

connexion that the terms of the draft resolution had been endorsed in principle by the Committee itself at its December session.

76. The draft resolution had limited objectives: the first, enunciated in paragraph 1, was that international transport organizations should base their requirements on the standards recommended by the Committee of Experts. Paragraph 2 aimed at preventing goods which met the international standards established by IMCO and the International Air Transport Association from being blocked in ports or airports because of differing local regulations. The problems raised by variations in packaging standards were a serious obstacle to trade and must be eliminated. The draft resolution dealt only with transport to and from airports and seaports. Finally, the third objective of the draft resolution was to invite Member States to take appropriate steps for the enforcement of adequate packaging standards. Of late there had occurred incidents which could probably have been avoided if each country had strictly complied with the standards recommended by the Committee of Experts.

77. In conclusion, he expressed the hope that the Council would be able to adopt without a vote the text submitted, which was very limited in scope.

78. The PRESIDENT suggested that consideration of the draft resolutions submitted under item 5 should be postponed to the following day.

### AGENDA ITEM 3

**Programme budget for 1976-1977 and medium-term plan for 1976-1979 (continued)\* (E/5612, E/5613 and Corr.1-4, E/5614, E/5632; E/5643, chap. I, draft resolution III; E/5660, E/5661 and Corr.2, E/L.1642, 1643/Rev.2)**

79. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should adopt without a vote the revised draft decision (E/L.1643/Rev.2) submitted by the delegation of Mexico.

*The draft decision was adopted [decision 74 (LVIII)].*

80. Mr. LOPEZ BASSOLS (Mexico) stressed the importance of the draft decision which had just been adopted. Several developing countries had indicated that, for economic reasons, it would not be possible for them to send a delegation to the World Conference

\* Resumed from the 1943rd meeting.

of the International Women's Year. However, that Conference had to define the basic objectives of an international action programme, and a limited number of countries should not have the responsibility of determining objectives for the whole world. The participation of a very large majority, if not all, of the countries of the third world in the Conference was therefore essential.

81. He appealed to Governments which undertook to make additional contributions to cover the travelling expenses of representatives from developing countries requesting such assistance so that they could attend the Conference to inform the Secretary-General of their decision as soon as possible.

82. Mr. WILDER (Canada) said that he was pleased to inform the Council that the Canadian Government had agreed to make a contribution to cover expenses of representatives of developing countries which, for economic reasons, would be unable to participate in the Conference in Mexico.

### AGENDA ITEM 4

**Rationalization of the work of the Council and its subsidiary bodies (continued)\* (E/5633, E/L.1648)**

83. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to take a decision on the draft resolution in document E/L.1648.

84. Mr. STURKEY (Australia), submitting an oral amendment to the draft resolution, proposed the addition of the following operative paragraph:

*"Decides further to postpone until 1976 the review of the subsidiary machinery of the Council, including the machinery for programme and co-ordination".*

85. The PRESIDENT said that if he heard no objections, he would take it that the Council decided to adopt draft resolution E/L.1648, as orally amended by the representative of Australia, without a vote.

*The draft resolution, as orally amended, was adopted [resolution 1920 (LVIII)].*

86. Mr. DONNELLY (United Kingdom) said that the participation of his delegation in the consensus on draft resolution E/L.1648 should not be interpreted as a modification of its position with regard to the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States.

*The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.*

\* Resumed from the 1941st meeting.

## 1948th meeting

Tuesday, 6 May 1975, at 10.50 a.m.

*President:* Mr. Iqbal AKHUND (Pakistan).

E/SR.1948

### AGENDA ITEM 7

#### Social development questions

REPORT OF THE SOCIAL COMMITTEE (E/5664)

1. The PRESIDENT said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Council agreed to follow the established practice in considering the re-

ports of the sessional committees, namely, to take a decision on all the recommendations concerning a given item before hearing explanations of vote.

*It was so decided.*

2. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the draft resolutions and draft decisions recommended to the Council by the Social Committee in paragraph 28

of its report on social development questions (E/5664). If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt draft resolutions I to V without a vote.

*Draft resolutions I to V were adopted* [resolutions 1921 (LVIII) to 1925 (LVIII)].

3. The PRESIDENT drew the attention of the Council, in connexion with draft resolution VI, to the fact that a resolution on the same subject had also been recommended by the Economic Committee (E/5670, para. 30, draft resolution III).

4. Mr. MACRAE (United Kingdom) proposed that in the interests of rationalization the two draft resolutions should be adopted as parts A and B of a single Council resolution.

