

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**  
SIXTH SESSION

Official Records

DOCUMENTS  
INDEX UNIT



**SECOND COMMITTEE 188th**

MEETING

Saturday, 19 January 1952, at 10.30 a.m.

Palais de Chaillot, Paris

**CONTENTS**

	Page
Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapter II) (A/1884, A/C.2/L.134 and Rev.1, A/C.2/L.135, A/C.2/L.143/Rev.1, A/C.2/L.144, A/C.2/L.145, A/C.2/L.146, A/C.2/L.147 and A/C.2/L.148) (concluded).....	265

Chairman : Prince WAN WAITHAYAKON (Thailand).

**Report of the Economic and Social Council  
(chapter II) (A/1884<sup>1</sup>, A/C.2/L.134 and Rev.1,  
A/C.2/L.135, A/C.2/L.143/Rev.1, A/C.2/L.144,  
A/C.2/L.145, A/C.2/L.146, A/C.2/L.147 and  
A/C.2/L.148 (concluded)**

[Item 11]\*

**REVISED JOINT DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY CHILE  
AND THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (A/C.2/L.134/  
Rev.1) (concluded)**

1. The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that it had to vote on an amendment (A/C.2/L.145) proposed by the Indian representative to the joint draft resolution of Chile and the United States (A/C.2/L.134) and on an oral sub-amendment proposed by the representatives of those countries (185th meeting, paragraphs 53 and 54).

2. Mr. NARIELWALA (India) said that in order to dispel the apprehensions made known to him by certain representatives in an unofficial exchange of views, he was willing to alter his second amendment by replacing the expression "the FAOs' task" by "the FAOs' study".

3. He wished to explain in that connexion that in accepting the amendment, those countries which were normally food-grain net-exporting countries would not be assuming any undertaking with regard to the actual constitution of grain reserves. The amendment confined itself to requesting them to co-operate with the FAO in the study which the latter was to make of the question.

4. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) said that in view of Mr. Narielwala's alteration to his amendment, he would withdraw his own sub-amendment.

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixth Session, Supplement No. 3.*

\* Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.

5. Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) wished to know what consequences the Indian proposal might have for the work of the FAO. He asked the FAO representative the two following questions: (a) Were the studies envisaged by the FAO to relate only to the constitution of food-grain reserves, or were they to take into account other food products? (b) In making those studies, did the FAO expect the co-operation only of countries possessing exportable surpluses of food-grain, or was it its intention to approach other countries as well?

6. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) formally proposed that the discussion on the Indian amendment should be re-opened in order to enable Mr. McDougall to reply to Mr. Lubin. He thought such a procedure was all the more justified in that Mr. Narielwala had altered his text and that the Committee would thus be voting on an amendment which differed from the one it had examined.

7. After a brief exchange of views in which Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. NARIELWALA (India) and Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) took part, the CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Chilean representative's proposal.

*It was decided to re-open the discussion on the Indian amendment by 23 votes to 5, with 15 abstentions.*

8. The CHAIRMAN called upon the representative of FAO.

9. Mr. McDOUGALL (Food and Agriculture Organization) said that the FAO Conference had imposed an enormous task on the Council and Director General of the FAO. In order to accomplish it, the latter must be given a certain freedom of action in examining the problem of food reserves.

10. In reply to the United States representative, he said that the studies envisaged by the FAO were not to relate to food-grain only, which were of course of immense importance, but to take into account other food products also. In making those studies the FAO

hoped to be able to approach both food-importing and food-exporting countries. There were problems such as the financing of reserves and the storage of products which would have to be examined with both groups of countries.

11. Mr. AMARAL MURTINHO (Brazil) pointed out that in view of the statement just made by the FAO representative and the opinions expressed unofficially by certain delegations, it would be wiser to avoid mentioning either group of countries explicitly in the text, for fear of restricting the scope of the draft resolution. It was also important to avoid reducing the problem to the mere storage of food grains, since there were other products, such as milk, powdered eggs and fats etc., which could be preserved and, if necessary, made available to countries suffering from famine.

