

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

FIFTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE, 214th
MEETING**

Wednesday, 30 November 1960,
at 3.30 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 26:</i>	
<i>Report of the Director of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (continued)</i>	179
<i>Agenda item 23:</i>	
<i>Question of an increase in the membership of the Security Council and of the Economic and Social Council (continued)</i>	179

Chairman: Mr. Carlet R. AUGUSTE (Haiti).

In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Gamboa (Philippines), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 26

Report of the Director of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (A/4478) (continued)

1. Mr. WILCOX (United States of America), exercising his right of reply, rejected the attacks and insinuations directed against the United States and himself by the Saudi Arabian representative at the previous meeting. He did not consider that detailed comments on those remarks would be helpful, since the Committee's immediate and important task was to deal expeditiously with the report (A/4478) of the Director of UNRWA, which had received commendation from every quarter.

AGENDA ITEM 23

Question of an increase in the membership of the Security Council and of the Economic and Social Council (A/SPC/L.51 and Add.1-5, A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3, A/SPC/L.53/Rev.1, A/SPC/L.54 and Add.1 and A/SPC/L.55 and Add.1) (continued)

2. Mr. MASSOUD ANSARI (Iran) said he had hoped that the amendments (A/SPC/L.54 and Add.1 and A/SPC/L.55 and Add.1) to the two draft resolutions (A/SPC/L.51 and Add.1-5 and A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3) would be introduced before the Committee was asked to comment on them. However, his own delegation's position was one of regret that the negotiations held between the various geographical groups with a view to arriving at a joint resolution on the question of an increase in the two Councils had not been successful.

3. There were three main objections to the original draft resolutions (A/SPC/L.51 and Add.1-5, and A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3). The first was the long period of three years envisaged before the entry into force of the new arrangements. That meant that the new Members would be deprived of their right to participate effectively in the major organs of the United Nations for a further three years even if the necessary amend-

ments to the Charter were ratified by two-thirds of the Members, including the five permanent members of the Security Council. Secondly, the draft resolutions made no provision for a redistribution of seats pending the necessary ratification of the amendments to the Charter. That was particularly serious in the case of the Economic and Social Council, which was concerned chiefly with matters of special interest to the newly independent countries. The more advanced European countries might well yield a seat to the developing countries without waiting for ratification. Thirdly, there were no specific provisions in the original draft resolutions regarding the distribution of the additional seats after the increases had been ratified. It should be made clear what countries were to occupy the additional two seats on the Security Council and six seats on the Economic and Social Council.

4. The amendments (A/SPC/L.54 and Add.1 and A/SPC/L.55 and Add.1) to a large extent met those objections and the Iranian delegation endorsed them wholeheartedly. It still hoped that a compromise could be found by the geographical groups concerned, and that resolutions could be worked out which would be sure of a large majority if not of unanimous approval.

5. Mr. CALERO RODRIGUEZ (Brazil) said that the two draft resolutions, of which Brazil was a co-sponsor, stated the universally approved aim of broader participation in the two Councils and indicated a means of attaining it, namely an increase in membership. The joint amendments indicated another means to the same end, namely a redistribution of the existing seats. Although there was no opposition to the principle of an increase, there were many objections regarding the wisdom of redistributing the existing seats.

6. The draft amendments referred to "immediate steps" for the redistribution of the existing seats on the two Councils, but they did not make it clear what those steps were to be and how the seats would be distributed after the steps had been taken. The suggestion had been made, for example, that Latin America had too many seats on the Economic and Social Council. Yet the four Latin American countries serving on the Economic and Social Council all had their separate outlook and separate problems. It was hard to see what advantage could ensue from reducing that representation. It had also been suggested that the highly industrialized countries of Europe might give up some of their seats on the Economic and Social Council to the new African Members. He could not feel that it would increase the efficiency of the Council for the more experienced countries to withdraw in favour of those lacking in experience. The case of the Security Council was somewhat different, since it dealt with problems that were essentially political. But there again, there were many shades of opinion within the geographical groups and he could not believe that the Security Council would benefit by having only one member to represent Latin America.

7. He agreed that the distribution of seats decided upon many years ago did not properly reflect the present wider membership of the United Nations. However, the practical problem of securing more effective representation was immensely complicated. To take Africa, for example, the outlook and approach of the States north of the Sahara was different from that of the States south of the Sahara.

8. The Brazilian delegation felt that the long-term approach through amendments to the Charter was the most satisfactory. It had not given up hope that the present obstacle to such amendments would disappear in the future. It would therefore vote against the joint amendments and in favour of the two draft resolutions. If the amendments were carried, it would reluctantly have to vote against the amended versions, in the hope that some better solution could be found before they went to the plenary session of the General Assembly.

