



ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

FIFTY-FIRST SESSION

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Friday, 30 July 1971

at 10.20 a.m.

PALAIS DES NATIONS, GENEVA

CONTENTS

Page

Agenda items 17, 10 (b) and 3 (a):

Measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council (*continued*)

Science and technology:

(b) Future institutional arrangements for science and technology (*continued*)

Second United Nations Development Decade: review and appraisal of the objectives and policies of the International Development Strategy

(a) System of over-all appraisal of progress in implementing the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade: report of the Economic Committee (*continued*) 217*President: Mr. DRISS (Tunisia)*

AGENDA ITEMS 17, 10 (b) AND 3 (a)

Measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council (*continued*) (E/1486 and Add.1-9, E/L.1382, E/L.1408/Rev.2, E/L.1422, E/L.1431, E/L.1435, E/L.1451 (part A), E/L.1458)

Science and technology:

(b) Future institutional arrangements for science and technology (*continued*) (E/4954 and Corr.1, E/4989, chap. VII; E/5012 (Part I), chap. I, sect. B; E/L.1400, E/L.1420 and Add.1, E/L.1451 (part B) and E/L.1451/Add.1, E/L.1458, E/L.1459)

Second United Nations Development Decade: review and appraisal of the objectives and policies of the International Development Strategy

(a) System of over-all appraisal of progress in implementing the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade: report of the Economic Committee (*continued*) (E/5029), annex; E/5059, E/L.1451 (part C) and E/L.1451/Add.1, E/L.1454 to 1458)

1. Mr. WIELAND ALZAMORA (Peru) said that the Peruvian delegation fully supported the Greek draft resolution (E/L.1458), whose sponsor, at the previous meeting, had shown its constructive and conciliatory spirit.

2. The fifteen-Power "package" draft resolution (E/L.1451), which dealt at one and the same time with the questions of increasing the membership of the Council, future institutional arrangements for science and tech-

nology and the system of review and appraisal for the Second Development Decade, no doubt had undeniable advantages but it was of such broad scope that all States Members of the United Nations, and particularly all the developing countries, should be given an opportunity to study it thoroughly. It was incumbent on the Council to act in the interests of those countries which the draft resolution would affect the most. At the meeting of the Group of 77 to be held at Lima and at the third session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, to be held at Santiago, the developing countries would have an opportunity to assess, at the ministerial level, the proposals in parts B and C of draft resolution E/L.1451 and would be able, in full knowledge of the facts and having had the necessary time to conduct the essential negotiations, to decide on a common stand which would really promote international co-operation. The Council should not adopt hasty decisions on questions of such vital importance as those dealt with in parts B and C of the draft resolution; such decisions should not be taken until the results of the meetings at Lima and Santiago were known.

3. With regard to the question of increasing the membership of the Council, which was dealt with in part A of draft resolution E/L.1451, he said that it did not concern the developing countries only and that some developed countries, which were also interested in the question, had not yet taken a final position on it. Hence, if the draft resolution was put to the vote at the present time, there would be no possibility of reaching a consensus on that extremely important question.

4. The Latin American countries members of the Group of 77 present at Geneva had recently adopted a joint position on international policy questions, which was, moreover, in conformity with the interests of the other countries of the third world, and they had asked him to inform the Council that they would all be in favour of the solution recommended by Greece in its draft resolution (E/L.1458). He asked that the vote on that draft resolution should be taken by roll-call.

5. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) complimented the representative of Sudan on the clear way in which, in introducing at the 1795th meeting the fifteen-Power draft resolution (E/L.1451), he had explained the reasons why agenda items 17, 10 (b) and 3 (a) had been dealt with together in a "package" proposal.

6. New Zealand wished above all to see the Council restored to a position of dignity and effectiveness. That might be a brave hope, and one not shared by everyone, but New Zealand was prepared to support whatever measures were necessary to achieve that result.

7. It was probably not easy at the present time to assess the full significance of the "package" proposal and his delegation continued to have doubts about it, but it had no doubt about the usefulness of dealing with agenda items 17, 10 (b) and 3 (a) together.

8. The first important step recommended in draft resolution E/L.1451 was that which formed the subject of part A, in which the General Assembly was asked to consider the possibility of enlarging the membership of the Council to fifty-four. That was not strictly what operative paragraph 1 of part A said and it would perhaps have been better to use less peremptory language in making that recommendation. Nevertheless, he had no doubt that the General Assembly, as was always the case when it had a recommendation of that kind before it for consideration, would give it all the attention which it deserved and would duly determine whether the membership should be fifty-four or some smaller number.