12. He therefore requested that the words "which are normally food-grain net-exporting countries" should be voted on separately.

13. Mr. AREAN (Argentina) supported the Brazilian representative's proposal and said that he was wholeheartedly in favour of the method which the FAO proposed to adopt. It was in fact essential that all Members of the United Nations should take part in examining the question of food reserves. In particular, the possible beneficiaries of the programme, i.e., the food-importing countries, should make their views known on problems of storage and the way in which the supplies made available to them would be distributed in case of emergency.

14. There was another argument in favour of that solution: it was impossible to foresee which countries might one day or other be overtaken by a disastrous food crisis; that was why all Member States must take part in the proposed studies.

15. Mr. NARIELWALA (India) said that he had referred only to food grain in his text because he was afraid that, by introducing an expression such as "food products", he would have made it too wide in scope and thus have complicated the proposed studies.

16. In order to meet the objections of certain representatives to the passage referring to net-exporting countries, he proposed to alter it as follows: "*inter alia* those possessing large surpluses of food grain".

17. Mr. MARINO PEREZ (Cuba) said that he fully supported the Argentine representative, who had dwelt on the need for ensuring the participation of importing as well as exporting countries. He thought that Mr. Narielwala's suggestion would be satisfactory in that respect.

18. ABDEL RAZEK Bey (Egypt) thought that shortages of food grain were the most dangerous; the first effort should therefore be directed towards remedying them without, of course, neglecting needs in connexion with other food products. He therefore suggested the following formula: "Requests all States Members of the United Nations which possess an exportable surplus of food products and in particular food grain..." Clearly the advice of such countries would be much more useful to the FAO than that of countries not producing enough for their own needs.

19. Mr. AREAN (Argentina) thought that a reference to food-grain might give countries with surpluses of other foodstuffs the impression that they were free not

to participate in the FAO studies, which were, in fact, intended to cover the establishment of food reserves of all kinds.

20. It was also essential that the establishment of reserves should be the subject of international agreements accepted by all States Members, since no exporting country could consent to create reserves unless arrangements were first made at the international level with regard to such problems as the cost of produce placed in reserve and methods of storage.

21. He therefore supported the Brazilian representative's proposal.

22. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) pointed out that the General Conference had laid down precise directives for the FAO Council. The Council itself would call upon countries for their co-operation and, in order to carry out its work, it would obviously have to consult all countries. It would therefore be advisable to delete from the Indian amendment the phrase to which objection had been taken.

23. Mr. NARIELWALA (India) agreed to delete the reference to States which were normally food grain net-exporting countries.

24. He asked, however, that it should be stated in the summary record of the meeting that it was his opinion that such countries should offer their fullest co-operation to the FAO with a view to the establishment of reserves to deal with critical food shortages.

25. The CHAIRMAN called upon the Committee to vote on the second paragraph of the Indian amendment (A/C.2/L.145) as amended, the words "which are normally food grain net-exporting countries", which the Indian representative had agreed to withdraw, being deleted.

*The amendment as amended was adopted by 41 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.*

26. The CHAIRMAN said that the new paragraph would be inserted between paragraphs 12 and 13 of the revised joint draft resolution submitted by Chile and the United States.

27. Mr. KHANDAN (Iraq) said that he had been instructed by the representatives of all the Arab countries to make a statement on their behalf before the revised joint draft resolution was put to the vote.

28. In the Near East, there was an abnormal situation resulting from the occupation by force of one of the Arab territories. The Arab countries did not maintain political or economic relations with the authorities currently administering that territory. Consequently, they were obliged to make a reservation with regard to the implementation of certain obligations under the revised joint draft resolution, in so far as those occupying that territory were concerned.

29. That reservation was due not only to the absence of any relations between the Arab countries and the occupying authorities, but also to the inhumanity the latter had shown towards the hundreds of thousands of Arab refugees who had been compelled to abandon their homes.

30. Subject to that reservation, the Arab countries would vote for the revised joint draft resolution.

31. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked that a separate vote should be taken on paragraph 1 of the revised joint draft resolution.