5. Miss GARCIA DONOSO (Ecuador) endorsed the United Kingdom proposal, but stressed that the working group to co-ordinate the action of intergovernmental agencies, specialized agencies and United Nations bodies should take into account not only the social and human rights aspects of the question but also the impact of international migration on population problems, as had been pointed out in the report of the Population Commission on its eighteenth session (E/5643) and in the Economic Committee.

6. Miss CAO PINNA (Italy), supported by Mr. LASCARRO (Colombia), endorsed the United Kingdom proposal. The draft resolution recommended by the Social Committee was the broader of the two and should therefore constitute part A of the resolution, while the draft resolution recommended by the Economic Committee, which took a narrower view of the subject, should be part B.

7. Mr. MACRAE (United Kingdom) recalled that the Council was to be provided with a statement of the financial implications of the draft resolution recommended by the Economic Committee.

8. The PRESIDENT noted that there appeared to be general agreement that draft resolution VI should be combined with the draft resolution recommended by the Economic Committee; action could be taken to that effect when the Council considered the latter draft resolution. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt draft resolution VI without a vote.

*Draft resolution VI was adopted* [resolution 1926 A (LVIII)].

9. The PRESIDENT informed the Council that the representative of the United States had requested a vote on draft resolution VII.

*Draft resolution VII was adopted by 32 votes to none, with 1 abstention* [resolution 1927 (LVIII)].

10. Mr. KIYA (Japan) said that, if his delegation had been present during the voting, it would have voted for draft resolution VII.

*Draft resolutions VIII and IX were adopted* [resolutions 1928 (LVIII) and 1929 (LVIII)].

11. The PRESIDENT informed the Council that the representative of the United States had requested a vote on draft resolution X.

12. Miss CAO PINNA (Italy) said that Italy attached great importance to United Nations action with regard to capital punishment. In introducing the draft resolution in the Social Committee, her delegation had stressed that it merely reiterated principles which had

already been affirmed in past resolutions of the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly. The purpose of the draft resolution was to stress the importance of a continuing study in depth of capital punishment, and it had therefore been possible for all delegations, including that of the United States, to concur in its adoption without a vote in the Social Committee. Her delegation was well aware of the political and social situations which might make it impossible for certain Governments to abolish capital punishment or amend their legislation immediately. However, the difficulties mentioned by the United States delegation in the Social Committee had not prevented the Committee's adopting the draft resolution without a vote, and she therefore appealed to the United States representative to reconsider his request for a vote on it at the present stage.

13. Mr. WIGGINS (United States of America) said that he was unfortunately unable to respond to the appeal of the representative of Italy for reasons which he would state in his explanation of vote.

*Draft resolution X was adopted by 27 votes to none, with 9 abstentions* [resolution 1930 (LVIII)].

*Draft decisions A, B and C were adopted* [decisions 75 (LVIII) to 77 (LVIII)].

14. Mr. WU Miao-fa (China), explaining his vote on draft resolution VII, said that his delegation, for the reasons which it had stated at the 754th meeting of the Social Committee, remained firmly opposed to the sentence in paragraph 11 of the Statement on the world social situation in the first half of the Second United Nations Development Decade regarding the adoption of effective measures towards disarmament to release resources for development.

15. Mr. KEILAU (German Democratic Republic) said that his delegation's participation in the adoption of draft resolution II without a vote should not be construed as a change in its position regarding the feasibility of voluntary contributions in support of United Nations youth programmes.

16. Mr. WIGGINS (United States of America) said that he deeply regretted having been obliged to call for a vote on draft resolution X. He pointed out that his delegation had not associated itself with the adoption of that draft resolution without a vote in the Social Committee, since it had not been present at the time. His Government could not take a position on the desirability of abolishing capital punishment, as implied in paragraph 1 of the draft resolution, because capital punishment fell largely within the legislative domain of the states rather than the Federal Government, and also because the constitutionality of capital punishment was currently under examination and a case involving it was before the Supreme Court. It would therefore cause serious problems if the Executive adopted a position on the subject.

17. Mr. KIYA (Japan) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution X because, although his Government was not yet in a position to abolish capital punishment completely, it shared the general feeling in favour of total abolition.

18. Mr. BYKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said the fact that his delegation had taken part in the consensus on draft resolution II, concerning the feasibility of voluntary contributions in support of United Nations youth programmes, in no way represented a change in its position on the question.

19. Mr. VON KYAW (Federal Republic of Germany) said that, while his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution VII, it wished to recall the reservations it had expressed in the Social Committee with regard to certain parts of the draft resolution.

