



**ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL**

**Thirty-sixth session**

OFFICIAL RECORDS

**Wednesday, 24 July 1963  
 at 3.10 p.m.**

PALAIS DES NATIONS, GENEVA

**CONTENTS**

Agenda item 12:

Reports of the regional economic commissions (*continued*) 227

*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 of the following Member States: Algeria, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Ghana, Greece, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, South Africa, United Arab Republic.

Observer for the following non-member State: Federal Republic of Germany.

Representatives of the following specialized agencies: International Labour Organisation, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, World Health Organization, Interim Commission for the International Trade 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.1016, E/L.1019, E/L.1020, E/L.1024, E/L.1025 and Rev.1) (*continued*)

1. Sir Ronald WALKER (Australia) said that his country in no way condoned the racial policies of South Africa. The Australian delegation to the seventeenth session of the General Assembly had made that quite clear when it had stated that the future of South Africa was inescapably multiracial, and that the only working basis for South African society was racial equality. In that connexion, he wished to correct a statement made at the 1290th meeting of the Council: the Press report that dockers at Sydney had refused to load arms destined for South Africa was inaccurate. Australia had shipped no arms to South Africa, and the report referred to the temporary hold-up, due to a misunderstanding, of a cargo destined for Tanganyika.

2. With regard to the action that the Council should take on the proposals before it, his delegation believed that broader considerations than the racial policies of South Africa should be taken into account; even if those policies were incompatible with the terms of reference of ECA, it did not automatically follow that South Africa should be deprived of membership of the Commission, for the best way of changing those policies was to remain in continuous contact with South Africa. Moreover, expulsion or suspension from ECA could be a precedent for expulsion or suspension of members of other United Nations bodies. In addition, South Africa was a sovereign State situated in the African continent and was listed in paragraph 5 of the terms of reference of ECA; it would be unwise of the Council to alter the geographical scope of the Commission. In principle, therefore, South Africa should be allowed to maintain its membership, even though it would not participate in the Commission's work for the time being.

3. On the other hand, the Australian delegation had been greatly impressed by the appeals of the African members of the Council, and of the observer for Algeria, to countries that could not agree in principle with the proposed suspension not to impose their votes to prevent something which was earnestly desired by ECA. The Australian delegation would therefore carefully consider the amendments which might enable it to refrain from casting a vote against the Ethiopian and Senegalese draft resolution (E/L.1019). In the first place, the United Kingdom amendment (E/L.1024) rightly drew attention to the decision of the Government of South Africa not to participate in the Commission's work as a significant recent development, and the amendment in no way implied approval of the reasons for that decision. Secondly, the second Argentine and United States amendment (E/L.1025), as amended by the Austrian delegation, should surely meet the wishes of the Commission. But the first amendment proposed in that document was not acceptable to Australia since it used words looking towards the provisions of the Charter which might lead to the expulsion of a State from Membership of the United Nations.

4. Mr. PASTORI (Uruguay) observed that the references that had been made to Article 68 of the Charter must have been made in error, for the provisions on the powers of the Economic and Social Council were contained in Articles 62 to 66, and Article 68 was the first article in the section on procedure. That article in no way gave the Council the right to take political decisions, and even less to impose sanctions of any kind. The argument that the Council must ensure the appropriate functioning

of its subsidiary bodies was sound, but that did not mean that it could take decisions which were contrary to its own competence.

5. The Uruguayan delegation maintained the view it had expressed at the thirty-fourth session of the Council that the Council was not competent to take a decision on such an issue. Moreover, the Council had taken contradictory decisions in the matter. For instance, at the 1278th meeting it had decided by a large majority that it was not competent to deal with the question of the Kurds raised by the USSR delegation on account of its political nature. And yet, a few days later, at the 1290th meeting, only two delegations had refrained from participating in the vote on ECA resolution IV, which was markedly political in character. In the case under consideration, the Council was no longer concerned with deciding whether the issue before it was political or not. It went further. And what was shocking and prejudicial to its prestige was that the draft resolutions submitted, in addition to their political nature and the contradictions they contained, constituted an injustice, because conduct, such as the application of the policy of *apartheid*, which would deserve — if the Council possessed the necessary competence — the imposition of strong sanctions, was attracting only a minor penalty, mere suspension, whereas for well-known reasons Portugal would be expelled. From that aspect, the two draft resolutions of Ethiopia and Senegal were more logical because they imposed the same sanctions on both countries.

