

Non-Governmental Organizations should meet at the earliest opportunity and carry out, as a matter of priority, the mandate laid down in Council resolution 1296 (XLIV), a task which had been deferred for many years.

37. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) pointed out that, if the report of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations concerning its review of the organizations was required for the Council's sixty-fourth session, the reports submitted by non-governmental organizations would be required by the Committee six weeks before its own session; it was the latter deadline which, in the view of the Secretary-General, could not be met by the Secretariat.

38. Mr. BROAD (United Kingdom) said he fully understood the difficulties referred to by the Secretary of the Council. His delegation had had reservations with regard to fixing the Council's sixty-fourth session as the time-limit for the review of the activities of non-governmental organizations by the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, and felt that the sixty-sixth session might be a more practical target.

The draft decision recommended by the Social Committee was adopted (decision 227 (LXII)).

39. The PRESIDENT said that the matter referred to in paragraph 11 of the report (E/5965) would be considered at the sixty-third session in the context of the approval of the biennial calendar of meetings.

AGENDA ITEM 12

Human rights questions (E/5927-5932, E/CN.4/1222 and Corr.1, E/L.1768)

40. Miss BALOGUN (Nigeria), introducing draft resolution E/L.1768 on behalf of the sponsors, said that it was traditional for the Council to adopt a resolution on trade union rights of African workers in South Africa. The sponsors hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.

2060th meeting

Friday, 13 May 1977, at 3.40 p.m.

President: Mr. Ladislav ŠMÍD (Czechoslovakia).

E/SR.2060

AGENDA ITEM 12

Human rights questions (concluded) (E/5927-5932, E/CN.4/1222 and Corr.1, E/L.1768)

REPORT OF THE SOCIAL COMMITTEE (E/5967)

1. The PRESIDENT said that, in paragraph 29 of its report on agenda item 12 (E/5967), the Social Committee recommended four draft resolutions and 11 draft decisions to the Council for adoption.

2. Sections A and B of draft resolution I had been adopted by the Committee without a vote. If there were no objection, he would take it that the Council also wished to adopt them without a vote.

Sections A and B of draft resolution I were adopted.

Section C of draft resolution I was adopted by 36 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

Draft resolution I, as a whole, was adopted (resolutions 2082 A (LXII), 2082 B (LXII) and 2082 C (LXII)).

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 2083 (LXII)).

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 2084 (LXII)).

Draft resolution IV was adopted by 35 votes to 2, with 11 abstentions (resolution 2085 (LXII)).

Draft decisions A to D were adopted (decisions 228 (LXII) to 231 (LXII)).

At the request of the representative of Cuba, a vote was taken by roll-call on draft decision E.

The Federal Republic of Germany, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, China, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Greece, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Rwanda, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of Italy, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Draft decision E was adopted by 43 votes to 1, with 5 abstentions (decision 232 (LXII)).

Draft decisions F to K were adopted (decisions 233 (LXII) to 238 (LXII)).

3. Mr. MUBAREZ (Yemen) said that he wished it to be noted that, if a vote had been taken on draft decision G, his delegation would have abstained.

4. Miss BALOGUN (Nigeria), referring to draft resolution E/L.1768, said that after holding consultations the sponsors had decided to make certain changes in the text, which did not alter the substance but broadened its scope. In the first place, the following new preambular paragraph should be inserted after the first preambular paragraph: "*Taking note of the report of the Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts on southern Africa (E/CN.4/1222 and Corr.1)*". At the end of the following preambular paragraph, the words "Namibia and Zimbabwe" should be added after the words "African workers in South Africa". In the last preambular paragraph, after the words "trade union solidarity with", the existing text should be replaced by the words "the struggle of African workers in southern Africa". At the end of paragraph 1, a comma should be inserted after the words "South Africa" and the words "Namibia and Zimbabwe" added. In paragraph 2, after the words "under detention" the words "in South Africa" should be replaced by the words "in southern Africa". In paragraph 3, a comma should be inserted after the words "South Africa" and the words "Namibia and Zimbabwe" added.

