



## CONTENTS

	Page
Work of the Council in 1955 ( <i>continued</i> ):	
(a) Basic programme for 1955: allocation of items to sessions ( <i>concluded</i> )	279
Disposal of items arising out of the ninth regular session of the General Assembly	280
Work of the Council in 1955 ( <i>concluded</i> ):	
(b) Establishment of dates for opening debate on items allocated to the March session	281
Question of the terms of reference of the Economic, Employment and Development Commission: report by the Secretary-General under Council resolution 557 C I (XVIII)	282
Appointment of a member of the Permanent Central Opium Board ( <i>concluded</i> )	284
Confirmation of members of functional commissions of the Council	285
Statement of the representative of the United States of America concerning the participation of his Government in the work of the Commission on International Commodity Trade	285
Closure of the session	285

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

*Present:*

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

Observers from the following countries: Brazil, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Iran, Netherlands.

The representatives of the following specialized agencies: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, International Monetary Fund, World Health Organization.

**Work of the Council in 1955 (*continued*):**

- (a) Basic programme for 1955: allocation of items to sessions (E/2663, E/2667, E/L.646, E/L.647 and Corr.1) (*concluded*)

[Agenda item 35 (a)]

NINETEENTH SESSION

*Agenda item 8*

1. Mr. BLOUGH (Secretariat), in reply to a question raised at the 833rd meeting by the representative of Yugoslavia, said that the Secretariat had already received comments (E/2612 and Add.1) on the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Restrictive Business Practices from five countries, two inter-governmental organizations, two specialized agencies and three non-governmental organizations. Thirty-six Governments and the European Coal and Steel Community had replied to the Secretary-General's request for information concerning the principal legislative, judicial, administrative and executive developments in the field of

restrictive business practices since 1 January 1953. Twenty of those replies had been utilized in connexion with the Secretariat report on the subject which was being prepared for the nineteenth session of the Council.

2. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the United Kingdom proposal that consideration of item 8 (Restrictive business practices) should be postponed until the resumed nineteenth session.

*The proposal was adopted by 7 votes to 2, with 9 abstentions.*

3. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that the wording of item 8 in Russian did not exactly correspond with the English text. He would like the translation to be revised.

4. The PRESIDENT assured the representative of the Soviet Union that the Secretariat would make the necessary arrangements.

*Agenda item 12*

5. Mr. GEORGES-PICOT (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Departments of Economic Affairs and of Social Affairs), in reply to a question raised at the 833rd meeting by the representative of Turkey, said that after consulting the services concerned he was in a position to say that the reports to be submitted to the Council at its nineteenth session in connexion with item 12 (Freedom of information) would be ready in time.

6. Mr. ABDEL GHANI (Egypt) drew the Council's attention to the fact that the next session of the Commission on Human Rights was to be held at the same time as the first part of the nineteenth session of the Council. He pointed out that such an arrangement was inconvenient for small delegations, which would have difficulty in providing two experts or representatives to participate in the work of the Commission on Human Rights and attend the meetings of the Council at which item 12 was considered.

7. He therefore proposed that the item should be entered in the agenda of the resumed nineteenth session of the Council.

8. Sir Douglas COPLAND (Australia) said that, while he understood the reasons for the Egyptian representative's proposal, he would recall that several important items had already been entered in the agenda of the resumed nineteenth session, which was thus in danger of being overburdened. Furthermore, he had understood, at the time of the adoption of resolution 557 B (XVIII) on the organization and operation of the Council and its commissions, that the first part of the March session would be devoted to major questions and the second part to routine business.

9. The question of freedom of information was important and to postpone consideration of it until the resumed nineteenth session would be contrary to the aim that had been set at Geneva.

10. Mr. TUNCEL (Turkey) thought that the question of freedom of information was the more important since, under the draft resolution before the General

Assembly,<sup>1</sup> consideration of it was to be linked with consideration of the draft convention on freedom of information.

11. He doubted whether Governments would have enough time to study the many relevant documents before the Council's nineteenth session, and was therefore prepared to go further than the Egyptian representative and postpone consideration of the question until the Council's twentieth session.

12. Mr. MEADE (United Kingdom) pointed out that the agenda of the twentieth session was already very full owing to the fact that the Council had decided to postpone consideration of the report of the Commission on the Status of Women until then. He therefore asked for the question of freedom of information to be kept on the agenda of the nineteenth session.

13. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) agreed with the United Kingdom representative.

14. Mr. ABDEL GHANI (Egypt) formally asked that the item, freedom of information, should be entered in the agenda of the resumed nineteenth session.

15. Mr. STANOVNIK (Yugoslavia) said that, while he approved of the Egyptian proposal in substance, he would like to point out that postponement of the question of freedom of information to the resumed nineteenth session would oblige the small delegations to employ an expert, not only for the first part of the session, but also for the second part, and that would cost the Governments concerned more.

16. Sir Douglas COPLAND (Australia) shared the Yugoslav representative's opinion. Furthermore, delegations were bound by the decisions adopted at Geneva. The Australian delegation, which had received precise instructions from its Government on the matter, could not support the Egyptian proposal.

17. Mr. ABDEL GHANI (Egypt) did not see why the Australian representative was opposed to his proposal, in view of the fact that he had raised no objection to the postponement of items 8 ("Restrictive business practices") and 9 ("Wood-pulp and paper"), which could hardly be described as "routine", to the resumed nineteenth session.

18. Mr. CAFIERO (Argentina) said that in his opinion the consideration of routine business in the resumed nineteenth session did not exclude the possibility of considering certain important questions. He would therefore support the Egyptian proposal.

19. Sir Douglas COPLAND (Australia) pointed out that item 9 ("Wood-pulp and paper") could be regarded as routine business. Item 8 ("Restrictive business practices") was a technical question, midway between routine business and major questions. Item 12 ("Freedom of information") was certainly a major question, and to enter it in the agenda of the resumed nineteenth session would be contrary to the decisions adopted at Geneva.

20. Mr. RIBAS (Cuba) was of the opinion that item 9 ("Wood-pulp and paper") was very important: a conference had just been held on the subject at Buenos Aires, and the Council would certainly have to consider its report. The question of restrictive business practices was also a major question.

21. If those two items had not been postponed until the resumed nineteenth session, the Cuban delegation

would have unreservedly supported the Australian representative's objections, but the Council had created a precedent by voting in favour of postponement. The Cuban delegation would therefore vote for the Egyptian proposal.

22. Mr. SINGH (India) shared the opinion of the Cuban delegation. He would vote for the Egyptian proposal.

23. Mr. EPINAT (France) said that he would also vote for the Egyptian proposal.

24. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the Egyptian proposal that the question of freedom of information should be entered on the agenda of the resumed nineteenth session.

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

25. Sir Douglas COPLAND (Australia) said that the Australian delegation reserved the right to raise, at the Council's next session, the question whether the practice of holding a second half of the first regular session should be maintained in future if instead of being devoted to routine business, that half, as well as the first, was to be used for the discussion of major questions.

26. Mr. TUNCEL (Turkey) supported the Australian representative.

#### TWENTIETH SESSION

##### *Agenda item 4*

27. Mr. MEADE (United Kingdom) made a number of observations on item 4 in the list of items for the twentieth session: (General review of the development and co-ordination of the economic, social and human rights programmes and activities of the United Nations and the specialized agencies as a whole). He recalled that the inclusion of that item had been proposed at Geneva during the debate which the Co-ordination Committee had held on the organization and operation of the Council. In that connexion, it had been suggested that the Secretary-General should produce a written statement setting out the problems to be dealt with and the progress achieved in economic and social matters. The Secretary-General had welcomed the suggestion, but it had not been mentioned in Council resolution 557 B (XVIII), and the United Kingdom delegation understood that no action was being taken on it by the Secretariat. It therefore formally proposed that such a document should be produced and that it should be listed with those referred to under item 4. It would also like to propose that the reports of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Monetary Fund and the United Nations Children's Fund should be added to the list. While it was true that those reports would have to be considered separately, the United Kingdom delegation was of the opinion that they should be included among the reports to be submitted to the Council in connexion with the general review of the development and co-ordination of the programmes and activities of the United Nations and the specialized agencies as a whole.

