



ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Seventeenth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

791st Meeting

(CLOSING MEETING)

*Friday, 30 April 1954,
at 2.45 p.m.*

HEADQUARTERS, NEW YORK

C O N T E N T S

	<i>Page</i>
Annual report of the Economic Commission for Latin America (E/2536 and Corr.1, E/L.593) (<i>concluded</i>)....	231
Economic development of under-developed countries: (a) report of the group of experts on international price relations; (b) reports by the Secretary-General under Council resolution 427 (XIV), paragraph 7, and General Assembly resolution 623 (VII); (c) international flow of private capital for the economic development of under-developed countries; (d) land reform; report of the Economic Committee (E/2588) (<i>concluded</i>).....	232
Report of the Interim Co-ordinating Committee for International Commodity Arrangements on the question of a study group on steel: report of the Economic Committee (E/2574)	235
Confirmation of members of functional commissions of the Council (E/2576 and Corr.1 and Add.1).....	235
Financial implications of actions of the Council (E/2448 and Corr.1 and 2 and Add.1 to 3, E/2559 and Add.1 and 2)	235
Consideration of the provisional agenda for the eighteenth session of the Council (E/2530/Rev.1 and Add.1, E/L.600)	235
Admission to Headquarters of representatives of non-governmental organizations (E/2568) (<i>concluded</i>).....	237
Closure of the seventeenth session.....	238

President: Mr. Juan I. COOKE (Argentina).

Present:

The representatives of the following countries: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Egypt, France, India, Norway, Pakistan, Turkey, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

Observers from the following countries: Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Netherlands.

The representatives of the following specialized agencies: International Labour Organisation, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, World Health Organization.

Annual report of the Economic Commission for Latin America (E/2536 and Corr.1, E/L.593) (*concluded*)

[Agenda item 7]

1. Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that in connexion with the discussion of the report (E/2536 and Corr.1) of the Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA) the USSR delegation wished to make a few brief remarks on the question under consideration.

2. The economic development of the Latin-American countries was closely linked with the development of economic relations throughout the world and the restor-

ation of normal international trade conditions. The Soviet Union was doing everything in its power to restore and expand world trade relations. The expansion of trade would undoubtedly promote general economic development and improved standards of living. In that connexion, the restoration and expansion of trade between the countries of Latin America and the European countries, and others situated outside the American hemisphere, was undoubtedly of great importance for the Latin-American countries. The representatives of the Latin-American countries who had made statements in the Council had pointed out that the industrial development of their countries could not be achieved without the expansion of world trade. Yet, as a number of them had observed, trade between their countries and the countries outside the American hemisphere was declining and was much smaller than it had been before the Second World War. They should also remember the insistent demands of the Latin-American countries for the stabilization of the prices of export goods and the restoration of normal trade relations.

3. ECLA's own report, in the section "International trade and finance", noted that there were clear indications of a worsening of the terms of trade for a number of Latin-American countries, that being a matter of great concern to their Governments.

4. Both the Commission's report and the statements made by the Latin-American representatives reflected the desire of the Latin-American countries for a resumption of trade with countries outside the American hemisphere, particularly with the countries of Europe, but also with the Asian and other countries. In that connexion a very important fact was the Soviet Union's readiness to develop mutually beneficial trade with the countries of Latin America. That readiness was evidenced, for example, by the conclusion of the USSR-Argentine trade agreement of 5 August 1953, under which the USSR was to deliver to Argentina considerable quantities of petroleum, coal, metallurgical products (pig iron, sheet steel, rails, etc.) and chemical and medical products. The Soviet Union would also deliver to Argentina equipment and machinery up to a considerable value.

5. The commodities which Argentina would deliver to the USSR during the first year covered by the agreement included linseed oil, wool, raw hides and sheepskins, quebracho extract, lard, pork fat, cheese, tinned meats, mutton, pork and other items among Argentina's staple exports.

6. The conclusion of the USSR-Argentine agreement had been warmly welcomed by the public in both countries. Thus, the Argentine newspaper *Prospiratos* had written that the agreement was of great importance for Argentina and for its economy as a whole.

7. Many Latin-American countries could find in the Soviet Union a vast and stable market for their goods, and in return obtain the goods they needed. The Soviet Union was prepared to give consideration to concluding

long-term contracts with the countries of Latin America for the purchase of goods in exchange for Soviet commodities, based on the negotiation of mutually beneficial prices to cover an extensive period of time, and subject to settlement in the national currencies of the countries of that region. Desirous of assisting the economic development of the Latin-American countries, the Soviet Union was prepared to supply them with industrial equipment and machinery. Moreover, Soviet trade organizations could supply those goods for payment on an instalment basis.

