

# GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWELFTH SESSION

Official Records

Thursday, 31 October 1957,  
at 10.55 a.m.

NEW YORK

## CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 12:	
Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapters II, III, IV and V) (continued)	
Draft resolution on methods of implementing Economic and Social Council resolution 654 A (XXIV) and draft resolution on the expansion of international trade (concluded) . . . . .	123
Draft resolution on bases for international co-operation (continued) . . . . .	126

Chairman: Mr. Jiří NOSEK (Czechoslovakia).

## AGENDA ITEM 12

**Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapters II, III, IV and V) (A/3613, A/3661, A/C.2/L.330, A/C.2/L.332 A/C.2/L.333/Rev.1, A/C.2/L.335/Rev.1, A/C.2/L.337 and Add.1) (continued)**

**DRAFT RESOLUTION ON METHODS OF IMPLEMENTING ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL RESOLUTION 654 A (XXIV) (A/C.2/L.332), AND DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE EXPANSION OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE (A/C.2/L.335/REV.1) (concluded)**

1. Mr. ENCINAS (Peru) said that exceptional circumstances had made it impossible for him to take part in the vote on the seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.2/L.335/Rev.1) at the 475th meeting; he therefore asked the Secretariat to record his delegation's vote in favour of each paragraph of the preamble, each operative paragraph and the draft resolution as a whole.

2. Mr. CHAUVET (Haiti), who had also been absent when the vote was taken, requested that his delegation's affirmative vote should be recorded.

It was so decided.

3. Mr. O'NAGHTEN (Cuba) wished to know whether the Bulgarian draft resolution (A/C.2/L.332) continued to be one of the Committee's documents even though it had been withdrawn by its author.

4. Mr. HADWEN (Canada), Rapporteur, said that the record of the discussions which would appear in the report of the Committee to the General Assembly would contain a summary of the draft and indicate the action taken on it.

5. Mr. O'NAGHTEN (Cuba) said that under the circumstances and knowing that the Bulgarian delegation intended to present that draft to the Economic and Social Council, a discrepancy between the Spanish and English texts of the third paragraph of the preamble should be removed. The Spanish version of that provision would probably succeed in winning many votes and the Cuban delegation asked that the English translation be brought into line with it.

6. Sir Alec RANDALL (United Kingdom), explaining his delegation's vote on the joint draft resolution, said

that it had abstained on the fourth paragraph of the preamble because of the reference it contained to the situation in land-locked countries. The United Kingdom delegation understood the difficulties of those countries and hoped that a satisfactory solution would be found for them; but, as it had had occasion to state in the Committee at the eleventh session of the General Assembly with respect to resolution 1028 (XI), it felt that it should not pre-judge the question, which was a matter for the Sixth Committee and was to be examined in March 1958 by an international conference of plenipotentiaries.

7. Mr. RAJAPATIRANA (Ceylon) regretted that the authors of the joint draft resolution had not responded at the 475th meeting to the appeal made to them by several delegations, including the delegation of Ceylon, and that they had not agreed to defer a vote in order to seek a more general agreement, for instance on the basis of a few amendments. Because of their impatience the draft resolution had received only 42 affirmative votes out of 82, with 21 abstentions. That was not encouraging for international economic co-operation. Ceylon, which was in favour of the expansion of international trade and was a Contracting Party to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), had voted for the joint draft resolution in the hope that it would help to strengthen economic co-operation; it had, however, to confess that the text was far from satisfactory and amounted to a self-directed appeal by the members of GATT to encourage each other to ratify the agreement establishing the Organization for Trade Co-operation.

8. Mrs. WRIGHT (Denmark) pointed out that some GATT members had abstained from voting and that the authors of the draft resolution had gratefully accepted several amendments proposed by various countries.

9. Mr. ARAGON (Guatemala) said that his delegation's abstention on the joint draft resolution as a whole was the logical consequence of its abstention on the third, fifth and sixth paragraphs of the preamble and on the two paragraphs of the operative part. Guatemala had found it difficult to vote in favour of those provisions. Guatemala had not ratified the Havana Charter because in its opinion that instrument held few advantages for essentially agricultural countries anxious to become industrialized in order to raise the level of living of their population. It was not a member of GATT for similar reasons. That abstention did not mean that Guatemala was not interested in a healthy expansion of world trade. On the contrary, it followed closely all efforts made to develop international co-operation, particularly in matters of trade, and was gratified to note that the problems of the small countries in process of development were beginning to be better understood. Because of that, he had been able to vote in favour of the first, second and fourth paragraphs of the preamble.

