proceed. Any representative could, of course, make any reservations he wished, or could try to reverse the Council's decision.

4. Mr. STOFOROPOULOS (Greece) said that since the 2033rd meeting he had studied additional documents, on the basis of which he had held further informal consultations with other delegations. He would have liked more time to consider alternative proposals. However, he would not stand in the way of any decision which the Council might wish to take.

5. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the question of the headquarters of ECWA was urgent. He respected the decision taken by ECWA itself, and hoped that the Council would adopt draft resolution E/L.1739 unanimously. His delegation reserved the right to make detailed comments on the statement of financial implications submitted by the Secretary-General (E/L.1738 and Corr.1 and E/L.1738/Add.1) when it was considered by the Fifth Committee at the current session of the General Assembly. However, he noted with appreciation that the construction of the building would have no financial consequences for the United Nations budget.

6. The PRESIDENT proposed that the Council should adopt draft resolution E/L.1739 without a vote.

* Resumed from the 2033rd meeting.

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 2045 (LXI)).

7. Mr. KITTANI (Observer for Iraq), speaking at the invitation of the President, expressed appreciation for the Council's unanimous confirmation of the ECWA decision. His Government would do all it could to provide the Commission with an efficient headquarters as expeditiously as possible. The Commission's decision to move to Baghdad was both an honour and a challenge to Iraq.

AGENDA ITEM 2

Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters (concluded) (E/5894, E/L.1736, E/L.1737, E/L.1740)

8. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the recommendation of the Commission on the Status of Women contained in paragraph 2 of the note by the Secretariat (E/L.1737), that the Commission should be authorized to hold a resumed twenty-sixth session in December 1976 to complete the remainder of its agenda, with special priority to drafting the Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women.

9. Mr. LOQUET (Belgium) said that the Commission on the Status of Women needed only a fortnight or so to complete its work on the draft Convention. To delay completion until the Commission's next regular session, or to entrust the work to some other body, would not be feasible as an alternative solution. In 1977 some members of the Commission would be replaced and the new members would not be familiar with the work already done. He was therefore categorically in favour of the proposal contained in paragraph 3 of document E/L.1737. However, in the interests of economy, his delegation would not oppose the suggestion that summary records might be dispensed with for the resumed session.

10. Mr. BARCELO (Mexico) said that his delegation would have preferred that the resumed session be held in New York, but if that was not possible he would not object to a meeting at Geneva during the period proposed.

11. Mr. ROUGE (France) said that his delegation had had objections of an administrative nature to the proposal to hold a resumed session of the Commission on the Status of Women; the objections were based essentially on his delegation's desire to see the biennial rule universally applied. However, the arguments he had heard had convinced him that an exception should be made for the Commission on the Status of Women in the case in question. The Council's report should indicate clearly that the case was exceptional and constituted no precedent, and that the rules for meetings of the Council's subsidiary bodies remained in full force.

12. Mr. KANAZAWA (Japan) said that his delegation's views had been expressed at the previous meeting and had not changed. However, if the Council wished to reach a consensus he would not stand in the way.

13. Mr. STOFORPOULOS (Greece) supported the recommendation of the Commission on the Status of Women. He thought moreover that the resumed session should have summary records, because past experience showed that if there were no summary records, other kinds of records tended to become more voluminous. More important still, the Commission would be completing the drafting of an important international instru-

ment, for which the summary records would be regarded as *travaux préparatoires* and would have special significance on that account.

14. The PRESIDENT proposed that the Council should endorse the recommendation of the Commission on the Status of Women that it should authorize the Commission to hold a resumed twenty-sixth session in 1976; accept the suggestion made by the Secretariat in paragraph 3 of its note (E/L.1737) that the resumed session should be held at Geneva from 6 to 17 December 1976, and decide to authorize the provision of summary records for the resumed session.

It was so decided (see decision 195 (LXI)).

15. Mr. BYKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the decision to authorize the Commission on the Status of Women to hold a resumed session had been taken in the light of the fact that the Commission's work on the draft Convention had reached a very advanced stage. The decision was in fact contrary to the decision of a higher United Nations organ, and must not be regarded as setting a precedent. The Secretariat should be instructed to do all it could to reduce expenditure on the resumed session.

16. The PRESIDENT took note of that suggestion.

17. He said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council approved of the new dates for the meetings of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities and its subsidiary bodies proposed in paragraph 4 of the note by the Secretariat (E/L.1737).

It was so decided (see decision 195 (LXI)).

18. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would assume that the Council approved of the proposals concerning the sessions of the *Ad Hoc* Intergovernmental Working Group on Corrupt Practices made in paragraph 5 of document E/L.1737.

It was so decided (see decision 195 (LXI)).

19. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the change regarding the special session of the Committee on Science and Technology for Development, outlined in paragraph 6 of document E/L.1737, was approved.

