



ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Friday, 13 December 1963,
at 3.30 p.m.

Resumed Thirty-sixth Session
OFFICIAL RECORDS

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 28:</i>	
<i>Calendar of conferences for 1964 (concluded):</i>	
(c) Date of the 1964 session of the Committee for Industrial Development	3
(b) Sessions of the Commission on Human Rights	3
<i>Agenda item 34:</i>	
Review of the composition of the United Nations FAO Inter-Governmental Committee on the World Food Programme	7
<i>Agenda item 40:</i>	
Travel, transport and communications:	
(b) Progress reports of the Committee of Experts for Further Work on the Transport of Dangerous Goods and the Group of Experts on Explosives	7

President: Mr. Alfonso PATIÑO (Colombia).

Present:

Representatives of the following States: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, India, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Senegal, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Yugoslavia.

Observers for the following Member States: Algeria, Chile, Luxembourg, Romania.

Representatives of the following specialized agencies: International Labour Organisation; Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations; United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; International Civil Aviation Organization; World Health Organization.

The representative of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

AGENDA ITEM 28

Calendar of conferences for 1964 (concluded):
(c) Date of the 1964 session of the Committee for Industrial Development

1. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to decide whether to change the dates of the session of the Committee for Industrial Development which was scheduled for 9 to 27 March according to the calendar of conferences for 1964 adopted at the thirty-sixth session. It had been suggested that the opening date should be advanced so that the last meetings of the Committee's session would not overlap the beginning of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, which would open at Geneva on 20 March.

2. Mr. MALINOWSKI (Secretary of the Council) drew the Council's attention to the fact that, if the opening

date was advanced, it would be difficult to have the necessary documentation ready in time.

3. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that his delegation had no objection to advancing the opening date, but wished to have the necessary documents in French in good time.

4. Mr. FRANZI (Italy) pointed out that it would be difficult for small delegations to send representatives both to the Committee for Industrial Development in New York and to the Conference in Geneva.

5. Mr. CVOROVIC (Yugoslavia) said that the general feeling of the Council was that the opening date of the session of the Committee for Industrial Development should be advanced by a week. It should be possible to have the documents ready in adequate time.

6. Mr. SOLODOVNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) agreed with the French representative; he saw no reason why the date of the session should not be advanced, provided that the necessary documents were made available in all working languages.

7. Mr. MALINOWSKI (Secretary of the Council) said that, in view of the observations of the French, Yugoslav and Soviet Union representatives, the Secretariat would do its best; however, it could not guarantee that it would be able to issue the documents by the earlier date.

8. Mr. UNWIN (United Kingdom) observed that if no change was made in the dates of the session of the Committee for Industrial Development, two problems would arise: first, the session would not end until Easter and, secondly, it would be difficult to find enough interpreters, since the Conference would begin before the Committee had concluded its work. It might be enough merely to shorten the session.

9. The PRESIDENT proposed that the opening date of the next session of the Committee for Industrial Development should be advanced by one week.

It was so decided.

(b) Sessions of the Commission on Human Rights

10. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider General Assembly resolution 1922 (XVIII) entitled "Sessions of the Commission on Human Rights". The draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1136/Rev.1) which had become resolution 1922 (XVIII) had been submitted to the Assembly by the Third Committee taking into account the Fifth Committee's report on the financial implications (A/5632). Resolution 1922 (XVIII) urged the Council to reconsider the decision it had taken at its thirty-sixth session, according to which the Commission on Human Rights would be unable to meet in 1964.

11. Mr. CHIBA (Japan) reminded the Council of the reasons for the decision it had taken. The conference rooms at Headquarters would be unusable because of the construction work scheduled for the first six months of the year. The Geneva building would be

fully occupied by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. From that point of view; therefore, the situation would be very difficult in 1964. While his delegation understood the reasons which had led to the adoption of resolution 1922 (XVIII), the difficulties which had prompted the Council to take its decision still remained. Moreover, if an exception was made for the Commission on Human Rights, there would be nothing to prevent other commissions also from asking to meet in 1964.

12. Mr. FRANZI (Italy) asked whether the difficulties referred to at the Council's summer session still existed.

13. Mr. SOLODOVNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that the Secretary-General's note on the financial implications of the draft resolution, which had been submitted to the Third Committee (A/C.3/L.1144); indicated that the Commission on Human Rights could hold a session provided it was concluded before 15 March. He asked for that note to be distributed to members of the Council.

