

UNITED NATIONS  
ECONOMIC AND  
SOCIAL COUNCIL  
OFFICIAL RECORDS



FIFTH YEAR, TENTH SESSION

371st MEETING

THURSDAY, 2 MARCH 1950, AT 3 P.M.

LAKE SUCCESS, NEW YORK

*President:* Mr. Hernán SANTA CRUZ (Chile).

**Economic development of under-developed countries (concluded): General Assembly resolution 306 (IV) of 16 November 1949 on economic development of under-developed countries; methods of financing economic development of under-developed countries (E/1562, E/1562/Corr.1, E/1562/Corr.2, E/1602, E/1602/Add.1, E/1614 and E/1614/Corr.1); General Assembly resolution 307 (IV) of 16 November 1949 on economic development and international economic and commercial policy (concluded)**

1. The PRESIDENT informed the Council that the authors of the various draft resolutions and amendments concerning item 9 of the agenda had met unofficially and had drafted a joint draft resolution (E/L.37).

2. They had also submitted two alternative proposals regarding the appointment of consultants to the Sub-Commission on Economic Development. The first of the two alternatives invited the Secretary-General to appoint three consultants to assist the Sub-Commission during its forthcoming session. According to the second alternative, the consultants thus appointed would participate in the work of the Sub-Commission on the same terms as its members.

3. Mr. CHANG (China) complimented the authors of the joint draft resolution on the outcome of their work. He regretted that he had been unable to attend the group's meeting. Had he been present, he would have opposed the inclusion of alternative A as it was directly based on the Chinese amendment (E/L.36), the purpose of which was to reconcile the various draft resolutions.

4. Alternative A was useless, as it had always been understood that, when necessary, the Secretary-General was entitled to call in consultants for specific tasks. There was no need whatsoever for the Council to adopt any proposal expressly inviting the Secretary-General to follow that procedure.

5. Mr. VALENZUELA (Chile) proposed the adoption of alternative B.

6. The PRESIDENT agreed with the logic of the Chinese representative's remarks. Alternative A had been proposed in order to take the Chinese amendment into account, but as the Chinese representative rightly declared it to be useless, the Council should only state its views on the joint draft resolutions and alternative B.

7. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) congratulated the authors of the joint draft resolution on the successful outcome of their work.

8. For reasons which he had already stated, he would, however, not be able to accept paragraphs 6 and 7 of the draft resolution. He therefore asked for a separate vote on each paragraph.

9. He agreed with the Chinese representative regarding the Secretary-General's authority to call in consultants if necessary.

10. Mr. PIERCE (Canada) said that the point at issue was whether the number of members on the Sub-Commission on Economic Development would remain unchanged, or whether it was to be assisted in its work by experts. His delegation felt that the Sub-Commission's composition should not be changed until such time as the Council had considered the entire problem of commissions and sub-commissions.

11. Generally speaking, his delegation preferred the system of calling in consultants to that of setting up sub-commissions. But in the case in point it seemed useless to call in consultants. The Sub-Commission on Economic Development was required to submit recommendations to the Council's following session, which was due to open on 1 July. Those recommendations would have to be studied carefully by Governments and should, therefore, be communicated to them at least two months before the opening of the session, or by 1 May. The Sub-Commission was due to meet on 17 April; it was, therefore, doubtful whether experts could be called in before that date and, even should that be possible, they would not have sufficient time to familiarize themselves with the problems to be discussed by the Sub-Commission.

12. It would be better to recruit experts after the Council's following session, when the Sub-Commission's sphere of action had been more specifically defined. There were many things to be done. The Technical Assistance Conference was to meet in the near future; some Governments were considering the possibility of enacting legislation to facilitate the influx of foreign capital; others were reorganizing the administrative structure of their countries in order to speed up their economic development. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development was carrying on negotiations with many countries. The Governments of Member States were engaged in a careful study of all those activities and it would, therefore, be advisable to wait until an opinion could be formed on the effectiveness of the national and international measures which were be-

ing taken, before a new group of experts was set up with definite terms of reference.

13. Furthermore, his delegation doubted whether the Sub-Commission itself could do much in the short time allowed to it. The Sub-Commission did, however, exist and was due to meet; it would therefore be reasonable to give it the opportunity to prove its usefulness.

14. In conclusion, the Canadian representative emphasized that, while it supported the joint draft resolution, his delegation did not approve of the continuation of the Sub-Commission beyond the Council's following session.