5. Mr. MOHAMMED (Bangladesh) said that his delegation wished to be added to the list of sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1768.

6. Mrs. MAIR (Jamaica) said that her delegation, which was one of the original sponsors of the draft resolution, accepted the changes introduced by the Nigerian representative. The report of the *Ad Hoc* Group of Experts (E/CN.4/1222 and Corr.1) clearly indicated that the problems referred to in the draft resolution were not confined to South Africa but existed throughout southern Africa, where there was a whole series of laws which openly violated international norms concerning trade union freedoms. She hoped that draft resolution E/L.1768 would be adopted without a vote.

7. Miss ILIĆ (Yugoslavia) said that her delegation wished to become a sponsor of draft resolution E/L.1768

8. Mr. BARCELO (Mexico) said that his delegation fully supported draft resolution E/L.1768 and wished to become a sponsor.

9. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt draft resolution E/L.1768, with the revisions introduced by the representative of Nigeria, without a vote.

Draft resolution E/L.1768, as orally revised, was adopted (resolution 2086 (LXII)).

10. Mr. MERKEL (Federal Republic of Germany), referring to draft decision B, just adopted, recalled the reservations his delegation had expressed in the Social Committee concerning the wording of the title of the study. He requested that in the preparation of the study due regard should be paid to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, in which international and national dimensions of economic rights were

considered side by side. Moreover, in the opinion of his delegation it would have been preferable, instead of using the word "requirements", to take into account the objectives of the relevant resolutions.

11. Mr. LINDENBERG SETTE (Brazil) said that his delegation had explained its position on draft decision F at meetings of the Social Committee. It was pleased to lend its full support to draft resolution E/L.1768, especially after the explanation of the representative of Nigeria to the effect that its scope had been broadened to cover the whole of southern Africa.

12. Mr. OTAKA (Japan) said that he wished to explain his delegation's position with respect to the references to the concept of the new international economic order made in several resolutions and decisions adopted by the Council, particularly in draft resolutions IV and XI in document E/5964 and Corr.1 and in the draft decisions in document E/5967. Although his delegation had agreed to support those resolutions and decisions when they had been adopted by the Council, the position of the Government of Japan was still the same as had been explained when General Assembly resolutions 3201 (S-VI) and 3202 (S-VI) had been adopted.

13. Miss MASSIP (Canada), referring to draft resolution IV (E/5967) on the question of the violation by Israel of human rights in the occupied Arab territories, said that pending a final settlement of the conflict in the Middle East every effort must be made to ensure that the rights of all people living in the region were respected. As a member of the Commission on Human Rights, Canada had participated in the Commission's thirty-third session, at which the question of the violation of human rights in the occupied territories had been discussed. At that time, her delegation had been unable to support one of the resolutions (resolution 1A (XXXIII)) and during the deliberations had explained its objections in detail.¹ Consistent with that position, her delegation had also opposed draft resolution IV when it had been put to the vote in the Social Committee. It had done so not only because draft resolution IV implicitly referred to the resolution adopted by the Commission on Human Rights but because it commended the Commission for having adopted measures which, in the opinion of Canada, had been based on unsubstantiated conclusions concerning violations of human rights in the occupied territories.

14. Her Government had carefully considered the text before the Council. It respected the humanitarian implications of its provisions and therefore supported paragraph 2 of draft resolution E/L.1768. Nevertheless, as the text as a whole clearly endorsed the substance of the resolution of the Commission on Human Rights, her delegation's objections persisted and it reluctantly had to maintain its position.

15. Miss RICHTER (Argentina) and Mr. BOZA (Peru) reiterated the views expressed by their delegations when draft decision F had been considered in the Social Committee.

¹ See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Sixty-second Session, Supplement No. 6, chap. II.*

16. Mr. FUENTES IBÁÑEZ (Bolivia) said that, if draft decision F had been put to a vote, his delegation would have abstained.

17. Mr. KEMAL (Pakistan) said that, if it had been present, his delegation would have voted in favour of draft decision E.

