



**UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL**



Distr.
GENERAL

E/1979/C.2/SR.21

14 May 1979

ENGLISH

ORIGINAL: SPANISH

First regular session, 1979

SECOND (SOCIAL) COMMITTEE

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 21st MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 2 May 1979, at 3 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. O'DONOVAN (Ireland)

CONTENTS

Human rights questions (continued)

Social development questions (continued)

Activities for the advancement of women; United Nations Decade for Women: Equality, Development and Peace (continued)

Draft rules of procedure for United Nations Congresses on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room A-3550.

Any corrections to the records of the meetings of this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

The meeting was called to order at 3.35 p.m.

HUMAN RIGHTS QUESTIONS (continued) (E/1979/19, E/1979/36; E/1978/14 and Add.1-8; E/1978/C.2/L.6)

1. Mr. ZACEMAN (German Democratic Republic) said his delegation believed that the Commission on Human Rights had done very useful work in considering massive violations of human rights in South Africa, Chile and the territories occupied by Israel.
2. The report contained in document E/CN.4/1310 presented further evidence of serious violations of human rights by the Chilean junta and showed that there had been no change in the situation in Chile. Many reports underlined the urgency of implementing the measures set out in General Assembly resolution 33/175 and in the resolutions adopted by the Commission on Human Rights at its thirty-fifth session. He referred in that connexion to the discovery of bodies in a mass grave at Lonquén and the suppression of the trade union movement. The Ad Hoc Working Group to inquire into the situation of human rights in Chile had demonstrated its effectiveness, and his delegation was therefore surprised that some States which had been supporters of the Group had now called for its dissolution. He trusted that the activities of the Special Rapporteur appointed pursuant to resolution 11 (XXXV) of the Commission on Human Rights would enable the United Nations to take new initiatives in support of the legitimate struggle of the Chilean people against fascism and for freedom and democracy.
3. It was regrettable that, in the appointment of experts to study the question of the fate of missing persons as provided for in paragraph 6 (b) of that resolution, the principle of equitable geographical distribution had not been observed.
4. His delegation welcomed the adoption by the Commission on Human Rights of resolution 1 (XXXV), entitled "Question of the violation of human rights in the occupied Arab territories, including Palestine", the implementation of which would help to meet the requests made in various Security Council and General Assembly resolutions.
5. In the view of his delegation, resolution 22 (XXXV) contained elements which could have a positive influence on the activities of the Commission on Human Rights, such as the statement in operative paragraph 1 that the Commission should take into account the concepts contained in General Assembly resolution 32/130. His delegation considered that resolution 22 (XXXV), paragraphs 5 and 6, were applicable to cases of gross and flagrant violations of human rights, as specifically defined in resolution 32/130, and felt that that point must be stressed because the violations of human rights referred to in the resolution had international repercussions on future United Nations activities. There were many international instruments aimed at eliminating gross and flagrant violations of human rights, and the ratification of them by all States would constitute an effective contribution to the achievement of that goal.

(Mr. Zachman, German Democratic Republic)

6. The German Democratic Republic had followed with interest the discussions on the right to development at the thirty-fifth session of the Commission on Human Rights. It had noted in the past the importance of the close interrelationship between the political and the socio-economic aspects of the right to self-determination, and it continued to believe that peoples had the right to take whatever measures they deemed necessary to achieve independent social and economic development, which was essential if they were to be able to implement their right to self-determination. The discussions on the right to development as a fundamental human right raised a whole series of burning issues, such as the adverse effects on the implementation and promotion of human rights of neo-colonialism, racial discrimination, the exploitation of economically weak countries by transnational corporations and the arms race.

7. His delegation regretted that the Commission had not been able to complete during the International Year of the Child the drafting of a convention on the rights of the child for submission to the General Assembly, and felt that the drafting of such a convention must not be further delayed. It hoped that the General Assembly, at its thirty-fourth session, would give the Commission a mandate to finalize the convention in 1980.

8. His delegation was ready to consider and adopt appropriate measures to implement the resolutions of the thirty-fifth session of the Commission on Human Rights.

9. Ms. WELLS (Observer for Australia) said that her delegation attached great importance to the role played by the United Nations, and particularly by the Commission on Human Rights, in promoting respect for human rights. Its effectiveness depended primarily on the political will of Member States and on their confidence in the efficiency and integrity of the Secretariat. At a time of budgetary constraints, the Division of Human Rights had been able to continue to carry out its ever-expanding tasks; however, it was obvious that consideration would have to be given to increasing the Division's resources.