15. Mr. DE SEYNES (France) agreed with the representative of Canada. He recalled that, during the session held the previous year by the Economic and Employment Commission, as well as during the Council's ninth session, the representative of France had already expressed his Government's opinion on the usefulness of the Sub-Commission on Economic Development. Nothing had happened since then to change that opinion. On the contrary, the only concrete proposals which had been submitted to the Council had been those of a group of experts. That was a further reason for preferring to make use of the service of experts.

16. The Council had decided to continue the Sub-Commission on Economic Development for the time being. His delegation did not oppose that decision, but thought it would be very inopportune to change the nature of the Sub-Commission by adding to it new experts recruited by the Secretary-General.

17. When criticizing the Sub-Commission, his delegation had referred solely to its method of work. If the Council wished to call in experts, it would be better to follow the system adopted in connexion with the group of experts appointed to study the question of full employment. Accordingly, it would be advisable to set up a group which would take full responsibility for a study which, when completed, would be submitted to a deliberative organ for consideration. It would hardly be wise however to ask the members of the Sub-Commission and a number of new experts to work together, for the Sub-Commission's session would then be unduly prolonged.

18. It was for all those reasons that he could not agree to alternative B.

19. Mr. PLIMSOLL (Australia) paid a tribute to the authors of the draft resolution. He agreed, however, with the Canadian and French representative's view with regard to alternative B. Moreover, there were certain objections of principle against alternative B which compelled the Australian delegation to vote against it.

20. The Sub-Commission on Economic Development, a body of experts appointed by their respective Governments, had given results which raised some doubts regarding its efficiency.

21. The adoption of alternative B would be the death warrant of the Sub-Commission: it would show that, in order to do useful work, the Sub-Commission had to avail itself of the services of experts recruited by the Secretary-General. In that case, it would be preferable to abolish the Sub-Commission altogether and to appoint a new body; that question would, moreover, be considered by the Council at its following session.

22. Furthermore, as long as the programme of the Sub-Commission was not strictly defined, the Secretary-General could not appoint experts. It was for the members of the Sub-Commission to draw up their own programme. They were always free to consult experts. The best solution both for the Sub-Commission and for the Secretary-General would be to leave the composition of the Sub-Commission unchanged and to give that body an opportunity to prove that, despite all, it could achieve concrete results.

23. Mr. DEHOUSSE (Belgium) also congratulated the authors of the joint draft resolution on their successful work. The text which they had proposed dispelled most of the doubts voiced by him at the preceding meeting. He would therefore vote in favour of the joint draft resolution.

24. Mr. Dehousse would have liked other documents to be mentioned in paragraph 5 of the draft resolution, in particular the report on the regional meeting held in 1947 by the International Labour Organisation at Istanbul, dealing with economic measures to achieve ILO's social objectives for the Middle East.

25. Mr. Dehousse considered that the Canadian representative had put forward conclusive arguments for the rejection of alternative B. It was no doubt necessary, as Sir Ramaswami Mudaliar had stressed, to preserve a certain harmony in the general structure of the Council, its Commissions and Sub-Commissions. Yet the Belgian representative did not see how experts appointed by their Governments and having the right to vote could be put on an equal footing with experts having only consultative status.

26. Lastly, the Secretary-General had a perfect right to consult experts or to publish studies even when not specifically requested to do so. The Belgian representative thought that it would be regrettable if, by voting on texts inviting the Secretary-General to carry out studies or to consult experts, and by frequently rejecting those texts, the Council were to give the impression that the Secretary-General did not have such prerogatives. The Belgian delegation considered that, whatever the circumstances, care should be taken to avoid any such implication or any interference in the Secretary-General's prerogatives in the matter in question.

*Alternative B was rejected by 11 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.*

*Paragraph 6 of the joint draft resolution (E/L.37) was adopted by 7 votes to 6, with 2 abstentions.*

*Paragraph 7 of the joint draft resolution was adopted by 7 votes to 5, with 3 abstentions.*

*The joint draft resolution as a whole was adopted unanimously.*

### **International Centre for Training in Public Administration (E/1577)**

27. Mr. OSORIO (Brazil) stated that the Secretary-General had in his report indicated to the Council his intention of entrusting the implementation of the programme of training in public administration to the Department of Economic Affairs, which was currently responsible for the technical assistance programme.