AGENDA ITEM 3

Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (concluded)* (E/5920, E/5921, E/5922, E/L.1764, E/NGO/62)

18. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt draft resolution E/L.1764, as orally revised by the Yugoslav delegation at the 2058th meeting, without a vote.

Draft resolution E/L.1764, as orally revised, was adopted (resolution 2087 (LXII)).

19. Mr. ALFONSO MARTINEZ (Cuba) said that, although the fact that the Council had just adopted draft resolution E/L.1764 prevented Cuba from becoming a sponsor, he wished to state that it would have liked to do so.

AGENDA ITEM 6

Agreement between the United Nations and the International Fund for Agricultural Development (E/5924)

20. Mr. MAHGOUB (Sudan), Chairman of the Committee on Negotiations with Intergovernmental Agencies, introduced the Committee's report (E/5924), which had been prepared in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 3 of Economic and Social Council resolution 2006 (LX) and to which was annexed the text of a draft agreement between the United Nations and the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD).

21. The text of the draft agreement was the result of long and difficult negotiations and represented a compromise worked out by the members of the Committee on Negotiations and the Chairman of the Preparatory Commission for IFAD. Paragraphs 7 and 8 of the report reflected the observations made by the Chairman of the Preparatory Commission for IFAD on article IX of the draft agreement and by the representative of Algeria on article XI.

22. The Committee on Negotiations had adopted the draft agreement on the understanding that its adoption would be without prejudice to the right of the members of the Committee to take a final position on the agreement at a later stage.

23. He hoped that the Council would endorse the draft agreement submitted by the Committee on Negotiations.

24. Mr. KHAMIS (Algeria) stressed the importance which his country had always attached to the problem of food

and recalled in that connexion that the idea of holding the World Food Conference, which had resulted in the establishment of IFAD, had been formulated precisely at the Fourth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Algiers in 1973.

25. The negotiations which had produced the draft agreement before the Council, representing a compromise, had been especially difficult. His delegation was pleased that the draft agreement clearly stipulated that IFAD would be constituted as a specialized agency. Therefore, in spite of its wish to facilitate some compromise which would make it possible to ensure an early start to IFAD operations, it had been obliged to express reservations on article XI of the draft, since that article did not include provisions which were contained in agreements concluded with other specialized agencies.

26. Consequently, his delegation proposed that the Council should amend article XI of the draft agreement by replacing the words "Article 55" with the words "Chapters IX, XI and XII of the Charter of the United Nations and in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples".

27. His delegation was well aware that the Agreement establishing IFAD² stipulated that IFAD should provide direct assistance only to developing countries that were members of the Fund or to intergovernmental organizations in which those countries participated. Nevertheless, the amendment which he had just proposed was fully warranted since its purpose was not, as had been stated, to enable IFAD to provide direct assistance to colonial territories or liberation movements but simply to reaffirm the general principle of decolonization accepted without reservation by the United Nations.

28. Furthermore, his delegation's intention was to ensure equality among all specialized agencies; for example, the agencies had to submit an annual report to the Economic and Social Council on how they were implementing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. He hoped that the amendment which he had just proposed would be accepted by the Council, since he did not wish the question to be put to a vote.

29. Mr. HERRERA VEGAS (Argentina) said that his delegation welcomed the consensus on the draft relationship agreement between the United Nations and IFAD, especially since a delegation from the Preparatory Commission for IFAD, headed by its Chairman, had participated in the consensus. On behalf of Canada, Iran, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, the United States of America and Argentina, his delegation recommended that the Council should adopt the following draft decision:

"The Economic and Social Council:

"(1) Takes note of the report of the Committee on Negotiations with Intergovernmental Agencies (E/5924);
(2) Endorses the draft relationship agreement between the United Nations and the International Fund for

* Resumed from the 2058th meeting.

² See A/CONF.73/15.

Agricultural Development proposed by the Committee on Negotiations with Intergovernmental Agencies and decides to transmit it to IFAD for approval."

30. With respect to the concern expressed by Algeria, his delegation hoped that it would not bring about a delay in adopting the agreement.

