



ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Fiftieth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Monday, 3 May 1971,
at 3.00 p.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Rachid DRISS (Tunisia).

AGENDA ITEM 20

Emergency assistance to Palestine refugees (E/L.1387)

1. Mr. AKWEI (Ghana) said that before introducing the draft resolution in document E/L.1387 he would like to indicate a few small changes in the text. The last words of operative paragraph 1 should be changed from "to the extent of \$2 million" to "up to \$2 million". The last words of operative paragraph 2 should be changed from "to the extent of \$1 million from each of them" to "to the maximum extent possible". The words "particularly of paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 2672 B (XXV)" should be added at the end of operative paragraph 4, and the word "possible" in operative paragraph 5 should be replaced by the word "appropriate".

2. The draft resolution was non-controversial and humanitarian. It was addressed solely to the need for funds to enable the Palestine refugees to enjoy the minimum amenities of human existence. It did not deal with the political aspects of the Palestine question. The United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) was experiencing deep financial difficulties and had a deficit of \$6.5 million for 1971. If that deficit was not liquidated, the only alternative would be to reduce its services drastically. The Working Group referred to in the third preambular paragraph had established contact with officials of the host countries and of neighbouring States in a position to offer assistance and had approached organizations in the United Nations family. He was sure that the Council would wish to welcome the positive response of the World Food Programme (WFP), the International Labour Organisation (ILO), the World Health Organization (WHO) and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), as referred to in operative paragraphs 1, 2 and 3. However, the measures envisaged in those paragraphs had not yet been carried out, which explained the necessity for operative paragraph 4. The main thrust of the resolution came in operative paragraphs 5 and 6, which requested the specialized agencies, non-governmental organizations and other United Nations bodies to respond to the challenge presented by the plight of the Palestine refugees.

3. Mr. HEDEMANN (Norway) said that the importance Norway attached to the subject of the draft resolution under consideration, of which his delegation was co-sponsor, had been reflected in a communiqué issued at the conclusion of the last meeting of the Nordic Ministers for Foreign Affairs urging Governments and organizations to increase their contributions to UNRWA without delay so that it could continue its humanitarian work without

reducing its activities. The Members of the United Nations had a collective responsibility to help the refugees. His Government had responded to the appeals made in the General Assembly resolutions referred to in the preamble to the draft resolution by announcing an extraordinary contribution of \$140,000 to UNRWA, in addition to which it had increased its regular contribution for 1971 by 100 per cent. The Norwegian Council for Refugees, a private organization, was also doubling its contribution to UNRWA in 1971. Thus the Norwegian contributions pledged to UNRWA for 1971 totalled approximately \$500,000. The main purpose of the draft resolution was to secure maximum assistance to UNRWA and the Palestine refugees from the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations family.

4. Mr. STATHATOS (Greece) welcomed the initiative taken by the delegations of Ghana and Norway in submitting draft resolution E/L.1387. His Government had always taken an active interest in the fate of the Palestine refugees and desired to contribute to the efforts to alleviate their plight. By adopting the draft resolution, the Council would be drawing the attention of the membership of the United Nations and its specialized agencies to the humanitarian aspects of the Palestine question and more particularly to the serious financial crisis which jeopardized the activities of UNRWA. The international community had the duty to ensure that UNRWA was provided with the financial means to continue its life-saving operation. The deficit which UNRWA faced was particularly alarming since it endangered the Agency's educational and vocational activities. Furthermore, the Commissioner-General of UNRWA had warned that a further reduction in the relief programme would have an adverse effect on the nutrition of children now living in emergency conditions. The Council would be failing in its duty if it did not take action to alleviate the sufferings of the Palestine refugees, who, through no fault of their own, were dependent on international solidarity for their existence.

5. His delegation would support the draft resolution under consideration, but felt that it should include an appeal to non-contributing countries for assistance to UNRWA. It might be argued that such an appeal was implicit in operative paragraph 4, which expressed the hope for an early implementation of General Assembly resolution 2672 B (XXV); however, his delegation thought that it would be preferable to insert an additional operative paragraph in which such an appeal would be specifically made.

6. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) said that his delegation was grateful to the delegations of Ghana and Norway for submitting the draft resolution. He associated himself with the remarks made by the representative of Greece concerning the need for an additional operative paragraph

appealing for assistance to UNRWA from non-contributing Member States. He was glad to note that the positive steps taken by the Director-General of UNESCO had already yielded results and suggested that the words “and the encouraging results obtained so far” should be added at the end of operative paragraph 3. He had doubts about the change in operative paragraph 5 indicated by the representative of Ghana, since all assistance was appropriate assistance. It would be better to retain the word “possible” and to insert the word “appropriate” before the words “ways and means”.

7. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that his Government had shown the greatest interest in the problem of the Palestine refugees ever since its inception in 1948 and had participated in the humanitarian work done by UNRWA. Up to 1970, its total contributions had amounted to about \$16 million. In 1970, it had contributed a total of \$1 million, \$800,000 of which was in the form of an extraordinary contribution. It was certainly desirable to ensure the financial soundness of UNRWA, and the normal way to do so would be for contributing countries to increase their contributions and for non-contributing countries to start contributing. However, in the absence of voluntary contributions it would be necessary to have recourse to indirect financial assistance. Of course, the only way to put an end to the sufferings of the refugees once and for all was to find a lasting solution to the Middle East problem, but in the meantime the United Nations should do all it could to enable UNRWA to reduce its deficit and continue its humanitarian efforts. It was in that spirit that the Council should consider the draft resolution before it, which should receive unanimous support. His delegation would vote in favour of it. However, it had no objections to the amendment suggested by the representative of the Sudan.

8. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon) said that his delegation welcomed draft resolution E/L.1387 and supported the additions suggested by the representative of the Sudan. It was grateful for the positive steps taken by the Director-General of UNESCO and hoped that his appeal would result in increased contributions from Governments. He paid a tribute to the Chairman of the Working Group, who had spared no effort to promote the objectives of General Assembly resolution 2728 (XXV), and to the Secretary-General, who had made several appeals for the implementation of the provisions of that resolution. His delegation appreciated the efforts of a number of Governments, especially the large contributors, which had increased their contributions to UNRWA, and it was glad that others had joined the list of Member States assisting UNRWA in its humanitarian task.

9. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) recalled that his Government had been a major contributor to UNRWA since its inception, had voted for General Assembly resolutions 2656 (XXV) and 2672 B (XXV) and was represented on the Working Group, to whose efforts and those of its Chairman it wished to pay a tribute. He supported the draft resolution with the changes mentioned by Ghana and those suggested by the Sudan. However, he felt that a few other minor changes would make the text more accurate. At the end of operative paragraph 4 the words “in accordance with constitutional procedures” should be added; the word “all” in operative paragraph 5 might be

deleted as some specialized agencies were not concerned; and the words “to continue” should be inserted after the words “the non-governmental organizations concerned” in operative paragraph 5.

10. Mr. AYOUB (Tunisia), Mr. QUARONI (Italy), Mr. SUMANTERA (Indonesia), Mr. TAIB (Malaysia), Mr. LOUYA (Democratic Republic of the Congo) and Mr. LEGNANI (Uruguay) supported the draft resolution, with the proposed amendments.

11. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) recalled that his Government had contributed substantially to UNRWA but felt that the main burden of relief should be borne by the States which were responsible for the eviction of the refugees from their homeland. The problem required a long-term solution based on the cessation of the aggressive actions which had caused it. The draft resolution was appropriate not only because of the present strain on UNRWA's finances but also because of the responsibility of the Economic and Social Council to carry out its obligations with regard to the situation in the Middle East. He would therefore support the draft resolution with the Sudanese amendments.

12. Mr. YOGASUNDRAM (Ceylon) supported the draft resolution and the Sudanese amendments to operative paragraphs 3 and 5. He hoped that the present crisis would not cause a further reduction in the services that UNRWA provided to the refugees, for that might have serious political repercussions. He trusted that the change in operative paragraph 1 indicated by the Ghanaian representative did not imply a reduction in the help of WFP; it was to be hoped that the aid target mentioned in the original version would be achieved.

13. He asked the UNESCO representative for information on the results of the action taken by the Director-General of that organization.

14. Mr. BUSH (United States of America), recalling that his Government had long supported UNRWA, said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution.

15. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) supported the draft resolution with all the proposed changes and said that he would like to pay a tribute to the brisk and effective way the Working Group had gone about its business in bringing to the attention of Member States the tragic and human problems of the Palestine refugees and the critical state of the finances of UNRWA.

16. He noted that New Zealand had consistently supported the Agency for 20 years and was one of the major contributors to it. Nevertheless, the needs of the Agency were great and urgent and he therefore supported fully the efforts made to increase the contributions of member Governments, agencies and others to enable the work of UNRWA to be continued at its present level.

