

UNITED NATIONS  
 ECONOMIC AND  
 SOCIAL COUNCIL  
 OFFICIAL RECORDS



THIRTEENTH SESSION, **557th**  
 MEETING

TUESDAY, 18 SEPTEMBER 1951, at 3 p.m.

PALAIS DES NATIONS, GENEVA

CONTENTS

	Page
Reports of the <i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee on the Organization and Operation of the Council and its Commissions (E/1995 and Corr.1, E/1995/Add.1 to 4): report of the Co-ordination Committee (E/2129 and Corr.1, E/2129/Add.1 and Corr.1 and 2) ( <i>continued</i> ) . . . . .	727

*President*: Mr. Hernán SANTA CRUZ (Chile).

*Present*: 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.

Representatives of the following specialized agencies:  
 International Labour Organisation, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

**Reports of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Organization and Operation of the Council and its Commissions (E/1995 and Corr.1, E/1995/Add.1 to 4): report of the Co-ordination Committee (E/2129 and Corr.1, E/2129/Add.1 and Corr.1 and 2) (*continued*)**

1. The PRESIDENT said that, in accordance with the Council's decision at the 556th meeting to proceed to a vote on section B and C of the draft resolution contained in the Co-ordination Committee's report (E/2129) and on the various amendments and proposals relating thereto, he would put those texts to the vote in the following order: the Indian and United Kingdom amendment to section B I, paragraph 3 (E/L.286); the Chilean amendment to section B I, paragraph 4 (E/L.287); the Polish amendment to section B I, paragraphs 6 and 7 (E/L.284); sections B I, B II, B III and B IV themselves (E/2129); the Pakistani proposal that the membership of the Commission on the Status of Women be increased to eighteen (E/L.285); and, finally, draft resolution D contained in the report of the Social Committee (E/2062) proposing that the membership of the Population Commission be increased to fifteen.

2. Replying to Mr. TSAO (China), the PRESIDENT confirmed, with regard to the Indian and United Kingdom amendment relating to a final session of the Sub-Commission on Statistical Sampling in 1951 (E/L.286), that no sessions of other commissions or sub-commissions were scheduled for that year. In view of the agreement reached at the 556th meeting that the Indian and United Kingdom amendment would be superfluous if the

United States proposal made at that meeting on section A of the draft resolution were adopted, the Council might perhaps wish to postpone the vote on that amendment until it had taken a decision on the United States proposal.

3. Mr. KRISHNAMACHARI (India) felt that there could be no objection to the amendment proposed by the Indian and United Kingdom delegations to paragraph 3 of section B I, whatever the result of the vote on the United States proposal with regard to section A.

*The joint Indian and United Kingdom amendment (E/L.286) was adopted by 15 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.*

*The Chilean amendment (E/L.287) was adopted by 17 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

*The Polish amendment (E/L.284) was rejected by 10 votes to 6, with 2 abstentions.*

4. Mr. INGLÉS (Philippines) requested that paragraphs 2, 4 and 5 of section B I (E/2129) be voted upon separately.

5. Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) felt it desirable that section B I be voted upon paragraph by paragraph. He would also request a separate vote on the retention of the reference to the Commission on Human Rights in paragraph 6 and on the retention of the words "or *ad hoc* bodies as appropriate" in paragraph 2.

6. Mrs. FIGUEROA (Chile) requested that a separate vote be taken on the retention of the words "the Commission on the Status of Women" in paragraph 7.

7. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) requested that a separate vote be taken on the words "to discontinue the Sub-Commission on Statistical Sampling" in paragraph 3.

8. The PRESIDENT put section B I to the vote paragraph by paragraph.

*Paragraph 1 was adopted by 15 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.*

Paragraph 2, up to and including the words "its regional commissions" was adopted by 16 votes to 2.

The retention of the words "or ad hoc bodies as appropriate" in paragraph 2 was approved by 13 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

The retention of the words "to discontinue the Sub-Commission on Statistical Sampling" in paragraph 3 was approved unanimously.

The remainder of paragraph 3 was adopted, as amended, by 15 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Paragraph 4, as amended, was adopted by 10 votes to 7, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 5 was adopted by 11 votes to 4, with 3 abstentions.

