

UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL



GENERAL
E/AC.6/SR.115
15 August 1951
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH AND FRENCH

Dual Distribution

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Thirteenth Session

ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTEENTH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Saturday, 28 July 1951, at 11 a.m.

CONTENTS:

Economic development of under-developed countries (item 4
of the Council agenda):

(a) Methods of financing economic development (continued):

Consideration of draft resolution for submission to the
Council (E/AC.6/L.47/Rev.1)

Present:

Chairman:

Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia)

Members:

Belgium	Mr. MASOIN
Canada	Mr. SINCLAIR
Chile	Mr. SCHWAKE VERGARA
China	Mr. YU Mr. CHA
France	Mr. de SEYNES
India	Mr. KRISHNAMACHARI Mr. DESAI
Iran	Mr. KHOSROVANI
Mexico	Mr. GONZALEZ-SOSA
Pakistan	Mr. Hadi HUSAIN
Peru	Mr. CABADA
Philippines	Mr. GARCIA
Poland	Mr. DUSZTAJN
Sweden	Mr. STERNER
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. KORUKIN
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. BELL
United States of America	Mr. LUBIN

Representatives of specialized agencies:

International Labour Organisation	Mr. HOWENSTINE
Food and Agriculture Organization	Mr. McDOUGALL
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development	Mr. DEMUTH Mr. LOPEZ-HERRARTE

Representatives of non-governmental organizations:

Category A

International Chamber of Commerce

Mr. L'HUILLIER

International Confederation of Free
Trade Unions

Miss SENDER

Secretariat:

Mr. Owen

Assistant Secretary-General in
charge of the Department of
Economic Affairs

Mr. Weintraub

Director, Division of
Economic Stability and
Development

Mr. Dumontet

Secretary to the Committee

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF UNDER-DEVELOPED COUNTRIES (item 4 of the Council agenda):
(a) METHODS OF FINANCING ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (continued):
Consideration of draft resolution for submission to the Council
(E/AC.6/L.47/Rev.1)

The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the Committee to the report of the Drafting Sub-Committee (E/AC.6/L.47/Rev.1) and to the draft resolution contained therein.

Mr. de SEYNES (France) said that the French delegation was prepared to vote for the draft resolution submitted by the Drafting Sub-Committee.

The text had the advantage of being at once both fairly complete and precise, and represented a felicitous compromise between the various points of view expressed during the general discussion.

The French delegation was nevertheless obliged to make a reservation, not in respect of the substance or the form of the draft resolution, but in respect of the procedure proposed in paragraph 4 thereof. Under that paragraph, the Economic and Social Council would be submitting the recommendations it had formulated to the sixth session of the General Assembly. It was true that it would be doing so in accordance with instructions in General Assembly resolution 400 (V), but the procedure proposed in the draft resolution would have two disadvantages; first, the coming into force of the provisions of the draft resolution would be delayed by several weeks, if not months. The sixth session of the General Assembly was due to open at the beginning of November, and there was no indication as to when it would be able to take up that particular draft resolution. Secondly, the procedure proposed raised an issue of principle; all the provisions of the draft resolution were fully covered by the terms of reference and authority conferred upon the Council by the Charter. The draft resolution contained recommendations addressed to Governments or to specialized agencies, and requests that certain studies should be undertaken by the Secretariat or by the specialized agencies. Had it been a question of establishing a fund maintained by contributions from Member States, as had been the case with technical assistance, or of setting up a new United Nations organ,

as had been the case with the Technical Assistance Board, the initiative taken by the Council would have required the approval of the General Assembly. But that was not so. It would therefore be dangerous for the Council to surrender its responsibilities in the matter to the General Assembly instead of making the draft resolution its own. For that reason, the French delegation proposed that the recommendations in paragraphs 5 et seq of the draft resolution, which were at present drafted as emanating from the General Assembly, should remain recommendations of the Council and come into force as soon as adopted by the Council. It went without saying that the General Assembly would have the right and the duty to study the provisions of the resolution and to make such comments on them as it thought proper. But the resolution in question did not differ in kind from any of the resolutions which the Council had in the past adopted on economic development and other matters, and it should therefore remain a Council resolution. The French delegation therefore proposed that paragraph 4 be deleted, and that the immediately following words "The General Assembly" be replaced by the words "The Economic and Social Council". It would be advisable to add at the end of the draft resolution a paragraph to the effect that, as instructed in General Assembly resolution 400 (V), the Economic and Social Council was reporting on the provisions it had adopted on methods of financing economic development.

