



ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Sixteenth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Tuesday, 28 July 1953
at 10.30 a.m.

PALAIS DES NATIONS, GENEVA

CONTENTS

	Page
Programme of concerted practical action in the social field of the United Nations and the specialized agencies (General Assembly resolution 535 (VI), Council resolution 434 (XIV)): Consideration of draft resolutions (E/2437, E/L.541/Rev.2, E/L.541/Add.1, E/L.545 and E/L.546) (<i>resumed from the 736th meeting</i>)	215

President: Mr. Raymond SCHEYVEN (Belgium).

Present:

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

Observers from the following Member States: Brazil, Chile, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Iran, Netherlands.

Observers from the following non-member State: Italy.

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, International Monetary Fund, World Health Organization, Universal Postal Union, International Telecommunication Union, World Meteorological Organization, Interim Commission of the International Trade Organization.

Programme of concerted practical action in the social field of the United Nations and the specialized agencies (General Assembly resolution 535 (IV), Council resolution 434 (XIV)): Consideration of draft resolutions) (E/2437, E/L.541/Rev.2, E/L.541/Add.1, E/L.545 and E/L.546) (*resumed from the 736th meeting*)

[Agenda item 10]

1. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft resolution B, submitted by the Social Commission (E/2437) ¹ in conjunction with the amendments proposed thereto in documents E/L.541/Rev.2 and E/L.546.

2. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) regretted that in their present form the proposed amendments to draft resolution B were completely unacceptable to the Polish delegation. His delegation had had doubts on the subject of draft resolution B at the time of its adoption by the Social Commission, and although it had since considered the possibility of supporting the resolution,

the present amendments, which constituted a step backwards, made that impossible. In the hope of reaching general agreement, therefore, he wished to propose certain amendments to those contained in the five-Power revised joint amendment (E/L.541/Rev.2). Before doing so, however, he felt it important that the Council should take a decision on paragraph 4 of that amendment, which suggested the deletion of paragraphs 5 and 6 and the annex of draft resolution B. His delegation would vote against that part of the amendment and, if a majority of the Council voted likewise and the proposed deletion was not accepted, then his delegation would have no amendments to propose to the remainder of the resolution. If, however, the vote resulted in the deletion of those parts of the resolution, his delegation would have a number of amendments to propose to paragraphs 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 in the form in which those paragraphs would appear if paragraphs 3 and 5 of the five-Power amendment were adopted.

3. Mr. HOARE (United Kingdom), introducing the three-Power amendments submitted by his delegation and those of France and Sweden (E/L.546), explained that the amendments constituted a revision of document E/L.545, effected after consultation between the co-sponsors. The revision consisted first in inserting after paragraph 2 of draft resolution B the second subparagraph of paragraph 1 of the earlier amendment, and secondly in substituting the first subparagraph of paragraph 1 of the earlier amendment for paragraph 8 of the five-Power amendment (E/L.541/Rev.2). It was not proposed to proceed any further with paragraph 2 of the earlier amendment. The object of the first amendment in the three-Power amendment was to relate the suggested programme of concerted practical action to the activities actually being undertaken at the present time. The second amendment, which would take the place of the new paragraph 8 as proposed by the five-Power amendment, was founded on a difference of principle. The five-Power amendment contained the words "within the framework of criteria and priorities", and a list of priorities then followed which seemed to him to constitute a repetition of the idea contained in the phrase in question. The paragraph should be designed simply as a directive, and should not establish new priorities within existing priorities; nor should priorities of the kind mentioned be decided simply by a vote of the Council. The Council had no right to draw up a list of priorities which might subsequently prove to contain serious omissions.

4. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that every endeavour had been made to reach agreement on the subject of the amendment submitted by his delegation and the delegations of Argentina, the Philip-

¹ See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Sixteenth Session, Supplement No. 7, Annex III, page 19.*

pinas, Venezuela and Yugoslavia. Further discussions had resulted in the preparation of a further joint amendment by the five delegations (E/L.541/Rev.2), and in it the sponsors had gone a long way to meet the requirements of the delegations of France, Sweden and the United Kingdom. To prove to the Council the extent of the compromises made he proposed to deal with the amendment point by point.

