



CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Point of order raised by the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics .....	19
Narcotic drugs: (a) International limitation of opium production (Council resolution 395 (XIII) (E/2186 and Corr.1, and Add.1 to 3, E/L.320) .....	19
Narcotic drugs ( <i>continued</i> ): (c) Report of the Permanent Central Opium Board (E/OB/7 and Addendum, E/L.319) .....	22
Narcotic drugs ( <i>continued</i> ): (d) Approval of the appointment of the Secretary of the Permanent Central Opium Board (article 20 of the 1925 Convention, as amended) (E/2225) .....	24
Narcotic drugs ( <i>continued</i> ): (e) Invitation to Libya to become a party to the Protocol of 19 November 1948 bringing under international control drugs outside the scope of the Convention of 13 July 1931 for Limiting the Manufacture and Regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs, as amended by the Protocol of 11 December 1946 (E/2188) .....	24
Narcotic drugs ( <i>continued</i> ): (f) Communication to governments of findings of the World Health Organization under article 8 of the 1925 Convention, as amended by the 1946 Protocol (E/2198) .....	24

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

*Present:* The representatives of the following countries:

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

Observers from the following countries:

China, India, Turkey, Yugoslavia.

**Point of order raised by the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics**

1. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking on a point of order, said he wished to make a few remarks on the distribution of documents relating to the Council's work. In view of the length of the Council's agenda, documents should be ready in good time so that representatives could study them and prepare themselves for the discussion of the questions to be examined. During the thirteenth session of the Council at Geneva each delegation had been presented every evening before 8 p.m. with the complete agenda for the following day and a list of all the working documents on the questions to be discussed. In addition, at the beginning of every meeting, when they took their places at the Council table, representatives had found all the necessary documents waiting for them.

2. He was surprised to note that that practice could not be followed at Headquarters, where working facilities were much better because the full staff and services were available. He asked the President and the Secretariat to assist delegations by making sure that they were provided at least with the necessary basic documents. That was an essential condition for the proper functioning of the Council.

3. The PRESIDENT replied that he fully appreciated the difficulties of delegations. He would go into the matter with the Secretariat and endeavour to comply with the USSR representative's request. Nevertheless, he drew attention to the rules established for the current session, remarking that if representatives would follow them they would greatly facilitate the Secretariat's work.

**Narcotic drugs: (a) International limitation of opium production (Council resolution 395 (XIII) (E/2186 and Corr.1, and Add.1 to 3, E/L.320)**

[Agenda item 19]

4. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to discuss item 19 (a), concerning the international limitation of opium production.

5. Mr. EPINAT (France) mentioned the Council's decision to draft a legal instrument (Council resolution 395 (XIII)) through which the provisions for strengthening the control of narcotic drugs throughout the world could be effectively applied. The Commission on Narcotic Drugs had drawn up, at its sixth session, a draft protocol for the limitation of opium production.<sup>1</sup> That protocol should be submitted to a conference for the appropriate international approval.

6. On behalf of the Belgian, Egyptian, United States and French delegations, he presented to the Council a joint draft resolution (E/L.320) dealing with the convocation of the proposed conference, which might meet in 1953.

7. The advances of science had obliged the Council and its Commission on Narcotic Drugs to do everything in their power to make the control of narcotic drugs more effective. The proposed instrument had, no doubt, certain gaps, but it would nevertheless mark real progress, for the distant goal towards which all efforts were directed was still inaccessible.

8. Mr. MAHMOUD (Egypt) said that the question before the Council had been discussed at length in the Council and in the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, and that the Council had decided at its thirteenth session to draft a protocol on the limitation of opium production.

9. A good many governments, including those of some opium-producing countries, had already answered the communication which the Secretary-General had addressed to them in conformity with the Council's decision. Most of the answers to that communication (E/2186 and Corr.1 and Add.1 to 3) had been favourable, none had been negative. Furthermore, the producing countries had met together<sup>2</sup> and announced that they were prepared in principle to limit the production of opium to medical and scientific needs.

10. The Egyptian Government was one of those which had unreservedly supported the idea of the protocol (E/2186, chap. II, section A, para. 11). As a victim of illicit traffic, Egypt welcomed any steps designed to limit to the minimum the production of opium and of narcotic drugs in general.