Finally, he apologized for introducing his amendment so belatedly. In the Drafting Sub-Committee, attention had been focussed on the substantive aspects of the draft resolution, so that the procedural issue had been rather neglected. It was for that reason that the French delegation had decided to raise the issue at the present moment, on the understanding that, if the Economic Committee was not prepared to settle it, his delegation could bring the matter up again in the Council.

Mr. GARCIA (Philippines) agreed with the French representative that, as the Economic and Social Council was one of the most important bodies of the United Nations, care must be taken to avoid anything in the nature of an abdication of its powers.

He felt, none the less, that the French representative's arguments were not entirely sound. In the third operative paragraph of General Assembly resolution 400 (V), it was clearly stated that the General Assembly "requests the Economic and Social Council to submit its recommendations to the sixth session of the General Assembly". In pursuance of that resolution, the Council had, at its twelfth session, adopted resolution 342 (XII), instructing the Economic Committee to play its part in complying with that request. Taken together, those two resolutions were a sufficiently clear indication that the Council should report back to the General Assembly in the first instance.

Mr. de SEYNES (France) explained that he would not press the Committee to take up the procedural issue immediately, because he fully realized that some delegations might not be prepared to take part in the discussion. Moreover, he was not overlooking the difficulties mentioned by the Philippines representative. He had simply wished to bring out the disadvantages inherent in the proposed procedure, by showing that it would result in delay in implementing the draft resolution and that it would tend to attribute a consultative rôle to the Council rather than the executive rôle assigned to it in the Charter.

He reserved the right to express his ideas in specific terms in the form of an amendment in the Council, and requested members of the Committee to ponder the matter in the meantime.

Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) could see no contradiction between the views of the French and Philippine representatives. The fact that the General Assembly had asked the Council to make certain recommendations to it did not preclude the Council from taking independent action as well. In fact, it had the right to take such action, and might very well frame its recommendations to the General Assembly on that basis.

Mr. SCHNAKE VERGARA (Chile) emphasized the extreme importance of the discussion. He was inclined to share the United States representative's opinion, but would prefer the question to be referred to the Council, where he would define his attitude in greater detail.

Mr. Hadi HUSAIN (Pakistan) recalled that, when the subject had been under discussion in the Drafting Sub-Committee, he had specifically asked the Chairman of that Committee whether the words "The General Assembly" following paragraph 4, were appropriate. The Chairman had replied that it was for the Economic Committee to draft a resolution for submission to the General Assembly. He (Mr. Hadi Husain) asked for clarification.

Mr. WEINTRAUB (Secretariat), speaking as Chairman of the Drafting Sub-Committee, said that he had informally pointed out that if the opening words of paragraph 4, as proposed by the Drafting Sub-Committee, were adopted, it would be logical to follow them with a draft resolution in the name of the General Assembly. His observations had related to the form, not to the substance.

Mr. GARCIA (Philippines), while appreciating the grounds on which the United States representative's observations were based, was nevertheless unable to agree with any interpretation suggesting that the Economic and Social Council was authorized to make independent recommendations. The kind of situation which the United States representative doubtless had in mind was that which arose, for example, when the Council undertook to make a study of a given problem on its own initiative, and as the result of that study formulated recommendations for submission to the General Assembly and other interested bodies. But when the Council was acting in pursuance of the instructions of the General Assembly, he considered that it was its duty to confine itself to informing that body of the results of its deliberations, which it could appropriately do by submitting a draft resolution for the Assembly's approval.

Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) thought that the Philippines representative was, perhaps, sticking a little too rigidly to the principles of formal logic: circumstances altered cases, and the subject which was now before the Economic Committee (and therefore the Council itself) had been on the agenda for a number of years. It was not a new subject, and thus had not originated with the fifth session of the General Assembly. He therefore considered that the Council was justified in contemplating action in its own right.