9. The second major point proposed in part B of the draft resolution, was the establishment of a standing committee for the application of science and technology to development. Some members of the Council were not sure exactly what the standing committee's terms of reference would be and their uncertainty was not without foundation. It was clear, however, that there was need for machinery to bring together the numerous activities now being undertaken in the application of science and technology to development and it was no less clear that the task of co-ordination came within the competence of the Council. The New Zealand delegation accordingly agreed with the concept of a standing intergovernmental committee supported by a body of highly competent experts in the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development.

10. The third major point, proposed in part C of the draft resolution, concerned the machinery for review and appraisal of progress in the implementation of the International Development Strategy for the Second Development Decade. It was unquestionably the General Assembly which would have to carry out the role ascribed to it in that respect under the Charter, which was essentially to assign particular functions to each competent organ in accordance with the decisions taken in resolution 2641 (XXV). The Council, in its acknowledged role of co-ordinator, should in particular carry out its obligations under paragraph 83 of the International Development Strategy adopted by the General Assembly and annexed to resolution 2626 (XXV); the establishment of a committee of the Council as provided in operative paragraph 1 of part C of the draft was fully in conformity with the principles adopted by the General Assembly. If the General Assembly should decide on some other course, the Council would have to reconsider certain elements in its decision. It would be regrettable if the establishment of a committee of the Council resulted in overlapping of activities, but if the Council was the first to set up a body for review and appraisal it could not be held responsible for such duplication.

11. The words in operative paragraph 1 of part C lacked elegance, but the New Zealand delegation knew that that

provision was the result of an extremely delicate compromise and the members of the Council all understood perfectly well the meaning of the provision in its present form. In the same spirit of conciliation, the New Zealand delegation supported operative paragraph 4 of part C.

12. In short, the New Zealand delegation would have no difficulty in voting in favour of parts B and C of draft resolution E/L.1451 since they provided a good basis for a restoration of confidence in the Council. In other circumstances part A would not have had his delegation's agreement because enlargement of the Council alone would not really improve the organization of the Council's work. His delegation realized, however, that it would be impossible for the Council to regain the confidence of certain countries if it did not become more representative.

13. His delegation therefore found elements in the package proposal which it approved and others which it did not approve, but if there had been unanimous agreement in the Council on all the elements of the proposal, there would have been no need for the package. It did seem to represent the greatest measure of agreement obtainable at the present time. His delegation thought that if a decision on the package proposal was deferred or if endeavours were made to amend it substantially, the Council would miss a historic opportunity of restoring its standing, which was at present very low. The world was in the throes of an extremely rapid scientific and technical evolution; the United Nations Charter should therefore show its flexibility and a Council decision on the lines of draft resolution E/L.1451 would meet that need.

14. The New Zealand delegation therefore not only supported draft resolution E/L.1451 but also wished to be included among its sponsors.

15. At the preceding meeting the representative of Ceylon had reminded members of the Council that they were custodians of the interests of all the States Members of the United Nations. None of the members of the Council knew for certain what would be the attitude of particular States non-members of the Council, but the Council obviously took the decisions which it thought would serve the interests of all. On behalf of the observer for Canada, he informed the Council that Canada supported the measures proposed in draft resolution E/L.1451.

16. At the 1796th meeting the representative of Greece, introducing his draft resolution (E/L.1458), had stated that it would probably be possible in another two or three months to obtain the concurrence of a much larger number of States Members to the measures proposed in the package resolution, and in particular that of the permanent members of the Security Council, whose agreement would be essential for an amendment of the Charter. While endorsing many of the arguments advanced by the representative of Greece, he did not approve the idea of deferring the Council's decision. The members of the Council had all had plenty of time to study the proposals grouped together in document E/L.1451, since they had been submitted informally at the fiftieth session. The necessary period of negotiation and consultation was over. If the General Assembly was to have useful discussions on the subject, it

would need a decision by the Council. The permanent members of the Security Council who were members of the Council, with one exception, had given no hint of their ultimate position on the question because they could only do so if they knew exactly what were the Council's wishes. The time had come to cut the Gordian knot and to decide clearly and unmistakably by vote.

17. Mr. CHAMMAS (Lebanon) said that he wished to give some explanations in reply to the comments made at the preceding meeting. In particular, the United Kingdom representative had said that he did not understand why the Lebanese delegation objected to the expression "as a rule" in paragraph 1 of the draft resolution submitted by the USSR (E/L.1382). That was an objection of principle, based on the provisions of Article 60 of the Charter. If the words "unless the General Assembly decides otherwise", for example, were inserted after "as a rule", draft resolution E/L.1382 would be perfectly acceptable to his delegation.

