

## **22nd meeting**

**Friday, 2 May 1980, at 11 a.m.**

*President:* Mr. Andreas C. MAVROMMATIS (Cyprus).

E/1980/SR.22

### **AGENDA ITEM 5**

**Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (E/1980/60, E/1980/L.34/Rev.1)**

i. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the report of the Sessional Working Group on the Implementa-

tion of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (E/1980/60). Paragraph 17 of the report contained a synopsis of five proposals considered by the Working Group; however, as indicated in paragraph 18, the Working Group, owing to lack of time, had been unable to consider those proposals in depth.

2. The Council also had before it a draft resolution (E/1980/L.34/Rev.1), which he invited the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany to introduce on behalf of the sponsors.

3. Mr. VOLLERS (Federal Republic of Germany) pointed out that the Working Group had encountered difficulties in carrying out its tasks in accordance with Council resolution 1988 (LX) of 11 May 1976. In fact, the Group had devoted its 1979 session to reaching an agreement on its method of work and a great deal of its 1980 session to procedural questions, rather than to the consideration of reports submitted by States parties to the Covenant. Moreover, members of the Group had experienced particular time pressures, because the ongoing discussions in the Council had also required their participation.

4. Draft resolution E/1980/L.34/Rev.1 was submitted in accordance with subparagraph (e) of Council decision 1978/10 of 3 May 1978. Its purpose was to give Governments an opportunity to reflect on the current situation with a view to finding ways of improving methods of work that were still not satisfactory. The sponsors suggested that the Council, at its organizational session for 1981, take a decision on the proposals contained in paragraph 17 of the Working Group's report; if it was unable to do so, they suggested that the existing system be maintained in order to avoid further loss of time.

5. Two changes should be made in the text of paragraph 2 of the draft resolution. First, the words "functions and mandate" should be replaced by the words "organization and administrative arrangements". Secondly, the words "first regular session in 1981" at the end of the paragraph should be replaced by "organizational session for 1981", as the Council had decided earlier that the report in question should be submitted to it at the organizational session; if that proved to be impossible, he suggested that the report should be considered at the Council's first regular session of 1981.

6. Since draft resolution E/1980/L.34/Rev.1 was the result of lengthy discussions of the various problems involved, the sponsor hoped that it would be acceptable to everyone.

7. Mr. CHATTERJIE (United Kingdom) said that the United Kingdom had welcomed the opportunity to submit its report<sup>1</sup> under articles 6 to 9 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights<sup>2</sup> in accordance with article 17 of the Covenant. The United Kingdom regarded the Covenant as an international instrument of great importance; it had been one of the first States to ratify it, and it took its obligations under the Covenant most seriously. It believed that economic, social and cultural rights together with civil and political rights formed the basis of a complex of human rights.

8. The United Kingdom's concern over economic, social and cultural rights was not something new; as the first country to experience the industrial revolution, it had been confronted early on by the need to take positive steps in that field. Since the nineteenth century, legislation had developed progressively; for example, the foundations of a social security system, laid after the First World War, had evolved into a comprehensive and highly sophisticated system covering the whole population in one way or another. The national health system, created immediately following the Second World War, had provided a free and comprehensive medical service for the entire population, thus establishing the United Kingdom as one of the pioneers in that field. With regard to article 8 of the Covenant, which dealt with trade unions and the right to strike, it was well known that

trade unions had for long played a full and important role in British society and been able freely to exercise their rights as defined in the Covenant.

9. The United Kingdom had submitted a comprehensive report on its implementation of articles 6 to 9, and an expert from the Department of Employment had attended meetings of the Working Group in order to answer questions. He expressed his delegation's appreciation for the interest which the Working Group had taken in his Government's report.