31. Mr. MADEY (Yugoslavia), after thanking the Chairman and the members of the Committee on Negotiations with Intergovernmental Agencies for having undertaken the difficult task of amending the original text and adjusting it to the *modus operandi* of the United Nations system, said that there was no need to stress the importance of creating IFAD, which was one of the outstanding achievements of the World Food Conference, convened at the initiative of the non-aligned countries and proposed at the Algiers summit conference. Yugoslavia had been the first country in category III to fulfil its promise to contribute to the Fund and had signed the Agreement. It nevertheless wanted the final text to deal with all the points which were considered important. Since Yugoslavia was not a member of the Committee on Negotiations, it had not had time to study the draft agreement thoroughly and therefore was unable to make any commitment. It reserved the right to take a final position on the draft agreement at a later stage.

32. With respect to the amendment proposed by Algeria, his delegation felt that the draft relationship agreement was seriously deficient in comparison with similar texts and therefore supported the proposal as a matter of principle. Whatever decision the Council adopted on the matter, his delegation would certainly have difficulty in endorsing the proposed agreement and reserved the right to clarify its position at a later time, especially on the draft decision proposed by Argentina.

33. Mr. KHALEF (Iraq) shared the view of the representatives of Algeria and Yugoslavia on the amendment to article XI of the draft agreement.

34. Mr. KINSMAN (Canada) stressed that the question posed by Algeria had been discussed extensively during the negotiations in the Committee, which in view of the highly specialized nature of the questions discussed had been extremely complicated and difficult. The texts had been legal in nature and had referred to a banking mechanism which in turn raised difficulties of its own. The other complicating factor had been that the Committee had had to start negotiations with the Chairman of the Preparatory Commission for IFAD, a commission which had included a number of delegations that had also been members of the Committee on Negotiations. The Committee had therefore had to strive to reach agreements which would not be mutually contradictory and to reconcile the various interests represented - an exceedingly difficult task.

35. While appreciating the arguments in favour of the Algerian proposal, and respecting the sovereign right of that delegation to express its disagreement, his delegation hoped the Council would adopt the draft agreement in its existing wording so as not to delay the beginning of the Fund's operations.

36. Mr. PARS' (Iran) said that he shared the views expressed by the representative of Canada. Iran attached great importance to the creation of the Fund and, as the second largest contributor, wanted it to start operating as soon as possible for the benefit of the developing countries. Iran, as a member of the Committee on Negotiations, could attest to the complexity of the negotiations which had produced the draft agreement prepared at Rome, and agreed with the delegation of Yugoslavia that it was a considerable improvement over the original text. He recalled that the General Assembly, in its resolution 3503 (XXX), had requested the Economic and Social Council to arrange for the negotiation with the Preparatory Commission for IFAD of an agreement with the Fund and, which was more important, that it should enter into such an agreement: it should be noted that the General Assembly had provided for the provisional application of the agreement.

37. Recalling that Iran had been one of the first supporters of the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, that it had submitted resolution 1514 (XV) in the General Assembly, and that as a member of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration it had subsequently continued to maintain that the United Nations must give assistance to non-self-governing territories, he noted that the questions raised by the representative of Algeria were dealt with in article XI, since it provided that the Fund should render such assistance as the United Nations might request under its Charter, particularly for the accomplishment of the principles and purposes set forth in Article 55, one of which was in fact self-determination.

38. His delegation hoped that the Council would adopt the draft agreement, since it was a compromise text.

39. Mr. BERG (Norway) fully supported the basic arguments put forward by the two preceding speakers. His delegation was concerned that the operations of IFAD might be unduly delayed. Exhaustive deliberations had taken place in the Committee on Negotiations, and he felt that the text which the Council had before it was far better than the first one had been. An extremely delicate question was involved and the Council must try to reach an agreement to support the draft agreement and submit it to the Preparatory Commission for IFAD for early adoption.

40. Referring to the proposal of the representative of Algeria, he said that, as had been demonstrated by its action, his delegation was concerned over some of the points made by the representative of Algeria, but it considered that the basic idea which he had expressed was fully covered by the reference to Article 55 of the Charter.

