



ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Thursday, 19 December 1968,
at 3.40 p.m.

**Resumed Forty-fifth Session
OFFICIAL RECORDS**

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
<i>Agenda item 12:</i>	
<i>Basic programme of work of the Council in 1969 and consideration of the provisional agenda for the forty-sixth session (concluded)</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Agenda item 16:</i>	
<i>Implementation of General Assembly resolution 2411 (XXIII) on an international development strategy</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Agenda item 10:</i>	
<i>Elections (concluded)</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>Agenda item 13:</i>	
<i>Replacement of officers of the Council</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>Closing of the session</i>	<i>8</i>

*President: Mr. Manuel PÉREZ GUERRERO
(Venezuela).*

AGENDA ITEM 12

Basic programme of work of the Council in 1969 and consideration of the provisional agenda for the forty-sixth session (concluded) (E/L.1241 and Add.1 and 2, E/L.1243 and Corr.1 and 2 and Add.1)

1. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to resume its consideration of document E/L.1243.

PART II.

SECTION (K)

The action recommended in section (k) was approved.

SECTION (L)

2. Mr. ZAKHAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that the role of the co-operative movement in economic development had been considered by the Second Committee in connexion with the second United Nations Development Decade. If the Council was to discuss the question of the second Development Decade at its forty-seventh session, it would also have to take up the question of the co-operative movement at that session.

3. Mr. KASSUM (Secretary of the Council) said that the Secretariat, when making the recommendation in section (l), had had in mind the fact that the Council's programme of work at its forty-seventh session would be a very heavy one. The question of the co-operative movement in economic development would no doubt be taken into account by the enlarged Economic Committee when it came to consider the question of the second Development Decade.

The action recommended in section (l) was approved.

SECTIONS (M) AND (N)

The action recommended in sections (m) and (n) was approved.

SECTION (O)

4. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that the problems of human environment should not be dealt with at a resumed session. In his opinion, the question should be considered at the summer session.

5. The PRESIDENT said he did not think that the time had come to take decisions on the time-table. That question would be left in abeyance to allow consultations among delegations.

The action recommended in section (o) was approved.

SECTIONS (P) TO (V)

The action recommended in sections (p) to (v) was approved.

6. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider document E/L.1243/Add.1.

SECTION (W)

7. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) pointed out that paragraph 2 of the resolution quoted in the document did not conform to the text adopted by the Third Committee.

8. The PRESIDENT said that the Secretariat would have the error corrected.

The action recommended in section (w) was approved.

SECTIONS (X) AND (Y)

The action recommended in sections (x) and (y) was approved.

9. The PRESIDENT said that the Council would take those recommendations into account in drawing up its programme of work.

10. Mr. UY (Philippines) drew attention to the two corrigenda to document E/L.1243 and asked what decision the Council was required to take on them.

11. The PRESIDENT recalled that the Council had decided to deal with the point raised in document E/L.1243/Corr.1 when it considered the new item entitled "Implementation of General Assembly resolution 2411 (XXIII) on an international development strategy" which it had, at its previous meeting, decided to add to the agenda for the current session, when it approved the action recommended in section (j) of document E/L.1243.

12. Mr. KASSUM (Secretary of the Council) pointed out that the Council was not required to make any decision on document E/L.1243/Corr.2, which was

merely a list of resolutions brought to its attention for its information.

13. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) said that the heading "Other resolutions or decisions adopted as recommended for adoption by the General Assembly brought to the attention of the Council" in document E/L.1243/Corr.2 was misleading. Some of the documents listed were neither resolutions nor decisions. They included draft resolutions which had been withdrawn before adoption, as in the case of the draft resolution submitted to the Second Committee on "One day of war for peace".^{1/}

14. Mr. KASSUM (Secretary of the Council) pointed out that in the case mentioned by the representative of the United Kingdom, the General Assembly had taken a decision: it had adopted resolution 2418 (XXIII) in which it postponed the consideration of the item to the twenty-fourth session.