6. Since the decision to be taken was of undoubted importance, it would be advisable forthwith to determine expressly whether or not the Council was authorized to take political decisions or to apply sanctions.

7. The PRESIDENT said that the Council would vote first on the Ethiopian and Senegalese draft resolution on the membership of the Republic of South Africa in ECA (E/L.1019) and the amendments thereto.

8. Mr. WAKWAYA (Ethiopia) asked for separate votes on the two amendments submitted jointly by Argentina and the United States.

9. Mr. ARKADIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that the Austrian sub-amendment accepted by the Argentine and United States delegations had not been circulated in writing. For instance, he had understood from the interpretation that the sub-amendment referred to "the Government of South Africa"; that term did not make it clear what country was meant.

10. Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America) said that, in order to avoid further confusion, the sponsors of the amendments would agree to use the words "the Government of the Republic of South Africa" instead of "the Government of South Africa" throughout their text.

11. Mr. ARKADIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) considered that the United States representative's suggestion was yet another instance of deliberate confusion of the Council's debates. No delegation which took

its responsibilities seriously could vote on a text which was being altered so frequently.

12. Furthermore, he would be interested to hear the Austrian delegation's interpretation of the term "constructive participation". The acts of the Government of the Republic of South Africa were noteworthy only by reason of their criminal aspects, and it seemed too much to expect that government to participate constructively in the work of ECA.

13. The PRESIDENT said that, pending the circulation of the revised amendment requested by the USSR representative, the Council could vote on the Ethiopian and Senegalese draft resolution on the membership of Portugal in ECA (E/L.1020).

14. Mr. MATSUI (Japan) asked for separate votes on operative paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of the joint draft resolution.

15. Mr. ARKADIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) remarked that the Council should be told the reason why the Ethiopian and Senegalese delegations wished Portugal to be deprived of membership of ECA.

16. Mr. WAKWAYA (Ethiopia) observed that the motivation of the joint draft resolution was clearly explained in the preamble and that both the draft resolutions had already been introduced.

17. Mr. DIOP (Senegal) said he would comply with the USSR representative's request, though he agreed with the Ethiopian representative that the authors of the joint draft resolution had given in the discussion a detailed statement of the grounds on which their proposal requested the exclusion of Portugal from ECA.

18. Very briefly, therefore, he would recall that the charge on which the request for Portugal's exclusion was based was that country's refusal to implement certain General Assembly resolutions, and in particular resolution 1514 (XV) on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. Whereas most of the great Powers with colonies, such as the United Kingdom and France, had carried out the provisions of that resolution in both Africa and Asia, Portugal, nurturing the out-dated illusion that its colonies were Portuguese provinces, persisted with determined obstinacy in its refusal to grant self-determination and independence to the peoples living under its tyranny and was resorting to acts of genocide to maintain its colonial empire. Such an attitude fully justified the request for exclusion made in draft resolution E/L.1020.

