



President: Mr. Rachid DRISS (Tunisia).

AGENDA ITEM 3

Outflow of trained personnel from developing to developed countries (concluded) (E/4798, E/4820 and Corr.1 and Summary, E/4820 and Add.1 and Corr.1, E/1379/Rev.1/Add.1, E/L.1412/Rev.1)

1. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon) introduced the revised text of the draft resolution (E/L.1412/Rev.1) agreed on by the members of the Working Group, of which he had been Chairman, and by the sponsors of draft amendments.

2. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no comments, he would take it that the text was adopted by consensus.

It was so decided.

3. Mr. FILIMONOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had supported the draft resolution, which in any event was merely a first step towards solving the problem. It had done so on the understanding that operative paragraph 4 would have no financial implications. He recalled that, so far as his delegation was concerned, the basis for the measures to be taken "in accordance with the Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade" was the joint statement on the second decade of development and social progress by the delegations of the socialist countries dated 21 September 1970.¹

4. Mr. GROS (France) asked whether the adoption of the draft resolution would have any financial implications other than those for operative paragraph 2 (a) and (b) originally referred to in document E/L.1379/Rev.1/Add.1. He added that his delegation had some reservations with regard to operative paragraph 4 in its present form.

5. Mr. KOEHRING (United States of America) said that his delegation had supported the draft resolution but did not accept the idea that, as stated in the third preambular paragraph, developing countries were suffering material loss from the "brain drain" to some advanced countries. It would have been more correct to say "may suffer material loss". The reference in operative paragraph 8 to General Assembly resolution 2688 (XXV) was, to be more accurate, a reference to paragraph 41 of the annex to that resolution.

6. The PRESIDENT confirmed that the resolution would have no financial implications other than those stated in document E/L.1379/Rev.1/Add.1. The Council had con-

cluded its consideration of item 3 and could now continue its discussion of agenda item 16.

AGENDA ITEM 16

Measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council (continued)* (E/4986 and Add.1 to 7, E/L.1382, E/L.1408, E/L.1421, E/(L)/CRP.1)

7. Mr. HAMBRO (Norway) said that, in paragraph 7 of its reply (E/4986/Add.1) to the Secretary-General's questions regarding measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council, the Norwegian Government had stated that it continued to have an open mind on the subject-matter and that it would give careful consideration to any constructive proposal or suggestion aimed at strengthening the Council and its standing, thus assuring increased confidence among Member States in the Council as one of the main instruments in the world community's efforts to promote sustained economic and social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom throughout the world. With regard to concrete suggestions for measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council, he would draw attention to his Government's views, which had been presented in document E/4986/Add.1.

8. A number of delegations had argued that enlarging the membership of the Council would provide it with additional political strength and support. His delegation concurred with that view. It also agreed with the proposals for enlarging the membership of the Council in order to enhance its central role in the review and appraisal of the objectives and policies of the International Development Strategy of the Second United Nations Development Decade (General Assembly resolution 2626 (XXV)). The developing countries had argued that the present size of the Council did not make it adequately representative of a United Nations membership of 127 countries. His delegation recognized that that was a valid point, and it was prepared to consider with other delegations any formula for enlargement which might emerge as a consensus of the members of the Council. However, the question of enlargement of the membership was closely linked with two other most important questions, namely, the review and appraisal machinery for the Second Development Decade and future institutional arrangements for science and technology. Those three questions should be considered as three aspects of one single problem. The Council should not take any decision with regard to one of those aspects without taking due account of the decisions it might take concerning the others. His delegation hoped that the members of the Council would be prepared to take final decisions on those matters at the fifty-first session.

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fifth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 42, document A/8074.

* Resumed from the 1765th meeting.

9. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) said that the Council should pause and take stock of a complex of draft documentation on the subject, not all under the item, before taking any decision. The first document in chronological order, had been draft resolution E/L.1382 submitted by the Soviet delegation.

10. The United States delegation had then submitted draft resolution E/L.1407 on future institutional arrangements for science and technology (agenda item 11). Although that draft resolution did not relate directly to the item under consideration, the fact that it proposed the establishment of a subsidiary body with an enlarged membership was directly relevant.

