



ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Resumed Forty-ninth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Wednesday, 11 November 1970,
at 3.25 p.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. J. B. P. MARAMIS (Indonesia).

AGENDA ITEM 5

Report of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs on its second special session (concluded) (E/4931, E/L.1362)

1. Mr. LAURENT (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations) said that the "production" aspect of narcotics raw materials, which had already been stressed in the debate, was of great interest to FAO, as the FAO representative had observed at the second special session of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs.

2. In 1958 and 1966, FAO had already made a practical contribution to the efforts to solve the problems concerning poppies and cannabis. The action undertaken had entailed measures relating to agrarian structure, irrigation, credit and the granting of subsidies, education and penal matters. At the same time, undesirable plants had been destroyed by mechanical, chemical and biological methods. It was thus clear that crop substitution was not a simple technical question, but called for comprehensive action relating to socio-economic structures: the efforts of the Governments concerned must cover not only agronomic research but also agricultural extension, the granting of subsidies for the purchase of fertilizers, insecticides and other inputs, and the implementation of measures designed to encourage the industrial processing or export of the substitute crops. Furthermore, it was necessary to ensure that crop substitution did not simply have the effect of encouraging the production of narcotic drugs from vegetable raw materials containing very high doses of active substances, which were therefore easier to hide.

3. That action, which was comprehensive in nature, encountered serious obstacles, such as the fact that traffickers could increase the profit margin offered to producers in order to incite them to continue their operations despite the subsidies granted by the authorities to encourage substitute crops. Furthermore, narcotics raw materials were often grown in inaccessible areas with a marginal economy.

4. In any event, FAO thought that the crop substitution method was valid and was prepared to co-operate with the other specialized agencies in defining priority sectors and helping the Governments concerned to implement pilot projects. FAO also considered that the special fund whose establishment was envisaged in draft resolution E/L.1362 could play a useful role, for example, by providing resources to pay the consultants whose services would be needed to plan crop diversification and to finance the measures taken within the framework of that action. The food resources of the World Food Programme could also

provide practical encouragement for the implementation of substitution projects. Generally speaking, FAO was ready to contribute, to the best of its ability, to the solution of the serious problem of drug abuse.

5. Mr. FERNANDINI (Peru) said that his delegation could not play a very active part in the discussion because Peru was, unfortunately, one of the main producers of a narcotics raw material, namely, the coca leaf. His Government had for several years been seeking to eliminate that production and had been combating drug abuse among the population.

6. That being so, his delegation had warmly welcomed the excellent draft resolution submitted at the 1726th meeting. The urgency of the situation called for energetic action by the members of the Council; in that connexion, the envisaged invitation to the specialized agencies and other competent international organizations to co-operate in the planning and execution of programmes and the establishment of a special fund were excellent measures. Since his delegation had not received its Government's authorization to announce a voluntary contribution to the fund for drug-abuse control, it could not officially sponsor the draft resolution, but he wished to assure the Council that he whole-heartedly supported the draft and hoped that it would be adopted unanimously.

7. Mr. QUARONI (Italy) said that his delegation fully agreed with the views expressed in the report of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs and endorsed the recommendations set out therein. Italy had already taken a series of measures to combat drug abuse and was always ready to co-operate in international action in that field, whether bilateral or multilateral.

8. Furthermore, his delegation whole-heartedly supported draft resolution E/L.1362. He could not yet make known his Government's position regarding a possible voluntary contribution to the proposed special fund, but he could express the hope that the resources thus mobilized would be used to finance exchanges of information and the provision of technical assistance to countries requesting it.

9. Mr. VARCHAVER (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) said that UNESCO had only recently become involved in the fight against drug abuse: the sixteenth session of the General Conference, which was currently meeting in Paris, had adopted a resolution on the eradication of drug abuse only a few days previously. Such abuse involved contemporary social and cultural phenomena, and for that reason alone was of interest to UNESCO in connexion with its work in the field of social science research. The problem called for a diversified approach at the international level, closely related to action at the national and local levels. Further-

more, it should be noted that in both developed and developing countries it was the young who were the first victims of drug abuse.

10. UNESCO would therefore undertake the action called for in the resolution recently adopted unanimously by the General Conference, developing activities which would complement the preventive action of WHO and the work of the other specialized agencies concerned. Those activities would deal not only with school education but also with the programmes for life-long integrated education directed at adults and youth. One of the means of action would be the use of mass media and collaboration with international non-governmental organizations dealing with education and youth. That programme, which would be launched in 1971 as funds became available, would cover the next three budgetary cycles, that is to say, a period of six years.

