



ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Eighteenth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

829th Meeting

Thursday, 5 August 1954
at 2.30 p.m.

PALAIS DES NATIONS, GENEVA

CONTENTS

	Page
Organization and operation of the Council and its commissions and amendment of rule 82 of the rules of procedure of the Council (Council resolutions 414 (XIII), 442 (XIV), 443 (XIV), 445 I (XIV), 512 A (XVII) and 530 (XVII) and General Assembly resolution 735 (VIII)) (<i>resumed from the 798th meeting and concluded</i>): Reports of the Co-ordination Committee and the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations (E/2646, E/2649, E/L.643)	255
Non-governmental organizations (<i>resumed from the 798th meeting and concluded</i>): Report of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations on the resolution adopted by the Conference of Consultative Non-Governmental Organizations (E/2645, E/C.2/398)	259
Co-ordination of the work of the United Nations and the specialized agencies (<i>resumed from the 807th meeting and concluded</i>): (b) Review of the 1955 programmes (Council resolution 497 C (XVI)): Report of the Co-ordination Committee (E/2648, E/L.645)	259
Annual report of the Economic Commission for Europe (E/2556, E/L.644) (<i>resumed from the 828th meeting and concluded</i>)	260

President: Mr. Juan I. COOKE (Argentina)

Present:

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

Observers from the following Member States: Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Indonesia, Israel, Mexico, Poland.

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

Organization and operation of the Council and its commissions and amendment of rule 82 of the rules of procedure of the Council (Council resolutions 414 (XIII), 442 (XIV), 443 (XIV), 445 I (XIV), 512 A (XVII) and 530 (XVII) and General Assembly resolution 735 (VIII)) (*resumed from the 798th meeting and concluded*): Reports of the Co-ordination Committee and the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations (E/2646, E/2649, E/L.643)

[Agenda item 29]

1. Mr. ENGEN (Norway), speaking as Chairman of the Co-ordination Committee, introduced the Committee's report (E/2649), and said that it was a factual account

of the Committee's decisions and resolutions. Because of the complex nature of the technical questions at issue, no attempt had been made to summarize the discussions leading up to the decisions. As explained in the report, the Committee had decided to divide discussion of the questions before it into three parts. The several draft resolutions submitted to the Council were contained in Annexes I, II and III.

ANNEX I: WORK OF THE SECRETARIAT IN THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL FIELDS

2. Mr. KUMYKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring to the draft resolution in Annex I on the work of the Secretariat in the economic and social fields, said that during the general discussion on that subject in the Council his delegation had stated, at the 797th meeting, its detailed views on the problems which would arise in the near future. It was clear from the Secretary-General's statement made at the 796th meeting that his views on those fundamental problems coincided with those of the Soviet Union delegation. The draft resolution, therefore, which endorsed the Secretary-General's approach, was acceptable to his delegation on the understanding that, in implementing it, the Secretary-General would bear in mind not only his written report (E/2598) to the Council, but also the oral statement to which he had referred, and that he would, in addition, take due account of the views expressed by members of the Council during the discussion.

3. Mr. MEADE (United Kingdom), indicating that the United Kingdom Government regarded the Council's work at the present session on the reorganization of its methods of work as of the utmost importance, wished to make one or two brief observations. In the first place, although it had been found impossible to shorten the duration of the Council's sessions, his delegation earnestly hoped that the periods fixed would be regarded as absolute maxima and that, with the lightening and concentration of the agenda—which was a desideratum to be commended to all—the sessions might in practice turn out to be considerably shorter. He hoped that the decisions to concentrate the work of the main summer session on two subjects—the world economic situation and co-ordination at a high political level—and that of the spring session on important subjects of a more specific nature discussed at a high technical level would be borne in mind when in the future the Council adopted resolutions providing for further discussion of items at subsequent sessions.

4. Obviously, there would have to be a period of transition, and at that very session the Council had adopted

resolutions placing certain specific items on the agenda for the 1955 summer session. That, doubtless, had been unavoidable. He would, however, suggest that decisions on the inclusion of items in the agenda be reviewed in future at the resumed session each December with a view to possible combination.