11. Next, and still under item 11, and after warning against the dangers of abolishing the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development and replacing it by another committee, the French delegation had produced draft resolution E/L.1420, which was designed to keep the Advisory Committee in existence.

12. The Council had also been presented under item 11 with draft resolution E/L.1400, the sponsors of which had, in the view of his delegation, endeavoured to bypass rather than strengthen the authority of the Council.

13. Draft resolution E/L.1408, now submitted by Greece and New Zealand, was a balanced text which merited serious consideration. His delegation did not endorse proposals for enlarging the membership of the Council, because enlargement would not necessarily lead to greater effectiveness. The Secretariat and every delegation would have to carry a heavier burden, and the volume of documentation would simply increase. However, draft resolution E/L.1408 did not call for an immediate decision. It proposed many practical measures to which his delegation could agree, while delegations would have sufficient time before the fifty-first session to decide whether certain matters could be considered by existing committees or whether new ones were needed. In that context, the last preambular paragraph of the draft resolution would state in terms that implied that the Council as a whole were agreed that longer-term measures to increase the membership of the Council were required to strengthen the representative character, the authority and the dynamism of the Council. His delegation was not yet convinced that such measures were advisable: as a factual statement of apparently agreed view the wording went too far. His delegation would therefore like the words "in particular" in that paragraph to be replaced by "including, it has been suggested,".

14. His delegation could not agree with the amendments to draft resolution E/L.1408 contained in document E/L.1421. The effect of the first of the paragraphs intended to replace those in section IV would be to precipitate a decision on enlargement of the membership of the Council, while the second would lead to the adoption of a general decision to enlarge the membership of the sessional committees, without regard to the merits in each case. It would be better to make no changes in the text submitted by Greece and New Zealand.

15. Mr. PATAKI (Hungary) said that a number of delegations had attempted to link any improvement in the

organization of the work of the Council to an increase in its membership. There seemed to be no adequate basis for that argument, since an arithmetical increase could not be a guarantee of greater effectiveness. No speaker so far had explained in detail why the organization of the work of the Council would be improved if its membership was increased. Nor did draft resolution E/L.1408 give any explanation on that point. Because of the changes in the world of today, the problems awaiting the Council during the 1970s were different from those it had had to deal with during the 1960s. In order to bring about a genuine improvement in the organization of the work of the Council, it would first be necessary to review the most urgent problems confronting the United Nations. The next step would be to consider what must be done under the auspices of the Council and the General Assembly, bearing in mind the relationship between the two organs. That was the only way of increasing the effective role and the prestige of the Council. The Soviet draft resolution (E/L.1382) was aimed in that direction, and his delegation hoped that the Council would be able to agree to it.

16. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon) said it was generally recognized that the Council had lost some of the authority which had been vested in it under the Charter. It was generally felt that over the past 25 years the United Nations had achieved greater results in the economic and social field than in the political field. Nevertheless, it was clear that the Council could do even more. The proliferation of specialized agencies—whose role could not, of course, be minimized—was a source of weakness because of the duplication and overlapping which occurred and the lack of co-ordination in general. A parallel trend could be seen at the national level in many countries. Chapters IX and X of the Charter conferred on the Council broad responsibilities and great powers. However, it was clearly necessary to stimulate the will of Member States to enable the Council to exercise those powers effectively and define precisely the guidelines to be followed in the economic and social field. During the past two years, the Council had been taking stock of the situation and had carried out a review which was in itself of great importance. However, what was needed now was effective action. The question of enlarging the membership of the Council must be considered as soon as possible. In that respect, the Soviet draft resolution (E/L.1382) was based on the principles of the Charter, but in the opinion of his delegation it did not go far enough. Operative paragraphs 2 and 4 were rather vague, perhaps intentionally. With regard to operative paragraph 5, asking the General Assembly what should be done could only delay the solution of the problem.

17. In the case of draft resolution E/L.1408, his delegation wished to stress the importance of the Commission on Human Rights and the Commission on the Status of Women, which were referred to in operative paragraph 3 of section II. It could not, therefore, support operative paragraph 4 of section III of the draft resolution. Questions relating to the violation of human rights arose daily and must be kept under active review. From that standpoint, it did not even seem to be enough that the Commission on Human Rights should meet once a year, and it would be desirable for it also to hold special sessions.