18. The Lebanese delegation, which was one of the sponsors of the amendment to draft resolution E/L.1408 appearing in document E/L.1421, thought that that amendment should be withdrawn, since draft resolution E/L.1408 had been revised and the essential ideas embodied in the amendment had been included in the package draft resolution (E/L.1451). If the amendment was not withdrawn, his delegation would no longer be one of its sponsors. The same was true of the amendment in document E/L.1431, the main ideas of which were more or less included in part A of draft resolution E/L.1451.

19. Some members of the Council had questioned the value and the legal validity of the proposals in draft resolution E/L.1451. The explanations provided by the Legal Counsel at the previous meeting had probably dispelled any doubts on the subject. In any case, the Economic and Social Council, in accordance with Article 72 of the Charter, and as confirmed by the footnote to page 1 of the 1967 edition of the Council's rules of procedure,¹ adopted its own rules of procedure.

20. The representative of Ceylon seemed to have based his argument at the preceding meeting on the fact that, were the General Assembly to elect twenty-seven new members of the sessional committees, those members would have to some extent a permanent mandate. The members of the Council, however, were automatically members of the sessional committees; consequently, either the representative of Ceylon assumed that the States elected as additional members of the sessional committees would not be candidates for the Council itself, or his argument was invalid. If one of those States was elected to the Council in 1972, the additional seat it occupied in the sessional committees would fall vacant.

21. When introducing his draft resolution (E/L.1458) at the 1796th meeting, the representative of Greece had proposed the kind of procedural decision which the Council usually adopted when it decided, after a detailed discussion,

to postpone any decision of substance. The Greek draft resolution was dated 27 July 1971, at which time the substantive proposal in document E/L.1451 had not yet been discussed in detail. Moreover, the Greek representative had defended his draft resolution with arguments of substance which obviously corresponded to the views of a large minority of the Council.

22. One of those arguments, often repeated during the debate, was that the Council should not adopt a decision which the General Assembly was likely to annul. He was in favour of leaving the Council and the General Assembly each to exercise its own authority and of letting the Council's decision stand the test of discussion in the General Assembly, which had never hesitated to amend a Council decision if it saw fit to do so.

23. The representative of Greece had also stated that the number of members of the Council had originally been only a quarter of the total number of States Members of the United Nations. That was not correct, because the ratio of eighteen to fifty-one was 35 per cent. Under the proposal in draft resolution E/L.1451 to increase the number of members of the Council to fifty-four, when the total number of States Members of the United Nations was 127, the proportion would be 42.5 per cent. If the representative of Greece were to support draft resolution E/L.1451 and accept what the developing countries had often recommended, namely an amendment of the present method of allocating seats, according to which ten seats were allocated to Eastern and Western European States and seventeen to African, Asian and Latin American States (cf. rule 146 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly), so that nine seats were now allocated to the European States and eighteen to the developing countries, the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1451 might perhaps agree to reconsider their proposal to increase to fifty-four the number of members of the Council and reduce that figure to fifty-two.

24. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece), speaking on a point of order, said that he wished to give an explanation to the Lebanese representative, who had said that he should have submitted his draft resolution at the end of the debate.

25. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan), speaking on a point of order, said that the representative of Greece was exercising his right of reply and that should not be done until the end of the discussion.

26. The PRESIDENT requested the representative of Greece, under rule 52 of the rules of procedure, to postpone his reply.

27. Mr. POISSON (Niger) said that he felt obliged to state, in view of the direction the discussion was taking, that the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1451 were more than ever determined to maintain and defend their proposal to enlarge the membership of the Council and to strengthen its role by establishing under its auspices a committee on science and technology and a committee responsible for the appraisal of the measures adopted in order to attain the

¹ United Nations publication, Sales No.: 67.I.33.

objectives of the Second Development Decade. He considered, moreover, that draft resolution E/L.1451 should be put to the vote that very day.

28. He was grateful to the President for his liberal attitude. The procedural discussion in the Council had enabled everyone to express his point of view freely. The President could have invoked numerous rules of procedure to prevent that, but had not done so.