5. With regard to the interpretation of the draft resolution in Annex II—Organization and operation of the Council and its functional commissions—he would recall that during the discussions in the Co-ordination Committee there had been frequent agreement on the interpretation of certain aspects of the draft resolution, yet that agreement naturally did not appear either in the draft resolution itself or in the report. Similarly, agreement had been reached on other important aspects of reorganization, and he would wish to make the point for the record that the Secretary-General, in tendering future advice to the Council on the interpretation of the draft resolution, should bear in mind the discussions in the Council at the current session.

6. Mr. FENAUX (Belgium) said that his delegation had been much interested in the remarks of the Soviet Union and United Kingdom representatives about the need for the Secretary-General to take account of the comments made during the discussion on that item of the agenda. For the Belgian delegation that need was obvious and indisputable.

7. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the draft resolution in Annex 1 to the report of the Co-ordination Committee (E/2649) on the work of the Secretariat in the economic and social fields.

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.

ANNEX II: ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION OF THE COUNCIL AND ITS FUNCTIONAL COMMISSIONS

Draft resolution A.I

8. Mr. KUMYKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, as had been previously pointed out, operative paragraph 2 (b) of draft resolution A.I seemed designed to restrict the liberty of action of the functional commissions. His delegation had already stated that it saw no need to modify the relations between the Council and those bodies, and he would accordingly request that a separate vote be taken on that sub-paragraph, when he would vote against it. He would likewise ask for separate votes on paragraphs 1 and 4 of the operative part; in accordance with the attitude adopted by his delegation in the Co-ordination Committee, he would abstain from voting on those paragraphs. He had no objections to the remainder of the draft resolution.

9. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that his delegation, which had sponsored the draft resolution (E/AC.4/L.93) in the Co-ordination Committee, had no intention of restricting the existing liberty of action of the Council's commissions. The proposal simply confirmed, and was a natural consequence of, what was in fact the customary practice. His delegation would therefore vote for paragraph 2 (b) of the draft resolution.

10. The PRESIDENT put to the vote separately paragraph 1, paragraph 2 (b), and paragraph 4 of draft resolution A.I contained in Annex II to the report of the Co-ordination Committee (E/2649).

Paragraph 1 was adopted by 16 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Paragraph 2 (b) was adopted by 13 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions.

Paragraph 4 was adopted by 16 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

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

11. Mr. STANOVNIK (Yugoslavia), explaining his vote, said he had abstained for the same reasons as had impelled him to abstain from the vote on the draft resolution in the Co-ordination Committee.

Draft resolution A.II

12. Mr. KUMYKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that the second part of paragraph 2 of Part I, and paragraph 4 of Part II, of the operative part of draft resolution A.II be deleted, and accordingly asked that separate votes be taken on those paragraphs.

13. Further, a number of decisions were embodied in that draft resolution which arose from decisions taken at the Council's thirteenth session (resolution 414 (XIII)), some of which, apparently, in the Secretary-General's opinion, would remain in force. If those decisions were retained, it should be stated in a footnote that the provisions in question could not be considered so binding as decisions taken at the eighteenth session.

14. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the Soviet Union oral amendment that the second part of paragraph 2 of Part I of draft resolution A.II be deleted.

The amendment was rejected by 15 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

15. Mr. SEN (India) said that he had abstained from voting because his delegation had already expressed its doubts of the value of the provision in the Co-ordination Committee.

16. Mr. KUMYKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, in view of the vote on his first amendment, he would withdraw his second proposal.

The remainder of draft resolution A.II was adopted unanimously.

Draft resolution B.I: Functional commissions

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

Draft resolution B.II

17. Mr. RIBAS (Cuba) recalled that in the Co-ordination Committee his delegation had opposed the discontinuance of the Fiscal Commission. The majority of the Committee having decided otherwise, the Cuban delegation was prepared to abide by that decision.