11. More than 90 per cent of the world production of opium found its way into illicit traffic. There was thus obviously urgent need to find a rapid solution to the ever-increasing over-production of opium and to limit production of the drug to scientific and medical needs. His delegation had therefore joined with those of Belgium, France and the United States to submit the joint draft resolution which the French representative had just introduced.

12. Mrs. CISELET (Belgium) said that though in Belgium the use of narcotic drugs had not reached alarming proportions, the evil did exist and her Government was taking energetic measures against it within the country.

13. However, in order to be effective the campaign had also to be conducted on the international level. Belgium

had therefore willingly become a party to all the conventions concluded since 1925 for the limitation of the manufacture of narcotic drugs and the control of illicit traffic. However, if only for the sake of human brotherhood, something further had to be done at the international level to eliminate what had become a real scourge in certain parts of the world.

14. During the Council's thirteenth session the Belgian representative had supported the draft interim agreement for the creation of an international opium monopoly, and on her delegation's proposal, the Council had decided to ask the Secretary-General to seek the views of the States Members of the United Nations and of those non-member States which were parties to the international conventions (Council resolutions 395 B and C (XIII)).

15. That inquiry had revealed a wide divergence of views which made it questionable whether the draft could be adopted by all the parties concerned. In the circumstances her Government thought it would be advisable to put aside the preliminary draft of the interim agreement for the time being, and to take it up again only if the protocol on the limitation of the production of opium were rejected, or adopted and found inadequate.

16. The chief provisions of the proposed protocol on the limitation of the production of opium were quite interesting and her delegation supported them. The observations collected by the Secretary-General showed, moreover, a definite majority in favour of the draft. Her delegation, together with those of Egypt, France and the United States of America, was therefore submitting the draft resolution (E/L.320) proposing that an international conference should be convened to adopt a protocol relating to the limitation of the production of opium.

17. There could not as yet be any certainty that the adoption of such a protocol would meet the situation adequately; but in the circumstances her Government saw no other practical method of intensifying the campaign against drug addiction by means of the limitation of production.

18. Mr. ARDALAN (Iran) said that his Government, conscious of the baneful effects of opium and other narcotic drugs on the health of people everywhere in the world, was extremely glad to welcome the measures proposed on the international level to regulate and limit the manufacture, distribution and use of such drugs. He referred to the steps taken by his Government and outlined in its annual report and, without going into details, assured the members of the Council that the special organs set up by his Government were carrying out very strict supervision and control.

19. As one of the very severe steps which it had taken, the Iranian Government had at one time even gone so far as to prohibit poppy cultivation. However, after a meeting in New York at which Iran had been recognised as one of the opium-producing countries, the prohibition had been replaced by a decree limiting poppy cultivation. His Government hoped thereby to succeed in limiting the cultivation of the poppy to medical and scientific needs.

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Thirteenth Session, Supplement No. 13*, annex F.

<sup>2</sup> Conference held at Ankara, November-December 1949.

20. Although Iran was not a party to the 1936 Convention, it nevertheless applied the provisions of that convention. He outlined the way in which the relevant measures were carried out, and emphasized that an objective programme was needed to make them fully effective. In addition, the Iranian peasants, the vast bulk of the population, who earned their living by cultivating the poppy, should be effectively helped by such means as the introduction of machinery so that they might find some other way of livelihood. Unfortunately, the efforts put forth so far had been of no avail.

21. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) referred to the two documents before the Council: (a) the draft interim agreement to limit the production of opium to medical and scientific needs (E/CN.7/221); and (b) the proposed protocol relating to the limitation of the production of opium (E/1998, annex F). He pointed out that the first solution was virtually equivalent to a monopoly of opium. During the fifth and sixth session of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs the United States representative had been instructed to support that idea, since it represented an effective means of control. The discussion in the Commission, however, had shown that that agreement would be difficult to conclude. Many divergent views had been expressed, and no accord could be reached on several important issues, particularly with regard to the prices on which the international monopoly should base its transactions, the possibility of ensuring effective international control, and competition from alkaloids.

22. The United States delegation had done its best to find a basis for agreement, but had finally concluded, during the sixth session, that an agreement could not be reached within a reasonable period. Since a recrudescence of illicit traffic in several countries called for early action, the United States delegation had then supported the preparation of a second document, the proposed protocol relating to the limitation of the production of opium. The protocol applied to opium the general principles of the 1931 Convention.