The retention of the reference to the Commission on Human Rights in paragraph 6 was approved unanimously.

The remainder of paragraph 6 was adopted by 15 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The retention of the words "the Commission on the Status of Women" in paragraph 7 was approved by 12 votes to 3, with 3 abstentions.

The remainder of paragraph 7 was adopted by 14 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

Paragraph 8 was adopted by 14 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

Section B I as amended, was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

Section B II was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

Section B III was adopted by 14 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

Section B IV was adopted by 14 votes to 3, with 1 abstention.

9. The PRESIDENT suggested that if adopted, the Pakistani proposal (E/L.285) should form section B V of the Co-ordination Committee's draft resolution.

*It was so agreed.*

*The Pakistani proposal (E/L.285) was adopted by 14 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.*

10. The PRESIDENT suggested that, if adopted, draft resolution D, in the Social Committee's report (E/2062), should form section B VI of the Co-ordination Committee's draft resolution.

*It was so agreed.*

*Resolution D (E/2062) was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.*

*Section B as a whole was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.*

11. Mr. ALVAREZ OLLONIEGO (Uruguay) explained that he had voted against the provision to the effect

that the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press should be terminated, because his Government considered that it should be maintained.

12. Mr. CALDERÓN PUIG (Mexico) said that he had voted for resolution B as a whole, because it had been drafted in a constructive spirit. He regretted that the Council had deemed it advisable to terminate the Sub-Commissions on Freedom of Information and of the Press and on the Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities.

13. The PRESIDENT, turning to section C I of the draft resolution contained in the Co-ordination Committee's report (E/2129) which dealt with the terms of reference of the Economic Commission for Europe, drew attention to the Soviet Union draft resolution (E/L.280/Rev.1), the Swedish draft resolution (E/L.281), the joint Indian and United States amendment to the Swedish draft resolution (E/L.289/Rev.1) and the Soviet Union amendment (E/L.291) to the latter. The Swedish draft resolution, having been submitted first, would have precedence over the Soviet Union draft resolution.

14. Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Soviet Union draft resolution (E/L.280/Rev.1) was more radical than the Swedish and proposed that it should be voted upon first.

15. Mr. KRISHNAMACHARI (India) and Mr. STERNER (Sweden) supported the Soviet Union representative's proposal.

16. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the Soviet Union proposal concerning the order of voting.

*The proposal was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.*

17. The PRESIDENT submitted that the Council should consider the form in which the Soviet Union draft resolution (E/L.280/Rev.1) would, if adopted, be included in section C (E/2129).

18. Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) believed that the only words which would create difficulty with regard to the incorporation of the Soviet Union draft resolution in section C were "The Economic and Social Council . . . Decides". They could be deleted if the draft resolution were adopted.

*The Soviet Union draft resolution (E/L.280/Rev.1) was rejected by 13 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions.*

19. The PRESIDENT said he would next put to the vote the Soviet Union amendment (E/L.291) to the Swedish draft resolution (E/L.281), followed by the joint Indian and United States amendment (E/L.289/Rev.1) to that same draft resolution, and finally the draft resolution itself.

*The Soviet Union amendment (E/L.291) was rejected by 13 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions.*

*The joint Indian and United States amendment (E/L.289/Rev.1) was adopted by 10 votes to 8.*

20. The PRESIDENT suggested that, if it was intended to include the Swedish draft resolution in section C, consideration must be given to the form in which it should be inserted since the preamble it contained would give rise to a difficulty.

21. Mr. KRISHNAMACHARI (India) believed that it would suffice to include the operative part of the Swedish draft resolution before section C I, sub-paragraph (a).

22. Mr. STERNER (Sweden) proposed that in the circumstances the Council should vote on the Swedish draft resolution as a separate resolution.

*It was so agreed.*

*The Swedish resolution (E/L.281), as amended, was adopted by 13 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.*

23. The PRESIDENT submitted that from the formal point of view it would be best to include the Swedish resolution with the other provisions in section C as part of the Council's decision on the terms of reference of the regional commissions.

*It was so agreed.*

24. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the Soviet Union amendment (E.L.274) to section C II.