9. The draft resolution (A/SPC/L.53/Rev.1) took yet another approach. It proposed no action on the substance of the question but advocated instead the establishment of a committee to study the matter and make proposals. However, since the USSR, one of the great Powers expected to serve on the proposed committee, had already announced that it would not accept any such body, the draft resolution had no prospect of practical success, and Brazil would therefore vote against it.

10. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that his delegation had defined its opposition to the two draft resolutions (A/SPC/L.51 and L.52) in detail at the 197th meeting of the course of the debate on those two resolutions, many delegations, including India, had recognized that they were foredoomed to failure and had submitted a draft resolution (A/SPC/L.53/Rev.1) in an attempt to find a way out of the impasse caused by the position assumed by the United States and its allies. He noted that the majority of Members recognized that the changes which had occurred in the world since the establishment of the United Nations needed to be reflected in its structure. There had been both a quantitative and a qualitative change in the Membership of the United Nations since its inception. The Soviet delegation had already had occasion to point out that one of the major inequities in the United Nations as it stood was that in practice, both the Secretariat and the other principal organs were in the hands of the United States and its allies in the Western bloc. His delegation therefore sympathized with the efforts of the African-Asian countries to achieve a more equitable distribution of the seats in the two Councils. However, the approach recommended in the draft resolution (A/SPC/L.53/Rev.1), namely the establishment of a special committee to seek a satisfactory solution, was still purely quantitative, even though it was constructive in intent. Minor numerical changes in the membership of the two Councils could only divert attention from the need for a thorough change in the organs of the United Nations. The redistribution of seats proposed by other delegations could not solve the problem either, unless it was designed to bring about the equitable participation of the three principal groups with equal rights, in accordance with the existing balance of forces. The executive and principal organs of the United Nations should be reorganized in order to give equal weight to the neutralist, socialist and Western blocs. That draft resolution could yield results provided that the pro-

posed committee was composed in accordance with the principles he had just stated and provided that it adopted a wider approach to the problem. If its functions were limited to proposing quantitative changes, it was doomed in advance. If a quantitative increase was combined with equal representation for the three world groups, it would prevent the present domination by one group. In the same way, the United Nations executive functions should be entrusted not to a single Secretary-General but to a group of three eminent persons chosen in accordance with the principles he had just defined.

11. The Soviet delegation would be able to accept that draft resolution if a second paragraph was included in the preamble recognizing the need to change the structure of the Secretariat of the United Nations, the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council so that the socialist, neutralist and Western groups would have equal representation in those organs. At the same time, the membership of the proposed special committee should provide for equal representation of the same three groups. The appropriate changes should therefore be made in operative paragraph 1.

12. A partial solution of the problem of equitable representation by means of a narrow and limited redistribution of the existing seats would not be acceptable to his delegation. The Soviet Union would therefore oppose the two draft resolutions even if the amendments proposed (A/SPC/L.54 and Add.1 and A/SPC/L.55 and Add.1) were adopted.

13. He urged all those delegations which sincerely desired to strengthen the United Nations and convert it into an effective instrument for peace to support the suggested Soviet amendments to the five-Power draft resolution (A/SPC/L.53/Rev.1). The proposed committee could only achieve real results through proposals which could be adopted by a two-thirds majority, including the permanent members of the Security Council.

Mr. Auguste (Haiti) took the Chair.

14. Mr. HARARI (Israel) requested that in accordance with rule 121 of the rules of procedure, the Committee should not vote until next day.

15. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) and Mr. NORIEGA (Colombia) endorsed the suggestion.

16. Mr. WACHUKU (Nigeria) said that the amendments (A/SPC/L.54 and Add.1 and A/SPC/L.55 and Add.1) would involve only slight changes in the wording of the original draft resolutions (A/SPC/L.51 and Add.1-5 and A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3) respectively, but they would add a second part to each, containing matter which was important to the African-Asian countries, which wanted more than a mere shadow membership of the United Nations. They must be treated not as colonials within the United Nations, but as the equals of other Members.

17. He had not asked for permanent seats for Africa or Asia, as some newspapers had said recently. He had merely served notice that it would later be necessary to give Africa and Asia a permanent seat. The immediate problem was the redistribution of the non-permanent seats. No gentleman's agreement could bind countries which had not been parties to it. The non-permanent seats belonged to all ninety-nine Member States, and the forty-five African-Asian States had a right to some of them. It was natural that no country wanted to give up what it had. But the African-Asian

States could not be expected to wait indefinitely for equitable representation, since the decisions of the two Councils affected them.