*There being no objection, it was so decided.*

#### **Disposal of items arising out of the ninth regular session of the General Assembly (E/L.646)**

##### *[Agenda item 36]*

28. The CHAIRMAN drew the Council's attention to the General Assembly's recommendations concerning

<sup>1</sup> Resolution 840 (IX) adopted by the General Assembly on 17 December 1954.

international respect for the right of peoples and nations to self-determination (E/L.646, item I (i)).

29. Mr. ABDEL GHANI (Egypt) thought that an immediate decision should be taken on the question of referring General Assembly resolution 837 (IX), to the Commission on Human Rights. The fact was that the Council, whose nineteenth session was to open on 29 March 1955, would not have time to consider the matter because the Commission on Human Rights was to meet on 31 March. The Egyptian delegation therefore formally proposed that the General Assembly resolution should be referred to the Commission on Human Rights.

30. Mr. TUNCEL (Turkey) said he would like to point out that the General Assembly seemed to think very little of the Council's prerogatives, since all it did was to request the Council to transmit to it such recommendations as might be made by the Commission on Human Rights, a subsidiary organ of the Council.

31. Mr. CHENG (China) recalled that in the General Assembly the Chinese delegation had voted against the resolution relating to international respect for the right of peoples and nations to self-determination (General Assembly resolution 837 (IX)). In the first place, it doubted whether the Commission on Human Rights would be able to complete its recommendations on such an important and complex question, a question which the General Assembly and the Council had been studying for a long time. Furthermore, it would be inadvisable to add to the already overloaded agenda of the Commission on Human Rights.

32. While the Chinese delegation would not oppose reference of the General Assembly resolution to the Commission on Human Rights, it would like to emphasize that the Commission should be left free to decide whether it could accomplish the additional task that had been entrusted to it.

33. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the Egyptian proposal to refer to the Commission on Human Rights the General Assembly resolution requesting the Commission to complete its recommendations concerning international respect for the right of peoples and nations to self-determination.

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

34. Mr. WOULBROUN (Belgium), explaining his vote, recalled that the Belgian delegation had already expressed its objections to the draft resolution in the General Assembly.

35. It would like to emphasize once more, however, that the Council derived its powers directly from the Charter of the United Nations and that no organ of the United Nations could restrict those powers. The Economic and Social Council could not be asked to play the part of a mere intermediary. It was the Council's duty to study such recommendations as might be prepared by the Commission on Human Rights and to transmit them to the General Assembly only when accompanied by the observations the Council thought fit to make on them. The Council could not disclaim interest in such a fundamentally important matter as international respect for the right of peoples and nations to self-determination.

36. Mr. BLOUGH (Secretariat) drew the Council's attention to item I (viii) in the note by the Secretary-General (E/L.646): "Establishment of a world food reserve".

37. As the report of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations would not be ready in time for consideration by the Council at its nineteenth session, the Council might perhaps think it advisable to postpone the item until its twentieth or even its twenty-first session.

38. Sir Douglas COPLAND (Australia) thought it might be possible to wait until the nineteenth session before making a final decision.

39. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) proposed that the item should be entered in the provisional agenda of the twentieth session in view of the fact that the Council would be able to amend that agenda at its nineteenth session if it considered that it would not be able to study the item at its twentieth session.

*It was so decided.*

40. Mr. BLOUGH (Secretariat), replying to a question from Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) concerning item I (ix) (International tax problems), explained that, owing to the importance and complexity of the matter, the Secretariat would be unable to present a full and detailed report to the Council before 1956.

41. Mr. SINGH (India) thought the order of the items in the draft list presented to the Council (E/L.646 and E/L.647 and Corr.1) was provisional and could be altered at the opening of the nineteenth or twentieth sessions.

42. Mr. ABDEL GHANI (Egypt) agreed with the Indian representative and said that he personally would like the Council to consider the questions of the establishment of a special United Nations fund for economic development and of the establishment of an international finance corporation (E/L.646, items I (vi) and (vii)) at its twentieth session, immediately after the item, "World economic situation".

43. The PRESIDENT declared approved the programme of work for 1955 (E/647 and Corr.1)<sup>2</sup> and also the provisional agenda of the nineteenth session, account being taken of the changes introduced and the statements made during the discussion.