*The Soviet Union amendment was rejected by 12 votes to 3, with 3 abstentions.*

25. The PRESIDENT said that he would now put to the vote the Secretary-General's proposal, the adoption of which had been formally moved by the Indian delegation, to the effect that paragraph (4) of section C be amended to read as follows: ". . . The Commission shall at each session recommend the date and place for its next session subject to the approval of the Council and in consultation with the Secretary-General. In special cases, the date and the place of the session may be altered by the Secretary-General in consultation with the Chairman of the Commission, the Secretary-General and the Council's Interim Committee on Programme of Meetings" (E/2129/Add.1/Corr.2).

*The Secretary-General's proposal was adopted by 15 votes to 3.*

26. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) suggested that the draft resolution contained in paragraph 3 of the report of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations (E/2127) which had been brought to the attention of the Co-ordination Committee, should be added at the end of section C, forming a new paragraph.

27. Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) wondered whether the Co-ordination Committee had been in order in dealing with a matter entrusted to another committee.

28. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) pointed out that the task assigned to the Co-ordination Committee related to the terms of reference of the regional commissions, whereas the Council Committee on

Non-Governmental Organizations had dealt with the question of the regional commissions' rules of procedure with regard to non-governmental organizations. The two were entirely different questions.

29. The PRESIDENT agreed with the explanation given by the United States representative. In fact, that distinction had been made by the *Ad Hoc* Committee itself when it had deemed that the question of rules of procedure of the regional commissions with regard to non-governmental organizations should be considered and reported upon by the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations.

30. He then put to the vote the draft resolution contained in paragraph 3 of the report (E/2127) beginning with the words: "Recommends to the regional economic commissions" and ending with the words: "during the thirteenth session of the Council", it being understood that, if adopted, it would be added at the end of section C (E/2129).

*The resolution (E/2127) was adopted by 14 votes to 3, with 1 abstention.*

31. Mr. MICHANEK (Sweden) explained that he had voted in favour of the resolution on the understanding that its adoption would not place any obligation upon regional commissions to revise their rules of procedure. The Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations had clearly specified that point in paragraph 4 of its report.

32. The PRESIDENT said he would next put to the vote section C as amended.

33. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) asked for separate votes to be taken on paragraphs (1), (3) I (a), (3) II (f), (3) II (k) and (4).

34. Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked for a separate vote on paragraph (2).

*Paragraph (1) was adopted by 15 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.*

*Paragraph (2) was adopted by 17 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

*Paragraph (3) I (a) was adopted by 14 votes to 3, with 1 abstention.*

*Paragraph (3) II (f) was adopted by 14 votes to 3, with 1 abstention.*

*Paragraph (3) II (k) was adopted by 14 votes to 3, with 1 abstention.*

*Paragraph (4) was adopted by 15 votes to 3.*

*Section C (E/2129), as amended, was adopted by 15 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.*

35. Mrs. FIGUEROA (Chile) said that her delegation understood that the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions had recommended that the General Assembly should not vote the funds required for establishing an office of the Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA) in Mexico City.

Recalling the very sound reasons for ECLA's decision, at its fourth session (E/2021) and the fact that a project on economic integration in the Central American republics had been accepted at the request of the governments concerned, and that preliminary studies had already been made, she pointed out that the Mexican Government had agreed to meet the local expenditure involved in that office. The saving achieved by the adoption of the Advisory Committee's recommendation would be more than counterbalanced by the expenses of persons who would have to travel from Santiago de Chile to the Central American republics. By framing such a recommendation the Advisory Committee had displayed its inability to understand the true nature of the functions of the Council and of some of its subsidiary organs. The Chilean delegation intended to raise the question in the General Assembly.

36. The PRESIDENT pointed out that the question raised by the Chilean representative was outside the competence of the Council and that only the General Assembly could deal with it.

37. Mr. CALDERÓN PUIG (Mexico), agreeing with the Chilean representative's views concerning the Advisory Committee's recommendation, said that its adoption would achieve no real economy. The Mexican Government had offered its full support to ECLA and he failed to understand why the Advisory Committee had made such a recommendation. The Mexican delegation hoped that the General Assembly would ignore it.

