



**C O N T E N T S**

	<i>Page</i>
Non-governmental organizations ( <i>continued</i> ): (d) Application of the Headquarters Agreement to representatives of non-governmental organizations (General Assembly resolution 606 (VI)) (E/L.317, E/L.372) ( <i>concluded</i> ) .....	385

**President: Mr. S. Amjad ALI (Pakistan).**

*Present:* The representatives of the following countries:

Argentina, Belgium, Canada, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, France, Iran, Mexico, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Observers from the following countries:

Chile, Netherlands.

The representative of the following specialized agency:

International Labour Organisation.

**Non-governmental organizations (*continued*):**  
**(d) Application of the Headquarters Agreement to representatives of non-governmental organizations (General Assembly resolution 606 (VI)) (E/L.317, E/L.372) (*concluded*)**

[Agenda item 34 (d)]

1. The PRESIDENT announced that the discussion of the participation of non-governmental organizations in the work of the United Nations would continue.

2. Mr. INGLES (Philippines) felt that requests by non-governmental organizations for representation when the General Assembly discussed economic and social subjects within their competence should always be granted rather than refused. Their attendance was an essential part of the arrangements for consultation provided for in Article 71 of the Charter. The Council had expressed that view in its resolution 413 C (XIII).

3. The access of the non-governmental organizations to the Council was subject to such restrictions that further screening before they were allowed representation at the General Assembly savoured of excessive caution. The granting of such permission should be a mere formality once they had been given consultative status.

4. Both the French draft resolution (E/L.317) and the Polish draft resolution (E/L.372) were ostensibly intended to make the representation of non-governmental organizations automatic in the General Assembly when it discussed economic and social subjects within their competence.

5. The French draft resolution, however, introduced new elements as compared with General Assembly resolution 606 (VI). First, it was restrictive, inasmuch as it apparently limited the representation of non-governmental organizations to the regular sessions of the General Assembly and, secondly, it referred to organizations in categories A and B only and omitted those on the Secretary-General's Register. He asked the sponsor and the Secretariat whether the latter organizations, some of which had been placed on the Register by the Council itself or by its Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations precisely because they had an important contribution to make to the Council's work, were thereby debarred from attending meetings of the General Assembly when items within their special competence were being discussed.

6. The final paragraph of the preamble and paragraph 1 of the operative part of the Polish draft resolution called for comment. The former stated that the Government of the United States of America was infringing the provisions of the Headquarters Agreement. That question would, in his opinion, arise only after the Council had established the procedure for inviting non-governmental organizations to send their representatives to the General Assembly pursuant to General Assembly resolution 606 (VI). Paragraph 1 of the operative part, on the other hand, requested the General Assembly to reconsider resolution 606 (VI). The Council was stopped from making that request. It had indeed the competence to make the necessary arrangements for the attendance of non-governmental organizations at General Assembly meetings under Article 71 of the Charter, but it had referred the matter to the General Assembly at its previous session. The Council was bound, therefore, by the General

Assembly's decision. All that remained for the Council to do was to implement resolution 606 (VI). Finally, paragraph 2 of the operative part of the Polish draft resolution introduced no new element, since it merely reiterated and amplified the last paragraph of resolution 606 (VI).

7. Mr. DE SEYNES (France) remarked that the questions within the purview of the Economic and Social Council which interested the non-governmental organizations would almost necessarily be taken up at the regular sessions. Accordingly, the French delegation had referred only to that type of session in its draft. But, if the Philippine delegation desired the omission of that specific reference, he would willingly agree. With regard to the omission of the non-governmental organizations on the Register, he recalled that the Council itself had decided to classify the privileges of organizations according to the categories to which they belonged. The Council had therefore placed on the Register organizations which it intended to consult only in exceptional cases. The Council had adopted that procedure to avoid increasing the expenditure incurred in consulting non-governmental organizations. He realized that the Philippine representative was legally entitled to request that provision be made for consultation with organizations on the Register. But it would be difficult in practice to extend to those organizations the facilities available to the organizations in categories A and B. Moreover, the General Assembly's sessions were public and therefore open to the representatives of non-governmental organizations on the Register.

