



ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Resumed Fifty-third Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Tuesday, 17 October 1972
at 3.15 p.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Károly SZARKA (Hungary).

Organization of work (E/5210/Rev.1, E/L.1518, E/L.1519)

1. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the note by the Secretary-General concerning the revision of the agenda (E/L.1519). In view of the explanations given by the Secretary-General, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council agreed to revise the agenda for the resumed fifty-third session by including the items "World Food Programme: modification of the WFP budget cycle" and "Calendar of conferences and related matters".

It was so decided.

2. The PRESIDENT said that the items which had just been added to the agenda would be items 11 and 12, respectively. The Council would take up item 11 on 18 October 1972 and item 12 might be taken up during the November meetings.

3. Item 2 (Question of the establishment of a United Nations revolving fund for natural resources exploration) had been deferred to the third part of the resumed session, following the receipt of a communication from the Chairman of the Group of 77 who had informed him that the Group wished the item to be deferred in order to allow for the conclusion of negotiations which were under way. The request had been considered by the officers of the Council, and it had been agreed that, instead of convening the Economic Committee and then deciding to defer consideration of the item, it would be preferable, in view of the heavy commitments arising from the current General Assembly session, not to convene the Economic Committee merely for the purpose of taking a procedural decision.

4. With regard to item 4 (Report of the Population Commission on its special session), the officers of the Council had been informed that the Secretary-General of the World Population Conference would take up his post in the last week of October. Since the report of the special session of the Population Commission was mainly concerned with preparations for the World Population Conference and World Population Year, it would be desirable for the Secretary-General of the Conference to be present at the time the Council discussed the item. The officers of the Council accordingly agreed to postpone the item until the third part of the resumed session.

5. At its previous meeting, the Council had decided, on the proposal of the representative of Tunisia, that the reports of the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank Group, the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment and the Trade and Development Board should not go directly to the Economic Committee, but should first be considered by the Council in plenary meeting. It was the understanding of the

officers of the Council that, in adopting the decision, the Council wished to follow the same procedure as it had adopted for the reports of the regional economic commissions and the United Nations Economic and Social Office in Beirut at the fifty-third session, when the item had been referred to the Economic Committee after a proposal of a substantive nature had been submitted in the plenary Council.

6. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) wondered whether consideration of item 2 should not be deferred until the spring or summer session of 1973 because, to judge from the progress made so far, the Council would not be in a position to take a decision on it in November 1972.

7. The PRESIDENT felt that the item should be retained on the agenda for the third part of the resumed session, at which time the Council could decide to defer consideration of it, if it so desired.

AGENDA ITEM 3

Report of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment (E/5211, E/5217)

8. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the report of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment (E/CONF.48/14), transmitted to the Council by a note by the Secretary-General (E/5211) and to the relevant report of the Secretary-General,¹ also transmitted to the Council by a note by the Secretary-General (E/5217). He then invited the Secretary of the Conference to introduce the agenda item.

9. Mr. STRONG (Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment) said that he wished to report on the first results of the initiative taken by the Council at its forty-fifth session when the question of convening an international conference on the environment had been raised in a United Nations forum for the first time. That far-sighted initiative had been welcomed by the General Assembly and had led, in due course, to the Stockholm Conference of June 1972.

10. The Conference itself and the preparatory process had demonstrated the magnitude of the tasks ahead, but the Council had just cause to be satisfied with the first results of the recommendation it had made four years before.

11. The Conference could be considered to have achieved its two principal objectives of providing the framework for intergovernmental action and arousing public support for such action.

12. The Declaration of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment included the important principle of the responsibility of States to ensure that activities under their jurisdiction or control

¹ Document A/8783.

did not cause damage to the environment of other States or of areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction. The Conference had also adopted an Action Plan consisting of 109 recommendations for action at the international level arranged in a functional framework, which constituted a first work programme for the international community in giving effect to the principles in the Declaration. Finally, the Conference had addressed recommendations to the General Assembly concerning the institutional and financial means for stimulating and co-ordinating international environmental action.

13. The institutional and financial recommendations were embodied in a resolution which envisaged the establishment of machinery for intergovernmental co-operation in the formulation of environmental policies and in the review of their implementation. In support of that machinery, it proposed the establishment of a small supporting secretariat and arrangements for funding and co-ordinating environmental activities.