#### **Work of the Council in 1955 (concluded):**

**(b) Establishment of dates for opening debate on items allocated to the March session (E/2663, E/2667, E/L.647 and Corr.1)**

[Agenda item 35 (b)]

44. Mr. GEORGES-PICOT (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Departments of Economic Affairs and of Social Affairs) recalled that under resolution 557 B (XVIII), the agenda of the Council's summer session was to be confined mainly to the study of the world economic situation and perhaps of the world social situation, and to a general review of the development and co-ordination of the economic, social and human rights programmes and activities of the United Nations and the specialized agencies as a whole. That was why the Council had decided that its July session should not last more than four weeks. For the twentieth session, however, the Council had made different arrangements. The agenda proposed by the Secretary-General (E/L.647 and Corr.1) already included fifteen items, to which the Council had just added the report of the Commission on the Status of

<sup>2</sup> See also the decision concerning the question of the terms of reference of the Economic, Employment and Development Commission, para. 83 below.

Women, the admission of new members to the Economic Commission for Europe, the financing of economic development and the establishment of a world food reserve. The agenda as amended by the Council would probably not permit the work of the session to be kept within the four-week limit prescribed by resolution 557 (XVIII). Furthermore, it was not possible to extend the session beyond 6 August. Under rule 2 of the Council's rules of procedure, an interval of at least six weeks had to elapse between the adjournment of the Council and the opening date of the General Assembly, so that the Council's report should reach Governments in time.

45. In order to meet that difficulty, it might, on the one hand, be decided immediately that the Council should convene one week before the date provided for in the calendar of conferences, that was to say on 5 July instead of 12 July; or, on the other hand, the Council could immediately state its intention to postpone certain items which it might not be able to consider until its twentieth session. In connexion with that last suggestion, the Council might wait until the time when, at its nineteenth session, it adopted the agenda of the twentieth session, before specifying the items which might be postponed. The members of the Council would also have to plan the composition of their delegations carefully, so that a number of committees could work simultaneously and make full use of the time allocated to the Council during the session.

46. The PRESIDENT proposed that, in accordance with established practice, the Secretariat should be requested, after consulting delegations and the specialized agencies, to prepare a document giving the order in which and the dates on which the items on the agenda could be considered.

*It was so decided.*

**Question of the terms of reference of the Economic, Employment and Development Commission: report by the Secretary-General under Council resolution 557 C I (XVIII)<sup>3</sup> (E/2665 and Corr.1, E/L.653, E/L.654)**

47. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) presented the draft resolution submitted jointly by Ecuador, the United Kingdom and the United States (E/L.653).

48. When it had been decided to discontinue the work of the Economic, Employment and Development Commission, some delegations had been afraid that the questions for which the Commission had been responsible would be neglected. That was not so, for many United Nations organs were concerned with them. The re-establishment of that commission would only complicate matters; it would be better to continue to handle the work as before, using groups of experts when desirable.

49. He drew the Council's attention to paragraphs 12 to 15 of the Secretary-General's report (E/2665 and Corr.1). In that report, the Secretary-General, who was in a particularly good position to judge, expressed the opinion that it was hardly desirable to re-establish the Economic, Employment and Development Commission with anything like its existing broad terms of reference. He himself thought it would always be possible to revert to the question if any real need to do so were felt later.

<sup>3</sup> Resolution adopted by the Council at its 829th meeting, under agenda item 29.

50. Mr. MEADE (United Kingdom) expressed gratification at the Secretary-General's report (E/2665 and Corr.1), which clearly indicated why the Commission had been suspended. The United Kingdom delegation fully shared the views expressed in paragraph 15, and was of the opinion that there was no valid argument for re-establishing the Commission. The report showed that the Council had taken the necessary steps to ensure that the work for which the Commission had been established would be carried on.

51. He need hardly stress the lively and continuing interest which Her Majesty's Government had concerning high levels of employment and standards of living throughout the world, and the economic development of the less developed countries of the world. The United Kingdom delegation considered that the work being done in that field by the Council itself and by other existing bodies would be duplicated, and indeed impaired, if the Commission were re-established.

52. Furthermore, it should be pointed out that the establishment of a new commission would involve further expense, and that room would have to be found for it in an already overloaded calendar of conferences.

53. Lastly, he was of the opinion that the "multiple discussion" referred to in paragraph 8 of the Secretary-General's report could only diminish the interest of delegations in the subject, lead to confusion and delay action.