10. Her Government was aware of a growing expectation that the United Nations would establish means of protecting human rights. The Commission on Human Rights had spent a considerable proportion of its meetings in considering situations involving serious violations of human rights. The time had come to decide precisely how, and by what procedures and criteria, allegations of violations of human rights should be dealt with. That was urgently necessary if the international community was to maintain its confidence in the ability of the United Nations to provide multilateral procedures applicable to all and accessible to all.

11. Australia was concerned at the increasing number of political assassinations and executions in many parts of the world, including, unfortunately, the ESCAP region to which it belonged.

12. The Commission's role in the promotion of human rights had been underlined by the request in General Assembly resolution 32/130 for an analysis of "the

(Ms. Wells, Observer, Australia)

alternative approaches and ways and means for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms". The results of the Commission's work, as reflected in draft resolution III in its report, showed the need for greater United Nations participation in the promotion of human rights. It was to be hoped that the Economic and Social Council, by adopting that draft resolution, would maintain the momentum towards change. It was also to be hoped that the Commission would have more time to consider the report of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities.

13. On the proposal of Australia, the Commission had decided to consider ways and means of further developing public information activities in the field of human rights. The resolution which had been adopted urged Governments to consider action to give publicity to such activities and requested the Secretary-General to report to the Commission at its next session.

14. Her delegation was satisfied with the progress that had been made with regard to the realization of economic, social and cultural rights, and agreed on the need for a study of the regional and national dimensions of the right to development as a human right.

15. The Commission was preparing drafts of four new international human rights instruments; two of them (a convention on torture and a convention on the rights of the child) were being drafted on the basis of existing declarations and, although progress was slow, it was important that they should be drawn up on a basis of consensus. It was most desirable, however, that Poland's initiative should be followed up as soon as possible in the form of a convention on the rights of the child.

16. Her delegation had been disappointed at the outcome of the Commission's discussions of the question of missing persons. Australia had sponsored the resolution on missing persons at the last session of the General Assembly and would be very sorry if no progress was made on that subject. It therefore hoped that the Economic and Social Council would take action on it at the current session.

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT QUESTIONS (continued) (E/1979/24, chap. I, draft resolution IV; E/1978/102; E/1978/L.3/Rev.2, E/1978/L.4; E/1979/C.2/CRP.3 and 4)

Draft resolution IV of the Commission for Social Development (E/1979/24)

17. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Committee, when considering the draft resolution, had had before it a number of amendments proposed by Argentina. As a result of discussions between the representatives of France and Argentina, further amendments had been suggested on which some delegations had expressed doubts. He now invited delegations to consider the amendments proposed in document E/1979/C.2/CRP.3, the first of which would delete the words "and submits it to the General Assembly for consideration at its thirty-fourth session" at the end of operative paragraph 1.

18. Mr. FAURIS (France) said that his delegation did not wish to insist on its amendment, but it still thought that paragraph 1 needed changing slightly. The Council could not take note of the draft Declaration because it had not received any official communication. It would therefore be better, instead of saying "Takes note of the draft Declaration ...", to say "Takes note of the paragraphs of the report on the twenty-sixth session of the Commission for Social Development concerning the draft Declaration ...". The rest of the paragraph could then remain as it was, including the part which his delegation had proposed should be deleted. His delegation wished to maintain the amendments to operative paragraphs 2 and 3 proposed in document E/1979/C.2/CRP.3. In making that proposal, it felt that it was maintaining a conciliatory attitude.

19. Miss KESTREPO DE REYES (Colombia) supported the amendments to draft resolution IV proposed by the delegation of France. Her delegation had hoped that the secretariat of the Commission for Social Development would finally submit the draft Declaration on Social and Legal Principles relating to Adoption and Foster Placement of Children Nationally and Internationally, referred to in draft resolution IV. Her Government had helped to finance the Expert Group which had been concerned with preparing the draft. The document apparently existed and had been duly signed, and she was therefore surprised that it had not been submitted to the Committee. Perhaps vested interests had prevented it. In any case, it did not show much respect for the Committee to present it with a draft resolution referring to a document that no one had seen.

20. The problem was a burning social issue of international dimensions, and her delegation would have liked to set an early date for starting the study of it so that the General Assembly could take it up at its autumn session; however, since that was not possible, her delegation had decided to support the French amendments. The negotiations for an agreement had dragged on far too long, because in fact they had not been genuine negotiations but simply a dialogue of the deaf. While her delegation had been asking for the draft resolution to be treated as urgent, the other side, by its own admission, had shown that its greatest wish was to have the item taken off the agenda.