15. The PRESIDENT drew the attention of the Council to document E/L.1241/Add.1 on the work of the Council in 1969 and invited suggestions from members.

16. Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT (United States of America) said he believed that the question of the application of science and technology to development should be dealt with at the spring session, since the agenda for the summer session was extremely heavy. The problems of human environment, which came within the context of science and technology, might however be discussed during the general debate at the summer session.

17. The PRESIDENT pointed out that the Council had not yet decided at which session the question of science and technology would be considered. The Secretary-General was to undertake some further consultations on the subject. It was true, however, that the summer session would no doubt be dominated by the preparations for the second Development Decade.

18. Mr. BRADLEY (Argentina) observed that the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development would find it rather difficult to prepare a comprehensive report on the problems of human environment for the summer session. It seemed, however, that it would be able to prepare a progress report which the Council could consider at its summer session in connexion with the question of science and technology, completing its consideration of the subject at its resumed forty-seventh session.

19. Mr. DUBEY (India) stated that after the discussions on the human environment and the action taken on the subject at the twenty-third session of the General Assembly (see resolution 2398 (XXIII)), it was not necessary to have another general debate on it at the forty-seventh session of the Economic and Social Council. The next step in the consideration of the subject was to examine the specific proposals to be suggested by the preparatory committee for the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment.

20. As regards the Secretary-General's suggestion that the general debate at the forty-seventh session

should cover various aspects of science and technology, his delegation felt that it would be necessary to take decisions during the next few months on a number of important issues on that subject. The Trade and Development Board at its seventh session had adopted a resolution suggesting the establishment of an intergovernmental committee on the transfer of technology^{2/} and the Council was required to express its views on it. Recently, the Council had become aware of and initiated studies on a number of problems relating to science and technology. It was time for the Council to consider whether all those activities could be carried on within the framework of the present institutional machinery. In that connexion, the role of the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development had also to be considered, as the Committee's terms of reference would expire in a few months' time. In the context of all that, it might be useful to cover the subject of science and technology in the general debate at the forty-seventh session, as suggested by the Secretary-General.

21. Mr. KASSUM (Secretary of the Council) said he thought that the Council might defer its decision until the forty-sixth session. That was a practice it had often followed in the past.

22. Mr. DE SEYNES (Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs) said that the Secretariat was always in a difficult position when it had to select the important topics to be considered in depth at one of the Council's sessions. In the case under discussion, the Council would perhaps have no objection to deferring its decision until the spring session. With regard to the question of science and technology, however, the Secretariat was bound by a decision of the Council that it should prepare for the forty-sixth session a report on institutional arrangements to strengthen the activities of the specialized agencies and other organs of the United Nations system with a view to meeting the continually increasing demands resulting from scientific and technological progress and creating an awareness of all the problems involved. The Secretariat had accordingly thought it proper to suggest that that report should be considered as part of a substantive debate, which was always wider in scope than a purely institutional discussion.

23. Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT (United States of America) said he was not insisting that the question of science and technology should be included in the agenda for the forty-sixth session. An item of such magnitude should not, however, be included in the agenda for the summer session, which was already very heavy. In that connexion, he agreed with the representative of India that it might be premature to discuss the problems of human environment in the general debate.

24. Mr. DUBEY (India) said he thought that the Council was unanimously agreed that the general debate should be mainly devoted to preparations for the second United Nations Development Decade. The next question was whether any other item should also be included in the general debate. The Secre-

^{1/} See Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-third Session, Annexes, agenda item 92, document A/7393, para. 3.

^{2/} See Official Records of the Trade and Development Board, Seventh Session, Supplement No. 1, resolution 48 (VII).

tary-General had suggested the inclusion of the question of science and technology. Both his delegation and the Under-Secretary-General had given arguments in favour of that suggestion. If it was felt that that important and vast topic could be covered in its entirety and the necessary decisions taken at the forty-sixth session, it would obviously not be necessary to resume consideration of it at the forty-seventh session. However, the Council would be in the best position to take a decision on that matter only at the forty-sixth session.

25. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) felt that, if the Council decided not to include the question of science and technology in the agenda for its forty-seventh session, it should not automatically include another item.

26. The PRESIDENT said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Council decided to consider in depth at its forty-seventh session the question of preparations for the second United Nations Development Decade. The Council would decide at its forty-sixth session whether to include another topic for detailed consideration.

It was so decided.

27. Mr. KASSUM (Secretary of the Council) drew the Council's attention to document E/L.1241/Add.2. Part I of that document required no decision by the Council. With regard to part II, he pointed out that, in its resolution 1147 (XLI), the Council had decided that the elections to each of its functional commissions should be held according to a geographical pattern set out in the resolution. Accordingly, the Secretary-General thought that the Council might wish to consider whether, in the light of the new procedure for election to the commissions, the operative paragraph of section V of its resolution 557 C (XVIII) should be amended deleting the words quoted in document E/L.1241/Add.2, paragraph 8.

28. Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT (United States of America) agreed to the proposed amendment. That should not mean, however, that when a Member State was elected to a functional commission it need no longer submit to the Secretary-General the curriculum vitae of its representatives.

29. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should decide to agree to the amendment suggested by the Secretary-General, bearing in mind the interpretation given by the representative of the United States.

It was so decided.

30. Mr. ÅSTRÖM (Sweden) pointed out that the conclusion of the Council's work for 1968 also marked the end of Sweden's participation for several years. His delegation wished to express its satisfaction at having been able to take part in the Committee's work during the past three years. On the occasion, it would like to make some remarks on the work of the Council.

31. The Economic and Social Council was the organ responsible—in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and under the general authority of the General Assembly—for the economic and social activities of the United Nations in their entirety. In that capacity the Council exercised three main functions:

it acted as the governing board, as it were, of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs, it was a forum for high-level discussion of international economic and social policy, and, finally, it acted as the principal co-ordinator, at the intergovernmental level, of all United Nations activities in the economic and social fields. However, the very word "co-ordination" was too passive. The Council should also play a creative and stimulating role. It was that third aspect of the Council's activities which was the most important. He recalled that, when Sweden had become a member of the Council in 1966, it had expressed some ideas concerning the role and functions of the Council. Now, as then, there was a real need for an instrument to appraise the activities of the various international agencies in relation to each other and to give political guidance on a long-term basis. The Council could and should become that instrument.

32. In the context of a global strategy for development, he wondered what could be done to enable the Council to play its role properly. The answer to that question was partly technical, partly political. Perhaps greater flexibility was needed in the Council's programme of work. It might also be better to have shorter and more frequent sessions. There might be no ready-made answers to those questions, but efforts should be made to improve the programme of work. Moreover, the Council devoted too much time and effort to extremely technical questions and administrative details. The level of the debates should be raised. If that was to be done, the agenda of the Council for future years must be examined in detail. As the representative of Canada had proposed in connexion with a report of the Second Committee, it was necessary to have enough faith in the representational character of the Council, which should be able to submit its proposals direct to the Assembly, without having to pass through intermediate organs. It might well be that by introducing some new thinking and adopting some new arrangements in respect of the problems referred to, the Council might become technically better equipped to tackle its central tasks and to raise its general authority.

33. The interest aroused by the Council's activities and the respect for, even the knowledge of its decisions, were not always what they should be. The emphasis should be on the quality of its activities. Special efforts were needed, at the national and regional levels, to ensure greater interest in and respect for the Council's activities. Member States belonging to a regional group should keep the other members of the group currently informed of its activities. It might even be desirable to invite those other States to send observers. Generally speaking, the aim should be to broaden both the basis and the impact of the Council's work so that all Member States of the United Nations felt that they had a stake, as indeed they had, in the proper working of the Council and in the successful pursuit of its central aims. The group consisting of the five Nordic countries had a long-standing tradition of very close consultation on all matters belonging to the field of activities of the Council.

