

# 1877th-meeting

Wednesday, 8 August 1973, at 10.50 a.m.

President: Mr. S. A. FRAZÃO (Brazil)

E/SR.1877

## AGENDA ITEM 3

### General discussion of international economic and social policy, including regional and sectoral developments (concluded)

#### REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC COMMITTEE (E/5390)

1. The PRESIDENT called the Council's attention to the draft resolution recommended for adoption by the Economic Committee (E/5390, para. 6).

2. Mr. STIBRAVY (United States of America) said that, when the draft resolution had been considered in the Economic Committee, his delegation had submitted certain amendments which, if substantially accepted, would have enabled it to support the draft resolution. Unfortunately, however, the Chilean delegation, as the sponsor, had rejected those amendments as not being in accordance with the spirit of its proposals. The United States, which would have wished to support a resolution dealing with important problems of multilateral trade and world food shortages, regretted the unwillingness of the sponsor to seek a consensus. His delegation would like the draft resolution to be put to the vote and would be obliged to vote against it.

3. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) said that, whereas his delegation understood the United States position as described in the Economic Committee, the allegation that the Chilean delegation had been unwilling to seek a consensus was unjust. His delegation had, in fact, accepted a large number of amendments in an effort to reach a consensus but the United States amendments would have deprived the draft resolution of its substance and purpose, and in accepting them his delegation would have lost the support of other delegations. He regretted that the draft resolution was being pressed to a vote.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 20 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.*

4. Mr. DUMAS (France) said that in expressing its support for the resolution just adopted, which included *inter alia* a reference to the dangers to peaceful co-existence (paragraph 6), his delegation was not signifying agreement with any doctrine whatsoever, but was merely referring to the duty of States to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours.

5. Mr. WANG Jun-sheng (China) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, which reflected the legitimate demands of developing countries. It had certain reservations, however, about paragraph 1. The apparent signs of reduction in international tension should

not be allowed to blind the international community to the fact that certain countries were continuing their expansionist and aggressive policies.

6. M. MAKEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the problems referred to in the resolution just adopted had a profound influence on the economic situation of all countries. His delegation welcomed the reference in paragraph 1 to the reduction in international tension. Certain Powers, however, were still pursuing a militaristic policy and States Members of the United Nations had to be constantly on their guard to counter their attempts to hoodwink public opinion, sow hostility among peoples and use the political *détente* to further their own selfish purposes. An improvement in the international political situation was the strongest guarantee for economic, social, scientific and technological co-operation among countries and for the development of the developing countries.

7. His delegation particularly welcomed the appeal to world public opinion to encourage and support prompt and effective action by Governments to remove the dangers to peace, international social justice, peaceful co-existence and the satisfaction of the vital needs of a large part of mankind. The resolution just adopted would make a substantial contribution to the Council's work in the interests of all countries, irrespective of their economic or social systems or levels of development. His delegation had reservations, however, about the reference to the attainment of a system of collective economic security. The definition of that concept was still under discussion and it was premature for the Council to refer to it in its decisions. It was interpreted by various delegations in different ways, some of which his delegation was unable to accept. Its own interpretation was that the term implied the establishment of an international situation in which all countries could develop in conditions of peace and security without any outside economic or political interference and without discrimination.

8. His delegation also had reservations concerning the reference in the resolution to certain other resolutions. It maintained the position it had held at the time of the adoption of UNCTAD resolution 84 (III), namely, that it was wrong to attempt to solve international monetary, trade or financial problems solely through IMF but that all interested countries should take part in discussing those matters and that the Council, UNCTAD and their subsidiary organs should play an increasing role in that respect.

9. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon) said that his delegation, which had been absent when the vote was taken, would have voted in favour of the draft resolution if it had been present.

## AGENDA ITEM 25

**Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (E/5306)**

10. The PRESIDENT said that the Council, at its resumed forty-seventh session, had decided that the annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees would be transmitted to the General Assembly without debate unless the Council decided otherwise at the specific request of one or more of its members or of the High Commissioner. Since no such request had been received, he suggested that the Council should decide to transmit the report to the General Assembly at its twenty-eighth session.