5. Paragraphs 1 and 2 were amendments to draft resolution B which in essence reproduced those proposed in the two final paragraphs of the three-Power amendment (E/L.545). Under paragraph 5 the new paragraphs 7(a) and 7(c) incorporated the proposals of the Venezuelan delegation; paragraph 7(d) those of the Indian and certain other delegations. The new paragraph 8 included the words "within the framework of criteria and priorities established by Council resolutions 324 (XI) and 451A (XIV)" with a view to meeting the wishes of the United Kingdom delegation, and it was unfortunate that the sponsors of the three-Power amendment still remained unsatisfied. The resolutions cited did indeed offer a framework within which to establish a more concise list of priorities relating directly to a concerted programme of social action. The original list of priorities given in resolution 451A (XIV) covered a broader field, including all kinds of priorities in the economic field, and could therefore not be substituted for the more concise list offered in paragraph 8 of the joint amendment. In the new paragraph 9 the words "considers it advisable . . . to pay particular attention to" had been included in order to make it clear that while the three practical methods and techniques specified in subparagraphs (a), (b) and (c) deserved special attention, other methods and techniques would not be excluded. In the new paragraph 10, the words "related to community development in their respective countries" had been inserted to indicate that the resolution was concerned primarily with the subject of community development. Lastly, in the new paragraph 12, the words "methods and techniques" had been substituted for the word "activities" as that had seemed a more appropriate wording.

6. With regard to the three-Power amendment (E/L.546), he felt that paragraph 1 was limited simply to observing that a programme of action in the social field existed and that nothing more was needed. That feeling was supported by the wording of paragraph 2, which substituted a reference to a general list of criteria and priorities in the economic and social fields for a clear statement of the areas and methods of a concerted programme of social action. By no stretch of the imagination could it be said that such a reference to a general list would "constitute sufficient guidance . . . for the purpose of a programme of concerted practical action in the social field".

7. To curtail paragraph 8 in the way suggested would take the heart out of draft resolution B (E/2437) and leave the Council in exactly the same position as it had been in before the Social Commission and the Council began their onerous discussions of a concerted programme of social action. He was therefore unable to accept the proposed amendment and hoped it would be rejected.

8. Mr. EPINAT (France) wished to explain the reasons why the French delegation had associated itself with the United Kingdom and Swedish delegations in submitting a sub-amendment (E/L.546) to the five-Power joint amendment (E/L.541/Rev.2).

9. In the first place, the French delegation wished to underline the danger it foresaw in altering the order of priorities which the Economic and Social Council had established with so much trouble (451A (XIV), Annex, paragraph 10). Further, there was a feeling of anxiety on the part of the specialized agencies, which could not help feeling some concern at seeing United Nations organs modifying established priority programmes less than a year after their establishment. It was essential for the specialized agencies, if they were to be able to do effective work, to have a certain degree of stability in the programmes, so that they could adapt their resources and means to the task assigned them.

10. In formulating their amendment, the three delegations were mindful of the fact that the Economic and Social Council had made it abundantly clear, in framing its list of priorities, that the programmes, although listed separately, were interdependent and complementary. They were also mindful of the Council's view that the interdependence of economic and social factors necessitated the co-ordination of economic development and social advancement in promoting a rise in living standards, and that the projects financed by the United Nations and the specialized agencies should be selected in the light of that interdependence.

11. Such being the case, he was at a loss to see how it would be possible to draw up a selective list of priorities such as the very extensive list appearing in the five-Power amendment, without running the risk of placing the specialized agencies in a somewhat difficult position, as well as of abandoning certain priorities which had previously been established. The programme covered by that list was far too extensive—and hence too ill-defined—to permit of any positive progress.

12. In addition, he would like to be sure that paragraph 9, which dealt with practical methods and techniques, did not leave out of account the tasks to be accomplished, for it was his conviction that the tasks and the methods were indissolubly linked. If the authors of the joint amendment shared that point of view, the French delegation would approve the paragraph, which outlined the way to be followed.