34. As for the composition of the Council, the membership had been increased a few years previously

from eighteen to twenty-seven. He wondered whether that improvement was sufficient. Since 1945 when the United Nations came into being, the number of Members of the General Assembly had risen from fifty-one to one hundred and twenty-six. Too many States still remained outside the deliberations of the Council. It should not be impossible to work out an arrangement whereby additional members could be associated with the work of the Council. If that were achieved, he believed that not only would a larger proportion of the membership of the United Nations become intimately involved in the work of the Council, but those Member States still outside the Council would also feel themselves more closely identified with the Council's actions and decisions. It might be assumed that their specific interests would stand a better chance of being taken into account if the various issues were dealt with within such a broader framework. It might also be hoped that the general authority of the Council would be enhanced. The Trade and Development Board of UNCTAD—a body of fifty-five—was for example looked upon as highly representative for the various aims and interests of the UNCTAD members in their entirety.

35. With regard to the Council's central role of co-ordination, it was essential that the Council should enjoy the confidence and support and benefit from the efforts of the specialized agencies, and co-operation between the Council, the Secretary-General and the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination must be expanded. The Secretary-General and the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination must continue to make suggestions and proposals to the Council. The Secretary-General should also play a greater part in that Committee. It seemed also desirable that the Council should reconsider the manner in which it examined the annual reports of the specialized agencies in order to ensure that those reports received the constructive scrutiny they deserved and that problems of co-ordination could be brought into the open.

36. The PRESIDENT thanked the representative of Sweden and said he hoped that an overhaul of methods would lead to an improvement in the Council's working practices. In accordance with rules 9 and 11 of the rules of procedure, the Council had completed its consideration of the provisional agenda for its next session. With regard to the organization of work and the establishment of dates for opening debate on the various items to be considered at that session, he suggested that, in accordance with the normal practice, the Secretariat should be entrusted with the preparation of the necessary documents after consultation with delegations.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 16

Implementation of General Assembly resolution 2411 (XXIII) on an international development strategy

37. The PRESIDENT drew the Council's attention to General Assembly resolution 2411 (XXIII) which provided for the addition of twenty-seven members to the Economic Committee of the Council.

38. Mr. DUBEY (India) asked whether the Council was to take an immediate decision on that matter. It did

not seem possible to do so until the twenty-seven candidates were known.

39. Mr. KASSUM (Secretary of the Council) said that the resolution requested the Council to enlarge its Economic Committee but did not ask it to decide on the membership. Once the Council had taken the decision to enlarge the Committee, it would be for the President of the General Assembly to designate the additional members.

40. Mr. VIAUD (France) felt that a decision of principle to increase the membership of the Committee from twenty-seven to fifty-four could be taken immediately. However, once the twenty-seven additional members had been designated by the President of the General Assembly, the Council should endorse the designation.

41. Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT (United States of America) agreed with the representative of France that the Council could take an immediate decision of principle to increase the membership of the Committee. However, he did not believe that there was any need for additional action during the following week.

42. The PRESIDENT felt that a further meeting could be avoided.

43. Mr. ZAKHAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked what form such a decision would take—in other words, whether Council would endorse a resolution of the General Assembly or would itself adopt a resolution.

44. Mr. BRADLEY (Argentina) said that, in fact, the Council had to take a very simple decision, namely, to enlarge the Committee and increase its membership to fifty-four.

45. The PRESIDENT said that, in his view, what was required was a resolution of the Council, and he invited delegations to take a unanimous decision.

46. Mr. ZAKHAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he wished to recall the position of the USSR on the decision. His delegation could not support it. His delegation believed that the proposed formula for enlarging the Economic Committee discriminated against the socialist countries, particularly the German Democratic Republic, and opened the way for the neo-colonialist and *revanchiste* régime of West Germany. If the Council took that decision in accordance with the text of the General Assembly resolution and if, as a result, the Federal Republic of Germany became a member of the Committee, the USSR would reconsider the question of its participation in that body.