14. He was sure that the consideration of those institutional and financial questions by the General Assembly would be greatly assisted by the views which the Council might wish to express. He felt, in particular, that the Assembly would wish to be guided by the views of the Council on the provisions of the Stockholm Conference which related to the subject of co-ordination, for which the Council exercised a special responsibility under the Charter. That responsibility had been very much in the mind of delegations at Stockholm when considering the functions and form of intergovernmental machinery for environmental co-operation, and the Conference had, in fact, recommended that the machinery which might be established by the General Assembly should have a special link with the Council. The means contemplated would provide for the intergovernmental body to report to the Assembly through the Council, thus enabling it to consider the environmental activities of the United Nations system in relation to the other principal activities of the system, particularly in the economic and social fields.

15. The need for effective co-ordination of environment programmes was perhaps the main theme of the institutional and financial recommendations of the Conference and also one which recurred in each section of the Stockholm resolution.

16. The resolution stated that the intergovernmental body would provide general policy guidance for the direction and co-ordination of environmental programmes within the United Nations system; that the executive head of the supporting secretariat would be specifically charged with co-ordinating responsibilities, and for that purpose would, among other things, be chairman of the proposed interagency co-ordinating board; and that the environment fund should be directed to the need for effective co-ordination in the implementation of environment programmes.

17. If there was cause for optimism about the prospects for achieving effective co-ordination of environment activities within the United Nations system, it was not only because of the merits of the measures proposed by the Stockholm Conference, but also because the preparatory process and the Conference had proved that the United Nations system itself, if properly used, had tremendous potential for effective and concerted action towards common goals. The Stockholm Conference had been a conference of the United

Nations system as a whole. It had been based upon the combined technical expertise of the various departments and agencies of the system, in the form of contributions of basic documents and expert personnel made available to assist in the planning and preparation of the Conference, and augured well for future work.

18. The institutional and financial arrangements recommended by the Conference involved new approaches to co-ordination to strengthen and rationalize the links which already existed among the elements of the system. In particular, the concept of central funding was designed to ensure that, in discharging new tasks in the environment field, the capacity of the various bodies of the system and the resources available for those tasks would be utilized in the most effective manner possible.

19. He recalled that, in a statement to the Stockholm Conference before it adopted the resolution on institutional and financial arrangements, he had expressed the view, on behalf of the United Nations Secretariat, that there was no doubt whatsoever that the ultimate authority for the approval of the programme of each agency rested with its governing body. It therefore followed that the functions assigned to any intergovernmental body which might be established, and to its secretariat, should be understood and exercised in the context of the principles of co-operation, co-ordination and concerted action inherent in the United Nations system, as laid down in the Charter, the constitutions of the agencies and the agreement concluded between the United Nations and each of the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency. Any arrangements for international environmental co-operation which might be decided upon by the General Assembly would be carried out by the United Nations Secretariat in that spirit.

20. In considering the need for co-ordination of activities in any field, it was unrealistic to approach the problem only at the Secretariat level. No system of co-ordination could function unless it was based upon co-ordination within and among Governments, and the Stockholm Conference had called upon the latter to establish appropriate national institutions to undertake the work of environmental action. It had also provided for a link between the co-ordination functions at governmental and Secretariat levels by recommending that the proposed interagency co-ordinating board should report annually to the proposed intergovernmental body.

21. The United Nations was at the beginning of a new chapter in international co-operation. It had set in motion a process which, while it had specific objectives, did not have a limit in time. States had accepted the responsibility of formulating and implementing principles for sound environmental management on behalf of their citizens and of mankind as a whole. They had agreed to give the United Nations responsibility for channelling those efforts into a common framework towards a common objective.

22. He was sure that the Council would continue to give to those responsible for the environment programmes of the United Nations the guidance which it was uniquely equipped to provide.

23. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) congratulated the Secretary-General of the Conference on his work in connexion with the problem of the environment. The Stockholm Conference had been a great success and he

pledged his delegation's support in the efforts of the United Nations to solve environmental problems.

24. Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya) felt that the Stockholm Conference had opened the way to agreement on a number of areas related to the environment, including the management of the human environment, and his delegation fully supported the recommendations adopted. At the Conference Kenya had been put forward as one of the countries prepared to act as host to the secretariat of the new body which would be established to deal with environmental problems. It was not his intention at the present time to adduce arguments in favour of establishing the secretariat at Nairobi; he would merely point out that the overwhelming majority of United Nations agencies had set up their headquarters in North America or western Europe and a fairer geographical distribution would seem desirable.