28. The Brazilian delegation had been the original sponsor of the draft resolution adopted by the General Assembly for the establishment of an international training centre. The centre for training in public administration could usefully supplement the programme of technical assistance by spreading knowledge of public administration in under-developed countries. The centre could also be used for training the civil servants of the Trust Territories. The Brazilian delegation would welcome practical measures leading to the early development of the international centre for training in public administration as an organ properly equipped to implement the programme of action approved by the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly.

29. The Brazilian delegation was submitting the following resolution (E/L.38):

*"The Economic and Social Council*

*"Takes note of the report of the Secretary-General on the arrangements considered desirable to co-ordinate the programme of the International Centre with the programme of technical assistance (E/1577); and*

*"Requests that a report on the final arrangements be submitted to a subsequent session of the Council."*

30. Mr. JUVIGNY (France) stated that it was the intention of the Secretary-General to ensure co-ordination between the programme of training in public administration and the programme of technical assistance in order to avoid any duplication in that field. The French delegation fully approved that intention. It wished to emphasize, however, that such co-ordination should be effected only where a relation obviously existed between the two programmes. While the programmes for 1950 were obviously related, it should not be expected that they would always remain so. Indeed, it was quite likely that in the future the international centre for training in public administration would deal with administrative problems having no direct relation to the programme of technical assistance.

31. The suggestions which had been made to the effect that the Department of Economic Affairs should be entrusted with the implementation of the programme of public administration seemed to go beyond the scope of the 1950 programme and to involve a permanent solution. That should not be the case even though the problems concerning technical assistance were predominant in the 1950 programme.

32. For those various reasons the French delegation, while supporting the proposed solution for the time being, did not wish to exclude the possibility of another solution in future.

33. It was therefore submitting, together with the Belgian delegation, an amendment (E/L.39) to the Brazilian draft resolution. The amendment proposed the insertion of the words "during the year 1950" after the words "to co-ordinate".

34. Mr. FENAUX (Belgium) recalled that his delegation had on a number of occasions stated its view on the problem of co-ordination between the different activities of the United Nations. The latter had taken measures to remedy the dispersion of effort from which it had suffered in its early days. It was in that spirit that the Belgian delegation had supported the programme of

technical assistance for under-developed countries, which was in itself an attempt to achieve co-ordination.

35. At the same time, co-ordination should not be taken to mean "amalgamation" or "concentration". All administrations tended to expand their activities. That tendency appeared even inside various administrations themselves. It undoubtedly was a sign of justifiable zeal but it should not interfere with a harmonious division of work.

36. The report by the Secretary-General (E/1577) did not escape such comment. In it, stress was put on the intention of entrusting the application of the public administration programme to the Department of Economic Affairs, which was in charge of the technical assistance programme. Thus, the first of those programmes would become an integral part of the second, although that had never been the intention of the authors of the two programmes.

37. The major part of the public administration programme for 1950 undoubtedly came within the framework of the technical assistance programme but a permanent character should not be ascribed to what was only a temporary phenomenon. It was for that reason that the delegations of Belgium and France were submitting an amendment.

38. Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom) observed that there was a difference between the wording of the title of the Brazilian draft resolution as it appeared in the mimeographed document (E/L.38) and the text of that draft. The title spoke of "Co-ordination of the *programme of training in public administration*. . .", while the first paragraph of the draft resolution referred to "the programme of the international centre".

39. It should be remembered that the International Civil Service Advisory Board had strongly urged that in dealing with the question of training in public administration the United Nations should act prudently at the outset.

40. It would therefore be advisable to adopt a resolution in keeping with that opinion and with the resolutions setting up the various programmes.

41. Mr. PIERCE (Canada) supported the joint amendment of Belgium and France and added that the representative of the United Kingdom had been entirely correct in stressing the difference between the wording of the title and the text of the Brazilian draft resolution.

42. Mr. ENCINAS (Peru) supported the Brazilian draft resolution. By adopting it, the Council would show that it considered the establishment of a centre for training in public administration as a preparatory step essential to the success of the technical assistance programme. The co-ordination of the two programmes would facilitate the pursuit of the final objective, which was the economic development of under-developed countries. The Council should, of course, be informed of any measures which might be taken to ensure the co-ordination of the two programmes.

43. Mr. FRIIS (Denmark) was impressed by the convincing arguments advanced by the representatives of France and Belgium.

44. He felt, however, that it might be useful if the representative of the Secretary-General would explain for what reasons the Secretariat had adopted the solution set out in its report (E/1577).

45. Mr. GOLDET (Secretariat) informed the Danish representative that the report by the Secretary-General (E/1577) had been prepared in accordance with resolution 253 (IX), which requested the Secretariat to co-ordinate the programme for training in public administration with the programme of technical assistance established in virtue of resolution 200 (III) of the General Assembly.