29. Although they had been the subject of all sorts of attacks and various subterfuges had been used against them, the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1451 had not been persuaded to abandon their defence of it. That attitude should give pause to all those who had thought that the sponsors were an ill-assorted group composed essentially of irresponsible people whose convictions could be shaken. As all those tactics had been ineffectual, the opponents of the draft resolution had had recourse to arguments which seemed well-meaning, but the sponsors had not allowed themselves to be moved by that form of paternalism, which they in no way appreciated. They had been advised to wait in order to allow those who wished to join them two months for reflection; but the enlargement of the membership of the Council was an urgent matter which must be settled without delay. The sponsors had also been asked to wait until the Lima Meeting of Ministers and the third session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, to be held at Santiago, were over. In 1967, the Algiers Ministerial Meeting was to have enabled the Group of 77 to adopt resolutions intended to facilitate the achievement of the objectives that were to be sought at the second session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, held at New Delhi. Everyone knew what had been the results of that Conference. The least advanced among the developing countries, in particular those associated with the Common Market, had bitter memories of it. Those countries would be better able to defend themselves at the meetings in Lima and Santiago. They would not again be taken by surprise. They would see to it that the essential United Nations organ in the economic and social field was able to play its own co-ordinating role and to examine the results obtained during the Second Development Decade. In other words, they would defend the Council, because the "walking-on" part which efforts were being made to assign to it, for the benefit of subsidiary United Nations bodies, was not in their interests. Lastly, the sponsors had been advised to wait until all the members of the Security Council accepted the principle of an enlarged Council. There again the countries of the third world were sceptical, for they wondered how a group of conservatives, whether right or left wing, would agree to give up privileges that they had granted themselves. The Council's membership would doubtless not be enlarged immediately, but the process should be set in motion as soon as possible.

30. He was convinced of the need to associate large and small States in every resolution, if it was impossible to obtain a consensus. Those who had stated that there was no serious reason for enlarging the Council had adopted an attitude prejudicial to the countries which had only recently been able to join the United Nations. Those

countries too had the right to participate in important decisions in the economic and social field. There was no reason to keep them indefinitely outside those discussions and the under-developed countries which wanted to wait were casting a painful shadow over the history of the third world.

31. In conclusion, he reaffirmed that his delegation was convinced of the need to increase the number of members of the Council immediately and to give it appropriate tools to enable it to play the part which was expected of it in the attainment of the objectives of the Second Development Decade.

32. Mr. NESTERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking on a point of order, said that he had not wished to interrupt the representative of Niger earlier, but he was surprised that the representative of Greece had been refused the floor, on the grounds of the rules of procedure, whereas the representative of Niger had been allowed to speak.

33. The PRESIDENT read out rule 52 of the rules of procedure and pointed out that he had merely applied that rule.

34. He read out the list of speakers and suggested that in the absence of any objection, he would declare that list closed.

It was so decided.

35. Mr. GROS ESPIELL (Uruguay) said his delegation had already explained (1794th meeting) why it considered it illogical to deal with three items in a single draft resolution. It had also pointed out that the joint examination of those three items infringed the Council's rules of procedure. Its views had not changed, although it might have adopted a more sympathetic approach to draft resolution E/L.1451 if, after studying it, it had thought that that proposal offered a positive solution to the problems in question. Unfortunately, after a thorough study, it had realized that it could not vote for any of the three parts of the text.

36. With regard to part A, his delegation subscribed to the principle that the Economic and Social Council should be enlarged to make it more representative. If part A had confined itself to stating that principle and there had been general agreement on the matter, it would have been able to vote for that part. Not only was that not the case, but operative paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 were so faultily drafted as to present insurmountable obstacles. Firstly, bearing in mind Article 108 of the Charter, operative paragraph 1 clearly had no chance of being adopted. It therefore seemed pointless to adopt a resolution which would remain a dead letter. Secondly, his delegation shared the view of the Legal Counsel, who had stated at the 1796th meeting that operative paragraph 2 conflicted with rule 26 of the Council's rules of procedure. Although reference had admittedly been made to General Assembly resolution 1992 (XVIII), in the present economic situation that resolution hardly constituted a precedent: when that

resolution had been adopted, the situation had been radically different from what it was today, and it was impossible to draw any analogy between that General Assembly resolution and the proposal at present before the Council. Lastly, operative paragraph 3 not only violated the rules of procedure but also ran counter to Articles 61 and 68 of the Charter. Article 61 of the Charter authorized the General Assembly to elect twenty-seven members of the Economic and Social Council. No other powers were vested in it in that connexion and there was no other article of the Charter which authorized the General Assembly to elect the members of the Council's sessional committees. That responsibility lay with the Council itself, which elected them under the provisions of Article 68 of the Charter. Thus, although his delegation was in favour of enlarging the Council's membership, it could not vote for part A of the draft resolution.