10. His delegation had read with great interest the report of the Working Group (E/1980/60), particularly section III, on organizational matters. Some of the ideas for change put forward in that section were very sound. Through no fault of its own, the Group had been faced with certain difficulties in carrying out its task, and it was a tribute to its members that they had been able to achieve as much as they had. However, there was clearly a strain on delegations which had to serve on a sessional working group of the Council while trying to fulfil other commitments at the same time, and the United Kingdom believed that the idea of a pre-sessional working group deserved serious consideration. It would also be valuable if the membership of the Working Group was drawn from candidates nominated by States parties to the Covenant which were members of the Council and possessing expertise and competence on matters dealt with under the Covenant. After all, States which became parties to the Covenant were voluntarily accepting an international obligation and, by submitting reports, were agreeing to allow the extent to which they were fulfilling that obligation to be measured. But the matters covered in the Covenant were largely technical, and it would therefore seem right, in order to ensure a thorough and accurate assessment of the reports, that the examination should be carried out by qualified experts. The latter would, moreover, be able to evaluate the different styles and approaches contained in the various reports—for example, to distinguish between States which claimed to have achieved everything and had in fact disguised much and those whose claims were more modest but whose efforts and achievements were more honest.

11. His delegation therefore hoped that, when reviewing in 1981 its decision on the composition of the Working Group, the Council would consider carefully the ideas set out in the report (E/1980/60), which were based on the practical experience gained during the current session. In particular, it hoped that the Council would be able to agree to set up a pre-sessional working group composed of experts from States parties to the Covenant who were members of the Council, taking into account the principle of equitable geographical distribution, which did not obtain in the present Working Group. His delegation had therefore sponsored draft resolution E/1980/L.34/Rev.1.

12. Miss RICHTER (Argentina) said that her delegation would like to know whether the Working Group, after examining 24 national reports, had any comments to make which might enable the Council to consider general recommendations in accordance with articles 19, 21 and 22 of the Covenant. If not, her delegation would like to know whether the Working Group had considered the possibility of organizing its work in such a way that conclusions could in future be drawn from its examination of reports.

13. Lastly, she drew the attention of the Secretariat to the necessity of complying with General Assembly decisions regarding the terminology used in all documents issued by the United Nations.

14. Ms. RASI (Finland) said that her delegation was especially pleased with the progress achieved in the im-

<sup>1</sup> E/1979/WGAd.9.

<sup>2</sup> See General Assembly resolution 23(00) A (XXXI), annex.

plementation of part IV of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. The Human Rights Committee had made considerable progress towards the implementation of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights,<sup>2</sup> and it was important that parallel progress should be made in connexion with economic, social and cultural rights.

15. Her delegation welcomed the fact that the work of the Working Group had been carried out on the basis of the method which the Council had approved by consensus at its first regular session of 1979, in its resolution 1979/43 of 11 May 1979. However, additional reports would be received and, in order to achieve the proper balance in its work, the Group would need more time for its meetings in future years. Her delegation supported the view expressed by the Working Group in that connexion, and she pointed out that the Human Rights Committee held three three-week sessions each year. Lastly, if the question of the composition of the Working Group could be dealt with at the organizational session for 1981, the members of the Group would have time to study the reports received well in advance.

16. As it had indicated previously, her delegation especially appreciated the work of the specialized agencies in connexion with the implementation of the Covenant; in its opinion, they should continue to co-operate closely and even participate more actively in that undertaking.

17. As an indication of the importance it attached to the implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, Finland had sponsored draft resolution E/1980/L.34/Rev.1.

18. Mr. BYKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Soviet Union supported international co-operation among States in promoting and developing respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and had always advocated that that co-operation should be based on the International Covenants on Human Rights,<sup>3</sup> which occupied a central place in the system of international human rights agreements concluded under United Nations auspices. Unlike the Universal Declaration of Human Rights,<sup>4</sup> which merely proclaimed goals, the Covenants imposed clearly defined international legal obligations on the States parties thereto.

19. The Soviet Union had taken an active part in drafting the two Covenants, had been the first of the permanent members of the Security Council to ratify them and was strictly implementing their provisions. The Soviet Union had urged that, since all human rights were interrelated and inseparable, a single Covenant should be drafted; the subsequent development of international co-operation in the sphere of human rights had confirmed the correctness of that approach. In General Assembly resolution 32/130 of 16 December 1977, particular emphasis was given to the conviction that all human rights and fundamental freedoms were indivisible and interdependent and that the enjoyment of economic and social rights was a prerequisite for the realization of all human rights. It was particularly gratifying that the very concept of socio-economic rights had been developed by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. His delegation was pleased that the Covenants had received the broad support of the international community. Nevertheless, further efforts were needed to ensure that the largest possible number of States became parties to them so as to make them truly universal in character.