18. However, it had submitted an amendment (E/L.643) to draft resolution B.II, paragraph 1, stressing the importance of the subject and recognizing that the Secretariat was now responsible for carrying out the

work falling to the United Nations in the fiscal field, and to paragraph 2, stating that the activity of the Fiscal Commission was no longer "necessary", for, in view of the importance of fiscal problems, it could not truthfully be said that the activity of the commission was "no longer useful".

19. Mr. AMANRICH (France), Mr. MEADE (United Kingdom) and Mr. EL-TANAMLI (Egypt) supported the Cuban amendment.

20. Mr. Anwar ALI (Pakistan) said that in the Co-ordination Committee his delegation had voted against the draft resolution in the conviction that the Fiscal Commission should carry on its useful task. Being still of the same opinion, he would again vote against it. He hoped, nevertheless, that, if the draft resolution were adopted, the Secretariat would continue, and intensify, its efforts in the fiscal field.

21. Mr. TUNCEL (Turkey) said that in principle he agreed with the representative of Pakistan, but he would vote for the Cuban amendment since it improved the Co-ordination Committee's draft resolution B.II.

22. Mr. NOVAK (Czechoslovakia) regretted that he could not support the Cuban amendment in its entirety. Paragraph 2 was acceptable, but he would abstain from voting on paragraph 1 as he considered the text of the Co-ordination Committee's draft resolution B.II more satisfactory in that respect.

23. Mr. MORALES (Argentina) said that his delegation had voted in the Co-ordination Committee for the discontinuance of the Fiscal Commission because the Secretariat was now carrying out the most important and most specific part of the United Nations' work in that sphere, with the result that the commission had lost its *raison d'être*.

24. The Argentine delegation would therefore vote for the Cuban amendment which accurately stated the facts.

25. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) would vote for the Cuban amendment for the reasons given by the Argentine representative.

26. Mr. AMANRICH (France) recalled that the French delegation too had voted against draft resolution B.II in the Co-ordination Committee. Should the Cuban amendment be adopted, however, as the French delegation hoped it would be, it would abstain from voting on the draft resolution as a whole.

27. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America), Mr. FENAUX (Belgium), Mr. STANOVNIK (Yugoslavia) and Mr. SEN (India) said they would take the same course as the French delegation.

28. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the Cuban amendment (E/L.643) to draft resolution B.II contained in Annex II to the report of the Co-ordination Committee (E/2649).

Paragraph 1 of the amendment was adopted by 15 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Paragraph 2 of the amendment was adopted by 16 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

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

Draft resolution B.II as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 13 votes to 1, with 4 abstention.

Draft resolution B.III

29. After an exchange of views between Mr. SEN (India), Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America), Mr. STANOVNIK (Yugoslavia), Mr. SOLLI (Norway), Mr. FENAUX (Belgium) and Mr. EL-TANAMLI (Egypt), the first-named speaker proposed that in the operative paragraph of draft resolution B.III the word "re-establish" be replaced by the word "revive".

The oral amendment was rejected by 9 votes to 1, with 6 abstentions.

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

Draft resolution B.III as a whole was adopted by 15 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

30. Replying to Mr. SEN (India), the PRESIDENT suggested that the necessary adjustments referred to in the footnote relating to section B.V of the report of the Co-ordination Committee (E/2649) be left to the Secretariat, which should also bring into line the French and Spanish texts.

It was so agreed.

Draft resolution C

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

Draft resolution D

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.

ANNEX III: COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL COMMODITY TRADE

The draft resolution was adopted by 12 votes to 3, with 3 abstentions.

31. Mr. MORALES (Argentina) said that, as the author of the resolution just adopted, he wished to explain his delegation's vote, but must first express the hope that the Secretary-General would bring the resolution to the notice of governments, and in particular draw attention to it at the elections to the commission to be held at the Council's resumed eighteenth session.

32. By voting for the resolution his delegation had expressed its desire to contribute to the realization of an aspiration which Argentina shared with a large number of countries faced with similar problems. It was imbued with no partisan spirit and had voted without reservation or prejudice in the firm conviction that the Council was blazing a new and promising trail of international co-operation.