54. Mr. DONS (Norway) said that the Secretary-General's report (E/2665 and Corr.1) clearly showed that the establishment of a new commission would raise some extremely complex problems of organization. Nevertheless, the Norwegian delegation was of the opinion that it was desirable to establish a body especially responsible for the particular study of questions of employment and economic stability. Before voting on the question of establishing a new commission, however, it was important to know exactly what its terms of reference would be and what services it would be able to perform. Furthermore, since the Council had just adopted new methods of work, it would be better to await the results of the reorganization before deciding on the functions to be assigned to a subsidiary body.

55. The purpose of the Norwegian resolution (E/L.654) was precisely to give delegations time to find the best solution. Furthermore, the agenda of the Council's twentieth session was already very heavily burdened, especially as the Assembly had decided to include in it the question of the establishment of a special fund for economic development and the question of establishing an international finance corporation. In his view, that was one more reason for waiting a year before making a decision.

56. Mr. MIR KHAN (Pakistan) favoured the immediate re-establishment of the Commission, but agreed that the Council did not have enough time to discuss the question in full just then. It would be inadvisable to take a hasty decision. His delegation would accept the Norwegian proposal, although it would prefer to see the question examined at the Council's twentieth session, when the Council considered the first report of the Commission on International Commodity Trade on its terms of reference and programme of work.

57. He felt that the Norwegian draft resolution (E/L.654) should be the first proposal to be put to the vote.

58. Mr. WOULBROUN (Belgium) also praised the Secretary-General's report (E/2665 and Corr.1). The reasons which had induced the Council, in 1951, to suspend the work of the Economic, Employment and Development Commission were now stronger than ever. The Commission had encouraged the preparation of reports on numerous economic questions; that task was now entrusted to the competent departments of the Secretariat and to the specialized agencies. The Commission had admittedly also considered reports submitted by groups of experts, but its other work had consisted primarily of academic discussions. If the Commission was re-established, its work would duplicate the efforts of many other bodies.

59. The Belgian delegation would therefore vote in favour of the joint draft resolution (E/L.653) and against the Norwegian proposal (E/L.654).

60. Mr. SINGH (India) recalled that resolution 414 B I (XIII) had only provided for the discontinuance of the Commission's work until 31 December 1954. Therefore, if the provisions of that resolution were strictly followed the Commission would automatically resume its work in 1955. In the meantime many delegations had expressed themselves in favour of a re-examination of the Commission's terms of reference. In his delegation's view, the Council should have concentrated on that point.

61. As the Council's organization had recently been modified, he felt that it would be inadvisable, for the time being, to decide whether the Commission should be re-established or discontinued; it was better to accept the compromise solution proposed by the Norwegian representative and to give delegations time to assess the results of the reorganization of the Council.

62. Sir Douglas COPLAND (Australia) agreed with the Belgian representative that the work formerly entrusted to the Commission had been largely taken over by other bodies. Notwithstanding the importance of economic and employment questions, it was not necessary to appoint a permanent commission to study them. It would always be possible, if the need arose, to appoint a special committee to study a specified question or assess the situation.

63. Mr. STANOVNIK (Yugoslavia) pointed out that the Secretary-General's report (E/2665 and Corr.1) had been circulated on 27 November 1954 and that consequently delegations had not been able to avail themselves of the prescribed six-weeks period to study the question and ask their Governments for instructions. In the case in point there was no reason why the six-weeks rule should not be observed.

64. So far as the re-establishment of the Commission was concerned, economic and employment questions raised important political issues which primarily concerned Governments. Any discussion of those matters should therefore be open to Government representatives and not only to experts. If the Commission's terms of reference were too wide, it might be desirable to restrict them, but there would be no justification for abolishing the Commission as such a body would be sadly missed. Moreover, the Commission would facilitate the Council's task by preparing part of its work.

65. For those reasons, he would support the Norwegian draft resolution (E/L.654), which should be put to the vote first.

66. Mr. HSIA (China) felt that, strictly speaking, there was no reason for re-establishing the Commission.

In any event, even if the Council decided to re-establish the Commission, its terms of reference would have to be changed and that would be tantamount to establishing a new commission. It would be advisable to follow the advice of the Pakistan representative and allow delegations a little more time to study the question. The Chinese delegation was not opposed to the re-establishment of the Commission, but, if the Norwegian draft resolution (E/L.654) was not adopted, it would vote in favour of the joint draft resolution (E/L.653).