20. His delegation attached great importance to the work of the Sessional Working Group. The consideration of reports of States parties to the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights had been productive and useful and had once again confirmed the importance of the rights covered by articles 6 to 9 of the Covenant and of the inalienable right to work. It had been clear that States parties attached great importance to the work of the Working Group; many of them had sent specially appointed experts or had assigned their permanent representatives to introduce their reports. The report of the Soviet Union<sup>5</sup> had reflected the realities of a developed socialist society which attached paramount importance to man and his well-being and guaranteed in law and in practice a broad range of socio-economic, political and cultural rights for all citizens.

21. His delegation considered that the results achieved by the Working Group were favourable and encouraging and that, if goodwill was present, the Group could adequately discharge the tasks entrusted to it. The Group had not been able to consider in detail the ideas put forward concerning the organizational and administrative aspects of its work in the future; his delegation considered that any action in that connexion should take into account the sessional nature of the Group's work and also the relevant decisions of the Economic and Social Council.

22. Mr. ERRAZURIZ (Chile) said that his delegation had followed the work of the Sessional Working Group with great interest and had listened closely to the discussion in progress, particularly the comments made by the representative of the United Kingdom. However, it had very serious doubts about the procedure followed in the consideration of reports submitted by States parties to the Covenant, and it therefore supported the proposal contained in draft resolution E/1980/L.34/Rev.1, paragraph 2. His Government would continue to study the matter with the utmost attention and would submit a detailed report for consideration by the Council in 1981.

23. Mr. FAURIS (France) said that, since the report of the Sessional Working Group (E/1980/60) was extremely brief and purely procedural, his delegation did not see how the Council could give its seal of approval thereto. Not all the summary records of the meetings of the Working Group were yet available in all languages, and there was no way for members of the Council who were not members of the Group to find out exactly what had occurred during its deliberations. In the light of those observations, his delegation supported the proposal contained in paragraph 2 of the draft resolution. The Council could hardly take a decision on the work of the Working Group solely on the basis of the latter's report, and his delegation had reservations with regard to the entire procedure followed.

24. Mr. GAGLIARDI (Brazil) said he wished to place on record that Brazil could not support the existing procedure whereby expenses for the implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights were covered by the regular budget of the United Nations.

25. The PRESIDENT said that, as he understood it, the Council's task in connexion with the Covenant was to consider reports submitted by States parties. The first step in that undertaking had been entrusted to the Working Group, which had done a remarkable job, under the circumstances, by considering 24 such reports. However, if the Group continued to work at its current pace, it would take at least 10 years for it to consider all the reports submitted, although it was not known how many States had already complied

<sup>2</sup> General Assembly resolution 217 A (III).

<sup>5</sup> E/1978/8/Add.16.

with their obligation under the Covenant and how many reports would be forthcoming.

26. In his opinion, since the summary records and the questions and answers exchanged during meetings of the Working Group were not yet available, all the Council could do was to take note of the Group's report (E/1980/60). Eventually, the Council would have to take a decision on the reports submitted by States parties to the Covenant, transmit them to the Commission on Human Rights and, on the basis of the Commission's decisions, submit recommendations to the General Assembly. However, when the Working Group would even complete its consideration of the reports submitted was still an open question.

27. In the hope of avoiding a repetition of the same situation the following year, he suggested that, during the second regular session of 1980, members of the Council exchange ideas with a view to facilitating the proceedings at the organizational session for 1981. For example, informal consultations might be held and useful decisions reached beforehand. He also suggested that, during such consultations, consideration be given to the composition of the Working Group and to the inclusion in it of States parties to the Covenant which were not members of the Council. On the basis of the results of the informal consultations, it might be possible to appoint a pre-sessional working group.

28. Mr. VOLLERS (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation could agree to the President's suggestion concerning informal exchanges of views, since some time would be needed to prepare proposals for consideration at the organizational session for 1981. It considered that States parties to the Covenant which were not members of the Council should be able to take part in the informal consultations as a matter of course.

*Draft resolution E/1980/L.34/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted without a vote (resolution 1980/24).*

29. Mr. ABDUL-AZIZ (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that, although his delegation had sponsored the draft resolution, it had not been altogether satisfied with it; however, it had accepted it in a spirit of compromise. It hoped that suggestions would be made for improving the organization and administrative arrangements of the Working Group.