18. No State had a right to any of the non-permanent seats or to bargain away another State's right without its consent. The seats should be put into a pool and the candidates should be openly elected by all Members. The Brazilian representative had argued that not all Latin American States had the same problems. The same was of course true of Africa, but Africa was still a single geographical unit, and had a right as such to some representation. It was for the African and Asian States to decide, once they had a seat, who would represent them in the Security Council. If Europe and Latin America each gave up one seat, Africa and Asia could be represented. The seat held by Ceylon was strictly a Commonwealth seat. He agreed that the Charter should be amended to enlarge the Councils: but members of the Security Council did not want an amendment and unless the seats were redistributed, Africa and Asia would have to wait forever to take an effective part in the United Nations work.

19. The amendments divided each resolution into a part A, calling for the enlargement of the Councils, and a part B calling for the redistribution of seats. The two things were complementary. The co-sponsors of the amendments had been accused of trying to bring a deadlock in the United Nations work. That was not their intention. Since they were excluded from the gentleman's agreement, they had no other way of negotiating for seats. If the other Member States sincerely wanted to solve the problem, they should let Africa and Asia choose one candidate each, or two candidates by agreement between them, and should then elect those candidates by a two-thirds majority. The Councils could only make the right decisions if their members could speak at first hand of their own areas' problems. Otherwise the Councils might act on wrong information. No one could deny the justice of redistribution, and it was not at all complicated. Later, other representatives might have a change of heart and the Charter might be amended to give all sections better representation.

20. Replying to a query by the representative of Ireland, he explained that he was not suggesting that all Western Europe's seats should be taken away. Europe, including the USSR, had three permanent seats and two non-permanent seats. Only one of the latter would be given to Africa, and one of the two Latin American seats could be given to Asia.

21. Mr. VALENCIA (Ecuador) said that the Nigerian representative had not spoken on the agenda item, which was the question of an increase in the membership of the two Councils. The General Assembly had not added the words "or of the redistribution of existing seats" to the title.

22. Mr. SCHELTEMA (Netherlands) said that the Nigerian representative had a good case, but an area could not be represented by permanent members. They were apart from the others; neither the Soviet Union nor the United Kingdom nor France represented Western Europe.

23. The agenda item was the increase in the membership of the two Councils, not the redistribution of seats. It was clear which country was making such an increase impossible, and it was not fair that other groups, which had supported an increase for many

years, should suffer. The proposed amendments would be an inadequate remedy to an unsatisfactory situation, and his delegation could not support them.

24. Mr. DIALLO Telli (Guinea) associated his delegation with the statement made by the Nigerian representative which covered most of the points. As one of the co-sponsors of the amendments, however, he would like to comment on certain points that had been raised by other speakers. There was no incompatibility between an increase in the membership of the Councils and a redistribution of the existing seats, and it would be impossible to secure for the African and Asian States the exercise of their rights without putting both proposals into effect. The Ecuadorian representative's question whether the amendments were within the scope of the agenda item had been implicitly answered in the affirmative by the General Assembly when it acceded to the request of the African and Asian States to postpone the Security Council elections pending the settlement of the question in the Committee.

25. He felt that it had become customary to try to split the African-Asian group even on issues which were of the most vital importance for its members. The question under discussion was such an issue, for many of the African and Asian States had the feeling that although they had been admitted to membership in the Organization they had not been fully accepted. In an effort to prevent a split in the group on that issue, the co-sponsors of the amendments had done their best to persuade the African and Asian sponsors of the draft resolutions themselves to join in sponsoring the amendments. Despite the unanimous desire of the African and Asian States for equitable representation, it now appeared that they might be divided on the means of securing it, with the result that nothing at all would be gained.

26. The Brazilian representative had intimated that in view of the inexperience of the new Member States the effectiveness of the work of the Councils might be impaired if the redistribution proposal was put into effect. The answer to that was that as the technical aspects of the work of the Councils was handled by the Secretariat, experience on the part of delegations was not a vital requirement. What the African and Asian States wanted was effective political representation in those bodies. If inexperience was to be invoked as an argument against redistribution it could be invoked with equal logic as an argument against giving the additional seats to the new Member States once an increase in the membership of the Councils had been effected.

27. The Brazilian representative had argued that the draft resolution (A/SPC/L.53/Rev.1) should be rejected because it would not lead to any practical results. Yet exactly the same thing could be said of the original draft resolutions (A/SPC/L.51 and Add.1-5 and A/SPC/L.52 and Add.1-3). It was with a view to converting them into proposals capable of producing positive results that the amendments had been submitted. The action taken on the amendments would determine his delegation's vote on the draft resolutions themselves.

28. Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan) considered it regrettable that the division in the Committee with regard to the item under discussion should take the form of a division between geographical areas, particularly between Latin America and the Asian and African countries. Upon reflection it could be seen, however,

that the division was natural in the circumstances and was inherent in the nature of the question. He hoped that all Members would interpret it in that sense rather than as an indication that there was a growing trend towards division along geographical lines within the Organization.

29. There were times when prolonged debate helped to reconcile opposing viewpoints. Once it had become clear, however, that opposing sides could not be persuaded to alter their positions, continued debate was likely only to widen the breach between them. In the present instance there could be only two justifications for postponing a vote: either time was required to study the amendments—an argument which was unconvincing since the text and purpose of the amendments were perfectly clear—or there was still a possibility of reaching an understanding. It seemed clear that those in favour of postponement wanted time to organize opposition to the amendments, which they had gone so far as to say were not within the scope of the agenda item. Any further intensification of the division on the question before the Committee might affect the position of delegations with regard to other issues on which no such division as yet existed. Accordingly he suggested that the discussion should be brought to a close, and delegations should express themselves by casting their votes.

30. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) wished to assure the African and Asian delegations that his purpose in supporting the suggestion of a postponement of the vote was to determine whether it might still be possible to avoid having to vote on a series of contradictory draft resolutions; it was not seeking to organize a majority for or against any of the texts. Mexico's sympathy for the African States had been amply demonstrated by its stand in the Fourth Committee, by the support it had always given to the principle of universality, and by its consistent advocacy of an increase in the membership of the Councils as imperative if all Member States were to be able to participate in the work of the United Nations on a footing of equality. If, as appeared to be the case, it was impossible to increase the membership of the bodies at the present time his delegation would have no objection to making a careful study of the possibility of redistributing the existing seats, but redistribution during the current session was obviously out of the question.

31. He recalled in that connexion that at the twelfth session three years earlier his delegation had taken part in drafting the draft resolution which became General Assembly resolution 1192 (XII) whose purpose was to increase the membership of the General Committee. That text could perhaps serve as a guide for the distribution of the seats on the Councils at such time as it became possible to increase their number. Considering that even if there were no obstacles to immediate approval of an increase in membership, the process of ratification would be a lengthy one, he appealed to the African and Asian States to agree to wait at least one more year, during which a detailed study such as that proposed in the five-Power draft resolution (A/SPC/L.53/Rev.1) could be undertaken. His own delegation had had to practise the greatest moderation in this matter, for it had been represented on the Security Council for only one year of the fifteen

years during which the United Nations had existed. Furthermore, only nine of the twenty Latin American countries had so far been elected to the Security Council. As for the Economic and Social Council eight of the Latin American countries had not yet been elected to that body. Finally, he pointed out that when questions of particular importance were under discussion it was the custom for the Latin American representatives on both Councils to request meetings of the Latin American group so that they could exchange opinions with other members of the group before voting. Thus, it could be said that in a certain sense they represented not only the interests of their own countries but also those of the Latin American group as a whole. While his delegation recognized that the representation of the African and Asian States in the Councils was far from adequate, he wondered, if until such time as that inequity was corrected, a similar procedure might not be followed in respect of the African-Asian group.

32. Mr. WACHUKU (Nigeria) observed that the Mexican representative's statement merely strengthened the argument of the African and Asian States, for their regions as such could not actually be said to have anyone to speak for them in the Councils and to consult with them on vital issues. None of the speakers opposed to the amendments had been able to counter the argument that the African and Asian States had a right to be represented adequately in United Nations bodies by virtue of their Membership in the Organization. No one had been able to argue that the Charter gave any State, apart from the permanent members of the Security Council, a permanent claim to a seat on either of the two Councils. The Committee seemed to be losing sight of the fact that the objective was to secure adequate representation for all Members and that increasing the composition of the Councils was merely a means to that end. From the statement made by the Mexican delegation it could only be inferred that the real reason why the Latin American States were counselling patience was so that all of them could first have an opportunity to serve on the Councils. Yet none of the African and Asian States had had that opportunity, despite the fact that Articles 23 and 61 of the Charter clearly entitled them to it. If they yielded to the plea that they should exercise patience they would be admitting by implication that the groups currently represented on the Councils had a permanent right to the seats. The non-permanent seats were not the prerequisite of any particular country or group but belonged to the United Nations as a whole and should be distributed equitably from one term to the next. The new States needed to serve on the Councils if they were to acquire experience, to obtain an insight into the functioning of the Organization and to have a more realistic grasp of the problems confronting it. He acknowledged that the Latin American Members had supported the cause of the African States on a number of issues and said that the Africans were deeply grateful, but that did not mean that when they finally achieved the goal of admission to the United Nations they should be willing to forgo any of the rights inherent in membership.

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.