23. He did not consider it advisable to reopen the debate on the question of a monopoly, since the majority of countries did not favour it for the time being.

24. The United States Government would therefore lend its support to the proposed protocol and hoped that it could be completed soon. The text was no doubt imperfect, but seemed to be acceptable as a whole. It constituted an appreciable step towards fulfilment of an enormous task. Mankind unfortunately had not yet found a method of completely suppressing the illicit traffic in opium.

25. He did not think that the Council should proceed to a detailed examination of the proposed protocol, which should be studied by a conference specially convened for the purpose as soon as possible and preferably before the middle of 1953. It would be advisable for the Secretary-General to request the governments of various countries to give supplementary opinions which the conference might take into consideration.

26. Mr. MEADE (United Kingdom) stated that his Government, which had always supported the principle of establishing a monopoly, had concluded that it would

be useless just then to continue the work undertaken for that purpose.

27. The protracted discussions that had taken place both in the Joint Committee of the Principal Opium-Producing Countries and of the Principal Drug-Manufacturing Countries and in the Commission on Narcotic Drugs had ended in a deadlock on several points, and it was apparent that there could be no immediate hope of that deadlock being resolved.

28. Of the many countries that had commented on the draft interim agreement to limit the production of opium to medical and scientific needs, only one, China, had submitted a reasoned statement in support of the establishment of a monopoly (E/2186, chap. II, section B, para. 35). That statement, excellent though it was, emphasized on purely theoretical grounds the superiority of the monopoly over the signature of the protocol relating to the limitation of the production of opium, but took no account of the practical difficulties of carrying out the first proposal.

29. On voting in the Social Committee at the thirteenth session of the Committee Council for the draft resolution on the general principles of the proposed protocol, the French representative had explained<sup>8</sup> that he had done so in a spirit of conciliation and courtesy. In the same spirit and with some reservations, the Government of the United Kingdom would support the proposed protocol, in spite of its manifest shortcomings.

30. The draft prepared by the Secretariat was necessarily rough and incomplete. He did not wish in any way to criticize its authors, since he was fully aware of the difficult circumstances in which they had worked; but the fact remained that it would have to be revised fundamentally before it could be submitted to an international conference.

31. The United Kingdom delegation was afraid that the Council, whose agenda was extremely heavy, would not be able to undertake that task. Nor did it think that the proposed protocol could be referred to the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, which was already drafting a single convention on narcotic drugs. Moreover, most governments had merely expressed their approval in general terms and had not submitted any detailed comments.

32. In those circumstances the United Kingdom delegation agreed with the United States representative that the wisest course would be to ask the Secretary-General to transmit the text of the proposed protocol to the governments and to request them to communicate their detailed comments on it, especially on those articles for which there were alternative texts.

33. It would also be desirable to ask governments to give their views immediately on the question of convening an international conference. The Council could then, in the light of the replies received, consider the next step to be taken.

34. Mr. HSIA (China) stated that his Government had already had several opportunities of expressing its views on the relative advantages of the two proposed methods of limiting the production of opium to medical

<sup>8</sup> See document E/AC.7/SR.191.

and scientific needs. The Chinese Government had always maintained that that purpose could be achieved only by an international agreement. Nevertheless, it was fully aware of the difficulties of concluding such an agreement, if only for the reasons that had just been given by the United States representative. Moreover, most representatives had not spoken in favour of that method. He therefore felt obliged to support the second solution, which consisted of preparing a protocol.

35. Such a solution was admittedly far from satisfactory; it was most unlikely to lead to effective limitation of the production of opium, since it contained no operative provision, however simple, which could give effect to such limitation. Because of that shortcoming the Chinese delegation had abstained from voting on the proposed protocol at the sixth session of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs.

36. Nevertheless, since it had decided to support the solution represented by the protocol, the Chinese delegation was inclined to share the views of the United States and United Kingdom representatives and to consider that no useful purpose would be served by re-opening the general debate at the current stage or by referring the question to the Commission on Narcotic Drugs. The only practical procedure would be to take the proposed protocol prepared by the Secretariat as a basis for future work and to invite governments to submit new comments on it; in that event the Council would not take any decision on the joint draft resolution submitted by Belgium, Egypt, France and the United States of America (E/L.320) until it was informed of the position taken thereon by Member States.

37. He hoped that in the meantime members of the Council would have an opportunity to consider the possibility of supplementing the provisions of the proposed protocol and to submit concrete proposals for the inclusion of the operative provision to which he had referred.

