

UNITED NATIONS
**ECONOMIC AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL**

OFFICIAL RECORDS



TWELFTH SESSION, **437th**

(OPENING) MEETING

Tuesday, 20 February 1951, at 3 p.m.

SANTIAGO, CHILE

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Motion on a point of order submitted by the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics regarding the representation of China on the Council	1
Election of the President and the Vice-Presidents for 1951	3
Adoption of the agenda (E/1890, Corr.1 and Corr.2 and E/1919)	4

President: Mr. Hernán SANTA CRUZ (Chile).

Present: The representatives of the following countries:

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

The representatives of the following specialized agencies:
International Labour Organisation, International Telecommunication Union.

Motion on a point of order submitted by the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics regarding the representation of China on the Council

1. Mr. CHERNYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking on a point of order, said that before the Council proceeded to consider the items on its agenda, his delegation thought it necessary to make a statement on the subject of Chinese representation on the Council.

2. The Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China had already informed the United Nations on a number of occasions that it did not recognize the right of the Kuomintang group to represent China, that it regarded the presence of representatives of that group in United Nations organs as illegal and that it called for their exclusion from those organs. The USSR delegation had supported that legitimate demand at the tenth and eleventh sessions of the Council.

3. A telegram dated 18 January 1951 had been received from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China, calling for the expulsion of representatives of the Kuomintang group from the organs of the Economic and Social Council on the ground that those representatives were illegally occupying China's seat.

4. Only the representatives of States and nations were entitled to sit in the Economic and Social Council. Since, however, the Chinese people had withdrawn all support from the Kuomintang group, the latter did not represent China. It was intolerable that persons with no political, moral or legal right to represent China should attend sessions of the Economic and Social Council, and it was equally intolerable that the People's Republic of China, representing as it did a population of 475 million, should not be represented.

5. In the opinion of the USSR delegation, it would greatly contribute to the success of the Council's work to invite a representative of the People's Republic of China to attend its sessions. In his absence, the Council was not in fact in a position to carry out its essential tasks.

6. The USSR delegation accordingly submitted the following draft resolution for the Council's consideration:

"The Economic and Social Council

"Decides

"1. To exclude the Kuomintang representative from the Economic and Social Council;

"2. To invite a representative of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China to participate in its work."

7. The PRESIDENT pointed out that, although the Economic and Social Council was authorized by Article 72 of the Charter to adopt its own rules of procedure, and although rule 18 of its rules of procedure provided for consideration of the credentials of representatives attending its session, General Assembly resolution 396 (V) had recommended that, in the interests of uniformity, whenever more than one authority claimed to be the government entitled to represent a Member State in the United Nations and that question became the subject of controversy in the United Nations, it should be considered by the General Assembly, or by the Interim Committee, if the General Assembly was not in session.

