



CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 4:	
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 ( <i>resumed from the 995th meeting and concluded</i> ) . . . . .	215
Agenda item 18:	
Elections . . . . .	215
Agenda item 15:	
Calendar of conferences for 1958 . . . . .	217
Agenda item 17:	
Arrangements regarding the report of the Council to the General Assembly . . . . .	218
Adjournment of the session . . . . .	218

*President:* Mr. M. MIR KHAN (Pakistan).

*Present:*

The representatives of the following countries: Argentina, Brazil, Canada, China, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Finland, France, Greece, Indonesia, Mexico, Netherlands, Pakistan, Poland, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yugoslavia.

Observers from the following countries: Bulgaria, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Federal Republic of Germany, Hungary, India, Israel, Japan, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Switzerland.

*Also present:* Miss Pelt, Chairman of the Committee to Review Candidates for Election to the Permanent Central Opium Board.

The representatives of the following specialized agencies: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, World Health Organization.

AGENDA ITEM 4

**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** (*resumed from the 995th meeting and concluded*)

REPORTS OF THE CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE  
(E/3034, E/L.770 and Corr.1, E/L.772)

1. The PRESIDENT asked the Council to proceed to a vote on the Pakistan amendments (E/L.772) to the joint draft resolution in document E/L.770 and Corr.1.

2. Mr. FARUQI (Pakistan) requested a separate vote on sub-paragraphs (1) and (2) of the operative paragraph of part I of the draft resolution as amended by him (E/L.772).

*Sub-paragraph (1) was not adopted, 7 votes being cast in favour and 7 against, with 3 abstentions.*

*Sub-paragraph (2) was adopted by 9 votes to 8.*

3. Mr. TSAO (China), explaining his vote, said that although his delegation continued to believe that the Commission on Human Rights and the Commission on the Status of Women should meet biennially, it had voted in favour of sub-paragraph 2 because it considered that the two commissions should receive equal treatment.

4. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the amended draft resolution (E/L.772), without sub-paragraph 1 of the operative paragraph of part I.

*The amended draft resolution was adopted by 8 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.*

5. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) and Mr. SCOTT FOX (United Kingdom) wished to make it clear that their abstention from the vote on the Pakistan amendments did not mean that their delegations did not approve the report of the Co-ordination Committee (E/3034).

6. The PRESIDENT announced that the Council had completed its consideration of item 4 of the agenda.

AGENDA ITEM 18

**Elections (E/2962 and Corr.1 and Add.1 to 11 and Add.1/Corr.1, E/3028, E/L.769 and Add.1)**

7. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to proceed to the election of members of the Permanent Central Opium Board, and announced that the Government of Czechoslovakia had withdrawn its nominee in favour of that of Yugoslavia.

8. Miss PELT (Chairman of the Committee to Review Candidates for Election to the Permanent Central Opium Board), introducing the Committee's report (E/3028) at the invitation of the President, pointed out, with reference to the final list of candidates given in the report, that the Committee had felt that the work of the Council would be facilitated if not more than one candidate of any one nationality were submitted. The list, therefore, included all the candidates nominated by governments, with the exception of certain persons of the same nationality as candidates already appearing on the list.

9. With regard to paragraph 4 of the report, she drew the Council's attention to addenda 9, 10 and 11 to document E/2962, which indicated that nominations of candidates had been received from the Governments of Guatemala and India after the Committee had completed its work and after the report had been issued.

10. Mr. FARUQI (Pakistan) said that, though on general grounds his delegation would be only too pleased to urge the Council to accept the nomination of candidates from India and Guatemala, he felt that in the interests of a businesslike disposal of the matter the list should be closed once the Committee had finished reviewing candidates. To permit the nomination of further candidates after the Committee had completed its work was unfair both to the Committee and the Council.

11. The PRESIDENT expressed the view that, notwithstanding the observations of the Pakistan representative, no harm would be done if the Council accepted the nominations received after the completion of the Committee's work. He suggested that the nominations received from the Governments of India and Guatemala be accepted.

*It was so decided.*

12. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider how it should proceed with the election of members to the Permanent Central Opium Board, bearing in mind that there had to be some kind of "personal union" between the Board and the Drug Supervisory Body. To achieve "personal union" between the two bodies, two of the eight places on the Permanent Central Opium Board were reserved for nominees of the World Health Organization (WHO) which had, in fact, nominated three candidates. He asked if the Council would wish first to elect two out of the three WHO nominees and then select the remaining six members by a separate ballot, or to elect all eight members in a single ballot, in the hope that the appropriate number of WHO nominees would be elected.