46. Mr. OSORIO (Brazil), referring to the difference between the title and the text of his draft resolution, said that in resolution 246 (III) the General Assembly had decided to establish an international centre for public administration.

47. The representative of Brazil suggested that in his draft resolution the words "for Training in Public Administration" should be added after the words "International Centre".

48. Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom) admitted that the General Assembly had decided to set up an international centre but added that there might be different kinds of training in public administration. The International Civil Service Advisory Board had recommended that the United Nations should not set up a school for public administration. To mention an international centre might give the impression that a university institution was being established.

49. He therefore suggested that the wording used in the title of the draft resolution should be used in the first paragraph of the draft. The text would then read: "... to co-ordinate the programme of training in public administration with the programme of technical assistance ...".

50. Mr. PLIMSOLL (Australia) supported the Brazilian draft resolution and shared the opinion of the representative of the United Kingdom.

51. Mr. JUVIGNY (France) requested that the Council should not vote on the Brazilian draft resolution until the French text of the draft had been circulated.

52. The PRESIDENT, in reply to the request made by the representative of France, stated that discussion of item 10 of the agenda was suspended and would not be resumed until the French text of the Brazilian draft resolution had been circulated.

### **Studies and data relating to the economic situation of Africa (E/1555, E/1555/Add.1, E/1555/Add.2 and E/1555/Add.3) (concluded)<sup>1</sup>**

53. Sir Sydney CAINE (United Kingdom) stated that he had been unable to reach an agreement with the representative of India on a joint text combining the Indian proposal (E/L.31) and the United Kingdom amendment (E/L.34/Rev.1). Accordingly the Council had the two texts before it.

54. Sir Ramaswami MUDALIAR (India) stated that he accepted the United States amendment (367th meeting, paragraph 39).

55. He pointed out that the part of the United Kingdom resolution relating to the preamble of the Indian draft resolution clearly indicated the difference between the substance of the two texts. The report on the principal changes in the economic field dealt only with what had occurred during a given year while the Indian draft resolution contemplated only a general survey of economic conditions in Africa not relating to any specific period.

56. He also recalled that the Economic Committee of the Council had decided to recommend to the Council that in future the report on major economic changes should be based as far as possible on the reports of the regional economic commissions.

57. In the circumstances, he did not see how the basic idea of his draft resolution could be preserved if the Council were to adopt the United Kingdom amendment.

58. Mr. CHANG (China) considered the Indian draft resolution very useful. He would support it because in his opinion the point at issue in the case of Africa was not to extend the scope of the report on world economy but to solve a specific problem.

59. He suggested that the word "preliminary" should be inserted before the word "survey" in the second paragraph of the Indian draft resolution.

60. Sir Ramaswami MUDALIAR (India) said that his objection to the United Kingdom amendment in its original form (E/L.34) applied equally to the amendment in its revised form (E/L.34/Rev.1); the Economic Committee had also recommended that the world economic report should not contain summaries by region, as the reports of the various regional economic commissions were available.

61. He accepted the Chinese representative's suggestion.

62. Moreover, in order to give the Secretariat more time to prepare the study he proposed, he was amending the text of his draft resolution so that the beginning of the second paragraph would read "*Requests* the Secretary-General to prepare, in time for the *thirteenth* session of the Council", instead of "... for the *twelfth* session ...".

63. Sir Sidney CAINE (United Kingdom) wanted to be sure the Secretariat would continue to prepare an annual world economic report. He thought it was going too far to propose to undertake a survey of economic conditions in Africa at once, as a study of that kind would entail much work.

64. Moreover, even if a special section on Africa should be included in the report on major economic changes in 1950, there was no reason why the section should not cover a longer period instead of being limited to a description of the changes in economic conditions in Africa in one year.

<sup>1</sup> See 367th meeting.

65. Finally, Sir Sidney thanked the representative of China for his effort to reach a compromise, but he was afraid that the addition of the word "preliminary" would raise more problems than it solved. What would follow the preliminary study?

66. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) pointed out that the United States amendment (367th meeting, paragraph 39) was to some extent a compromise. The United States delegation feared that a special study might not achieve any useful purpose because its limits had not been made sufficiently clear. The Secretariat would have great difficulty in undertaking such a study if it did not have a clear idea of the precise limits of the topic to be studied.