41. Mr. MOUSKY (United States of America) associated himself with the views expressed by the representatives of Canada and Iran and emphasized that the Agreement had been signed by 91 countries, and not simply delegations. One of the points on which the Committee on Negotiations had reached full agreement was that no delegation should reopen the debate on the draft agreement. It was in the interests of all that IFAD should begin operations as soon as possible as a specialized agency.

42. His delegation could not accept the Algerian proposal to replace the words "Article 55" in article XI of the draft agreement with the words "Chapters IX, XI and XII". While the United States supported the basic concepts established in Chapters IX, XI and XII of the United Nations Charter, it did not consider it appropriate to refer to those Chapters in an agreement on relations between the United Nations and IFAD. Furthermore, before the articles of the agreement with IFAD had been considered or adopted, the 91 signatory States had taken a clear decision that IFAD loans should be limited to developing countries which were members of the Fund or to intergovernmental organizations to which those members belonged. For those reasons, his delegation had a decided preference for the wording of article XI as contained in document E/5924 and was confident that the Economic and Social Council would deem it appropriate to support the agreement in its present form and to transmit it to IFAD so that it could enter into effect provisionally as soon as possible.

43. Mr. MAHGOUB (Sudan), Chairman of the Committee on Negotiations with Intergovernmental Agencies, read out a telegram which he had received from the Chairman of the Preparatory Commission for IFAD, in which the latter expressed the hope that, at its current session, the Economic and Social Council would endorse what had been agreed upon in negotiations between the Preparatory Commission for IFAD and the Committee. He said that the telegram had been sent in response to his own request asking the Chairman of the Preparatory Commission to inform him as soon as possible of the Commission's reaction to the agreed text.

44. Mr. MADEY (Yugoslavia) said that there was no doubt that all delegations attached the greatest importance to the procedures establishing the Fund's functions. However, the procedures had to ensure the best possible co-operation between the Fund and the United Nations. Therefore, each Government had the right to analyse carefully the draft submitted by the Committee on Negotiations. For that reason, he disagreed with the views expressed by the representative of the United States, who had referred to a provisional implementation of the agreement, in other words to the existence of a certain understanding that would in some way preclude the possibility of reviewing the agreement in the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly. He proposed in consequence that the draft decision submitted by Argentina should not include the endorsement by the Council of the proposed draft agreement.

45. Mr. KABORE (Upper Volta) said that while the draft, which was the result of arduous negotiations, was a fairly comprehensive document, it nevertheless contained a number of deficiencies which the representative of Algeria, for very sound reasons, was endeavouring to remedy. In his view, the proposal of the representative of Algeria did not conflict with the text of article XI as it appeared in document E/5924. Perhaps the Council could endeavour to accept that position, to which his delegation would agree.

46. Mr. KHAMIS (Algeria) said that he did not see how his amendment could create difficulties for the Council. Nor did he understand how the signature and ratification of the Agreement establishing IFAD could raise problems as had

been stated. The principle of decolonization was a basic element in the work of the United Nations, and the Economic and Social Council, as a United Nations organ, should comply fully with the relevant provisions of the Charter and the General Assembly resolutions on the matter.

47. In view of the fact that many delegations had been unable to participate thus far in the negotiations on the draft agreement and that those delegations might have some suggestions to make in that regard, and bearing in mind the fact that the draft which the Council had before it was in no way a final text, he proposed that the Council should adopt the Yugoslav proposal that it should simply take note of the report of the Committee on Negotiations and transmit it to the Preparatory Commission for IFAD for its consideration. For its part, his delegation would submit its amendments again at a later stage in the process of negotiation between the United Nations and IFAD.

48. Mr. VAN BUUREN (Netherlands) appealed to the delegation of Algeria, and to other delegations which had supported the latter's amendment, to bear in mind the fact that a great deal had been achieved in the Committee on Negotiations, whose deliberations had made it possible to satisfy practically all the wishes of the members of the Council represented in the Committee. To reopen negotiations on the draft agreement as a whole would serve no useful purpose, and might actually delay the initiation of the operations of IFAD.

49. Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) said that his delegation had no objection to the inclusion, in article XI of the draft agreement, of a reference to chapters of the Charter and to the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, as the delegation of Algeria had proposed. In any event, the Council must above all take account of the fact that the Preparatory Commission for IFAD had indicated its provisional agreement to the draft, since it was desirable that the Council should endorse a text which was actually acceptable to IFAD. It was imperative not to take any action which might jeopardize the unity of the United Nations system when the aim was precisely to make the new organization a part of that system.

50. Mr. MAHGOUB (Sudan), Chairman of the Committee on Negotiations with Intergovernmental Agencies, said it should be clearly understood that, while there was of course no direct link between the agreement between the United Nations and IFAD and the commencement of the Fund's activities, it was also true that any delay in reaching a consensus on the agreement would, in practice, delay the signature and ratification of the Agreement establishing the Fund. In any event, any decision taken by the Council on the question at the current stage would not be final, since the draft agreement would have to be considered by the Preparatory Commission for IFAD, and the Council would be able to take up the question again at its following session.

51. His delegation agreed with the substance of the amendment proposed by the representative of Algeria. Nevertheless, as Chairman of the Committee on Negotiations, he hoped that the Council would bear in mind that the Committee's deliberations had made it possible to solve

a number of very difficult problems and had ensured respect for the authority of the United Nations in its relations with the new specialized agency. He was afraid that, if the discussion on the draft agreement as a whole was reopened, the consensus reached on other highly controversial questions might be jeopardized. He expressed the hope, therefore, that the Council would find a solution which would preserve the agreements already reached, without prejudicing the position of any delegation.

52. Mr. LEMP (Federal Republic of Germany) said that the text of the draft agreement appearing in document E/5924 constituted a delicate compromise solution. It should be remembered that, during the deliberations of the Committee on Negotiations, the spokesman for the Group of 77 had been in constant touch with the various members of that Group and had made many suggestions in the Committee; all interested delegations had also had an opportunity to participate directly in the work of the Committee.

53. Since there was reason to believe that IFAD would be able to accept the draft agreement appearing in document E/5924, which would avoid prolonging negotiations indefinitely, his delegation was firmly of the view that the Economic and Social Council should endorse the draft agreement. He would be grateful if the representative of Algeria would not press his amendment since, for the reasons already given by other delegations, it would be very difficult for his delegation to accept it.

54. Mrs. DERRE (France) said that IFAD had already decided that its loans would be granted solely to its member countries. If some delegations in the Economic and Social Council wished the Fund's activities to be broader in scope, they should have expressed that view in IFAD and not in the Council.

55. Her delegation could not accept the amendment proposed by the representative of Algeria, because of the position which it had already adopted in the deliberations leading to the establishment of IFAD. The delegations represented in the Committee on Negotiations with Intergovernmental Agencies, as well as the representatives of IFAD, had already made many concessions, as a result of which a delicate balance had been achieved. The basis of that balance must be respected fully, particularly in view of the fact that the agreement had always been considered as constituting an indivisible whole.

56. Mr. KHAMIS (Algeria) said that, in the light of the last three statements, a number of clarifications were called for. First, it should be understood that at no time had negotiations been concluded, and he reminded members of the Committee on Negotiations that his delegation had emphasized at the time that it attached such importance to the question that it could not adopt a final decision in that Committee. He also recalled that other delegations, too, had expressed reservations regarding the article in question.

57. Although his delegation had certainly stated that it would not ask for its amendment to be put to a vote in the belief that it would be adopted unanimously—that did not mean that it did not continue to insist on it.