37. The Council had heard the observer for Trinidad and Tobago explain (1795th meeting) on behalf of the Latin American group the reasons why that group was unanimously opposed to parts B and C of the draft resolution: those matters were to be considered at the Lima Ministerial Meeting and later at the third session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, and it was essential that the developing countries should have an opportunity to state their views in a body in which they could all express themselves.

38. For all those reasons, it would not be in the interests of the international community for the Council to adopt draft resolution E/L.1451. Negotiations should first be held with a view to reaching an agreement which had the support of the great majority of members.

39. He was prepared to support the Greek draft resolution (E/L.1458) because he hoped that if that proposal was adopted, there might be a good chance of reaching a more or less unanimous solution.

40. Mr. ANTOINE (Haiti), speaking on a point of order, stated that he had not been informed of the meeting of the Latin American group to which the Uruguayan representative had referred.

41. Mr. ZAGORIN (United States of America) said that, since the Brazilian representative unfortunately seemed to have become a counsellor of despair and that pessimistic forecasts had also been made by the representatives of Uruguay and Greece, he wished to draw attention to certain historical facts. When the vote had been taken on the resolution increasing the membership of the Economic and Social Council to twenty-seven, the USSR and France had voted against that proposal, while the United States and the United Kingdom had abstained. Yet the Council now had twenty-seven members. What had happened? In point of fact, the USSR had been one of the first countries to ratify that amendment to the Charter and the United States had been the fourth or fifth country to do so.

42. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) thanked the Brazilian representative for the care with which he had

quoted at the 1796th meeting the relevant passage of the United Kingdom proposals on measures to improve the organization of the Council's work (E/4986). He wished to point out, however, that the opening phrase of the passage quoted by that representative referred to the functions which the Council was "best fitted" to perform (and not which it was *alone* able to perform). The last sentence quoted stated that the proper forum for the discussion of general policy issues was the General Assembly. As everybody knew, it was often difficult to decide where general policy began or ended. Obviously, the General Assembly had already taken a policy decision by approving the International Development Strategy for the Second Development Decade and there was therefore no inconsistency between the proposals in document E/4986 and the line taken by his delegation during the present debate.

43. With regard to the observations made by the New Zealand and Lebanese representatives, and supported by the representative of Greece, concerning a permanent member of the Security Council, that permanent member had not said that it would not change its mind but neither had it said that it would.

44. At the 1796th meeting the Greek representative had made a powerful and profound statement because it had touched on the philosophy of the United Nations. Among other things he had stressed the need for reflexion and caution, and had reminded the Council of certain occasions on which it had regretted acting too hastily. The Soviet representative, in his turn, had pointed out that the best was often the enemy of the good. However, after carefully considering the postponement requested by the Greek representative and while recognizing that draft resolution E/L.1451 was far from perfect, he could not accept draft resolution E/L.1458. He would vote for parts B and C of draft resolution E/L.1451, but could not support part A.

45. Mr. MOJSOV (Yugoslavia) said he wholeheartedly supported the proposal made at the previous meeting by the Greek representative, who had urged members of the Council to reflect on the very important consequences which draft resolution E/L.1451 would have for the future and had called for the postponement of its examination. The question covered by the draft resolution, namely an increase in the membership of the Council and its sessional committees, had already been raised on several occasions at the Council's forty-ninth and fiftieth sessions but it had not been possible to reach any decision. He found it surprising that, at the present session, document E/L.1451 had not been formally submitted until the end of the Council's work, contrary to the usual United Nations procedure whereby delegations were allowed time for the careful study and thorough discussion of draft resolutions before taking a decision. When the Council was discussing such important and controversial questions and when written amendments had been submitted to a draft resolution, consultations between the sponsors and other delegations were essential in order to harmonize views and arrive at a decision that was acceptable, if not to all countries, at least to an overwhelming majority of them. If document E/L.1451 had been circulated to members of the Council at

the outset of its work, it might have been possible to reach a rational solution.

46. Regrettable though it was that delegations had not had time to make a careful study of the draft resolution, there were even stronger reasons for postponement. Not only the Council but the entire United Nations system was on the eve of a period of far-reaching changes with the admission to the United Nations of the People's Republic of China and, if the principle of universality was applied, of the two Germanies and other countries which were still struggling for their independence. The Council would certainly have to adapt itself to those changes. Like the French, United Kingdom and Soviet representatives, he did not question the desirability, in principle, of enlarging the Council and its sessional committees. He believed, however, that the Council should carefully weigh the political and structural implications of the proposals made in that respect and refrain from taking a hasty decision on the eve of those important changes.