67. The United Kingdom amendment was the simpler solution of the problem, and he would vote for it. He had nevertheless submitted a separate amendment to widen the scope of the United Kingdom amendment without, however, launching the Secretariat into a study the limits of which were unknown.

68. It was clear that in succeeding years, the Council would have before it a whole series of studies on problems of economic development, and, as Africa was one of the principal under-developed regions of the world, it would be given special attention in all those studies under the United States amendment, which was a compromise between the two extreme positions of India and the United Kingdom.

69. Mr. DEHOUSSE (Belgium) agreed with the United Kingdom representative that the insertion of the word "preliminary" in the second paragraph of the Indian draft resolution might be dangerous.

70. He also drew the Council's attention to a possible consequence of the Indian representative's amendment to substitute "thirteenth session" for twelfth session" in his draft resolution. The debate on the world economic situation took place during the Council's winter session; in 1951 that would normally be the twelfth session of the Council. If the debate on economic conditions in Africa was to take place during the thirteenth session, that meant that the two problems would be discussed separately. Hitherto, however, it seemed to have been understood that the debate on economic conditions in Africa would be held at the same time as the debate on the world economic situation.

71. He was therefore unable to accept the Indian representative's amendment to his draft.

72. Mr. BORIS (France) recalled that the representative of India had said that he thought the Secretariat no longer wished to publish an annual world economic report. In his note (E/1611), however, the Secretary-General said that he planned to publish a world economic report every year and that he thought it superfluous to include in it a detailed description of the situation in different regions.

73. When the Council discussed the question, the French delegation had said (361st meeting) that it could not approve cessation of the publication of descriptive summaries for each region. It was true that there were regional economic commissions which were able to prepare reports for certain regions of the world. But there was no economic commission for North America, the

Middle East, Africa or Australia, and therefore a world economic report of the kind proposed by the Secretariat would be very incomplete.

74. The Secretary-General had said (367th meeting) that he would take the French representative's remarks into account and, as there had been no objections in the Council, Mr. Boris concluded that the project had been abandoned. There would therefore be a section on economic conditions in Africa in the next world economic report. That procedure would offer the further advantage that the report as a whole would be better balanced and the space given to Africa would be proportionate to that region's importance.

75. Mr. CHANG (China) said that by "preliminary survey" he meant a survey made with the idea that a fuller study would be prepared later, if that should later be thought desirable.

76. He further considered that the United States amendment did not depend on acceptance of the United Kingdom amendment, but was equally compatible with the Indian text.

77. Sir Ramaswami MUDALIAR (India) said that by "preliminary survey" he meant one which might be followed by a final survey. He asked what the Secretariat's plans were with regard to the next world economic report.

78. His draft resolution referred to an independent study, which would not be dependent on the Council's desire to examine certain documents at certain times. That was why he had substituted "thirteenth session" for "twelfth session".

79. In conclusion, he recalled that Mr. Thorp had said the United States amendment was applicable to either the Indian draft resolution or the United Kingdom amendment; he had therefore accepted it.

80. Mr. OWEN (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Economic Affairs) stated that the next world economic report would be much more analytical and, consequently, much less descriptive than its predecessor. The Secretariat considered that, as the regional economic commissions' reports were being published, it was useless to overburden the world economic report with material that could be found in them.

81. He was not prepared, at that stage, to say in what form the Secretariat could take account of the comments of representatives. If the Secretariat was required to include in the world report sections for special problems on areas such as Africa, it would of course do so.

82. If the Council adopted the United Kingdom amendment, the section of the world economic report on economic conditions in Africa would be published simultaneously with the report itself, that is, early in 1951. He believed that in that case the additional cost of the new section of the report could be absorbed by his Department's budget as established by the General Assembly.

83. On the other hand, if the Council adopted the Indian proposal, the special study on Africa would be published for the thirteenth session of the Council and would cost an additional 30,000 dollars.

84. Mr. CHANG (China) noted that the Assistant Secretary-General seemed to prefer the solution proposed in the United Kingdom amendment. Mr. Chang was in favour of the study called for in the Indian proposal but realized that it might be more expensive.

85. The PRESIDENT stated that it was the Secretary-General's duty to let the Council know the financial implications of draft resolutions it was considering adopting.

86. Sir Sydney CAINE (United Kingdom) accepted the United States amendment. It brought out clearly the fundamental difference between the United Kingdom amendment and the Indian draft resolution. The United States amendment merely provided, in general terms, that whenever it prepared an economic publication, the Secretariat should give particular attention to the special problems of the economic situation of Africa. The United Kingdom amendment was, in substance, merely a particular case under the United States amendment.