13. He would like to observe, in conclusion, that the efforts of the drafting group had not been in vain; on the contrary, they had made it possible to reach agreement on a number of points of considerable importance, as the United States representative had pointed out.

14. Mr. VIRA (India) suggested that a separate vote should be taken on each paragraph of the three-Power amendment (E/L.546). He also proposed the deletion of the words "in the Council's opinion" and the word "sufficient" in paragraph 2 of the amendment in the hope that the amendment would thereby become more acceptable to other delegations. In saying so, he did not imply that the new paragraph 8 proposed under the five-Power amendment (E/L.541/Rev.2) was not acceptable to him. If, however, there was a question of prefer-

ence, he thought that paragraph 2 of the three-Power amendment (E/L.546), after amendment as suggested by him, was preferable to the new paragraph 8 of the five-Power amendment, as the former did not create any new sets of priorities or criteria. In the five-Power amendment, although passing reference was made to previous resolutions on priorities and criteria, there was no mention of important subjects such as scientific education, research and land reform.

15. Mrs. CISELET (Belgium) said that her delegation did not wholly approve of either of the two draft amendments; its preferences were divided between the different paragraphs concerned. For that reason, she supported the Indian representative's request and would like the vote on the amendment submitted by France, the United Kingdom and Sweden (E/L.546) to be taken paragraph by paragraph.

16. The PRESIDENT remarked that the Council would certainly have to vote twice. His opinion was that paragraph 2 of the three-Power amendment (E/L.546) should be voted on first, and that paragraph 1 of the same amendment—i.e., the sub-amendment to draft resolution B—should be voted on afterwards.

17. Mrs. CISELET (Belgium) agreed with the procedure proposed by the President.

18. Mr. MORALES (Argentina) agreed with the United States representative's views concerning the three-Power amendment (E/L.546). The list of priorities in the new paragraph 8 to draft resolution B should be retained because they answered the need for a basic directive for the carrying out of the programme. He agreed with those who thought there was a close link between progress in the economic field and progress in the social field. In general, the priorities listed in the new paragraph 8 related to social projects; many of them, however, would be achieved as a result of economic development and would therefore flow from action other than that contemplated by the draft resolution. Thus it was not possible—nor was it necessary—to state all the possible priorities, since those not covered under paragraph 8 would be covered by the general principles set out in paragraph 7. It was essential, however, that some priorities should be established, not only because that was desirable in itself, but also because the form of words used in the preamble to draft resolution B called for the preparation of a programme of concerted practical action in the social field and the establishment of criteria and priorities. The draft resolution also required that proper attention should be given to both the economic and the social aspects of the problem. Scientific education and research could therefore be included under the priorities in paragraph 8, since the improvement of housing, the raising of standards of health, and the control of communicable diseases—which were economic matters—would lead automatically to a social priority of that kind.

19. He was not in favour of paragraph 2 of the three-Power amendment, since it would serve to deprive the draft resolution of its most important element.

20. Mr. HOARE (United Kingdom) said that it had not been the intention of his delegation to attempt to

establish criteria and priorities which would endure for all time, and he would therefore gladly accept the Indian oral amendment to the three-Power amendment (E/L.546).

21. Mr. EPINAT (France) and Mr. MICHANEK (Sweden) also agreed to the Indian proposal.

22. Mr. TUNCEL (Turkey) said that his delegation firmly upheld the principle that economic and social problems were interrelated. That principle was recognized in sub-paragraph (a) of paragraph 7 of the five-Power amendment (E/L.541/Rev.2) to draft resolution B (E/2437). After careful consideration of the various opinions expressed by representatives, however, the Turkish delegation had come to the conclusion that the enumeration of the projects included in paragraph 8 of the five-Power amendment was such as to give some social problems a measure of priority over the economic problems set forth in the list of priorities. His delegation would therefore like the principle of interdependence to be reasserted in paragraph 8. Consequently, he proposed the insertion, after the words "by Council resolutions 324 (XI) and 451 A (XIV)" of the following phrase: "and without constituting priority treatment as against the economic questions included in the list of priorities . . .".