21. Her delegation considered it particularly important that the United Nations should study the problem of adoption and foster placement of children, which was a social problem of international dimensions. However, it could not accept the un lawyerlike argument that, since there were States which had comprehensive domestic legislation on the subject, any international convention that might result from the studies carried out by the United Nations would be opposed. Nor could it agree that the item should be dropped by the United Nations because adoption was not recognized in certain religious doctrines. To accept such arguments would be to deny the universality of the United Nations, which was the essence of its being. As the French delegation had explained clearly, the matter was one which required close international co-operation at the highest technical levels, since it involved very delicate social, legal and other aspects which could not be treated lightly or made a mockery of by saying that it amounted to legalizing the sale of children. In fact, it was quite the opposite: finding a method of adoption with due regard to the protection of children's rights.

22. The CHAIRMAN said that draft resolution IV, operative paragraph 1, if amended as proposed by France, would read as follows:

"Takes note of the paragraphs of the report of the Commission for Social Development on its twenty-sixth session concerning the draft Declaration on Social and Legal Principles relating to Adoption and Foster Placement of Children Nationally and Internationally and submits them to the General Assembly for a first reading at its thirty-fourth session."

23. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the amendment.

24. It was so decided.

25. Miss RICHTER (Argentina) said that if the amendment had been put to the vote her delegation would not have participated, because it seemed pointless to request the General Assembly to consider a subject on which it had decided in 1978 not to take any action. Nor did there seem to be any point in requesting a first reading of a draft declaration on which the views of Governments would be needed. According to the Secretariat, it would be very difficult to submit those views to the General Assembly at its thirty-fourth session.

26. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the second and third amendments to draft resolution IV proposed by France in document E/1979/C.2/CRP.3, paragraphs 2 and 3.

27. It was so decided.

28. Draft resolution IV, as a whole, as amended, was adopted.

Document E/1979/C.2/L.3/Rev.2

29. Mr. CARDWELL (United States of America) said that, since submitting the original version of the draft resolution, the sponsors had had discussions with a number of delegations and had agreed to revise operative paragraph 2 to read:

"Further requests that, following the Sixth Congress, the Secretary-General take appropriate measures to effect the transfer of the Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Branch to Vienna, without prejudice to the maintenance of a liaison office at Headquarters."

30. Mrs. SEMICHI (Algeria) said that her delegation would like some explanations concerning the change in the text, since it introduced a new idea that had not been in the original draft.

31. Mr. MONTHE (United Republic of Cameroon) said that he too would like some explanations concerning the proposed change. He also pointed out that at the thirty-third session of the General Assembly the Secretary-General, in paragraph 42 of his report on the subject (A/C.5/33/39), had referred to the

(Mr. Honthe, Cameroon)

possibility of some adjustments in the time-table or other details of the plan of implementation, as implementation proceeded, and had suggested that he should be authorized to make such adjustments and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its thirty-fourth session. He would like to know whether the Secretariat was in a position to make those adjustments.

32. Mr. YEPES ENRIQUEZ (Ecuador) pointed out that many of the developing countries did not maintain permanent delegations in Vienna and needed to keep in touch with the Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Branch through their permanent missions at Headquarters in New York. That was the reason why the maintenance of a liaison office in New York had been requested.

33. Mrs. de BARISH (Observer for Costa Rica) said that draft resolution E/1979/L.3/Rev.2 was based on a justifiable concern to ensure that preparations by the Secretariat for the Sixth United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders would continue at the same pace and without interruption during the transfer to Vienna of the Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Branch. She agreed with operative paragraph 1, but it conflicted with paragraph 2, which requested the Secretary-General, following the Sixth Congress, to take appropriate measures to effect the transfer of the Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Branch, "in its entirety," to Vienna. That paragraph would adversely affect the Latin American Institute for the Prevention of Crime and Treatment of Offenders at San José, Costa Rica, since it would make communication between the Institute and the Branch more difficult. At the thirty-third session of the General Assembly, her delegation had made a statement in the Fifth Committee expressing the hope that, even if the crime prevention units were transferred to Vienna, a nucleus of specialist staff would be kept at United Nations Headquarters in order to maintain the valuable co-operation that was being given to the Latin American countries. Her delegation considered that paragraph 2 added nothing positive to the preparations for the Sixth Congress, and therefore favoured its deletion; moreover, it was unnecessary, because the General Assembly had already adopted two resolutions requesting the transfer of the Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Branch to Vienna.