*It was so decided.*

## AGENDA ITEM 6

**Development planning and projections****REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC COMMITTEE (E/5394)**

11. The PRESIDENT said that, since the Economic Committee had unanimously adopted the draft decision in paragraph 4 of its report (E/5394), the Council might wish to adopt it without objection.

12. Mr. de ALENCAR NETO (Brazil) said that his delegation understood that, in taking note of the report of CDP on its ninth session (E/5293), the Council would not be endorsing the contents of the report. The arrangements for the future work of CDP outlined in chapter III of its report, depended on the results of the first review and appraisal of the International Development Strategy and the CDP report had yet to be considered by the General Assembly, which would be responsible for deciding how that Committee should conduct its future work. His delegation could agree to take note of the report on that understanding.

13. Mr. KETTAB (Algeria) said that his delegation regretted that the Council had been unable to study the report of CDP in depth. The CDP Working Group would have an important part to play in introducing new parameters into the International Development Strategy, with the review and appraisal of which the work of CDP was closely connected. His delegation hoped that the convening of its tenth session at Vienna would make it possible for CDP to contribute to the work of the Second General Conference of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization. The Committee's contribution should not be confined to the technical aspects; it should deal also with organizational problems such as the question of autonomy and financial resources for UNIDO and the development of all that body's programmes.

14. M. MAKEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation generally supported the work of CDP and agreed with most of the recommendations made in the report on the Committee's ninth session. It did not agree, however, that the present *détente* was failing to create greater opportunity for development support

(E/5293, para. 29). It also had reservations about some of the proposed arrangements for CDP's future work, on which it might wish to comment at the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly.

*The draft decision was adopted without a vote.*

## AGENDA ITEM 14

**The impact of multinational corporations on the development process and on international relations****REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC COMMITTEE (E/5392 and Corr.1)**

15. The PRESIDENT said that the Economic Committee had adopted the draft decision in paragraph 6 of its report (E/5392) without objection. The Council might wish to do the same.

16. Mr. MACKENZIE (United Kingdom) said that at the end of the Economic Committee's discussion of the item it had been proposed that delegations' comments should be referred to the study group on the impact of multinational corporations on the development process and on international relations. While his delegation had no objection to that course, it would be wrong to give the impression that the views expressed were the unanimous views of the Committee. His delegation had no intention of making a substantive defence of multinational corporations; in fact, he agreed with some of the views expressed in the Committee. When the report of the Group was available, it would be glad to discuss all aspects of the subject, but it had considered it inappropriate to go into substantive questions at the present stage.

17. Two representatives in the Economic Committee had stated that the study group would be responsible for examining "the harmful effects of the activities of multinational companies and the negative impact of multinational companies". There was no such allusion in the terms of reference of the Group, which was required "to study the role of multinational corporations and their impact on the process of development, especially that of the developing countries", and also the implications of multinational corporations for international relations (Council resolution 1721 (LIII), para. 1). If he could be assured that those comments would be included among those to be forwarded to the Group, he would not insist on any change being made in the draft decision. If not, he would like the words "in committee and plenary" to be inserted after the words "and of the comments made thereon".

18. Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya) said that the Council's request to the Secretary-General to carry out a study on the legal, social, economic, political and technological implications of the application of the principle of permanent sovereignty over natural resources was relevant to the question of the impact of multinational corporations on the development process and on international relations. He hoped that the reports on the two topics would be submitted concurrently so that they could be discussed together. The activities of multinational corporations could

be beneficial or prejudicial depending on whether they assisted the developing countries to develop their resources or themselves plundered those resources.

19. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) said that he would have no difficulty in accepting the addition proposed by the United Kingdom delegation, although it seemed superfluous. If the comments of delegations were brought to the attention of the study group, it would be obvious that they were comments made both in the Committee and in the Council. The reports to which the Kenyan representative had referred would also no doubt be brought to the attention of the study group.