Mr. CHA (China) supported the French representative's proposal, and thought that the time factor involved was of considerable importance. The subject had already been before the Council for a number of years, and if all responsibility for specific action was left to the General Assembly, a good deal more time would pass before such action could be taken.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the French representative's proposal be referred to the Council. That would give representatives time to consider it more carefully.

Mr. de SEYNES (France) agreed. As he had indicated, he would introduce an appropriate amendment in the Council.

The Chairman's suggestion was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN asked the Committee to examine the draft resolution in document E/AC.6/L.47/Rev.1 paragraph by paragraph.

Mr. MASOIN (Belgium) pointed out that document E/AC.6/L.47/Rev.1 was in effect the report of the Drafting Sub-Committee. The Committee should therefore also consider the two paragraphs preceding the draft resolution.

In that connexion, it should be noted that Council resolution 342 (XII) had instructed the Committee to examine the problem of economic development. In fact, following an agreement reached at the first meeting, the Committee had strictly confined its work to the methods of financing economic development or, to be more precise still, of financing it by foreign capital. It would therefore be prudent to make that point clear at the beginning of the Committee's report, and to stress that the Committee had concentrated on that particular aspect of the problem without prejudice to the study of other aspects, which were dealt with in the report of the Economic, Employment and Development Commission and elsewhere.

Mr. WEINTRAUB (Secretariat) suggested the following procedure, which was the usual practice in similar cases. The Committee would devote its attention to the draft resolution itself, leaving it to the Chairman in

collaboration with the Secretariat to draft the introductory paragraph. That paragraph would be framed in the usual way, and would state, inter alia, that the Committee had met in pursuance of Council resolution 342 (XII) and had decided to limit its work to certain specific items in the Report of the Group of Experts, and to the corresponding sections of the report of the Economic, Employment and Development Commission.

It was agreed that the procedure suggested by the representative of the Secretariat should be adopted.

Paragraphs 1, 2 and 3

Paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 were adopted without comment.

Paragraph 4

After an exchange of views between Mr. de SEYNES (France), Mr. KHOSRAVANI (Iran) and Mr. KRISHNAMACHARI (India), the CHAIRMAN suggested that it be left to the Council itself to take a decision on paragraph 4.

It was so agreed.

Paragraph 5

Mr. GARCIA (Philippines) said that, when paragraph 5(a) was viewed in conjunction with paragraph 1, it was clear that its intention was to recommend that under-developed countries should do their utmost to channel their available domestic resources into their development programmes. That was clear and agreed. But in many under-developed countries development programmes were at present being financed with the assistance of foreign capital as well. He had in mind the fact that, in utilizing their foreign capital resources, the governments of some under-developed countries had reserved the right to channel such foreign investments into activities likely to promote economic development. For that reason he proposed the deletion of the word "domestic" from the phrase "for maximizing the availability of domestic capital for essential national development programmes" in paragraph 5(a).

Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) could not agree with the Philippines proposal. His delegation considered that the word "domestic" had been included for a specific reason. In sub-paragraph (a) of paragraph 5 consideration was given to the situation of under-developed countries which were faced with the problem of creating institutions and techniques for increasing to the utmost their availabilities of domestic capital. In sub-paragraph (b), on the other hand, attention was focussed on the developed countries, whose task it was to create organizations for stimulating exports of their domestic capital to the under-developed countries.

Thus, if the word "domestic" was deleted, sub-paragraph (a) would lose its point.

Mr. Hadi HUSAIN (Pakistan) agreed that the word "domestic" should be retained. Sub-paragraph (a) dealt with the utilization of domestic capital by the under-developed countries; sub-paragraph (b) referred to the flow of capital from the developed to the under-developed countries; and sub-paragraph (c) suggested that under-developed countries should increase their capacity to absorb such foreign capital as might be available for financing their development programmes. There was, therefore, a need to prescribe in sub-paragraph (a) maximum utilization of domestic capital.

Mr. GARCIA (Philippines) did not agree that the idea of maximising the availability of domestic capital would be lost if his amendment was adopted. He merely wanted to allow for the fact that many under-developed countries were in fact using foreign resources in addition to their own, so that the word "domestic" might not be absolutely pertinent. However, he would not press his amendment.