10. Mr. QUEUILLE (France) invited the Committee, at the close of the long debate which had ended in the adoption of the seven-Power draft, to stop for a moment to measure the progress made since the eleventh session of the General Assembly. The previous year, two schools had opposed each other; neither winning the day. The French delegation had opted for a position which it had continued to defend at the present session: it had formulated the hope that GATT would soon have a more solid legal foundation and that, to bring that about, the Agreement establishing the Organization for Trade Co-operation would shortly be ratified. It was with real satisfaction, therefore, that he had noted during this year's discussions a certain tendency to compromise which appeared to be initiating the desired development. The Bulgarian delegation had had the wisdom to withdraw its text which, though prompted by a praiseworthy desire for universality, reflected only the position of one particular school. Thanks to that gesture the Committee had begun to make progress: the statements by certain of its members, those by the representatives of Hungary, of Czechoslovakia and, in some respects, even of Bulgaria, gave reason for hope and for confidence that progress would be real and substantial.

11. At the present session the French delegation had confined itself to presenting a modest amendment (A/C.2/L.336) reflecting the approach it advocated. As it would have been content to be a voice in the wilderness, it had been very glad to see that other signatories to GATT had followed the same trend, which might be called the trend of the GATT "evolutionists". The most important fact undoubtedly was that the representatives of countries which had not yet joined GATT had, one way or another, expressed the hope that that instrument might undergo a favourable change. He referred, in particular, to the statements by the representatives of Saudi Arabia and Egypt at the 472nd and 475th meetings. Their practical suggestions reflected their desire for co-operation.

12. By adopting the joint draft, the Committee stressed the urgent need for ratification by the great trading Powers, which was essential if the revised Agreements were to come into force. Once that first stage had been completed, it would be important to direct the new GATT organization towards solving the problems of the under-developed countries, as called for in the Brazilian oral amendment (472nd meeting), as well as on the lines laid down in article 3 of the Agreement establishing the Organization for Trade Co-operation.<sup>1/</sup> The Committee's debates would have been a useful factor in that great forward movement. In that perspective, it was essential not to underestimate the difficulties ahead. The comprehensive debate now concluding was proof of that. He recalled that in the discussion on the same subject at the eleventh session, the representative of France had already indicated (441st meeting) how difficult it would be for a multi-lateral world organization to prepare a set of rules which would be applicable both to trade between countries with planned economies and to trade between countries with free economies.

13. Mr. FLÈRE (Yugoslavia) noted that the debate which had just taken place on international trade pro-

blems had shown the same differences of opinion as that of the previous year and had resulted in a similar resolution. There had been no more effort to find common ground or a common solution, and his delegation regretted that fact all the more because the questions involved were of great importance to all countries.

14. In order to explain Yugoslavia's position, he would mention that his Government followed the activities of GATT with great interest and appreciated the wishes of the countries which were interested in the establishment of the Organization for Trade Co-operation. It must be recognized, however, that the purpose of both GATT and the proposed Organization was the achievement of liberalized trade: that policy was very useful, perhaps even essential, for a large number of industrialized countries, but it did not further the interests of many under-developed countries which were obliged to have regard to their own urgent development needs. Furthermore, it was not quite clear how the concept and provisions of GATT and the Organization could be applied in the case of countries with different trading systems. It would not be easy to solve those problems and a great deal of effort would be necessary to establish international machinery capable of regulating trade between countries with different trade policies and different economic systems. That was a task primarily for the United Nations, but the resolution which had just been adopted had glossed over the problem and the debate had not brought the Committee any nearer to a better understanding of it. For that reason, his delegation had abstained from voting on the joint draft resolution as a whole. He would add that the resolution had been put to the vote and adopted by a procedure which could hardly further the intentions of the sponsors. A vote with such a large number of abstentions could not be considered as providing effective support for United Nations action in matters of trade.