87. He had no intention of preventing the Council from receiving information on economic conditions in Africa. He did, however, wish the Council to receive enough information within a reasonable time to enable it to examine the special problems of Africa. A study of the kind proposed by the Indian representative would give the Secretariat much more difficulty than some members of the Council seemed to think. It therefore seemed better for the Council to be provided with the best possible summary of available information and for the Secretary-General then to be asked, as in the United States amendment, to study the problems affecting Africa whenever such a study was appropriate.

88. Mr. CHANG (China) thanked the Assistant Secretary-General for having informed the Council of the financial implications of the proposals before it.

89. He would vote for the Indian draft on the clear understanding that its adoption would not entail any additional expense. The Indian proposal requested the Secretary-General to prepare a survey relating to economic conditions in Africa "using material readily available". Thus, it was not a question of undertaking a special study or of hiring experts to undertake original work. Moreover, the insertion of the word "preliminary" would still further reduce the difficulty of such a task for the Secretariat.

90. In fact, the work would not be much more difficult than that envisaged in the United Kingdom amendment.

91. Mr. OWEN (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Economic Affairs) said it was very difficult for the Secretariat to decide how the authors of draft resolutions interpreted their own proposals. If the only difference between the United Kingdom amendment and the Indian proposal was that, in the first case, the study of economic conditions in Africa was to be published as a section of the world economic report and, in the second case, as a separate study, the cost would, obviously, be the same in both cases. Mr. Owen thought, however, that the two proposals reflected different conceptions and that the study envisaged in the Indian proposal would actually be more comprehensive. It would be possible to publish a special section on Africa in the next world economic report,

provided, however, that that chapter were not so large as to throw the report out of balance and to entail additional expense.

92. On the other hand, the preparation of a separate study—which he assumed would be a much fuller study—might require the recruitment of two or three experts and entail supplementary expenses amounting to 30,000 dollars, which was not a very great sum.

93. Mr. CHANG (China) stated that he would vote for the Indian proposal on the clear understanding that its adoption would not entail additional expenses.

94. The PRESIDENT put the United Kingdom amendment (E/L.34/Rev.1) to the vote.

95. Mr. VALENZUELA (Chile) requested a separate vote on the first part of the United Kingdom amendment, which was hardly more than a factual recital, whereas the remainder bore on the substance of the Indian proposal.

*The first part of the United Kingdom amendment was adopted by 11 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions.*

*The remainder of the amendment was adopted by 9 votes to 3, with 3 abstentions.*

*The Indian draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 14 votes to 1.*

96. Mr. PADILLA NERVO (Mexico) explained that he had abstained from voting on the United Kingdom amendment because he believed that the Indian proposal should have been voted on in its original form, which he had favoured. He considered the United Kingdom amendment an entirely new proposal.

97. He had voted for the final text as a whole because he agreed that the economic problems of Africa needed study and special attention.

### **International Centre for Training in Public Administration (E/1577) (concluded)**

98. The PRESIDENT said that the French text of the Brazilian draft resolution (paragraph 29) had been circulated.

99. Mr. OSORIO (Brazil) accepted the joint Belgian and French amendment (paragraph 33), but could not accept the amendment proposed by the United Kingdom.

100. The PRESIDENT put the United Kingdom amendment (paragraph 49) to the vote.

*The amendment was adopted by 10 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions.*

*The Brazilian draft resolution, as amended, was adopted unanimously.*

### **Calendar of conferences for 1950 (concluded) (session of the Sub-Commission on Economic Development)**

101. The PRESIDENT recalled that the United States delegation had proposed (355th meeting, paragraph 52) cancellation of the session of the Sub-Commission on Economic Development scheduled for April 1950.

102. The proposal conflicted with the decision which the Council had taken at the current meeting with regard to item 9 of the agenda.

103. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) stated that the decision taken by the Council had made the United States proposal on the next session of the Sub-Commission on Economic Development obsolete.

104. The PRESIDENT declared that, as the United States proposal was no longer relevant, consideration of the calendar meetings for 1950 could be considered closed.

*It was so decided.*

### **Programme of work of the Council**

105. The PRESIDENT proposed that the Council should not hold a meeting on the afternoon of Friday, 3 March 1950, in order to enable the Secretariat to prepare a report on the financial implications of the decisions taken by the Council during its tenth session.

*It was so decided.*

The meeting rose at 5.55 p.m.