Mr. KRISHNAMACHARI (India) said that in the interests of complete accuracy some such modification as that proposed by the Philippines representative was, strictly speaking, required. While he agreed that sub-paragraph (b) recommended Member Governments of the developed countries to take certain steps within their power, it did not altogether take account of the fact that capital was already flowing from developed countries to under-developed countries, or that efforts should be made to utilize such capital efficiently.

Mr. BELL (United Kingdom) recalled that paragraphs 5(a) and 5(b) had been separated, because it had been difficult to make paragraph 5 in its original form refer to anything but domestic capital, whereas two different conceptions had to be expressed; first, the channelling of domestic capital into national enterprises; and secondly, an expansion of the export availability of capital.

Paragraph 5, as originally drafted, could even have been taken to mean that the under-developed countries should export their capital, and that the developed countries should channel their own capital into their own national enterprises. Hence the deletion of the word "domestic" from sub-paragraph (a) would defeat the very purpose underlying the division of paragraph 5.

Mr. GARCIA (Philippines) pointed out that the governments of a number of under-developed countries were launching development programmes financed either by national capital alone, or by national and foreign capital together. The contribution of foreign capital might or might not favour economic development according to whether it was used to finance, for example, the import of building equipment and the carrying-out of town planning schemes or, on the contrary, the import of luxury goods. Thus, in the opinion of his delegation, sub-paragraphs (a) and (b) of paragraph 5 dealt with two different questions. Sub-paragraph (a) concerned the efforts which governments of under-developed countries should make to utilize to the full the capital to be found within their countries, whether that capital was national or foreign; whereas sub-paragraph (b) concerned the efforts which the governments of more developed countries should make to facilitate the flow of capital towards under-developed countries.

Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) asked whether the Committee really intended that no suggestion should be made that under-developed Member Governments should do their utmost to secure the maximum availability of domestic capital for financing their development programmes. It seemed to him that it would be possible to read that undesirable implication into the text if the Philippines amendment was adopted.

Mr. MASOIN (Belgium) noted that two equally worthy ideas emerged from the discussion: in the first place, under-developed countries were to be encouraged to raise the availability of their domestic capital to the utmost; in the second place available capital, whether domestic or foreign, was to be directed towards the fulfilment of essential development programmes. The Belgian delegation wondered, therefore, whether it would not be possible to include those two ideas in sub-paragraph (a) of paragraph 5 by amending it to read:

"(a) Member Governments of under-developed countries review the adequacy of their national institutions and techniques for maximizing the availability of domestic capital and directing available capital towards the fulfilment of essential national development programmes".

Mr. GARCLA (Philippines) accepted the Belgian amendment.

Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) thought that in order to make it clear that the same capital was being referred to, the word "such" should be inserted between the words "directing" and "capital".

Mr. Hadi HUSAIN (Pakistan), while agreeing with the substance of the Belgian amendment, wished to suggest what he thought would be a slight textual improvement. He would prefer the end of sub-paragraph (a) to read "... for maximizing the availability of their domestic capital for, and the flow of foreign capital into, essential national development programmes".

Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) thought that that would merely duplicate sub-paragraph (c).

Mr. BELL (United Kingdom) could not agree with the United States representative. As he saw it, sub-paragraph (c) referred to a certain number of measures which the governments of under-developed countries might adopt in order to increase their capacity to absorb foreign capital. It did not refer to what the representative of the Philippines had in mind, namely, the national institutions and techniques for the actual control of overseas investments. That was, he thought, a distinction which should be borne in mind.

Mr. BLUSZTAJN (Poland) recalled that numerous documents published by the United Nations had stressed the responsibility of under-developed countries for drawing up general economic development plans and for channelling availabilities of both domestic and foreign capital in order to ensure the execution of such plans. That idea was not clearly expressed in the draft resolution, and he therefore preferred the Pakistani amendment, which improved the text in that respect, and was, he thought, clearer and more concise than the Belgian version.

Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) said that if he had rightly understood the meaning of the Pakistani amendment, sub-paragraph (a) would contain two distinct recommendations: first, that the availability of domestic capital for development should be increased to the maximum; second, that efforts should be made to increase the flow of foreign capital for the national development programmes of the under-developed countries. If that was so, his delegation could support the Pakistani amendment.

Mr. MASOIN (Belgium) withdrew his amendment in favour of the Pakistani proposal.

The Pakistani amendment was adopted.