25. Mr. HASSAN (Sudan) associated his delegation with those of Tunisia and Kenya in congratulating the United Nations on the successful outcome of the Conference.

26. Mr. RIZVI (Pakistan) said that the Conference had illustrated, as no other event in recent times, the unity and interdependence of the world and had underlined the inherent relationship between environmental issues and the objectives of development. It had shown that environmental contradictions arose not merely from an excessive and reckless consumption of resources, as characterized by the more affluent world, but also from a shocking lack of consumption, as apparent in the poverty, misery and malnutrition of the poorer countries. That basic perspective must be adequately reflected in the implementation of the Declaration and of the Action Plan.

27. The character and function of the institutional machinery recommended by the Conference, to be established by the General Assembly at its current session, therefore assumed primary importance. Policies and programmes must first reflect the balance of the Declaration and the Action Plan and, in addition, must at all times be integrated and co-ordinated with over-all United Nations policies for economic and social development.

28. The regrettably brief debate in the Council was timely; it allowed stress to be laid on the importance which must continue to be placed on the work of the Council, and on its responsibility under the Charter for co-ordinating and providing policy guidance on all economic and social development matters. If the Council was to be able to discharge its responsibilities, it must be given the opportunity and right to examine, in depth, the report of the proposed Governing Council for environmental programmes and to ascertain that policies concerning development and environmental questions were complementary and not conflicting. His delegation therefore hoped that any decision on the items would reflect the readiness and responsibility of the Economic and Social Council to perform its functions of co-ordination and integration, as provided for in the Charter, in the field of the human environment.

29. Mr. KARUNATILLEKE (Sri Lanka) joined other delegations in welcoming the successful outcome of the Conference and stressed the need to co-ordinate environmental action with over-all development policies. However, it was important that the developing countries should not lose sight of the urgent problems

that had been raised in the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. In his view, the Council and the Second Committee were facing other equally important problems which should be accorded equal priority.

30. Miss GONZALEZ MARTINEZ (Mexico) said that her delegation wished to express its gratitude for the meticulous organization of the Conference and the generous hospitality offered by the Swedish Government. A series of important recommendations had been adopted at Stockholm, including a resolution on financial and institutional arrangements which focused on international action and, more particularly, on arrangements for co-ordinating general environmental activities. Her Government welcomed the recommendation to establish a Governing Council for environmental programmes—to which it wished to belong—with the same membership as that established for the Economic and Social Council by General Assembly resolution 2847 (XXVI) and with a similar geographical distribution to that of a number of Council organs. Mexico had consistently urged that every State should hold itself responsible for protecting its own environment. However, the most privileged countries, which bore the heaviest responsibility for the environmental crisis, should participate more fully in applying corrective measures, by making their scientific and technological expertise available to the developing countries. Furthermore, no policies should be adopted in respect of environmental preservation which might have adverse effects on the development of the latter countries.

31. The bases for the principles she had mentioned had been laid at the first Conference at Stockholm, and her delegation hoped that the second Conference would adopt them as criteria for tackling environmental problems on a world-wide scale.

32. Finally, Mexico's deep and continuing interest in environmental problems had been demonstrated by the invitation issued at Stockholm to hold the second Conference in Mexico.

33. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) said that the report of the Stockholm Conference would provide background material for an intensive and comprehensive discussion in the Second Committee. His delegation would support a decision by the Council which took note of the report with satisfaction.

34. The Conference had been a bold step in the preparation of a blueprint for international co-operation on many fundamental questions which would affect the quality of life on earth for generations to come. Among the very impressive documents it had produced was the Declaration on the Human Environment which, although it carried no binding legal obligation, provided a definition of problems of the environment and was an inspiration for future action. The Action Plan offered a coherent framework for the Earthwatch and its supporting measures. One resolution laid the foundation for institutional and financial arrangements for further international action and another condemned nuclear weapons tests, especially those carried out in the atmosphere.

35. The decisions which would ultimately reverse undesirable trends and policies had yet to be taken by Governments. The next important step following the Stockholm Conference would be the establishment by

the General Assembly of an institutional framework for future international co-operation. His Government was in broad agreement with the framework proposed at Stockholm. Many environmental activities were already being carried out by Governments and organizations both within and outside the United Nations system, including the agencies within the Council's co-ordinating jurisdiction. The creation of the new institutions proposed by the Conference would facilitate the Council's work of co-ordination in the future, but would by no means relieve it of its responsibilities under the Charter. The Council should examine carefully its future role with respect to environmental questions in the light of the decisions to be taken by the General Assembly.