8. Mr. KUNOSI (Czechoslovakia) said that his delegation whole-heartedly supported the USSR proposal.
9. Mr. INGLES (Philippines) said that, having regard to the provisions of General Assembly resolution 396 (V), his delegation considered that the Council was not competent to discuss the substance of the USSR proposal.
10. That resolution had provided for the consideration of any question of the representation of a Member State by the General Assembly or by the Interim Committee for the reason that, by virtue of its composition, the General Assembly was the organ best fitted to consider the views of all Member States on matters affecting the functioning of the Organization as a whole.
11. Since neither the General Assembly nor the Interim Committee had as yet had time to reach any decision on the question of Chinese representation and since the Council was subordinate to the General Assembly, the proper course for it to take in a matter of such political importance was to await a decision by the General Assembly.
12. His delegation therefore formally moved, under rule 49 of the rules of procedure that, in view of General Assembly resolution 396 (V), the Council should adjourn its debate on the USSR proposal.
13. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) opposed the Philippine proposal, first, because it attempted to undermine the competence of the Council. If the Council was not competent to deal with the credentials of representatives, it was not competent to deal with other and far more important items on its agenda.
14. Secondly, the Philippine proposal was designed to avoid a vote on the USSR proposal by means of a procedural manoeuvre. The point at issue was not, however, a matter of procedure; it was one of vital importance to the successful functioning of the Council. It could not therefore be treated as the Philippine representative had proposed, but must be discussed fully in all its aspects.
15. Many members of the Council would agree that, if the question of Chinese representation, which had arisen some fifteen months before, had been settled in accordance with the principles of international law and with the requirements of the Charter, the United Nations in general, and the Economic and Social Council in particular, would be better able to fulfil their basic tasks. Under United States pressure, however, the representatives of a bankrupt political party, which had no authority as a government and which could make no useful contribution to the work of the United Nations or to the implementation of its decisions, had been retained in the General Assembly and in other organs of the United Nations, while every attempt to settle the question of Chinese representation had been sabotaged. At the same time, preparations had been made for aggression against the People's Republic of China, and that aggression was likely to spread to other parts of Asia.
16. The Council must decide the question of Chinese representation on its merits, in accordance with the provisions of international law and the requirements of the Charter, without regard to political considerations. It must not be influenced by the fact that the United States of America had not yet accepted the failure sustained by its foreign policy. A precedent for the admission of representatives of the People's Republic of China had been set by certain of the specialized agencies, which, despite United States pressure, had decided to recognize reality and admit the true representatives of the Chinese people.
17. The Council's agenda included many problems of the highest importance, which could not be adequately discussed in the absence of representatives of the People's Republic of China, whose experience and achievements in the economic and social fields qualified them to make a valuable contribution to the Council's work.
18. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) supported the Philippine proposal for somewhat different reasons from those given by the Philippine representative.
19. He had no doubt that the Council, as one of the principal organs of the United Nations, was master of its own procedure. He did not, however, believe that the Philippine proposal would in practice undermine the Council's authority in any way. It was merely a question of waiting until the General Assembly had had time to reach a decision.
20. In any event, his government was of the opinion that representatives of the Chinese communist regime should not be seated in the United Nations while that regime was engaged in armed aggression against United Nations forces in Korea, in defiance not of the United States of America, as some delegations had suggested, but of the United Nations.
21. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the Philippine proposal to adjourn the debate on the USSR proposal.

The proposal was adopted by 12 votes to 6.
22. Mr. CHERNYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that by adopting the Philippine proposal, the Council had succeeded in evading a decision for which it did not wish to accept the responsibility. The USSR delegation deplored that action as illegal and unjustifiable, since in its opinion the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China was the only government entitled to represent China in the United Nations.
23. Mr. SCHAULSOHN (Chile) considered that the USSR proposal, at least in the form in which it then stood, was unsatisfactory from the standpoint of procedure, since it was not within the Council's competence to exclude one representative of a country and invite another to take his place.
24. He had voted for the Philippine proposal, first, because his delegation considered that a question affecting all organs of the United Nations should be decided by the General Assembly, in which all Member States were represented, and secondly, because it considered that the problem of representation should be settled once and for all. It had introduced a proposal in the *Ad Hoc*

Political Committee at the fifth session of the General Assembly¹ with that object in view, but that proposal had unfortunately not been adopted.

25. In the interests of the prestige of the United Nations, it considered that the Economic and Social Council should comply with General Assembly resolution 396 (V) and should await a decision by the General Assembly.

26. Mr. CHANG (China) regretted the impression which the discussion of his country's representation might have given to the people of Chile. The arguments used by a number of speakers seemed to him to be unworthy of an organ of the United Nations and to be more appropriate to soap-box oratory.

27. He found it difficult to believe that the references which had been made to the Kuomintang group related to himself. He had represented the only legally constituted government of China, not the Kuomintang group, in the Economic and Social Council ever since its establishment and still represented that government. Despite the vicissitudes of fortune, that government remained the only legally constituted government of China. While the Chinese people were passing through a difficult period of adjustment to the modern world, they would surmount their difficulties with typical Chinese patience and ability. No regime promoted by Soviet expansionism could truly represent them.

28. Unlike those delegations which had engaged in attacks upon the Kuomintang group, his delegation had always striven to make a practical and constructive contribution to the work of the Economic and Social Council. He had himself introduced the question of economic development in June 1946² and had participated in the drafting of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

29. He had voted for the Philippine proposal because he considered that compliance with General Assembly resolution 396 (V) was the proper course for the Council to take at that time. It seemed to him that the recommendations contained in resolution 396 (V) were at least morally binding on the Council; he had therefore been surprised to see that a number of delegations had not seen fit to comply with them.

