

ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCILCONSEIL
ECONOMIQUE
ET SOCIALE/AC.7/SR.47
27 July 1948

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Dual Distribution for Council Members

SEVENTH SESSION

SOCIAL COMMITTEE

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FORTY-SEVENTH MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 27 July 1948 at 10.00 a.m.

<u>Present:</u>	CHAIRMAN:	Mr. KAMINSKY (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic)
Australia		Mr. JOCKEL
Brazil		Mr. GUERREIRO
Canada		Dr. DAVIDSON
Chile		Mr. MAQUEIRA
China		Mr. CHA
Denmark		Mr. DICH
France		Mr. KAYSER
Lebanon		Mr. HELOU
Netherlands		Mr. van HEUVEN
New Zealand		Mr. SUTCH
Poland		Mr. ALTMAN
Turkey		Mr. TARHAN
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics		Mr. KULAGENKOV
United Kingdom		Mr. RUNDALL
United States		Mr. STINEBOWER
Venezuela		Mr. PEREZ PEROZO

N.B. Will delegates who wish to have corrections made to the Summary Record please submit such corrections in writing to the Secretariat, Room C-436, within 24 hours of distribution of the Summary Record.

Also present:

Representatives of Specialized Agencies:

International Labour Organization Mr. METALL

World Health Organization Mr. HOWELL

Representatives of Inter-governmental organizations:

Preparatory Commission of the
International Refugee Organization Miss BAVERSTOCK

Consultants from Non-governmental organizations:

World Federation of
Trade Unions Miss SPIEGEL

International Federation
of Christian Trade Unions Mr. VANISTENDAELE

Secretariat:

Mr. LAUGIER Assistant Secretary-
General for Social Affairs

Sir RAPHAEL CILENTO Director, Social Activities
Division

Mr. MESSING-MIERZEJEWSKI Secretary of Committee

The CHAIRMAN welcomed the Chairman and the Rapporteur of the Social Commission and invited the Rapporteur to take his place at the Committee table.

DISCUSSION ON THE REPORT OF THE THIRD SESSION OF THE SOCIAL COMMISSION (Item 15 on the Council Agenda) (Document E/779)

The Rapporteur of the Social Commission took his place at the Committee table.

The RAPPORTEUR of the Social Commission stated that the Report of the Social Commission submitted to the members of the Council differed from Reports submitted at the preceding sessions in its greater length. The Commission felt that the work of the Council would be expedited if the main trends of the Commission's discussions were outlined in the Report; that would also put representatives in a better position to judge of the intrinsic value of the decisions taken and recommendations made.

There was a second factor which would promote efficient discussion; the President of the Council had addressed a letter to the Chairman of the Commission, expressing the desire that draft texts of any resolutions which the Commission might propose for adoption by the Council be included in the Report. Such drafts would be found in the body of the Report and in annex II (Document E/779).

There had unfortunately been considerable delay in distributing Summary records of the meetings, which had much impeded the work of the Commission (see Document E/779, page 3).

On the other hand the work of the Commission had been greatly furthered by the preparatory work carried out by the Commission's Advisory Committee on Planning and Co-ordination. At the sixth session of the Economic and Social

Council some doubt had been expressed as to the usefulness and advisability of setting up such a Committee. The majority of the members of the Commission had however expressed the view that the Committee had fully justified its establishment; and many of its recommendations had been adopted. The Commission had not succeeded in completing its agenda at its second session. That unsatisfactory situation would have recurred at the third session had it not been for the work done by the Planning Committee and its analysis of the Commission's programme of work.

Since the Commission's work was not purely technical, but covered various fields of activity, the organization of its work was not easy; nevertheless, the purely organizational phase could now be considered ended. It was generally felt, therefore, that the Advisory Committee should not be perpetuated as such. An agenda committee had been set up in its stead, consisting of seven members who would meet in 1949 for not more than five working days shortly before the next session of the Commission. That Committee would have to study the draft agenda of the fourth Session and advise the Commission thereon. The Commission was well aware that both from the organizational and budgetary points of view the number of Committees and Sub-Commissions should be limited to the greatest possible extent, and that the establishment of such a body as the Agenda Committee must therefore be based on sound grounds. In the present instance the experience of the previous three sessions of the Commissions suggested that such a step would be fully justified, particularly in view of the current rule, introduced in the

interests of economy, that the Commission should sit only once a year. It was obvious that preparations for that single session must be as thorough as they could be made.

