



ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Thirty-sixth session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

OCT - 9 1963

Monday, 22 July 1963
at 3.30 p.m.

PALAIS DES NATIONS, GENEVA

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 12:	
Reports of the regional economic commissions (<i>continued</i>)	199

President: Mr. A. PATIÑO (Colombia)

Present:

Representatives of the following States: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, India, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Senegal, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Yugoslavia.

Observers for the following Member States: Algeria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Denmark, Greece, Hungary, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Romania, South Africa, United Arab Republic.

Observers for the following non-member States: Federal Republic of Germany, Switzerland.

Representatives of the following specialized agencies: International Labour Organisation, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, International Civil Aviation Organization, World Health Organization.

The representative of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

AGENDA ITEM 12

Reports of the regional economic commissions (E/3727/Rev.1, E/3820; E/L.1008 and Add.1, E/L.1016, E/L.1017, E/L.1019, E/L.1020) (*continued*)

1. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to resume consideration of the report of ECA (E/3727/Rev.1).
2. Mr. ARKADIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the consideration of certain points arising out of the report of ECA had not unnaturally given rise to acrimonious discussion at the thirty-fourth session of the Council, at the resumed thirty-fourth session and again at the current session. It could not be said that the

debates redounded to the credit of the Council as a main organ of the United Nations. In particular, the position taken by the majority of the Council's members at the resumed thirty-fourth session was hard to understand, as was the situation that had arisen during the current debate. The two African States members of the Council had submitted a draft resolution (E/L.1017) proposing that the views and recommendations of ECA on the membership of Portugal and South Africa in the Commission be transmitted to the General Assembly at its eighteenth session. Of course, it was evident from the attitude already expressed by a number of members that the Council was not to be expected to take radical action on the question, but the draft resolution departed from the decision of ECA itself.

3. Another strange development in the debate had been that some members had even raised the question of the Council's competence. The ECA had considered the matter and had taken a decision; the Council had felt competent to examine that decision at its thirty-fourth session and then again at the resumed thirty-fourth session, and it was inconsistent to raise the question of competence when the issue was coming before the Council for the third time. Another member had raised the question of interference in the domestic affairs of certain States; but the whole matter had already been discussed at two sessions of the Council without that question being raised. Moreover, the South African delegation to the United Nations had on numerous occasions tried to avoid discussion of its policies on grounds of interference in its domestic affairs, but had been defeated by an overwhelming majority in the General Assembly.

4. Some members has argued that, since the Ambassador of South Africa in Berne had already sent a communication to the President of the Council (E/3820) expressing his government's intention not to participate in ECA, a convenient solution had been found for the problem. The communication merely stated, however, that South Africa would not attend any ECA conferences or participate in the other activities of the Commission while the hostile attitude of the African States towards South Africa persisted: in other words, South Africa was not renouncing its membership of the Commission, but was leaving ECA on a temporary basis. But the Commission's decision had been that Portugal and South Africa should be formally and deservedly deprived of membership, and that the Council should reconsider the decision it had taken at its resumed thirty-fourth session. The Commission's intention was to punish the Governments of Portugal and South Africa for the crimes they had committed; it was not for the Council to try to mitigate or distort that decision. The Soviet delegation could

understand the attitude of members who felt that they could not support the ECA recommendation for political reasons or because of their traditional ties with Portugal and South Africa; those delegations could not be forced to cast their votes in favour of the ECA proposals, but they should not try to justify their opposition by artificial arguments. The Council had no right to ignore the opinion of ECA, which was obviously the body best informed on events in Africa. Moreover, it was the Council's bounden duty to take its own decision on the social problems involved.

5. The French representative at the 1269th and 1289th meetings had urged the Council not to take a hasty decision and to await the findings of the Security Council, which was dealing with the question. But the Economic and Social Council would be placed in an equivocal position if, for some reason, the expulsion of South Africa from the United Nations were vetoed by one of the permanent members of the Security Council. Such an outcome of the debates in that body would paralyse the Economic and Social Council, which had been considering the question for over a year. Moreover, the Economic and Social Council was not bound by the veto rule.

6. The most practical approach to the problem would be to decide, on the basis of the ECA proposals, to deprive Portugal and South Africa of membership of the Commission. Moreover, since paragraph 2 of ECA draft resolution II already proposed that the Council should decide to transmit the Commission's views and recommendation to the General Assembly, there seemed to be no need for a separate decision to the same effect, as proposed in the Ethiopian and Senegalese draft. Indeed, it was surprising that the African members of the Council were not defending vigorously the decision in which they had participated in their regional commission. The change in their attitude in the five months that had elapsed since the fifth session of ECA might be due to outside pressure or to a sudden reversal of convictions; his delegation would be grateful for an explanation of that change. In any case, there were no grounds whatsoever for giving that draft resolution, submitted by two African delegations, priority over the draft resolution adopted unanimously by all the African members of ECA.

7. Mr. DIOP (Senegal) said that what ECA really wanted was that its resolutions 42 (IV) and 44 (IV), adopted in 1962, should be transmitted to the General Assembly. Contrary to what the previous speaker had said, the reason underlying that request was not at all mysterious. It lay in the reluctance shown by the members of the Council in 1962 to give consideration to those two resolutions and in the apprehension of ECA lest the Council find some new way of evading a decision on them at the current session. The General Assembly was quite capable of dealing with the matter, on the principle that the greater included the less, and because the Assembly was entitled to concern itself with rights it had delegated to the Council, especially if the Council asked it to do so at the prompting of ECA.