33. The Argentine delegation thanked all who had supported its resolution, and those who, while holding widely divergent views, had nevertheless made constructive suggestions, which it had not hesitated to accept.

34. Its firm hope was that there would be no holding back on the part of any member from the joint endeavour which the Council was embarking upon in order to help

solve a problem that affected the well-being of large sections of the world's population.

35. Sir Alec RANDALL (United Kingdom), explaining his vote, recalled that in the Co-ordination Committee his delegation had submitted a draft resolution (E/AC.24/L.101) proposing that no action be taken to establish the Commission on International Commodity Trade until the Contracting Parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) had had an opportunity of considering action in the field of primary commodity problems. It had been made clear that the United Kingdom Government was positively in favour of inter-governmental action to mitigate violent fluctuations in primary commodity markets, and he had further supported the draft resolution (E/AC.24/L.97) which provided that a new international institution should be set up to deal with the problem. His delegation's sole disagreement with the Argentine delegation related to the nature of the institution and the auspices under which it should function. His delegation had subsequently withdrawn its draft resolution. However, as his delegation had stated in the Co-ordination Committee, the United Kingdom Government intended to raise the question again during the forthcoming review of GATT, and he had welcomed the view expressed by the Argentine representative and other members of the Co-ordination Committee that there was no incompatibility between discussions by the Contracting Parties on the one hand and the immediate establishment of the new commission on the other.

36. His delegation still had serious doubts about the effectiveness of the commission, and for that reason had been obliged to vote against the resolution just adopted. However, he agreed with the Argentine view that in practice the success of the new body would depend on the determination of governments to conduct its business in a practical manner unhindered by political considerations. His delegation believed that in the field of commodity policy progress could be achieved only by means of negotiation.

37. Addressing the President as leader of the Argentine delegation, he wished him to know that the willingness to negotiate shown by the Argentine delegation in the Co-ordination Committee had encouraged the United Kingdom Government to take a rather more hopeful view of the potentialities of the commission, and had provided a precedent for that body, in following which would be its best chance of achieving fruitful results.

38. The United Kingdom Government, if elected to the commission at the resumed session, would be prepared to co-operate fully in its work. Personally, he would be most happy if his apprehensions proved to be groundless.

39. The PRESIDENT, speaking as leader of the Argentine delegation, thanked the United Kingdom representative for his tribute.

40. Mr. SOLLI (Norway), explaining his delegation's abstention from the vote, said that the Norwegian Government attached the greatest importance to an

orderly expansion of the trade in raw materials, exports of which played a predominant role in his country's economy. He therefore welcomed the progress made since the seventeenth session, at which the Norwegian delegation had been obliged to vote against the Argentine draft resolution on the subject despite its appreciation of the acceptance by Argentina of the Norwegian proposal that the views of governments be sought, a course which might have brought considerable advantages at the current session. That fact, coupled with the co-operative spirit shown by the Argentine delegation and the valuable statements of the United Kingdom delegation, had to some extent allayed the Norwegian Government's fears that the establishment of the commission might actually retard progress towards a workable solution, and had justified the hope that a satisfactory instrument might eventually be forged. His delegation continued, however, to have doubts about many of the implications of the resolution just adopted, and was particularly disturbed by the fact that the largest trading countries had voted against it, although some encouragement was to be drawn from the statement just made by the United Kingdom representative. Raw-material problems could not be simply voted out of existence.

41. He noted with approval that some provision had been made in the resolution for the revision of the commission's terms of reference and procedures. He hoped that the commission would, in all its activities, including procedural matters, take note of the epithet " advisory " which preceded its title.

42. Mr. GUTMANN (France) said that the French Government was not opposed to the establishment of the commission, nor even to its beginning to work immediately. It was prepared to co-operate in the work thus undertaken, the importance of which it fully appreciated, and was willing to participate in the new body's activities. But it did feel that the commission's structure, as now agreed on, held a threat to its efficient operation and to the Council's authority. The French delegation had therefore had no option but to vote against the resolution just adopted.