8. Mr. BORATYNSKI (Poland) recalled that United Nations organs had met on various occasions outside the United States of America. On none of those occasions had the representation of non-governmental organizations raised any problems. The United States Government alone, by its dilatory tactics, had tried to prevent certain organizations from participating in the discussions of organs meeting at United Nations Headquarters. He recalled that Article 71 of the Charter authorized the Council to make suitable arrangements for consultation with non-governmental organizations. The Council ought to ensure that the principle of automatic representation of non-governmental organizations in the discussions of United Nations bodies was respected. It was with that idea in mind that the Polish delegation had submitted its draft resolution (E/L.372).

9. The PRESIDENT asked the Secretary to inform the Council of the opinion of the Legal Department of the Secretariat, which had been consulted at the request of the Uruguayan representative.

10. Mr. YATES (Secretary of the Council) stated that the Polish draft resolution raised the question whether and in what circumstances the Secretary-General would be able to put the provisions it contained into effect. The draft resolution asked the Secretary-General, in the first place, to continue to give assistance to the representatives of non-governmental organizations with a view to facilitating the carrying out of their consultative functions. That, in the opinion of the Secretariat, would mean that the Secretary-General should continue to act within the

provisions of part IX of resolution 288 (X), which governed consultative status. With regard to the last phrase in paragraph 2 of the operative part of the draft resolution, beginning with the words "and to give suitable assistance", Mr. Yates pointed out that it was linked grammatically to the words "to continue" at the beginning of the paragraph. Furthermore, the words "suitable assistance" must be understood in the sense of the arrangements indicated in document E/C.2/INF.2, which had been communicated to the Council and to the non-governmental organizations themselves in July 1951.

11. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) noted that the French draft resolution (E/L.317) was based on General Assembly resolution 606 (VI); in fact, the preamble quoted the very words of that resolution. It might be asked why the preamble of the French draft resolution, that was, the text adopted by the General Assembly, was then limited by the operative paragraph of the draft resolution, for while the General Assembly resolution spoke of organizations having consultative status, the operative part of the French draft resolution referred specifically to organizations in categories A and B. The Czechoslovak delegation could see no justification for any such restriction and did not understand why the draft resolution did not respect the spirit of the General Assembly resolution.

12. Again, according to the French draft resolution, the Economic and Social Council would request the Secretary-General to invite those organizations to send a representative. Under the terms of the General Assembly resolution, however, non-governmental organizations were entitled to send not one but several representatives. Moreover, in view of the diversity of the questions the Council dealt with, it would be impossible for one single representative to represent any organization properly.

13. He did not understand why the French draft resolution would admit representatives of non-governmental organizations to the regular sessions only of the General Assembly. It was true that so far all the special sessions of the General Assembly had been devoted exclusively to political questions, but there was no reason why that should always be so in the future. The General Assembly might very well convene a special session to consider economic and social matters.

14. Finally, the operative part of the French draft resolution referred to the competence of the organization concerned, but not, as did the General Assembly resolution, to that of the Council. The Czechoslovak delegation thought that it would be well to reproduce in that paragraph the last phrase of the preamble, where the competence of the Council was mentioned, in line with General Assembly resolution 606 (VI).

15. The operative part of the French draft resolution should therefore be amended in order to remove the limitations in question. It would then run as follows:

*Requests* the Secretary-General to invite each non-governmental organization having consultative status to send representatives to attend public meetings of the General Assembly at which economic and

social matters within the competence of the Council and of the organization concerned are discussed.”

16. Mr. DE SEYNES (France) thought that some of the amendments proposed by the Czechoslovak representative were acceptable.

17. With regard to the number of representatives each organization could send, he considered that the Council was bound by the General Assembly resolution, which referred, in the singular, to the representative designated by an organization. In its resolution 413 C (XIII), the Economic and Social Council had declared that it was for the General Assembly itself to decide under what conditions particular categories of persons, and in particular representatives of non-governmental organizations, might be admitted to its meetings. He did not think that, having made a statement to that effect, the Council could change the provisions adopted by the General Assembly. So far as organizations on the Register were concerned, he had already explained why they had been excluded from the French resolution. He would like to hear the views of the members of the Council on that point.