47. Mr. UY (Philippines) said that he had no difficulty in supporting the decision, whether it involved the endorsement of the General Assembly's resolution or the adoption of a resolution by the Council. There was actually no discrimination in the decision, which would merely increase the base of the Committee by enabling members of specialized agencies to participate in it in order to prepare for the second Development Decade better.

48. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should adopt the following draft resolution:

"The Economic and Social Council,

"In accordance with the provisions of paragraph 1 of General Assembly resolution 2411 (XXIII) of 17 December 1968 on an international development strategy,

"Decides to enlarge its Economic Committee by twenty-seven members."

49. Mr. DUBEY (India), supported by Mr. VIAUD (France), proposed that paragraph 2 of the General Assembly resolution should be mentioned in the text, and that the words "for the purpose of establishing the Preparatory Committee for the Second United Nations Development Decade" should be added at the end of the draft resolution.

50. Mr. MUZIK (Czechoslovakia) said that his delegation could not agree to that text, because the decision taken by the General Assembly violated the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and caused greater discrimination by improving the position of only some non-member States.

51. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the text, with the amendments proposed by the representative of India.

52. Mr. ABE (Japan), supported by Mr. DUBEY (India), asked whether, in the event that the draft resolution was adopted, Council resolution 1356 (XLV) should be regarded as having ceased to have effect.

53. The PRESIDENT replied that in that event only paragraph 8 of the resolution would cease to apply.

54. Mr. BRADLEY (Argentina) said that, once the Committee's terms of reference had been broadened, the earlier resolution was automatically affected, and it should be clearly stated that it was superseded.

55. Mr. DUBEY (India) said that, in the nature of things, every new resolution improved upon the ones before. However, that did not necessitate specific mention that any resolution superseded earlier ones.

56. Mr. KASSUM (Secretary of the Council) said that, following consultation with the Legal Counsel, it seemed that only paragraph 8 of resolution 1356 (XLV) would no longer be applicable.

57. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to approve the text of the draft resolution, as amended, on the understanding that resolution 1356 (XLV) would remain valid except for paragraph 8.

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 21 votes to 3.

58. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should schedule an organizational meeting of the Committee for 6 January 1969. It might be possible to continue the meeting, if necessary, on 7 January.

59. Mr. BRADLEY (Argentina) said that his delegation objected to the choice of that date, because 6 January was Epiphany, the celebration of which was of particular significance to the countries of Latin America. Furthermore, if it was essential that the meeting should be held in January, it would be better to hold it when a sufficient number of representatives had returned from leave and when the Secretariat had had enough time to prepare the documents. His delegation therefore believed that it would be premature to hold the first meeting of the Preparatory Committee

for the Second United Nations Development Decade in the first few days of January and that it would be much wiser to postpone it until the end of the month. Meanwhile, the Economic Committee of the Council could, if necessary, begin preparations for the work of the enlarged Committee by holding a meeting before the end of December. At that time, a date could be set for the first meeting of the Preparatory Committee, towards the end of January.

60. Mr. VIAUD (France) said he did not think it would be possible to hold the meeting before 31 December 1968 since the members of the Economic Committee elected several days earlier could sit only from 1 January on. Accordingly, the enlarged Committee could include only the members of the present Economic Committee, of whom nine would be retiring on 1 January. The meeting could be postponed until the end of January but that would create special problems for his delegation. Although the projected meeting might not be of great importance, it would surely be very useful, for it would provide an opportunity of organizing the future work of the enlarged Committee. Some members of the Council had to leave New York at the end of January to attend the session of the Trade and Development Board, and it would therefore be impossible for them to be present at the meeting of the enlarged Committee. His delegation therefore thought that 7 and 8 January would be preferable. Nevertheless, it fully appreciated the arguments put forward by the Argentine delegation.