67. Mr. RIBAS (Cuba) said that, if the question had been raised at Geneva, at the time of the reorganization of the Council, his delegation would have proposed that the Commission should be given the same terms of reference as the Fiscal Commission, which had been abolished at that time (Council resolution 557 C II (XVIII)).

68. Nevertheless, accepting the conclusions reached by the Secretary-General's report, he felt that the Commission should not be re-established. He would consequently vote for the joint draft resolution (E/L.653).

69. Mr. CAFIERO (Argentina) was not convinced by the arguments adduced in favour of the joint draft resolution (E/L.653). He agreed with the Yugoslav representative that the United Nations should have a body specifically entrusted with the study of economic, employment and development questions.

70. Secondly, it would be premature to decide not to re-establish the Commission, as the Secretary-General had not completed his study of the structure of the United Nations. As far as the duplication of effort was concerned, it was one of the primary tasks of the Committee on Co-ordination to prevent it.

71. Consequently, it was preferable to display a conciliatory attitude and to adopt the Norwegian draft resolution (E/L.654).

72. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that in the Soviet Union, where full employment was guaranteed, the problem of unemployment did not arise. If the Commission was re-established, the manpower situation in the USSR could cause it no concern.

73. By contrast, in many countries, despite progress in social legislation and measures taken to guarantee employment to workers, there were large numbers of unemployed leading a precarious existence. Under the Charter of the United Nations, the Council had a duty to do all in its power to seek a solution of that economic and social problem affecting the lot of millions of human beings.

74. Advantages could certainly be derived, especially by the under-developed countries, from a special commission studying questions of employment and economic development. Therefore, the USSR would not oppose the re-establishment of the Commission, which might assist those countries in overcoming serious difficulties. The USSR delegation would therefore vote in favour of the Norwegian draft resolution (E/L.654); which did not exclude the possibility of re-establishing the Commission. If the Commission was re-established, however, it would be necessary to ensure that it did not lead to any duplication of effort with a number of existing agencies.

75. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) could not accept the Yugoslav representative's arguments. He did not agree that the Commission should



be re-established on the pretext that it could examine questions with which the Council itself could not deal for lack of time. There also seemed to be no very good reason for putting the Norwegian draft resolution (E/L.654) to the vote before the joint draft resolution (E/L.653). Nevertheless, he would not insist that the Council should decide first on the joint draft.

76. It would be wrong to regard the abolition of the Commission as an indication that the Council was losing interest in questions of employment and economic development. In point of fact, those questions were so important that the Council should deal with them direct. In any event, if it became indispensable, at a later stage, to establish some commission similar to the Economic, Employment and Development Commission, the Council would be perfectly free to take a decision to that effect.

77. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) felt that certain bodies were already exercising many of the functions which could be entrusted to the Commission if the Council decided to re-establish it. The re-establishment of the Commission might therefore lead to some unfortunate overlapping. For that reason, he could not accept the Norwegian draft resolution (E/L.654), which left the possibility of re-establishing the Commission open, and would abstain from voting on it.

78. On the other hand, his delegation supported the joint draft resolution (E/L.653), subject to certain modifications. He proposed that the following clause should be inserted at the end of the first paragraph of the preamble: "and (3) that the Commission on International Commodity Trade is to examine its terms of reference and submit a report to the Economic and Social Council at its twentieth session". He also proposed that the operative paragraph should be slightly modified, so as to read: "Decides not to re-establish for the time being the Economic, Employment and Development Commission".

79. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America), Mr. MEADE (United Kingdom) and Mr. TRUJILLO (Ecuador) said that they had no objection to the two amendments the Venezuelan representative had proposed.

80. In reply to Mr. WOULBROUN (Belgium), who asked whether he was prepared to withdraw his draft resolution in view of the amendments to the joint draft resolution (E/L.653), Mr. DONS (Norway) said that he maintained his text (E/L.654).

81. Sir Douglas COPLAND (Australia) and Mr. WOULBROUN (Belgium) disagreed with some previous speakers; the Norwegian draft resolution was not a procedural motion and rule 55 of the rules of procedure was not applicable. Consequently, the Council should first vote on the draft resolution which had been submitted earlier (E/L.653).