47. With regard to the establishment of a new committee on the application of science and technology to development, he questioned whether such a step was feasible when the powers of that new body had not yet been determined or its terms of reference clearly defined.

48. Lastly, the machinery proposed in part C of the draft resolution for appraising the results of the Second Development Decade seemed unnecessary if the following three points were taken into account: first, an initial appraisal was to be made in 1972; second, of the 127 Members of the United Nations, only twenty-six had replied to the Secretary-General's questionnaire on the means and methods of appraising the results of the Second Development Decade, and that was an inadequate basis on which to take a decision; lastly, paragraph 4 of resolution 2641 (XXV), which had been unanimously adopted by the General Assembly, made it clear that it was for the General Assembly to take a decision on the question of a system of over-all appraisal of the International Development Strategy for the Second Development Decade, and that the Council could not prejudge that decision. Any disagreement between the Council and the General Assembly would impair the Council's prestige and that would be particularly harmful to the developing countries which were to meet at Lima at the ministerial level to study development problems.

49. For all those reasons, he appealed to members of the Council to avoid the harmful consequences to which a hasty decision would lead.

50. Mr. MARSH (Jamaica) associated himself with the observations of the Lebanese and United Kingdom representatives, although he did not share the latter's reservations regarding the draft resolution, of which his country was a co-sponsor.

51. The point at issue was whether procedural matters could be raised in connexion with the substance of a proposal. The Legal Counsel had explained the legal aspects of the matter and it appeared that paragraph 3 of part A was in conformity with the precedents set by the General

Assembly in establishing subsidiary bodies. The Ministerial Meeting at Lima would be most important, but there was nothing in the draft resolution to suggest that the General Assembly had to take a decision before that meeting. He could see nothing in draft resolution E/L.1451 which was incompatible with the role of either the Council or the General Assembly or which might bring about a conflict of authority between those two bodies. Clearly, any decision by the Council was subject to review by the General Assembly and, for that reason, he thought it preferable for the Council to take even an imperfect decision for transmission to the General Assembly rather than simply refer the matter to the Assembly, a procedure which would merely complicate the work of a session which seemed likely to be a difficult one in view of the multiplicity of problems that would have to be considered.

52. Mr. RAZAFINDRABE (Madagascar) said he wished to associate himself with the statements by the representatives of Sudan and Lebanon. He too thought that an enlarged Council would be more representative and better able to examine the economic and social problems it was called upon to solve, thus playing a more effective role in promoting development. Moreover, those problems were of interest not only to developing countries, but to the developed countries themselves.

53. He had listened with interest to the Greek representative's proposal at the previous meeting. It was important that all points of view should be expressed freely in the Council and the sponsors of the draft resolution had no intention of imposing their views on other delegations; their aim was rather to establish a dialogue and they were open to suggestions from other delegations, not all of which had made their position clear at the present stage of the discussion. He did not, however, agree with the Greek representative that there was a divergence of opinion on the draft resolution. Many delegations had expressed favourable views on the subject and there were grounds for optimism, since the debate had led to constructive exchanges of views.

54. Moreover, it was not feasible to postpone a decision on the draft resolution pending the outcome of the Lima meeting or of the third session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. There were urgent trade and development problems whose solution might well be compromised.

55. He would not change his position, but hoped that the delegations which had made useful observations would find it possible to come to terms with the sponsors of the draft resolution.

56. Mr. NESTERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) endorsed the Lebanese representative's request that the summary records should be as full as possible and should accurately reflect the positions of delegations, since the Council would have to refer to them subsequently.

57. After listening carefully to the statements made by all the sponsors of the draft resolution, he had come to the conclusion that no telling argument had been put forward in its support. Despite the variations in tone or nuance between one country and another, all the statements shared

the lack of any solid foundation. Some delegations had perhaps not stated their real reasons for pressing for adoption of the draft resolution, but, in any event, the Council had no basis for taking the decisions proposed.

58. The assertion that there was a crisis of confidence in the United Nations or that the members of the Council lacked adequate information, as the Sudanese representative had maintained, could not be regarded as valid arguments. Under rule 75 of the Council's rules of procedure, any Member of the United Nations which was not a member of the Council might participate in its deliberations on any matter of particular concern to that Member. He did not agree that the debate had resulted in constructive exchanges of views. It might perhaps have been possible to reach agreement if the various items had not been brought together in an omnibus resolution. Parts B and C, dealing respectively with the establishment of a committee on the application of science and technology to development and machinery for review and appraisal of the International Development Strategy, had been discussed only superficially since attention had been concentrated on part A, dealing with the possible enlargement of membership of the Economic and Social Council. Yet it was on parts B and C that the Council had had the best chance of reaching an understanding. The form in which the sponsors had presented their proposal had ruled out any possibility of agreement.