18. Mr. ABDON (Iran) recalled that the Iranian delegation to the General Assembly had been one of the co-sponsors of the draft resolution the Assembly had adopted and that he himself had been the Rapporteur of the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly. It was in that capacity that he would like to make a few comments with regard to the meaning to be given to the words “the representative” in the General Assembly resolution.

19. The question had been raised in the Sixth Committee and in the ensuing debate on that point it had been agreed that the words “the representative” signified “any representative”, which meant that each organization could send several representatives, within a reasonable number, of course. The French delegation’s interpretation was therefore contrary to that of the Sixth Committee.

20. He favoured the French draft resolution, together with the amendments submitted by the Czechoslovak delegation, but he proposed that the words “a representative” in the operative part should be replaced by “any representative”. In any case, it must be noted in the record that by that term the Council meant that each organization would send no more than a reasonable number of representatives.

21. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) had nothing to add with regard to the draft resolution submitted by the Polish delegation, particularly since the Czechoslovak delegation which had hitherto supported it was proposing amendments to the French draft resolution. It might thus be assumed that the Polish draft resolution had been dropped. That seemed the obvious course, for, whereas the French draft resolution was constructive and sought for a fair solution of the problem regarding the sending of representatives of non-governmental organizations, the Polish draft resolution merely continued a fruitless discussion which had lasted for two years. It was aimed directly against the United States and did not provide any solution.

22. The French draft resolution was entirely consistent with General Assembly resolution 606 (VI). He

was not quite sure, however, what amendments the French delegation had accepted and would like further information, as the United States delegation’s vote would depend on the amendments.

23. The sending of representatives of non-governmental organizations should preferably be confined to regular sessions of the General Assembly, but that was only a minor matter.

24. What categories of non-governmental organizations should be represented was, however, a very important question. The organizations had been classified in various categories precisely because some—those in category A—were concerned with all matters within the Council’s competence; others—those in category B—were concerned with important special fields; and, finally, organizations whose status did not qualify them for classification in either category A or category B were placed on the Register.

25. Some of the many organizations on the Register were only remotely concerned with matters within the Council’s competence. Some of them had been placed on the Register by action, not of the Council, but of one or another of the specialized agencies. To grant privileged admission to the Assembly hall, while it was hard to find seating even for members of government delegations would not be justified. It was to be hoped, therefore, that the French delegation would not alter its text in that respect.

26. With regard to the number of representatives to be sent by each non-governmental organization, it should be noted that the General Assembly resolution used the words “the representative” in the singular. There again the question of seating arose. If each of the more than one hundred organizations in categories A and B was allowed to send three or four representatives to the General Assembly the Assembly’s character as an intergovernmental body would be changed. Besides, since the organizations would attend the Assembly not as consultants but as observers, it was difficult to see why they should require three or four representatives. He hoped that the French representative should not accept that amendment either. The General Assembly resolution, referring as it did to a single representative, should be respected.

27. He did not quite understand the last point of the amendment submitted by the Czechoslovak delegation namely the insertion of the words “within the competence of the Council”; it seemed superfluous as the General Assembly did not deal with economic and social matters which were not within the competence of the Economic and Social Council.

28. Mr. DE SEYNES (France) wished to make it clear that he had not accepted the amendments submitted by the Czechoslovak representative; he had stated that he would leave the decision to the Council.

29. The matter was of no great theoretical importance. The admission of their representatives would, however, cause considerable practical difficulties and the rights of the public might be infringed, since seating was limited. He would therefore prefer to maintain his text, which dealt only with organizations in categories A and B.

30. Bearing in mind the Iranian representative's interpretation of the words "a representative" used in the French draft resolution, he thought that in practice a solution might be possible: a different representative might attend each meeting if there were several meetings.

31. He would accept the amendments submitted by the Czechoslovak representative, namely the deletion of the words "in regular session" and the modification of the final phrase of the operative part to read "within the competence of the Council and of the organization concerned are discussed".

32. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) reminded the Council that his delegation had voted against resolution 606 (VI) at the sixth session of the General Assembly. The text would have to be reconsidered, but he must make it clear that he accepted the principle that the Council could not reverse a decision of the General Assembly. That was why he could not accept the French proposal, which, in four places, was contrary to the provisions of resolution 606 (VI). Incidentally, the United States representative was accepting that proposal precisely in so far as it diverged from the General Assembly resolution.

33. With regard to the amendment submitted orally by the representative of Czechoslovakia, there seemed to be no good reason to put the word "representative" in the singular if a phrase was added to the preamble stipulating that that representative might be assisted by a reasonable number of advisers and experts. The United States Government was making special efforts to prevent the non-governmental organizations from taking part in the Council's work. That intention clearly emerged from the United States representative's objections to the Czechoslovak representative's oral amendment and from the manner in which he had influenced the French representative by his statements. The United States Government could not be expected to grant visas to the advisers and experts, so that the end sought by the Czechoslovak amendment would not be attained. He would, however, vote for it, but that did not imply that he was abandoning his support of the Polish draft resolution. If that draft resolution, which should be put to the vote first, was rejected, the USSR delegation would vote for the Czechoslovak amendment, in order to prevent the situation created by the General Assembly's decision at its sixth session from becoming even worse than it was.

34. The United States representative's argument was weak. The United States representative could not deny that the Headquarters Agreement had been violated on several occasions. There was the case of Mr. Fisher, the representative of the World Federation of Trade Unions who, although he had had a regular visa, had been imprisoned by the United States police and then expelled. The United States representative could not deny that that scandalous arrest was a flagrant violation of the Headquarters Agreement. Thus, many facts proved that the United States Government sought to obstruct the execution of the Headquarters Agreement. Definite proof of that could be found especially in the circumstance that the Secre-

tary of the World Federation of Trade Unions had been denied a passport and had been unable to leave the United States to take part in a United Nations conference held outside of headquarters. That was another fact which the United States representative would be unable to refute.

35. Mr. STERNER (Sweden) recalled that at the preceding meeting reference had been made to difficulties encountered by his own delegation, as well as by Swedish representatives going to other United Nations meetings in the United States, when it had asked for entry visas to the United States. The applicants had been required to complete a questionnaire on their political affiliations and some had refused to do so. The matter had been satisfactorily settled following the intervention of the United States delegation. He wished to thank the United States delegation for its intervention in the matter. He did not think that delegations should seek to exploit the subject under discussion.

36. Mr. BORATYNSKI (Poland) was not surprised at the Swedish delegation's difficulties. The representative of the Women's International Democratic Federation had also been questioned about her political affiliations when she had asked for a visa, but she had not had the benefit of the United States delegation's intervention.

37. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) explained that Mr. Fisher, the representative of WFTU, had not been imprisoned, as Mr. Morozov alleged. He had been detained and then returned to France because the immigration authorities had not considered that the provisions of the Headquarters Agreement were applicable to representatives of non-governmental organizations seeking admission to the General Assembly. Mr. Fisher had never been refused admittance for the purpose of attending meetings of the Economic and Social Council or its subsidiary bodies.

38. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) indicated that at the preceding meeting he had stressed the necessity of taking a position on the basis of legal arguments. The representative of Iran had just expressed the same view and, as Rapporteur of the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly, had given a legal interpretation of the problem. Mr. Rodriguez Fabregat said that he had listened with interest to the statement of the Secretary of the Council. Nevertheless he would like to have the opinion of the Legal Department.

39. Mr. COX (Secretariat) said that the meaning of the singular in the text of resolution 606 (VI) of the General Assembly was a question of interpretation. The text was not explicit enough to justify the conclusion that the General Assembly intended to limit each non-governmental organization to a single representative, but a review of the records would be necessary. He thought that the interpretation of the Iranian representative, who had served as Rapporteur of the Sixth Committee, should be taken into consideration.

40. The draft resolution submitted by the Polish delegation did not raise any legal question on which the Secretariat could take a position. Paragraph 2 of the

operative part seemed to raise administrative rather than legal questions. The text requested the Secretary-General to continue to give assistance (that is, assistance which he was already giving) including access to the Headquarters district. There was no question of the admission of representatives of non-governmental organizations to United States territory, and access to the Headquarters district did not raise any problems within the competence of the Secretariat.