Although it was universally recognised that in current circumstances economy was highly desirable, the Commission wished again to raise with the Council the question of the frequency of the Commission's meetings. The field of competency of the Commission was so wide and important that it hardly seemed desirable that discussion of all the subjects involved should be compressed into one single annual session. He asked whether it were logical that the Commission, as an advisory body of the Council, should meet less frequently than the Council itself. The Commission shared the conviction that the Council had a very important task to fulfil in the social field; it was therefore hardly right that the Council should be deprived of a report on the Commission at one of its two annual sessions. If the Commission were in a position to hold two regular sessions at least each year it would be the better able to promote and improve the handling of social matters.

There was the further consideration that were the Commission authorised to meet twice a year, the Sessions could be made shorter than the Third Session, and the increase in cost would be relatively small, particularly in view of the advantages which might be expected to accrue from the adoption of such a procedure.

The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to examine the documents before it and to make suggestions as to methods of work. He asked the Secretary to describe the documents.

Mr. MESSING (Secretary), after reading a list of the documents submitted to the Committee, assured representatives that the Secretariat would give every possible assistance where documents were concerned.

Mr. SUTCH (New Zealand) suggested that the best method of work would be for the Committee to consider the resolutions one by one, rather than to hold a general discussion on them. When it had examined the Resolutions, the Committee could proceed to examine those sections of the Report which embodied no resolutions. He believed that that procedure would shorten the Committee's work.

Mr. DAVIDSON (Canada) supported the suggestion made by the representative of New Zealand and suggested further that consideration of the Resolution on Migration should be deferred to a later stage, in view of the fact that the Commission on Population had also drafted a resolution on the same subject.

The CHAIRMAN accepted the procedure proposed by the representative of New Zealand and Canada.

RESOLUTION I: PROGRAMME RESULTING FROM RESOLUTION 58 (I)
OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY (DOCUMENT E/779 ANNEX II PAGE 41)

Mr. van HEUVEN (Netherlands) said that General Assembly Resolution 58 (I) envisaged very important activities in the social field, and that its implementation would mean the promotion of social progress and higher standards of living. The Commission recommended the continuation of the advisory social welfare services; that recommendation raised the question of finance, and the recommendation that efforts be made to secure increased financial participation on the part of recipient Governments was welcome. It would be

desirable for countries to be able to contribute up to fifty per cent of the expense involved. But countries in difficult economic positions might be unable to meet that expenditure if it were too high. He felt therefore that, with a view to the implementation of the programme, the present arrangements should be maintained, but that the Secretary-General should endeavour to secure increased financial participation from Governments.

Mr. DICH (Denmark) said that his delegation considered the advisory social welfare services to be a useful branch of the social activities of the United Nations and deserving of the Council's interest. In order to ensure the best possible results, while yet giving due weight to the financial aspect of the matter, he would make the following proposals.

He did not believe that the present arrangement, by which countries were able to choose the country of destination of their nationals holding United Nations fellowships, was wholly satisfactory. It was not certain that every country had complete knowledge of the best foreign possibilities for the study of various social problems. He believed that a better method would be to authorise the Secretariat or a special Committee to make a study to determine which countries were most suitable in that regard and to establish priority between them. Such a Committee would naturally take into account the wishes expressed by the country sending out fellows, but it should be empowered to propose and, if necessary, take a firm decision on, which country or countries might be chosen as fields of study in the social sphere.

If his point of view met with support within the Committee, he would possibly later propose an appropriate amendment.

With regard to the financial aspect, he did not propose to examine the question from the point of view of the most economical application of the funds of United Nations. His main reason for stressing the matter was that, as was well known, cheapness and waste went together. Countries would make better use of the fellowships or the consultant services if they had to pay more for them. Furthermore, it would only be possible to keep requests within reasonable limits if the recipient countries had to make a reasonable contribution towards expenses. He believed, however, that the differences in the financial situations of various countries must be taken into consideration, and that wealthier countries should be asked to contribute more than poorer ones.

Measures should be taken to cut down travelling expenses; and countries should be encouraged to apply for services, and especially for consultants, from countries which were not too remote geographically.