36. Miss LIM (Malaysia) said that the success of the Stockholm Conference showed what political will could accomplish. Her delegation endorsed the recommendations adopted at Stockholm and welcomed the remarks of the Secretary-General of the Conference concerning the institutional and financial arrangements agreed upon and the responsibilities of the Economic and Social Council as the chief co-ordinating body. The resolution on those arrangements showed that the role of the Council under the Charter of the United Nations had been fully taken into account.

37. Mr. CZARKOWSKI (Poland) said that Poland had not participated in the Conference and would express its position on the resolutions and recommendations of the Conference and their implications in the General Assembly.

38. Mr. HALASZ (Hungary) reiterated his Government's regret that, as a result of disregard for the principle of universality, discrimination had been practised against the German Democratic Republic, with the result that that State, Hungary and a number of other socialist countries had not participated in the Conference.

39. On the eve of the Conference and at the fifty-third session of the Council, his delegation had deplored the lack of international co-operation on environmental problems. It was not satisfied with the proceedings of the Conference or its report and consequently felt that the Council should simply take note of the report and not express satisfaction with it.

40. Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had not taken part in the Conference and bore no responsibility for its recommendations and decisions. It could not accept some of them and would state its substantive position in the Second Committee.

41. The Soviet Union attached considerable importance to environmental questions and had taken steps to preserve its natural environment. The question of organizing international co-operation in that field had been under discussion in the United Nations for some time, and his delegation had consistently and actively called for broad-based and genuinely equitable co-operation without discrimination of any kind. It had from the outset supported the decision to convene the Conference. The attainment of the objectives pursued at Stockholm and all future United Nations efforts in that sphere required the participation of all States, without exception. The human environment was one of the deepest concerns of all peoples of the earth and their interests must not be sacrificed to the kind of narrow

political prejudices which had forced the General Assembly into preventing the German Democratic Republic—and, as a result of the Assembly's decision, a number of other States—from participating in the Conference.

42. The exclusion of the German Democratic Republic, a highly industrialized, sovereign socialist State which had a keen interest in the environment of Europe, had undermined international co-operation, weakened the Conference and cast doubt on the practical significance of its recommendations.

43. He appealed to the Council and the Second Committee to ensure that the principle of universality was reflected in the decision to be taken by the General Assembly concerning the Conference. Any other approach would jeopardize international co-operation.

44. Mr. DEBRAH (Ghana) said that the problems discussed at the Conference transcended national frontiers and that, irrespective of the reasons why some States had not taken part in the Conference, it was imperative to associate all nations in future environmental activities. The report should be considered objectively and should form the working basis for future action by the entire international community.

45. Mr. CUBILLOS (Chile) said that his Government had favoured the participation of the German Democratic Republic in the Conference and felt that the exclusion of that State and the consequent non-participation of the socialist countries of Eastern Europe and also of Cuba had deprived the Conference of a range of valuable experience and ideological thinking necessary for formulating environmental policies. His delegation would state its reservations concerning the results of the Conference in the Second Committee.

46. It was true that the environmental problems of the developing countries differed from those of the developed countries.

47. His delegation had certain doubts concerning the proposed intergovernmental machinery and wished to have further clarification in the Second Committee concerning the question of effective co-ordination, referred to by the Secretary-General of the Conference, and the scope and purposes of the proposed environment fund. The fund which, he assumed, would be financed from voluntary contributions, should not serve to divert the scarce resources available to the United Nations for international economic and social development.

48. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should adopt the following draft decision:

“The Economic and Social Council takes note of the report of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment and the report of the Secretary-General thereon.”

49. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) proposed that, in the light of the views expressed by a number of delegations, the decision should affirm the Council's readiness to carry out its responsibilities under the Charter with respect to the co-ordination of environmental activities.

50. The PRESIDENT pointed out that, since Pakistan was not a member of the Council, it could not make a formal proposal.

51. Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya), recalling that useful proposals had been made by the representatives of

the specialized agencies at the fifty-third session of the Council concerning their participation in environmental activities, said that it was the duty of the Council to co-ordinate efforts in that field. Accordingly, he formally proposed that a statement of the Council's desire to exercise such co-ordination should be reflected in its report to the General Assembly.