8. The following statement, made by Mr. Dardal, the head of the Argentine technical mission which had recently visited the Soviet Union, testified to the possibilities offered by the Soviet Union in that regard.

“The Argentine technical mission came to the Soviet Union in order to examine the possibilities of purchasing machinery and equipment for petroleum and coal extraction, power production, transport and mechanization—goods provided for in the trade and payments agreement concluded between the USSR and the Argentine Republic on 5 August 1953. During its stay, the mission, with the active assistance of the Soviet authorities, accomplished much fruitful work. The Argentine technicians were not familiar with Soviet industry and were greatly impressed with its degree of development. They saw a number of installations testifying to its tremendous achievements. On the basis of this visit it may be said that the purchases to be made in the Soviet Union will promote the development of mineral extraction, the production of electric power, the development of transport and the mechanization of agriculture, as provided in the Argentine Government’s second five-year plan. Furthermore, the Soviet market is capable in the future of absorbing large quantities of our export commodities, and the prospects for future trade between the USSR and Argentina are therefore highly favourable.”

Such were the conclusions reached by Mr. Dardal, the head of the Argentine technical mission, after his visit to the Soviet Union.

9. The Soviet Union delegation invited two or three representatives of each Latin-American country and two or three senior members of the secretariat of ECLA to visit the Soviet Union in September and October 1954, for a period of approximately one month, to familiarize themselves with the development of industry and agriculture in the USSR. Soviet Union organizations were prepared to defray the cost of their stay in the USSR.

10. So far as the ECLA report was concerned, the Soviet Union delegation had no objection to the Council taking note of it.

11. Mr. MIR KHAN (Pakistan) stressed the ties of friendship binding Pakistan and the Latin-American countries. He warmly supported the draft resolution in document E/2536.

12. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the draft resolution submitted by ECLA (p. 17 of E/2536).

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.

13. Mr. FENAUX (Belgium) said that his delegation was happy to support draft resolution E/L.593, as amended, which met Italy’s desire to participate in ECLA’s work.

14. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the draft resolution submitted by Argentina, Cuba, Ecuador and Venezuela (E/L.593), as amended at the 790th meeting.

The draft resolution was adopted by 17 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Economic development of under-developed countries: (a) report of the group of experts on international price relations; (b) reports by the Secretary-General under Council resolution 427 (XIV), paragraph 7, and General Assembly resolution 623 (VII); (c) international flow of private capital for the economic development of under-developed countries; (d) land reform: report of the Economic Committee (E/2588) (concluded)¹

[Agenda item 3]

15. Sir Douglas COPLAND (Australia), speaking as Chairman of the Economic Committee, stated that the Committee had agreed, with progressively increasing support, on all the problems connected with the agenda item and had formulated the three draft resolutions in document E/2588.

16. There had been acute differences of opinion on draft resolution A, particularly on the question whether or not the time was ripe for the establishment of a permanent advisory commission on international commodity trade. On the other hand, there had been general agreement on draft resolution B, which adequately reflected the viewpoints of the under-developed countries requiring capital and of those countries which could supply it. Draft resolution C recognized that land reform was a long-term problem and that the question of land tenure was only one aspect of the broad questions of economic development and the increase of agricultural productivity in the under-developed countries.

17. Mr. HOTCHKIS (United States of America) said that he had two fundamental objections to draft resolution A. In the first place, the decision to establish the permanent advisory commission on international commodity trade was hasty and ill considered. Secondly, the draft resolution made no provision for adequate consideration of the functions that might properly be assigned to that commission. It would be unwise to establish a new body to deal with problems of international trade in primary commodities without having made a preliminary survey of what existing bodies were doing.

18. The draft resolution invited the Governments of Member States to transmit to the Economic and Social Council, before its eighteenth session, any relevant comments on the advisory commission. It was clear that any decision establishing such a commission should have followed, and not preceded, the receipt of comments from Governments and should in any case have been held in abeyance pending reconsideration, at the Council’s next session, of the reorganization of the Council and its regional commissions.

19. The advisory commission’s terms of reference as defined in the draft resolution were open to serious criticism. The artificial establishment of a “just and equitable relationship between the prices of primary commodities and the prices of manufactured goods in international trade” was neither practicable nor desirable.