34. Mr. TARASYUK (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the oral revision of draft resolution E/1979/C.2/L.3/Rev.2 contained an important proposal in that a liaison office was being created at Headquarters. He proposed that a decision on the draft resolution should be deferred.

35. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that paragraph 2 did not request the Secretary-General to maintain a liaison office: it requested that a decision be taken without prejudice to that matter.

36. Mrs. SEMICHI (Algeria) asked whether the Economic and Social Council could take a decision, since the General Assembly had already taken other decisions on the transfer of the Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Branch to Vienna.

37. Mr. GAGLIARDI (Brazil) said that operative paragraph 1 contained a request to

/...

(Mr. Garliardi, Brazil)

the Secretary-General to examine the possibility of temporarily deferring a transfer, and paragraph 2 requested him to take measures. He felt that the measures which the Secretary-General would have to take were being prejudged, and for that reason his delegation would abstain if the matter were put to the vote.

38. Mr. SHERIFIS (Cyprus) proposed that the words "in its entirety" should be deleted from operative paragraph 2 and, at the end of that paragraph, the phrase "in accordance with the provisions of General Assembly resolutions 31/194 and 33/181" should be added.

39. Miss SIBAL (India) asked if the Secretary-General had expressly stated his intention to maintain a liaison office at Headquarters. As the Chairman had said, the oral revision did not request the establishment of a liaison office, but implied that a decision had already been taken. She wished to know whether the decision had been taken or not.

40. Mr. BAUMANN (Federal Republic of Germany) said he believed the words "in its entirety" to be necessary, since part of the staff was already in Vienna and it only remained to transfer the personnel left in New York at the end of the Sixth Congress. He supported the retention of paragraph 2, but the text would have to be modified along the lines suggested by the representative of Brazil. The revision introduced orally by the United States, adding the phrase "without prejudice to the maintenance of a liaison office at Headquarters", would also have major financial implications, which made him wonder whether the Council could take a decision in that regard.

41. Mr. CARDWELL (United States of America) proposed that consideration of the draft resolution should be postponed so that new negotiations on paragraph 2 could be held with the delegations concerned.

42. Mr. WENEMAN (Poland) said his delegation did not support an increase in the number of liaison offices in the modern era of rapid communication; such measures had been necessary at the time of sailing ships.

ACTIVITIES FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF WOMEN; UNITED NATIONS DECADE FOR WOMEN:
EQUALITY, DEVELOPMENT AND PEACE (continued) (E/1979/6/Rev.1)

43. Mrs. MAIR (Secretary-General of the World Conference of the United Nations Decade for Women), referring to questions raised in the Committee on the appropriateness of holding a third session of the Preparatory Committee for the World Conference, said that the total cost of a two-week session was estimated at \$106,000. That did not imply that an extraordinary outlay of that amount would have to be made, since most of the sum could be defrayed within existing sections of the budget.

44. It had been argued, at the thirty-third session of the General Assembly, that the delay in taking up consideration of the item was due to the need for the report of the first session of the Preparatory Committee to be submitted to the Economic and Social Council at its resumed session before the General Assembly

could begin to consider the subject. In recent consultations and the general debate in the Committee the same concern had been expressed; the Economic and Social Council should therefore consider whether it wished to transmit the report of the second session of the Preparatory Committee, planned for early September, directly to the General Assembly at its thirty-fourth session rather than through the Council at its resumed second session.

45. Together with other members of the Conference secretariat, she had met representatives of United Nations bodies and organizations and of the four regional commissions and had made considerable progress in preparing for the Conference. The contributions of United Nations bodies and organizations to the regional preparatory meetings for the Conference had been identified, and workable time-limits had been established, taking into account the fact that the Secretariat had begun its activities late and no special appropriations for the Conference had been included in the budgets of the various agencies. She asked the Committee to bear in mind the limited resources allocated to the Conference, which explained the limited ability of the regions and Member States to participate effectively in preparations for the Conference and in the Conference itself.