59. He had already drawn attention to all the internal inconsistencies of the draft resolution. For example, as the Ceylonese representative had clearly shown (1796th meeting), the procedures set out in the draft resolution would result in the sessional committees being enlarged before the Council itself, which was absurd, since the members of those committees were also members of the Council. One might well ask what the sponsors of the draft resolution were trying to achieve and whether their aim was the complete paralysis of the Council.

60. The Legal Counsel had said that there were precedents for the measures proposed in the draft resolution, and that the Council was the master of its procedure. The representative of the Soviet Union did not, however, see any need to amend the Charter or the Council's rules of procedure which, in his view, provided an adequate basis for the efficient functioning of the Council. Moreover, decisions taken in circumstances which were different from those in which the Council now found itself could not be taken as precedents.

61. Despite their declared willingness to enter into an exchange of views, the sponsors of the draft resolution had not tried to institute a genuine dialogue. The Sudanese representative had said he had no desire to bring pressure to bear on the members of the Council, but wished to convince them, while the Kenyan representative had stated on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution that he would not accept any amendments to that text. In those conditions, there could be no possibility of agreement. Analysis of the discussions showed that there were, broadly speaking, two attitudes, the first advocating a careful study of the draft resolution with due regard for the various

positions (in his view, the only way to achieve genuine co-operation and a constructive solution which took the responsibilities of all States into account), and the second seeking to impose itself by means of majority votes. The latter approach ran counter to the principles of the Charter. Such a situation was not new: the United Nations had known a period during which certain Powers had tried to impose their will by similar methods. It was as well to remember that during that same period the United Nations had been reduced to impotence.

62. Some delegations had stressed the need to reach as wide a measure of agreement as possible, since the future of the Council was at stake. If the fifteen co-sponsors of the draft resolution imposed their solution on the twelve other members, the latter would not thereby be compelled to bow to their arguments. Thus, the method adopted was far from being the one most conducive to the efficient functioning of the Council.

63. Other delegations had proposed that the discussions should be continued or adjourned. Although that solution seemed acceptable, the USSR considered that the draft resolution as a whole was completely unacceptable from the legal standpoint and that not only certain permanent members of the Security Council but many other delegations would be unable to support it.

64. Fate had willed that the Soviet Union should become a great Power. That status was by no means an unmixed blessing, entailing as it did very heavy responsibilities, shared with the countries which had recently achieved independence and which also had their part to play in the promotion of peace, security and international co-operation.

65. The Lebanese representative had said that he would have no misgivings if the question were to be referred to the General Assembly. The Soviet Union had no apprehensions on that score either, but would point out that the main objective was the confident co-operation of great and small Powers in the interests of all countries and especially the developing countries.

66. The PRESIDENT said that, in the absence of any objection, he would call upon the observer for Algeria under rule 75 of the rules of procedure.

67. Mr. BOUDJAKI (Observer for Algeria) said he wished to make it clear that he was speaking at the request of the African members of the Council. He stressed the importance which the African group attached to solidarity within the Group of 77 and its acute awareness of its obligations towards developing countries as a whole.

68. The African countries were convinced of the importance of the forthcoming Ministerial Meeting at Lima and had therefore decided to hold a meeting at Addis Ababa to determine their position on the issues to be dealt with at the Lima meeting, first at the regional level and then at the level of the Group of 77, so as to harmonize the positions of the third world before the third session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. They would spare no effort to that end and were ready to

make compromises and even sacrifices. However, they expected their attitude to be reciprocated in the interests of mutual confidence.

69. Mindful of their special responsibility, the African countries members of the Economic and Social Council firmly believed that their efforts to strengthen the Council would promote the interests of developing countries, improve international co-operation for economic and social development and confirmed the dynamic character which the International Development Strategy must have if it was to become the viable instrument required by General Assembly resolution 2626 (XXV). They were fully alive to the part which the Council should play in improving the economic and social situation of the developing countries and which should be supplemented by the measures they were taking within UNCTAD. They did not regard their efforts to strengthen the Council as incompatible with the objectives they were pursuing in UNCTAD.

70. The Council must face its responsibilities and proceed to act in taking a decision on the proposal submitted by sixteen countries, including seven African countries; that proposal merited endorsement in the form of a favourable decision by the Council.