¹ Resumed from the 769th meeting.

Those who advocated this had never shown how it might be achieved without resulting in a network of controls and far-reaching government interference with free enterprise which would do more harm than good to the world economy. There seemed to be no chance that the proposed commission would be able to solve this problem, and its inclusion was an unwarrantable enlargement of the commission's functions beyond even what experts had proposed. Finally, the duties in connexion with statistical data which the draft resolution laid on the commission should not be entrusted to a new body without carefully considering whether or not they could be better performed by existing bodies.

20. With regard to draft resolution CI on land reform, his delegation had pointed out in the Economic Committee that the phrase in paragraph 5 "giving particular attention to the problem of financing" was undesirable. Countries would undoubtedly have many problems to solve in connexion with rural improvement programmes, but finance was only one of those problems, and not necessarily the most important. The bulk of the necessary finance must be obtained from domestic sources, although outside assistance might be required in particular cases. The draft resolution contained a comprehensive and excellent recommendation to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and it would be unhelpful to the General Assembly to ask it to give its attention particularly to problems of financing.

21. His Government maintained a keen interest in the question of land reform and had promoted rural improvement under its own technical assistance programmes. It felt that farm and home ownership was a valuable stabilizing factor in international relations. The question of land reform was composed of many facets involving the problem of rural improvement which, in the United States, had been fostered by such means as agricultural extension services, improvement credits and rural co-operatives.

22. Mr. DE SEYNES (France) stated that his delegation could not vote in favour of draft resolution A as it stood. Its negative vote did not mean, however, that it took a final stand with regard to the possible establishment of a trade stabilization commission. But the French Government felt that before such a commission was set up, its terms of reference should be clearly defined and the results of the conference of the signatory Powers of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) should be known, GATT being the most important international organization concerned with trade policy, as its member States accounted for about 80 per cent of the world's trade.

23. He had two further points to make. First, this was the first time that the Economic and Social Council was clearly divided on a major problem before it and that no serious effort had been made to reconcile the various views. In the past, when dealing with such problems as full employment, the establishment of the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development (SUNFED) or other important questions, considerable work had been accomplished in private or by working groups, leading to a solution satisfactory to the great majority. The French delegation felt that only such a method could give fruitful results and hoped that at its July session the Council would return to it.

24. Secondly, the present debate could not but draw attention to the use made of the opinions of experts. Groups of experts, all internationally known, had on

two separate occasions given their views on the problems of the terms of trade and the stabilization of the prices of primary commodities; yet the draft resolution before the Council departed from the experts' recommendations to the extent of contradicting them on at least two points: reversal of long-term tendencies and the establishment of price parity between primary commodities and manufactured goods. It was somewhat surprising that the only recommendation of the experts which had been retained by the majority was that relating to procedure, which the experts, who were all economists, had been least competent to make. That rather paradoxical attitude raised the whole question of the Economic and Social Council's methods of work.

25. Mr. De WINTER (Belgium) said that his country imported raw materials and exported manufactured goods and was responsible for the administration of overseas territories which exported raw materials. His Government was thus keenly interested in measures for the avoidance of excessive fluctuations in the prices of primary commodities.

26. Nevertheless, he regretted that he could not vote for draft resolution A. A decision of such importance as the establishment of a permanent advisory commission on international commodity trade should have been taken only after mature reflection and in the light of any decision taken later in the year regarding the reorganization of the Council itself and GATT. The terms of reference stated in the draft resolution were so wide that the commission might be unable to produce definite results and might well duplicate some of the functions of the Council itself.

27. The draft resolution referred to the necessity of maintaining a just and equitable relationship between the prices of primary commodities and the prices of manufactured goods in international trade and mentioned the secular deterioration in the terms of trade in such commodities. Both matters were highly controversial. It had rightly been pointed out that the establishment of price parities for a wide range of commodities in international trade would be most difficult, even if it should prove practicable at all without a large measure of control in world economy.

28. The experts had confined their report entitled *Commodity Trade and Economic Development* (E/2519) to a survey of short-term and medium-term fluctuations in world raw material markets and to a study of measures to eliminate such fluctuations. His Government was ready to co-operate to the full in such measures on an international scale, but could not support draft resolution A. He had voted in the Economic Committee for the paragraph postponing action on the resolution to the Council's eighteenth session and agreed with the French representative that the intervening period could profitably be used for consultation.