30. Mr. KUNOSI (Czechoslovakia) said that he had voted against the Philippine proposal because he considered that the facts submitted to the Council by the USSR and Polish delegations had not been refuted by the representative of China.

31. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) said that he had voted against the Philippine proposal because it was not merely a procedural motion but rather an attempt to avoid a decision on an important substantive question.

32. He objected to the remarks made by Mr. Chang; it was not for the representative of a political party to decide how representatives should express their views. The truth was the same, whether it was expressed at a

political gathering or in a United Nations body. Moreover, he was not alone in his opinion of the Kuomintang; prominent persons in the United States Government had voiced similar views, in even stronger terms. Those views would inevitably continue to be voiced until the true representative of the Chinese people occupied his seat in the Council.

33. He deeply regretted that the opening of the twelfth session of the Council should have been marked by an act of injustice.

Election of the President and the Vice-Presidents for 1951

[Agenda item 1]

ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT

34. Sir Ramaswami MUDALIAR (India) proposed Mr. Santa Cruz (Chile), not only as a tribute to the country which he represented and which was acting as host to the Council, but also as a tribute to the important contributions he had made to the work of the United Nations as representative of Chile and in particular as President of the Economic and Social Council during 1950.

35. Sir Bertrand JERRAM (United Kingdom), Mr. BORIS (France), Baron VAN DER STRATEN-WAILLET (Belgium), Mr. ARROYO TORRES (Uruguay), Mr. CHANG (China), Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) and Mr. CABADA (Peru) supported the proposal of the Indian representative.

36. Mr. CHERNYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed Mr. Katz-Suchy (Poland). Mr. Katz-Suchy was eminently qualified for that office in view of his great contribution to the work of the United Nations bodies, and particularly that of the Council. The country which he represented had made great progress in the social and economic fields in recent years and its experience would greatly help the Council in its work. His election would also be desirable from the point of view of equitable geographical distribution, Poland being one of the Eastern European countries of which no representative had as yet been President in the Council.

37. Mr. KUNOSI (Czechoslovakia) supported the USSR representative's proposal.

38. The PRESIDENT noted that two candidates had been nominated for President. In accordance with rule 66 of the rules of procedure, the Council must vote by secret ballot.

39. He invited the representative of India to preside during the voting.

Sir Ramaswami Mudaliar (India) took his seat as Acting President.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

At the invitation of the Acting President, Mr. Kunosi (Czechoslovakia) and Mr. Cabada (Peru) acted as tellers.

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Session, Ad Hoc Political Committee*, 58th meeting.

² See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Second Session*, 7th meeting.

Number of ballot papers:	18
Invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	18
Abstentions:	0
Number of votes cast:	18
Required majority:	10

Number of votes obtained:

Mr. Santa Cruz (Chile).....	14
Mr. Katz-Suchy (Poland).....	3
Sir Ramaswami Mudaliar (India).....	1

Mr. Santa Cruz (Chile), having obtained the required majority of those present and voting, was elected President.

Mr. Santa Cruz (Chile) took his seat as President.

40. The PRESIDENT thanked the members of the Council for the honour they had conferred upon him by electing him President.

41. He would postpone his inaugural statement until later so as to enable the Council to proceed with the election of the Vice-Presidents and the adoption of its agenda.

ELECTION OF THE FIRST VICE-PRESIDENT

42. Baron VAN DER STRATEN-WAILLET (Belgium) proposed Sir Ramaswami Mudaliar (India) as the First Vice-President.

43. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) and Mr. CABADA (Peru) seconded the proposal.

Sir Ramaswami Mudaliar (India) was elected First Vice-President by acclamation.

ELECTION OF THE SECOND VICE-PRESIDENT

44. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) proposed Mr. Nosek (Czechoslovakia) as the Second Vice-President. Mr. Nosek had taken an active part in the work of many United Nations organs. Moreover, his election would be in conformity with the principle of equitable geographical distribution inasmuch as he represented one of the Eastern European countries, no representative of which had yet held the office of President of the Council.