19. Mr. ARKADIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Senegalese representative's remarks had shown the Council why ECA wished to deprive Portugal of membership. The arguments in favour of that action were indeed serious; reports to the General Assembly had confirmed that the demands of the African members of ECA were based on facts. The Government of Portugal was conducting a policy of genocide against the African peoples of its territories and was keeping

them in a position of subservience by fire and sword. Since the original decision to deprive Portugal of membership, which the Council had seen fit to ignore, additional facts had come to light, and the position in Portugal's African territories was even deteriorating. Portugal had not only not abandoned its policy of genocide, but had flouted a number of decisions of the General Assembly by declaring that the colonies which it exploited and oppressed were an integral part of its own territory. That absurd claim could not be upheld by anyone. Accordingly, the only conclusion that could be drawn was that Portugal would persist in its criminal policies, irrespective of representations by ECA, one of whose principal tasks was to maintain the economic and political independence of African peoples until colonialism had been finally eradicated from the African continent. The Council should therefore give its full support to the Ethiopian and Senegalese draft resolution.

20. The PRESIDENT put to the vote operative paragraph 1 of the joint draft resolution (E/L.1020).

*At the request of the representative of Ethiopia, a vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Japan, having been drawn by lot the President, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Japan, Jordan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Senegal, Czechoslovakia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, Australia, Austria, United States of America, Ethiopia, India, Italy.

*Against:* None.

*Abstaining:* Uruguay, Argentina, Colombia, El Salvador, France.

*Operative paragraph 1 was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.*

21. The PRESIDENT put to the vote operative paragraph 2 of the joint draft resolution.

*At the request of the representative of Ethiopia, a vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Argentina, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Ethiopia, India, Jordan, Senegal, Czechoslovakia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia.

*Against:* None.

*Abstaining:* Argentina, Australia, Austria, Colombia, El Salvador, United States of America, France, Italy, Japan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay.

*Operative paragraph 2 was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.*

22. The PRESIDENT put to the vote operative paragraph 3 of the joint draft resolution.

*At the request of the representative of Ethiopia, a vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Australia, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Ethiopia, India, Jordan, Senegal, Czechoslovakia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia.

*Against:* None.

*Abstaining:* Australia, Austria, Colombia, El Salvador, United States of America, France, Italy, Japan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Argentina.

*Operative paragraph 3 was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.*

23. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the joint draft resolution as a whole.

*At the request of the representative of Ethiopia, a vote was taken by roll-call.*

*The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Senegal, Czechoslovakia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, Ethiopia, India, Jordan.

*Abstaining:* United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Colombia, El Salvador, United States of America, France, Italy, Japan, Uruguay.

*The joint draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.*

24. Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America) explained that his delegation had been unable to vote for the exclusion of Portugal from membership of ECA because it was opposed in principle to the expulsion of Member States on the grounds of their policies. His country's attitude to the principle of self-determination was well known, but it believed that expulsion was not the best way of dealing with the matter. In the opinion of the United States delegation, it would be proper for Portugal to be given the rank of associate member of ECA on the same basis as other European countries still having possessions in Africa. On the other hand, a vote against the draft resolution would have implied that Portugal should be a full member of the Commission. The United States delegation had therefore felt obliged to abstain from voting because the vote had not been taken on what the United States considered to be the proper issue.

25. Mr. TREU (Austria) said he had abstained from voting on the joint draft resolution because his government believed that all States in the African region should be given an opportunity to co-operate in the economic and social advancement of the continent. However, such co-operation could be achieved only if agreement were reached on certain fundamental issues, and in view of the attitude shown by Portugal, his delegation had been obliged to abstain from the vote.

26. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan) observed that, since the Council had just decided to confine membership of ECA to the States enumerated in paragraph 3 (i) of the joint draft resolution it had adopted, it would seem that both Portugal and South Africa had been deprived of member-

ship. He suggested that the meeting be suspended to consider the new situation that had arisen.

27. Mr. ARKADIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, since the Council had decided to deprive Portugal of membership of the ECA, there was no need for delegations to maintain their positions in respect of the membership of South Africa. The sponsors of all the amendments to the joint draft resolution on the membership of South Africa should consider withdrawing their proposals.