43. However, it trusted that it would prove possible to reach broader agreement at a future date, on the basis of a larger measure of give-and-take. Fortunately, the statements just made by the President and the representatives of certain countries justified a feeling of lively optimism in that respect.

44. Mr. WOULBROUN (Belgium) said that his delegation had not voted in favour of the resolution because, for one thing, it was not convinced that the newly established commission, with its ill-defined terms of reference and a structure which fitted uneasily into that of the Council, would prove to be the truly effective organ that his delegation would have liked to see.

45. At the same time it had not wished to vote against the resolution, because it attached great weight to the stabilization of the violent fluctuations in prices and supplies on the commodity market; because many countries—especially the under-developed ones—had advocated its establishment; because the adoption of the

resolution did not preclude examination of the question by the Contracting Parties to GATT; and because the text provided for reconsideration of the question after the forthcoming review of GATT.

46. Notwithstanding its reservations and abstention, the Belgian Government would adopt a positive attitude towards the work thus undertaken.

47. Mr. EL-TANAMLI (Egypt) expressed his Government's gratitude to the Argentine delegation for its initiative and conciliatory spirit, thanks to which the resolution had been adopted by a large majority.

48. The Egyptian delegation was also glad to note the statements made by the delegations which had been unable to vote for the resolution.

49. Finally, he wished to point out that the resolution was an extension of Council resolution 512 A (XVII) and of General Assembly resolution (623 (VII)) concerning the grave problem of the terms of trade of the primary producing countries. Thus a wide new vista had been opened up to the Council and the United Nations as a whole.

50. Mr. SEN (India) paid tribute to the Argentine and United States delegations, which had made progress on such a difficult matter possible in the Co-ordination Committee. He welcomed the statement made by the United Kingdom representative, and joined with him in hoping that the same spirit of compromise would prevail in the meetings of the commission.

51. Mr. ADIL (Pakistan) associated himself with the remarks made by the Indian representative, and expressed his appreciation of the encouraging statements made by the French and United Kingdom representatives.

52. Mr. HOTCHKIS (United States of America) complimented the Chairman of the Co-ordination Committee on the outstanding way in which he had guided the Committee's deliberations and contributed to the results achieved. He also expressed his appreciation of the Argentine representative's attitude in the Committee.

53. Mr. ENGEN (Norway), speaking as Chairman of the Co-ordination Committee, thanked the United States representative.

54. Mr. MORALES (Argentina) thanked the members of the Council for their kind tributes to his delegation, and in turn expressed its appreciation of the co-operative attitude shown by all the members of the Co-ordination Committee.

55. Mr. FENAUX (Belgium), speaking as Chairman of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, introduced the Committee's report (E/2646) on the amendment of rule 82 of the Council's rules of procedure.

56. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the revised text of rule 82 of the Council's rules of procedure submitted in the report of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations (E/2646).

The revised text was adopted unanimously.

Non-governmental organizations (resumed from the 798th meeting and concluded): Report of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations on the resolution adopted by the Conference of Consultative Non-Governmental Organizations (E/2645, E/C.2/398)

[Agenda item 28]

57. Mr. FENAUX (Belgium), speaking as Chairman of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, introduced the Committee's report (E/2645) on the resolution adopted by the Conference of Consultative Non-Governmental Organizations concerning hearings of non-governmental organizations (E/C.2/398).

58. The PRESIDENT proposed that the Council place on record its intention of following the practice suggested in the recommendation contained in the report of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations (E/2645).

It was so agreed.

Co-ordination of the work of the United Nations and the specialized agencies (resumed from the 807th meeting and concluded): (b) Review of the 1955 programmes (Council resolution 497 C (XVI)): Report of the Co-ordination Committee (E/2648, E/L.645)

[Agenda item 26]

59. Mr. ENGEN (Norway), speaking as Chairman of the Co-ordination Committee, introduced the report of the Co-ordination Committee on the review of 1955 programmes (E/2648).