11. Monsignor GIOVANNETTI (Observer of the Holy See) said that the Holy See and the Catholic Church were deeply concerned about drug abuse, especially among the young. The Holy See had already expressed its interest in that question by ratifying the 1961 Single Convention for the Control of Narcotic Drugs and was always mindful of the basic importance of research, education and the formulation of sound public opinion with respect to the physical and psychological effects of drug abuse. He therefore deeply appreciated the aims of the draft resolution before the Council (E/L.1362).

12. In a recent address to a group of Italian doctors meeting in Rome to discuss the drug problem, Pope Paul VI had called drug abuse “a fatal plague” spreading under cover of a secret commercial traffic, and had appealed to the doctors to warn their patients of the dangers and the powerful attraction of drugs. On that occasion, the Holy Father had pledged that the Holy See would co-operate with medical practitioners by doing all it could to draw the attention of pastors, parents, teachers and directors of associations and publications to the insidious phenomenon of drug abuse, exhorting them to take all necessary measures to control it.

13. In view of that background, he supported those who had spoken in favour of the draft resolution before the Council.

14. Mr. KOTSCNIG (United States of America) said that the sponsors of the draft resolution had decided to accept the United Kingdom oral amendment (1726th meeting) to operative paragraph 3.

15. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) thanked the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1362 for amending the text to take account of the United Kingdom amendment.

16. Mr. AHMED (Secretary of the Council) read out operative paragraph 3 as amended:

“Requests the Secretary-General, in keeping with the recommendation of the Commission, to establish, as an initial measure and as a matter of urgency, a United Nations fund for drug-abuse control to be made up from voluntary contributions, such fund to be used initially for the purposes which were approved by the Commission, and administered by the Secretary-General . . .”.

17. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that he would like to see the word “*stupéfiants*” replaced by the word “*drogues*” in the title, the second preambular paragraph, operative paragraph 3 and operative paragraph 4 of the French text of the draft resolution.

18. The PRESIDENT said that his suggestion would be taken into account. He invited the Council to vote on draft resolution E/L.1362.

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 22 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

19. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) observed that, while his delegation had voted for the draft resolution and was entirely in agreement with the motives of the sponsors, it nevertheless entertained a few reservations about some of the provisions. Firstly, it regretted that the second preambular paragraph was not linked more closely to the resolution adopted by the Commission on Narcotic Drugs at its second special session, and especially that it omitted reference to a need for long-term international action, as set forth in paragraph 1 of the Commission’s resolution. Moreover, operative paragraph 3 in its original form had not been satisfactory, and his delegation welcomed the incorporation of the United Kingdom amendment, which made it possible to encompass all the provisions of the resolution of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs.

20. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) drew attention to a point of translation in the French text of the second preambular paragraph where the rendering of the term “enforcement machinery” by “*organes de coercition*” did not seem apt.

21. Mr. KOTSCNIG (United States of America) assured the representative of Pakistan that the sponsors were fully aware of the need to undertake a long-term programme of action such as the one envisaged in the resolution of the Commission of Narcotic Drugs.

AGENDA ITEM 7

Calendar of conferences (continued)*

(a) Date and place of the sixteenth session of the Population Commission

22. The PRESIDENT recalled that the Secretary-General, in the draft calendar of conferences, had suggested that the Population Commission might meet in Geneva during the first two weeks of November 1971. The Council had decided to defer its decision on the matter until its resumed forty-ninth session in order to give the Secretariat adequate time to consider whether it would be possible to hold the session of the Population Commission at Headquarters at a suitable date.

23. Mr. AHMED (Secretary of the Council) stated that, in accordance with the decision of the Council, both the Office of Conference Services and the substantive division concerned had been consulted. The Office of Conference Services had suggested that the Population Commission might meet in New York from 28 June to 9 July 1971 or in the period January-March 1972, if that were convenient to

* Resumed from the 1725th meeting.

the Council. However, the Population Division had found both of those dates somewhat inconvenient: to hold the session in 1972 might mean delaying preparations for the Third World Population Conference planned for 1974; while to hold the session in the summer of 1971 might create serious difficulties in the preparation, translation and reproduction of documents, since it was a time when the documentation needs of the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly were especially pressing. Another disadvantage of holding the session in the summer of 1971 would be that the Commission's report could only be transmitted to the Council one year after the completion of that session.