8. If, however, the Council did not think it advisable to transmit the two resolutions to the General Assembly

and declared that it alone was competent to consider their substance, it should begin that consideration at once. To state, as some delegations did, that the Council must await the results of the Security Council's discussions simply meant deferring consideration yet again, for it was impossible to tell how long the Security Council would spend on the matter. Besides, the Security Council was to decide on the expulsion of the Republic of South Africa and Portugal from the United Nations. That was a political matter, whereas the Council was being asked to decide a matter of internal discipline, the exclusion from ECA of two of its members whose attendance interfered with the Commission's work. The ILO and the International Bureau of Education had taken a similar decision, and there was nothing to prevent the Council also from acting independently.

9. Mr. CHAKRAVARTY (India), clarifying his delegation's views on the issue, recalled that the Uruguayan representative had said at the 1289th meeting that his main reason for not being able to support the ECA draft resolution was that it constituted interference in the domestic affairs of two member States. But South Africa's plea of domestic jurisdiction in connexion with the problem of *apartheid* had been rejected by an overwhelming majority at least at sessions of the General Assembly over the past two or three years. The Assembly had rightly felt that the policy of racial segregation represented a threat to world peace, and that Article 2 (7) of the Charter could not be invoked in that case. Portugal's claims that its African territories were provinces of Portugal had also been rejected, and the General Assembly had declared those African possessions to be Non-Self-Governing Territories. In view of those unequivocal decisions by the General Assembly, it was not open for other organs of the United Nations to take the contrary view.

10. The French and Italian representatives, also at the 1289th meeting, urged the Council to postpone its decision on the matter until the decisions of the Security Council on the same subject were known. It should be borne in mind, however, that it was not yet known what action, if any, the Security Council would take. It might decide on sanctions, suspension or expulsion. Only in the latter two cases would action by the Economic and Social Council duplicate that of the Security Council; in any case, all three courses raised serious matters which fell exclusively within the competence of the Security Council. The Economic and Social Council was dealing with the much simpler question of depriving Portugal and South Africa of membership in a regional economic commission; that action need not be deferred because a more far-reaching problem was being considered by the Security Council.

11. The Argentine representative had implied that since the question had so many political implications, it should be dealt with by the Security Council or the General Assembly, and not by the Economic and Social Council. If so, the Ethiopian and Senegalese draft resolution should be acceptable to the Argentine delegation: a proposal that the whole matter be transmitted to the

General Assembly would save considerable embarrassment to delegations which doubted the Council's competence to consider the substance of the question. The Indian delegation had therefore nothing against giving priority to the Ethiopian and Senegalese draft resolution.

12. Mr. DUPRAZ (France), replying to the USSR representative, said that he did not see how a veto in the Security Council could paralyse the Economic and Social Council, and in any case it was not within his recollection that France had had occasion to exercise its right of veto. The French delegation's conduct would not vary even if the consensus in the Council was that the Council should not await the results of the Security Council's debates before deciding on the matter under consideration. To confuse competences was a way of complicating the issue: since the matter was a political one and was currently under consideration by a political organ of the United Nations, the French delegation thought that it would be premature for the Council to take a decision.

13. Mr. KLACK (Observer for the Central African Republic), speaking at the invitation of the President, said that the Government of the Central African Republic was as concerned as the rest of the members of ECA at the fact that the African continent had so few representatives in the Economic and Social Council. He was glad therefore that nine members of the Council had submitted a draft resolution (E/L.1008 and Add.1) by which African representation on the Council would be increased on an equitable geographical basis. Had the African countries been more equitably represented in the Council, the effect of reservations and abstentions which surprised all the African States, especially in connexion with ECA resolutions, which the Council should simply have endorsed, would not have been so deplorable. Rule 71 of the Council's rules of procedure provided that the Council should define the composition of its commissions; and it was simply on that question of the composition of a commission that ECA was asking the Council to take a decision, a decision which would modify the attitude it had assumed in 1962. The attempt to confuse the issue by certain delegations, which had raised artificial questions of competence and had even once more suggested that consideration of the subject should be deferred till the next session, had led the African countries to think that the Council wished to drop the matter, for political reasons. Having drawn their conclusions from the Council's attitude, the Ethiopian and Senegalese delegations had therefore submitted a draft resolution proposing that the two resolutions of ECA be transmitted to the General Assembly, in the hope that speedier action would be taken on them.

14. He hoped that the Council would adopt that draft resolution; but if it did not do so, and if there were to be a debate on the expulsion of Portugal and the suspension of South Africa's membership in ECA, he hoped the substance of the matter would really be dealt with and that attention would not be diverted to questions of competence or principle which required no further discussion.

15. Mr. BENAMAR (Observer for Algeria), speaking at the invitation of the President, said that the Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria placed special weight on the principles laid down in the United Nations Charter and believed that all problems should be dealt with in the various organs of the United Nations in the light of those principles. During the discussion of the agenda item, he had observed the vigour with which ECA had tackled the great problems encountered by the African countries in combating under-development. It was well known, too, that the Algerian Republic was fervent in desiring the total decolonization of the African continent, for that was, in its view, a prerequisite of the fulfilment of legitimate African social and economic aspirations.