17. Mr. ORČIĆ (Yugoslavia), Mr. DE SOTO (Peru), Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil), Mr. NDUNG'U (Kenya), Mr. MARCH (Jamaica) and Mr. ANTOINE (Haiti) supported the draft resolution.

18. Mr. ZAKHAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the

draft resolution as a whole because it appreciated the need to render assistance to the Arab peoples, victims of the aggression by Israel, the troops of which continued to occupy a part of the territories of the Arab States.

19. At the same time, his delegation would request a separate vote on operative paragraphs 2, 5 and 6 and would abstain in the vote on those paragraphs. In that connexion, it wished to make its position clear and to stress that the USSR had rendered and was continuing to render important bilateral assistance to the Arab peoples, victims of the Israeli aggression. The USSR would continue to give support to its Arab friends and to provide them comprehensive assistance on a bilateral basis.

20. Mr. VARCHAVER (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) said that on 1 January 1971 the Director-General of UNESCO had launched an appeal for voluntary financial assistance to the joint UNRWA/UNESCO educational effort, on the basis of decisions taken by the Executive Board at its eighty-fourth and eighty-fifth sessions in 1970. To enhance the appeal, the Director-General had invited the Permanent Representative of Sudan to the United Nations to visit a number of countries in order to obtain additional contributions from Governments and from non-governmental and private organizations, an invitation which had been accepted. The response to the appeal had been encouraging and more was expected as a result of the visits still to be made by the Sudanese representative and the spontaneous response of a number of Member States. So far, cash contributions totalling \$778,635 had been pledged or received from Abu Dhabi, Bahrain, Denmark, Dubai, Kuwait, Libya, Norway, Qatar and Switzerland. In addition, the Governments of Iran, Iraq, Lebanon and Sweden had promised financial contributions of as yet unspecified amounts. Still other Governments had expressed their willingness to review their position on contributions. Lastly, various non-governmental and private organizations in Finland, Italy, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom had pledged substantial contributions in kind, ranging from the services of experts to the supply of timber and educational materials. The Director-General wished to express his gratitude for the generosity of many Governments and organizations and for the devoted efforts of his special envoy. He also wished to express the hope that countries and organizations which had not yet done so would soon join in supporting the joint educational efforts of UNRWA and UNESCO.

21. Mr. AKWEI (Ghana) said that the sponsors of the draft resolution (E/L.1387) accepted the Sudanese and United Kingdom amendments. Although they would have preferred the Greek suggestion to be withdrawn because the point he had raised was already covered by the second preambular paragraph, they had agreed to insert the words "particularly of paragraph 3 of resolution 2672 B (XXV)" after the words "above-mentioned decision" in operative paragraph 4.

22. They hoped that the USSR representative would not press his request for a separate vote on individual paragraphs of a resolution of the nature of the one before the Committee, since that would tend to diminish its impact.

23. Mr. ZAKHAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation wanted to express by

means of a vote its reservations on the three operative paragraphs in question.

24. The PRESIDENT put to the vote operative paragraphs 2, 5 and 6 of the draft resolution (E/L.1387), as amended.

The paragraphs were adopted by 24 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

25. The PRESIDENT invited the Committee to vote on draft resolution E/L.1387 as a whole, as amended.

The draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was adopted unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 9

Transport development (continued):

(b) Preparation for the United Nations/IMCO Conference on International Container Traffic (E/4963, E/L.1380, E/L.1388)

26. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) observed that transport had always been a creative and dynamic sector, and one of its most significant features was the development of containerization. Although that development was still at a relatively early stage, it was vital that action should be taken by the international community to regulate practices and procedures. His Government therefore warmly supported the Council's decision, taken at its resumed forty-eighth session, that a United Nations/IMCO Container Conference should be convened. Steps should be taken to ensure that the developing countries were not left out of containerization development. Their share of world shipping tonnage in 1969 had been only 7.6 per cent, although they had accounted for 64.7 per cent of all cargoes loaded and 18.1 per cent of all cargoes unloaded. Since containerization and container traffic were capital-intensive, there was a danger that they might be negative factors in the establishment of an equitable share for the developing countries in shipping and other modes of transport. He therefore advocated that technical and financial assistance should be provided to enable the developing countries to participate in new developments such as containerization and the "LASH" system of specially designed barge-carrying vessels.