24. If the session were to be held in 1972, many members of the Commission, in view of their four-year mandate, would be precluded from participating in more than one session. That restriction would apply to the Central African Republic, the Dominican Republic, France, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Pakistan and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. Finally, there would be a saving in the cost of travel of staff to Geneva, if the session were held at Headquarters, but the saving would be offset by the cost of members of the Commission travelling to New York.

25. Mr. MILTON (United Kingdom) stated that his delegation was among those which had had reservations about holding the session of the Population Commission in Geneva in November 1971. However, in the light of the explanations given by the Secretary of the Council, his delegation no longer entertained any objection to the original proposal of the Secretary-General.

26. The PRESIDENT suggested that the sixteenth session of the Population Commission should be held at Geneva from 1 to 12 November 1971 in accordance with the proposal put forward in the draft calendar of conferences.

It was so decided.

(b) Draft resolution E/L.1360

27. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) introduced the draft resolution and stated that its sole purpose was to recall the principles governing the procedure for arranging sessions of the regional economic commissions. Those principles were set forth in the rules of procedure of the commissions, in Article 69 of the Charter and in rule 75 of the rules of procedure of the Economic and Social Council. While it was a straightforward matter and should not prove too controversial, the sponsors were quite prepared to bear in mind any suggestions of other members of the Council.

28. Mr. ARVESEN (Norway) drew attention to the matter of the participation of observers in the deliberations of the regional organs, which did not appear to have been interpreted correctly in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution. No distinction was made between what might be called the "passive" observers and the "active" observers, the former merely being present at the deliberations and the latter having the right to speak and submit proposals. Under the Charter and the established practice of the United Nations and the specialized agencies, any State Member of the United Nations was entitled to be present at any official open meeting of any United Nations organ.

However, the active participation of an observer in the deliberations of an organ to which it did not belong was governed by the relevant provisions of the Charter and of the rules of procedure of the organ concerned, particularly Article 69 of the Charter, rule 75 of the rules of procedure of the Economic and Social Council, and the terms of reference of the regional commission in question. In other words, to be allowed to participate in the deliberations of a regional commission and to submit proposals, a State Member of the United Nations which was a non-member of the commission had to be invited by the commission itself, in accordance with the relevant provisions of its terms of reference or rules of procedure.

29. The wording of operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution was incomplete in that the right of choice of venue for the sessions of the regional economic commissions was not governed solely by the rules of procedure of the said commissions but also by any relevant resolution of any main organ of the United Nations, particularly of the General Assembly. Thus, his delegation, before taking a position on the draft resolution before the Council, wished to hear the advisory opinion of the Office of Legal Affairs on the correctness of its own interpretation of the relevant provisions of the Charter and other instruments.

30. Mr. MARTOHADINEGORO (Indonesia) stated that the draft resolution covered familiar ground and was primarily intended to corroborate established practice. The possibility of misinterpreting such practice should not be overlooked, and appeared to justify the adoption of a resolution.

31. With regard to operative paragraph 1, he drew attention to the financial implications of any unexpected change of venue and the importance of the matter to the regional economic commissions.

32. Mr. DONLON (Ireland) said that operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution E/L.1360 caused his delegation considerable difficulty. Article 69 of the Charter and rule 75 of the rules of procedure of the Council referred to participation in deliberations and not to the granting of observer status. His delegation had examined the terms of reference and rules of procedure of ECA but was unable to find any provision therein dealing with the granting of observer status to Member States which were not members of ECA. Paragraph 9 of the terms of reference and rule 70 of the rules of procedure governed the participation of such States in meetings but did not refer to observer status. His delegation would therefore vote against the operative paragraph, and, if it was maintained, would vote against the draft resolution as a whole.

33. Mr. VIAUD (France) said the representative of Tunisia had intimated that the draft resolution was merely intended to reiterate provisions taken from existing texts. It could therefore be asked whether the draft was necessary, since the issues involved should have been settled by reference to those texts. It was, moreover, essential to distinguish between law and practice. While all constitutional provisions, the terms of reference of the agencies for instance, derived from law, practice derived from the precedents established by United Nations agencies. In the draft submitted, the preamble referred to established practice;

but the rules of procedure of ECA, which were similar to those of the other regional economic commissions, were based on law. If the members of a regional economic commission decided to meet in one of their respective capitals instead of at commission headquarters, they were at liberty to do so; but in that case, it would be preferable for them to refer to the terms of reference of the commission concerned rather than to practice. The preamble therefore needed to be redrafted.