30. Mr. FAURIS (France) said that his delegation had not objected to the adoption of the draft resolution because it was in favour of anything that might improve the existing confused and ineffectual procedure. Nevertheless, it considered that the resolution should have specified the role of States parties to the Covenant which were not members of the Economic and Social Council and of States members of the Council which were not parties to the Covenant, and also that it should have clarified the functions and mandate of the Council with respect to the implementation of the Covenant.

31. The PRESIDENT said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to take note of the report of the Sessional Working Group (E/1980/60).

*It was so decided (decision 1980/122).*

32. The PRESIDENT said that the Council had thus concluded its consideration of agenda item 5. He requested the Secretariat to solicit the views of States members of the Council and States parties to the Covenant as to whether informal consultations should be held before the second regular session of 1980.

## AGENDA ITEM 9

### Social development questions

#### REPORT OF THE SECOND (SOCIAL) COMMITTEE (E/1980/49)\*

33. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the report of the Second (Social) Committee on agenda item 9 (E/1980/49), in paragraph 12 of which the Committee recommended the adoption by the Council of three draft resolutions, I to III.

34. Ms. RASI (Finland) suggested that, in paragraph 6 of draft resolution III, the words "through the Commission for Social Development" should be added at the end of the paragraph.

35. Mr. RANGACHARI (India), said that, on behalf of the original sponsors of draft resolution III, he could accept the proposed amendment.

*Draft resolution I, draft resolution II and draft resolution III, as orally amended, were adopted without a vote (resolutions 1980/25, 1980/26 and 1980/27).*

36. Mr. GAGLIARDI (Brazil) said that, in view of the financial implications of draft resolution II, his delegation hoped that the secretariat would take fully into account the contents of operative paragraph 2.

37. The PRESIDENT said that the Council had concluded its consideration of agenda item 9.

## AGENDA ITEM 6

### Human rights questions

#### REPORT OF THE SECOND (SOCIAL) COMMITTEE (E/1980/51)\*\*

38. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the report of the Second (Social) Committee on agenda item 6 (E/1980/51), in paragraph 43 of which the Committee recommended for adoption by the Council 6 draft resolutions, I to VI, and 20 draft decisions, I to XX.

39. Miss ST. CLAIRE (Assistant Secretary of the Council) said that a sentence to the effect that the representative of Morocco had made a statement regarding draft decision XIX should be added at the end of paragraph 38 of the report.

40. Mr. HASNAOUI (Morocco) recalled that, during the Second (Social) Committee's consideration of draft decision XIX, submitted as draft decision 19 by the Commission on Human Rights in its report (E/1980/13 and Corr.1, chap. I, sect. B), his delegation had stated that Morocco considered itself in no way bound by the provisions of resolution 4 (XXXVI) of the Commission, contained in chapter XXVI of the latter's report, and had explained that, for Morocco, the question of Western Sahara was a problem of preserving its territorial integrity and national independence. It had therefore opposed the approval of the report of the Commission on Human Rights, and at its request the Chairman of the Committee had made a statement clarifying the meaning of the expression "takes note of". Since the Council was in the process of adopting the report of the Second (Social) Committee, he would like that statement to be reflected in it.

\* A corrigendum (E/1980/49/Corr.1) to the report was issued subsequently.

\*\* A corrigendum (E/1980/51/Corr.1) to the report was issued subsequently in order to incorporate the omissions pointed out during the discussion.



41. Mrs. SEMICHI (Algeria) asked whether the Council was considering the report of the Second (Social) Committee or the report of the Commission on Human Rights.

42. The PRESIDENT said that the statement made by the Chairman of the Second (Social) Committee was reflected in the summary record of the 22nd meeting of the Committee. There was no question of the Council's adopting the report of the Committee or even taking note of it: it was merely acting on the draft resolutions and draft decisions contained in the report.

43. Mr. HASNAOUI (Morocco) said that the question of Western Sahara was a very important issue to his country. The Second (Social) Committee was a subsidiary body of the Council, and it was legitimate for his delegation to request that the statement he had referred to be mentioned in paragraph 38 of the Committee's report. It was not enough that it was reflected in the summary record.