38. Mr. CABADA (Peru) shared the views of the Chilean and Mexican representatives. It was essential for ECLA, in his opinion, to have operational centres in various parts of the American continent.

39. Mr. ALVAREZ OLLONIEGO (Uruguay) agreed with the Chilean, Mexican and Peruvian representatives. He hoped that the General Assembly would reject the Advisory Committee's recommendation.

40. Mr. KRISHNAMACHARI (India), explaining his vote on section C, recalled that in 1947 the Indian delegation had proposed that non-member States participating in the work of the regional economic commissions be granted voting rights. That proposal had, however, been rejected and since that date the Indian Government had become a party to certain compromises within the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East (ECAFE) regarding its rules of procedure. In order to observe the gentlemen's agreement into which the Indian Government had entered at sessions of ECAFE, he had therefore voted with the majority on section C. He wished to make it clear, however, that that vote in no way indicated a change in his Government's attitude. It held that the best solution to the problem was that all independent countries should become Members of the United Nations.

*The meeting was suspended at 5.5 p.m. and was resumed at 5.25 p.m.*

41. The PRESIDENT requested the Council to turn to section A of the draft resolution submitted by the Co-ordination Committee (E/2129). He pointed out

that a large number of amendments had been proposed to that section and suggested that they be considered *seriatim* with reference to the paragraphs to which they applied. He also suggested that each amendment should be put to the vote immediately after it had been discussed.

42. The first amendment was that of the Swedish delegation (E/L.288) to paragraph 1 of section A I.

43. Mr. MICHANEK (Sweden) recalled that the reference in paragraph 1 to the holding of the Council's sessions at the Headquarters of the United Nations had originally been proposed in the Co-ordination Committee by the Mexican delegation. His delegation, however, felt that the Committee, in adopting that proposal, had not taken a sound decision and that the Council should reconsider it. The Council should each year decide where to hold its sessions in the coming year, since many considerations other than those of economy had to be taken into account.

44. Mr. CALDERÓN PUIG (Mexico) fully appreciated the reasons advanced by the Swedish representative in support of his delegation's amendment (E/L.288), the object of which was to annul the decision adopted by a substantial majority in the Co-ordination Committee. It was true that the Mexican delegation had, in committee, submitted an amendment recapitulating the provisions of rule 6 of the Council's rules of procedure. That rule had always been in existence, and had never prevented the Council from meeting elsewhere than at United Nations Headquarters. On the other hand, the adoption of the Swedish amendment would involve the substantive amendment of the rules of procedure—a step which, in the opinion of those delegations which had supported the Mexican amendment, would be undesirable.

45. The Swedish representative had stated that considerations other than those of a financial nature should also be taken into account. He (Mr. Calderón Puig) shared that opinion: the Mexican amendment adopted by the Co-ordination Committee was designed to enhance the effectiveness of the Council's work; it was precisely for that reason that the Committee had adopted it.

46. He did not deny that Council sessions held elsewhere than at Headquarters had the advantage of stimulating the interest of the various countries; but in view of the speed at which news could be dispatched from one end of the world to the other, the location of the Council's meeting-place was a matter of minor importance. Accordingly, he would oppose the Swedish amendment and support the text adopted by the Co-ordination Committee. Its adoption by the Council, he reiterated, would in no way prevent the latter from meeting elsewhere than at United Nations Headquarters.

47. Mr. KRISHNAMACHARI (India) considered that since the Mexican amendment merely re-emphasized the terms of rule 6 of the Council's rules of procedure, which were perfectly clear, there had been no real need for it. The Swedish delegation had objected to that unnecessary re-emphasis, and had consequently submitted its amendment which proposed that one session of the Council should be held at United Nations Headquarters, while

the other could take place wherever the Council decided, including Headquarters if that was so desired. He himself felt that it was not always good for the Council to conduct its business in the same atmosphere, and, in the view of his delegation, the Council should hold its sessions away from Headquarters as frequently as possible, while, of course, holding one session a year in New York. For that reason, he would support the amendment proposed by the Swedish delegation.

48. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) considered that the purpose of paragraph 1 was only to confirm or reaffirm rule 6 of the Council's rules of procedure, which seemed to have been forgotten. It was indeed as well to reaffirm that rule, for, even while that rule was still in force the Council had travelled to many places.

49. The Swedish amendment, on the other hand, would open the door still further to even more sessions being held away from United Nations Headquarters and he would therefore vote against it.

50. He wished to make it clear, however, that he did not feel that all the Council's sessions should necessarily be held at Headquarters. For instance, it had proved very useful to hold one session in Santiago de Chile, for members had thus been able better to understand the importance of a vast region of the world. An invitation to the Council to hold one of its forthcoming sessions in the Far East would also undoubtedly receive very sympathetic consideration from both the Council and the United States Government.

51. Mr. CORLEY SMITH (United Kingdom) pointed out that while the paragraph in question merely re-stated a rule of procedure which had been overlooked, the Swedish amendment would tend to change the meaning of that rule, since it implied that one session should be held away from United Nations Headquarters. His delegation would, therefore, vote against the Swedish amendment.

52. Mr. ABELIN (France) thought that the Indian representative had been quite right in affirming that the Mexican amendment raised a question of principle. The original text submitted to the Co-ordination Committee did not make such specific provisions as the amendment in question and, as a result of the latter's adoption, the resolution would appear to prejudge the whole question of the place at which the Council's sessions should be held.

53. He was by no means unaware of the existence of rule 6 of the rules of procedure and knew that certain considerations of a budgetary nature had been evoked in order to give particular emphasis to it. He would like, however, to point out that in any decisions of the General Assembly which were political in character, budgetary considerations rightly played only a subsidiary role.

54. The United States representative had suggested that an attempt was being made to turn the members of the Secretariat into globe-trotters. It was however customary for diplomats and statesmen to travel and obtain on the spot impressions of events which concerned them.

55. His delegation would not bring into the discussion the personal considerations which led it to prefer Geneva, since, quite apart from them, it considered that the holding of certain Council sessions at Geneva offered very real advantages which should be taken into account. The question was however far wider than that, involving as it did the universal character of the Council, which the French delegation was anxious to have stressed. When some Latin American countries had proposed that the twelfth session of the Council be held at Santiago de Chile, France had been in favour of the proposal, because it thought it a good idea that the Council should meet in Latin America. Such a consideration would apply equally to other parts of the world.

56. Of all the organs of the United Nations, the Economic and Social Council was the one most directly concerned with standards of living and human circumstances. That was one reason why his delegation felt that the Council should not always meet in the same spot, whatever advantages the latter might have, and however great a debt of gratitude was due to the country which had offered such generous hospitality to the United Nations.

57. In his opinion, the universal character of the Council and the need for the latter to meet in different parts of the world could never be sufficiently emphasized. What was true for the Council was equally true for the General Assembly. When the Co-ordination Committee had considered the Mexican amendment, the French representative had recalled the experience of the League of Nations, stressing the fact that the latter had failed to arouse sufficient interest for its activities among the peoples of its States Members. It was for the United Nations to draw the conclusion from that experience.

58. The Swedish amendment was a natural rejoinder to the amendment submitted by Mexico. Without prejudging the substance of the question, it interpreted the sentiment of a number of delegations and, he thought, of a very large number of nations. Accordingly, without in any way prejudging the substance of the question, he would vote for the amendment submitted by the Swedish delegation.

59. Mrs. FIGUEROA (Chile) expressed appreciation of the United States representative's remarks concerning the session held in Santiago. In the Co-ordination Committee the Chilean delegation had voted in favour of the Mexican delegation's amendment. Representatives of the Chilean Government had repeatedly expressed the view that United Nations organs should, from time to time, hold sessions away from Headquarters. Her Government was, however, no longer as enthusiastic as it had been for Geneva as a meeting place for the Council, since the sessions held in Geneva had not had the repercussions and publicity they deserved. But she was in favour of the Council and other United Nations bodies holding sessions in various countries—such as India or Pakistan, for example—since there was much benefit to be derived from holding sessions in different countries. By holding its twelfth session in Santiago, the Council had not only gained first-hand knowledge of the Latin-American region, but the people in that region had also learnt the

value of the Council. Despite the extensive media of information available for reporting Council proceedings, news transmitted solely through such media was not sufficient to teach the true value of the Council, because such news was always condensed. Teaching the value of the United Nations, which could only be adequately done by direct means, was one of the Council's functions. There was no doubt that the session held at Santiago had greatly influenced public opinion in Chile in favour of the aims and purposes of the United Nations. It should not be forgotten that governments, and consequently the United Nations, were dependent on public opinion. In view of those considerations, she would vote in favour of the Swedish amendment.

60. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) said that he hesitated to take part in the discussion, since he knew the views of all members of the Council on the problem and also what the decision on the Swedish amendment would be. He would, however, point out that although the United States representative had alleged that his opposition to that amendment had nothing to do with the question of where the 1952 sessions of the Council should be held, he would, if the Swedish amendment were rejected, almost certainly argue that its rejection was a reason for adopting the United States delegation's views when the issue was discussed under item 52 of the Council's agenda. The United States representative had said that the Council should re-affirm rule 6 of its rules of procedure. The Polish delegation was aware of no reason why the Council should do so; it would be illogical to pick out one rule for emphasis. In the Co-ordination Committee the Polish delegation had opposed the adoption of the paragraph in question. Of the thirteen sessions of the Council, very few had been held away from Headquarters; none before 1948. Moreover, the General Assembly itself had set an example for holding sessions away from Headquarters. He was prepared to vote in favour of the Swedish amendment, which, he considered, would imply confirmation of the Council's present practice in regard to the interpretation of rule 6. The Polish delegation considered that practice quite satisfactory.

61. He proposed the deletion of the words "at the Headquarters of the United Nations, unless the Council decides otherwise" in paragraph 1 of section A I, and requested that his proposal be put to the vote before the Swedish amendment.

62. Mr. YU (China) said that he was in favour of occasionally holding sessions away from United Nations Headquarters so as to spread knowledge of the United Nations and of the Council in particular. For that reason he was glad that the twelfth session had been held in Santiago. The adoption of the Swedish amendment would not change the draft resolution very much. The Council's decisions which had resulted in its twelfth

and thirteenth sessions being held away from Headquarters were simply taken in accordance with rule 6 of the rules of procedure, and the Council had the right to decide that its next session and any other of its future sessions should be held at or away from Headquarters. Since he was opposed to any restriction being put on that right, and since the adoption of the Swedish amendment would restrict the Council's freedom of action to hold its sessions in each of the three coming years at Headquarters or elsewhere he would vote against the amendment.

63. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that the fact that the Chilean representative had used the same arguments as he himself, although she had reached a different conclusion, showed that their positions on the issue were not very far apart. The adoption of the Swedish amendment would, unlike the adoption of paragraph 1 in the form submitted by the Co-ordination Committee, involve a change in rule 6, which was both unnecessary and undesirable. Of the thirteen sessions of the Council six had in fact been held away from United Nations Headquarters.

64. The PRESIDENT pointed out that one of those six sessions had been held in London where the United Nations had then had its temporary headquarters.

65. Mr. INGLÉS (Philippines) said that sessions of the Council should as a general rule be held at Headquarters, although some sessions should, exceptionally, be held elsewhere, if the change were justified by special circumstances, but he thought that special circumstances such as those he had in mind would most probably arise only at long or irregular intervals. He was opposed to the regular holding of one session of the Council away from Headquarters each year that the adoption of the Swedish amendment would entail. Consequently, he was in favour of adopting paragraph 1 in the form in which it had been submitted by the Co-ordination Committee. It was in accordance with rule 6 of the rules of procedure, which he took to mean that the sessions of the Council should as a general rule be held at Headquarters and away from Headquarters only by way of exception.

66. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the Polish representative's proposal that the words "at the Headquarters of the United Nations unless the Council decides otherwise" in paragraph 1 in section A I (E/2129) be deleted.

*The proposal was rejected by 8 votes to 6, with 2 abstentions.*

*The Swedish amendment (E/L.288) was adopted by 9 votes to 8, with 1 abstention.*

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.