16. If ECA was to work effectively and achieve its aims, the Council simply must give due weight to the ECA recommendation that the South African Republic and Portugal should be deprived of membership. It was obvious that the Economic and Social Council was alone competent to execute that recommendation, as was shown by rule 71 of its rules of procedure. The fact that South Africa had decided to refuse to participate in the work of ECA until further notice did not in any way affect the need to exclude that country from the Commission. Some delegations had used the Ethiopian and Senegalese draft resolution as an occasion for raising ill-timed questions of competence so as to delay the discussion; their attempts to secure in that way the deferment of a decision by the Council on the ECA recommendation were deplorable.

17. Mr. LEGGESE (Ethiopia) suggested, with reference to the question of the Council's competence, that critics of the joint draft resolution might examine its relationship with the ECA proposals more closely. The ECA draft resolution asked the Council to reconsider the decision it had taken at its resumed thirty-fourth session and to transmit the Commission's views and recommendations to the General Assembly; the joint draft pursued the same objectives, but suggested a slightly different procedure. If the first ECA recommendation were followed, the whole question of substance should be re-examined; but opinions as to the Council's competence to do so, and to take action, obviously varied. The sponsors of the joint draft considered that the Council was fully competent to take action, and had therefore prepared two further drafts (E/L.1019 and E/L.1020) repeating the content of the ECA resolutions, namely, the provisions to the effect that Portugal and South Africa, respectively, should be deprived of membership in ECA. Since the resumed thirty-fourth session of the Council, there had of course been new developments which might lead the Council to reconsider its decisions before deferring the matter to the General Assembly. Some members had cited in that connexion the communication received from South Africa; but that communication was contrary to the spirit of the many General Assembly resolutions condemning the policy of *apartheid*. The statement of the South African Government that South Africa had made a sincere attempt to co-operate with ECA was absolutely untrue; South Africa had utterly failed to co-operate with the United Nations itself, and still less had

it co-operated with the Organization's subsidiary bodies. Moreover, the reference to the hostile attitude of African States towards South Africa was a complete distortion of the facts; everyone was aware that the African States were only anxious that their brothers in South Africa should be given their rights. They were not hostile to South Africa, but to the policy and actions of the Government of that country, which were physically and morally degrading for the majority of the population. Accordingly, there could be no question that the South African communication provided a satisfactory solution of the problem.

18. Mr. ARANGO (Colombia) said that no useful purpose would be served by voting on a proposal to transmit the views and recommendations of ECA to the General Assembly. The Council must face its own responsibilities in the matter, and should not content itself with serving as a post office between ECA and the General Assembly. On the other hand, it was important to take the South African communication into account. The Colombian delegation could not accept the reasons given in that document for South Africa's withdrawal from the Commission, but since the Council had authority to establish subsidiary bodies and to determine their membership, it could decide that South Africa's withdrawal from ECA was an irreversible decision, constituting deprivation of membership.

19. Mr. LEGGESE (Ethiopia) said that the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights embodied the ideals and principles to which all Member States subscribed; and any government which violated or repudiated them automatically lost the language to communicate with the others and thus brought upon itself isolation from the peoples and nations of the world. South Africa had not only repudiated the Charter and the Declaration, but had also flagrantly violated other principles dear to twentieth century civilization and had thus forfeited the right to membership of the community of nations. The policy of *apartheid* had been condemned throughout the world by individuals, groups and governments as being contrary to the Charter and the Declaration. In its resolutions 616 B (VII), 917 (X) and 1248 (XIII), the General Assembly had declared that policies designed to perpetuate or increase discrimination were inconsistent with the Charter. In resolution 1663 (XVI), it had reaffirmed its condemnation of policies based on racial superiority as reprehensible and repugnant to human dignity, and totally inconsistent with South Africa's obligations as a Member State. At the Belgrade Conference of Heads of State or of Government of Non-aligned Countries in 1961, the leaders of the uncommitted nations had condemned the policy of *apartheid* and had urged South Africa to abandon it immediately. The 1963 Summit Conference of Independent African States had also unanimously decided to support the recommendations of the United Nations Special Committee on the Policies of Apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa and had appealed to all governments still maintaining diplomatic, consular or economic relations with that government to break them off and to cease any other form of encouragement for the policy.

20. Despite all those condemnations and appeals, the South African Government stubbornly continued its policy of *apartheid* and, by enacting the new General Law Amendment Act which increased government powers to bring about the arbitrary arrest, detention and exile of Africans, had clearly chosen to flout world public opinion. The South African Government had proudly announced a few days previously that the Pan-African Congress and the African National Congress had been smashed; and, according to newspaper reports, the police had made over 5,000 arrests since November 1962. Furthermore, the South African Government was rapidly expanding its military forces and arming European civilians to prevent the oppressed masses from demanding their basic rights.

21. The only way out of the situation seemed to be to take collective international action against South Africa. Such action by all Members of the United Nations had been urged by the Heads of the Independent African States, and it was to be hoped that those States would be joined by all Members, particularly those having strong political and economic ties with South Africa. One way of manifesting that support would be to vote for the draft resolution which the African members of the Council had submitted.