20. In his statement in the Economic Committee, he had made no reference to the terms of reference of the study group in the manner alleged by the United Kingdom representative, and he had no desire to distort or falsify those terms of reference. He had merely expressed the hope that the study would not neglect the aspect of its terms of reference relating to the implications of multinational corporations for international relations.

21. M. MACKENZIE (United Kingdom) said that reference to the summary records of the Economic Committee's meetings would show that his comments had related to statements made by two other delegations and not by the Chilean delegation.

22. The PRESIDENT said that, in adopting the draft decision, it would be understood that the comments to be brought to the attention of the study group would be those made both in the Economic Committee and in plenary. He suggested that the documentation on the question of permanent sovereignty over natural resources, to which the Kenyan representative had referred, should also be brought to the attention of the study group.

*It was so agreed.*

23. M. MAKEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the secretariat should take into account the desire of a number of delegations that an expert from the socialist countries should be included in the study group.

24. The PRESIDENT said that those comments would be reflected in the summary record of the meeting.

*The draft decision was adopted without a vote.*

## AGENDA ITEM 7

### Dissemination of information and mobilization of public opinion relative to problems of development

#### REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC COMMITTEE (E/5406)

25. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the report of the Economic Committee on agenda item 7 (E/5406). As the Committee had adopted the draft resolution in paragraph 15 unanimously, the Council might wish to do the same.

26. Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya) said that his delegation had no objection to the draft resolution as it stood. It

should, however, include a reminder to Member States of their responsibility to support the United Nations system with regard to mobilizing public opinion in its favour. At present, the world press put out more derogatory criticisms than praise of the work done by the United Nations system on problems of development. The efforts being demanded of the United Nations system in keeping the public better informed of those problems should be given that additional support.

27. M. MAKEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the draft resolution, despite repeated revisions in the Economic Committee, still presented difficulties for his delegation. A number of its provisions were still unacceptable and he would therefore ask for a separate vote to be taken on the sixth preambular paragraph and on operative paragraphs 7 and 9, to be followed by a vote on the draft resolution as a whole. The same procedure had been followed in the Economic Committee.

*The sixth preambular paragraph was adopted by 19 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.*

*Operative paragraph 7 was adopted by 20 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.*

*Operative paragraph 9 was adopted by 21 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.*

*The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 25 votes to none.*

28. Mr. MAKEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), explaining his vote, said that his delegation maintained the stand it had taken on the draft resolution in the Economic Committee. The informing and mobilizing of public opinion was a matter exclusively within the competence of States. The United Nations, in its public information activities, should ensure that attention was not diverted from the real causes of failure to achieve the aims of the Second United Nations Development Decade, where such failure occurred. Nor should those activities lead to any additional expenditure.

29. His delegation would have preferred the latter part of the sixth preambular paragraph to be deleted or for that paragraph to be supplemented to cover those points. Secondly, it should have been specified in operative paragraph 7 that the mobilization of public opinion in question was that relating to the tasks of the Second Development Decade. Thirdly, in connexion with operative paragraph 9, it was premature to attempt to broaden the activities of CESI. Lastly, his delegation opposed the suggestion made by the Secretary-General in the addendum to his report (E/5358/Add.1, para. 9) that provision for the operation of CESI should be made in the regular budget.

30. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) said that, as a sponsor, he was grateful to the Soviet delegation for voting in favour of the resolution as a whole, despite its continuing difficulties concerning some of the provisions.

31. The fact that the main responsibility for informing public opinion accurately about development problems lay with Governments was recognized in the fifth preambular

paragraph but, since the press of developed countries had hitherto failed to give sufficient importance to that matter, it was vital that the United Nations itself should engage in appropriate public information activities.

32. Secondly, paragraph 9 had been included with the object of obtaining much-needed co-ordination of public information activities throughout the United Nations system, and CESI had been selected as the focal point in that effort. Hitherto, the Centre's work had not always been found satisfactory. It would thus be given a fresh opportunity of improving its methods and policies. His delegation's future stand in regard to CESI would depend on the degree of efficiency obtained in its work.