38. Mr. ISHAQ (Pakistan) stated that his delegation would vote for the joint draft resolution presented by the delegations of Belgium, Egypt, France and the United States of America (E/L.320). It considered that the proposed protocol, the general principles of which were acceptable, provided the best compromise solution in the circumstances, since the Commission on Narcotic Drugs had concluded that it would be impossible for the time being to obtain the approval of governments for the proposed interim agreement.<sup>4</sup>

39. He wished to make some general remarks. In the first place, in Pakistan opium was used mainly for non-medical purposes. The Government had decided gradually to restrict consumption to medical and scientific needs only, but it would find that difficult to do immediately. In those circumstances the Pakistan delegation considered that it would be advisable provisionally to extend the interpretation of the term "medical needs" to include "quasi-medical" needs. Such a decision would make it possible to give drug addicts the same treatment as medical patients and thus to spare them the

sufferings and slow death which would be the inevitable result of the radical suppression of the drug to which they had become addicted.

40. For the same reason the Pakistani delegation also wished to propose a revision of the provision in the proposed protocol concerning the disposal of opium seized in the illicit traffic, in such a way that its use for "quasi-medical" purposes might be authorized.

41. He pointed out to the Council that Pakistan was not at that time an opium-producing country. It still obtained the opium it required from abroad, although experiments had been conducted, in particular during the last three years, with a view to freeing the country from that dependence. The Pakistani delegation therefore wished to stress the importance of avoiding any measure which might prevent countries which did not produce but could produce opium from meeting their own requirements. Many other countries, Australia in particular (E/2186, chap. II, section B, para. 30a), had expressed the same views in their replies to the Secretary-General. Pakistan had instituted a national monopoly which controlled the production, distribution and consumption of opium; the adoption of his proposal therefore gave rise to no danger of encouraging the illicit traffic in his country.

42. In conclusion, he agreed with the United Kingdom representative that the text of the proposed protocol should be circulated to Member States, whose opinion should also be requested on the convening of the proposed international conference.

43. Mr. MAHMOUD (Egypt) explained that he had not commented on the substance of the proposed protocol in his previous statement because he had considered that the question would thenceforward fall within the competence of the international conference. Nevertheless, he wished to associate himself with the remark made by the Pakistani representative, whose proposal would, if adopted, result in the allocation of part of the opium seized in the illicit traffic to medical and scientific purposes.

44. The PRESIDENT called for action on the joint draft resolution presented by the delegations of Belgium, Egypt, France and the United States of America (E/L.320).

45. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked for a postponement of the vote, since he had not had enough time to study the document which had just been distributed.

46. Mr. MEADE (United Kingdom) also wished the vote on the joint draft resolution to be postponed, because he intended to submit an amendment to it.

*It was decided to postpone the vote on the joint draft resolution (E/L.320) until a later meeting.*

**Narcotic drugs (continued): (c) Report of the Permanent Central Opium Board (E/OB/7 and Addendum, E/L.319)**

[Agenda item 19 (c)]

47. The PRESIDENT proposed that the Council should proceed to consider the report of the Permanent Central Opium Board.

<sup>4</sup> See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Thirteenth Session, Supplement No. 13*, para. 103.

*At the invitation of the President, the Chairman of the Permanent Central Opium Board took a place at the Council table.*

48. In accordance with rule 74 of the rules of procedure, the PRESIDENT proposed that the representative of India should be invited to take a place at the Council table.

*It was so decided.*

*Mr. Rajan (India) took a place at the Council table.*

49. Mr. ARDALAN (Iran) recalled that he had already tried during debates in the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, by quoting figures provided by his Government, to eliminate the misunderstandings which had given rise to the statements in the report of the Permanent Central Opium Board (E/OB/7, chap. III, para. 6 (b)). The Board had been impressed by a difference of 333,347 kilogrammes between its own estimate (585,668 kilogrammes) of the remainder of the production and exports declared by the Government of Iran and the stock (256,321 kilogrammes) declared by the Government of Iran. The Board's figures for Iranian exports in 1950 were 43,664 kilogrammes, whereas, according to the quarterly reports transmitted to the Board, Iranian exports amounted to 240,270 kilogrammes. If that correction were effected, if the adjustments were made which had to be made whenever calculations were based on prepared opium and not on raw opium, and if the loss which took place during the various stages of processing raw opium were taken into account, the difference between Iran's stock and its exports for 1950 would be decreased to 33,897 kilogrammes, or only 5 per cent of the total stock for that year. That was a normal and perfectly admissible loss due to the slow but constant evaporation of latex.