13. Mr. VAILLE (France) said that the resolution adopted by the Council at its 995th meeting (E/RES/667 H (XXIV)) did not call for a separate vote which would in any case be a violation of the 1925 Convention and of the established practice. In paragraph 2 of that resolution the Council invited the World Health Organization, the Commission on Narcotic Drugs and the Permanent Central Opium Board "to consider appointing to the Drug Supervisory Body . . . persons who are members of the Board". The 1925 Convention provided that the Economic and Social Council should appoint eight members possessing certain technical qualifications. The Committee to Review Candidates had observed that provision and had submitted two lists of candidates. His delegation considered that the Council should elect the eight members together.

14. The PRESIDENT called for a vote by secret ballot to elect eight members of the Permanent Central Opium Board, and he invited Mr. Soemintardjo (Indonesia) and Mr. Bourbonnière (Canada) to act as tellers.

*A vote was taken by secret ballot.*

Number of ballot papers . . . . .	18
Number of valid votes cast . . . . .	18
Required majority . . . . .	10
Number of votes obtained:	
Mr. Parreiras (Brazil) . . . . .	16
Mr. Reuter (France) . . . . .	15
Mr. May (United States of America) . . . . .	14
Sir Harry Greenfield (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) . . . . .	13
Mr. Joachimoglu (Greece) . . . . .	12
Mr. Kusevic (Yugoslavia) . . . . .	11

*Having obtained the required majority, Mr. Parreiras (Brazil), Mr. Reuter (France), Mr. May (United States of America), Sir Harry Greenfield (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), Mr. Joachimoglu (Greece) and Mr. Kusevic (Yugoslavia) were elected members of the Permanent Central Opium Board.*

15. The PRESIDENT pointed out that only six of the nominees had obtained the required majority. Two of them were nominees of WHO. Under the rules of procedure the remaining two members must be elected from among the four nominees who had obtained the next highest number of votes: they were Mr. El Tersawi (Egypt), Mr. Hossick (Canada), Mr. Looho (Indonesia) and Mr. Vishwanathan (India).

16. He called for a vote to elect two more members.

*A vote was taken by secret ballot.*

Number of ballot papers . . . . .	18
Number of valid votes cast . . . . .	18
Required majority . . . . .	10
Number of votes obtained:	
Mr. El Tersawi (Egypt) . . . . .	11

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

17. The PRESIDENT called for a vote to elect the remaining member of the Board.

*A vote was taken by secret ballot.*

Number of ballot papers . . . . .	18
Number of valid votes cast . . . . .	18
Required majority . . . . .	10
Number of votes obtained:	
Mr. Looho (Indonesia) . . . . .	12

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

18. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to proceed to the election of one-third of the membership of the Commission on International Commodity Trade, and announced that the Government of Romania had withdrawn from the election in favour of Bulgaria.

19. The six retiring States were Egypt, France, India, Pakistan, Turkey and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, each of which was eligible for re-election.

20. Mr. CHERNYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) considered that the election should be deferred

until the resumed twenty-fourth session, to give delegations more time to consider the question. He would make a formal proposal to that effect.

21. Mr. MELLER-CONRAD (Poland) supported that proposal.

22. Mr. CARNEIRO (Brazil) opposed the proposal to defer the election. The various delegations were, he was sure, in a position to proceed with the election immediately.

23. Mr. SCHURMANN (Netherlands) observed that as the election had already been postponed once it would be unwise to postpone it yet again.

24. Mr. CHERNYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he would not press his proposal to a vote.

25. The PRESIDENT then called for a vote by secret ballot to elect six members to the Commission on International Commodity Trade, and he invited Mr. Soemintardjo (Indonesia) and Mr. Bourbonnière (Canada) to act as tellers.