14. Mr. MALINOWSKI (Secretary of the Council) confirmed that it would be possible for the Commission on Human Rights to hold a session at Headquarters, from 17 February to 13 March, for example.

15. Mr. UNWIN (United Kingdom) said that General Assembly resolution 1922 (XVIII) was not entirely in accordance with the facts. The fourth paragraph of the preamble seemed to imply that it was only the difficulties caused by the construction work at Headquarters that had led the Council to decide that the Commission should not meet in 1964. But at the Council's summer session, many delegations had stressed various practical reasons, such as lack of funds and shortage of staff, which the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions had endorsed. Moreover, the Council could scarcely reconsider its decision with regard to the Commission on Human Rights, as operative paragraph 2 requested it to do, since the decision concerned not merely that commission but all the conferences and meetings which had been scheduled to be held at Headquarters. He wished to refer the Council, in that connexion, to paragraph 16 of the report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions concerning review of the pattern of conferences (A/5647) in which the reasons for that decision were given.

16. There could be no doubt that difficulties had increased since the General Assembly, in resolution 1797 (XVII), had requested the Economic and Social Council to give due consideration to the financial implications of its actions.

17. Moreover, other commissions would then be equally justified in requesting the Council's attention and asking it to make an exception in their favour; that applied particularly to bodies which met every two years and which, if they were unable to hold a session in 1964, would therefore go for four years without meeting.

18. If it reconsidered its decision, therefore, the Council would run the risk of reopening the complex question of priority and of setting off a prolonged discussion. The best course, therefore, would be to adhere to what had been decided at the summer session.

19. Mr. DELGADO (Senegal) drew the Council's attention to the importance of the work of the Commission on Human Rights, which was responsible for the

preparation of a draft convention on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination. In the Third Committee, there had been a large majority in favour of holding a session of the Commission on Human Rights in 1964. Resolution 1922 (XVIII) requested the Council to reconsider its decision: the formula proposed was a flexible one which was in no way inconsistent with the principle of the Council's autonomy. It was not being asked to alter a decision already taken, but to make an exception in favour of the Commission on Human Rights because of the special importance of the latter's programme. The Council should bow to the wishes of the General Assembly.

20. Mr. CARRILLO (El Salvador) said that his delegation attached the highest importance to the 1964 session of the Commission on Human Rights. It had voted in favour of the draft resolution adopted by the Third Committee. His delegation would therefore be happy if the Council reconsidered its decision, provided that special arrangements were made with regard to the financial implications.

21. Mr. GARCIA DEL SOLAR (Argentina) recalled that at the thirty-sixth session, his delegation had voted in favour of the proposal to adjourn the next session of the Commission on Human Rights; the consideration advanced by the Secretary-General at that time in regard to administrative difficulties had fully justified that decision.

22. However, the Argentine delegation had inevitably been impressed by the fact that a large majority of the members of the General Assembly had expressed the desire that the Commission on Human Rights should meet in 1964 so that there should be no interruption in its annual labours, particularly that of preparing a draft international convention on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination. While his delegation had, in the General Assembly, supported the autonomy of the Council, whose firm decision had been based on extremely cogent reasons, it had had to take into account the virtually unanimous opinion of the members of the General Assembly. It should also be remembered that a Latin American country, Costa Rica, had offered to serve as host to the Commission on Human Rights if the Commission was unable to meet at Headquarters owing to physical considerations.

23. The Council now had before it a request by the General Assembly urging it to reconsider its decision. However, the replies given by the Secretary of the Council to the two representatives who had requested further information with regard to the technical difficulties which had been mentioned at the thirty-sixth session had not made it clear whether those difficulties had disappeared. Consequently, his delegation would decide on its final position after the Secretary of the Council had explained the situation more clearly.