61. Mr. BILLNER (Sweden) said that he wished to propose a compromise between the positions of the Argentine and French delegations, which were equally valid. He suggested that the enlarged Committee should meet, if possible, between the session of the Governing Council of UNDP and the session of the Trade and Development Board.

62. Mr. UY (Philippines) said that he agreed with the French representative, particularly since the Argentine delegation's suggestion would mean entrusting the preparatory work for the second Development Decade to a small committee, namely the present Economic Committee, while the Council had just adopted a resolution to enlarge the Economic Committee for the purpose of establishing the Preparatory Committee for the Second United Nations Development Decade. If the Council supported the Argentine proposal, the twenty-seven members who were to be designated by the President of the General Assembly to join the Economic Committee would have no opportunity of taking part in the initial preparatory work for the Decade; his delegation was therefore unable to agree to a procedure that would cause the Economic Committee to meet before the enlarged Committee.

63. Mr. DUBEY (India) noted that there appeared to be agreement on the need for the Preparatory Committee to meet as soon as possible, since the General Assembly resolution provided that the programme of work of the Preparatory Committee should be communicated to the other United Nations bodies concerned with preparing for the Development Decade in order to assist them in their preparatory work. In view of the fact that the session of the Governing Council of UNDP and the session of the Trade and Development Board followed immediately upon each other and even

overlapped by a few days, the most suitable dates for a meeting of the Preparatory Committee seemed to be 7 and 8 January.

64. Mr. DE SEYNES (Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs) said that, as the Indian representative had pointed out, the Preparatory Committee, in accordance with paragraph 9 of General Assembly resolution 2411 (XXIII) which set it up, was to communicate its programme of work and calendar of meetings to Governments and all organizations in the United Nations system which would be participating in preparations for the Decade. A number of organs were planning to meet at the beginning of the coming year and expected to be informed at that time of the calendar and programme of work of the Preparatory Committee. It should also be noted that the delay in arriving at a consensus concerning preparations for the Decade had placed the Secretariat in a somewhat embarrassing position with regard to the Committee for Development Planning, whose members were extremely busy people. It had not yet been possible to notify them of the exact dates that their services would be required, and that should be done as soon as possible in the light of the decisions of the Preparatory Committee with regard to the organization of its work. Finally, the Office of Conference Services had indicated that the first part of January would be by far the most convenient time to schedule a meeting of the type anticipated for the Preparatory Committee. It was for all those reasons that the Secretariat had suggested 6 January as the date for the Committee's meeting.

65. Mr. BRADLEY (Argentina) said that his delegation withdrew its objections with regard to the date of the Preparatory Committee's meeting but that unfortunately, under the circumstances, it would be unable to participate in the meeting.

66. The PRESIDENT suggested that the solution might be for the Preparatory Committee to meet on 7 and, if necessary, 8 January.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 10

Elections (concluded)*

67. The PRESIDENT pointed out that the Council still had to elect one member of the Population Commission from the Western European and other States and one member of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations from the same group.

68. Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT (United States of America) requested that the election of the member of the Population Commission should be postponed until the next session of the Council.

It was so decided.

69. He also announced that the candidate for the last seat on the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations was Turkey.

70. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect Turkey to the seat which remained to be filled from the Western European and other States.

Turkey was elected to the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations.

71. Mr. VARELA (Panama) said that the representative of Jamaica had asked that the Council should be informed that he would be unable to sit on the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations. As a result, Uruguay was now the only Latin American country represented on the Committee.

72. Mr. BRADLEY (Argentina) said that the Committee should have no difficulty in continuing its work even though one of its seats still had to be filled. When the Latin American States presented a new candidate, the Committee might consider including him in its list of members.

73. The PRESIDENT said that he shared the Argentine representative's view that the Committee should have no difficulty in continuing its work with one vacancy, as long as a majority of members were present and the vacancy was filled as soon as possible.