*A vote was taken by secret ballot.*

Number of ballot papers . . . . .	18
Number of valid ballots . . . . .	18
Number of valid votes cast . . . . .	18
Required majority . . . . .	10

Number of votes obtained:

France . . . . .	18
Egypt . . . . .	17
Pakistan . . . . .	17
India . . . . .	16
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics . . . . .	15
Austria . . . . .	12
Bulgaria . . . . .	6
Romania . . . . .	1
Turkey . . . . .	1
United States of America . . . . .	1

*Having obtained the required majority, France, Egypt, Pakistan, India, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and Austria were elected members of the Commission on International Commodity Trade.*

#### AGENDA ITEM 15

##### Calendar of conferences for 1958 (E/3040)

26. The PRESIDENT recalled that at its 989th meeting the Council had entrusted to him the appointment of members of the committee of representatives to make the necessary arrangements for the celebration of the tenth anniversary of the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. He thought it would be appropriate to establish a committee of six members, four of them being the States represented on the previous committee—namely, Chile, France, Pakistan and the Philippines. He hoped to select the other two members in the near future after consultation with delegations, and members of the Council would be informed as soon as the selection had been made.

27. Mr. FARUQI (Pakistan) said that he understood that the twenty-fifth session of the Council would partly coincide with the 1958 session of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East (ECAFE). He felt that the Council should consider arrangements to avoid partial overlapping of the two sessions.

28. Mr. BUXTON (United Kingdom), speaking as Chairman of the Interim Committee on Programme of Conferences, observed that the dates for the 1958 session of ECAFE had not yet been settled and were to be fixed in consultation between the Secretary-General and the Government and Federation of Malaya. He hoped that it would be possible to avoid a clash with the Council's twenty-fifth session.

29. The PRESIDENT directed that the comments of the Pakistan representative be taken into account by the Secretariat.

30. Mr. MELLER-CONRAD (Poland) observed that all the decisions of the Interim Committee on Programme of Conferences had been unanimous with the exception of the one mentioned in paragraph 5 of the Secretary-General's report (E/3040). The Soviet Union proposal recommending to the Council to decide that the Commission on Human Rights should meet in Paris in 1958 had been rejected by 3 votes to 2, the 3 votes being cast by the same delegations as had voted against the proposal in the Social and Co-ordination Committees.

31. While he understood the United Kingdom delegation's opposition, which was true to the spirit of Pitt and Fox, that of the United States of America greatly surprised him. He found it hard to believe that the United States delegation had forgotten the glorious names of its history, in particular those of La Fayette and Benjamin Franklin. He nevertheless hoped that the Council would declare in favour of the Soviet Union proposal, and that the fourteenth session of the Commission on Human Rights would be held in Paris.

32. The PRESIDENT observed that if the Council approved the Secretary-General's report on the calendar of conferences for 1958 (E/3040), and in particular paragraph 5, there would be no need for any draft resolution on the subject. If the report were not approved, he would put to the vote draft resolution H in the report of the Social Committee (E/3027), which the Council, at its 989th meeting, had referred to the Interim Committee.

33. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that he deeply resented the Polish representative's suggestion that his country cared nothing for history or the traditions of France and did not wish the fourteenth session of the Commission on Human Rights to be held in Paris. Other things being equal, he could think of no more suitable place to hold the Commission's next session. But since the resources available to the United Nations were limited, his delegation believed that they would be better used in assisting under-developed countries.

34. His opposition to the proposal to hold the Commission's fourteenth session in Paris could not thus be

interpreted as meaning that his country was unaware of the magnificent contribution of France to the cause of human liberty.

35. Mr. LOMAKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that his delegation had repeatedly appealed to the United States and United Kingdom representatives not to give priority to financial considerations, and to vote with their hearts rather than with their wallets. His delegation would continue to urge the Council to approve the recommendation that the Commission's fourteenth session be held in Paris.

36. Mr. EPINAT (France) said that his delegation deeply appreciated the tributes paid to the France of today and the France of history within the Social Committee, the Interim Committee and the Council. While regarding the proposal that the Commission on Human Rights meet at Paris as a compliment to his country, he felt that the position of those delegations which maintained that functional commissions should meet at New York was entirely reasonable.

37. His Government had not been able to solve certain problems, in particular that of premises, but had given the assurance that the members of the Commission would be given the best possible reception if it met in Paris. He hoped that the matter would not give rise to any controversy and noted that in any case the Council's decision was subject to confirmation by the General Assembly.

38. Mr. MACKAY (Canada) said that in opposing the proposal to hold the fourteenth session of the Commission on Human Rights in Paris his delegation, which had the highest regard for all the French people had done in the cause of human rights, was guided entirely by the strong arguments put forward by the Secretary-General concerning the administrative and financial difficulties involved.