34. Contrary to what was said in operative paragraph 1, it was a question not of appropriateness but of a point of law, and that paragraph should also be reworded. Operative paragraph 2 referred to observer status, but it might be asked what that term implied. The expression had sometimes been used in reference to intergovernmental or non-governmental organs but never in reference to participation by Member States. It was of course possible to invent new terminology, but that did not seem to be the purpose of the discussion, and care must be taken not to create confusion. As the Norwegian delegation had said, the presence of a representative of a Member State at a meeting of an organ might be active or passive. As was known, the President of the Economic and Social Council had on several occasions authorized the representative of a State Member of the United Nations which was not a member of the Council to take the floor. The established practice was, therefore, that a Member State, by virtue of the privileges conferred on it, could attend any meeting of any organ of the United Nations. In the present instance, it might be asked whether the sponsors' intention was to define a point of law or to initiate a change in practice. Detailed explanations on that subject would be welcome.

35. Mr. OLDS (United States of America) said that his delegation's position was similar to that of the Norwegian delegation. The Council would not, of course, oppose a measure that would strengthen the action of the regional economic commissions, but the questions raised by the French delegation were very relevant, and a number of problems seemed to be left unsolved. It appeared that no clear definition of observer status had so far been established. In any event, passive observer status was not granted on the basis of a decision by any organ but in accordance with the provisions of the Charter. If some delegations did not agree with that interpretation, the Council could consult the Office of Legal Affairs, but the consequences of calling that right in question would be very grave. Where a State Member of the United Nations which was not a member of an organ wished to speak, the case was quite different: it was for the Chairman of the competent organ to take a decision on the matter in accordance with the rules of procedure of the organ concerned.

36. The question of the choice of venue for meetings raised other problems, which were covered by the conventions on privileges and immunities; his Government was a party to the various United Nations conventions, and he well remembered some problems which had arisen, in particular with regard to the participation of Cuba, and was not unaware of some of the difficulties which had been encountered, in particular by the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East (ECAFE) and ECA. In any event, and that important point should be stressed, the established practice was for the host country to respect and apply the

instruments in force. The language of the operative part of draft resolution E/L.1360 seemed too ambiguous and might give the impression that it related not only to active participation in a meeting but also to the rights conferred by the Charter on every Member State.

37. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) said that the sponsors of the draft resolution were ready to accept any proposal which would improve their text. Nevertheless, a number of questions arose. It was established that no observer had the right to speak without the Chairman's permission, and a number of delegations had spoken about the difference between an "active observer" and a "passive observer". At Headquarters, the participation of observers had never raised any problems, but the fact should not be overlooked that observers were never absolutely inactive and their reactions sometimes complicated the debate.

38. In the case of meetings of the regional economic commissions, the well-known problems of visas, security and so forth were involved. Some delegations had referred to the principle of universality; his delegation would like to see the United Nations become even more universal in character, but that principle must not be allowed to create a situation where the wish of one single Member State could alter decisions of the regional economic commissions. That type of problem was not exceptional but had arisen on a number of occasions and had had very important practical consequences. After consulting the Office of Legal Affairs and senior officials, including the Secretary-General, his delegation had felt it appropriate to submit a text which would clarify certain points. The regional economic commissions must not be exposed to having to change the venue of their meetings, after it had been chosen by a majority decision, so that a passive observer or passing tourist could attend for the sake of the principle of universality. Tunisia had the greatest respect for United Nations conventions and attached great importance to ensuring the safety of anyone attending a conference held in its territory. In view of the many practical problems involved, including the question of visas, it was to be hoped that a rational solution would be found.

39. Mr. ROUAMBA (Upper Volta) expressed regret that the Council had not had time to refer the question to the Sixth Committee and to ask it to clarify a number of points which were still unclear. Several delegations had raised the question of the definition of the term "participant" and the nature of the commitments entered into by host countries. The Economic Commission for Africa, acting under its resolution 130 (VII), had accepted the Tunisian Government's invitation. The interpretation of the texts in force, even with the help, where necessary, of the good offices of the Secretary-General, could sometimes be a complicated task. After consulting other States members of the African Group, his delegation had felt that ECA was faced with certain specific problems and that the adoption of a text by the Council would facilitate their solution. He agreed that a distinction should be drawn between practice and points of law, and it was perhaps time for the Council to look into that kind of problem more closely.