58. IFAD granted loans only to member developing countries and to intergovernmental organizations of which those countries were members. His delegation was not proposing that the Fund should grant loans to liberation movements or Trust Territories. In view of the many restrictions which article XI placed on the granting of assistance by the Fund—restrictions which, moreover, were intended to prevent the Fund from making loans to liberation movements, Namibia, Rhodesia, and Namibian and Rhodesian refugees—he could not understand why his amendment was being interpreted as meaning that his delegation wished the Fund to grant loans to PLO, SWAPO, ZAPU or ZANU, among others. His delegation simply felt that the Fund, as a specialized agency and in the context of item 23 of the provisional agenda for the sixty-third session (E/L.1757), entitled “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”, should co-operate with the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council in implementing that Declaration.

59. Mr. AL-HUSSAMY (Syrian Arab Republic) endorsed the Algerian amendment without reservation; he also shared the concern expressed by the delegation of Yugoslavia, since he felt that all countries which were not members of the Committee should have an opportunity to consult with their Governments, and that the draft agreement could not be adopted until it had been carefully examined. He therefore proposed that the Argentine text should be amended to state that the Economic and Social Council endorsed the draft agreement “in principle” or “provisionally”. A third paragraph might be added which would “request the Secretary-General to transmit the draft relationship agreement to Governments for their comments”, emphasizing that the General Assembly should adopt it at its thirty-second session.

60. Mr. OLIVERI LOPEZ (Argentina) read out the following new text which had been drafted in a spirit of compromise:

“The Economic and Social Council takes note with appreciation of the report of the Committee on Negotiations with Intergovernmental Agencies (E/5924) and decides to transmit the draft relationship agreement between the United Nations and the International Fund for Agricultural Development proposed by the Committee on Negotiations with Intergovernmental Agencies to IFAD for adoption”.

61. Mr. BARCELO (Mexico) supported the Argentine proposal since it made due allowance for his country's concern, namely, that the negotiations were not finally closed.

62. Mr. KHAMIS (Algeria) requested that, if the Argentine proposal was adopted by consensus, the Algerian amendment should be included in the material to be transmitted to IFAD.

63. Mr. NAKAMURA (Japan) said that, inasmuch as the draft relationship agreement which the Committee had before it was the result of extensive negotiations and was a compromise text, he hoped that the Council would approve

it, while recognizing the right of the members of the Council to take whatever final position they might wish to take on the draft agreement and the amendment proposed by the Algerian delegation at a later stage. He also suggested that the Argentine delegation should endeavour to arrive at a text acceptable to all delegations.

64. Mr. PATTISON (United Kingdom) said that his country, which was not a member of the Committee on Negotiations, hoped that the Council would take note of the relationship agreement and transmit it to IFAD for its approval. He could accept the proposal by the Argentine delegation.

65. Mr. VAN BUUREN (Netherlands) endorsed the remarks of the United Kingdom representative and said that the text proposed by Argentina was entirely acceptable to his delegation.

66. The PRESIDENT read out the text submitted by Argentina, with a slight addition:

“The Economic and Social Council

“Takes note with appreciation of the report of the Committee on Negotiations with Intergovernmental Agencies (E/5924) and decides to transmit to the International Fund for Agricultural Development:

“(a) For its approval, the draft relationship agreement between the United Nations and the International Fund for Agricultural Development proposed by the Committee on Negotiations with Intergovernmental Agencies;

“(b) The summary record of the Council’s discussion of the matter.”

67. Mr. PARSI (Iran) pointed out that, technically speaking, the Committee on Negotiations had approved the text; he therefore proposed that in the text just read out the word “proposed” should be replaced by “approved”.

68. Mr. AL-HUSSAMY (Syrian Arab Republic) supported that proposal.

69. Mr. MADEY (Yugoslavia) said that he endorsed the Argentine text as well as the text read out by the President. However, he totally disagreed with the Iranian delegation that the draft agreement had been approved, since every member of the Committee had reserved its right to take a final position at a later stage. He therefore considered the text read out by the President to be a good compromise solution.

70. Mr. KHAMIS (Algeria) expressed full agreement with the remarks of the representative of Yugoslavia.

71. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt the draft decision in the form he had just read out.

The draft decision proposed by the President was adopted (decision 241 (LXII)).