AGENDA ITEM 13

Replacement of officers of the Council (E/4589)

74. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect a President and a Vice-President to replace the present holders of those offices, since their countries had ceased to be members of the Economic and Social Council.

75. Mr. VIAUD (France), speaking on a point of order, recalled that there had previously been a case in which the President represented a country which had ceased to be a member of the Council. On that occasion, the Council had been without a President until the spring session. He wondered whether it was truly necessary to elect an acting President and Vice-President.

76. Mr. KASSUM (Secretary of the Council) pointed out that the new rule 23 of the Council's rules of procedure provided that, if the Member of the United Nations of which the President or any of the Vice-Presidents was a representative ceased to be a member of the Council, a new President or Vice-President was to be elected for the unexpired term. There was, moreover, a relevant precedent; the previous year, the representative of Dahomey had had to retire from the Vice-Presidency for that reason and the representative of Libya had been named Vice-President for the unexpired period.

77. Mr. CUEVAS CANCINO (Mexico), noting that the replacement for the President had to come from the same geographical region, proposed that the Council should elect Mr. Berro, the representative of Uruguay, to the Presidency.

78. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, after hearing the French representative's observations and the Secretariat's explanations, he had carefully reread rule 23 of the Council's rules of procedure. He was now convinced that the rule did not apply to the present situation, for it provided that an acting President should be elected only when unforeseen circumstances arose during the year in which the President had been elected, the purpose being to ensure that the Council's work could continue up to the

*Resumed from the 1575th meeting.

end of the year. In the present case, the situation in no way called for the election of a replacement, since the Economic and Social Council would not meet again before the spring session. In fact, the election of a new President would mean overriding rule 23. Furthermore, if it should be necessary for the President or the officers to hold consultations before the opening of the spring session, one of the remaining Vice-Presidents could easily assume responsibility for the matter. In that way, there would be no need to infringe the Council's rules of procedure. His delegation could therefore see absolutely no necessity for electing an acting President and Vice-President.

79. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that the Mexican proposal was completely in accordance with the letter of rule 23 of the rules of procedure as amended by the Council at its resumed forty-first session. Nevertheless, he wished to draw the Council's attention to the fact that the new rule 23 did not appear to apply to the present situation but rather to cases in which tenure of office was terminated during the year because of unforeseen events. Moreover, under the circumstances, although there would be certain advantages in the precedent which would be established by electing an acting President and Vice-President, there would also be certain disadvantages. Since the Council showed a tendency to convene its spring sessions at increasingly later dates, that would mean that the acting President would remain in office almost as long as the official President. Since the President of the Council was frequently the representative of a country which had been a member of the Council for three years, the same somewhat irregular situation might well occur every year. His delegation therefore felt that if it was going to become normal procedure to elect an acting President and Vice-President, an effort should also be made to shorten their term in office as much as possible, in accordance with rule 2 of the rules of procedure, which provided that the first regular session of the year should be fixed as late as administratively practicable to the first Tuesday in April—a date that coincided with the election of the new President. In that regard, by selecting 12 May as the date for the opening of the 1969 spring session, the Secretariat and the members of the Council had violated the rules of procedure. His delegation felt that the Council's spring session should henceforth open no later than during the second fortnight of April, notwithstanding the administrative requirements. A certain regularity should be maintained in scheduling the Council's meetings, and if it continued to meet at varying times, the two sessions might soon follow virtually one upon the other. He therefore felt that the decision to elect an acting President and Vice-President should prompt the Council to return as soon as possible to the practice of abiding by its rules of procedure, particularly rule 2.

80. Furthermore, his delegation could support such a decision only if the election of an acting President did not hamper the application of the Council's decision on the equitable geographical rotation of the Presidency among the various groups. For example, if the spring session, for reasons that were not yet foreseeable, was cancelled, it should be clearly understood that the regional group from which the President was to be elected for the following year—in the present instance,

Western European and other States—would remain at the head of the list in accordance with the provisions of the annex to Council resolution 1193 (XLI).