18. With regard to operative paragraph 5 of section II and operative paragraph 1 of section III of draft resolution

E/L.1408, he hoped that it was not the intention of the sponsors to give the Secretary-General the power to formulate solutions in areas where the responsibility for decisions rested with the Council. His delegation was in general agreement with the draft resolution but reserved the option of submitting amendments.

19. Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) said that it was necessary to recognize the political functions of the Council and to affirm its leadership role in connexion with the International Development Strategy for the Second Development Decade. The developing countries wished to be associated more closely with the formulation of over-all policy. An increase in the membership of the Council might not be sufficient to guarantee the effectiveness of its work, but in any event the desire of the developing countries to be associated with the making of political decisions on which their economic and social development would depend should be acceded to. The industrialized countries should not regard an expansion of the membership of the Council as being directed against them. Draft resolutions E/L.1382 and E/L.1408 appeared to be complementary. The Soviet draft resolution stressed the relationship between the Council and the General Assembly, whereas the text submitted by Greece and New Zealand related solely to the work of the Council.

20. With regard to the Soviet draft resolution (E/L.1382), it appeared essential to go beyond mere recommendations and to take real decisions. Strict respect for the Charter should not doom the United Nations to immobility. Procedurally, it would seem that consideration of the relationship between the General Assembly and other organs should be a matter for the Special Committee on the Rationalization of the Procedures and Organization of the General Assembly, which was responsible for making a comprehensive study of the question.

21. With regard to draft resolution E/L.1408, the need for arrangements, including institutional arrangements, for implementing the Strategy must be recognized. The provisional agenda must be co-ordinated and synthesized, and duplication should be avoided. The documentation submitted should be clear and precise, and the Council's recommendations to the General Assembly should be made in such a way as to permit worth-while discussions at the Assembly level.

22. It still appeared possible to revise the texts of the two draft resolutions with a view to reaching agreement on a single text. Finally, his delegation wished to stress that there could be no reorganization without reinforcement, and no reinforcement without reorganization.

23. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan), introducing the amendments (E/L.1421) to draft resolution E/L.1408 on behalf of the delegations of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ghana, Indonesia, Italy, Kenya, Lebanon, Madagascar, Pakistan, Sudan and Tunisia, said it was clear from the debate on agenda item 16 that the Council had been unable to fulfil the hopes placed in it, that some of its former functions were now being increasingly entrusted to other bodies or to the General Assembly because they were considered better able to deal with particular questions, and that if that distressing trend continued the Council's

authority would naturally continue to decline. In order to remedy the situation, it was therefore only natural to consider an expansion of the membership of the Council, especially since it had a central role to play in connexion with the machinery for the review and appraisal of the implementation of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade. The debate on future institutional arrangements for science and technology had also proved that, if the Council was more broadly representative, it would be in a much better position to take meaningful decisions in that area. The extent of the Council's role was undoubtedly linked to its enlargement, as had been noted by a number of delegations, including, in particular, that of Italy. It was also heartening to note the favourable attitude adopted by the United States delegation on that question. He did not rule out the possibility afforded by draft resolution E/L.1408, but its provisions did not go far enough. Practically all the developing countries and some developed countries supported the principle of a change in the composition of the Council, which did not mean a violation of the Charter as some had said they feared. The membership, which had originally been 18, had already been increased to 27. It would be sufficient, in the present case, to adopt a proposal for the amendment of the Charter. Although some seemed to think otherwise, amendment of the Charter was a minor point, since it would relate only to the composition of the Council and not to that of other United Nations organs. The sponsors of the amendments (E/L.1421) were not pressing for the measures in question to be taken necessarily at the twenty-sixth session of the Assembly, but they would like the principle that measures should be discussed to be accepted.

24. While some provisions of draft resolution E/L.1408 were acceptable, the delegations submitting the amendments had been unable to endorse the provisions of operative section IV, for consideration of changes in the structure of the Council could not be postponed until the fifty-first session. For that reason the first of the two paragraphs proposed to replace that section recommended to the General Assembly at its twenty-sixth session to take all necessary steps, including a proposal aimed at amending the Charter, to ensure an adequate and early enlargement of its membership and the second paragraph would in the interim period, enlarge the membership of the sessional committees of the Council up to 54, and the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination to 27.