39. Sir Samuel HOARE (United Kingdom) said that his delegation's objections to the proposal to hold the Commission's fourteenth session in Paris were purely technical: it fully recognized the achievements of the French people in the field of human rights but felt that the advantages of holding the session in Paris had been outweighed by the technical and financial difficulties emphasized by the Secretary-General.

40. Mr. FARUKI (Pakistan) moved the closure of the debate.

41. Mr. LOMAKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) opposed the motion for closure.

42. Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic) supported the motion.

*The motion for closure was adopted by 12 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions.*

43. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the report by the Secretary-General on the calendar of conferences for 1958 (E/3040).

44. Mr. LOMAKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested a separate vote on paragraph 5, which

concerned the fourteenth session of the Commission on Human Rights.

*Paragraph 5 was rejected by 8 votes to 7, with 3 abstentions.*

*The Secretary general's report, excluding paragraph 5, was adopted unanimously.*

45. The PRESIDENT said that the Council, having rejected the recommendation of the Interim Committee regarding the location of the fourteenth session of the Commission on Human Rights (E/3040, paragraph 5), would have to vote on the draft resolution on that subject submitted by the Social Committee (E/3027, draft resolution H). He put that draft resolution to the vote.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 8 votes to 6, with 4 abstentions.*

46. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) explained that if the French delegation to the twelfth session of the General Assembly was prepared to put forward proposals for relieving the financial burden placed upon the United Nations by the holding of the fourteenth session of the Commission on Human Rights in Paris, his delegation might well change its attitude towards the resolution just adopted.

#### AGENDA ITEM 17

##### Arrangements regarding the report of the council to the General Assembly (E/L.755)

47. The PRESIDENT drew the Council's attention to paragraph 3 of the Secretary-General's note (E/L.755) and asked the Council whether it authorized him to prepare its report to the General Assembly, in consultation with the two Vice-Presidents and the Secretariat.

*The Council approved the contents of the Secretary-General's note and authorized the President to prepare its report to the General Assembly.*

#### ADJOURNMENT OF THE SESSION

48. The PRESIDENT said that, in the economic sphere, the Council had concentrated its attention on the problem of reconciling the rapid rate of long-term growth with the need for maintaining internal and external balance. The problem was universal, but it was especially acute in the under-developed countries, where the margin of resources that could be diverted from the pressing claims of consumers to the needs of economic development was distressingly small. Though the rate of economic development ultimately depended upon the intelligence and vigour with which the under-developed countries themselves pursued sound policies of economic growth, they urgently required foreign aid.

49. Considerable attention had been devoted to international trade problems and, in particular, to the implications of the proposed European Common Market and the European Free Trade Area. While the lowering of trade barriers might be expected to increase Europe's prosperity, there was naturally some concern over the possible effects on exports from outside countries. It

was agreed, however, that it was too early to foresee the effects of the project and that the matter should be considered by the United Nations in its annual review of the world economic situation and its regional economic surveys.

50. Another important problem examined by the Council had been that of increasing the effectiveness of international consultations within the framework of the United Nations as to a means of improving international economic conditions. The Council had approved a resolution requesting the Secretary-General to prepare a report on that subject for submission to the twenty-sixth session (E/RES/654 E (XXIV)).

51. The Council had noted the heavy economic burdens placed upon many countries by large armaments expenditure and had expressed the hope that the United Nations Disarmament Commission and its Sub-Committee would progress steadily towards the goal of internationally-supervised disarmament (E/RES/654 B (XXIV)).

52. The resolution adopted by the Council on the subject of the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development (SUNFED) (E/RES/662 B (XXIV)) had been opposed by the three largest potential contributors, the United States of America, the United Kingdom and Canada. The difference of opinion related to timing and the method of approach. No one would deny that the governments and peoples of those three countries, the United States of America in particular, had made and were making enormous and unprecedented contributions to the economic development of the less developed countries. The cause of the under-developed countries was as dear to the opponents as to the supporters of the resolution. He hoped that the recommendation in the resolution would not hinder but further that cause.

53. The Council had also considered the part played by bilateral and multilateral aid in the development of the under-developed areas. It had been seen from the Secretary-General's report (E/3021) that the flow of private capital to the under-developed countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America was only half as large as the flow of public international economic assistance. In future sessions the Council might well compare the relative size of the two streams of capital funds for economic development.