22. In connexion with the background of the question of membership of South Africa and Portugal in the Commission, in its resolutions 42 (IV) and 44 (IV) ECA had recommended the Council to deprive Portugal and South Africa, respectively, of membership in the Commission. While both recommendations had failed to obtain a majority in the Council, resolution 42 (IV) had been returned to ECA for reconsideration in the light of developments subsequent to the Commission's adoption of that resolution. The fifth session of ECA had had before it a report by the Executive Secretary on measures pursuant to resolution 42 (IV) and a report on the action taken by the Council on the recommendations of the Commission at its fourth session.

23. In accordance with the relevant paragraphs of resolution 42 (IV), the Executive Secretary had again approached the Powers responsible for Non-Self-Governing Territories in Africa with a view to the application of ECA resolution 24 (III). Replies had been received from the Governments of France and the United Kingdom; Belgium had meanwhile ceased to have territorial responsibilities in practice, and Spain had submitted a memorandum to the Council expressing its willingness to abide by the provisions of General Assembly resolution 1466 (XIV) and ECA resolutions 24 (III) and 42 (IV). South Africa and Portugal, on the other hand, had not seen fit to reply to the Executive Secretary's communication.

24. During the deliberations of the fifth session of ECA, African delegations had expressed indignation at the attitudes of South Africa and Portugal; and France, the United Kingdom and Spain had intimated their intention of not standing in the way of African members of the Commission on any issue supported by the majority on matters of interest to African countries. While that had been a welcome gesture, it was difficult to think of

any issue debated in the Commission that would not be of interest to African countries. The Commission had therefore expressed the hope that France and the United Kingdom would refrain from preventing the Council from reaching the desired solution. Rules were created to serve a useful purpose, but ideals and values should not be subservient to rules which were outdated and failed to take changing conditions into account.

25. The basic questions were whether the Council was able to take the action recommended by the Commission and whether the issue was political or directly within the Council's purview. Of course, if an issue were regarded as purely political, it could be referred to the organs which had been established to deal with such questions. But the terms of reference of ECA had been adopted by the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 671 A (XXV); and there was no doubt that the Council could amend them, for they had already been so amended at the Council's twenty-sixth session and revised in consequence of General Assembly resolution 1325 (XIII).

26. The reasons for requesting the Council to deprive South Africa and Portugal of membership of ECA were simple and clear. Portugal had on several occasions refused to apply the resolutions of the Assembly and the Commission concerning the representation of Non-Self-Governing Territories; its failure to reply to the Executive Secretary's communication under ECA resolution 24 (III) had been interpreted by the Commission as refusal of even associate membership; and Portugal maintained a policy of oppressing the inhabitants of Angola and Mozambique. The Commission had thus decided that Portugal's participation in its work would serve no useful purpose in the common struggle against poverty, disease and illiteracy in Africa. At a time when the United Nations was discussing the use of outer space, science and technology for the benefit of mankind and the details of the Development Decade, and when such institutions as the United Nations training and research institute and the African development bank were being established, Portugal, which was still maintaining that Angola and Mozambique were an integral part of its territory, had no place in such a dynamic institution as ECA.

27. The question of South Africa's membership presented a different problem. Although South Africa happened to be situated in the African continent, its government had persistently defied the very principles for which the Council and ECA had been established. The General Assembly, in resolution 1702 (XVI), had noted with deep regret that the South African Government had prevented the Committee on South-West Africa from entering its territory; it had noted with increasing disquiet the progressive deterioration of the situation in the said territory as a result of the ruthless intensification of the policy of *apartheid*; and it had expressed the deep emotional resentment of all African peoples at the rapid expansion of South Africa's military forces and at the fact that European soldiers and civilians were being armed for the purpose of oppressing the indigenous peoples.

28. It was encouraging to hear from time to time such news as that of the refusal of dockers at Sydney to load a cargo of rifles destined for South Africa, of anti-*apartheid*

funds being established and of statements of censure by President Kennedy. It was difficult to see, however, why the Council should not once more condemn the policy of *apartheid* as practised in South Africa. The African members of the Commission could not confine themselves to condemning the policy from a theoretical point of view. One of the arguments against the expulsion of South Africa from United Nations bodies was that such expulsion would serve no useful purpose. And yet the South African Government continued to destroy the fundamental freedoms of masses of people and to commit acts intended to destroy a whole national group, physically through legalized murder and mass imprisonment and morally by denying the African inhabitants their fundamental human rights. Those acts should be deplored and condemned, and those who deliberately committed them should be made to abide by the minimum international standards. That was why ECA had decided once more through resolution 68 (V) to reaffirm the position it had expressed in its resolution 42 (IV) and had again asked the Council to support its legitimate demands.

29. The two draft resolutions submitted by his delegation together with that of Senegal were almost identical in content with the resolutions which the Commission had adopted at its fourth session: their text was clear and simple, and they had the general support of the Commission's members.

30. Mr. DIOP (Senegal) felt that everything had been said on the subject of the policy of racial discrimination practised by the Republic of South Africa and the refusal of the Portuguese Government to carry out General Assembly resolution 1466 (XIV). It was obvious that the two countries were pursuing an ostrich-like policy and blindly persisting in their criminal errors by refusing to adapt themselves to the irreversible trend of history. Such an attitude represented a real danger to international peace and security, and it was the duty of the United Nations, as the guardian of world peace and security, to step in and compel the two countries to stop their criminal policy.