25. The sponsors of the amendments were prepared to discuss them with interested delegates in order that the Council might take a constructive decision before the end of the current session.

26. Mr. VIAUD (France) asked the sponsors of amendments E/L.1421 why they had proposed 54 as the enlarged membership of the sessional committees of the Council in the interim period and whether they would agree to change it if the General Assembly decided on a different number.

27. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan) said that the sponsors were open to any suggestion in connexion with any of their amendments. The General Assembly would not necessarily have to agree to the number mentioned, which had been

chosen because it would ensure a sufficiently broad representation.

28. Mr. SAM (Ghana) pointed out that the question of measures to improve the organization of work of the Council had been on the agenda for two years and that the draft resolution under discussion was the first constructive proposal submitted to the Council. His delegation, although it was a sponsor of the amendments, would have liked to become a sponsor of draft resolution E/L.1408, since it had so many good features; it therefore hoped all the more that the amendments would be taken into account, thereby making the draft resolution more satisfactory.

29. As the Pakistan representative had said, the number suggested for the membership of the sessional committees could be discussed with interested delegations. The General Assembly obviously would not have to accept that number.

30. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) drew attention to a number of points in the proposed draft resolutions to which his delegation objected. Draft resolution E/L.1382 was objectionable because it would limit the role of the Second Committee of the General Assembly and thus reduce the Assembly's freedom of action. The solution it proposed was not satisfactory, since it altered the existing balance between the various organs of the United Nations. Draft resolution E/L.1408 contained a number of excellent provisions, such as operative paragraph 6 of section III; strict observance of rule 14 (4) of the rules of procedure of the Council was indeed very important. Governments should have enough time to communicate their instructions. Similarly, the provisions of operative paragraph 3 of section II and operative paragraph 3 of section III were fully justified, and in that connexion he pointed out that final decisions should not be made by subsidiary bodies.

31. On the other hand, his delegation joined the Soviet delegation in objecting to the provision in operative paragraph 1 of section III, requesting the Secretary-General to suggest a particular course of action in the Council.

32. His delegation would also like to propose some amendments.² It suggested replacing the third preambular paragraph by the following text:

"Noting that paragraph 83 of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Decade, approved by the General Assembly in resolution 2626 (XXV), provides that an over-all appraisal of the progress in implementing the International Development Strategy will be made by the General Assembly, on the basis of the above-mentioned reviews [at the national, regional and sectoral levels] and of comments and recommendations, within the framework of a specific mandate, by the Committee for Development Planning."

33. In addition, in operative paragraph 2 (c) of section I, the words "a debate on" should be added after the words "in alternate years" and the words "with a view to assisting the General Assembly in performing the over-all appraisal" after the words "United Nations Development Decade".

² Subsequently circulated as document E/L.1422.

34. Lastly, the following new section should be inserted after section III:

"IV

"1. Welcomes the participation in its deliberations, in accordance with rule 75 of the rules of procedure of the Council, of Member States which are not members of the Council, in the conviction that such a participation will ensure a politically more solid and wider basis for decisions;

"2. Invites Member States which are not members of the Council to make full use of the right accorded them in rule 75 of its rules of procedure, by presenting draft resolutions, draft decisions or amendments, in their own name or in conjunction with members of the Council, in such a manner as to provide adequate treatment for the interests of all Members of the Organization."

The existing section IV would accordingly become section V.

35. The PRESIDENT recalled that it had been previously decided to postpone consideration of the question of observers. He asked whether the Council believed that the question could be included in the problem now under consideration.

36. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil), speaking on a procedural point, said that he saw no reason why the Council could not consider his amendment on the question of observers, since a wide range of questions had already been raised during the debate.

37. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) said that while his delegation understood the Brazilian representative's position, it believed that the question of the rules of procedure, which was in fact the subject of the amendment, could not be included in the problem under discussion.

38. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) pointed out that the Council did not have much time before the close of the session and that if it agreed to consider the Brazilian amendment, the debate might be prolonged without arriving at any result. Moreover, it should be noted that if it was decided in principle to enlarge the membership of the Council, the question would be settled automatically.

39. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) thought that the representative of Brazil was within his rights in suggesting his amendment. His delegation saw no reason why matters which might affect rule 75 of the rules of procedure could not be discussed in connexion with agenda item 16, since the whole structure and operation of the Council was being discussed. The Brazilian amendment was therefore admissible, even though he thought at first hearing that it was unnecessary and divisive.

40. The PRESIDENT said that it had been decided to postpone consideration of the question of observers because the question was not on the Council's agenda. He wondered whether it could really be considered part of the item on measures to improve the organization of work.

41. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) said that a clearer distinction than that suggested by the Brazilian representative should be made between observers and members of the Council.

42. The discussion on agenda item 16 was very broad and included all sorts of topics. The Brazilian representative therefore had the right to introduce the aspect of the question that he had raised. His amendment should, however, be worded differently, since it would, if adopted, result in a change in the Council's rules of procedure.

43. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) remarked that the Brazilian amendment could be made a proposal to amend the rules of procedure. It was, however, out of place in draft resolution E/L.1408.

44. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) felt that a proposal to amend the rules of procedure was always admissible, although his delegation could see no need for it in the present case. However, if a delegation felt that such a proposal was necessary, it should have the question of amending the rules of procedure included in the agenda and then submit proposals after the general debate on that question.

45. Mr. SAM (Ghana) asked the Secretariat what procedure was usually followed when a proposal to amend the rules of procedure was adopted.

46. Mr. AHMED (Secretary of the Council) said it was his understanding that when the Council took a decision which would have the effect of amending the rules of procedure, the Secretary-General submitted suggestions concerning the amendment, which were then considered by the Council. Instead of amending the rules of procedure, the Council might also decide to suspend the application of particular rules. Thus, the application of some rules was still suspended at present.

47. Mr. SAM (Ghana) pointed out that the Council itself had not been very sure how rule 75 should be interpreted and had had to rely on an interpretation by the Office of Legal Affairs. When the question had been raised during the session, at its 1750th meeting the Council had taken a decision enabling it to proceed but had not settled the substance of the problem. Consequently it should now make it clear that the rules of procedure, and in particular rule 75, were to be interpreted in the manner indicated by the Office of Legal Affairs. He saw no reason, therefore, to regard the Brazilian amendment as inadmissible, since it was intended simply to clarify the interpretation of rule 75.

48. Contrary to what had been implied, a decision to enlarge the membership of the Council's sessional committees, or even the Council itself, would not settle the question of observers, since many States Members of the United Nations would still not be members of the Council or of its sessional committees and therefore, according to some, would not have the right to submit proposals.

49. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) said that the Brazilian amendments should be submitted in writing and that in the meantime the Council could continue its consideration of the draft resolutions and other amendments before it.

50. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) observed that his delegation, which was a full member of the Council, was being denied even the right to submit amendments while it was trying to affirm the right of observers to submit proposals. Such an attitude on the part of the Council might create a dangerous precedent.

51. Draft resolution E/L.1408 dealt with many other questions not explicitly included in the agenda. Why, then, should the question of observers, which was of undeniable interest, be excluded? Such exclusion smacked strongly of discrimination. Contrary to what some representatives had said, the amendment was not designed to change the rules of procedure but simply to clarify the interpretation of rule 75 by the Office of Legal Affairs.

52. The PRESIDENT said that the intent was not to deprive anyone of the right to submit amendments but simply to apply rule 56 of the rules of procedure, which provided that amendments must be introduced in writing and handed to the Secretary-General, who must circulate copies to the representatives 24 hours before they were discussed and voted upon. In the meantime, the Council was continuing its consideration of the documents before it.

53. Mr. FINGER (United States of America) recalled his delegation's position on enlargement of the Council. At the 1765th meeting the United States representative had said that any enlargement was envisaged solely to strengthen the work of the Council and not to encourage the enlargement of other United Nations bodies; on that condition, among others, his delegation would be ready to give the question serious consideration.

54. In the meantime, temporary measures should be taken, and for that reason his delegation looked favourably on draft resolution E/L.1408; it wished merely to make several proposals at a later date to the sponsors regarding section IV.

55. As the representative of Norway had pointed out, measures designed to improve the Council's organization of work should be adopted by the largest possible majority. For that reason his delegation was glad that the sponsors of the amendments (E/L.1421) had shown a spirit of compromise and co-operation.

56. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he was sorry that, apparently as a result of a misunderstanding, one delegation felt that it had been discriminated against. Naturally any member of the Council was entitled to submit amendments to any draft under consideration by the Council. In fact, other amendments had been submitted to draft resolution E/L.1408. However, all those amendments dealt with the substance of the question that was being discussed, namely, measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council. If, on the other hand, a delegation wished to make proposals for the amendment of a rule of procedure it should follow a specific and well established procedure. Since the question was not on the agenda, the Brazilian amendments could not be accepted.

57. The PRESIDENT pointed out that the question of the Brazilian amendments had been left pending until the amendments were submitted in writing.

58. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) said that the amendments (E/L.1421) would change the character of draft resolution E/L.1408, in that the Council would be required to decide at that early stage on the question of the enlargement of its composition. The sponsors had considered it advisable, for the time being, to deal only with short-term measures, which were also less controversial, and to postpone consideration of long-term measures until the fifty-first session. The proposed amendments would call for an amendment of the Charter and it would therefore be dangerous to take a hasty decision in the matter. It would be better to allow time for clear-cut views to emerge so that it would be possible to estimate the amount of support for the proposals to expand the Council.

59. He would like to know if the United States delegation was ready to submit the proposals it had referred to.

60. He agreed that, with a view to facilitating the Council's deliberations and also for practical reasons, it might be better to postpone consideration of the Brazilian amendments until later. He would point out, however, that if it was possible to submit proposals that implied an amendment of the Charter there was every reason for allowing amendments that merely entailed amendments to the rules of procedure.

Mr. Caranicas (Greece), Vice-President, took the Chair.

61. The PRESIDENT suggested that the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1408 might wish to hold consultations with the sponsors of the amendments to see if they could come to some agreement.

62. Speaking as representative of GREECE, he pointed out that if, as some representatives had suggested, draft resolution E/L.1408 was evasive on certain points it was because the sponsors wished it to be adopted unanimously or at least by a large majority. It was not too important whether the draft was adopted at the present session or at the Council's fifty-first session, which was not very far off.

63. Mr. KITCHEN (United States of America) said that his delegation would like to hold consultations with the sponsors to find out if it would be possible for draft resolution E/L.1408 to cover some points embodied in a draft resolution (E/L.1407) on future institutional arrangements for science and technology, submitted by the United States delegation.

64. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan) said that his delegation did not approach the question of amending the Charter lightly. In any case, it had indicated at the previous session of the General Assembly that it was, generally speaking, opposed

to a revision of that basic instrument. That did not mean, however, that the United Nations should remain static.

65. He agreed that it would be wrong to take a hasty decision on such an important matter as the enlargement of the Council. However, it was the duty of all the members of that organ to take every possible opportunity to try to harmonize different views. Any progress in that direction was encouraging, even if no formal decision was taken.

66. The amendments submitted by his and other delegations (E/L.1421) were certainly not intended to create confusion or complicate the work of the Council. It was simply that, as a result of a compromise, some delegations had accepted the view that the new standing committee for science and technology should be set up under the Council rather than under the General Assembly. Those delegations thought, however, that in that event it would be advisable to enlarge the composition of the Council and of the sessional committees and, unfortunately, that steps could not be taken without altering the Charter. It should be made clear, however, that the sponsors of the amendments were not insisting that the Charter should be amended at the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly but only wished the question to be actively considered at that session.

67. Section IV of the draft contained in document E/L.1408 was worded somewhat ambiguously since it was not very clear if the "possibility of the enlargement of their membership, modification of their terms of reference and the pattern of their meetings" referred only to the sessional committees or both to the committees and the Council.

68. Mr. QUARONI (Italy) said that he was very much in favour of the idea of holding consultations between the sponsors of the draft resolutions and the sponsors of amendments.

69. Mr. PRAGUE (France) thought that such consultations should be open to all who wished to participate in them.

70. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) thanked the representatives of the United States and Pakistan for their clarifications. He, too, thought that consultations would be very useful.

71. The PRESIDENT said that consultations would be held the following morning between the sponsors of the draft resolutions and the sponsors of amendments and that those consultations would be open to all who wished to take part in them.

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.