41. The PRESIDENT drew the Czechoslovak representative's attention to the fact that the first paragraph of the operative part of resolution 606 (VI) of the General Assembly was worded: "Authorizes the Secretary-General . . . to make arrangements to enable the representative designated by any non-governmental organization having consultative status . . .". It should be noted that the word "representative" was singular.

42. Under the terms of that resolution the Council was empowered to request the Secretary-General to take all the steps he considered necessary to facilitate the attendance, at public meetings of the General Assembly, of the representative designated by any non-governmental organization having consultative status: that was the intention of the French draft resolution. The Czechoslovak amendment, in so far as it provided that the Secretary-General might extend an invitation to more than one representative of each non-governmental organization, went beyond the provisions of paragraph 1 of resolution 606 (VI) and therefore was not within the competence of the Council. In the circumstances, the amendment would be admissible only as a recommendation for amendment of the relevant paragraph of resolution 606 (VI) which, if adopted by the Council, would be transmitted as a recommendation to the General Assembly.

43. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) thought that his proposal raised no difficulties if consideration was given to the interpretation which the Iranian representative had just given the Council in his capacity as Rapporteur of the Sixth Committee.

44. Mr. ABDON (Iran) pointed out that in its original form the draft resolution submitted by the delegations of France and Iran to the Sixth Committee during the sixth session of the General Assembly contained the words "arrangements to enable a representative". Subsequently, in the light of opinions expressed in the Sixth Committee, the two sponsors of the draft resolution had agreed to the formula "*the* representative", which appeared in the text finally adopted by the General Assembly. At the time, he had made it clear to the Sixth Committee that the sponsors of the draft resolution did not intend to limit to a single representative the number of representatives of each non-governmental organization who could attend public meetings of the General Assembly. That interpretation had been generally accepted.

45. Nevertheless, he understood the President's doubts and feared that, if other delegations shared those doubts and opposed the Czechoslovak amendment, that negative vote might in future be interpreted to mean that the Council wished to limit the number of representatives of non-governmental organizations who could participate in the work of the

General Assembly. He therefore suggested that the Czechoslovak representative should withdraw his amendment on that point, with the reservation that, in accordance with the statements of the representative of Iran, in his capacity as Rapporteur of the Sixth Committee, and of the representative of the Secretariat, it was clearly understood that it had never been the General Assembly's intention to limit the number of representatives of non-governmental organizations.

46. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovak) said that the Czechoslovak delegation accepted the amendment proposed by the USSR representative to the Czechoslovak amendment to the French draft resolution. The text he wished to see adopted to replace the operative part of the draft resolution would adhere to the original wording as regarded the expression "to send a representative to attend", but would be completed by the words: "This representative may be accompanied by such alternate representatives and advisers as may be required".

47. Such a solution was consistent with the spirit of rule 25 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly and rule 17 of the rules of procedure of the Council.

48. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) did not understand how the Czechoslovak representative could invoke the rules of procedure of the General Assembly and the Council to support his thesis. The rules in question related to the representation of Member States, and such an interpretation would be tantamount to placing non-governmental organizations on the same footing as governments. Even assuming that that interpretation was legally valid, which was not the case, it would be illogical because the representatives of non-governmental organizations attended the meetings of the General Assembly only as observers. It was absurd to assume that in that capacity they required alternates or advisers.

49. On the other hand, most of the non-governmental organizations directly concerned in the work of the United Nations—and that was particularly true of the organizations in which the USSR, Polish and Czechoslovak representatives were especially interested—had an accredited representative in New York. Intervention by the Secretary-General during an Assembly session might be necessary only if an additional representative, coming from abroad, wished to attend the meetings. It could reasonably be assumed that in practice the organizations in question would be represented by more than one person.