28. Mr. DUCCI (Italy) observed that his delegation to the fifteenth session of the General Assembly had voted in favour of the declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples; and, as a non-colonial power, it could not endorse the policies pursued by the Portuguese Government. He had abstained from voting on the draft resolution, however, in the belief that the Council was not competent to take political decisions. Through the adoption of the draft resolution, Portugal had been deprived of the opportunity of ranking as an associate member of ECA, and that, in his delegation's opinion, was a matter which only the General Assembly and the Security Council could decide.

29. He had been surprised at the Jordanian representative's statement: it was hardly in the tradition of United Nations procedure to act without motivation on such a matter as the inadvertent omission of the name of South Africa from paragraph 3 (i) of the joint draft resolution.

30. Mr. PASTORI (Uruguay) said he had abstained from voting on all the paragraphs of the draft resolution for the basic legal reasons he had explained at the 1292nd and 1293rd meetings.

31. Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America) said he had no objection to the suspension of the meeting requested by the Jordanian representative. He had, however, been surprised to hear that representative suggest that a change in paragraph 5 of the terms of reference of ECA might be interpreted as a final action by the Council in connexion with South Africa's membership of ECA. All the members of the Council had acted on the assumption that draft resolution E/L.1019 referred only to the membership of South Africa and that document E/L.1020 referred only to that of Portugal. Since South Africa was not mentioned by name in annex III to the ECA report, his delegation had assumed that the joint draft resolution on Portugal made no change in the terms of reference so far as South Africa was concerned.

*The meeting was suspended at 4.55 p.m. and resumed at 5.15 p.m.*

32. The PRESIDENT said he understood that a measure of agreement had been reached during the adjournment that would enable the Council speedily to dispose of the point raised by the representative of Jordan. The agreement was that the insertion of the name of the Republic of South Africa in paragraph 3 of the draft resolution adopted would be made dependent on the outcome of the vote on the joint draft resolution relating to South

Africa. He was most grateful for the breadth of vision shown by the delegations that had supported joint draft resolution E/L.1020.

33. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan) remarked that the many references in the discussion to legal interpretations of questions of competence, law and order and so on, had made the members of the Council most conscious of legal considerations. He had accordingly felt bound to ask for clarification on the legal point he had raised earlier. However, he realized that practical wisdom often prevailed over legal niceties and, accordingly, his delegation had no objection to the Council's continuing consideration of the joint draft resolution relating to South Africa.

34. Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America) said he too would like to express appreciation to the sponsors and supporters of the joint draft resolution adopted for agreeing to a procedure that was eminently fair and reasonable. He had been convinced throughout that there was no intention of taking advantage of what was in fact a misunderstanding. He greatly appreciated the honourable stand thus taken.

35. Mr. WAKWAYA (Ethiopia) explained that in the normal course of events the joint draft resolution relating to South Africa's membership of ECA would have been dealt with before the joint draft resolution relating to Portugal, since the two draft resolutions had been submitted in that order. In addition, having received assurances that the Council was prepared to deal with the South African issue in a way favourable to the ECA stand, the sponsors had felt justified in omitting mention of the Republic of South Africa in operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution on Portugal. It was accordingly not the fault of the sponsors that the existing situation had arisen. Their desire was to have a considered decision on the South African issue, even though they might have been justified in standing on the letter of the law, considering the many legal technicalities that had already been introduced into the discussion. With the object of avoiding embarrassment to Council members and in a spirit of co-operation, the Ethiopian and Senegalese delegations were agreed not to press the legal interpretation put forward by the representative of Jordan, pending the decision on the joint draft resolution on South Africa. His explanation, he thought, made it plain that there had been no intention of using tricky procedural manoeuvres, and charges to that effect should be withdrawn.