40. The draft resolution could still be improved, and the sponsors were ready to accept any proposals to that end. However, it should not be judged on the basis of extraneous

issues. Some misgivings could be dispelled by a closer examination of the wording of the draft resolution. Member States were, of course, entitled to attend any meeting, but if the host country did not have ample facilities that right should not be exercised in such a way as to deny the regional economic commissions the right of free choice of venue for their meetings. Lastly, the "geographical" nature of the commissions should be borne in mind.

41. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) said that account should be taken of the particular circumstances in which meetings away from Headquarters were held. The distinction made by the Norwegian delegation between "active observers" and "passive observers" did not, in fact, exist. If one looked at the reports of the various organs, it would be noted that a list of members and a list of observers was attached to each. It was understood that the observers had participated in the meetings in question, even if they had not spoken. In short, the Council should adopt a realistic position by interpreting the rules in force constructively. The question of access to the venue of the meetings did not arise in the present case; it would arise only if the competent organ had granted observer status. Furthermore, if too strict an application of the rules was insisted upon, some observers might be refused permission to participate. At all events, the regional economic commissions could not be denied their rights.

42. The PRESIDENT, noting that the Council was not in a position to take a decision on draft resolution E/L.1360, suggested that the decision should be deferred to a subsequent meeting. In the meantime, those delegations which had amendments to propose could consult the sponsors.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 10

Reconsideration of the composition of the membership of the Committee on Natural Resources (E/L.1357 and Corr.1)

43. Mr. FRANZI (Italy) said that from a series of consultations with delegations belonging to various regional groups, it had become apparent that a number of countries wished to be represented on the Committee. The Council must, of course, act in accordance with the principle of equitable geographical distribution, but Member States should be represented not only at the political level, but also at a very high technical level.

44. Since the Committee's terms of reference were very broad and since it would not confine its consideration to the economic aspects of the exploitation of natural resources, the composition of its membership should be reconsidered very carefully. The Council might first of all decide in principle that a change should be made and then reach a decision on the number of members by the end of its resumed forty-ninth session. In the meantime, the situation would become clearer, consultations could be held, and applications for membership could be submitted in full knowledge of the facts. Since the Committee was to meet at an early date and to submit its report to the fiftieth

session of the Council, Member States should make preparations as soon as possible for participating in its work.

45. Mr. BRADLEY (Argentina) said that the exact number of new candidates for the Committee on Natural Resources was not yet known, but applications were already far in excess of twenty-seven. For instance, the number received from Latin America was well above the number of seats allocated to the region. That might not be so in the case of other regions, but, since the principle of equitable geographical distribution precluded exchanges between one region and another, it seemed that the number of members of the Committee would have to be increased. Between the date of adoption of resolution 1535 (XLIX) and the opening of the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly session, non-members of the Council had had difficulty in learning of the decision which had been taken, and it had not been possible to ascertain the wishes of a number of Members of the United Nations. It should be borne in mind that all Members of the United Nations had an economic and social interest in natural resources, whether energy, agricultural resources or mineral resources. It would appear that, in order to decide on the number of members of the Committee, the views of those concerned should be taken into account. The proposed membership of the Committee represented slightly less than one fifth of the States Members of the United Nations. Thus, the interests of the other four fifths were not taken into account. Some delegations had maintained that the Council would lose face if it changed the decision it had taken three months earlier. However, the reason why the members of the Council had met was to rectify omissions, and the number of candidates must be taken into account.

46. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that some delegations had spoken of law and practice. His delegation wished to appeal to reason. In July, the Economic and Social Council had taken a decision on the terms of reference and composition of the reconstituted Committee on Natural Resources. What was now being asked of the Council was that it should undo what it had done at the same session. Yet precedent required that anybody should wait at least long enough for it to become apparent that the decision which had been taken must be changed. The question of geographical distribution had been raised; yet the figure of twenty-seven corresponded to the geographical distribution of the Council itself and was therefore unexceptionable. Moreover, the Council's decision had been given all the publicity required by the rules of procedure. The text of the Council's resolutions had been circulated to all representatives who were members of Permanent Missions at the beginning of the General Assembly's proceedings. The Council had always made it a rule to set a figure of twenty-seven for the membership of its subsidiary bodies. In a few cases, such as that of the Commission on Human Rights, it had increased the number to thirty-two, but it had done so with due deliberation and after lengthy discussion. Even if it was decided to increase the number of members, enough time should be allowed for all delegations to be informed and be able to indicate their desire to be represented in the Committee. Under those circumstances, his delegation doubted whether the election could take place before the end of the year. Moreover, reference to the rules of procedure would show that no substantial justifi-

cation had as yet been advanced for the proposed change. The number of members of the Committee should be established in the light of what was expected of it, and not of the desire for change of those who would like to participate in it. The order of the factors should not be reversed. The situation would be different if the new decision was taken after some experience had been gained. For the time being, if the Council wished to show that it took its responsibilities seriously, it should adhere to the decision taken in July.

47. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that his delegation was somewhat concerned; it feared that the Council might be obliged, owing perhaps to political pressure, to reverse itself on a question which had already been settled. The representative of Italy had referred to the great interest of the vast majority of the Members of the United Nations, and the representative of Argentina had said that there were more candidates than seats. However, it did not seem logical to set the number of seats according to the number of candidates. When the Committee on Natural Resources had been established, many members had expressed doubts about it, and the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Survey Programme for the Development of Natural Resources had indicated in paragraph 14 of the report on its second session¹ that a number of delegations had regarded its establishment as premature. Not a few members of the Council still had reservations with regard to the terms of reference of the Committee. Some had suggested that it should not be composed entirely of experts but should also include government administrators. A decision to increase the number of members would be premature and illogical. If the establishment of the Committee had been a mistake, it might well be a further mistake to try to increase its membership now. It would be best to close the debate and proceed to the election.

48. Mr. BRADLEY (Argentina) said that his arguments had been reinforced by the discussion. The Permanent Missions which had received the Council's report between August and November had not had the time to organize meetings to make their views known. Council resolution 1535 (XLIX), paragraph 3, indicated that those intending to become members would have to wait at least two years, and that made the question even more important to those wishing to become members immediately. It should be borne in mind that every argument had its own logic, and that there was no such thing as absolute logic. After a few inquiries, it appeared that ten candidates could be expected from the countries of western Europe, four from the countries of Eastern Europe, ten from Africa, seven from Asia and seven from Latin America. The total was far in excess of twenty-seven.

49. Mr. SKATARETIKO (Yugoslavia) said that logic meant considering the facts, which were very simple. More countries were interested in participating in the Committee than had been provided for in Council resolution 1535 (XLIX). The Council had agreed in the past to establish bodies with a membership of more than twenty-seven. Moreover, the United Nations on its twenty-fifth

anniversary was not the United Nations of twenty-five years previously. It was a question of development. Instead of indulging in political controversy or philosophical considerations, it would be better to have informal consultations to determine how many members the Committee should really have.

50. Mr. MWHIA (Kenya) agreed with the representative of Greece, and said that the Council should not change its decision. If it was noted that the number of candidates was now thirty-eight and it was accordingly agreed to change the number of members of the Committee, only to find later that there were forty-five candidates, would the Council again have to change the decision it had taken? The Council should not take decisions which might be disputed at any session. It should lay down the exact number of members of the Committee. At present, what was important was that the Committee should begin to function. Only later could a final decision be taken. The interested members should therefore meet and consult together by geographical group.

51. Mr. KASATKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the views of Yugoslavia were not those of the majority of the socialist countries. The socialist group agreed with the representative of Kenya. The decision taken by a competent organ should be respected, and the group of socialist States was ready to agree that the Committee should be established with the membership laid down by the Council in July.

52. Mr. FERNANDINI (Peru) said that a rigid attitude should not be adopted; in view of the large number of candidates, it would harm no one if the number of members of the Committee was set at, say, thirty-nine. The Council could reconsider its decision and no one could criticize it for having changed its mind.

53. Mr. SAM (Ghana) said that the arguments of the representatives of France and Kenya were convincing. The Council had shown maturity in the past, and should not compromise the decision it had taken. His delegation urged the members of the Council to retain the figure of twenty-seven members.

54. Mr. FRANZI (Italy) pointed out that, in July, the members of the Council had been mainly engrossed in the problems of the Second United Nations Development Decade. In a few days, the Second Committee would be discussing the question of national sovereignty over natural resources. The problem, which in some respects might appear to be of a legal nature, was connected with the development of natural resources. After the Second Committee had discussed the item, the members of the Council would have a clearer idea of the interest of Member States. It would then be possible to put to the vote during the resumed session the specific proposal made by the representative of Peru.

55. The PRESIDENT urged interested delegations to hold informal consultations on the matter under discussion.

¹ Document E/4797.