44. Mrs. SEMICHI (Algeria) said that a distinction must be drawn between procedural matters and the substance of a problem. It was not possible to change the Council's procedure for considering reports of its sessional committees.

45. The PRESIDENT suggested that a foot-note referring to the relevant summary record be added to paragraph 38 of the report.

46. Mr. HASNAOUI (Morocco) said that the Committee's report was supposed to reflect the reality of its discussions; he could not understand the Council's difficulty in specifying what had actually happened. As for the President's suggestion, he saw no reason to refer to the summary record. It was merely a question of a statement of fact. The Chairman of the Second (Social) Committee was present and could verify what he had said.

47. Mr. MULLER (Secretary of the Council) said that during the 33 years he had served in the United Nations the term "takes note of" had never been interpreted to mean "endorses". The inclusion of a foot-note explaining that fact would merely restate traditional practice.

48. Mr. HASNAOUI (Morocco) expressed appreciation for the Secretary's clarification and said that his delegation could accept the inclusion of a foot-note containing the statement made by the Chairman of the Second (Social) Committee.

49. Mrs. SEMICHI (Algeria) questioned whether the Council should allow itself to change long-standing procedure at the whim of certain delegations. However, her delegation would not oppose the inclusion of a foot-note.

50. Mr. HASNAOUI (Morocco) said Algeria had always claimed that the problem of the Sahara was not its concern, whereas the Moroccan Government maintained that it was a bilateral conflict between Algeria and Morocco. Algeria was preventing the consummation of Morocco's territorial integrity; it was from Algeria that armed attacks were being launched, and that country was responsible for the tension in the area. It was not surprising, therefore, that the Algerian delegation should be seeking to block a collective effort to clarify the wording of a report. He would be forced to reopen the debate if the Algerian delegation or any other engaged in provocation against his delegation.

51. The PRESIDENT said he understood that the Algerian delegation had no objection to the inclusion of a foot-note.

52. Mrs. SEMICHI (Algeria) said that the foot-note should simply read: "The Chairman of the Second (Social) Committee made a clarification".

53. Mr. HASNAOUI (Morocco) said that his delegation would not let the matter rest. The Council could not yield to the *diktat* of the Algerian delegation.

54. Mr. CARDWELL (United States of America) proposed that the Council should proceed with its work and that the point at issue should be clarified in informal consultations between the Secretariat and the interested delegations.

55. The PRESIDENT said that, unless any delegation objected, he would proceed as proposed by the representative of the United States.

56. He invited the Council to take action on draft resolutions I to VI recommended to the Council for its adoption by the Second (Social) Committee in paragraph 43 of its report (E/1980/51).

57. Mr. CARDWELL (United States of America) pointed out that the report did not reflect the fact that his delegation had not participated in the vote on draft resolution I and asked that that fact be recorded.

*Draft resolutions I to VI were adopted without a vote (resolutions 1980/28 to 1980/33).*

58. Mr. VERKERCKE (Belgium) said his delegation continued to believe that the French text of paragraph 5 of draft resolution VI needed to be brought in line with the English text, despite the fact that the French Service of the Translation Division did not share that view. It therefore associated itself with the explanation given by the Italian delegation in the Second (Social) Committee and stressed that its participation in the consensus was on the basis of the English and Spanish versions only.

59. Mr. NORDENFELT (Sweden) reiterated that his delegation's decision to join the sponsors of draft resolution VI had been based on the English text of paragraph 5.

60. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to take action on draft decisions I to XX recommended for adoption in paragraph 43 of the report (E/1980/51).

*Draft decisions I to VI, VIII, X, XII, XIII and XV to XX were adopted without a vote (decisions 1980/123 to 1980/128, 1980/130, 1980/132, 1980/134, 1980/135 and 1980/137 to 1980/142 respectively).*

61. Mr. GAGLIARDI (Brazil) reiterated the views expressed by his delegation in the Second (Social) Committee on draft decision VI and X.

62. Mr. SHERIFIS (Cyprus) reiterated the views expressed by his delegation in the Second (Social) Committee on draft decision VI.

63. Mr. HASNAOUI (Morocco) referred to the statements made by his delegation in the Second (Social) Committee with respect to draft decision XIX.

64. Mr. EDIS (United Kingdom), referring to draft decision XX, stated that his Government deplored all examples of capital punishment in public without due process of law.