Paragraph 5(a), as amended, was adopted.

Paragraph 5(b) was adopted.

Mr. Hadi HUSAIN (Pakistan) pointed out that, unless the Drafting Sub-Committee intended to extend the scope of sub-paragraph (c) to all governments, which he did not believe to be the case, the word "Member" should be inserted at the beginning of that sub-paragraph.

Mr. de SEYNES (France) observed that the Pakistani representative had raised a question of principle. The French delegation did not consider it necessary to specify that the text referred only to the Governments of Member States. If the Governments of non-member States wished to take advantage of the recommendations addressed to Member States, so much the better. His delegation proposed, therefore, that the expressions "Member Governments" and "Member countries" be replaced by the expressions "Governments" and "countries" respectively throughout the draft resolution.

Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) supported the French proposal. Since there were countries which were members of specialized agencies, but which were not members of the United Nations, it might be advisable to universalize rather than to limit the terms of paragraph 5.

Mr. Hadi HUSAIN (Pakistan) said that in those circumstances he would agree to the word "Member" being deleted passim.

The French proposal was adopted.

Paragraph 5(c) was adopted.

Paragraph 5(d) was adopted.

Paragraph 6

Paragraph 6 was adopted.

Paragraph 7

Paragraph 7 (a) was adopted.

Mr. GONZALEZ-SOSA (Mexico) reserved the right of his delegation to comment on the draft resolution as a whole in plenary. As to paragraph 7(b), he would confine himself to saying that it was far from satisfactory. Although Mexico provided favourable conditions for the inflow of foreign capital, the incentives derived from such favourable conditions benefited nationals as well as foreigners; paragraph 7(b) should therefore aim at setting up a system of incentives that would result in a non-discriminatory system for all law-abiding enterprises, whether foreign or national.

Mr. GARCLA (Philippines) said that his delegation agreed that the under-developed countries should take steps to provide incentives for the inflow of private foreign capital. With regard to the phrase in sub-paragraph (b) reading "non-discriminatory treatment in the conduct of their business affairs", if that meant that foreign investors should enjoy full liberty before the law and normal freedom to pursue their activities, he would have no objection to it. If, however, it affected the right of the nationals of a country to a certain priority

in developing their businesses, a right recognized in a number of under-developed countries, his delegation would be obliged to oppose it.

Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) thought that the operative part of the phrase was the words "in the conduct of their business affairs". That meant that once the foreign investors concerned were established in their business ventures, they should be accorded full and equal rights with nationals of the country in which they were operating.

Mr. de SEYNES (France) pointed out to the Mexican representative that paragraph 7 did no more than outline the conditions under which States seeking to attract private foreign capital could obtain it. If certain countries felt that, under their legislative systems, they could expropriate private foreign capital without adequate and effective compensation, paragraph 7 would in no way prevent their doing so. It merely stressed the need for providing for just and prompt compensation, thus constituting a plain statement to which no one could object.

Mr. GONZALEZ-SOSA (Mexico) explained that Mexico not only respected but also encouraged private ownership. None the less, in the event of expropriation the compensation allotted was paid on the terms and conditions laid down in the constitution and national legislation.

Mr. CUBADA (Peru) had no objection to paragraph 7; he considered that it in no way limited the power of States in that respect, and that it contained no reference likely to injure the prestige of certain States because of action they had already taken. He therefore supported paragraph 7, and explained that Peru made no distinction between foreign and domestic capital and had no legislation or body likely to deter the flow of foreign capital into the country.

Paragraph 7 (b) was adopted.

Paragraph 7 (c) and (d)

Paragraph 7 (c) and (d) were adopted.

Paragraph 8

Mr. Hadi HUSAIN (Pakistan) proposed that the words: "an international finance corporation referred to in the Report of the Group of Experts" be replaced by the phrase "the International Finance Corporation proposed in the Report of the Group of Experts".

Mr. LUBIN (United States of America), referring to recommendation 16 of the Group of Experts, pointed out that the experts did not specifically propose the establishment of an international finance corporation.

Mr. CHA (China) understood that the ad hoc Committee on the organization and operation of the Council and its Commissions would shortly submit a report for the Council's consideration, which would include a proposal that in future separate sessions should be convened to deal with economic, social and co-ordination matters. It would therefore be preferable for the time being not to attempt to fill in the blank space before the word "session" in paragraph 8.