50. He hoped that additional explanations which would be given subsequently would suffice to dispel the Board's apprehensions and that the Board would correct its report accordingly.

51. Mr. MAY (Chairman of the Permanent Central Opium Board) stated that an unpleasant aspect of the Permanent Central Board's work was a critical scrutiny of the statistics provided by governments. The figures in the report had been based on information previously furnished by the Government of Iran. Before drafting its report the Board had given the Iranian Government an opportunity of rectifying its statements. Thus the Iranian Government had reported that 100 tons of opium had been lost during the processing of raw opium into prepared opium and 30 tons through evaporation. The Board had invited the Government to send it a representative. In accordance with the regular procedure, the Board would take note of the Government's explanations in its next report.

52. Mr. RAJAN (India) said he was grateful for the opportunity of replying to the adverse statement about his Government contained in the Permanent Central Opium Board's report (E/OB/7, chap. III, para. 1). He first outlined the history of the question.

53. After considering the report, his Government had sent a written protest to the Chairman of the Board, who had informed the Government that its remarks would be placed before the Board at its session in June

1952. In the meantime the Indian representative at the seventh session of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs had explained<sup>6</sup> why there had been delays in submitting statistics on the production, export and stocks of raw opium in the years preceding 1950.

54. The cause of those delays had been that before 15 August 1947, the date on which India had attained its independence, there had been in that country hundreds of small states which had largely controlled their own affairs and whose governments had exercised independent jurisdiction over the cultivation and production of opium in their own territories. The Government of India had thus had no direct control over those states and had not been able to ensure the submission by their governments of timely and accurate statistics. In its anxiety to submit statistics in good time, it had sent provisional returns, which had been followed by revised figures. That had happened long before 1950, and his Government had therefore felt that the Board might have given it the opportunity to justify itself before publishing those somewhat derogatory comments.

55. The situation had changed since then. With the inauguration of the Indian Constitution the Government of India was in a position to assume full control over all the opium-producing areas of the country, except Jammu and Kashmir. It had passed the necessary legislation in March 1950 and had established, on 1 April of the same year, the administrative machinery necessary for the production of timely and accurate statistics. The statistics for 1951 had thus already been submitted to the Permanent Central Opium Board. His Government hoped that the Board would, at the session in June 1952, give careful consideration to its remarks and be able to remove the erroneous impression given by the 1950 report by issuing a supplementary note to the report and a Press release, as requested by the Indian Government.

56. Mr. MAY (Chairman of the Permanent Central Opium Board) expressed regret that the Government of India should have felt so strongly about the comments contained in the Board's report. The Board's only concern was to collect accurate statistics; it was perfectly true that before 1950 India had been unable to furnish such statistics, but the corrections had come in such rapid succession that the Board had been unable to rely on the accuracy of any of the data. The Board would be only too happy to give the Indian Government's explanations all the publicity desired. He appreciated the praiseworthy efforts made by the Indian Government to furnish all the necessary data since the publication of the Board's report.

57. Mr. MEADE (United Kingdom) said that as far as Kenya was concerned (E/OB/7, chap. III, para. 5) there had been no deliberate violation of article 14, paragraph 2, of the 1931 Convention. As a result of unforeseen delays in transit in 1949 the 1950 estimates had been exceeded. Steps had been taken to prevent a repetition of the occurrence.

58. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) complimented the Board on the way in which it had discharged its duties. He stressed the increasing need for the various governments to collaborate more closely

<sup>6</sup> See document E/CN.7/SR.157.

in the work of the Board. The Board had pointed out in its report (E/OB/7, chap. III, para. 1) that it was especially towards the improving and strengthening of national controls that governments should in the first place direct their efforts to combat the illicit traffic which originated in the producing countries and to avoid the dangers inherent in the appearance of numerous new narcotic drugs.

59. For that purpose the delegations of Belgium, France and the United States of America had prepared a joint draft resolution (E/L.319), which he hoped would meet with the Council's approval.