15. Nevertheless, his delegation was convinced that the United Nations would continue to seek ways and means to contribute to the expansion of international trade. For that purpose, modest but realistic measures should be taken. Concrete results might be obtained through inter-governmental consultations, as the Secretary-General had suggested in the Introduction to his Annual Report to the twelfth session of the General Assembly (A/3594/Add.1)<sup>2/</sup> in a more propitious atmosphere the United Nations would be in a position to find common ground with respect to the problem of establishing an international trade organization.

16. Mr. O'BEIRNE (Ireland) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on those paragraphs of the seven-Power draft resolution which dealt with the establishment of the Organization for Trade Co-operation. For very good reasons connected with the pattern of its economy and external trade, Ireland had not yet seen its way to accede to GATT. For the same reasons, Ireland would not be likely in the immediate future to be in a position to take part in the work of the Organization for Trade Co-operation.

17. Mr. KEDADI (Tunisia) considered the resolution just adopted to be of considerable importance as it was designed primarily to secure the expansion of international trade, which was the most certain pledge of lasting peace. But the text was not without its disquieting features: if it had been a question of setting up a

<sup>1/</sup> Contracting Parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, *Basic Instruments and Selected Documents*, Volume I (revised), Geneva, April 1955, page 75.

<sup>2/</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twelfth Session, Supplement No. 1A.*

new trade organization, access to and participation in which would be open to all Members of the United Nations on an equal footing, his delegation would have had no hesitation in supporting it. It had voted in favour of the first three paragraphs of the preamble, which referred to the economic development of the less developed countries, but being unable to find in the remainder of the resolution any practical and effective measure which would be likely to speed up the economic development of those countries, it had been obliged to abstain on the draft resolution as a whole.

18. Mrs. GINOR (Israel) said that her Government considered the expansion of international trade as one of the best means of promoting understanding and the establishment of friendly relations among peoples. Her delegation had accordingly voted for the seven-Power draft resolution, which sought to use existing machinery with a view to promoting international co-operation in trade matters.

19. Despite the Australian representative's statement that membership in GATT was open to all countries which were prepared to observe its rules, her delegation had been unable to vote for operative paragraph 2, which urged the Governments of Member States to approve the Agreement on the Organization for Trade Co-operation at as early a date as possible because that Agreement would have to be approved by the Contracting Parties to GATT, which included only a limited number of States Members of the United Nations. However, her delegation had voted for the draft resolution as a whole, in the belief that its adoption would contribute to the development of international trade.

20. Mr. PSCOLKA (Czechoslovakia) recalled that during the general debate he had emphatically expressed his delegation's preference for the establishment of a truly universal trade organization of the specialized-agency type, designed to promote the expansion of foreign trade among all countries of the world: it was unfortunate that no such organization had yet come into being. Having expressed that preference, his delegation had been unable to vote for a number of paragraphs in the joint draft resolution concerned with the establishment of the Organization for Trade Co-operation, which originated from GATT. It had abstained from voting in order not to prejudice possible further efforts within the United Nations to achieve the desired end. Although Czechoslovakia had from the outset been a member of GATT, and did not deny its usefulness in many respects, his delegation had to admit that its sphere of activities and membership were rather limited and the same would apply to the proposed Organization. But his delegation wished to express the hope that the Organization, if it came into being, would eventually be reorganized in accordance with the principle of universality and would fulfil the hopes of those who regarded it as the beginning of a world organization.

21. Mr. O'NAGHTEN (Cuba) wished to point out to the representative of Bulgaria that the arguments which the Cuban delegation had advanced in support of its objection to the Bulgarian draft resolution appeared in the summary record of the 473rd meeting. He would add, with regard to the arguments which had later been adduced in favour of the Bulgarian draft resolution, after Cuba's intervention in the general debate—in particular, the suggestion that the conference of ex-

perts might lead to the establishment of a new international organization—that he did not think that over-ambitious projects had much chance of being carried out. In view of the fate of the Havana Charter and the small number of Member States which had consented to bind themselves by an instrument even as limited as GATT, the establishment of a world trade organization which would include the eighty-two Members of the United Nations seemed a little unlikely, unless it was to be merely a kind of academic institution for the study of trade problems. Those were the primary considerations underlying his delegation's opposition to the Bulgarian draft resolution.

22. His delegation had voted in favour of the seven-Power draft resolution because it did not share the misgivings of certain members at the inclusion of two categories of members in the Organization for International Trade. It thought it quite reasonable that certain powers should be reserved to the Contracting Parties to GATT and on questions of direct interest to GATT.