### AGENDA ITEM 9

#### Narcotic drugs

##### REPORT OF THE SOCIAL COMMITTEE (E/5667)

20. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the draft resolutions recommended by the Social Committee in paragraph 13 of its report on narcotic drugs (E/5667).

*Draft resolutions I to VII were adopted* [resolutions 1931 (LVIII) to 1937 (LVIII)].

21. Mr. BYKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that if draft resolutions II, V and VII had been put to the vote, his delegation would have abstained. He also wished to place on record his delegation's understanding that the resolutions on narcotic drugs which had been adopted had no additional financial implications for the regular budget of the United Nations.

### AGENDA ITEM 8

#### Human rights questions

##### REPORT OF THE SOCIAL COMMITTEE (E/5669 AND ADD.1)

22. The PRESIDENT drew attention to two errors in document E/5669. The first was the omission of a paragraph introducing the draft resolution, which should read: "11. The Social Committee recommends to the Economic and Social Council the adoption of the following draft resolution". The second was that the two draft resolutions recommended for adoption should actually constitute parts of a single draft resolution and should therefore be headed "A" and "B" instead of "I" and "II". He invited the Council to take action on the draft resolutions and draft decisions on human rights questions recommended by the Social Committee in its report (E/5669 and Add.1).

*The draft resolution in document E/5669 was adopted* [resolution 1938 (LVIII)].

*Draft resolutions I to III and draft decisions A to I in document E/5669/Add.1 were adopted* [resolutions 1939 (LVIII) to 1941 (LVIII) and decisions 78 (LVIII) to 86 (LVIII)].

23. Mr. KEILAU (German Democratic Republic) recalled that, in the debate in the Social Committee on the study of reported violations of human rights in Chile, his delegation had stressed that strict observance and full implementation of Economic and Social Council resolution 1873 (LVI) and General Assembly resolutions 3059 (XXVIII) and 3219 (XXIX) were an urgent matter for the United Nations.

24. Mr. BYKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, in the debate in the Social Committee, his delegation had also stressed that implementation of the relevant United Nations resolutions, particularly General Assembly resolution 3219 (XXIX), continued to be a major task of the United Nations, including the Economic and Social Council. His delegation hoped that the report requested in resolution 3219 (XXIX), paragraph 6, would be duly submitted to the General Assembly at its thirtieth session.

25. His delegation also wished to confirm its view that establishment of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group referred to in resolution 8 (XXXI) of the Commission on Human Rights (see E/5635, chap. II) without due regard to the principle of regional representation would prejudice the work of the Group itself and the co-operation of States in the activities of United Nations bodies. Furthermore, the establishment of the working group referred to in draft decision B recommended by the Social Committee for adoption was contrary to Economic and Social Council resolution 1503 (XLVIII).

### AGENDA ITEM 12

#### Statistical questions

##### REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC COMMITTEE (E/5659)

26. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should defer consideration of the item until it had concluded its consideration of item 3, concerning the programme budget, because the Economic Committee had adopted a draft decision which might be superseded by a decision on the programme budget taken in plenary meeting.

*It was so decided.*

### AGENDA ITEM 11

#### Population questions

##### REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC COMMITTEE (E/5670 AND CORR.1)

27. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the draft resolutions and draft decisions recommended for adoption in paragraph 30 of the report of the Economic Committee on population questions (E/5670 and Corr.1).

*Draft resolutions I and II were adopted* [resolutions 1942 (LVIII) and 1943 (LVIII)].

28. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) said that draft resolution III would have no financial implications if the proposed *ad hoc* group met in New York, but there would be financial implications if it met in Geneva. The details of those financial implications would be provided to the Council at a later date.

*Draft resolution III was adopted* [resolution 1926 B (LVIII)].

*Draft decisions I to VII were adopted* [decisions 87 (LVIII) to 93 (LVIII)].

29. Mr. BYKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, if a vote had been taken on draft resolution III recommended by the Economic Committee, his delegation would have abstained. The Soviet delegation in the Population Commission had abstained from voting on resolution 1 (XVIII), of which the Council took note in draft decision V. His delegation had not objected to the adoption without a vote of draft resolution III of the Population Commission (see E/5643, para. 1), but it had expressed a reservation in the Economic Committee about the financial implications of paragraph 3 of the draft resolution.

30. Mr. MACRAE (United Kingdom) observed that the Council had not been able to do justice to its task of considering the results of the World Population Conference, partly because of its decision that draft resolution III of the Population Commission should be considered in plenary meeting. His delegation reserved the right to introduce a proposal on that point under item 3.