It was so decided (see decision 195 (LXI)).

20. The PRESIDENT drew the attention of the Council to the decision of the Commission on the Status of Women regarding the Programme for the United Nations Decade for Women, reproduced in paragraph 7 of the note by the Secretariat (E/L.1737). If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council approved of the action outlined under points (a), (b) and (c) in paragraph 8 of document E/L.1737.

It was so decided (decision 196 (LXI)).

AGENDA ITEM 28

Election of the members of the *Ad Hoc* Intergovernmental Working Group on Corrupt Practices established under Economic and Social Council resolution 2041 (LXI) of 5 August 1976

21. The PRESIDENT said that, following consultations with the chairmen of the regional groups, it had been agreed that the composition of the 18-member *Ad Hoc* Intergovernmental Working Group should be as follows: five seats for the African States, four seats

for the Asian States, three seats for the Latin American States, two seats for the socialist States of Eastern Europe and four seats for the Western European and other States. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council agreed to that composition.

It was so decided (see decision 197 (LXI)).

22. Mr. AMIRDZHANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that the representatives of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic and the Soviet Union had expressed their views on the composition of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group at the sixty-first session of the Council at Geneva. Speaking on behalf of those delegations, he said that any decision adopted on the matter should not constitute a departure from the existing principles of equitable geographical distribution within the United Nations system or serve as a precedent. He would like his remarks reported in the summary record.

23. The PRESIDENT said that the reservation did not seem relevant since the composition of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group as proposed was entirely consistent with current United Nations practice and had been arrived at through a gentleman's agreement. He too wished his comments to be recorded in the summary record and in the report of the Council.

24. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) read out a partial list of candidates, which were for the five seats allotted to African States: Algeria, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Uganda and Zaire; for the four seats allotted to Asian States: Iran, Japan and Pakistan; and for the three seats allotted to Latin American States: Colombia, Mexico and Venezuela.

25. Mr. VINCI (Italy), speaking as Chairman of the group of Western European and other States, said that his group had discussed the matter at great length and, in order not to hold up the work of the Working Group, had decided to endorse the candidature of the United States of America but was not in a position to present an agreed list of nominees, as there were eight Member States (the United Kingdom, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium, Canada,

Norway and Italy) and Switzerland that wished to participate in the Working Group. The group appreciated the fact that the Council was prepared to leave the *Ad Hoc* Working Group open-ended, on the basis of the rules of procedure and long-standing practice. Accordingly all those States would participate in the work of the Working Group on that understanding, and the possibility of expanding the Group in future would be kept open. He hoped that the spirit of co-operation thus demonstrated would be understood. Meanwhile, all the delegations named were in touch with their Governments in connexion with the possibility of reducing the number of candidates.

26. The PRESIDENT pointed out that Council resolution 2041 (LXI) stated clearly that the *Ad Hoc* Working Group would have 18 members. Any member of the Council or of the United Nations wishing to participate in the Working Group would have to act in accordance with the Council's rules of procedure. If the Council wished the Working Group to be open-ended it would have to take a decision to that effect.

27. Mr. UDOVENKO (Observer for the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), speaking at the invitation of the President, said that the Eastern European States had no candidates at the current stage.

28. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should elect the members representing the group of African States, the group of Asian States, the group of Latin American States and the group of Western European and other States.

Algeria, Colombia, Iran, Japan, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Sierra Leone, Uganda, the United States of America, Venezuela and Zaire were elected members of the Ad Hoc Intergovernmental Working Group on Corrupt Practices (see decision 197 (LXI)).

29. The PRESIDENT suggested that the chairmen of the regional groups should inform him of the other candidates in due course. The remaining members of the Working Group would be elected at a later date.

The meeting rose at 4.45 p.m.

2036th meeting

Monday, 15 November 1976, at 3.45 p.m.

President: Mr. Siméon AKE (Ivory Coast).

E/SR.2036

AGENDA ITEM 26

United Nations Special Fund (A/31/21)

1. Mr. ALGARD (Norway), President of the Board of Governors of the United Nations Special Fund, introducing the report of the Board of Governors of the Special Fund (A/31/21), said that, although the Fund had finally received its first contributions, he was somewhat more pessimistic about its future than he had been when reporting to the Council and to the General Assembly on previous occasions. His past optimism had stemmed from a refusal to believe that the appeals for contributions made by the General Assembly at two

special and two regular sessions would go unheeded, and he still hoped that he had been right. He had been convinced that, if only a few countries could be persuaded to come forward, that would break the vicious circle in which one group of potential donors waited for another to make the first move. He had hoped that a breakthrough had come when Venezuela and Norway, which belonged to different groups of potential donors, had responded to the appeal for contributions made as part of the consensus reached at the seventh special session of the General Assembly, but subsequent events had not met his expectations. The industrialized countries he had approached had preferred to give their