29. Mr. MORALES (Argentina) stated that he would support the three draft resolutions. Approval by the Council of draft resolution A would be an effective means of promoting the economic development of under-developed countries and thus of achieving a balanced and prosperous world economy. Since the organization and establishment of the proposed permanent advisory commission on international commodity trade was to be postponed to the Council's eighteenth session, he hoped that those countries which were unable to vote for the draft resolution would finally be

able to contribute to the efficient working of so important a project. He drew attention to the spirit of conciliation which, despite the urgency of the matter, had led his delegation to accept the amendment postponing implementation of the resolution. The draft resolution could not be called premature, the more so since its underlying philosophy had been laid down in General Assembly resolution 623 (VII) and stated at the Inter-American Conferences of 1940 and 1954.

30. He would vote for draft resolution B because at least something positive would be gained by its adoption, but he reserved the right, when the matter was considered by other bodies, to submit amendments to remedy some of its defects.

31. He would also support draft resolution C.

32. Sir Douglas COPLAND (Australia) pointed out that the Economic Committee had been sharply divided on draft resolution A, although the subject was one on which a large measure of agreement would have been desirable.

33. A number of problems affecting the status of the proposed commission would be discussed in forthcoming months; he thought it would therefore have been wiser to await the outcome of those discussions before taking any final decision on the establishment of a new body. His delegation was not against the commission in principle and would therefore abstain in the vote.

34. Australia was just as keenly interested as Argentina in the question of terms of trade, but favourable terms for one group of countries might very well be unfavourable for another group.

35. The Secretary-General had informed the Council (E/L.578) that he proposed to submit to it such conclusions from his review of the organization and work of the Secretariat as might relate to the Council's programmes and documentation. The Council might well ask the Secretary-General to take the proposed commission into account in preparing his report, but, if it did so, it was obviously most desirable that the commission should have been established by the unanimous vote of the Council.

36. Mr. ALFONZO RAVARD (Venezuela) said that his delegation would vote for all three draft resolutions. The first reflected, in moderate terms, aspirations which the less developed countries had held for many years. It did not call for any positive action, but merely for a study of possible measures for the elimination of excessive fluctuations in the terms of trade. That was a difficult problem, but the proposed commission, by careful study and well-thought-out proposals, might be able to devise a formula which would take the interests of all countries concerned into account.

37. The commission would be called on to study measures aimed at the maintenance of a just and equitable relationship between the prices of primary commodities and the prices of manufactured goods in international trade. While some delegations regarded that as an impossible task, that difficulty should be faced with a confidence that it could be solved and it might perhaps appear less formidable in the light of experience than some people thought. It would be the commission's task to make recommendations which would be fair to all parties.

38. He would also vote in favour of the second draft resolution as he thought it an excellent compromise

text, conciliating the interests of countries which exported and those which imported private capital. He had no objection to the text of the third draft resolution.

39. The PRESIDENT put draft resolution A (E/2588) to the vote.

At the request of the Argentine representative, a vote was taken by roll call.

The United Kingdom, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Argentina, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Egypt, India, Pakistan, Turkey, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Against: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Belgium, France, Norway.

Abstaining: Australia.

The draft resolution was adopted by 12 votes to 5, with 1 abstention.

40. Sir Alec RANDALL (United Kingdom) explained that his negative vote did not indicate that he was in any way opposed to the idea of price stabilization. On the contrary, he was convinced that excessive fluctuations in the prices of primary commodities were harmful to producers and consumers alike and that all practical measures should be taken to stabilize prices and improve conditions of trade. On the other hand, the experts on commodity trade and economic development had not suggested any methods for determining a just and equitable relationship between the prices of primary commodities and manufactured goods. It therefore seemed somewhat unreasonable to appoint a commission to establish such a relationship. Moreover, the terms of reference of the commission were so broad as to preclude the likelihood of its doing any useful work. The whole question of international trade would shortly be discussed by the signatory Powers of the GATT, which would review seven years' work. Pending that review, it seemed rather premature to appoint a new body to discuss virtually the same question.

41. He agreed with the Australian and French representatives that it was an odd compromise to force a decision through and then invite Governments to comment on the *fait accompli* with which they had been presented. Although he was not convinced that resolution A was the best method of approaching the problem, in the period before the eighteenth session, his delegation would give careful consideration to the position created by the adoption of that resolution.