He wondered whether the representative of the International Bank could say whether the Bank would be able to submit the report provided for in paragraph 8 before the first session devoted to economic matters was convened.

Mr. DEMUTH (International Bank for Reconstruction and Development) intimated that the Bank would be able to submit a report to the next session of the Council devoted to economic matters, provided that that session was not held before the end of 1951.

Paragraph 8 was adopted.

Paragraphs 9 to 14

Paragraphs 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14 were adopted.

Paragraphs 15 and 16

Mr. G.RCLA (Philippines), referring to paragraphs 15 and 16, reminded the Committee that Council resolution 342 (XII) called upon the Economic Committee to consider measures relating to external finance only. Most representatives

would agree that the utilization of domestic resources was useful where they were available, but he wished to place on record that his delegation considered that the insertion of articles relating to domestic financing was contrary to the Committee's terms of reference. He would not however enter a formal reservation on the subject.

Paragraphs 15 and 16 were adopted.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had now to decide whether itself to take a vote on the resolution as a whole, or leave the Council to do so.

Mr. BLUSZTAJN (Poland) considered that the Committee had discharged its terms of reference. It had examined the question, studied various proposals and prepared a draft resolution for submission to the Council. The text was long and detailed, and it would consequently be as well to allow delegations time to study all its implications, leaving it to the Council itself to decide what should finally be done about it. He had already expressed his opinion on that point during the general discussion, and reserved his delegation's right to study the draft resolution in greater detail, and, if necessary, to submit amendments to it in plenary meeting.

The CHAIRMAN, speaking as the representative of Czechoslovakia, associated himself with the statement of the Polish representative, and reserved his Government's right to revert to the substance of the draft resolution in plenary.

Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) was confident that those representatives who had participated in the work of the eleventh and twelfth sessions of the Council would agree that, when the Economic Committee had been asked to meet a week in advance of the opening of the thirteenth session proper, it had been expected that it would produce a document expressing a unanimous or a majority opinion, and containing recommendations ready for adoption by the Council. He therefore proposed that an immediate vote be taken.

With regard to the procedural difficulties mentioned by the French representative, he appreciated them to the full and therefore considered that,

even though the Committee should take an immediate vote, the Council should be left to decide whether the recommendations were to emanate from the General Assembly or itself.

Mr. SCHNAKE VERGARA (Chile) supported the United States proposal. The Committee had studied the matter, a general discussion had been held, a Drafting Sub-Committee had prepared a text reconciling the various points of view expressed, and that text itself had been amended by the Committee. There was consequently no reason to defer the vote on the draft resolution, particularly since there had been no objection to the text. By voting, delegations would in no way forfeit their right to submit their opinions to the Council, and he personally reserved his right to submit further comments in plenary.

Mr. STERNER (Sweden) and Mr. Hadi HUSAIN (Pakistan) also supported the United States proposal.

Mr. BLUSZTAJN (Poland) said that his delegation could not take part in an immediate vote, and reserved the right to revert to the draft resolution in plenary.

Mr. KORIUKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that if his delegation had so far refrained from commenting on the proceedings, that did not necessarily indicate its approval of them. If the draft resolution were put to the vote, his delegation would abstain, and ~~reserve its right to re-open the subject~~ **in the Council.**

The CHAIRMAN said that there appeared to be a general consensus of opinion in favour of taking a vote on the draft resolution. He therefore put it to the vote as amended.

The draft resolution (E/AC.6/L.47/Rev.1) was adopted, as amended, by 14 votes to none with 3 abstentions.

Mr. de SEYNES (France) hoped that the resolution would be submitted to the Council as soon as possible; to do so would be to respect the various

resolutions adopted on the subject which had urged the Council to find the speediest solution possible to one of its most serious problems. He made that suggestion at the present stage so that delegations which proposed to submit amendments in plenary could do so in good time.

The CHAIRMAN, speaking as the representative of Czechoslovakia, said that he reserved his delegation's right to present its observations on the draft resolution at the plenary meeting.

Speaking as Chairman, he said that, since the Committee had completed the work entrusted to it, it remained only for him to close the present series of meetings and to thank all those who had taken part.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.