71. Mr. PATHMARAJAH (Ceylon) said he was sorry that the representative of Niger had attributed to opponents of the draft resolution intentions which they had never had. His own delegation, like others, had tried to find a satisfactory compromise, whilst respecting the rules of procedure of the Council.

72. His delegation was afraid that the representative of Lebanon had misunderstood its position. He had pointed out at the 1796th meeting that, if the draft resolution was adopted, the sessional committees would have, in addition to their present members, another twenty-seven members who would be elected at the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly and would retain their seats until the Economic and Social Council had been enlarged. Some of them might perhaps be elected to the Council before its enlargement, but the draft resolution said nothing about the procedure for filling the additional seats in the sessional committees which became vacant as a result. In view of the comments made during the debate, it would be an illusion to think that the transitional period could last less than three years. Everybody knew how much time had elapsed between the adoption of resolution 1992 (XVIII) of 1963 and the enlargement of the Council in 1965; yet that proposal for enlargement had been approved by virtually all delegations, which was not the case today. During the interim period, the members of the Council who sat in that capacity in the sessional committees and whose terms of office expired in 1972 and 1973 could not resume membership of those committees unless they were elected full members of the Council, as the draft resolution did not provide for the election of any additional members to the committees after the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly.

73. For those reasons, his delegation questioned the legality of the proposal. It was not of course opposed to

enlarging the Council — quite the contrary — but it could not support the provisions of draft resolution E/L.1451; it was therefore in favour of postponing the debate, in accordance with the Greek proposal, so that a more judicious resolution might be drafted.

74. Mr. PATAKI (Hungary), observing that he had been criticized during the debate for his attachment to tradition, said that the long standing tradition of negotiation, compromise and conciliation in the Economic and Social Council was hardly open to criticism. It was vital to avoid hasty decisions on package-deals submitted to the Council, and every delegation was entitled to expect thorough consideration of its opinions on such a serious matter.

75. There were many arguments in favour of deferring a decision. One particular aspect of draft resolution E/L.1451 had apparently been overlooked: operative paragraph 4 of part A provided that until the proposed structural changes took effect, "all substantive items on the agenda of a session of the Council, apart from the general debate, would be allocated to the sessional committees for their in-depth consideration with a view to submitting concrete recommendations to the Council". In that connexion, it should be recalled that, under rule 26 of its rules of procedure, the Council could request its sessional committees to study and report on "any item on the agenda". His delegation doubted whether the draft resolution was in conformity with Article 62 of the Charter, which defined the powers of the Council. In fact, draft resolution E/L.1451 was of a very restrictive nature and, in his delegation's view, the history of the United Nations would not show any example of a body adopting decisions having the effect of restricting its own powers.

76. For all those reasons, he believed that the Council was passing through a very critical phase, in which it should show the greatest caution and should take the views expressed by all delegations into account. He hoped that a co-operative attitude would ultimately prevail and that a decision would be deferred.

77. Mr. CHTOUROU (Tunisia) said he was afraid that the USSR representative had misunderstood the intentions of the sponsors of the draft resolution.

78. He wished to pay a tribute to the Greek representative, to whose statement he had listened with the greatest attention and whose arguments would be borne in mind by his delegation.

79. The issues now under discussion in the Council had already been considered at the fiftieth session and draft resolution E/L.1451 was the product of the negotiations and exchanges of views which had since taken place. Unfortunately it had not been possible to achieve a broad consensus on certain questions but there were grounds for hope that the remaining differences of opinion could be eliminated. Moreover, a decision by the Council would in no way prejudice the attitude of the General Assembly or of the other United Nations bodies which would have to take a decision. Tunisia was anxious that the views of all delegations should be known, that a majority should

emerge and that the minority delegations should state their opinions and perhaps reconsider their position on the draft resolution. The door was not closed, and during the debate in the General Assembly every delegation could put forward its arguments. The decision to be taken by the Council was merely the beginning of a process. His delegation therefore appealed to the Greek delegation to consider the possibility of withdrawing its draft resolution (E/L.1458).

80. Mr. NESTERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking on a point of order, said that he had

certainly not misunderstood the intentions of the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1451. The Kenyan representative's statement (1796th meeting) had been confirmed by the representative of Lebanon, who had said in substance that the sponsors of the draft resolution did not wish to change their text in any way, that they did not need unanimity, that they would be satisfied with a majority and that they would force the permanent members of the Security Council to bow to the majority vote. Those statements left no room for any ambiguity, and the whole attitude of the co-sponsors bore out that interpretation.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.