32. The CHAIRMAN put paragraph 1 of the revised joint draft resolution (A/C.2/L.134/Rev.1) to the vote as modified by India (A/C.2/L.146).

*Paragraph 1 of the revised joint draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 41 votes to 5.*

33. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the revised joint draft resolution as a whole (A/C.2/L.134/Rev.1), as amended.

*The revised joint draft resolution, as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 42 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.*

34. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked to be allowed to explain his vote.

35. He was deeply grateful to the members of the Committee who had agreed to embody in the joint draft resolution a number of amendments proposed by his delegation and by the delegations of certain under-developed countries. Those amendments had helped to improve the draft.

36. He regretted, however, that the Committee had not accepted his third amendment regarding the necessity for freeing world resources in order to combat famine by bringing the armaments race to an end (A/C.2/L.137). It was for that reason that he had abstained when the vote had been taken.

37. He hoped that his delegation's efforts to strengthen the joint draft resolution would contribute to the success of the campaign against famine.

38. The CHAIRMAN called upon the Committee to vote on the Yugoslav draft resolution (A/C.2/L.143/Rev.1) and on the amendments to it submitted by Chile (A/C.2/L.147) and India (A/C.2/L.148).

REVISED DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY YUGOSLAVIA  
A/C.2/L.143/Rev.1) (*continued*)

39. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) withdrew his second amendment to paragraph 6 of the Yugoslav draft resolution in view of the fact that the Indian representative had submitted a similar amendment, which he regarded as wholly acceptable.

40. Mr. MATES (Yugoslavia) thanked the Chilean representative for having withdrawn his second amendment. He accepted the first Chilean amendment and the Indian one.

41. Referring to the observations made by the Indian and certain other representatives that, because of legal considerations they would find it difficult to vote for paragraph 7, he said that he was prepared to withdraw the paragraph. He asked, however, that it should be stated in the summary record of the meeting that, in agreeing to withdraw paragraph 7, he in no way abandoned his position. He would continue to lay emphasis on the necessity for fulfilling obligations assumed under Article 102 of the Charter. Those obligations related to all agreements, and not to commercial agreements alone.

42. Other representatives had commented on paragraph 3, in which a reference was also made to the United Nations Charter. They had said that the phrase was an interpretation, and not a citation from the

Charter. The phrase was in conformity with the spirit of the Charter but, as it had been inserted only by way of explanation, he would agree to delete it.

43. He could not, however, replace the words "working population", as a number of representatives had requested. He considered that the question of the living standards of the working population was of fundamental importance. In making it the subject of his draft resolution, he was not in fact raising a new problem, as there were already a great many national and international measures which applied especially to the working population, such as legislation on minimum wages, social security, employment benefits and tax reductions for the low income groups. It was thus generally recognized that special measures must be adopted to combat factors which tended to lower the standard of living of the working population.

44. While recognizing that the standard of living of the working population depended on total national income and *per capita* income, he said that the correlation was neither automatic nor absolute. Governments were, in fact, obliged to take part of the national income to meet the obligations they assumed towards the people of their country, in particular to ensure national security. The Yugoslav representative had already said that his Government had rejected the choice between security and welfare, and that it had done its utmost to control factors which might lower the standards of living of the Yugoslav people, and in particular of the working population.

45. It was clear that the United Nations could not give any directives to the governments concerned regarding the type of measures that should be taken in that respect. It should, however, at least direct their attention to a problem which was very real and invite them to do everything within their power in that respect.

46. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that his delegation had already stated its views on the living standards of the working population (183rd meeting), and had said that it would vote for the Czechoslovak draft resolution which, by advocating the termination of the armaments race, had the merit of proposing measures likely to raise the living standards of the workers. Any measure not based on that essential condition would remain a dead letter. Since the Yugoslav draft resolution did not include such a proposal, the Soviet delegation would not vote for it, but would try to improve it as far as possible by voting for the Indian and Chilean amendments. It was regrettable, however, that the Chilean amendment to paragraph 6 had been replaced by the Indian amendment, which did not mention the strengthening of trade union rights. That omission should be remedied, and he proposed the retention of the words "strengthen trade union rights".

47. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) said that the social legislation proposed in the Indian amendment (A/C.2/L.148) might well include measures to strengthen trade union rights; in any event, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights already included provisions on that subject. It therefore did not appear essential to mention it explicitly in the draft resolution; but he would not oppose the addition of a specific reference to the strengthening of trade union rights in the text of the Indian draft amendment.

48. Mr. MATES (Yugoslavia) said that he had accepted the Chilean amendment to paragraph 1 of his draft

resolution and the Indian amendment to paragraph 6. Those amendments had become part of the draft resolution. They could not therefore be put to the vote, as the USSR representative had implied; but perhaps he had misunderstood him.

49. Mr. BLUSZTAJN (Poland) formally proposed the addition of the words "and for strengthening trade union rights" after the words "housing and education" in paragraph 6 of the Yugoslav draft resolution.

50. Mr. MATES (Yugoslavia) said that he would vote for that amendment to paragraph 6 of his draft resolution if it was put to the vote.

51. Mr. FORSYTH (Australia) said that he would be unable to vote for the draft resolution because paragraph 6 contained a number of expressions which he could not accept. The representative of Yugoslavia had said that governments must seek at the same time to raise the living standards of their people and to promote their country's security, but in existing circumstances it might be impossible to pursue those two objectives simultaneously. Some parts of paragraph 6, which did not take those facts sufficiently into account, should therefore be modified. For example, the paragraph called upon governments to take all possible measures to reduce the burden of taxation on certain sections of the population, which might at present be impossible for certain governments. Moreover, the Yugoslav representative had himself said that the General Assembly could only indicate the objectives to be aimed at, and that it was not its function to determine the measures to be adopted by governments for achieving those objectives. He therefore proposed that the words "to take all possible measures" should be replaced by "to give special attention to", which would involve deleting the words "to increase", "to reduce", and "to adopt". The new text would also require a number of alterations of style.

52. Mr. NARIELWALA (India) appreciated the Australian representative's misgivings. He accepted the first alteration he had suggested, but regretted he was unable to accept the additional modifications, which would alter substantially the sense of the paragraph.

53. He could not accept the Polish amendment. The strengthening of trade union rights was not a measure directly connected with the raising of general living standards which was the subject of the draft resolution.

54. Mr. MATES (Yugoslavia) agreed with the representative of India with regard to the Australian representative's proposals: he too accepted the first amendment proposed, but could not accept the additional amendments, which were alterations of substance and did not simply follow from the first. The Indian representative, and he himself, had tried to meet the views of the Australian representative, and he hoped that, as a result, the latter would be able to vote for the draft resolution.

55. The Polish amendment was primarily a matter for the Indian representative, the sponsor of the new paragraph 6; but he would support it if it was put to the vote.

56. Mr. FORSYTH (Australia) thanked the representatives of India and Yugoslavia for accepting the essential part of his proposed amendments. The changes made would enable him to vote for the draft resolution as a whole, but he would abstain from voting on para-

graph 6, which was still not entirely in accordance with his delegation's views. He asked that that paragraph should be put to the vote separately.

57. Mr. AMAN (Sweden) said that if a reference was to be made in paragraph 6 to the strengthening of trade union rights, it should be noted that the International Labour Organisation had taken a number of important decisions on that question. He therefore suggested that the Polish amendment should be altered to read: "and, with due regard to the decisions adopted by the Conference of the International Labour Organisation, for strengthening trade union rights".

58. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) could not agree to a special reference to the International Labour Organisation, in which the millions of workers affiliated to trade unions belonging to the World Federation of Trade Unions were not represented. He asked the Swedish representative to withdraw the additional phrase he had suggested; if not, he would be obliged to propose a similar reference to the trade unions affiliated to the World Federation of Trade Unions.

59. Mr. AMAN (Sweden) said that he would withdraw his suggestion, provided that the pertinent decisions of the Conference of the International Labour Organisation were mentioned in the record.