33. Lastly, he would like to express his thanks to Mr. Fernand-Laurent of the French delegation for his untiring efforts to reconcile divergent views; those efforts had been instrumental in achieving a text that had received unanimous support.

### AGENDA ITEM 13

#### Role of non-governmental organizations in the programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination

#### REPORT OF THE COUNCIL COMMITTEE ON NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS (E/5386 and Corr.1 and Add.1, E/L.1567)

34. The PRESIDENT recalled that at the Council's 1859th meeting it had been decided that the report of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations should be considered in plenary.

35. Mr. MULLER (Hungary), Rapporteur of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, introducing the Committee's report (E/5386 and Corr.1), said that the task of the Committee, as laid down in Council resolution 1783 (LIV), had been greatly facilitated as a result of action taken by interested non-governmental organizations. A series of proposals on the role of the non-governmental organizations in the programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination had been drawn up by the Committee of Non-Governmental Organizations on Human Rights, the report of which had served as the basis for the Committee's consideration of the matter. Unfortunately, the Committee had not had enough time to consider the proposals in detail. It had nevertheless decided to submit those proposals, with slight modifications, to the General Assembly through the Council as its own recommendations (*ibid.*, annex I).

36. He drew attention to the proposal submitted by a non-governmental organization concerning possible United Nations assistance to non-governmental conferences held on human rights issues (*ibid.*, paras. 11-13).

37. The Committee had been unable to consider the proposals on modifications of the draft programme of action for the Decade, set out in annex II to its report. It

had, however, taken the view that those proposals, too, should be brought to the attention of the General Assembly.

38. In conclusion, he expressed appreciation to the non-governmental organizations which had taken an active part in the Committee's work.

39. Mr. SEKYIAMAH (Ghana), introducing the draft decision submitted by Ghana, Hungary and the Netherlands, (E/L.1567) said that he would first like to express his appreciation of the impressive work done so expeditiously by the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations and its officers and of the contribution made by the interested non-governmental organizations in that work.

40. The idea underlying the draft decision was that the Council should complete the process begun by the Committee by transmitting to the General Assembly for consideration at its twenty-eighth session the recommendations set forth in annex I to the Committee's report, and the suggestions contained in annex II for the Assembly's information. The two matters had been dealt with separately in the draft decision owing to the lesser status of the suggestions.

41. The proposal that the United Nations should assist non-governmental organizations by providing conference facilities, and possibly some financial assistance, for proposed non-governmental organization conferences on human rights issues had given rise to a number of reservations on the part of delegations and the Committee had agreed that, before a decision could be taken, the matter would need to be examined by the Secretary-General in view of the possible financial implications. The Secretary-General had been unable at that juncture to state what the financial implications might be and had signified his intention to report on the whole question to the General Assembly at its twenty-eighth session, if the Council should decide to endorse the proposal (E/5386/Add.1). Paragraph 3 of the draft decision was designed to provide the legislative basis for such action by the Secretary-General, which would enable the General Assembly to take an informed decision on the matter.

42. He hoped that the draft decision would be adopted without opposition. The Philippine delegation had asked to join the sponsors.

43. Mr. STIBRAVY (United States of America) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft decision. It was to be regretted that the Committee had not had enough time for a full consideration of the draft recommendations in question. With regard to paragraph 3 of the draft decision, the Fifth Committee of the General Assembly would have to review the question of financial implications; his delegation looked forward to receiving detailed information from the Secretariat as a basis for appropriate consideration of the proposal.

44. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) confirmed that, if the draft decision was adopted, the Secretary-General intended to report to the General Assembly on the financial implications of the proposal concerning assistance to non-governmental organizations.

45. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) said that his delegation was ready to support the draft decision. It was understandable, in view of the complexity of the subject, that the Committee had been unable to go further in its work. The draft recommendations in annex I to its report, however, covered positive steps which would enable the interested non-governmental organizations to play an effective part in the programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. He had special reasons for welcoming that prospect for he had found the co-operation of those organizations wanting at the time when he had been preparing the Special Study on Racial Discrimination in the Political, Economic, Social and Cultural Fields in the series undertaken by the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities.<sup>1</sup> The steps now advocated showed that there had been a change of attitude since then.

46. Mr. MACKENZIE (United Kingdom) thanked the representatives of Hungary and Ghana for the clear explanations they had given. His delegation's support for paragraph 3 of the draft decision was qualified in the same way as that of the United States. Secondly, its support for paragraph 1 should not be taken as implying a change of attitude on the part of his Government in regard to the programme for the Decade; its past reservations concerning the programme still stood.

47. Mr. MAKEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had consistently promoted United Nations action to combat racism and racial discrimination and had played an active part in the preparation of the programme for the Decade in the Commission on Human Rights. Indeed, the draft Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid*, qualifying *apartheid* as a crime against humanity, had been initiated by his delegation, together with those of Guinea and Nigeria,<sup>2</sup> in the Third Committee of the General Assembly and in the Commission. At its fifty-fourth session the Council had approved both the programme and the draft Convention and had recommended them to the General Assembly. With regard to the draft decision before the Council, his delegation agreed with the Chilean representative that non-governmental organizations in consultative status should intensify their activities in that vitally important area.

48. He further agreed with the representatives who had stressed the need for further study of the financial implications of United Nations assistance to non-governmental organizations in the form of conference facilities. The Soviet Union's position on the matter at the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly would be determined both by the specific estimates submitted by the Secretariat and by the organizations which would be involved in the exercise.

49. Mr. DUMAS (France) said that his delegation had not had time to study the draft decision thoroughly, since it had

only just received the French text. It was therefore obliged to reserve its position on paragraph 3.

50. Mr. IPARRAGUIRRE (Spain) endorsed the previous speaker's remarks. His delegation would make its comments on the question in the General Assembly.

51. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to adopt the draft decision (E/L.1567) without a vote.

*The draft decision was adopted.*

## AGENDA ITEM 28

### Calendar of conferences

#### REPORT OF THE CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE (E/5403, E/5404)

52. The PRESIDENT drew the Council's attention to the report of the Co-ordination Committee (E/5403) and to a letter from the Chairman of the Committee on Negotiations with Intergovernmental Agencies concerning the work of that Committee at the current session (E/5404). In connexion with the letter, if the Council decided to authorize the Committee to hold a further series of meetings in New York from 11 to 22 February 1974, those meetings would of course be included in the provisional calendar set out in the annex to the report of the Co-ordination Committee (E/5403).

53. Furthermore, the Economic Committee at its 666th meeting had decided by 28 votes to 2, with 7 abstentions, to recommend the Council to authorize ACASTD to hold its twentieth session in 1974. On the assumption that the Council would adopt that recommendation when it considered the Economic Committee's report on item 10, provision should be made for that session in the calendar. The dates of 21 October to 1 November 1974 given in the draft calendar of conferences (E/L.1551) should therefore be reinstated in the calendar for 1974.

54. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon) pointed out that the Economic Committee had recommended for adoption by the Council a draft resolution on the establishment of an economic commission for Western Asia, operative paragraph 1 of which stated that that body would be established as from 1 January 1974. Without prejudging the Council's decision on the matter, he expressed the hope that the Secretariat would be authorized to make the appropriate arrangements after that decision had been taken.

55. The PRESIDENT said that that would be done. He invited the Council to take a decision on the draft resolution recommended for adoption in the report of the Co-ordination Committee (E/5403, para. 11).

*The draft resolution was adopted without a vote.*

56. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to take action on draft decision I recommended for adoption by the Co-ordination Committee (E/5403, para. 12).

<sup>1</sup> See *Racial Discrimination* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.71.XIV.2).

<sup>2</sup> See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Fifty-second Session, Supplement No. 7 (E/5113)*, paras. 37-48.