24. Mr. MELOVSKI (Yugoslavia) said that his delegation had voted in favour of resolution 1922 (XVIII) under which the General Assembly urged the Council to reconsider its decision. The majority of the members of the Third Committee had felt that the Commission on Human Rights could meet at Headquarters in 1964 provided that it completed its work before 15 March and, according to the Secretary-General's note, the meeting would not, in that case, pose either an insurmountable technical problem or a financial problem. One of the main reasons that had been given was that the Commission had to prepare a draft international convention on the elimination of all

forms of racial discrimination. General Assembly resolution 1906 (XVIII), it should be noted, requested the Economic and Social Council to invite the Commission on Human Rights to "give absolute priority" to the preparation of that draft convention so that it could be submitted to the Assembly for consideration at its nineteenth session. Moreover, the work of the Third Committee depended to a large extent on the co-operation of the Commission on Human Rights. It was therefore essential that the Commission should be able to meet in 1964.

25. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that the Council was now being called upon to reconsider the decision it had taken at its thirty-sixth session so as to take into account the wishes expressed by the Third Committee through the intermediary of the General Assembly. He wished, however, to make it clear that he would oppose the Council's reconsidering the question of the calendar of conferences for 1964 or by that means indirectly raising the problem of the periodicity of the meetings of the Council's functional commissions. The only question before the Council was the session of the Commission on Human Rights. At the Council's thirty-sixth session, his delegation had pointed out that it would be useful to schedule a session of the Commission on Human Rights in 1964 for reasons it had stated at the time. However, his delegation had accepted the majority decision of the members of the Council. In the Third Committee, similarly, it had voted in favour of the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1136/Rev.1), while leaving the Council entirely free to come to its own decision on the question. His delegation shared the views expressed by the representatives of Italy and Senegal as to the advisability of the Council's reconsidering its decision. It had no objection to a session of the Commission on Human Rights being held in 1964, provided that the Council's decision was strictly limited to the commission and was not used as a pretext for discussing the possible convening of the other functional commissions, and provided that the Council did not take up the more delicate question of the periodicity of the meetings of the functional commissions, which was to be examined at the thirty-seventh session.

26. The PRESIDENT pointed out that agenda item 35 (Work of the Council in 1964) did, in fact, concern a possible meeting of the Commission on International Commodity Trade. For all that, the only question now being considered by the Council was that of the sessions of the Commission on Human Rights. The French representative's remarks accordingly in no way implied that the Council was required to take a decision at the present stage on the proposal to place on the agenda for the thirty-seventh session the possibility of convening a session of the Commission on International Commodity Trade.

27. Mr. VIAUD (France), speaking on a point of order, said that, in his delegation's opinion, the Council would only be able to decide on a possible session of the Commission on International Commodity Trade in the light of the results of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. If the results of the Conference justified such a session, the Council might, for overriding reason, consider reviewing the decision it had taken at its summer session.

28. The PRESIDENT said he took it that the representative of France agreed that that question should be dealt with during the consideration of agenda item 35.

29. Mr. SOLODOVNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that General Assembly resolution 1922 (XVIII) did not authorize the Council to examine the question of convening other functional commissions. It merely urged the Council to reconsider a previous decision so that the Commission on Human Rights could meet in 1964.

30. Some representatives had argued that technical difficulties, including a shortage of staff, might make it impossible for the Commission to meet in 1964. However, in paragraph 2 of his note on the financial implications (A/C.3/L.1144), the Secretary-General stated that if the Commission were to hold its session at Headquarters, at New York, prior to 15 March 1964, every effort would be made to provide the necessary conference-servicing staff from within the available resources. In paragraph 3 of the same document the Secretary-General estimated the additional costs arising out of the Commission's session at \$26,000. He wished to point out that travel expenses would probably be below the estimated figure, since many delegations would already be on the spot. Since the expenditure to be incurred would be insignificant, and since a large number of delegations had voted in favour of the General Assembly resolution, his delegation would support any proposal for convening the Commission on Human Rights in 1964.