60. Mr. INGLES (Philippines) said that many under-developed countries had been compelled to increase their taxes in order to meet additional expenditure for the protection of their security for the development of their economies. He suggested that the words "to reduce" in paragraph 6 of the draft resolution should be replaced by the words "to render more equitable".

61. Mr. NARIELWALA (India) felt unable to accept that amendment, which corresponded neither to his own views nor to those of the Yugoslav representative. Their common intention had been the reduction of the tax burden on the poorer sections of the population, whose wages had fallen, whereas the Philippines amendment implied that the distribution of tax burdens was inequitable.

62. Mr. MATES (Yugoslavia) agreed with the Indian representative. The wording suggested by the Philippines representative would be tantamount to an expression of censure on Member States for not having equitably distributed the tax burdens on their people. The intention of the relevant passage of the Yugoslav draft resolution was entirely different: it concerned the reduction of the tax burden on the poorer sections, even where the distribution of taxation was, generally speaking, equitable. The passage should not be interpreted as obliging all Member States to reduce their taxation, since the end in view could be attained by other means. He was therefore unable to accept the change requested by the Philippines representative, and trusted that he would agree to withdraw it.

63. Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) asked whether the explanatory remark just made by the Yugoslav representative could not be interpreted as meaning that the tax burden on lower income groups should be reduced, even where it was equitable, even if it meant that an excessive burden would be imposed on the middle classes. If that was the case, the United States delegation would be unable to support that provision.

64. Mr. MATES (Yugoslavia) said that it was by no means his intention to recommend an inequitable dis-

tribution of the tax burden. He pointed out that the wording suggested by the representative of the Philippines would involve examining the fiscal legislation of all countries, in order to determine whether taxation was equitably distributed.

65. Mr. INGLES (Philippines) said that the chief object of his suggestion had been to obtain clarification. He was satisfied with the explanations given by the Indian and Yugoslav representatives and would withdraw his suggested amendment. He asked for a separate vote, however, on the phrase: "to reduce the burden of taxation of the lower income group of population".

66. The CHAIRMAN announced that discussion of the Yugoslav draft resolution was closed.

67. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) observed that, at a previous meeting, the French representative when speaking of the armaments race had given an incomplete, and consequently inaccurate, quotation from an interview given by Generalissimo Stalin to the newspaper *Pravda*. The Czechoslovak representative read out in full the relevant passage of the interview and stated that, since it was impossible to expand armaments and to raise living standards simultaneously, two courses were open in the matter. One was to use every effort to ensure the peaceful development of the economy and the raising of living standards: that was the method adopted by the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies, and that method helped to strengthen peace and international security. The other course was to increase armaments: that was the method chosen by the United States and the other capitalist countries; it increased the poverty of the populations and jeopardized the maintenance of peace and international security. That was the basic difference between the attitude of the USSR and the People's Democracies, and the attitude of the United States and the other capitalist countries. What he had just said would no doubt be a sufficient reply to the observations made by the Belgian and United Kingdom representatives.

DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY CZECHOSLOVAKIA (A/C.2/L.135) (*concluded*)

68. The CHAIRMAN put the Czechoslovak draft resolution (A/C.2/L.135) to the vote, paragraph by paragraph.

*Paragraph 1 was rejected by 28 votes to 6, with 10 abstentions.*

*Paragraph 2 was rejected by 18 votes to 7, with 19 abstentions.*

69. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) withdrew the phrase: "in accordance with the present resolution" from paragraph 3 of his draft resolution.

*Paragraph 3, as amended, was rejected by 15 votes to 7, with 20 abstentions.*

70. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Czechoslovak draft resolution as a whole was therefore rejected.

REVISED DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY YUGOSLAVIA (A/C.2/L.143/Rev.1) (*concluded*)

71. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the oral Polish amendment to insert in paragraph 6 the phrase: "and for strengthening trade union rights" after the words "housing and education".

*The amendment was adopted by 31 votes to one, with 10 abstentions.*

72. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the phrase: "to reduce the burden of taxation of the lower income groups of population" in paragraph 6 (A/C.2/L.148).

*The phrase was adopted by 39 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.*

73. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph 6 as a whole, as amended.