57. Mr. ARIM (Turkey) recalled that at its 511th meeting, the Co-ordination Committee had decided that item 82 of the provisional calendar of conferences for 1974 should read: "Dates: To be determined" and "Place: Geneva and elsewhere in the region". In the text reproduced in the Committee's report, however, the item read "Few days (dates undetermined)". He hoped that the final version of the text would be corrected.

58. Mr. STIBRAVY (United States of America) said that his delegation had been one of the two which had voted against the Co-ordination Committee's recommendation that ACASTD should hold its twentieth session in 1974, since it considered that the biennial cycle of meetings of subsidiary bodies which the Council was trying to introduce should be strictly observed. His delegation would not, however, press for a vote on the question, provided its reservation was duly recorded.

59. Mr. MACKENZIE (United Kingdom) associated himself with the United States representative's remarks.

*Draft decision I was adopted.*

60. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to take action on draft decision II recommended for adoption by the Co-ordination Committee (*ibid.*).

*Draft decision II was adopted.*

61. Mr. MACKENZIE (United Kingdom) reminded the Council of some suggestions that his delegation had made at the end of the fifty-fourth session with a view to saving time.<sup>3</sup> Much progress had been made under the President's vigorous leadership, but there was still room for improvement in the effective utilization of the Council's time. His delegation would submit a few practical suggestions to the secretariat and hoped to be able to conduct some informal consultations with other delegations with a view to agreeing on necessary changes.

62. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation, too, considered that the biennial cycle of meetings of the Council's subsidiary bodies should be adhered to as far as possible. It would also urge observance of the Council's decision not to set up too many subsidiary organs. The decision to hold a meeting of the ACASTD in 1974 must be regarded as an exception, not as a deviation from the system; it was on that understanding that his delegation had not pressed for a vote on the draft decision in question.

## AGENDA ITEM 29

Elections (E/5395, E/L.1566)

(a) Commission on Human Rights

(b) Committee on Science and Technology for Development

(c) Committee on Review and Appraisal

(d) Committee on Natural Resources

(e) Committee for Programme and Co-ordination

(f) Working Group on the preparation of a new draft instrument or instruments of international law to eliminate discrimination against women, established by resolution 5 (XXIV) of the Commission on the Status of Women

(g) Board of the United Nations Research Institute for Social Development

63. The PRESIDENT pointed out that at its fifty-fourth session the Council had postponed several elections until the fifty-fifth session owing to lack of candidates.

(a) *Commission on Human Rights*

64. The PRESIDENT suggested that, since there was no candidate for the vacancy, the election should be postponed until the resumed fifty-fifth session.

*It was so decided.*

(b) *Committee on Science and Technology for Development*

65. The PRESIDENT said that there was one candidate, Mexico, for one vacancy from the Latin American Group. Since the candidacy was endorsed by the Latin American Group, he assumed that the Council would wish to elect Mexico by acclamation.

*Mexico was elected for a term of office of three years beginning on 1 January 1974.*

66. The PRESIDENT suggested that, since there were no candidates for the other vacancies on that Committee, the elections should be postponed until the resumed fifty-fifth session.

*It was so decided.*

(c) *Committee on Review and Appraisal*

67. The PRESIDENT announced that there were no candidates for the vacancies. He suggested that elections to the seats of five members from African States for a term of office expiring on 31 December 1973 should be cancelled, since the Committee would not meet again in 1973.

*It was so decided.*

68. The PRESIDENT suggested that elections to fill seven vacancies for a term of office of four years beginning on 1 January 1974 should be postponed until the resumed fifty-fifth session.

*It was so decided.*

(d) *Committee on Natural Resources*

69. The PRESIDENT suggested that, since there was no candidate for the one vacancy, the election should be postponed until the resumed fifty-fifth session.

*It was so decided.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, Fifty-fourth Session, 1858th meeting.

(e) *Committee for Programme and Co-ordination*

70. The PRESIDENT suggested that, since there was no candidate for the vacancy, the election should be postponed until the resumed fifty-fifth session.