27. While noting that there had been fruitful co-operation between different United Nations bodies at the secretariat level and that progress had been made on a number of items of the agenda for the Conference he expressed concern that, with the exception of the Economic Commission for Europe (ECE), regional economic commissions had played virtually no part in the preparatory process; now that the United Nations had a Membership of 127 States, a truly universal approach, rather than a solely European one, was called for.

28. He believed that it would be advisable to set up a United Nations/IMCO intergovernmental preparatory committee which would undertake to, *inter alia*, define the scope of the Conference. He noted in that connexion that one of the topics of the Conference was entitled "Legal problems concerning in particular the liability of combined

transport operators and related questions" (see E/4963, para. 2 (c)) and that under that topic a draft Convention on the International Combined Transport of Goods (TCM) had been circulated. That document was in no way relevant to containerization and indeed made no reference to containers or container traffic. The general objective of the draft Convention was to provide regulatory control over all intermodal or combined transport operations, which had been carried on long before the advent of containers. It provided for control to be exercised by the combined transport operator, who would be able to make decisions affecting in various degrees such matters as cargo routing, the competitive position of transport companies and national economies, preferential arrangements for shipping and labour conditions at points of trans-shipment, all of which has serious economic implications. His delegation felt that no international convention on combined transport should be based on concepts that might bring about a situation in which all unitized cargoes would depend entirely on services supplied by a few countries. Although the draft Convention would not be compulsory, it would inevitably have far-reaching effects in the long term. It was not surprising, therefore, that the UNCTAD Committee on Shipping had in its resolution 17 (V) recommended that the Economic and Social Council should be invited to consider undertaking a study of the economic implications, in particular for developing countries, of the proposed TCM Convention. Some kind of regulation of intermodal or combined transport operation was possible and desirable, but the developing countries could not be rushed into arrangements that were contrary to their economic interests and benefited a small group of countries only. Although attention should be given to the legal and other problems posed by intermodal or combined transport operations, such problems went beyond the question of international container traffic and should not be taken up at the Conference. In any event, there would not be time to do so.

29. In support of his delegation's view that the draft Convention lay outside the scope of the Conference, he pointed out that the combined transport operator would act and the combined transport document would be issued even if unitization through containers or other means did not take place. Intermodal or combined transport operations represented a current practice, the characteristics, requirements and legal problems of which were by no means confined to the domain of containerization or any other form of unitization. Moreover, the specific terms of reference of the Conference—as a conference on international container traffic—had been duly respected when other items had been discussed. To include consideration of the draft Convention in the agenda of the Conference would be to seek to secure over-all control of transport operations by a back-door approach. That was a good example of a matter over which the Council should exercise policy control.

30. His delegation supported the study called for by the UNCTAD Committee on Shipping and would in due course, together with other delegations, submit a draft resolution on the question.

31. Mr. HEDEMANN (Norway) said that it had been obvious for many years that there was a need for unified rules governing both the liability for goods that were moved

by combined transport and the legal character of the relevant documentation. After describing the work carried out on the draft TCM Convention since 1957 by the International Institute for the Unification of Private Law, and the International Maritime Committee, he expressed his delegation's satisfaction that the Council had at its forty-eighth session decided to take up the matter as part of the agenda for the Container Conference. On that subject, he had to disagree with the view of the Brazilian representative. On the other hand, he fully agreed that the Council should act on the recommendation made by the UNCTAD Committee on Shipping and undertake a study on the economic implications, in particular for developing countries, of the proposed Convention. His delegation believed that such a study would show that the Convention would be more favourable to cargo owners than the existing law applicable to combined transport and that the negotiable combined transport document dealt with in the Convention would prove to be a most useful instrument for furthering international trade. It was important that the study should be available well in advance of the Conference and he therefore suggested that November 1971 should be set as the time-limit for its completion. At the latest, the study should be circulated by the end of January 1972, when, according to the time-table proposed by the Secretary-General in his note (see E/4963, para. 6), the consolidated draft Convention, proposals and recommendations would be circulated to Governments and the organizations concerned.