60. Mrs. CISELET (Belgium) explained the reasons why her delegation endorsed the joint draft resolution. There was good reason, she said, to believe that illicit traffic in narcotics drugs originated in the producing countries. In the joint draft resolution those countries were urged to report to the Permanent Central Opium Board their full production, stocks and exports of opium and coca leaves in 1950. That information would, without any doubt, facilitate the Board's work.

61. Mr. MAHMOUD (Egypt) said that his Government's Anti-Narcotics Administration had noted a fresh outbreak of traffic in narcotics drugs in the Middle East. He would therefore gladly support the joint draft resolution before the Council.

62. Mr. MEADE (United Kingdom) associated himself with the Belgian and Egyptian representatives in hoping that the Council would adopt the joint draft resolution, which, if properly implemented, might achieve a large part of what the draft protocol on the limitation of opium was intended to secure.

63. The PRESIDENT proposed that a preamble should be added to the joint draft resolution stating that the Council had taken formal note of the said report.

*It was so decided.*

64. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) remarked that the only document which the delegations had had time to study was the report itself.

65. As delegations had not had time to consider the joint draft resolution at leisure, its examination should be deferred.

*It was decided to postpone the vote on the report of the Permanent Central Opium Board (E/OB/7 and Addendum).*

66. The PRESIDENT thanked the Chairman of the Permanent Central Opium Board.

**Narcotic drugs (continued): (d) Approval of the appointment of the Secretary of the Permanent Central Opium Board (article 20 of the 1925 Convention, as amended) (E/2225)**

[Agenda item 19 (d)]

67. The PRESIDENT presented to the Council the Secretary-General's memorandum (E/2225) on the appointment of Mr. Atzenwiler as Secretary of the Permanent Central Opium Board.

*Mr. Atzenwiler's appointment was unanimously approved.*

**Narcotic drugs (continued): (e) Invitation to Libya to become a party to the Protocol of 19 November 1948 bringing under international control drugs outside the scope of the Convention of 13 July 1931 for Limiting the Manufacture and Regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs, as amended by the Protocol of 11 December 1946 (E/2188)**

[Agenda item 19 (e)]

68. Mr. MAHMOUD (Egypt) said that since Libya had attained its independence in December 1951, many international organizations had opened their doors to it, and it had been invited to accede to a number of international treaties. His delegation was therefore happy to support the invitation to Libya to become a party to the Protocol on narcotic drugs of 19 November 1948, as it was convinced that that instrument would help Libya, a young country, to carry out the social reforms which it hoped to introduce.

69. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the draft resolution (E/2188) entitled "Invitation to Libya to become a party to the Protocol of 19 November 1948, relating to narcotic drugs".

*The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.*

**Narcotic drugs (continued): (f) Communication to governments of findings of the World Health Organization under article 8 of the 1925 Convention, as amended by the 1946 Protocol (E/2198)**

[Agenda item 19 (f)]

70. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether discussion of document E/2198 could be postponed, as it was not yet available in Russian and his delegation would therefore be unable to take part in the debate at the current meeting.

71. The PRESIDENT proposed the postponement of the consideration of item 19 (f) of the agenda.

*It was so decided.*

72. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) wished to know why the Secretariat had been unable to furnish a Russian translation of the document, which had appeared in English on 8 April 1952.

73. Mr. YATES (Secretary of the Council) replied that, while Russian, Spanish and Chinese were official languages, they were not working languages of the Council. The only working languages were English and French. He then read rules 38 and 39 of the Council's rules of procedure relating to the translation of documents.

74. Under those two rules resolutions, recommendations and other official decisions of the Council were drafted in the official languages; the rules did not however apply to draft resolutions or documents under discussion. In practice such documents were translated only at the request of delegations and within the limits of the available facilities. Russian, Spanish and Chinese-speaking representatives were neither officially nor unofficially entitled to ask for the postponement of a dis-

cussion on any item because of the absence of translations of such documents in those official languages. Occasionally, in the case of certain documents not falling within the categories mentioned in rules 38 and 39 of the rules of procedure, a delay had been granted as a courtesy on the request of delegations. Chairmen faced with similar decisions, however, usually ruled that the discussion of items could not be delayed for that reason as of right. The Secretariat would make every effort to

satisfy the USSR delegation if it would make its wishes known.

75. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thanked the Secretary of the Council for his explanation, but stressed that his delegation could not take decisions on questions which it had been unable to study owing to the absence of a Russian text.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.