82. After an exchange of views between Sir Douglas COPLAND (Australia), Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. WOULBROUN (Belgium), Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia), Mr. PIRACHA (Pakistan) and Mr. RIBAS (Cuba), the PRESIDENT said that the second paragraph of rule 66 of the rules of procedure applied to the Norwegian draft resolution, which should be considered as a previous question and put to the vote before any proposal on the substance.

83. The PRESIDENT put the Norwegian draft resolution (E/L.654) to the vote.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 9 votes to 8, with 1 abstention.*

# **Appointment of a member of the Permanent Central Opium Board (E/2636 and Add.1/Rev.1 to Add.7, E/L.652) (concluded)**

## **REPORT OF THE SELECTION COMMITTEE (E/L.652)**

84. The PRESIDENT said that, according to information supplied by Governments, two candidates besides those mentioned in paragraph 4 of the Selection Committee's report (E/L.652)<sup>4</sup> fulfilled the conditions set forth in the International Opium Convention of 1925. They were Mr. Georges Joakimoglu (Greece) and Mr. Estefanus Loocho (Indonesia). He read rules 67 and 68 of the rules of procedure.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Amanrich (France) and Miss Bell (United States of America) acted as tellers.*

*A vote was taken by secret ballot.*

<i>Number of ballot papers:</i>	18
<i>Invalid ballots:</i>	0
<i>Number of valid ballots:</i>	18
<i>Abstentions:</i>	0
<i>Number of members voting:</i>	18
<i>Required majority:</i>	10

## *Number of votes obtained:*

Mr. Liang (China).....	5
Mr. Loocho (Indonesia).....	5
Mr. Pernambuco (Brazil).....	3
Mr. Renborg (Sweden).....	3
Mr. Kusama (Japan).....	1
Mr. Taningco (Philippines).....	1

*In accordance with rule 68 of the rules of procedure, a second ballot was taken, confined to the two candidates who had obtained the largest number of votes in the first ballot, Mr. Liang and Mr. Loocho.*

<i>Number of ballot papers:</i>	18
<i>Invalid ballots:</i>	1
<i>Number of valid ballots:</i>	17
<i>Abstentions:</i>	1
<i>Number of members voting:</i>	17
<i>Required majority:</i>	9

<sup>4</sup> Paragraph 4 of the Selection Committee's report (E/L.652) reads as follows:

"The Committee examined the list of candidates and the information relating to them (E/2636 and addenda) from the point of view of the provisions [of article 19 of the 1925 International Opium Convention, as amended by the Protocol of 11 December 1946, and of Council resolution 49 (IV)].

"It is of the opinion that the following candidates satisfy them: Professor Felix Bergmann (Israel), Professor Werner Koll (German Federal Republic), Dr. Shiko Kusama (Japan), Dr. Chi-kwei Liang (China), Dr. Pedro Filho Pernambuco (Brazil), Mr. Bertil A. Renborg (Sweden), Professor A. Vartiainen (Finland), Mr. Khayrat Mamiche (Syria).

"The Council has been informed of the death of Mr. Ichiro Keimatsu (Japan).

"Since the Committee was appointed, it has been informed that the Government of Iran has withdrawn the nomination of Mr. Abbas Gholi Ardalan on his appointment to an official position under his Government.

"As regards the remaining candidates, the Committee is not clear, on the information presented to it, that they satisfy all the provisions of the Convention, namely: Professor Georges Joakimoglou (Greece), Dr. Paulino M. Taningco (Philippines), Dr. Estefanus Loocho (Indonesia).

"At the direction of the Committee, further requests for information have been addressed to the nominating Governments in these cases, and any information so furnished, which might enable the Council to decide that a candidate satisfied the provisions, will be communicated to it."

*Number of votes obtained:*

Mr. Liang (China).....	9
Mr. Loohe (Indonesia).....	8

*Having obtained the required majority, Mr. Liang (China) was elected a member of the Permanent Central Opium Board.*

85. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) and Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) pointed out that the only real representatives of the Chinese people were those nominated by the Government of the People's Republic of China and protested against the illegal appointment of an individual designated by the authorities of National China.

86. Mr. HSIA (China) felt that it was unnecessary to refute the Soviet representative's remarks and wished only to thank the Council for its selection of the candidate proposed by the Chinese Government.