31. Mr. DUMAS (France) said that although his delegation had joined in the consensus on draft resolution III recommended by the Economic Committee, it was not sure that the best way to deal with the question of migrant workers was to set up an *ad hoc* group. The work which would be entrusted to the group was already being carried out by such bodies as the International Labour Organisation. The establishment of the group might cause duplication of work and extra expense. If a vote had been taken on draft resolution III, his delegation would have abstained.

32. Mr. VON KYAW (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation wished to reiterate the reservation which it had expressed in the Economic Committee concerning the duplication of work that might result from the establishment of the *ad hoc* group referred to in draft resolution III.

33. Mr. MOUSKY (United States of America) associated his delegation with the reservation stated by the representative of France.

### AGENDA ITEM 10

#### Mid-term review and appraisal of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade and the implementation of the Declaration and the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order

##### REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC COMMITTEE (E/5674)

34. Mr. MACRAE (United Kingdom) said that the last statement in paragraph 7 of the report of the Economic Committee (E/5674) did not accurately describe the discussion which had taken place in the Committee. He suggested that the word "general" should be deleted.

35. After a discussion in which Mr. GONZALEZ DE COSSIO (Mexico), Mr. BYKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. VON KYAW (Federal Republic of Germany), Mr. MACRAE (United Kingdom), Mr. DUMAS (France), Mr. ACEMAH (Uganda) and the PRESIDENT participated, Mr. OLIVERI LOPEZ (Argentina) proposed that paragraph 7 should be amended to read as follows: "A majority of the representatives who participated in the discussion suggested that in the process of the mid-term review and appraisal of the Strategy full account should be taken of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States."

*It was so decided.*

36. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the members of the Council wished to adopt the draft decision in paragraph 8 of the report (E/5674) without a vote.

*The draft decision was adopted [decision 94 (LVIII)].*

### AGENDA ITEM 5

#### Transport questions (*concluded*) (E/5620, E/5621, E/L.1649-1651, 1654, 1655)

37. Mr. EL-ASHRY (Egypt) said that, according to the report of the Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods (E/5620), the purpose of the list of dangerous goods drawn up by the Committee was to serve as a guide for the classification of other goods not included in it. The Committee had also recognized the need for such lists to be kept up to date, which meant that there was still more work to

be done. Apart from that, the Committee's work entailed certain aspects, such as some test methods devised for the evaluation of packaging, which might be beyond the technical capacities of the developing countries. Although that fact had been taken into consideration in paragraph 35 of the report, it might be appropriate for the Council to remind the Committee of the limited technical capabilities of the developing countries, in order to make the Committee's recommendations practical and applicable. That could be accomplished by inserting the phrase "taking into consideration the real capabilities of the developing countries" after the word "efforts" in draft resolution E/L.1649, paragraph 1.

38. His delegation associated itself with the observations made by the representative of Brazil at the preceding meeting regarding the various draft resolutions submitted on the item under consideration, particularly with respect to the lack of representation of the developing countries in the Committee of Experts.

39. Mr. GONZALEZ DE COSSIO (Mexico) said that his delegation also had some amendments to propose to the draft resolutions under consideration but believed that the Council should first take a decision on the Brazilian representative's proposal, made at the preceding meeting, that consideration of the item should be deferred until the fifty-ninth session. If the Council so decided, there would be no need to proceed with a substantive discussion of the draft resolutions at the current time.

40. Mr. FASLA (Algeria) supported the proposal made by the representative of Brazil at the preceding meeting.

41. Mr. QADRUD-DIN (Pakistan) observed that considerable time was needed to consider adequately all the technical problems raised by transport questions. He wondered whether there would be sufficient time, even at the fifty-ninth session of the Council, to do justice to the item. His delegation therefore suggested that it might be better to postpone consideration of it until the sixtieth session.

42. Mr. BRITO (Brazil) said that his delegation could agree to the Pakistan delegation's suggestion. It had itself merely proposed what it considered to be the minimum delay needed for adequate consideration of the item.

43. Mr. MACRAE (United Kingdom) said it appeared from informal consultations that a number of delegations wanted more time to consider the item in depth, while others had difficulties with the United Kingdom amendment (E/L.1655) to draft resolution E/L.1650. While his delegation understood the preoccupations of those delegations, it considered delay undesirable, as it had explained at the preceding meeting. Nevertheless, if the Council wished to defer consideration of the item until its fifty-ninth session, his delegation would accept that decision, which would give delegations more time to study the United Kingdom amendment and to propose further amendments, if they so desired. In any event, his delegation hoped that the item would be considered at the next session and that any difficulties would be eliminated before then through informal consultations.