23. If the text of paragraph 8 were retained in its present form, the Turkish delegation would be obliged to vote for the three-Power amendment.

24. After further suggestions by Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) with regard to the order of voting, the PRESIDENT proposed that the Council should deal first with the three-Power amendment to resolution B (paragraph 1 of document E/L.546).

It was so agreed.

25. Mr. FOMIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), supported by Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America), objected that the three-Power amendment was unnecessary because it merely repeated the substance of paragraph 3 of the original draft resolution B (E/2437, Annex III).

26. Mr. HOARE (United Kingdom) said that the purpose of the proposal for a new paragraph had been to affirm that the existing activities of the United Nations and the specialized agencies constituted the basis of a programme of concerted practical action in the social field. Since a basis was not the same as a whole structure, that aspect should be brought out. Paragraph 3 of the original text would then draw attention to certain needs which must be taken into account in achieving such a programme. The two paragraphs were not incompatible.

27. Mr. REYES (Philippines) said he would vote against the amendment because he could not accept the claim that the programme of activities now being undertaken provided an adequate basis for a programme of practical action such as that requested by the General Assembly. The Secretary-General's report (E/CN.5/291)—particularly paragraphs 857, 858 and 866—showed that, owing to financial and staff limitations, he and the executive heads of the specialized agencies had been unable to make a thorough survey of the basis for an effective pro-

gramme of concerted action. Moreover, it was acknowledged that existing techniques and services had not been sufficiently adapted to the particular problems and requirements of less developed countries seeking to raise their standards of living. An attempt to remedy this situation was made in the sections of the revised joint amendment to draft resolution B (E/L.541/Rev.2), placing emphasis on community development and on regional consultation by which the less developed countries might make their needs known to the Council.

28. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) thanked the sponsors of the five-Power amendment for incorporating some of his suggestions, particularly those on the close relationship between economic development and social development. It was to be hoped that the apprehensions of the Turkish representative would be allayed by a more thorough examination of the principles set forth in paragraph 7. He could not accept the three-Power amendment to draft resolution B, even with the inclusion of the Indian oral amendment.

29. Mr. HOARE (United Kingdom) said that the discussion had shown that the intention and meaning of the three-Power amendment (E/L.546) had been misunderstood. Its sponsors had thought it necessary to insert a clause bearing on the relation between present activities and a future programme of concerted practical action. That was all that had been intended, and there had never been any suggestion that the programme of present activities constituted an adequate basis for the future programme. Since the revised five-Power amendment (E/L.541/Rev.2) and paragraph 3 of the original text (E/2437) went a long way towards achieving the same purpose as that which the three-Power amendment had been intended to attain, the sponsors of the latter were prepared to withdraw paragraph 1 in document E/L.546.

30. The PRESIDENT asked the Council to turn to point 1 of the revised five-Power amendment (E/L.541/Rev.2) to draft resolution B (E/2437).

31. Mrs. CISELET (Belgium) asked whether the United States representative and the co-sponsors of the revised joint amendment (E/L.541/Rev.2) would agree to the insertion of the words "with appreciation" after the word "Notes" in the new paragraph which was to follow paragraph 2. She felt that the Secretary-General had done an excellent piece of work in preparing the report in conjunction with the specialized agencies, and that the Council should express its appreciation.

32. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that he, and probably the other sponsors of the revised joint amendment, would be glad to accept the addition proposed by the Belgian representative.

33. Mr. FOMIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the difficulty about the Belgian oral amendment was that the Council had not examined the Secretary-General's report (E/CN.5/291) at all thoroughly, and that the Social Commission itself had not expressed satisfaction with it. The Council was engaged in drawing up a programme of concerted action which might not be wholly consistent with that recommended by the

Secretary-General. The specialized agencies and non-governmental organizations might be confused by any discrepancies.

34. Mrs. CISELET (Belgium) thanked the authors of the joint amendment for agreeing to her proposal. She could not quite understand the point made by the Soviet Union representative, seeing that the additional words she had suggested referred to the word "Notes", leaving the organizations concerned full freedom of interpretation.