DRAFT RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR UNITED NATIONS CONGRESSES ON THE PREVENTION OF CRIME AND THE TREATMENT OF OFFENDERS (E/CN.5/556)

Draft rules of procedure revised by the Vice-Chairman of the Committee, Mr. O'Donovan (Ireland), on the basis of informal consultations (E/1979/C.2/CRP.4)

Rule 60

46. Mr. GREEN (New Zealand), referring to General Assembly resolution 32/209 on limiting the use of consultants and experts, asked for clarification with regard to the two paragraphs of rule 60.

47. Mr. ERDOS (Hungary) said he had reservations with regard to the inclusion in paragraph 2 of rule 60 of the phrase "at United Nations expense". He felt that the cost of the consultants and experts would be an outlay in excess of those which were already being made.

48. Mr. BRYSHKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation could not accept the current wording of rule 60, paragraph 2, since it departed from the provisions of resolution 32/60 stipulating that the provisional rules of procedure of congresses had to conform to the practice of other congresses. Rule 60, paragraph 2, went further and had financial implications.

Rule 44

49. Miss RICHTER (Argentina) said that, in her view, the unrestricted establishment of subsections and working groups in which reports were submitted discriminated against those delegations which did not speak English, since the practice could lead to the subsections and working groups' working without

(Miss Richter, Argentina)

interpretation or translation. She repeated her proposal that a comma should be added at the end of rule 44, followed by the phrase "to the extent that available facilities permit", referring to the capacity of congresses to provide interpreters and translators for work in subsections.

50. Rule 44, as amended by the delegation of Argentina, was adopted.

Rule 4

51. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt rule 4, paragraphs 1, 2 and 3.

52. It was so decided.

53. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objections, he would take it that the Committee wished to delete rule 12.

54. It was so decided.

Rule 34

55. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt rule 34, paragraphs 1, 2 and 3.

56. It was so decided.

Chapter VII

57. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee approved the title of chapter VII: Subsidiary organs.

58. It was so decided.

Rule 45

59. The CHAIRMAN said, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee adopted rule 45, paragraph 1.

60. Mr. EDIS (United Kingdom) proposed that consideration of rule 45, paragraph 2, should be postponed until the question of article 44 had been cleared up.

Rule 46

61. The CHAIRMAN said, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt rule 46.

62. It was so decided.

Rule 47

63. Consideration of rule 47 was postponed.

Rule 49

64. Mr. BAUMANN (Federal Republic of Germany) asked whether, in the light of the financial implications, it was customary for Arabic to be an official language at congresses held under the auspices of the United Nations. He proposed that rule 47 should be considered in conjunction with rule 49.

65. Mr. Borg OLIVIER (Office of Legal Affairs) said that there were precedents for the use of Arabic in the General Assembly and in recent important conferences but that special authorization from the General Assembly was required.

66. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee's informal Working Group had thought of drawing a distinction between the expression "working languages" and "official languages", but had decided not to do so.

67. Mr. Sid AHMED VALL (Mauritania) said that he hoped the two rules would be adopted as soon as possible.

68. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt rules 47 and 49.

69. Rules 47 and 49 were adopted.

Rule 50

70. Mr. GREEN (New Zealand) said that he had no objections to the rule but believed that there was no difference between "sound recordings" and "other recordings".

71. The CHAIRMAN said that the Office of Legal Affairs saw no problem in deleting "other recordings", so that the title of rule 50 would read "Sound recordings of meetings". If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt rule 50.

72. Rule 50 was adopted.

Rules 52 and 53

73. The amalgamation of rules 52 and 53 into a single rule, in accordance with the proposal contained in document E/1979/C.2/CRP.4, was approved.

Rules 55, 56, 57 and 58

74. Rules 55, 56, 57 and 58 were adopted.

Rule 60

75. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the rule should be considered at a later meeting since it was not yet possible to provide the clarification requested by the representative of New Zealand.

76. Mr. SHERIFIS (Cyprus) wondered whether the text would not be improved by the deletion of the phrase "having an interest" from paragraph 1 of rule 60.

77. The CHAIRMAN said that certain delegations had requested that the time-limit for the submission of resolutions on human rights questions and questions concerning the composition of the Committee on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders should be extended until 1 p.m. on the following day, Thursday, 3 May 1979. Although he wished to point out that that did not imply that the rule under which delegations were to be given 24 hours to examine documents was not being observed, if the Committee had no objection, he would take it that it wished to extend the time-limit for submitting draft resolutions on the aforementioned questions until 1 p.m. on 3 May 1979:

78. It was so decided.

79. Mr. YEPES ENRIQUEZ (Ecuador), with reference to document E/1979/C.2/CRP.4, said that, on the request of the representative of the United Kingdom, paragraph 2 of rule 45 had not yet been adopted and he wished to point out that once rule 45 was adopted there would be no reason to leave the adoption of rule 45, paragraph 2, pending.