23. He wished to congratulate the sponsors of the joint draft resolution on the results of the vote; he pointed out that only eight delegations had voted against operative paragraph 2 and even if the abstentions were counted, the draft resolution as a whole had been adopted by an absolute majority. Moreover, in accordance with the rules of procedure it had easily obtained a two-thirds majority of the votes cast.

24. Mr. KAMENOV (Bulgaria) said that he had not contended that the representatives of Belgium and Cuba had failed to explain their objections to the Bulgarian draft resolution; he had simply pointed out that the arguments they had used were not valid.

25. Mr. O'NAGHTEN (Cuba) thanked the representative of Bulgaria for recognizing that he (Mr. O'Naghten) had explained his opposition to the Bulgarian draft resolution, and observed that the onus of proof lay on the person presenting the proposal. In the case in question, the fact that the proposal had been withdrawn was rather significant, and he would like to ask whether the representative of Bulgaria thought his arguments were valid.

26. Mr. WOULBROUN (Belgium) pointed out that it was difficult to judge the value of an argument objectively. However that might be, the majority of members of the Committee had shown their preference by voting for the seven-Power draft resolution.

27. Mr. LAMANI (Albania) said he had voted against the joint draft resolution because his delegation was convinced that the implementation of the proposal made by the seven Powers, far from representing a step forward, would seriously hamper the development of international economic relations. Moreover, some of those who had supported the draft resolution had not been fully satisfied with it. The seven-Power text could not replace the Bulgarian draft resolution; it was to be hoped that the recommendations in the latter text would be better understood and receive a warmer welcome in the future. Albania, for its part, would always be prepared to participate in any effort aimed at establishing true international co-operation.

28. Mr. SOLANO LOPEZ (Paraguay) had abstained from voting in view of the fact that under the seven-Power draft resolution, the principal requirement for admission to the proposed organization would be acces-

sion to GATT. However, he had supported the amendment proposed by Afghanistan (A/C.2/L.343), which was of special interest to his country.

29. Mr. EL KOHEN (Morocco) explained that his delegation had voted for the first part of operative paragraph 2 because it wished to stress the importance attached to economic co-operation and the expansion of international trade. As it had not had sufficient time to make a proper study of the recommendation in the second part, it had preferred to abstain from voting on that portion of the draft resolution.

30. Mr. KACEM (Afghanistan) thanked the members of the Committee who had supported the amendment which he had submitted, and the Netherlands delegation, in particular, which had helped him to overcome certain difficulties. With regard to the draft resolution itself, the Afghan delegation had abstained from voting on the fifth and sixth preambulatory paragraphs, the second part of operative paragraph 2, and the draft as a whole, since no final decision had yet been taken with regard to possible accession by Afghanistan to GATT.

31. Mr. HALIQ (Saudi Arabia) considered that the seven-Power draft resolution had been badly worded, badly presented and badly argued. Instead of championing the cause of freedom and equity in matters of international trade, its sponsors had dealt with the problem subjectively, frequently showing greater preoccupation with the attitude of certain great commercial Powers than with the interests of the great majority of the economically less important countries. Despite its length, the discussion had served merely to emphasize existing difficulties, without really attempting to solve the great problems which international trade presented. Under those circumstances, it was preferable not to adopt a resolution, and it was for that reason that his delegation, earlier in the debate and again before the vote was taken, had recommended the withdrawal of the two drafts and had abstained when the seven-Power draft had been put to the vote.

32. Mr. QUINTERO (Panama) said that, although his delegation had abstained from voting on the seven-Power draft resolution, it was not opposed to the substance of that proposal. Panama was convinced of the need to expand international trade. It could not, however, agree to the requirement specified for admission to the Organization for International Co-operation.

**DRAFT RESOLUTION ON BASES FOR INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION (A/C.2/L.337 AND ADD.1)**  
(continued)

33. Mr. SOLANO LOPEZ (Paraguay) said that in view of the complexity of the problems that would arise in the preparation of a declaration of economic principles, it would be wise not to make undue haste in the matter, but to proceed slowly but steadily. In submitting its draft resolution entitled "Bases for International Economic Co-operation", Mexico would seem to have adopted that attitude. For that reason the delegations of Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Uruguay, Venezuela and Paraguay had decided to support that draft resolution in principle.