42. Mr. EL-TANAMLI (Egypt) warmly supported the resolution. He was convinced that its adoption would redound to the benefit of the United Nations.

43. Mr. TRUJILLO (Ecuador) said that he had voted in favour of resolution A. The establishment of a just and equitable relationship between the prices of primary commodities and manufactured goods would benefit the under-developed and the highly industrialized countries alike by improving general trade possibilities.

44. The PRESIDENT put draft resolution B of E/2588 to the vote.

The draft resolution was adopted by 15 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

45. The PRESIDENT put to the vote section I (Land Reform) of draft resolution C (E/2588).

Section I was adopted unanimously.

46. The PRESIDENT put to the vote section II (Co-operatives) of draft resolution C (E/2588).

47. Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked for a separate vote on the first paragraph of the preamble.

The first paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 16 votes to 2.

Section II, as a whole, was adopted unanimously.

48. Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) explained that he had voted against the first paragraph of the preamble because the part of the report *Progress in Land Reform* (E/2526) dealing with agricultural co-operatives contained a number of slanderous allegations against the collective farms in the USSR.

Report of the Interim Co-ordinating Committee for International Commodity Arrangements on the question of a study group on steel: report of the Economic Committee (E/2574)

[Agenda item 9]

49. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the draft resolution in the report of the Economic Committee (E/2574), which took note of the report of the Interim Co-ordinating Committee (E/2537).

The draft resolution was adopted by 16 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Confirmation of members of functional commissions of the Council (E/2576 and Corr.1 and Add.1)

[Agenda item 23]

50. The PRESIDENT requested the Council to consider the nominations submitted for confirmation in documents E/2576 and Corr.1 and Add.1.

51. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) asked for a separate vote on the nomination of Mr. Kan Lee to the Fiscal Commission.

52. Mr. HSIA (China) asked for separate votes on the nominations of Mr. Suyazov to the Transport and Communications Commission and Mrs. Fomina to the Commission on the Status of Women. He would refrain from challenging the nominations of certain other Governments which were not represented on the Council.

53. The PRESIDENT put the challenged nominations to the vote.

The nomination of Mr. Kan Lee was confirmed by 14 votes to 3, with 1 abstention.

The nomination of Mr. Suyazov was confirmed by 17 votes to 1.

The nomination of Mrs. Fomina was confirmed by 17 votes to 1.

54. Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation could not consider Mr. Kan Lee the legal representative of China on the Fiscal Commission. The legal representative could be appointed only by the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China.

55. Mr. HSIA (China) objected that such remarks were out of place.

56. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objections, he would consider the other nominations to the functional commissions of the Council confirmed.

It was so decided.

Financial implications of actions of the Council (E/2448 and Corr.1 and 2 and Add.1 to 3, E/2559 and Add.1 and 2)

[Agenda item 24]

57. The PRESIDENT drew particular attention to the documents explaining the financial implications of the Council's actions at the current session (E/2559 and Add.1 and 2). The documents had been transmitted to the Council for information only; no action was necessary.

58. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) noted with pleasure that the Council had adopted a number of far-reaching decisions on important issues without adding any further charges to the United Nations budget. The Secretary-General was to be congratulated on having found it possible to assume certain additional work-loads within the present budget.

59. Mr. KOS (Yugoslavia) was glad to see from document E/2559 that Mr. Scheyven's work in collating governmental comment on the recommendation concerning a special United Nations fund for economic development had been given first priority. Unfortunately, Mr. Scheyven's task was apparently being complicated by the fact that a number of Governments had not yet transmitted their comments to him. Mr. Scheyven was called upon to report to the Council at its next session.

60. It would therefore be in the Council's interest to appeal to those Governments which had not yet replied to do so. The appeal might be directed through the Secretariat.

It was so decided.

Consideration of the provisional agenda for the eighteenth session of the Council (E/2530/Rev.1 and Add.1, E/L.600)

[Agenda item 25]

61. Mr. MEADE (United Kingdom) was surprised to note that on the provisional agenda for the eighteenth session (E/2530/Rev.1) the removal of obstacles to international trade and means of developing international economic relations appeared as a separate item (agenda item 3). When the agenda of the current session had been adopted (756th meeting), he had proposed the postponement of that item to the eighteenth session and had suggested that at that time it should be considered as item 2 (c), under the general heading of the world economic situation, to which it was intimately related. He had the impression that the Council had adopted his proposal.