31. Mr. DUCCI (Italy) said he had listened with great interest to the introductory remarks by the representatives of Ethiopia and Senegal on the two new draft resolutions before the Council. The situation was a somewhat confused one, since the Council had before it four different draft resolutions on the same matter. Delegations had had time to obtain instructions from their governments regarding draft resolution II of ECA, but they had not had time even to read through the two new draft resolutions. He therefore wondered whether it might not be appropriate to defer discussion on them till the following day, so that delegations could study their provisions and to consult their governments on the subject.

32. Mr. WODAK (Austria) supported the Italian suggestion. After the original postponement, he had received his government's instructions and was in a position to discuss the ECA draft resolution; but in view of the new situation that had arisen as a result of the submission

of the two new draft resolutions, he needed time in which to obtain further instructions.

33. Mr. LEGGESE (Ethiopia) explained that the draft resolution relating to South Africa (E/L.1019) was worded in exactly the same terms as resolution 44 (IV) of ECA, with some additions to cover events at the fifth session of ECA. Similarly, the main provisions of the draft resolution relating to Portugal (E/L.1020) were the same as those of ECA resolution 42 (IV). He would accordingly appeal to the Council not to postpone its decision for too long. At the beginning of the current session, a moral assurance had been given that the Council would take action on both questions, and now suggestions were being made that it would be better to await the outcome of the Security Council's consideration of the matter. While he did not reject that idea out of hand, he would point out that there could be no assurance that the Security Council would have reached a decision within a few days.

34. Sir Ronald WALKER (Australia) remarked that, in view of what the previous speaker had said, it seemed unnecessary for him to press for the adoption of the Italian suggestion, which, in the circumstances, was a legitimate one. When the earlier understanding on postponement had been arrived at, the Council had had before it only the ECA draft resolution on which his delegation had since received instructions from the Australian Government. At the same time, he had been instructed to inform his government about any further draft resolutions on the same subject that might eventually be submitted.

35. The texts of the two new draft resolutions before the Council might, as had been claimed, be identical with those earlier ECA resolutions, but they obviously took no account of the communication received from the Government of South Africa or of other developments since the fourth session of ECA. In those circumstances, he would greatly appreciate having a few hours' time in which to obtain further instructions from his government, and he was glad that the co-sponsors were not objecting to a postponement till the following day.

36. Mr. ARKADIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) congratulated the delegations of Ethiopia and Senegal on the draft resolutions they had submitted, which plainly defined the position taken up by ECA and ruled out all misunderstandings and ambiguities. He had been greatly impressed also by the statements made on behalf of the Central African Republic and of Algeria, which represented the voice of truth, expressing the will of the African peoples on the issue.

37. Hardly, however, had all those statements been concluded than use was again being made of the old manoeuvre of asking for delay, on the pretext that a new situation had arisen making it necessary to seek further instructions from governments. No new situation had in fact been created. The present proposals merely confirmed the decision taken a year before by the African States to exclude South Africa and Portugal from membership of ECA. There were accordingly no valid grounds for further delay, and the request for postponement

was simply another attempt to gain time in the hope that the issue might somehow be shelved once again.

38. Mr. DUCCI (Italy) said he had due respect for the Council, and was sure that it would not take any decision without close consideration of all that was involved. The same applied to his government and to himself as its representative. He would be failing in his duty if he were to take a stand on draft resolutions, the terms of which he had not even read.

39. Further, according to rule 56 of the rules of procedure, texts should be circulated twenty-four hours before they were discussed and voted upon, unless the Council decided otherwise. He would expect that rule to be applied.

40. Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America) said he was somewhat surprised at the turn the discussion was taking. If he had understood the Ethiopian representative aright, he was agreeable, in simple courtesy to other members, not to press for immediate consideration of the two new draft resolutions. Although similar in content, the two draft resolutions were not identical with past resolutions of ECA in that they contained references to later developments. As no prior notice had been given of their submission, he was confident that the sponsors would agree to adequate time being given for consultation with governments; a two-day delay would be the most appropriate.

41. Mr. LEGGESE (Ethiopia) confirmed that the two co-sponsors were not pressing for immediate discussion of the two new draft resolutions since he was well aware of the relevant provisions of the rules of procedure. He was anxious, however, that the matter should be dealt with as early as possible on the following day. In the light of what had been said, he would be willing to leave the decision on that point to the discretion of the President.

42. Mr. MATSUI (Japan) said that before voting on the Italian representative's proposal to defer the discussion, it was necessary to determine the duration of the deferment.

43. Mr. DIOP (Senegal) said that, like the representative of Ethiopia, he was prepared to leave the question of the length of time for which the discussion should be deferred to the President's discretion, without the Council's having to resort to a vote.

44. Mr. JEV TIC (Yugoslavia) recalled the argument put forward at the 1289th meeting to the effect that the competence of the Council in the matter under consideration should be recognized, and that a decision should be taken on the relevant resolution submitted by ECA. In the same spirit, he would appeal to the Council to take up the two new draft resolutions immediately, setting aside considerations of formal rules of procedure.