Paragraph 1 of the revised joint amendment (E/L.541/Rev.2), with the oral amendment proposed by Belgium, was adopted by 16 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Paragraph 2 of the revised joint amendment was adopted unanimously.

35. The PRESIDENT observed that paragraph 3 in the revised five-Power amendment had been automatically adopted, and asked the Council to deal next with paragraph 4.

36. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) pointed out that a negative vote on that paragraph would mean that the remainder of the amendment would fall. That would entail jettisoning the Council's entire work on one of the most important subjects on the agenda of the current session.

37. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) replied that, on the contrary, a positive vote for that part of the amendment would imply that the entire work of the Social Commission would fall and would be replaced by a text cancelling that submitted by one of the Council's most important functional commissions. The terms in which the Social Commission's draft resolution B had been couched were generally acceptable. The Polish delegation had, indeed, some objections; but it would be prepared to accept the text as it stood in order to show the Social Commission that the Council had given its programme thorough consideration. Although the draft resolution could be improved, he was defending it both on its merits and because it represented the work of a body of qualified specialists who had drafted the programme and annex after long and arduous work. He urged the members of the Council, especially those who were members of the Social Commission, to defeat the five-Power amendment.

38. Mr. FOMIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) maintained the view which he had expressed in the general debate—that the Social Commission's draft resolution B provided a sound basis for discussion. The United States representative had argued that it was badly drafted and needed improvement; but the alterations proposed in the five-Power amendment were not merely drafting changes, but deleted many important points of substance. The Social Commission's draft resolution should preferably be adopted as a basis in order to avoid giving the impression that the Council was ignoring that Commission's work. A number of the sponsors of the joint amendment were members of the Social Commission and had had ample opportunity to raise any objections they might have had in that organ; to do so at the present stage was definitely unfair to the Social Commission.

39. Mr. REYES (Philippines) was surprised to find the United Kingdom delegation, which had not shown much enthusiasm for the Council's criteria and priorities, defending these same criteria and priorities in opposition to the United States delegation which had originally worked them out. The Soviet Union and Polish delegations on the other hand, were warmly defending a draft resolution of the Social Commission (resolution B) on which the former had abstained when it had been adopted by the Commission.

40. He was not clear whether the whole of the remainder of the five-Power amendment (E/L.541/Rev.2) would fall if paragraph 4 were rejected. The under-developed countries attached considerable importance to the provisions of paragraphs 9 and 10 of the five-Power amendment because they believed that it was an attempt to meet their requirements by placing emphasis on community development and regional consultation, and would not wish them to be discarded.

41. Mr. FOMIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) explained that his delegation had abstained from voting for the draft resolution in the Social Commission because in its view it was incomplete, although it provided a good basis for further progress. Thus, his delegation's present attitude was not inconsistent with its former stand, particularly since the United States and United Kingdom delegations were trying to amend the original resolution on the ground that the programme set forth in it was too far-reaching.

42. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America), replying to the Philippine representative, explained that if paragraph 4 of the five-Power amendment (E/L.541/Rev.2) were rejected and the original text substituted, paragraphs 6, 7, 8, 9 and 12 of the former would then become obsolete. Paragraphs 10 and 11 might remain, but in fact the whole amendment might as well be withdrawn.

43. He could not agree with the Polish representative that the adoption of the five-Power amendment would mean jettisoning the entire work of the Social Commission. The language used in that amendment was essentially that embodied in the original text, although in a more succinct form. The United States delegation, as a member of the Social Commission, could thus sponsor the amendment, which was simply a confirmation and refinement of the original.

44. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) disagreed with the assertion that the amendment was simply a confirmation and refinement. The comparison of even one paragraph—for instance, paragraph 9, which purported to reproduce section C of the annex—showed the omission of the vitally important studies recommended in paragraph 7 (b) (i) and other equally important subjects. The draft resolution thus amended would be only a repetition of pious aspirations instead of a real programme of concerted practical action.

45. Mrs. CISELET (Belgium) thought that the Council should take a decision on the sub-amendment (E/L.546) submitted by the French, United Kingdom and Swedish delegations to the joint amendment before voting on paragraph 4 of the joint amendment itself (E/L.541/

Rev.2). She proposed, therefore, that a vote should be taken first of all on the sub-amendment, paragraph 2 in document E/L.546.