62. In any event, he formally moved that item 3 on the provisional agenda should become item 2 (c).

63. Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), supported by Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia), opposed that proposal.

64. The USSR delegation had introduced the item as a separate item and wished it to be discussed as such. There were many proofs of the difficulties existing in international trade and practical steps had to be taken

to overcome them. The world economic situation was a very general subject, in which the practical aspects of measures to remove obstacles to international trade would be completely swamped. Moreover, any of the economic items on the agenda could equally well be said to be linked to the world economic situation; since a number of them, which were much less important than the item on trade, were to be treated as separate items, the United Kingdom representative's argument was not valid.

65. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) supported the United Kingdom proposal.

66. He did not agree with the USSR representative about the general and theoretical nature of the Council's debate on the world economic situation. On the contrary, that debate was one of the Council's most important discussions each year and it led to the adoption of some of the most vital resolutions. Trade was certainly a basic issue in the world economic situation and to discuss it as part of item 2 was not to detract from its importance, but merely to place it in its true context.

67. Mr. EL-TANAMLI (Egypt) suggested that items 2 (a) and (b) and item 3 should all be separate. It would be very ill-advised to attempt to hold a single general debate on the world economic situation and full employment. The discussion of the world economic situation was a survey of prevailing conditions, whereas the Council would undoubtedly make recommendations on future policy in connexion with the item on full employment.

68. Mr. SAKSENA (India) supported the Egyptian representative's suggestion. He was inclined to agree with the USSR representative that any of the economic items on the agenda could equally well be included in the discussion of the world economic situation. It would be best to have a general discussion on that topic and then treat each of the major related topics separately.

69. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America), supported by Mr. MEADE (United Kingdom), objected to the Egyptian representative's suggestion. The Council had a very heavy agenda for its next session and the work should be streamlined as much as possible. The world economic situation, world trade and full employment were so closely linked that separate general debates on each of them would inevitably involve repetition. The other economic items were more specialized and therefore in a different category.

70. Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) supported the Egyptian representative's suggestion. By preventing a separate discussion on trade, the United Kingdom and United States representatives clearly hoped to stop the Council from adopting any practical measures.

71. The PRESIDENT proposed that the United Kingdom proposal should be put to the vote before the Egyptian proposal.

72. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) and Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) objected.

The President's proposal was adopted by 11 votes to 4, with 3 abstentions.

The United Kingdom proposal was adopted by 10 votes to 4, with 4 abstentions.

73. Mr. MEADE (United Kingdom) suggested that, as it was desirable that delegations should be able to

make their arrangements in advance, the Council should decide tentatively to begin the discussion of the item on the first Monday after the opening of the session, that is, 5 July.

74. Mr. BUNGE (Argentina) proposed that the Secretariat should be asked to draw up a provisional time-table and circulate it to governments some weeks before the beginning of the session.

It was so decided.

75. The PRESIDENT asked the Council to decide whether or not item 4 (c), "Methods to increase world productivity" should be included in the agenda.

The inclusion of item 4 (c) was approved unanimously.

76. The PRESIDENT drew attention to section II, paragraph 3, of the note by the Secretary-General (E/2530/Rev.1), which explained why item 7, "Transport and communications: (a) Report by the Secretary-General on the results of the London Conference on Pollution of Sea Water; (b) Report by the Secretary-General on the United Nations Conference on Customs Formalities for the Temporary Importation of Private Road Vehicles and for Tourism", had been added to the agenda.

The inclusion of the item was approved unanimously.

77. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the proposal in section III of the note by the Secretary-General (E/2530/Rev.1) that consideration of item 12 (a) should be postponed to a future session and that the remainder of the item should be amended to read: "Report by the Secretary-General on the advisability of convening a conference of non-governmental organizations interested in the eradication of prejudice and discrimination (Council resolution 502 C (XVI))".

78. Mr. BUNGE (Argentina) thought the Council would hardly be in a position to discuss item 12 (a) at the eighteenth session and that that item should therefore be postponed to a future session. Item 12 (b) would, in that case, become item 12 on the agenda of the eighteenth session and would be re-worded as suggested in the note by the Secretary-General (E/2530/Rev.1).

It was so decided.

79. The PRESIDENT asked the Council to decide whether or not item 16, "Question of calling a United Nations regional cartographic conference for Asia and the Far East" should be included in the agenda.

The inclusion of item 16 was approved unanimously.