34. He hoped that since the Romanian delegation had withdrawn its own text (A/C.2/L.330) and had decided to become a co-sponsor of the Mexican draft resolution,

the latter would receive the unanimous support of the Committee.

35. Mr. COSIO VILLEGAS (Mexico) and Mr. SERBAN (Romania) accepted the Indian amendment (A/C.2/L.342).

36. Mr. ABDEL-GHANI (Egypt) said that his delegation, convinced of the need to promote international economic co-operation, would support the draft resolution of Mexico and Romania in the hope that a wider dissemination of the relevant General Assembly and Economic and Social Council resolutions would stimulate efforts to harmonize the economic interests of different countries. There was no doubt that a compendium of those resolutions, especially if it contained a summary of the debates held on them, would be of great use not only to the new Members of the United Nations, but to the other countries also. However, if the proposed document was to be confined to resolutions of the United Nations, the Secretariat could prepare it without the Committee's having to adopt a resolution. A resolution would be necessary only if the draft resolution of Mexico and Romania asked that the compendium should also contain declarations and agreements made outside the United Nations for the promotion of international economic co-operation. The Egyptian delegation believed that the compendium should indeed include such declarations and agreements, since it would then present a general picture of the trends that were evident in various areas in the field of international economic co-operation. That general picture might suggest certain guiding lines, which might take the form of a declaration of principles, as the Romanian delegation had proposed, and might in the future take the form of a more binding instrument, such as an international convention on economic co-operation. In that connexion, the proposed document should contain a summary of the observations made during the twelfth session by several delegations concerning the desirability of drawing up, on the basis of the various resolutions, certain principles which could serve for the formulation of a declaration on economic co-operation. That suggestion did not necessitate any change in the draft under consideration, since that text already contained such a recommendation in the last paragraph of the preamble.

37. Mr. SERBAN (Romania) pointed out that in preparing and submitting the draft resolution in document A/C.2/L.330, his delegation had based its position on a fact noted both by the authors of the World Economic Survey, 1956 (E/2982) and by many speakers during the debate, that the economies of the various countries were growing steadily more interdependent. That fact had led the Romanian delegation, like many others, to the conclusion that it was essential to give the closest attention to problems of international economic co-operation and to support all practical efforts to increase such co-operation. In view of the diversity of economic systems in the world today and of the fact that the various countries were far from having attained the same degree of economic development, it might well be asked on what basis such practical efforts should be undertaken, and an attempt must be made to find common denominators which made allowance for the differences among Member States. Many delegations had accordingly considered that the time was ripe to formulate the principles on which international economic co-operation should be based, and that was what the Romanian delegation had attempted to do in

its draft resolution. The discussions which that draft had provoked and the fact that 34 delegations had taken part in them proved that the Romanian proposal reflected a current economic fact.

38. The Romanian delegation had maintained from the outset that the preparation of such a declaration of principles could not and should not be the task of one delegation alone, and it was gratified that several representatives had made observations and submitted suggestions with a view to helping in the drafting of the declaration. The debate had enabled the delegations to exchange views profitably and constitute basic suggestions for a solution which could be used at a later stage. But in view of the complexity of the problem, the diversity of the opinions expressed and the fact that several delegations, although favourable to the idea of a declaration of economic principles, were not prepared to adopt such a declaration at the present session, the Romanian delegation had withdrawn its draft resolution. It reserved the right to raise the question again at the next session of the General Assembly and hoped that the other delegations would then be in a position to consider the matter in detail and take decisions regarding the formulation of the principles in question. The Romanian delegation had associated itself with the Mexican delegation in submitting the draft resolution in document A/C.2/L.337 to the Committee in order to help pave the way for the discussion at the General Assembly's thirteenth session. Like the Mexican delegation, it wished to stress that it considered the accomplishment of the task entrusted to the Secretariat under that resolution to be only the first step towards the preparation of a declaration of principles to regulate international economic co-operation.

39. Mr. QUINTERO (Panama) recalled that Mr. Padilla Nervo, whose speech at the 699th plenary meeting had inspired the draft resolution submitted jointly by the delegations of Mexico and Romania, had expressed the fear that one or more States might draw up a draft declaration of economic principles in which indisputable principles would be set forth in such a manner and presented in such a context that the proposed declaration would take on a tendentious character and become unacceptable to the other delegations. The latter would then be compelled to work out other proposals of their own which would not be satisfactory to the authors of the first draft. Mr. Padilla Nervo had rightly emphasized that the proposed declaration of principles should help to unify, not divide, Members. The fears of the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Mexico, which had been shared by the Panamanian delegation, had proved to be well founded, since the Romanian draft resolution, though containing principles which no one had opposed, had nevertheless provoked sharp criticism and had been deemed unacceptable.