36. Mr. UNWIN (United Kingdom) welcomed the statements of Jordan and Ethiopia; their account of the way in which the situation had arisen corresponded exactly to the idea he himself entertained. He had noticed that the name of the Republic of South Africa did not appear in the text of the draft resolution just adopted, and since both joint draft resolutions in question had been introduced at the same time it was plain that it had been intended that they would be taken up in sequence, and had been assumed, in drafting the second, that the one on South Africa would be disposed of in a way favourable to the sponsors. He had also noted that the same omission occurred in the report of ECA for 1963 — as

in joint draft resolution E/L.1020 — doubtless owing to a clerical error, and he had further assumed that the same clerical error had unwittingly been repeated in the draft resolution. His delegation appreciated the statements made by the delegation of Ethiopia and Senegal, and thanked them for the stand they had taken.

37. Mr. ARKADIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that the Council would be acting rightly and hence avoid all misunderstanding if it confirmed the decision implicit in its vote on joint draft resolution E/L.1020. In other words, the Council should approve the draft resolution on South Africa as it stood, and the omission of South Africa's name from the list of members of ECA would then be justified.

38. There was, however, a second compelling reason why that action should be taken. Having decided that Portugal should be excluded from membership of ECA, the United Nations and the world at large would fail to understand if similar action was not taken against the Republic of South Africa, which had been condemned for similar crimes against humanity. It was to be hoped that the members of the Council would appraise the situation as it was and also approve the second joint draft resolution, without amendment.

39. The PRESIDENT said it should be made plain that the inclusion or non-inclusion of the Republic of South Africa in the list of members of ECA appearing in operative paragraph 3 of the joint draft resolution adopted would depend upon the Council's decision on the joint draft resolution relating to South Africa.

40. The revised text of the Argentina-United States amendment (E/L.1025/Rev.1) to that draft resolution had since been distributed in all working languages; the words "Government of the" in paragraph 2 had been included in error and should be deleted.

41. He declared closed the discussion on joint draft resolution R/L.1019. The Council would proceed to vote, first, on the United Kingdom amendment (E/L.1024) to the joint draft resolution, then on the revised Argentina-United States amendment and finally in the joint draft resolution itself.

42. Mr. WAKWAYA (Ethiopia) withdrew his request for a separate vote on the two paragraphs of the revised Argentine-United States amendment.

43. Sir Ronald WALKER (Australia) asked that the two paragraphs of the Argentine-United States amendment be put to the vote separately.

44. Mr. ARKADIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that, in deciding the order of voting, the President had apparently overlooked the request of the Ethiopian representative that priority be given to the draft resolution.

45. The PRESIDENT recalled that the Ethiopian request had been that the joint draft resolution should be given priority over ECA draft resolution II.

46. In accordance with rule 65 of the rules of procedure, amendments to a draft resolution must be voted upon first. A request had been made that the votes should be by roll-call.

47. The PRESIDENT put to the vote on the United Kingdom amendment.

*A vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Colombia, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Colombia, El Salvador, United States of America, France, Italy, Japan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Argentina, Australia, Austria.

*Against:* Ethiopia, India, Jordan, Senegal, Czechoslovakia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia.

*Abstaining:* Uruguay.

*The United Kingdom amendment was adopted by 10 votes to 7, with 1 abstention.*

48. The PRESIDENT put to the vote paragraph 1 of the revised Argentine-United States amendment.

*A vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Jordan, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Argentina, Austria, Colombia, United States of America, Italy, Japan.

*Against:* Senegal, Czechoslovakia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, Ethiopia.

*Abstaining:* Jordan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Australia, El Salvador, France, India.

*Paragraph 1 of the revised Argentina-United States amendment was adopted by 6 votes to 5, with 7 abstentions.*

49. The PRESIDENT put to the vote paragraph 2 of the Argentine-United States revised amendment.

*A vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Australia, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Australia, Austria, Colombia, Italy, United States of America, Japan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Argentina.

*Against:* Ethiopia, India, Jordan, Senegal, Czechoslovakia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia.

*Abstaining:* El Salvador, France, Uruguay.

*Paragraph 2 of the revised Argentina-United States amendment was adopted by 8 votes to 7, with 3 abstentions.*

50. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the Ethiopian-Senegalese draft resolution, as amended.