80. Mr. VAKIL (Secretary of the Council), referring to item 29, "Organization and operation of the Council and its commissions and amendment of rule 82 of the rules of procedure of the Council", drew attention to section II, paragraph 2, of the note by the Secretary-General (E/2530/Rev.1), which explained the addition of the final clause.

81. He further drew attention to the last paragraph of the addendum to the note by the Secretary-General (E/2530/Rev.1/Add.1).

The revised wording was approved unanimously.

82. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America), referring to paragraph 1 of the addendum to the note by the Secretary-General (E/2530/Rev.1), pointed out that the Council had already decided (788th meeting) that the item, "Allegations regarding infringements of

trade-union rights", should be placed on the agenda of the eighteenth session.

83. Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) opposed the inclusion of the item in the agenda. The only document on the subject before the Council was a draft resolution submitted by the United States delegation (E/L.601, draft resolution A), which contained slanderous allegations against the USSR. That was not a correct approach to the problem of infringements of trade-union rights.

84. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) maintained that the item had already been placed on the agenda; the confusion had arisen because section IV of the note by the Secretary-General (E/2530/Rev.1), stated that three new allegations regarding infringements of trade-union rights relating to States non-members of the International Labour Organisation had been received by the Secretariat. The only question was whether those new allegations should be considered. In view of the fact that the Council had previously decided that new allegations should be considered only once a year, he suggested deferring their consideration to the nineteenth session and discussing only the United States draft resolution (E/L.601, draft resolution A) at the eighteenth session.

85. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) supported the USSR proposal that the item should not be included in the agenda.

86. The PRESIDENT put the USSR proposal to the vote.

The proposal was rejected by 12 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions.

87. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) said he had voted in favour of the USSR proposal because he did not consider that the discussion of draft resolution A submitted by the United States (E/L.601) would be a useful contribution to the Council's work.

88. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) appealed to the Secretariat and to the specialized agencies to distribute the documents for the eighteenth session as early as possible. Unless delegations received the documents by the middle of May at the latest, they would be in a difficult position.

89. He hoped that at the eighteenth session the Economic Committee and the Social Committee would begin work on the third or fourth day. The agenda for the session was very heavy and, if that were not done, the Council would not get through its work in the prescribed time.

90. Furthermore, he thought it would be well once again to establish a co-ordination committee. Items such as the organization of the Council and its commissions could be dealt with by that Committee.

91. Mr. BORIS (France) endorsed the United States representative's remarks and hoped that translations of the documents into all the working languages would also be issued in good time.

92. Mr. GEORGES-PICOT (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Departments of Economic Affairs and of Social Affairs), in reply to a question by Mr. MORALES (Argentina), stated that the usual arrangements were being made by the Secretariat for the eighteenth session of the Council to convene in Geneva in accordance with the pattern of conferences.

Admission to Headquarters of representatives of non-governmental organizations (E/2568) (concluded)²

93. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia), referring to the report of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations (E/2568), recalled that at the opening meeting of the session (755th meeting) the United States representative had informed the Council that visas had been granted to the representatives of a number of non-governmental organizations, including Mr. Dessau, a duly designated representative of the World Federation of Trade Unions. In reply to a question, the United States representative had stated that Mr. Dessau's visa had been granted "that very morning". Owing to the action of the United States authorities in issuing the visa at such a late date, Mr. Dessau had been unable to participate in the Council's work before the second week of the session. The procedure followed by the United States authorities was clearly in contravention of United States obligations under the Headquarters Agreement. Moreover, Mr. Dessau's visa placed such restrictive conditions on his movements that the discriminatory attitude of the United States authorities was only too clear. The conditions were listed in the statement by the WFTU (E/C.2/386). It was significant that the United States representative had not mentioned them.

94. Mr. Dessau's delayed arrival could not be justified by the slanderous attacks which the United States representative had levelled at various Member States, the WFTU and its representative. The WFTU was a very important non-governmental organization with over 80 million members. It constantly fought to improve standards of living throughout the world and played a constructive part in the work of the Council and its commissions.

95. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) pointed out that, although Mr. Dessau's visa had been granted only on the opening day of the session, the United States authorities could not be held responsible for the fact that Mr. Dessau had not arrived for a further week. It was regrettable that he should have been absent for the first few days of the session, but the items discussed during the first week had been largely procedural items of no concern to the non-governmental organizations. Hence Mr. Dessau's belated arrival had not interfered with the participation of the WFTU in the Council's work, particularly as another WFTU representative had been present from the outset.