50. The USSR representative had accused the United States delegation of trying to limit the scope of resolution 606 (VI), which the United States had, however, supported at the sixth session of the General Assembly. The contrary was true. Resolution 606 (VI) might lend itself to restrictive interpretation in that it provided that the Secretary-General should make the necessary arrangements "upon request of the Economic and Social Council or its Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations". That might in fact be taken to mean that the Council or its Committee had to participate in the choice of a limited number of organizations to be invited by the Secretary-General. The

French draft resolution gave resolution 606 (VI) the widest possible interpretation, since it asked the Secretary-General to invite all organizations of consultative status in categories A and B to send a representative to attend public meetings of the General Assembly. The fact that he would vote in favour of the draft resolution in the hope that it would be adopted showed that the United States delegation had no intention of limiting the scope of resolution 606 (VI).

51. Mr. MUNOZ (Argentina) could not support the Polish draft resolution because, apart from the reasons given by other representatives for opposing it, the Council could not properly ask the General Assembly to reconsider a resolution, particularly when its text was perfectly clear.

52. As regards the interpretation of the words "the representative designated" in paragraph 1 of the operative part of resolution 606 (VI), they should be examined in their proper context. The paragraph was not mandatory; the General Assembly authorized the Secretary-General to take certain action on the request of the Economic and Social Council or its Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations. Consequently, the Council seemed to have been left considerable latitude. The French draft resolution offered a solution, which was to limit the non-governmental organizations to "a representative". The Czechoslovak representative's proposal that non-governmental organizations should be permitted to be represented by several persons might also be considered. The Council could choose between those proposals which, he emphasized, related only to the sentence referring to the invitation which the Secretary-General was to transmit to the non-governmental organizations, and not to the subsequent sentences concerning the representation of those organizations.

53. On the other hand, the French draft resolution very properly limited the somewhat automatic invitation to organizations in categories A and B. The Philippine representative's suggestion that those provisions should be extended to all organizations on the Register could not be accepted; the procedure concerning such organizations would continue to be governed, as in the past, by the provisions of resolution 606 (IV).

54. He regretted the French representative's agreement to delete the words "in regular session" from his draft resolution. The question was of no particular importance; it might, however, be assumed that the participation of the non-governmental organizations would not be necessary when the General Assembly was discussing problems which would necessitate the calling of special sessions. If it were necessary, the Secretary-General could very well undertake to notify the organizations concerned in due time.

55. Lastly, he thought that the addition of the words "within the competence of the Council", to which the French representative had also agreed, in no way improved the original text. The General Assembly's purpose in adopting resolution 606 (VI) had assuredly been to secure the participation of organizations which, in the words of rule 80 of the Council's rules of procedure, had "special knowledge of the subject to be

discussed". He would have liked to see those words included in the operative part of the French draft resolution.

56. Mr. ABDOH (Iran) again drew the Council's attention to the fact that the General Assembly resolution spoke of "the representative" and not "a representative". He had already explained the reasons for that wording; there was no need to repeat them. He therefore urged the French representative to bring his proposal into line with the General Assembly's resolution; it would then read as follows: "Requests the Secretary-General to invite each such non-governmental organization to send *its* representative...".

57. Mr. DE SEYNES (France) agreed to that drafting.

58. The PRESIDENT proposed, in accordance with rule 65 of the rules of procedure, that the Council should first decide on the French draft resolution (E/L.317), which had been submitted before the Polish draft resolution (E/L.372).

59. Mr. BORATYNSKI (Poland) thought that according to the provisions of rule 65, the Polish draft resolution asking the Council to request the General Assembly to reconsider its resolution 606 (VI) should take precedence over the French proposal—which related to the application of that resolution—because it raised a prior question.

60. After a brief discussion during which Mr. ABDOH (Iran) said that the view was justified as regards paragraph 1 of the operative part of the Polish draft resolution and Mr. MUNOZ (Argentina) questioned the Polish representative's interpretation of rule 65, Mr. BORATYNSKI (Poland) formally proposed that his draft resolution should be put to the vote first.

*The proposal was rejected by 12 votes to 3, with 3 abstentions.*

61. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to take a decision on the Czechoslovak amendment to the French draft resolution.

62. Mr. MUNOZ (Argentina) asked that each point of the amendment should be put to the vote separately.

63. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the Czechoslovak proposal to replace the words "each such organization in categories A and B" by "each non-governmental organization having consultative status".

*The proposal was rejected by 9 votes to 6, with 3 abstentions.*

64. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the Czechoslovak proposal to insert the words "of the Council and" between the words "within the competence" and "of the organization concerned".