*A vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Argentina, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Argentina, Austria, Colombia, United States of America, Italy, Japan.

*Against:* Ethiopia, Jordan, Senegal, Czechoslovakia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia.

*Abstaining:* Australia, El Salvador, France, India, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay.

*There having been 6 votes in favour, 6 votes against and 6 abstentions, the draft resolution, as amended, was not adopted.*

51. The PRESIDENT said that the Council should next vote on draft resolution II in part IV of the ECA report (E/3727/Rev.1).

52. Mr. UNWIN (United Kingdom) asked that the two paragraphs of the draft resolution be put to the vote separately.

53. Mr. WAKWAYA (Ethiopia) said he found himself at a loss to understand the significance of the last vote taken, in view of the previous stand of the majority of members that the Council was competent to deal with the substance of the South African issue, and their assurances that they were ready to do so at the current session. If the vote simply reflected original intentions, it would have been quicker for the Council to proceed immediately with the consideration of ECA draft resolution II. In the minds of the members of ECA, there had never been any doubt of the Council's competence in the matter. Since it would seem that their confidence in the assurances given had been misplaced, the Ethiopian and the Senegal delegations would appear to be open to the charge of compromising the stand taken by ECA. Before proceeding further, therefore, he would like to have the legal position clarified.

54. Mr. ARKADIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) felt that the Ethiopian representative should rather be gratified by the turn of events, since the amendments to the joint draft resolution had completely nullified its original purpose. The final vote was tantamount in effect to a rejection of those amendments by the Council as a whole. It was to be hoped that, in rejecting the wrong solution, the Council was in fact taking a stand in favour of the right solution represented by the recommendations of ECA in draft resolution II. The way had been cleared for an unequivocal approval of that draft resolution, which should afford the Ethiopian representative some consolation.

55. In conformity with the consistent Soviet stand, he had voted against the amendments and against the amended draft resolution. His delegation would vote for both paragraphs of draft resolution II, and he would point out that, whatever decision the Council took, the matter would undoubtedly be raised in the General Assembly.

56. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan) said that, since the Council had been unable to arrive at a decision on the South African issue, the only course remaining open would be to refer the matter to the General Assembly for adequate consideration and appropriate action, through the adoption of draft resolution II. Under Article 60 of the Charter, the Council was perfectly entitled to take that course. He accordingly hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted without further complications.

57. Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America) thought there was another alternative open to the Council, and one which his delegation would advocate. The joint draft resolution relating to South Africa had been defeated by a tie vote. It was clear, however, that at least thirteen members of the Council — the six that had voted for the draft resolution and the seven that had spoken in favour of the unamended version — were in favour of some action being taken in the matter at the current session. Undoubtedly it was desirable and equitable that the Council should arrive at a conclusion at that session, and the fact that its first effort had not been successful was by no means extraordinary: the same thing happened in other deliberative bodies.

58. His delegation had taken part in consultations on various wordings and at one time had been hopeful that the sponsors would be able to accept the proposed amendments, which would have enabled an equitable decision to be reached. There was therefore no need to give up hope, and he would propose that discussion of the item be adjourned to give time for further consideration of the substance of the various proposals and for additional informal consultations designed to achieve an agreed text. It would be a pity if a difference of opinion on the kind of action to be taken should be allowed to paralyse the Council. The United States was still opposed to referring the matter to the General Assembly, and he was sure that a decision in consonance with the Council's responsibility could be arrived at in the time remaining.

59. The PRESIDENT said that the United States proposal came under rule 50 of the rules of procedure, which required him to allow one member to speak in its favour and one member against, after which it would have to be put to the vote immediately.

60. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan) endorsed the proposal, because his delegation was in favour of any move that might lead to fruitful results. It would be glad to make one further attempt to find a formula acceptable to the majority of the Council members.