45. Mr. CHERNYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Sir Ramaswami MUDALIAR (India) and Mr. BORIS (France) seconded the Polish representative's proposal.

46. Mr. CHANG (China) said that while there was no need for a secret ballot, he would not take part in the election of the Second Vice-President, and the Council's decision therefore could not be considered as unanimous.

Mr. Nosek (Czechoslovakia) was elected Second Vice-President by acclamation.

Adoption of the agenda (E/1890, Corr.1 and Corr.2 and E/1919)

[Agenda item 2]

47. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the Agenda Committee's report (E/1919), which consisted of three

parts: recommendations regarding the inclusion, deletion or deferment of items (paragraphs 3 to 10), recommendations regarding the procedure to be followed in the consideration of agenda items (paragraphs 11 to 15) and recommendations regarding the order in which the items would be considered (paragraphs 16 to 18). A more detailed account of the Agenda Committee's proceedings could be found in the summary records of the Agenda Committee's meetings (E/C.3/SR.22 and E/C.3/SR.23).

RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THE INCLUSION, DELETION OR DEFERMENT OF ITEMS

48. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) proposed the deletion of item 24 of the provisional agenda which involved the question of the accession by the Government of the German Federal Republic to the Convention on Road Traffic.

49. That government did not represent the German people as a whole and had been constituted in violation of the Potsdam Agreement, which provided that Germany should form an economic and political entity. The Economic and Social Council should not set precedents for violations of international agreements by including such an item in the agenda. The question was not a purely technical one; it involved principles of international law. The Polish delegation did not feel that the Government of the German Federal Republic was entitled to accede to the Convention on Road Traffic or to any other international agreement.

50. Mr. CHERNYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) supported the Polish representative's proposal for the reasons stated by that representative.

51. As regards item 14 — "Trade-union rights: allegations regarding infringements of trade-union rights" — he did not object to its inclusion. On the contrary, he welcomed discussion of that question, but he reserved his position on the slanderous allegations made in connexion with that item.

52. Mr. CORLEY SMITH (United Kingdom), referring to the Polish representative's suggestion for the deletion of item 24, pointed to paragraph 4 of the Agenda Committee's report giving the reasons why his delegation had proposed the inclusion of that item in the Council's agenda. He hoped that the item would be retained.

53. As regards the proposal made by the Polish representative in the Agenda Committee for the deletion of item 11, he supported that proposal, not because he considered that the item fell within the domestic jurisdiction of the States concerned, as the Polish representative had maintained, but for different reasons. The item had originally been submitted in 1947 by the International Co-operative Alliance and had subsequently been re-submitted at several sessions of the Council. The proposal had been based on the assumption that there was a world shortage of oil resources. Inasmuch as that was not the case, there was no need to go into the question.

54. With reference to item 23 — "Development of a twenty-year programme for achieving peace through the

United Nations" — he noted that it consisted of three parts, dealing with economic development, human rights and the work of the specialized agencies. In order to avoid duplication of work, the Council might consider each of those parts at plenary meetings as recommended by the Agenda Committee, together with items 4, 5, and 6; 12 and 26 which dealt respectively with those three questions.

55. Mr. NYSTROM (Sweden), said with reference to the Polish representative's proposal regarding item 24, that the item should be retained on the agenda in view of its importance to European road traffic.

56. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the Polish representative's proposal for the deletion of item 24 of the agenda.

The proposal was rejected by 15 votes to 3.

57. The PRESIDENT, while appreciating the motives for the United Kingdom representative's proposal concerning item 23, thought that the Council would better fulfil the wishes of the General Assembly, expressed in its resolution 494 (V), if it were first to hold a short discussion on the Secretary-General's memorandum (E/1900) as a whole.

58. Mr. CORLEY SMITH (United Kingdom) said that he would not press his proposal regarding item 23.

59. Noting that the Polish representative had not maintained his proposal for the deletion of item 11 from the agenda, he put forward the same proposal on his own behalf.

60. Mr. BORIS (France) supported the United Kingdom proposal.

61. Mr. SCHAULSOHN (Chile) was opposed to the deletion of so important an item and considered that the Council should examine it.

62. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the United Kingdom proposal for the deletion of item 11.

The proposal was adopted by 8 votes to 4, with 3 abstentions.