81. In conclusion, he stated that his delegation would support the election of an acting President and Vice-President on condition that the Council clearly indicated that it would not thus be setting a precedent and that it would strictly respect the decisions taken earlier concerning the selection of the President, the rotation of the Presidency and the date of the April session. If there was a conflict, the Council should be guided by its rules and not by considerations of the moment, which were, in any case, dependent on circumstances.

82. Mr. UY (Philippines) said that he supported the Mexican representative's nomination of Mr. Berro for the office of President.

83. He noted that the new rule 23 of the rules of procedure derived directly from rule 21 and stated specifically that if the Member of the United Nations of which the President or any of the Vice-Presidents was a representative ceased to be a member of the Council, a new President or Vice-President was to be elected for the unexpired term. Some delegations seemed to question whether it would be appropriate to elect a new President since the Council would not, in principle, meet before the spring session; he drew attention, in that connexion, to rules 4 and 5 of the rules of procedure, which provided for the possibility of special sessions. If such a session was necessary, the Council would have to have an acting President and, perhaps, an acting Vice-President. The election of those two officers was entirely in conformity with the rules of procedure, and his delegation thought that the Council should proceed to vote on the matter. He formally moved the closure of the debate.

84. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he questioned the validity of the arguments invoked by the representative of the Philippines in proposing that the Council should proceed to a vote. The hypothetical possibility of a special session in no way justified the election of an acting President and Vice-President. Moreover, that procedure would close the door on the two Vice-Presidents who were still officers of the Council. There was no reason why the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania, for example, should not exercise the functions of the Presidency. The motion for closure seemed to him to be a manoeuvre of which the United Republic of Tanzania would be the victim. The Council should reflect on the consequences of its actions and refrain from adopting a decision which would have the effect of excluding from the Presidency a representative of an African country. The representative of the Philippines was placing himself in the position of a spokesman for imperialism.

85. The PRESIDENT observed that in any case rule 23 of the rules of procedure prohibited him from continuing to exercise his functions after 1 January 1969 and provided unequivocally that, when the country of which the President or any of the Vice-Presidents was a representative ceased to be a member of the Council, the latter must elect a new President or Vice-President for the unexpired term, which in the present

instance would last until the spring session. Such elections were therefore entirely in conformity with the rules of procedure, and, since a candidacy had been put forward, he suggested that the Council should elect Mr. Berro, the representative of Uruguay, to the Presidency.

Mr. Pedro P. Berro (Uruguay) was elected President of the Council.

86. Mr. UY (Philippines), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, protested against the accusations made by the representative of the USSR. The latter had questioned the honesty of the Philippine delegation's intentions and had contended that it was trying to stand in the way of the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania. That was absolutely false. It was also the first time that the Philippines had been accused of imperialism.

87. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) explained that all he had meant was that the Philippine delegation, whether intentionally or not, had stood in the way of one or two representatives by preventing them from assuming the post of acting

President. As for the question of imperialism, it could not be denied that the Philippines, together with the United States, was committing aggression against the freedom-loving people of Viet-Nam.

88. Mr. CUEVAS CANCINO (Mexico) observed that the possibility of replacing the President by one of the Vice-Presidents, which had existed under the old rule 23 of the rules of procedure, had ceased to exist when that rule had been amended by the Council at its resumed forty-first session. In the present circumstances, it was imperative to elect a new President and Vice-President for the unexpired term.

89. Mr. POWER (Ireland), supported by Mr. DUBEY (India), nominated Mr. Christiansen (Norway) for the post of Vice-President.

Mr. Kjell Christiansen (Norway) was elected Vice-President of the Council.

Closing of the session

90. The PRESIDENT declared the session closed.

The meeting rose at 7 p.m.