72. Mr. AMIRDZHANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring to the decision which had just been

adopted, said he wished to point out that the Soviet Union did not participate in IFAD and that its position with regard to the Fund had been stated on several occasions in other relevant forums of the United Nations system. If a vote had been taken on the draft, his delegation would have abstained.

AGENDA ITEM 1

Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters (concluded)*

PARTICIPATION OF AN INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION IN THE WORK OF THE COUNCIL (E/5983)

73. The PRESIDENT drew the Council’s attention to the note by the Bureau (E/5983) concerning the application by the Latin American Faculty of Social Sciences for designation by the Council in accordance with rule 79 of the rules of procedure and said that the Bureau recommended that that organization be designated to participate, without the right to vote, on an *ad hoc* basis in the deliberations of the Council on questions within the scope of the activities of the organization. If there were no objection, he would take it that the Council decided to approve the recommendation of the Bureau.

It was so decided (decision 239 (LXII)).

Research within the United Nations system on the role and position of women in development (E/5914)

74. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to take note of the progress report of the Secretary-General on research within the United Nations system on the role and position of women in development and on ways and means to organize and finance further research (E/5914).

It was so decided (decision 240 (LXII)).

AGENDA ITEM 16

Consideration of the provisional agenda for the sixty-third session (E/L.1757)

75. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) said that, as a result of decisions adopted by the Council at its current session and in view of other actions it had taken, certain changes should be made in the provisional agenda submitted by the Secretariat (E/L.1757). First, a foot-note should be added to item 9, entitled “United Nations University”, indicating that the item would be taken up at the resumed session in order to conform with the cycle of meetings of the Council of the United Nations University which was to meet after the sixty-third session of the Economic and Social Council. Secondly, and in view of the decisions adopted with respect to the agreement with IFAD, it would be necessary to change the title of item 26 back to the original version agreed upon at the organizational session before it had been decided to divide the consideration of the item between the sixty-second and

* Resumed from the 2048th meeting.

sixty-third sessions. Consequently, the title should again read "Agreements between the United Nations and inter-governmental organizations". When it took up that item, the Council would examine the agreements with IFAD and the World Tourism Organization.

76. At its current session, the Council had before it a letter addressed to the President of the Economic and Social Council by the Chairman of the Human Rights Committee (E/5929) indicating that the Committee, which was to report to the General Assembly through the Economic and Social Council, had decided to schedule its second session for 11-31 August 1977. Consequently, it would be necessary to add an item for consideration at the resumed sixty-second session entitled "International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights: report of the Human Rights Committee".

77. Mr. ALFONSO MARTINEZ (Cuba) considered the first and third of the changes to document E/L.1757 suggested by the Secretary of the Council to be appropriate. With regard to the amendment to item 26 of the provisional agenda, he wondered whether the reasons which had prompted the Secretariat to suggest those changes were sufficiently weighty to justify including two questions of such importance in a single item. He wished to know what practical advantages the proposal could have for the Council.

78. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) said that when the programme of work for the entire year had been adopted at the organizational session, the Council had decided that the agenda of the sixty-third session would include a single item covering both agreements. It had subsequently been decided that the agreement with IFAD would be taken up at the sixty-second session and,

consequently, that item had been included in the agenda for that session and the provisional agenda for the sixty-third session had been amended on the assumption that only the agreement with the World Tourism Organization would be considered at that time. Bearing in mind that, in accordance with action taken at its sixty-second session, the Council would have to consider both agreements at its sixty-third session, the Secretariat had been of the view that the Council would wish to revert to the original title of item 26 adopted in January.

79. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objection, he would take it that the Council decided to adopt the draft provisional agenda for the sixty-third session (E/L.1757), with the changes made by the Secretariat.

*It was so decided.*³

80. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objection, he would take it that the Council decided to adopt the document on organization of the work of the sixty-third session (E/L.1766) provisionally, on the understanding that a final decision would be taken at the beginning of the session, as had been done at the sixty-second session.

It was so decided.

Closure of the session

81. The PRESIDENT declared the sixty-second session of the Economic and Social Council closed.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.

³ The provisional agenda for the sixty-third session was subsequently circulated as document E/5990.