52. Mr. **DRISS** (Tunisia) felt that the Council had not given adequate consideration to the report of the Conference. The Council must take its work seriously, for it was not a mere letter-box which transmitted documents to other bodies.

53. Mr. **de AZEVEDO BRITO** (Brazil) said that the Secretary-General of the Conference had touched on a number of important matters relating to co-ordination.

54. The Council's responsibility for co-ordination and its readiness to assume that responsibility, were obvious; furthermore, full account had been taken at Stockholm of the role of the Council, particularly with respect to co-ordination. The Council therefore need not reiterate its co-ordinating role in its decision, and the text read out by the President should be adopted. Substantive discussion of the report should be left to the Second Committee.

55. Mr. **ODERO-JOWI** (Kenya) said his delegation had made its proposal because it believed that there was a clear need in environmental action programmes for co-ordination among a number of United Nations agencies. Furthermore, the World Plan of Action for the Application of Science and Technology to Development indicated the need for co-ordination between it and environmental action. There accordingly appeared to be no reason why reference should not be made to the Council's responsibility for co-ordination.

56. Mr. **AKRAM** (Pakistan) agreed with the comments made by the representatives of Chile and Sri Lanka, in particular with regard to the need to co-ordinate environmental action with over-all development policies. If all members agreed that the Council must exercise its functions of co-ordination in that respect, as the representative of Brazil had stated, there could be no objection to reflecting that view of the Council, either in its decision or in its report to the General Assembly.

57. Mr. **McCARTHY** (United Kingdom) said his delegation had always shared the views referred to by the representative of Pakistan. However, on procedural grounds, it believed that the representative of Brazil was right. The Council had wished to be given an opportunity to discuss the report of the Conference more fully, but the General Assembly had decided that the main discussion should be in the Second Committee. In the debate there, his delegation would express its general support for the Stockholm "package" and would indicate its awareness of the complex mechanisms for co-ordination which were incorporated in its recommendations. There was no need for the Council to reiterate what its generally acknowledged functions were and it should therefore adopt the decision suggested by the President. Thereafter, the Council could meet to consider the final decision of the General Assembly and ensure that its co-ordinating role was taken fully into account.

58. Mr. **DRISS** (Tunisia) said that the situation was clear. The Council had met to discuss the report of the

Conference, but its discussion had not been adequate. One statement by the Secretary-General of the Conference and a number of general statements by delegations did not constitute a debate that was sufficiently exhaustive for it to express any views on the subject. The Council must, either before or after the debate in the Second Committee, consider the report in detail. If it abdicated its responsibility in that respect for the sake of accelerating the process of discussion of the report, its role would be reduced to that of a mere letter-box for the General Assembly. Its functions were the detailed examination of reports and the co-ordination of programmes, and it must discharge those functions seriously. If possible, the item under discussion should be kept on the agenda of the session.

59. Mr. **TERENCE** (Burundi) endorsed the comments of the representative of Tunisia. In his delegation's view, the Council should discuss the report in detail at its current session, since to postpone it might create the impression that the matter was one of no importance or urgency.

60. Mr. **CUBILLOS** (Chile) said that the Council must face the facts. While it would be desirable to study the report in detail in the Economic Committee, that would only duplicate the debate in the Second Committee, which was responsible for formulating the final decision. Perhaps a solution might be for the Council's decision, as formulated by the President, to refer to the statements made by some delegations.

61. The **PRESIDENT** asked whether, since the views of all delegations would be reflected in the Council's report, the Council was ready to adopt the decision he had suggested.

62. Mr. **ZAGORIN** (United States of America) said his delegation shared the position of the President. The views of delegations would be adequately reflected in the Council's report, and while he sympathized with the desire of the representative of Tunisia for a more detailed study, he did not believe that to be practically possible only two days before a full-scale debate in the Second Committee.

63. Mr. **DRISS** (Tunisia) said he did not find the arguments against the Council discussing the report in depth convincing. In July, the Council had been informed that there had not yet been time to prepare the report for discussion. Now it was being told that it had no time to discuss it. In its desire to facilitate the work of the General Assembly, the Council was abdicating its authority. Already, one meeting scheduled for its resumed session had been cancelled, and it was now being asked to reach a decision in the space of a few hours. At a time when efforts were being made to strengthen the role of the Council, that approach was unacceptable.