54. Consideration of the problems of natural resources had again been prominent in the Council's discussions. In particular, the importance of energy resources for economic development had been stressed. Special attention had also been given to possible economic applications of new sources of energy, both atomic and non-atomic (E/RES/653 (XXIV)).

55. Considerable attention had been devoted to the work of the three regional economic commissions, which had become universally recognized as important instruments for the promotion of international co-operation and economic development. The Council had been impressed with the practical value of the commissions' work and with the spirit in which they had responded to the Council's call for improved co-ordination and concentration (E/RES/655 (XXIV)).

56. The Technical Assistance Committee had met for the first time during the present session with its six additional members. Among them he would like to mention particularly the representative of the Council's host country, Switzerland. The Council could not but have noted with regret that the Programme for 1958 had had to be somewhat reduced. He hoped that the obstacles to the growth of the Programme would prove temporary and that the rate of increase in resources which had characterized the work of the present year would be fully maintained in future.

57. The failure of international organizations to make any progress in resolving the chronic instability in the prices of, and the volume of trade in, primary commodities was significant. The subject should continue to receive the Council's active attention. The fortunes of the under-developed countries followed very closely upon the fortunes of primary commodities entering into international trade (E/RES/656 (XXIV)).

58. On the world social situation, the Council had engaged in an extensive debate which reflected the importance of social questions in the modern world. While the Secretary-General's report (E/CN.5/324/Rev.1) showed that social conditions had significantly improved in much of the world during the previous five years, it also emphasized that the progress made had been uneven. Indeed, the progress achieved looked less impressive in the light of the magnitude of the needs of the under-developed countries and the potentialities of modern science. The Council had also debated at length the serious problem of urbanization, understanding of which had been greatly facilitated by the Secretary-General's report. Its findings had enabled the Council to examine possible remedies for improving social conditions generally. Questions relating to balanced and integrated economic and social development and to the improvement of family levels of living had been fully discussed.

59. In the matter of human rights, the Council had been passing through a period of transition. The stage of drafting human rights legislation had now been mainly completed and the Commission was now, with the Council's approval, developing a new programme of concrete action. That programme had not yet reached the point where it had made any appreciable impact on the Council's discussions and consequently no momentous decision on it had been taken. The most important action taken by the Council in the field of human rights related to the observance in 1958 of the tenth anniversary of the adoption of the Universal Declaration (E/RES/651 B (XXIV)).

60. The Council's work on the status of women had been more substantial. It had adopted a series of resolutions relating to the rights of women (E/RES/652 A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I (XXIV)) and had taken an important decision about the periodicity of the sessions of the Commission on the Status of Women (E/RES/652 J (XXIV)), which had one of the finest records of achievement of any Council body. The quality of its work had not ceased to improve and it had acquired the increasing respect of the Council, not least through the efforts of the Council's Vice-President, Miss Bernardino.

61. The Council had heard with interest from the newly appointed United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, Dr. A. Lindt, at the 988th meeting, of the progress achieved in solving the Hungarian refugee problem and in carrying out the programme of the United Nations Refugee Fund (UNREF). It was certainly gratifying that the Council had adopted without a dissenting vote a resolution recommending a prolongation of the High Commissioner's office for five years as well as an intensification of the UNREF programme (E/RES/650 (XXIV)).

62. The Council had devoted much thought to questions relating to co-ordination and concentration. Happily, the Co-ordination Committee had been able to complete an important part of its work before the Council had convened and had also profited much from the personal participation of the Secretary-General and many of the heads of the specialized agencies. The major results of the Council's deliberations on that subject were embodied in a series of resolutions (E/RES/664 (XXIV) and 665 (XXIV)) and the Co-ordination Committee's reports (E/3034 and Add.1, E/3039). The problem of co-ordination was a continuing one and its importance would increase with the expansion of the work of the various organizations of the United Nations family in that field. Fears had been expressed that, under the garb of co-ordination, an attempt was being made to curtail the economic and social activities of the United Nations. The Council would do well to allay those fears by adopting measures which made its intentions quite clear and by seeking to increase the efficiency of programmes instead of just diminishing their size.

63. Finally he thanked all members of the Council for their co-operation and the Secretariat for their assistance.

64. Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic), First Vice-President, thanked the President for his kind references to her personally and to the Commission on the Status of Women, so dear to her heart. She was also grateful to the President and all representatives for the support they had given her both as First Vice-President and as Chairman of the Social Committee. Her work in the latter capacity had been the most unforgettable experience in her long association with the United Nations, particularly because she felt that her election to that office had opened the door for other women to assume comparable functions and thus eventually to achieve the complete equality of rights envisaged in the Charter.