**Confirmation of members of functional commissions of the Council (E/2664 and Add.1 and 2)**

[Agenda item 32]

87. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) supported by Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked that the confirmation of the appointment of Mr. Choh-ming Li (Statistical Commission), Mr. Cheng Paonan (Commission on Human Rights) and Miss Pao Swen Tseng (Commission on the Status of Women) should be put to the vote separately.

88. Mr. HSIA (China) asked that the confirmation of Mr. Ryabushkin (Statistical Commission and Population Commission) and of Mr. Zonov (Social Commission) should be put to the vote separately.

*Mr. Choh-ming Li was confirmed as a member of the Statistical Commission by 13 votes to 4, with 1 abstention.*

*Mr. Cheng Paonan was confirmed as a member of the Commission on Human Rights by 13 votes to 4, with 1 abstention.*

*Miss Pao Swen Tseng was confirmed as a member of the Commission on the Status of Women by 13 votes to 4, with 1 abstention.*

*Mr. Ryabushkin was confirmed as a member of the Statistical Commission by 17 votes to 1.*

*Mr. Ryabushkin was confirmed as a member of the Population Commission by 17 votes to 1.*

*Mr. Zonov was confirmed as a member of the Social Commission by 17 votes to 1.*

*There being no objection, the appointments of the other persons listed in documents E/2664 and Add.1 and 2 were confirmed.<sup>5</sup>*

**Statement of the representative of the United States of America concerning the participation of his Government in the work of the Commission on International Commodity Trade**

89. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) recalled that at the 832nd meeting the United States delegation had been unable to state whether the United

States Government could participate in the recently established Commission on International Commodity Trade. He would now make his Government's position known: it wished for the time being to keep in close contact with the work of the Commission in the hope that it might be of possible assistance. It was not prepared at that time to take part in the Commission's work. It was prepared, however, to re-examine the question of its eventual participation after the Commission's terms of reference and the scope of its activities had been clarified.

**Closure of the session**

90. The PRESIDENT announced that Mr. Georges-Picot, Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Departments of Economic Affairs and of Social Affairs, would soon leave the United Nations Secretariat to take up his duties as French Ambassador to Mexico. He wished to thank Mr. Georges-Picot for the devoted manner in which he had always carried out his task. All the delegations had appreciated the competence with which he had directed the departments entrusted to him and his outstanding intelligence, humanity and level-headedness.

91. He wished to express his deepest regret at Mr. Georges-Picot's departure and to wish him every success in the high office which he was about to assume.

92. Mr. RIBAS (Cuba) and Sir Douglas COPLAND (Australia) paid a tribute to the President for the high qualities which he had displayed in conducting the debates. He had enabled the Council to complete its work in a spirit of co-operation.

93. They thanked Mr. Georges-Picot for his unceasing efforts on behalf of the United Nations during his three years with the Secretariat.

94. Mr. TUNCEL (Turkey), Mr. CAFIERO (Argentina), Mr. MEADE (United Kingdom), Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela), Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America), Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. HSIA (China), Mr. WOULBROUN (Belgium), Mr. EPINAT (France), Mr. STANOVNIK (Yugoslavia), Mr. MIR KHAN (Pakistan), Mr. RAMADAN (Egypt) and Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) joined in the statements made by the Cuban and Australian representatives.

95. Mr. GEORGES-PICOT (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Departments of Economic Affairs and of Social Affairs) expressed his deep gratitude for the tribute paid to him by the President and members of the Council. He was proud to have been associated with the Council's work, which had enriched his experience.

96. He was convinced that no better successor could have been chosen for a post requiring such a high degree of skill and impartiality than Mr. Philippe de Seynes, whose profound knowledge of economic matters delegations had been able to appreciate.

97. The PRESIDENT thanked the members of the Council for their kind remarks and for the co-operation which they had always displayed. It was because of general goodwill that the Council had been able to complete its work satisfactorily, despite inevitable differences of opinion.

98. He declared the session closed.

The meeting rose at 7.10 p.m.

<sup>5</sup> For the list of members of functional commissions as confirmed see *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Resumed Eighteenth Session, Supplement No. 1A*, Other decisions taken by the Council at its resumed eighteenth session.