45. In reply to a question by the PRESIDENT, Mr. DUCCI (Italy) said that, if the co-sponsors were opposed to the discussion's being deferred till the morning of the next day but one, he would not object to the two draft resolutions being discussed the following afternoon.

The important thing, however, was to achieve unanimity, and a deferment till the next day but one would give time in which to study the texts and obtain instructions from governments.

46. The PRESIDENT said that further discussion of ECA draft resolution II and of the three draft resolutions submitted by Ethiopia and Senegal would be deferred till the following day.

47. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft resolution IV in part IV of the ECA report and the draft resolution on enlargement of the Economic and Social Council (E/L.1008 and Add.1), submitted jointly by the delegations of Argentina, Austria, France, Italy, Japan, Senegal, the United Kingdom, the United States of America and Uruguay.

48. Mr. DIOP (Senegal), introducing the joint draft resolution, said that it called for an increase in the membership of the Council because its present composition no longer reflected realities, inasmuch as twenty-six new States had become Members of the Organization in the last three years. If the new Members of the United Nations were to be able to make their proper contribution to the Council, an increase in its membership was therefore indispensable. For that reason, on behalf of the sponsors his delegation urged the members of the Council to give the joint draft resolution a favourable reception.

49. Mr. DUCCI (Italy) said the ECA recommendation that adequate representation of Africa in the Council be ensured on the basis of equitable geographical distribution expressed a pressing and vital need and reflected the fully justified demand of African Member States to be accorded representation on the main United Nations bodies. But there was more involved than merely redressing an inequitable situation. The object must be to place the Council in a position effectively to perform the functions assigned to it under the Charter; and, to do that, representatives of all regions must take an adequate part in its work.

50. The imbalance between the membership of the General Assembly and that of the other principal United Nations bodies was only too patent. New sovereign and independent States with a powerful voice of their own had taken their place in international life by joining the United Nations. Thus, the peoples of entire regions had rightly been accorded the free and equal status of members in the community of nations, and the Council was called upon to enable them to contribute most effectively to the solution of international problems.

51. The need for corrective action was self-evident both from the standpoint of numerical proportion and from the closely related one of geographical distribution. There would be no advantage in aiming at a geographical distribution which would not in fact give all countries in turn the opportunity of membership; for that was the only way of securing the active interest and participation of all nations.

52. He was aware of the objections that had been voiced against change in the numerical composition of the Coun-

cil, but he still failed to see why such considerations should be applied to an essentially practical situation of relatively limited scope. The objections were of a political nature, and should not be allowed to prevail over technical considerations although positions of principle should not be prejudged. The primary consideration was the widespread interest of developing countries in programmes initiated by the Council, particularly within the framework of the Development Decade. Furthermore, even from a strictly legal standpoint, it might be argued that an enlargement of the Council could not be viewed as an important revision of the Charter, since such a step would in no way alter the Charter's scope and spirit.

53. The number of seats on the Council had been set originally on the basis of the technical conditions prevailing at the time. Subsequent developments would suggest that an increase in membership was fully in keeping with the objectives laid down by the Charter. Such an increase would represent rather an adaptation of the Charter to current realities than an amendment of it. Hence the cumbersome revision procedure provided for by Article 108 would not necessarily be applicable.

54. That point need not, however, be considered in depth by the Council, whose task was fairly simple and limited in scope: it was to make an objective appreciation of the situation and urge the General Assembly — the competent body — to review the matter and take the necessary steps to bring about an appropriate increase in the Council's membership. It was in that spirit that, together with the other co-sponsors, his delegation recommended for adoption the joint draft resolution.

55. Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America) associated his delegation with the remarks made by the representatives of Senegal and Italy. The joint draft resolution, which expressed a viewpoint that had been held by his government for a number of years past, was supplementary to ECA draft resolution IV, and was in no way intended as a substitute for it.

56. Mr. ARKADIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the position of the Soviet Union on the question of the enlargement of the Council's membership was well known. The Soviet Union had adopted a sympathetic attitude to, and was prepared to support, proposals designed to enlarge the representation of African States in Council organs, since such action would raise no procedural difficulties. Enlargement of the Council itself, however, would entail a revision of the Charter requiring ratification by all the permanent members of the Security Council. Such action was ruled out until such time as the People's Republic of China was granted its rightful place as a permanent member of the Security Council.

57. That was the situation, and it was well understood by the African States, which would not be duped by manoeuvres in the Council aimed at presenting the Soviet Union as a villain frustrating their legitimate desires. Operative paragraph I of the joint draft resolution was an expression of pious sentiment, but was totally divorced from reality.

58. As a means of meeting the African States' legitimate desires, there should be a redistribution of seats in the Council: one from the western States should be given to Africa, raising its number of seats to three. That would be an equitable solution not involving any revision of the Charter. In addition, the membership of the functional commissions would be enlarged, and the Soviet Union would support proposals to that effect.

59. Mr. JEVTIC (Yugoslavia) said that Yugoslavia had consistently supported all efforts to strengthen the independence of countries and territories in Africa and elsewhere, and his delegation would therefore support the two draft resolutions before the Council. The reasons underlying the need for enlargement of the Council were obvious. The membership of the United Nations had increased substantially and, in view of the increased significance of economic co-operation for development, the desire of the African countries to have an equitable geographical representation in the Council was fully understandable.