40. The representative of Mexico, who had stressed at an earlier meeting that the only basis for any United Nations work was conformity with the views and interests of Members and that the desired agreement could not be reached on the basis of the Romanian draft resolution, had endeavoured to exert a conciliatory influence. His efforts had been completely successful, since the representative of Romania had agreed to withdraw his draft resolution and to support that of Mexico. It was primarily because the draft resolution of Mexico and Romania was inspired by that spirit of conciliation that the Panamanian delegation and the other Latin

American delegations had decided to support it. They had not, however, undertaken to vote for that draft resolution in its present form and they were accordingly prepared to support any amendment which would not violate the spirit of conciliation in which that text had been conceived. For that reason, the delegation of Panama supported the amendment of India (A/C.2/L.342), as it accorded with its own desire that the Secretariat's task, which was not an end in itself but a means of preparing the declaration of economic principles, should be completed rapidly. The delegation of Panama also considered that it would be appropriate to indicate in the preamble to the resolution that the compendium and index mentioned in the operative part should be used in the drafting of a declaration of economic principles designed to strengthen international economic co-operation. If the delegation of Argentina proceeded with its announced intention of submitting a proposal along those lines, the representative of Panama would support such an amendment.

41. Certain highly industrialized countries had indicated that they could not help having certain misgivings about the proposed declaration of principles. Their fears were groundless, since there was no reason why such a declaration, which would be of great value to the under-developed countries, should conflict with the interests of the industrialized countries. The economic Charter of the Americas, adopted at the Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace, in 1945 at Chapultepec, and the Declaration of Economic Principles signed at Buenos Aires, for example, were not prejudicial to the interests of the industrialized countries having economic relations with Latin America. Moreover, the more highly developed countries should bear in mind that it was impossible to solve world economic problems by maintaining the existing imbalance between the privileged economy of the industrialized countries and the beggarly economy of the under-developed countries. Such an imbalance ultimately jeopardized even the development of the more advanced countries, and it could be said that the well-being of all people was indispensable to world security.

42. Mr. COSIO VILLEGAS (Mexico) said that although the proposals of the Egyptian representative were interesting and although it was true that they might help the Committee to arrive at the desired result, it was nevertheless inappropriate to ask the Secretary-General to study documents which were extraneous to the United Nations. The texts which had been mentioned by the Egyptian representative and had been extensively commented upon in the world press could readily be obtained from libraries.

43. Mr. DIPP GOMEZ (Dominican Republic) said that his delegation had agreed to support the Mexican resolution and that, in principle, it approved the Indian amendment and the suggestions of the Egyptian representative. He would like to know whether the Secretary-General would be able to meet the wishes of the representatives of India and Egypt.

44. Mr. HALIQ (Saudi Arabia) preferred that the draft resolution should not be amended. Before expressing an opinion on the first proposal of the Egyptian representative, which would request the Secretary-General to analyse documents other than United Nations documents, he would await the views of the Secretariat on the subject. With respect to the Egyptian representative's second suggestion, he felt that it would be suffi-

ent for the Secretariat to indicate in the introduction to the document which it was to prepare the reasons for the task it had been assigned, without the Committee having to state them in the draft resolution. He would also like to know whether the word "principles" in the fourth paragraph of the preamble referred to the principles which had been discussed during the Committee's debates or to those mentioned in the second preambular paragraph, i.e., the principles set forth in the General Assembly resolutions. That point should be clarified in the text. Lastly, he preferred the term "subject index" appearing in the English text of the operative part to the French term "index analytique"

which, in his opinion, implied that the Secretariat would have to formulate conclusions, whereas that was exclusively the function of the Economic and Social Council.

45. Mr. SALEM (Argentina) said that he would not formally submit the amendment to which the representative of Panama had referred, as he would not wish to introduce into the draft resolution of Mexico and Romania elements likely to give rise to a controversy which would prevent that text from being adopted unanimously.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.