65. The PRESIDENT announced that a recorded vote had been requested and would be taken on draft decision VII.

*In favour:* Algeria, Australia, Barbados, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Hungary, India, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Mexico, Romania, Senegal, Spain, Sweden, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

*Against:* Argentina, Brazil, Chile.

*Abstaining:* Bahamas, Central African Republic, China, Dominican Republic, Indonesia, Jordan, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Thailand, Zaire.

*Draft decision VII was adopted by 38 votes to 3, with 12 abstentions (decision 1980/129).*

66. The PRESIDENT announced that the representative of the United States had requested a recorded vote on draft decision IX.

*At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on draft decision IX.*

*In favour:* Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Barbados, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, China, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Romania, Senegal, Spain, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

*Against:* Belgium, France, Germany, Federal Republic of Italy, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*Abstaining:* Australia, Central African Republic, Finland, Ireland, Japan, Sweden.

*Draft decision IX was adopted by 40 votes to 6, with 6 abstentions (decision 1980/131).*

67. The PRESIDENT announced that the representative of the United States had requested a recorded vote on draft decision XI.

68. Mr. EDIS (United Kingdom) said that his delegation was puzzled by the high figures for the financial implications of draft decision XI, given in annex III to the report of the Commission on Human Rights (E/1980/13 and Corr.1). It would welcome an explanation at some stage on whether the figures shown for translation, revision and typing covered the reinstatement of staff dismissed as a result of the Council's previous decision to eliminate summary records, and why additional messengers, guards and cleaners would be required if records were reinstated. Moreover, no account seemed to have been taken of the reduction in costs if alternative means of recording the proceedings were abandoned in favour of a reversion to summary records.

69. The PRESIDENT said that notice had been taken of the United Kingdom representative's questions with a view to the relevant services providing answers at a later stage.

70. Replying to a question from Miss RICHTER (Argentina), Miss ST. CLAIRE (Assistant Secretary of the Council) drew attention to paragraph 4 of the report of the Second (Social) Committee (E/1980/51) and said that all the financial implications in annex III to the report of the Commission on Human Rights (E/1980/13 and Corr.1) had been brought to the Committee's attention when it had discussed the relevant draft resolutions and decisions.

71. Miss RICHTER (Argentina) thanked the representative of the United Kingdom for drawing attention to the financial implications of draft decision XI, and said that it would perhaps be better if the Council did not prejudge its decision on the financial implications.

72. Mr. BYKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that the reinstatement of summary records should not involve any increase in expenditure, because the posts already existed and no new staff would need to be

employed. The figures submitted in the report of the Commission on Human Rights (*ibid.*) had clearly been exaggerated.

73. Mr. CARDWELL (United States of America) drew attention to a discrepancy in the voting figures shown in paragraph 29 of the report of the Second (Social) Committee (E/1980/51) in the English and French versions.

74. The PRESIDENT requested the Secretariat to look into the matter and make the necessary changes.

*At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on draft decision XI.*

*In favour:* Algeria, Bahamas, Brazil, Bulgaria, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Romania, Senegal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

*Against:* United States of America.

*Abstaining:* Argentina, Australia, Barbados, Belgium, Trinidad and Tobago.

*Draft decision XI was adopted by 47 votes to 1, with 5 abstentions (decision 1980/133).*

75. Mr. SHERIFIS (Cyprus) referred members of the Council to his explanation of vote after the vote on draft decision XI at the 21st meeting of the Second (Social) Committee.

76. The PRESIDENT announced that the representative of Australia had requested a recorded vote on draft decision XIV.

*At the request of the representative of Australia, a recorded vote was taken on draft decision XIV.*

*In favour:* Australia, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Malawi, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Senegal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Venezuela, Zaire, Zambia.

*Against:* Bulgaria, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, India, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

*Abstaining:* Algeria, Argentina, Brazil, Indonesia, Iraq, Lesotho, Mexico, Yugoslavia.

*Draft decision XIV was adopted by 34 votes to 6, with 8 abstentions (decision 1980/136).*

77. Mr. ZHANG Zifan (China) referred members of the Council to his delegation's explanation of vote after the vote on draft decision XIV at the 21st meeting of the Second (Social) Committee.

*The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.*