31. Sir Ronald WALKER (Australia) said it should be pointed out that the terms of General Assembly resolution 1922 (XVIII), and particularly those of the fourth preambular paragraph, did not do full justice to the considerations which had motivated the Council's decision. When the Council had decided that the functional commissions, with the exception of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, should not meet in 1964, it had been faced with very serious problems. On the one hand, it had been obliged, owing to the alterations that had become necessary at Headquarters, to find meeting places for the various United Nations organs during that period. On the other hand, the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions had stressed that the number of meetings should be fixed in a rational way and with due moderation. As paragraph 4 of the Secretary-General's report concerning review of the pattern of conferences (A/5638) showed, the number of meetings had considerably increased between 1960 and 1962: in economic, social and human rights activities, in particular, meetings had increased from 1,264 to 1,801, a rise of 50 per cent. It was essential, therefore, to limit the number and duration of meetings of the subsidiary organs. However, the Council had before it a number of requests from almost all United Nations organs expressing their desire to meet in 1964. Thus, the Commission on Human Rights had formally recommended the Council "to provide for the twentieth session of the Commission on Human Rights to last at least five weeks" (E/3743, p. 50). Only after examining all those requests had the Council decided that none of the functional commissions, except the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, should meet in 1964. The Council had not therefore decided *in vacuo*, as General Assembly resolution 1922 (XVIII) might lead one to believe. He was perfectly well aware of the importance of the work done by the Commission on Human Rights, including its work on the preparation of a draft international convention on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination.

32. Attention should also be drawn to the views expressed by the Secretary-General in his note to the

Third Committee (A/C.3/L.1144) on the financial implications of the draft resolution on sessions of the Commission on Human Rights (A/C.3/L.1136 and Add.1 and 2). In that note, the Secretary-General had pointed out that the views which he had expressed in the report on the programme of conferences for 1964 submitted to the Economic and Social Council at its thirty-fifth session (E/3741), and which he reiterated in his statement to the Council's thirty-sixth session (1274th meeting), remained valid. He had also expressed the hope that, for administrative and budgetary reasons, the calendar of meetings as approved by the Council would be maintained. The Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions had associated itself fully with that decision and had declared in its report (A/5611) on the financial implications of the draft resolution that it could not lend its support to the suggestion that the Economic and Social Council should reverse the decision which it had taken in July. For those reasons, his delegation felt that General Assembly resolution 1922 (XVIII) was clumsily worded, for it gave the impression that the Council's decision concerned only the Commission on Human Rights.

33. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan) said that one of the reasons motivating the decision of the Council at its thirty-sixth session, namely, lack of premises, appeared to have been removed. In the circumstances, there was no longer any reason for the Council not to reconsider its decision. It was of course unfortunate that the General Assembly should have settled the question of priorities so categorically in its resolution, but that did not prevent the Council from taking its own decision. His delegation would vote in favour of any proposal for a session of the Commission on Human Rights being held in 1964.

34. Mr. TRIVEDI (India) understood why some delegations were anxious not to alter the 1964 schedule of conferences, but he still felt that the decision taken at the thirty-sixth session should be reconsidered. The members of the Council were agreed in recognizing that it was most important for the Commission on Human Rights to meet. Some delegations had argued that the Council should not be placed in the position of having to alter its decision with regard to the other functional commissions. That argument was based on principle, and the Indian delegation recognized its weight. It believed none the less that the argument went beyond the framework of the discussion. The Council had before it a request from the General Assembly which had been adopted by a large majority, and its first duty was to examine it.

35. The reasons for the Council's earlier decision seemed to have become inoperative. The Secretary of the Council had stated that the problems of premises and personnel could be solved. At the same time, as the USSR representative had observed, the expenses involved were not very high. Those material considerations seemed to be moving the Council to reconsider its previous decision. It was legitimate to point out that the text of Assembly resolution 1922 (XVIII), and particularly operative paragraphs 2 and 3, had a number of defects. But the Council had to decide on a specific proposal concerning the 1964 session of the Commission on Human Rights. He urged the other members of the Council to reconsider the decision they had taken at the thirty-sixth session.

36. Mrs. CATTÁROSSI (Uruguay) recalled that her delegation had voted for the text adopted by the Third

Committee concerning the 1964 session of the Commission on Human Rights. Since the technical difficulties referred to during the thirty-sixth session seemed to have been largely removed, and since it was urgent for the Commission on Human Rights to prepare a draft international convention on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination, her delegation was in favour of the Council's reconsidering its decision.

37. Mr. MALINOWSKI (Secretary of the Council), replying to the representative of Argentina, explained that, during the consideration of the question in the Third Committee, the Secretary-General, after enumerating the difficulties involved, had expressed the view that it was possible to organize a session in 1964. The Commission on Human Rights could meet from 17 February to 13 March without prejudice to the work of the other organs.

38. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the proposal concerning the organization of a session of the Commission on Human Rights from 17 February to 13 March 1964.

The proposal was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

39. Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America) said that the United States delegation, for its part, had been prepared to abide by the decision adopted by the Council in July. However, since the Secretary-General himself had stated that it was possible to organize a session in 1964, and in view of the opinion of the majority, his delegation had not wished to vote against the proposal.

40. Mr. SOLODOVNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled the terms of paragraph 2 of resolution 1922 (XVIII) whereby the General Assembly urged the Council to reconsider its decision so that the Commission on Human Rights might continue to meet annually. It was his view that the Council had not decided to do away with annual sessions. If it had, however, then the Council should take a vote on the matter.

41. Sir Ronald WALKER (Australia) recalled the position adopted by Australia in the General Assembly. His delegation had not been in favour of the proposal, but it had preferred to abstain in deference to the position of the majority. However, it would have preferred the proposal to have been somewhat differently worded, and to have drawn attention to the exceptional nature of a decision taken in consideration of the General Assembly's vote.

42. Mr. WODAK (Austria) explained why his delegation had opposed the draft resolution in the General Assembly, had abstained in the vote in the Third Committee and had now voted in favour of the resolution. At the thirty-sixth session, the Secretary-General had first suggested that only one of the functional commissions should meet in 1964; then, owing to the difficulty of selecting the commission, it had been decided that none should meet. Since then, the situation had changed. While the Council had of course taken no part in the General Assembly's decision, its own decision had to take into account the very large majority in favour of the resolution in the Assembly. However, it was only for the holding of a session of the Commission on Human Rights in 1964 that Austria had voted, and its vote should not be construed as a stand on the question of the frequency of sessions.

43. Mr. GARCIA DEL SOLAR (Argentina) said that his vote was the logical consequence of his delegation's position at the summer session of the Council and in the General Assembly.

44. The PRESIDENT, replying to the representative of Austria, said that the vote had in fact related only to the question of the holding of a session in 1964. However, when it considered item 35, the Council would have to deal with certain questions relating to item 28.

45. Mr. SOLODOVNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) wondered what action the Council should take on the request contained in paragraph 2 of resolution 1922 (XVIII), concerning annual sessions of the Commission; The Assembly's request could not be left unanswered.

46. The PRESIDENT replied that the Council would examine that question when discussing the programme of conferences and future activities, probably at the thirty-seventh session.

47. Mr. SOLODOVNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) agreed that the question of annual sessions would arise in the future and would require a decision by the Council. The Council had never formally decided to do away with annual sessions.

48. Mr. FRANZI (Italy) considered that General Assembly resolution 1922 (XVIII) did not imply a decision about the frequency of future sessions of the Commission; that was a question which the Council could debate at the following session.

AGENDA ITEM 34

Review of the composition of the United Nations/FAO Inter-Governmental Committee on the World Food Programme (E/L.1040)

49. The PRESIDENT recalled that, under the terms of General Assembly resolution 1714 (XVI), the Council was to have reviewed in 1962 the composition of the United Nations/FAO Inter-Governmental Committee on the World Food Programme. However, it had proved necessary to defer the review until the current session. At its thirty-ninth session, in October 1962, the Council of FAO had adopted a resolution under which it decided to retain the members whom it had previously appointed and who were listed in the Secretary-General's note (E/L.1040). The Council of FAO had since elected two other members, in conformity with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Conference of FAO.

50. The Council, for its part, under item 32 (Elections), would examine the question of the appointment of the two members it was to elect. For the time being, it would deal only with questions arising out of General Assembly resolution 1714 (XVI).

51. Mr. FRANZI (Italy) proposed renewing the appointment of the existing members, who in any case had served for only a short time.

52. Mr. UNWIN (United Kingdom) took a somewhat more moderate view, but felt that the Council should adopt a decision similar to that of the Council of FAO.

53. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that the question could be divided into three: first, confirmation of the ten members appointed by the Council; second, consideration of the question of the expansion of the Committee, which would henceforth include twelve representatives of States Members of the United Nations; and, third,

selection of the two countries to occupy the two new seats.

54. Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America) considered that the General Assembly had already decided on the second point. The third point would be dealt with in connexion with agenda item 32. The only question to be discussed therefore was that of the renewal of the appointment of the existing members.

55. Mr. HIREMATH (India) believed, like the representatives of Italy and the United Kingdom, that the Council should take a decision similar to that of the Council of FAO.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 40

Travel, transport and communications:

(b) Progress reports of the Committee of Experts for Further Work on the Transport of Dangerous Goods and the Group of Experts on Explosives (E/3841, E/L.1042)

56. Mr. UNWIN (United Kingdom) presented the draft resolution of his delegation (E/L.1042). The text was based on the work of the two groups of experts which had examined the question of the transport of explosives and other dangerous goods.

57. As the Council knew, the Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods had been set up to make recommendations for harmonizing existing codes for the transport of dangerous goods in respect of classifying, listing and labelling. The Committee of Experts for Further Work on the Transport of Dangerous Goods had been set up under Council resolution 724 C (XXVIII) to keep up to date the work of the former Committee of Experts and to begin work on the harmonization of the packaging of such goods.

58. The new Committee had succeeded in bringing the list of dangerous goods up to date. After studying the question of packing, it had come to the conclusion that the right course would be to prepare performance tests for such packings which might be adopted throughout the world. Since that work might overlap to some extent with work already being done by the International Air Transport Association (IATA), the performance tests of IATA had been incorporated in the regulations of the Committee of Experts, supplemented by standards appropriate to the various kinds of packing. The regulations also included more detailed packing notices applied to groups of dangerous goods. The report of the Committee of Experts (E/3841, annex 1) contained a number of realistic proposals on procedure for determining how far the IATA approach could be adapted to other modes of transport.

59. The Committee of Experts had taken the view that explosives were too special a problem to be dealt with by the main committee, and had suggested a separate group of experts to deal specifically with explosives. The Group of Experts on Explosives had held two sessions and had succeeded in preparing a list of explosives classified according to the nature of the explosive hazard. The main difficulty in dealing with explosives on a world-wide basis was that each country used its own trade names. Thus the nomenclature proposed by the Group had considerable value as a basis for any international agreement on explosives. The Group had appointed two rapporteurs to prepare draft proposals on packing explosive substances and explosive objects respectively.

60. In the past, the practical impact of the proposals of the United Nations experts on the bodies which controlled the main codes governing explosives had been limited. Nevertheless, some progress had been made. The United Kingdom had undertaken to change its codes in harmony with those proposals as soon as there was any general move in that direction. The Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization was preparing an international code for the carriage of dangerous goods by sea based on the recommendations of the United Nations experts. Again, the recommendations of IAEA on the carriage of radioactive substances were within the framework of the United Nations recommendations, and good progress had been made in introducing IATA's recommendations in the leading codes of the world.

61. The United Kingdom strongly supported the efforts to harmonize the codes, and the aim of the draft resolution was to enable the work that had been undertaken to continue. Moreover, that work could be useful to countries which did not possess the necessary experts or experience to prepare a code of their own. In addition, the draft resolution proposed to shorten the title given to the Committee to distinguish it from its forerunner; it now became "Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods".

62. Since the recommendations of the Committee of Experts should be made readily available if their impact was not to be lost, the draft resolution requested

the Secretary-General to circulate the experts' recommendations in a suitably revised and abridged version, deleting the explanatory background, which was no longer relevant. Six years previously, the Secretary-General had addressed a circular to Governments and international bodies about the Committee's recommendations. The publication of a new and complete edition of the recommendations might be an appropriate occasion for pressing again for their adoption.

63. Finally, the draft resolution requested the Secretary-General to convene future meetings of the Committee of Experts and its subsidiary bodies. The Committee itself had recommended in its report that each of the two subsidiary expert groups should have one meeting, lasting one week, in the latter part of 1964, followed by a meeting of the Committee of Experts itself for two weeks in the spring of 1965. The United Kingdom delegation considered those suggestions amply justified. However, it was aware of the heavy tasks confronting the Secretariat in 1964, and preferred to avoid any commitment in respect of future meetings.

64. Sir Ronald WALKER (Australia) asked that delegations should be given some time to study the draft and that the vote should be postponed until the following meeting.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6.5 p.m.