32. Mr. WEBB (United States of America) referred to the great impact that the container revolution had had on international transport and to its major role in the development of a new transport concept—intermodalism. He noted that the container revolution had resulted mainly from the efforts of the private sector and said that, in the view of the United States, the role of Governments in that area should be mainly one of encouraging and facilitating the process. It regarded the development as a desirable one because containerization led to increased world trade by reducing or preventing increases in the costs of transport. Since the private sector had already been reasonably successful in its efforts, it would be unfortunate if Governments took action which had the effect of stifling innovation or distorting the benefits to be derived from containerization. If anything, Governments had lagged behind in establishing the necessary administrative and legal framework for container movement. However, there was a good record of international co-operation in the matter, and he cited the Customs Convention on Containers as an example.

33. It was natural that container traffic has so far developed mainly among the highly developed countries, but the time had come to make the existing intergovernmental framework universal in scope, and the Container Conference would provide an opportunity to do so. His delegation hoped that as many of the developing countries as possible would participate in the Conference, so that the resulting agreements and conventions would be widely accepted and thus bring economic benefits to all. The proposed date and duration of the Conference and the Secretariat's proposal (see E/4963, para. 7) with respect to invitations were acceptable to his Government. He expressed the view, however, that as a matter of protocol the

invitations should come from the Secretaries-General of the United Nations and IMCO, as co-sponsors of the Conference. Observers should be limited to those organizations having consultative status or special working arrangements with the specialized agencies.

34. Although he was aware that certain aspects of the Conference had been discussed at a number of meetings of such bodies as IMCO and ECE, he felt that the time had come for Governments to take a collective look at the arrangements and to reach whatever decisions were necessary to ensure that adequate preparations were made. There were a number of matters on which the Secretariat would need guidance, such as the priority to be given to the various topics, and it was also essential to reach early agreement on a provisional agenda. He therefore proposed that the Secretariat should address a circular letter to Governments, based on the Council's discussions, requesting their views on a number of points. September 1971 might be set as the time-limit for replies, which could then be communicated to Member States in the following two months. He also proposed that the Council should set up a small intergovernmental preparatory committee, representing both the United Nations and IMCO, that would consider the replies at, say, the beginning of January 1972. The committee could prepare guidelines for the Conference and work out a provisional agenda. It might also reconvene before the opening of the Conference to assist in final preparations. Because of the time factor, the Council should take a decision on his proposals at the current session.

35. With regard to the study recommended by the UNCTAD Committee on Shipping, his Government's support was qualified by the belief that such a study should be directed to very specific ends, such as the development of certain types of information that would permit Governments to evaluate better the TCM Convention and its possible consequences. His delegation had prepared and would make available to other delegations an informal paper on suitable items that could be taken up. In that connexion, his delegation felt that the range of possible conflicting interests in the TCM Convention was better defined along industry sector lines than along national lines. As an example, it considered that shipper interests in the TCM Convention shared a common position regardless of their country of domicile. He hoped that the proposed economic study would be completed as expeditiously as possible and that it would be undertaken by an outside consultant or consulting firm with specific terms of reference provided by the Council. Because of the complexity of the Convention, the study would involve three overlapping areas: international intermodal transport operations, especially containerization; transport insurance, including both liability insurance of the carriers and cargo insurance of the shipper or consignee; and the legal structure provided by the existing international transport liability conventions, namely The Hague Rules, 1921, and the Convention for the Unification of Certain Rules regarding International Transport, with Additional Protocol, signed at Warsaw, October 12, 1929.¹ When completed, the study should be sent not only to Governments but also to the secretariats of the organizations concerned, as well as to the regional economic commissions.

¹ League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. CXXXVII (1933), No. 3145.

36. Mr. JAIN (Observer for India), addressing the Council under rule 75 of the rules of procedure, stressed the importance for India and other developing countries of the United Nations/IMCO Container Conference. In particular, he endorsed the comments made by the Brazilian representative on the subject of the TCM Convention and agreed that there should first be a full study of the economic implications which the Convention would have for the developing countries. Consultations with all Member Governments as well as with the regional economic commissions would be most valuable and might establish whether a country-wide or an industry-wide problem was involved.

37. He also agreed with the United States proposal for a preparatory committee, pointing out that if Governments were asked in advance for their views on the agenda items for the Conference, it would prevent substantive items that had not been properly considered from arising unexpectedly.

38. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the development of containerization was making it possible to establish a more effective international system of transport. All countries would benefit from the development of that new system, and the United Nations/IMCO Container Conference would, by bringing together all the transport organizations and other organizations with an interest in the matter, create an opportunity for solving the various technical and legal problems that had arisen in that connexion. As a system of intracontinental and intercontinental freight movement, containerization had three main advantages. It provided the most rapid means of transport of goods between countries, it resulted in substantial reductions in cost, and it facilitated the better organization of the labour involved in the transportation of goods. At the international level, it would bring about a reduction in the manpower required for customs inspection and other customs procedures. For those reasons, his Government favoured the introduction of the container system in as many countries as possible. Such a system would be particularly advantageous to the developing countries. His delegation was keenly interested in the preparations for the United Nations/IMCO Container Conference and intended to take an active part in formulating a system to promote containerization in all parts of the world. As many countries as possible should participate in that process, and it was incomprehensible that certain delegations wished to omit a country as important as the German Democratic Republic from the Conference.

39. His Government was confident that the Conference would lead to the introduction of a world containerization system on a single basis. A uniform system of containerization, such as the one to be introduced in his own country, would help in solving five major transport problems: First, it would facilitate the passage of containers between countries. Secondly, it would permit more rapid loading and unloading operations, making use of up-to-date techniques and thereby reducing the manpower required. Thirdly, it would promote the more effective utilization of technological improvements in transport facilities. Fourthly, it would increase the safety of personnel involved in freight transport and help in the preservation of goods. Finally, it would accelerate and simplify commercial,

customs, health and other procedures by standardizing the paperwork involved.

40. His delegation thought the Conference should consider four main questions: the draft convention on the combined transport contract; the draft convention on safe intermodal transport of containers; the draft of a revised customs convention relating to containers; and the standardization of containers for international air, sea and land transport.

41. His delegation would be willing to consider other questions as well, such as those relating to preservation and insurance against damage in the transport of plants and other agricultural produce, which were of particular concern to the developing countries. The Economic Commission for Europe would be able to formulate recommendations on such questions, which would make the Conference more constructive and likely to produce positive results.

42. He hoped that the Conference would hasten the day when all types of transport would serve the true purpose of development to the advantage of all peoples and not just that of profit-making corporations. In conclusion, he pointed out that the introduction of an international container system would create the conditions necessary for the establishment of an international transport centre.

43. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had no objection to the inclusion of the topic indicated in paragraph 2 (e) of document E/4963, but felt it should not be a separate item as it would inevitably arise in connexion with the discussion of the safety and customs conventions. The topic referred to in paragraph 2 (g) likewise need not constitute a separate item; indeed, it might even be undesirable to decide on any particular pattern of documentation. He doubted whether special container manifests would be acceptable to various Government customs authorities, including the United Kingdom's. He also had reservations with regard to topic (f), as it was difficult to see at the present time whether separate identification would prove necessary to customs authorities. Otherwise, he found the general preparation for the Conference to be proceeding satisfactorily.

44. He disagreed with the Brazilian representative's implication that the preparation of the Conference was being rushed by the shipping countries to the detriment of the developing countries and that the Conference in general would be disadvantageous to the latter. The developing countries were well represented in UNCTAD and had

participated in the preparatory work done by IMCO. He could understand Brazil's doubts about the appropriateness of discussing at the Conference a convention which went beyond the original technical purpose of the Conference, but he felt that the development of containers and the need for the Conference had made questions related to the Convention more urgent and its discussion at the Conference would therefore be quite in order.

45. His delegation supported the UNCTAD proposal for further study and felt that the Council's best course would be to agree to the study and ask for its submission as soon as possible.

46. The United Kingdom representative doubted the need for the establishment of the small intergovernmental study group proposed by the United States representative, as he feared arguments about its composition. The scope of the work of the group, if established, should be carefully defined: it should merely prepare for the Conference and should not redraft documents.

AGENDA ITEM 7

Report of the Statistical Commission (*concluded*) (E/4938, E/4989, chap. VI, sect. A; E/L.1372, E/L.1389/Rev.1)

47. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), introducing a revised version (E/L.1389/Rev.1) of the draft resolution, said that the sponsors had made every effort to take account of the many views expressed on their original draft; in particular, they had rearranged the order of paragraphs to accommodate those views. They had included an idea suggested by the French representative in operative paragraph 4 and an idea suggested by the Sudanese representative in operative paragraph 7.

48. Mr. PRAGUE (France) proposed the inclusion of the word "national" before the words "statistical matters" in operative paragraph 4.

49. The sponsors having accepted the amendment proposed by France, the PRESIDENT put draft resolution E/L.1389/Rev.1 to the vote.

The draft resolution, as orally amended, was adopted unanimously.

The meeting rose at 6.5 p.m.