65. Her country having completed the term for which it had been elected to serve on the Council, the present was the last occasion on which her delegation would be taking part in the latter's deliberations. She wished therefore to recall its wholehearted contribution to the Council's work throughout the past three years, and to express the hope that it might yet meet members of the Council in other United Nations bodies.

66. She paid a tribute to the President for the dignity, objectivity and skill with which he had guided the Council in its business. She also paid tributes to the Second Vice-President, the the Secretary-General and to all other members of the Secretariat, both from Headquarters

and the European Office, for the contribution they had made to the successes achieved at the session. Finally, she expressed her appreciation of the help given by the representatives of the specialized agencies and non-governmental organizations.

67. Mr. SCHURMANN (Netherlands) could find no better vehicle to convey his delegation's appreciation of the way in which the President had conducted the Council's debates than the model of the good man, described by the great Pakistan poet Iqbal: "His purposes are great. His ways are graceful. His glance wins him friends. He is soft of speech, but warm in his quest."

68. Sir Alec RANDALL (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the Canadian, Pakistan and United Kingdom delegations, associated himself with the very eloquent tribute just paid to the President by the Netherlands representative. If, as the admirable and balanced review just given by the President suggested, the Council had had a harmonious and fruitful session, that was very largely due to the President's wise and sound guidance. Not having had an opportunity of paying a tribute to the Chairman of the Economic Committee in that body, he would like to say how much the United Kingdom delegation appreciated the way he had conducted the Council's economic deliberations.

69. In echoing very sincerely the tributes paid to all members of the Secretariat, he wished to place on record his delegation's view that the quality of the summary records produced at Geneva was extraordinarily high, and to express the hope that as high a standard would be achieved in New York. Having said that, he would like to mention one or two minor aspects of the servicing of the Council's meetings, such as the distribution of documents and the provision of carafes, in respect of which arrangements at Geneva were not quite so satisfactory as in New York. But those observations were not intended to detract in any way from the great debt of gratitude which the Council owed to all members of the Secretariat, from the highest to the lowest.

70. Mr. CHERNYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the work of the Council's twenty-fourth session had been conducted in a businesslike manner and many of its resolutions had been adopted unanimously, despite the attempts that had been made to spoil the atmosphere of co-operation, in particular by the representative of the World Veterans Federation.

71. He regretted that the Council had not adopted the draft resolution submitted by his delegation on the suspension of nuclear tests. He hoped that subsequently the Council would find common ground on that issue and be able to adopt a unanimous resolution. The Council had also failed to adopt an appropriate draft resolution on SUNFED, and he hoped that the desired unanimity on that question would be achieved in due course.

72. That said, he wished to add his delegation's tribute to those paid to the President, the Chairman of Committees, the Secretary-General and all members of the Secretariat.

73. Mrs. LEIVO-LARSSON (Finland) associated her delegation with the tributes paid to the President, the other officers of the Council, the Committee Chairmen and the Secretariat. The President's friendly guidance had been particularly helpful to newcomers to the Council like herself.

74. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) also congratulated the President on the gentle and skilful manner in which he had directed the Council's deliberations. He expressed his delegation's appreciation of the work of the Vice-Presidents and the Committee Chairmen and of all who had contributed to the success of the session which, in spite of certain divergencies of views, had achieved much, not least in the field of co-ordination. In fact, the frank statement of divergencies, far from being disruptive, was conducive to better mutual comprehension and thus to real fundamental co-operation.

75. Mr. MICHALOWSKI (Poland) added his delegation's endorsement to the well-deserved tributes to the President, the Committee Chairmen and the Secretariat. The wide measure of agreement reached and the spirit of co-operation displayed were hopeful signs for the future.

76. Mr. GHORBAL (Egypt), Mr. SEKULIĆ (Yugoslavia), Mr. EPINAT (France), Mr. TETTAMANTI (Argentina), Mr. CARNEIRO (Brazil) Mr. CHENG PAONAN (China), Mr. THAJEB (Indonesia) and Mr. BENSIS (Greece) associated their delegations with the tributes to the President, the Committee Chairmen and the members of the Secretariat.

77. The PRESIDENT thanked the Council for its expressions of appreciation, and declared the session of the Council adjourned.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.