60. Mr. HOTCHKIS (United States of America) drew attention to the United States amendment (E/L.645) to the draft resolution in the Committee's report.

61. Mr. AZMI (Egypt) recalled that at the 806th meeting he had supported an Argentine suggestion that the Council should defer a decision on the reports of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination until it had examined the reports of the Co-ordination Committee, the Technical Assistance Committee and the Economic Committee. The Council had now done so, and should adopt an appropriate resolution.

62. Hence the Egyptian delegation would vote for the United States amendment (E/L.645).

63. Mr. FENAUX (Belgium) agreed with the Egyptian representative.

64. The PRESIDENT put to the vote paragraph 1 and paragraph 2 of the United States amendment (E/L.645) to the draft resolution in paragraph 3 of the report of the Co-ordination Committee (E/2648).

Paragraph 1 of the amendment was adopted unanimously.

Paragraph 2 of the amendment was adopted by 15 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

65. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the draft resolution, as amended.

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

66. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the report of the Co-ordination Committee on review of 1955 programmes (E/2648) as a whole, as amended.

The report as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 16 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Annual report of the Economic Commission for Europe (E/2556, E/L.644) (resumed from the 828th meeting and concluded)

[Agenda item 5]

67. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the joint draft resolution on inter-regional co-operation submitted by the delegations of Belgium, Czechoslovakia and France (E/L.644).

68. Mr. CORKERY (Australia) wished to make it clear that in the view of his delegation the provision in the joint draft resolution for the matter to be discussed again at the twentieth session and for the preparation of the organizational and technical report on the practical conditions under which the trade consultations might be held, could in no way be regarded as committing the Australian Government on the question of whether or not such conferences should be held. That matter could be considered only in the light of the circumstances operating at the time of the twentieth session.

69. Resolution 5 (E/2556) of the Economic Commission for Europe (ECE) had provided for trade consultations between ECE on the one hand and the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East (ECAFE) and the Economic Commission for Latin America on the other. He trusted that in the study to be prepared by the Secretary-General, consideration would be given to the question of how Member States not represented in ECE or in ECAFE could participate in any consultations held between those two regional commissions. It was clear that countries in the third region would have an interest in such inter-regional trade.

70. Mr. HOTCHKIS (United States of America) said that his delegation would vote for the joint draft resolution, although it reserved its general attitude with regard to consultations between United Nations regional organizations.

71. At the 828th meeting the Belgian representative had stated that the Belgian, Czechoslovak and French

delegations had co-operated in preparing a joint draft resolution (E/L.644) which they hoped would be unanimously adopted. While it was true that one of the purposes of the United Nations was to extend the area of unanimous agreement which already existed on certain subjects, such as the desirability of technical assistance, there were many issues—for example, the most rapid means of achieving the economic development of under-developed countries—on which there was a perfectly natural disparity of opinion. A clear recognition of genuine differences of opinion was wholesome. Under regimes in which the rights of minorities were respected, those minorities had a most important contribution to make. Unanimity should not be sought at the cost of sacrificing one's innermost convictions. Like the apostle of tolerance, the Council must be prepared to protect the right to disagree.

72. Mr. JANNE (Belgium), replying to the United States representative, said that the Council did no more than submit recommendations. The weight attached to those recommendations depended on the circumstances in which they were adopted. That was why it was necessary to strive to the utmost after unanimity. Subject to that reservation, he shared the opinion of the United States representative that unanimity was not indispensable in all cases. The main thing was that the Council's decisions should be clear and well considered.

73. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the joint draft resolution on inter-regional co-operation (E/L.644).

The joint draft resolution was adopted unanimously.

74. Mr. KUMYKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), explaining his vote, said that he welcomed the unanimity which had been achieved, and shared the Belgian representative's interpretation of the importance of enhancing the prestige of measures adopted at international meetings by achieving the greatest possible area of agreement.

75. It was the understanding of his delegation that a representative of the Central People's Government of the Chinese People's Republic would participate in any consultation of trade experts which might be called, since no positive results could otherwise be expected.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.