60. His understanding was that an increase in the Council's membership to at least thirty was envisaged.

61. Mr. TETTAMANTI (Argentina) said that while there was general agreement that the countries of Africa, which were new Members of the United Nations, should be more widely represented, opinions differed as to the method by which their representation was to be ensured. Some delegations thought that the best method was to increase the membership of the Council, whereas other delegations, including that of the Soviet Union, thought that the existing seats in the Council should be redistributed. His delegation, for its part, believed that it was not possible for the new States to enter the Council by means of a change in the existing distribution of seats, which was the result of the "gentlemen's agreement" of 1946. By its attitude, the delegation of the Soviet Union was setting the old and new Members of the United Nations against each other, thus creating an absolutely artificial situation which was prejudicial to the interests of all. The delegation of the Soviet Union stated that it was prepared to accept an increase in the membership of the functional commissions, but was opposed to an increase in the membership of the Council because, in its opinion, such a change would involve a revision of the Charter, which would require the approval of two-thirds of the Members of the General Assembly and ratification by the permanent Members of the Security Council, one of which — China — according to the USSR delegation, was not adequately represented. By clinging to that argument, the Soviet Union was preventing a fair settlement of the question, and was thus acting contrary to the interests of the African countries. The problem could be solved with a little flexibility, a little political wisdom. His delegation thought that neither the Latin American region nor any other region should give up its rightful place in the Council, to which the only method of admitting new members was to create new seats.

62. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan) said his delegation intended to support the joint draft resolution; in so doing it was passing no judgement on the political aspects of the prob-

lem, nor attempting to ascribe blame for previous lack of action. The Council was not a political organ, and it was to be hoped that the General Assembly would find the means of remedying the existing imbalance in the Council's membership.

63. Mr. ARKADIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that by opposing recognition of the legitimate rights of the People's Republic of China Argentina was impeding any revision of the Charter. It was for Argentina to show political wisdom and change its stand on that matter, if it were really desirous of enlarging the membership of the Council in favour of Africa.

64. He recalled that the Committee on arrangements for a conference for the purpose of reviewing the Charter had, at its recent session, set up a sub-committee to consult with all Member States and in particular with the permanent members of the Security Council. It would be interesting to know whether that sub-committee was going to consult the People's Republic of China or the Formosa clique. That was a side issue, however; the main point was that work was going on elsewhere in an attempt to tackle the issues concerning revision of the Charter. And no equitable or just solution would be found until the rights of the People's Republic of China were granted.

65. Mr. ARANGO (Colombia) said his delegation would vote for the joint draft resolution since its provisions met the technical requirements and the need for more equitable representation of the full United Nations membership in the Council. However, the legitimate participation of the African States must on no account be achieved to the detriment of other areas of the world; the ECA draft resolution implied an increase in membership.

66. The PRESIDENT said that he would put to the vote draft resolution IV in part IV of the ECA report and joint draft resolution E/L.1008 and Add.1.

67. Mr. UNWIN (United Kingdom) asked for a separate vote by paragraphs on ECA draft resolution IV.

68. Mr. ZAPOTOCKY (Czechoslovakia) asked whether paragraph 2 of draft resolution IV implied an increase in Council seats or a redistribution of the existing seats. Perhaps the representative of Ethiopia or of Senegal could give some explanation on the point, since his delegation's vote would depend on the answer.

69. Mr. WAKWAYA (Ethiopia) said that, so far as he had understood from the discussion in ECA, the choice of method to ensure adequate representation of Africa in the Council was left to the General Assembly; no particular course was advocated in the draft resolution.

70. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan) said the text was explicit on the point: the proposal was that the General Assembly should take "all measures" and the decision regarding the specific measures to be taken was left to the Assembly.

71. Mr. ARKADIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation could not participate in the

vote on the ECA draft resolution without an explanation of its purport from a representative of the Commission. The text of paragraph 2 was open to a number of interpretations. The USSR delegation wished to know whether the paragraph meant an equitable geographical redistribution of seats in the Council as then constituted, or whether the intention was to increase the membership of the Council. The Jordanian representative's statement did not clarify the situation.

72. Mr. PASTORI (Uruguay) associated himself with speakers who had said that they had no doubts as to the advisability of increasing the membership of the Council so to achieve equitable geographical distribution. Perhaps the misunderstandings which were causing anxiety to the USSR representative might be dispelled if paragraph 2 of the ECA draft resolution were deleted and if the words "on the basis of equitable geographical distribution" were added at the end of operative paragraph 2 of the joint draft resolution.

73. Mr. WAKWAYA (Ethiopia) thought that the words "all measures" in paragraph 2 of the ECA draft resolution made it quite clear that that was a general recommendation, whereas the joint draft resolution proposed more specific measures. He did not believe that the addition suggested by the Uruguayan representative would make it necessary to delete paragraph 2 of the ECA text.

74. Mr. ARKADIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) reiterated that he could not participate in a vote on the ECA draft resolution without an explanation of its meaning. If the text could be interpreted to mean that membership of the Council should be increased, he would vote against it; on the other hand, if it implied a redistribution of seats within the existing membership of the Council, he would willingly vote in favour of it.