96. The complaint concerning the restrictive nature of Mr. Dessau's visa was irrelevant and out of order. The Headquarters Agreement spoke only of access to Headquarters and Mr. Dessau had been ensured such access.

97. Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) fully supported the Czechoslovakia representative's statement. It was deplorable that the activities of the United Nations should depend on the unilateral, arbitrary actions of the United States authorities. The fact that all the representatives of non-governmental organizations had arrived in time except the representatives of the WFTU and the Women's International Democratic Federation clearly indicated the discriminatory attitude of the United States authorities. The WFTU was an important organization in category A. The restrictive conditions imposed on its representative

² Resumed from the 755th meeting.

were an insult to Mr. Dessau. He asked the Secretary-General and the United States authorities to ensure that persons seeking to enter the United States to attend the nineteenth session of the Council be granted proper visas, regardless of their political convictions.

98. The SECRETARY-GENERAL explained that the Headquarters Agreement approved by the General Assembly was the result of difficult and delicate negotiations, as were the clarifications set out in the progress report on negotiations with the United States concerning the interpretation of the Headquarters Agreement (E/2492). Two interests had to be balanced: the interests of the international organization, whose work had to be undisturbed by special national interests and unilateral action, and the interests of the host country, with its own domestic policies, which might be at variance with the views expressed in the United Nations. According to a valid legal interpretation, the Headquarters Agreement provided only for access to Headquarters. A reasonable interpretation of that provision had been agreed on. There was nothing to preclude the United States Government from qualifying a representative's right to live in the United States of America, provided that it did not interfere with his work at the United Nations and his right to a reasonable life outside.

99. He had welcomed the United States representative's statement at the opening meeting as an indication of United States respect for the Headquarters Agreement. The fact that the United States authorities were prepared to inform the Council of their actions and the reasons for them could not be interpreted otherwise. At the sixteenth session, the United States Government had indicated that it would do everything possible to ensure speedy decisions on visas. He trusted that it would live up to that promise. He himself would do everything in his power to facilitate speedy decisions and to emphasize the importance of timely action in the interests of the United Nations.

Closure of the seventeenth session

100. The PRESIDENT said that it had been as a result of a new social conscience awakened after the Second World War that so much of the Charter of the United Nations had been devoted to the needs of the peoples for better standards of living. The success or failure of the United Nations had to be judged in the light of the ends in view.

101. The chief item discussed at the seventeenth session had been the economic development of underdeveloped countries. That was the most important ques-

tion to be considered by the Economic and Social Council and by the United Nations as a whole. The low standards of living prevalent in many parts of the world were a challenge to the effectiveness of the United Nations and a test of its worth. To achieve results in that field international co-operation was essential.

102. The characteristic feature of the present day was an awakening of entire continents to the need for economic independence and social justice, to be attained through political freedom. If that need could be satisfied, a great step would have been taken towards the solution of other international problems. Very little, however, had been achieved so far, largely owing to a lack of awareness among the public; but a still greater responsibility rested with those who refused to admit the gravity of the problem or who attempted to maintain the *status quo*.

103. An endeavour should be made to keep the public better informed about the Economic and Social Council's work. Very little space was given in the Press to its debates, unless some political argument took place in the Council which had nothing to do with the Council's real work.

104. There was a body of opinion in the Council which endeavoured to raise the level of the debates above political and ideological differences, as had been apparent during the debates on freedom of information and on the infringement of trade-union rights. There had also been evidence of a better understanding of the limitations of the United Nations. A step towards the achievement of universality had been made in the inclusion of a number of countries as full members of the regional economic commissions.

105. He thanked the members of the Council for their co-operation and the members of the Secretariat for the help they had given the Council in its work.

106. Mr. OZGUREL (Turkey), Mr. SAKSENA (India), Mr. NUÑEZ PORTUONDO (Cuba), Mr. EL-TANAMLI (Egypt), Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia), Mr. HSIA (China), Mr. BORIS (France), Sir Alec RANDALL (United Kingdom), Mr. KOS (Yugoslavia), Mr. PEREZ PEREZ (Venezuela), Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America), Mr. FENAUX (Belgium), Mr. LOOMES (Australia), Mr. ENGEN (Norway), Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) and Mr. TRUJILLO (Ecuador) paid tributes to the President for the ability and impartiality with which he had conducted the Council's debates.

The meeting rose at 7.15 p.m.