64. Mr. **ODERO-JOWI** (Kenya) said it would be hard for his delegation to support a decision the effect of which would be to pre-empt the authority of the Council. He accordingly agreed with the representative of Tunisia.

65. Mr. **ZAGORIN** (United States of America) said his delegation did not believe that to adopt the decision suggested by the President would weaken the role of the Council. What would have that effect would be interference by the Council with the orderly work of the United Nations. An extremely important Conference, acclaimed as a success by all who had partici-

pated in it, had taken place in June. At the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly it was decided that the report of the Stockholm Conference should be submitted to the General Assembly through the Economic and Social Council. To keep its report on the agenda of the Council, and thereby prevent it from being discussed by the General Assembly, would constitute a real abdication of responsibility; indeed, the Council would be failing even to act as a mere "letter-box", to use the term of the distinguished representative of Tunisia.

66. Mr. VERCELES (Philippines) supported the decision suggested by the President. Certainly, the Council should discharge its co-ordination functions as fully as possible, but from a practical standpoint, that was not possible in the present instance, since the Second Committee was to meet in two days. For the Council not to forward the report on the Conference would constitute an abdication of responsibility. The most it could do in the circumstances was take note of the report.

67. Mr. RAE (Canada) said that his delegation attached very great importance to the work of the Conference. A previous speaker had referred to the spirit of Stockholm as one of co-operation; there was also apparently a very real spirit of the Economic and Social Council and an awareness of its responsibilities, and his delegation hoped that the two bodies could work together constructively. The most sensible course for the Council to take at the present juncture appeared to be that advocated by the President. If it took note of the report and forwarded it to the General Assembly, it would at least have achieved something. In the future, the Council would, of course, have a real and vital role to play in examining and co-ordinating activities relating to the environment, in accordance with its responsibilities under the Charter.

68. Mr. de AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) strongly supported the course of action suggested by the President. The nature of resumed sessions of the Council obliged it to deal with items more superficially than it would wish to do in other circumstances. Moreover, the representatives of those countries which had not participated in the Conference had already stated that they would express their views in the General Assembly. It appeared important for their views to be heard before any decision was taken. The Council could not delay the action to be taken by the General Assembly in the Second and Fifth Committees, and accordingly, on practical grounds, it would be best to take note of the report. Such a decision would in no way diminish the role or functions of the Council, which could at a later stage consider the decision arrived at by the Assembly with a view to ascertaining what action it could appropriately take.

69. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt the decision he had read out.

It was so decided.

70. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) said that the Council had been asked for its views on an extremely important question and had then been compelled to arrive at a decision which was not based on adequate study of that question. Of course, delegations could state their views on the report in the General Assembly, and his delegation's view would be strongly in favour of the conclusions arrived at by the Conference. However, the point he wished to make was somewhat different. If the wish of Member States was to strengthen the Council, they must apply the formula for doing so consistently and not vary it to suit individual cases. In future, every effort must be made to avoid transmitting reports to the General Assembly before they had been studied in depth in the Council.

71. Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya) said his delegation was not fully satisfied with the decision arrived at by the Council. Environmental programmes could not be divorced from over-all development programmes, and action in relation to the environment would require co-ordination and co-operation among a number of specialized agencies. Environmental programmes, which were scientific in nature, would also come within the competence of the Committee for Science and Technology, and it was thus essential for the Council to work out guidelines for co-ordination. If that was not done, there would be more overlapping and duplication than there had ever been before. His delegation accordingly still felt that it would have been desirable to incorporate, in the Council's decision, a reference to its co-ordinating role.

72. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) said it was regrettable that some delegations had hesitated to reflect in the Council's decision the importance of its inherent right to co-ordinate all action relating to development, including environmental programmes. He hoped that the Second Committee would consider that aspect in detail and would grant the Council the constitutional right to examine the reports of the Governing Council of the new body to be set up to deal with the environment, and to co-ordinate and integrate the policies and activities of the United Nations system in relation to the environment.

73. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) said it appeared to him strange that delegations should wish to refer, in a decision of the Council, to views which had been expressed only after the debate on the subject had been concluded and the decision had been placed before them for approval.

74. Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, in view of its general attitude to the Stockholm Conference, stated earlier in the meeting, his delegation was unable to agree with those delegations which had been in favour of taking note of the report of the Conference. Had the decision been put to a vote, his delegation would have abstained.

The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.