75. The PRESIDENT observed that the decisions of ECA could be interpreted only by the Commission itself, and not even by the Executive Secretary. The next session of the Commission would not be held until February 1964; of course, any delegation was free to submit a resolution requesting a clarification from ECA, but meanwhile the Council must take a decision on the resolutions before it.

76. Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America) pointed out that the draft resolutions of ECA had been before the Council since the beginning of the session and that the Executive Secretary had been present for some weeks. The USSR representative could have asked for any explanations he wished to have at that time; in any case, that representative was fully aware of the procedural possibilities in the existing circumstances.

77. Mr. VIAUD (France) recalled that in March 1963 when ECA had voted on the text which had become resolution 81 (V) of the Commission, from which draft resolution IV before the Council had been derived, his delegation had expressed reservations with respect to paragraph 1, but had voted for paragraph 2, while stating that it interpreted the text as meaning that an increase

in the Council's membership was one means of satisfying the African States and increasing their representation in the Council. The USSR representative could thus be assured that the increase in the Council's membership was one of the means which had been envisaged in the Commission. If the texts adopted by ECA did not expressly state that one method rather than another should be used in order to satisfy the African States, neither did they exclude an increase in the Council's membership as being one of the methods which had undoubtedly been thought of by the Africans who had voted for ECA draft resolution IV in question.

78. Since an increase in the Council's of the membership was one of the possible solutions, his delegation had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution urging the General Assembly to take the necessary action to bring about an appropriate increase in the membership of the Council in order to satisfy a group of nearly forty countries which currently were only represented in it by two members.

79. Since, however, the USSR representative had suggested other solutions, he would recall that two years previously western Europe had given up one of its seats in the Council, the one occupied at present by Senegal. Moreover, of the various groups of countries represented in the Council, one, comprising eight or nine countries, was represented by two members; that was a large representation which would have to be taken into account in redistributing the present seats on the basis of the degree of representation of different groups of countries in the Council. That was not, however, the question which the Council was called upon to consider. What it had to do at that stage was to take a decision on the ECA draft resolution and on the joint draft resolution. With regard to the former, his delegation, while renewing its reservations with respect to paragraph 1 — and in that connexion he supported the request for a separate vote by paragraphs made by the representative of the United Kingdom — would vote for paragraph 2. With regard to the latter, it would vote for the draft, while expressing the hope that the General Assembly would take favourable action on it and that such action would meet with the approbation of the Security Council.

80. Mr. ARKADIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the French representative's statement merely confirmed his view that paragraph 2 of the ECA draft resolution was not clear. If the Commission had been fully aware whether or not an increase in the membership of the Council was meant, no explanation from the French delegation would have been needed.

81. With regard to the United States representative's remarks, he could see no real argument against asking ECA for a clarification of its resolution. It would be out of order to vote on a draft of which there were so many possible interpretations. His delegation, for one, could not participate in the vote.

82. Mr. UNWIN (United Kingdom) observed that certain delegations had been reproached for referring a resolution back to ECA at the resumed thirty-fourth session of

the Council, and were then being reproached for pressing for a vote on an ECA draft resolution. He would, however, have every sympathy with the USSR delegation if it refrained from voting on a text which it did not fully understand; and he agreed with the President that the only way out of that delegation's difficulty would be formally to propose to refer the resolution back to the sixth session of ECA.

83. Mr. ARKADIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked the United Kingdom representative to explain whether he understood the ECA resolution to mean that redistribution should be effected with or without increased membership of the Council.

84. Mr. UNWIN (United Kingdom) said that in his view the only explanation of paragraph 2 of the ECA resolution was that the membership of the Council should be increased.

85. Sir Ronald WALKER (Australia) considered that the suggestion to refer the text back to ECA was extraordinary and unnecessary. Paragraph 2 of the resolution expressed the desire of members of the Commission to obtain by all reasonable means a more adequate representation of African countries in the Council. The Australian delegation would vote for paragraph 2 on that basis. The term "all measures" did not mean "all measures except an increase in the membership of the Council"; the suggestion was a general one, and the only way of achieving equitable distribution was to enlarge the Council.

86. In conclusion, the Australian delegation would abstain from voting on paragraph 1 of the draft resolution, which seemed to ignore and even to reflect critically

upon the work of the Special Committee on the policies of *apartheid*.

87. Mr. TETTAMANTI (Argentina) said he could not follow the USSR representative's arguments. The ECA resolution IV was a recommendation to the Economic and Social Council, and its interpretation could be left to the Council. It was open to the USSR delegation to take all kinds of procedural measures, including proposing an amendment to the text.

88. The PRESIDENT put to the vote separately the two paragraphs of draft resolution IV in part IV of the ECA report.

Paragraph 1 was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

Paragraph 2 was adopted by 15 votes to none.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 15 votes to none.

89. The PRESIDENT put to the vote joint draft resolution E/L.1008 and Add.1.

The joint draft resolution was adopted by 15 votes to 2.

90. Mr. PASTORI (Uruguay) explained that he had abstained from voting on paragraph 1 of the ECA resolution because it was political in content and because the Council was not competent to deal with it. He had voted for paragraph 2 on the understanding that equitable geographical distribution would be achieved through an increase in membership of the Economic and Social Council.

The meeting rose at 7.15 p.m.