*It was so decided.*

(f) *Working Group on the preparation of a new draft instrument or instruments of the international law to eliminate discrimination against women, established by resolution 5 (XXIV) of the Commission on the Status of Women*

71. The PRESIDENT announced that there were three candidates from the African Group for three vacancies, two candidates in the Asian Group for three vacancies and one candidate for the vacancy for the group of socialist countries. Assuming that the candidacies of Egypt, Nigeria and Zaire had been endorsed by the African Group, he suggested that those countries should be elected members of the Working Group.

*It was so decided.*

72. The PRESIDENT suggested that, on the assumption that the candidacies of Indonesia and the Philippines were endorsed by the Asian Group, those countries should also be elected.

*It was so decided.*

73. The PRESIDENT suggested that Hungary, whose candidacy could be assumed to have been endorsed by the group of socialist countries, should also be elected.

*It was so decided.*

(g) *Board of the United Nations Research Institute for Social Development*

74. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the Secretary-General's note (E/5395) concerning the confirmation of the nomination of one member of the Board. At its fifty-fourth session the Council had deferred that confirmation until the current session. On the basis of the results of a poll conducted by correspondence among the members of the Commission for Social Development, the Secretary-General, on behalf of the Chairman of the Commission, had recommended confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Vicente Sánchez of Chile as a member of the Board for a four-year term ending on 1 July 1977. He suggested that the Council should confirm the appointment of Mr. Sánchez.

*It was so decided.*

QUESTION OF AN INCREASE IN THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE *AD HOC* GROUP OF EXPERTS ON TAX TREATIES BETWEEN DEVELOPED AND DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (E/L.1566)

75. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the draft decision proposed by Brazil (E/L.1566) on the question of an increase in the membership of the *Ad Hoc* Group of Experts on Tax Treaties between Developed and Developing Countries.

76. Mr. de ALENCAR NETO (Brazil) said that his delegation was aware that the subject matter of its draft

decision might not be regarded as coming strictly under agenda item 29. Nevertheless, the Secretary-General required the decision of the Council in order to nominate an additional expert for the *Ad Hoc* Group. The Brazilian delegation had ventured to ask for a decision at the current session because the *Ad Hoc* Group was to meet in December 1973 under the biennial system, and its next meeting would not be held until February 1975. Brazil's request for membership of the Group was based on the precedent established by Sri Lanka in July 1970, at the forty-ninth session of the Council.<sup>4</sup> The draft decision was an exact reproduction of the Council's earlier decision, with the substitution of the name of Brazil for Ceylon.

77. The substantive reason for his delegation's request was that Brazil had concluded a number of tax treaties with interested countries and had closely followed the work of the *Ad Hoc* Group through observers. It was sure that its experience would be of use to the Group and it therefore appealed to the Council to waive any procedural difficulty that might impede its admission.

78. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon) supported the Brazilian draft decision.

79. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) said that it was regrettable that so many vacancies on the Council's subsidiary bodies could not be filled and that certain seats in the Council itself had remained unoccupied during the session. Accordingly, his delegation felt in duty bound to support the candidacies of countries which were concerned with the problems facing the Council and attended meetings as observers.

80. Mr. FERNANDEZ VILLAVERDE (Spain) supported the Brazilian draft decision.

*The Brazilian draft decision (E/L.1566) was adopted.*

## AGENDA ITEM 24

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations (*concluded*)

## REPORT OF THE CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE (E/5402)

81. Mr. DUGERSUREN (Mongolia) said that his delegation had been absent when a vote had been taken on the draft resolution in paragraph 10 of the Co-ordination Committee's report (E/5402) but wished to have it recorded that it would have voted in favour of that draft resolution.

82. Mr. NTAKABANYURA (Burundi) said that his delegation was in the same position as the Mongolian delegation and wished its vote in favour of the resolution in question to be recorded.

*The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.*

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, Forty-ninth Session, Supplement No. 1 (E/4904), p. 7.