61. Mr. ARKADIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking on a point of order, contested the President's ruling on procedure. The Council was engaged in voting on the draft resolutions before it and, according to rule 63 of the rules of procedure, the voting could not be interrupted for the submission of further proposals. He accordingly asked that the United States proposal be ruled out of order and that the Council proceed immediately to a vote on ECA draft resolution II.

62. The PRESIDENT recalled that, in deciding that priority be given to the joint draft resolution on South Africa, it had been clearly established that once that resolution was disposed of the Council would proceed to consideration of ECA draft resolution II. He had at no time, however, announced the closure of the discussion on draft resolution II. Rule 63 of the rules of procedure was therefore not applicable.

63. Mr. ARKADIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking on a point of order, once again contested

the President's ruling and pointed out that, as the Council had already taken a decision concerning one part of the subject matter of draft resolution II — namely, the membership of Portugal — there could be no question of the discussion's not having been completed. The procedure suggested by the President would be tantamount to re-opening the discussion of a matter that was already settled, since, to be consistent, the discussion would also have to bear on the question of Portugal's membership. He accordingly insisted that rule 63 of the rules of procedure be applied.

64. The PRESIDENT said it was not his duty to rule on the usefulness of continuing a discussion. Since the discussion on draft resolution II had not been closed, he had no alternative but to accord the right to speak on that draft resolution to any members wishing to do so.

65. Noting that no member wished to speak against the United States proposal that consideration of ECA draft resolution II be deferred until a later meeting of the session, he invited the Council to vote on it.

*The United States proposal was approved by 12 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions.*

66. Mr. CHAKRAVARTY (India), speaking in explanation of his vote on the joint draft resolution said he had abstained from voting on its amended form because he would have liked it to remain in its original form. He had therefore opposed the amendments, but they had been adopted, with the result that the original resolution was very much distorted. That had placed him in a dilemma: having opposed the amendments, he could not vote for the amended resolution; but to vote against it might have given the impression that he was opposed to preventing the Republic of South Africa from participating in ECA.

67. Mr. PASTORI (Uruguay) said that, whereas he had abstained in all the previous votes, he had voted in favour of the United States motion for postponement in the hope that the additional time would enable members to agree about the questions of legal competence whose importance he had stressed during the discussion at the 1293rd meeting.

68. Mr. UNWIN (United Kingdom), explaining his vote on the two draft resolutions, said that his govern-

ment's position on the points of principle raised by the ECA recommendations regarding Portugal and South Africa had been made clear in several previous statements in the Council and in ECA at Leopoldville.

69. The United Kingdom delegation had abstained from voting on the joint draft resolution because it considered that any such resolution was out of place, since South Africa had announced that it would no longer take part in the Commission's work.

70. It had been unable to support the draft resolution relating to Portugal because it did not think that that was the correct method of expressing disapproval of Portuguese colonial policy. His delegation had been unable, on the other hand to vote against Portugal's expulsion, for that would have been tantamount to supporting that country's continued full membership. The right course for Portugal would be to apply for associate membership of ECA, both for itself and its dependent territories in Africa, as other metropolitan Powers — including the United Kingdom — had done.

71. Mr. ARKADIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said his delegation had voted in favour of both the resolutions sponsored by Ethiopia and Senegal, and it also supported ECA draft resolution II.

72. He considered that the attempt which had been made to shy away from a decision, instead of proceeding with the voting, constituted a violation of the rules of procedure in the hope of finding a loop-hole and gaining time. It was regrettable that the President had ignored rule 63, and had acted under rule 50, which did not properly apply to the case.

73. If he were in the place of the Ethiopian and Senegalese representatives, he would insist on an immediate vote on that part of the ECA recommendation which remained to be voted on. He hoped that Ethiopia and Senegal and the other African countries represented by observers would succeed in mustering support for the ECA proposal, and secure the rejection of any amendments or changes. That was the only course which would serve the interests of the African States; and in pursuing that course they could rely on his delegation's full support.

The meeting rose at 6.40 p.m.