*The amendment was rejected by 6 votes to 5, with 7 abstentions.*

65. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the Czechoslovak proposal to add to the text of the operative part of the French draft resolution the words: "This representative may be accompanied by such alternate representatives and advisers as may be required."

*The amendment was rejected by 10 votes to 3, with 5 abstentions.*

66. Mr. MUNOZ (Argentina) noted that, the various points of the Czechoslovak amendment having been rejected, the original French draft resolution remained, with the change suggested by the Iranian representative, which the French representative had accepted. It ran: "Requests the Secretary-General to invite each such organization in categories A and B to send its representative . . .". That formulation was more ambiguous than the original text of the French draft resolution and would surely give rise to difficulties of interpretation. Its meaning should be made clear in order to facilitate the task of the Secretary General, who would be responsible for putting the Council's resolution into effect.

67. Mr. ABDOH (Iran) repeated the explanation he had given the Council as the Rapporteur of the Sixth Committee, and Mr. DE SEYNES (France) accepted that interpretation.

68. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) recalled that the Argentine representative had expressed the view that it was for the Council to take a decision on the interpretation to be given to paragraph 1 of the operative part of resolution 606 (VI). The United States delegation had explained the practical reasons why it thought that only one representative of each non-governmental organization should be admitted to the General Assembly.

69. To clarify that intent, it therefore formally proposed that the words "its representative" should be replaced by "a representative" in the operative part of the amended French draft resolution (E/L.317), even though the word "its" was clearly enough in the singular.

70. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking on a point of order, observed that the voting had begun and that under rule 62 of the rules of procedure after the voting had commenced, no representative should interrupt the voting **except on a point of order** in connexion with the actual conduct of the voting. He must protest against the way in which the debate was being conducted and appeal to the President to respect the rules of procedure, the scrupulous enforcement of which was essential for the good order of the Council's work and to state that the United States amendment was not admissible.

71. The PRESIDENT observed that the voting had been interrupted only to enable some members of the Council to obtain an explanation they needed in order to decide how they would vote. A question of interpretation had been raised which would be of the utmost importance to the Secretary-General in carrying out the Council's decision. The interruption of the voting was accordingly justified and the United States representative's amendment was in order.

72. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) challenged that ruling.

*The President's ruling was upheld by 13 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions.*

73. The PRESIDENT called for a vote on the United States oral amendment to the effect that the words "its representative" should be replaced by the words "a representative".

*That amendment was not adopted, 7 votes being cast in favour and 7 against, with 4 abstentions.*

74. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the French draft resolution (E/L.317), as a whole, as amended.

*The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 13 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions.*

75. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) explained that he had voted for the French draft resolution because he considered that the expression "its representative" could not possibly be interpreted as meaning more than one representative.

76. Mr. FENAUX (Belgium) agreed that grammatically there could be no doubt that the expression "its representative" in the singular meant a single representative. Because the French text was quite clear on that point the Belgian delegation had abstained from voting on the United States amendment, which it believed unnecessary.

77. The PRESIDENT asked the Council to take action on the Polish draft resolution (E/L.372).

78. Mr. OVERTON (United Kingdom) thought that, as the Council had adopted the French draft resolution concerning the implementation of resolution 606 (VI) of the General Assembly, it could no longer vote on the Polish draft resolution, which requested the General Assembly to reconsider that resolution.

79. He proposed that the Council should make a formal decision to that effect under rule 65 of the rules of procedure.

80. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) thought that the Council could not jettison the Polish draft resolution, especially after hearing the United States representative clearly intimate that the end sought by his Government was to limit the participation of the representatives of the non-governmental organizations in the work of the United Nations.

81. The PRESIDENT asked the Council to vote on the United Kingdom representative's proposal that the Polish draft resolution should not be put to the vote.

*That proposal was adopted by 8 votes to 4, with 5 abstentions.*

82. Mr. STERNER (Sweden) explained that he had abstained because, unlike the United Kingdom representative, he had believed that the Polish draft resolution, against which his delegation had been going to vote, should be put to the vote.

The meeting rose at 6.25 p.m.