*Paragraph 6 as amended, was adopted by 42 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

74. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Yugoslav draft resolution as a whole and as amended.

*The draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 38 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.*

75. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) explained that he had voted against the first two paragraphs of the Czechoslovak draft resolution, since the constructive provisions contained therein had been embodied in the Yugoslav draft. He recalled that, in all the resolutions hitherto adopted by the Committee, there had been agreement in omitting any reference to the armaments race. Moreover, he had already stated his delegation's view on that issue and on collective security, neither of which came within the purview of the Committee.

76. Mr. GALVEZ (Guatemala) said that he had voted for the Czechoslovak draft resolution, paragraph 1 of which merely stated the incontestable fact that rearmament was causing deterioration in the position of the workers, while paragraph 2 recommended measures to remedy that situation. He wished to stress that his vote did not in any way mean that his delegation shared the motives attributed in various quarters to the sponsors of the draft resolution.

77. Mr. DE SMET (Belgium) observed that he had been able to vote more readily for the Yugoslav draft resolution since its sponsor had taken account of the legal objections he had raised to paragraphs 3 and 7 on the ground that they had contained an interpretation of the Charter. He wished however to make a reservation in respect of paragraph 1 of the draft resolution. As he had already pointed out during discussion of the Czechoslovak draft resolution the level of real wages in Belgium had not fallen, since a sliding wages scale was in operation there.

78. Mr. BETETA (Mexico) explained that he had abstained from voting on the Czechoslovak draft resolution not on substantive grounds but because of the political interpretations to which the draft could give rise. Its more constructive provisions had further been embodied in the Yugoslav draft resolution.

79. Mr. MARINO PEREZ (Cuba) said that the Cuban delegation had voted for the Yugoslav draft resolution understanding that in certain countries collective security transcended all other needs, including the possible improvement of the living standards of their working population, but nevertheless recognizing that the improvement of the standard of living of the working population would continue to be one of the primary objectives in such countries.

80. It had voted for the draft resolution in spite of the fact that the term "working population", as generally understood, did not include the middle classes, such as

men and women teachers, office workers in public and private employment who were paid salaries and not wages, farmers owning or renting small holdings and other sections of the working population. The Cuban delegation would have preferred the term "working population" to have been defined so as to embrace not only the working class, but also, and explicitly, the various groups and occupations comprising the middle class.

81. Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) shared the Cuban representative's view on that point and observed that the term "working population" should apply to all manual social and intellectual workers their dependents and persons who had retired from active work or business life. He had voted for paragraph 6 on the understanding that its provisions aimed at raising the standard of living of the lower income groups of the population and not at reducing that of the other groups.

82. Mr. NARIELWALA (India) said that he had abstained from voting on the Czechoslovak draft resolution because of its political implications. In agreement with other delegations, he had included some of its provisions in the Yugoslav draft resolution.

83. Mr. SELASSIE (Ethiopia) had also abstained from voting on the Czechoslovak draft resolution because its constructive elements had been embodied in the Yugoslav draft resolution.

JOINT DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY BELGIUM AND FRANCE (A/C.2/L.144)

84. Mr. KAYSER (France), recalling that the object of the joint draft resolution had already been explained by the Belgian representative and himself (185th meeting) felt it was hardly necessary to return to the subject.

85. Mr. JACOME (Ecuador) supported the joint draft resolution and said that the Conference of Foreign Ministers of the Latin-American States, upon the proposal of Ecuador, had recently approved a similar decision.

86. Mr. COLIACOPOULOS (Greece) warmly supported the joint draft resolution, noting that the shortage of newsprint and printing paper was a threat to freedom of information and a hindrance to the advancement of education. He recalled that in 1951 his country had been obliged to reduce its consumption of newsprint by 43 per cent.

87. The CHAIRMAN put the joint draft resolution of Belgium and France (A/C.2/L.144) to the vote.

*The joint draft resolution was adopted by 33 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.*

88. The CHAIRMAN announced that consideration of the second item of the Committee's agenda was now concluded.

The meeting rose at 1.55 p.m.