44. Mr. KLEIN (United States of America) said that, since the expert appointed by his Government was Chairman of the Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods, he felt obliged to clarify

for the Council precisely what a postponement of consideration of the proposals before the Council would entail.

45. In the first place, the Committee of Experts had made a series of recommendations to the Council between July 1959 and May 1970, and in May 1970 the Council had agreed to the consolidation of all those recommendations into four volumes. In May 1973, the Council agreed to the consolidation of amendments to the earlier recommendations into two additional volumes. In all cases the Council had duly noted the recommendations. Postponement of action on the two United States draft resolutions, as proposed by Brazil, would not, therefore, pertain to these earlier actions by the Council but only to the present draft resolutions, one of which (E/L.1650) would merely amend the recommendations already noted by the Council, contained in the six volumes he had mentioned, and set out in the lengthy annexes to the report of the Committee of Experts on its eighth session.<sup>1</sup> With regard to the second United States draft resolution (E/L.1649), the proposal by the Brazilian delegation for postponement would, of course, delay consideration by the Committee of Experts of the drafting of an International Convention on the Transport of Dangerous Goods by All Modes of Transport.

46. His delegation understood the reasons for the Brazilian proposal and had no objection to the postponement proposed.

47. Mr. BRITO (Brazil) said that the United States representative's comments on documentation relating to transport questions pointed up the need to make hitherto inaccessible documents available to the developing countries. Especially in view of the fact that a new codification was contemplated, the developing countries wanted an opportunity to study and digest all the relevant documents beforehand. That would take time, especially since the recommendations of the

Committee of Experts had unfortunately gone for years without being adequately analysed by the Council.

48. Each of the three draft resolutions before the Council implied some degree of approval of the Committee's recommendations; the one proposed by the United Kingdom went furthest by giving implicit recognition to the desirability of implementing the recommendations. If the recommendations of the Committee of Experts, which had been drawn up mainly with the developed countries in mind, were to have broader application, then it was eminently reasonable for the developing countries to seek an opportunity to examine them more closely.

49. Mr. GONZALEZ DE COSSIO (Mexico) endorsed the views expressed by the representative of Brazil and noted that the representatives of the United Kingdom and the United States had expressed their willingness to have the consideration of their draft resolutions postponed. His delegation therefore believed that, as a compromise, the Council should postpone consideration of the item only until its fifty-ninth session. The additional few months thus gained would allow further consideration both of the draft resolutions and of the report of the Committee of Experts. Moreover, Geneva was an appropriate place to take up transport questions, since the Intergovernmental Preparatory Group on a Convention on International Intermodal Transport—a subject mentioned in draft resolution E/L.1649—met there under the auspices of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. He asked whether the representative of Pakistan would be willing to agree to that compromise.

50. Mr. QADRUD-DIN (Pakistan) withdrew his proposal.

51. The PRESIDENT said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to postpone consideration of agenda item 5 until its fifty-ninth session.

*It was so decided.*

*The meeting rose at 12.40 p.m.*

<sup>1</sup> E/CN.2/CONF.5/57.

## 1949th meeting

Tuesday, 6 May 1975, at 3.15 p.m.

*President:* Mr. Iqbal AKHUND (Pakistan).

E/SR.1949

### AGENDA ITEM 13

**Elections (E/5668 and Corr.1, E/L.1616, 1626-1628, 1628/Add.1/Rev.1 and Add.2, 1629-1633)**

1. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect members of the Council committees, functional commissions and other subsidiary bodies of the Council in the order in which those different bodies were listed in the *Journal*.

2. He invited Mrs. G. M. Allam (Egypt), Mr. M. Jalili (Iran), Mr. V. Petrone (Italy) and Mr. T. Tanabe (Japan) to act as tellers.

### STATISTICAL COMMISSION (E/L.1626)

3. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect eight members of the Statistical Commission for a term of office of four years beginning on 1 January 1976.

4. Miss ST. CLAIRE (Assistant Secretary of the Council) read out the following list of candidates: for the two seats allotted to the Socialist States of Eastern and Kenya; for the two seats allotted to the Asian States: India and Iraq; for the seat allotted to the Latin American States: Argentina; for the seat allotted to the Western European and other States: Ireland; for the two seats allotted to the Socialist States of Eastern Europe: Czechoslovakia and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.