63. The PRESIDENT, in connexion with a point of order raised by Mr. BORIS (France), said that the Agenda Committee had placed item 20 — "Report of the Executive Board of the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund" — on the agenda on the understanding that the Council would subsequently decide whether one or both reports should be examined at the current session.

64. He then put to the vote the provisional agenda submitted by the Agenda Committee, as amended by the Council.

The provisional agenda, as amended, was adopted by 14 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

65. The PRESIDENT then invited the members of the Council to present any proposals they might wish to make for the inclusion of new items.

66. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) requested that the document submitted by the World Federation of Trade

Unions, in support of its proposal for the inclusion of an item alleging infringement of trade-union rights by the French Government, should be distributed to the members of the Council.

67. After they had had an opportunity to study the document, he would propose the inclusion of the item.

68. At the suggestion of the PRESIDENT, the representative of POLAND agreed to postpone his proposal until the following day, to allow sufficient time for distribution and study of the document.

69. Mr. KUNOSI (Czechoslovakia) drew attention to paragraph 6 of the report of the Agenda Committee (E/1919), in which it was stated that the Agenda Committee did not recommend inclusion of the item proposed by the WFTU, "Lowering of the workers' standard of living: a result of war economy", because the decision of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations not to request the Secretary-General to place the item on the provisional agenda must be regarded as final.

70. He considered the Agenda Committee's decision illogical, since it was absurd for the Council to consider itself bound by a decision taken by one of its own subsidiary bodies. Moreover, the question was one of great importance and urgency; the WFTU had submitted a serious document on the subject for the Council's consideration, and he felt that the Council should not refuse to examine the problem. The World Federation of Trade Unions was entirely within its rights in drawing the Council's attention to a problem the importance of which was widely recognized; and Mr. Kunosi thought it would be dangerous for the Council to uphold the decision of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations and thereby refuse to consider a problem so vitally important to many people throughout the world.

71. He therefore proposed that the item should be included in the agenda.

72. The PRESIDENT recalled that it was as a result of his own ruling that the item in question had not been recommended for inclusion in the agenda. In rule 10 of its rules of procedure, the Council had laid down a procedure for the treatment of items proposed by non-governmental organizations in category A, and the rule provided clearly that the decision of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations was to be considered as final. In the circumstances, he once more ruled that the item was out of order.

73. He explained, however, that his ruling in no way closed the door to discussion of the problem, since any delegation which so desired could propose the item for consideration. Moreover, in connexion with the discussion of item 3 of the provisional agenda — "World economic situation" — any member of the Council would have ample opportunity to comment upon the effects of rearmament on the standard of living of the working classes in any country; and WFTU would have the right to request a hearing by the Council on the subject.

74. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) considered the President's interpretation of rule 10 of the rules of pro-

cedure as both incorrect and dangerous for the future work of the Council. If that interpretation were accepted, the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations would become virtually an organ superior to the Council, with power to prevent the Council from discussing any item proposed by a non-governmental organization.

75. He pointed out, moreover, that the question was far too important to be considered in connexion with the *World Economic Report 1949-1950* (E/1910), which did not even devote a separate chapter to the problem of the lowering of the workers' standard of living.

76. In his opinion, the Council should be grateful to the WFTU for bringing the matter to its attention, and should welcome the opportunity to study the problem as a separate item on the agenda of its current session.

77. Mr. CHERNYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) held that the President's ruling constituted an infringement of the right of the non-governmental organizations to submit reports and proposals for consideration by the Council. Moreover, the question at issue involved one of the fundamental objectives set forth in the Charter; that is, the raising of standards of living throughout the world.

78. He drew attention to resolution 49 (I) of the General Assembly, which dealt with relations between the Economic and Social Council and non-governmental organizations, with specific reference to the World Federation of Trade Unions.

79. The PRESIDENT pointed out that the procedure laid down by the Council, upon which his ruling was based, had been evolved in conformity with the recommendations made in resolution 49 (I) of the General Assembly. Rule 10 indicated clearly that a non-governmental organization desiring to propose an item for inclusion in the Council's agenda could do so only through the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, and that the decision of the latter Committee was to be regarded as final. He therefore maintained his ruling, pointing out that any member of the Council was free to challenge that ruling and have it put to the vote.