80. The CHAIRMAN said that rule 60 and paragraph 2 of rule 45 were the only rules in document E/1979/C.2/CRP.4 still to be considered. He reminded the members of the Committee that, during the discussion of agenda item 7, the report of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination on measures for achieving better co-ordination between social and other development activities within the United Nations system (E/1978/102) had been available to the Committee. He asked whether the Committee wished to take a decision taking note of that report.

81. Mr. NEWMAN (Poland) said that document E/1978/102 had been discussed at the resumed session of the Economic and Social Council and had been strongly criticized by many delegations, including his own. No decision could be reached to take note of that report and consideration of the latter had been postponed until the next regular session so that it could be discussed in detail. That discussion had not taken place and it was difficult to accept the document since it left no option open for discussion of the social factor as distinct from the economic factor and, while it was true that the two were related, it could not be said that the solution of the economic problem would automatically eliminate the social problems. There were insufficiently developed countries in which the social problems were not particularly serious; conversely, there were countries with a high level of development which had very serious social problems. The question was very complex and required very careful consideration.

(Mr. Neneman, Poland)

82. Furthermore, he wished to point out that the Committee was not dealing with rhetorical questions or discussions by experts because the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination was an important organ of the Secretariat and its decisions would therefore significantly influence the United Nations system.

83. Mrs. RICHTER (Argentina) said that document E/1978/102 had been considered by the Economic and Social Council the previous year, together with other documents concerning the item in question. At the end of the discussion of the documents submitted, it had been decided that the item on the strengthening of the social sector of the United Nations would be considered in plenary meeting at the next regular session. She asked why that document was still before the Social Committee when all the other documents had been passed on to the plenary and when delegations would need it to find out the Secretariat's views and to formulate their own. For example, her delegation had already expressed surprise that, in the list of resolutions mentioned, a very important one submitted by the Group of 77 on the world social situation had been omitted. As that item was being dealt with in other forums, her delegation had serious doubts as to whether it would be appropriate for the Social Committee to take note of the report, even with reservations.

84. The CHAIRMAN said that many delegations found it difficult to take note of document E/1978/102. Consequently, he suggested that consideration of the item should be postponed since, if delegations could not agree, the only way of reaching a decision taking note of the report of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination would be by means of a vote.

Draft decision E/1979/C.2/L.4

85. Mr. VERKERCKE (Observer for Belgium) proposed two subamendments to the draft decision submitted by the delegation of the United Kingdom. In the title, he had proposed that the words "Draft Declaration on the" should be deleted and that the text of the introductory paragraph should be replaced by the following:

"The Economic and Social Council has taken note of the following draft of a Declaration on the rights of deaf-blind persons* and decides to bring it to the attention of the General Assembly at its thirty-fourth session as part of the documentation relating to item 79 of its provisional agenda."

86. Mr. EDIS (United Kingdom) accepted the subamendment proposed orally by the Observer for Belgium.

87. Mrs. RICHTER (Argentina) said that she preferred the following wording: "the Economic and Social Council has taken note of a Declaration", etc.

88. Mr. EDIS (United Kingdom) accepted the amendment.

* Adopted 16 September 1977 by the Helen Keller World Conference on Services to Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults.

89. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objections, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the amended text of draft decision E/1979/C.2/L.4.

90. It was so decided.

E/1979/C.2/L.3/Rev.2

91. Mr. CARDWELL (United States of America) said that his delegation believed that it had a wording which would satisfy the concerns of the majority of delegations. He read out the proposed amendment to operative paragraph 2 of the revised draft resolution (E/1979/C.2/L.3/Rev.2), which would insert, after "Criminal Justice Branch", the words "in accordance with General Assembly resolutions 31/194 and 33/1817".

92. Mr. TARASYUK (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) recalled the comments made by the representatives of Brazil and Cyprus to the effect that paragraph 2 prejudged the question of the Secretary-General's transferring the Branch.

93. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objections, he would take it that the Committee wished to postpone consideration of the revised draft resolution pending further informal consultations. He also announced that the time-limit for the submission of draft proposals and draft resolutions on the items which were outstanding had been extended to 1 p.m., Thursday, 3 May. The Committee intended to complete its work on Friday, 4 May.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.