

injustice would merely be replaced by a new one.

This procedure would not, I think, Sir, contribute to a harmonious and lasting solution. On the contrary,

I fear it would arouse the determined opposition of a formidable number of member states, all of whom are naturally obligated to defend their own regional interests. It might also be a bad precedent, which would give all areas a feeling of insecurity regarding their entitlement. Any attempt to raid these seats would likely arouse far more widespread opposition than has ever been shown toward proposals for simple enlargement. We would also agree with the distinguished representative of Guinea that re-distribution without enlargement could not provide sufficient seats for a satisfactory representation of Africa and Asia.

Perhaps distinguished delegates would permit me to recall, for the record, the present distribution between areas of seats in ECOSOC. The 18 seats are now held as follows: 5 for the permanent members of the Security Council, (who are not counted in the area groups because of their special responsibilities); Latin America for 20 states, 4 seats; Western Europe for 17 states, 3 seats; the Commonwealth for 11 states, 1 seat; Asia for 14 states, 2 seats; the Middle East and Africa for 30 states, 1 seat; and Eastern Europe for 8 states, 2 seats. Now Sir, I do not want to suggest that the sole criterion for electing members to ECOSOC should be equitable geographical distribution. Although the Charter lays down no criteria for membership, ECOSOC in our view cannot function efficiently unless a reasonable balance is maintained between the contributing and receiving countries. Distribution of seats should