80. He further drew attention to the fact that under the terms of rule 85, the Council could suspend any of its rules of procedure at any time, if it so desired.

81. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) felt that the matter was too important to be decided on the basis of a vote on a ruling by the President. He was concerned with the fundamental principle involved; the precedent which such a ruling would set might well endanger the Council's relations with the non-governmental organizations. It was unthinkable that the Council should empower one of its small subsidiary bodies to make decisions which must be accepted as final.

82. He appealed to the President to withdraw his ruling.

83. Mr. CABADA (Peru), referring to a remark by the PRESIDENT, said that if the rules of procedure were to be altered, the modifications could not be made

to apply retroactively to the question at issue, but must apply only to future cases.

84. Mr. CHERNYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought that the problem would not be solved by amending rule 10; it was essential that the rules of procedure should be interpreted and applied in conformity with the spirit of the General Assembly's resolutions. The mere fact that the Council NGO Committee had taken a decision by a majority vote did not alter the fact that that decision was a violation of the spirit of resolution 49 (I) of the General Assembly.

85. He added that several of the Council's rules of procedure, among them rule 10, were illegal and invalid, having been adopted at a time when several members of the Council were absent.

86. Mr. CORLEY SMITH (United Kingdom) declared that the last statement of the USSR representative was unacceptable; if rule 10 were to be considered illegal, all the other rules of procedure must be equally illegal, since they had been adopted at the same time.

87. He supported the President's ruling, and stressed the fact that the item in question could be proposed for inclusion by any delegation in its own name. He could not agree with the Polish representative that a question of precedent was involved, since other items proposed by non-governmental organizations had been refused by the Council NGO Committee.

88. He urged that the Council should give close attention to the report of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations and to the statements on the question at issue which several delegations had inserted in the record. It would be noted that no objection to the item itself had been raised; it had merely been pointed out that the substance of the question could be dealt with in connexion with certain other items already included in the provisional agenda.

89. The PRESIDENT observed that since no member of the Council had formally challenged his ruling, the ruling would stand.

RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THE PROCEDURE TO BE FOLLOWED IN THE CONSIDERATION OF AGENDA ITEMS

That part of the report was adopted without discussion.

RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THE ORDER IN WHICH ITEMS WILL BE CONSIDERED

90. Mr. ANDRADA (International Telecommunication Union) thanked the Council, on behalf of his organization, for its invitation to attend the current session, and stressed the desire of the International Telecommunication Union to continue its close co-operation with the Council.

91. In accordance with the terms of the agreement between the United Nations and the ITU, the latter had studied the Council's provisional agenda and determined the items which were of particular interest to it. The agency considered it desirable that it should be represented at the Council's meetings when those items were

discussed. Because, however, of the rules adopted by its Administrative Council regarding representation on the various United Nations bodies, rules which were motivated by concern for strict economy owing to the limited financial resources available to the ITU, it was essential that its representative should remain in Santiago as short a time as possible. Accordingly, the agency had dispatched a telegram to the Secretary of the Economic and Social Council, requesting that the items of interest to the ITU should be discussed at consecutive meetings as soon as possible; unfortunately, however, owing to a delay in transmission of the message, the Agenda Committee had been unable to take cognizance of the request.

92. He therefore requested that parts (a) and (b) of item 26 should be discussed early in the session, immediately before items 4 and 5, which were also of particular interest to his organization.

93. The PRESIDENT thought that it would be difficult to make the specific change in the order of items which had been requested by the ITU representative;

however, the order of items as adopted would not be firmly fixed beyond possibility of later modification.

94. He assured the ITU representative that the Council would do all in its power to meet the agency's desires, and hoped that it would not be necessary to vote on the ITU request.

95. Mr. BORIS (France) hoped that the French translation of the *World Economic Report* 1949-1950 would be issued soon, since it would be required for the consideration of item 3.

The last part of the Agenda Committee's report was adopted subject to the reservations made in the course of the meeting.

96. The PRESIDENT stated that requests from non-governmental organizations to be heard in connexion with items on the agenda should be submitted by 22 February at 7 p.m.

The meeting rose at 6.50 p.m.