46. Mr. MORALES (Argentina) and Mr. AZMI (Egypt) supported the Belgian representative's proposal.

47. The PRESIDENT said that he had come to the conclusion that to vote first on the three-Power sub-amendment (E/L.346, paragraph 2) would be logical, since the decision taken on that sub-amendment might well influence delegations' votes on the proposal to delete paragraphs 5 and 6 of the original text (E/L.541/Rev.2, paragraph 4).

48. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) maintained that the vote should first be taken on the amendment farthest removed, which was undoubtedly that of the five Powers.

49. Mr. FOMIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) supported the Polish representative's view, especially as some delegations might wish to propose further amendments to the five-Power text.

50. The PRESIDENT said that the procedural argument should be decided by the Council rather than by any strict application of the rules of procedure in the case at issue. He asked for the Council's decision on the Belgian representative's motion for a vote on the three-Power sub-amendment (E/L.546).

The Belgian motion was adopted by 11 votes to 2, with 5 abstentions.

51. Mr. FOMIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking to the three-Power sub-amendment (E/L.546), expressed his agreement with those delegations which had contended that its adoption would be tantamount to recognizing that the programme of concerted practical action in the social field could not usefully be discussed by the Council. But resolution 451 A (XIV) (Annex, paragraph 12) had laid it down that the Council should ask its commissions to review their future programmes annually; and, consequently, the programme proposed by the Social Commission was entirely in accordance with that resolution, whereas the three-Power sub-amendment was not. Paragraph 3 of the Social Commission's resolution just adopted (in paragraph 2 of E/L.541/Rev.2) referred to the need for reorientation. The Council has thus decided that the programmes should be reviewed and reoriented, but it was now being asked to decide that everything should stay as it had been. There was no particular objection to enumerating the items of the programme, as the Social Commission had done. The three-Power sub-amendment excluded the possibility of the Council's expressing its opinion concerning the details of the programme of concerted action, and hence the delegation of the USSR would vote against it.

52. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that he had voted for the Belgian proposal simply because the three-Power sub-amendment (E/L.546) was the farthest removed from the original text. If that amendment were accepted, it would render null and void all the work done by the Council and the Social Commission, and would revert to the earlier list of priorities drafted for a quite different purpose.

53. The Indian oral amendment weakened the three-Power sub-amendment even more. All that would be left would be to tell the General Assembly, in reply to its request for a programme of concerted practical action (535(VI)), to refer to a previous resolution as offering some guidance, without specifying what that programme would be.

54. Mr. VIRA (India) said that he had proposed the deletion of the word "sufficient" from the three-Power sub-amendment (E/L.546) to meet a point originally raised by the United States representative himself. The Indian delegation found all the texts before the Council meritorious, but the three-Power sub-amendment was preferable. If, however, that sub-amendment would really jettison all the arduous work that had been done both by the Social Commission and by the Council, that was wholly contrary to his intention, particularly as his delegation had voted for draft resolution B (E/2451, Annex III) in the Social Commission. He had merely thought that the three-Power sub-amendment was an improvement; but if it was not, he would be prepared to withdraw his own oral amendment.

55. Mr. HOARE (United Kingdom) reminded the Indian representative that the sponsors of the three-Power sub-amendment had already accepted his oral amendment. He explained that the priorities to which Council resolution 451 A (XIV) referred were not relative priorities; the intention had merely been to bring certain items into relief. The question of an annual or any other review, or reorientation, was completely immaterial. Paragraph 3 of the Social Commission's draft resolution B merely meant that some readjustments might have to be made by the specialized agencies in the light of the amount of attention the Council felt that particular activities should receive. The General Assembly had given the Council no mandate to re-write the list of priorities, and that was precisely what the sponsors of the three-Power sub-amendment did not wish to see done. All that they had tried to do had been to select the specifically social activities and to re-classify the remainder. The Council should be extremely cautious about upsetting the order of priorities already established.

The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.