It would be advisable for the Resolution to include a directive to the Secretary-General upon the principle of scaling subsidies. He asked in any case that that point be incorporated in the records.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States) said that the United States Delegation had followed with great interest the discussion on the advisory social welfare services, and had carefully studied the Resolution submitted to the Council by the Social Commission in its report and discussed in the Secretary-General's paper (Document E/828). The United States Delegation was prepared to support the continuation of the advisory social welfare services in 1949. The Report of the Social Commission established the need for the

continuation of the services and indicated that the programme rendered great assistance to Governments; it formed indeed one of the most important activities of the United Nations in the social field. The advisory social welfare services represented an important means by which the United Nations provided services to underdeveloped areas, as requested by the Council. In accordance with the same Resolution of the Council, special emphasis had been laid in the programme on child welfare. Consultants provided to Governments had also rendered assistance in making the studies of social welfare administration requested by the Council in its Resolution 43 (IV).

The United States Delegation believed that, thanks to the extensive study of that programme undertaken by the Social Commission, it was unnecessary for the Council to study in detail the Commission's recommendations concerning the nature of the services and methods of administration. The United States Delegation accepted the Social Commission's recommendations on those points. The use of United Nations funds for that purpose was not only fully justified, but necessary, since it provided an important means of promoting social reconstruction in devastated areas and social advancement in under-developed areas. No other agency provided services in that field.

His Delegation noted with satisfaction the substantial financial participation of receiving countries. It was important to note however that that participation did not in fact represent any substantial reduction in the basic costs of the programme. Such economies in the use of United Nations funds as could be effected in that manner should be applied for meeting outstanding requests for

services, especially requests from countries that had not previously received assistance but which stood in need of them.

The United States Government was prepared to support the adoption of the Resolution submitted by the Social Commission and was willing to play its part in helping to carry the services forward for another year. It was prepared to support the programme for 1949 on the same financial basis as was adopted in 1948 - that was, \$670,186. He would therefore propose the deletion of the words "at least" in paragraph (e) of Resolution I, and that the figure in the financial estimate be rounded off at \$675,000 (Document E/779/Add.1).

Mr. DAVIDSON(Canada) commended the quality of the Report presented by the Social Commission and believed that it augured well for the future progress of the Commission. The work of the Commission, however, would only be effective if it could hold two sessions a year.

With regard to the Resolution, the Canadian Government viewed the programme with sympathy, believed that its continuation in 1949 was justified, and was prepared to contribute to the cost. He considered that the administrative policies and procedures were reasonably satisfactory, and that the programme could be continued on the same lines as in the past. He himself had had experience with the candidates sent to Canada and considered them to have been well selected and capable of taking full advantage of the opportunities given them for observation and the gathering of information. He had, however, certain reservations to make with regard to the last two sections of the resolution - (d) and (e). Progress had been made towards the achievement

of the aims set out in (d) but, as the representative of the United States had noted, the participation of the recipient governments constituted only a paper contribution. Any extension of the programme was therefore impossible, and he would recommend that every means be sought to make the programme self-supporting. He therefore proposed that the words "and intensify" be inserted after the words: "That the Secretary-General continue...." in section (d).

With regard to (e) he wished to indicate that the Canadian Government did not think it desirable that a definite sum, as proposed by the representative of the United States, should be indicated for appropriation by the General Assembly. He believed the time had come when the appropriation should be reduced, and while no such reduction as would cripple the programme should be made, a token reduction was worth considering. Countries should take an increasingly greater share in the financing of their programmes.

Disagreeing with the statement of the United States' representative that there were no other agencies working in that field, he referred to specialised agencies and non-governmental organizations in his own country and in the United Kingdom with programmes of fellowships, consultant services and seminars. The problem for the United Nations was one of co-ordination; he believed that in future the Secretariat would have to act as a clearing house for governments, specialized agencies, and non-governmental organizations in programmes of that kind. While, in due course, the financial participation of the United Nations would become minimal, the Secretariat should make a maximum contribution in the role of a clearing house. Some financial support was certainly justified and while he thought

a figure of \$500,000 might appropriately be submitted to the General Assembly, he did not wish definitely to specify a figure at that juncture. He therefore moved the deletion of paragraph (e) in Resolution I.

Mr. KULAGENKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) expressed the opinion that the documents before the Committee did not describe in sufficient detail the extent of the work done. He questioned the use of United Nations funds for the services described in the resolution. A great deal had been heard about the necessity for economy, as for instance at the preceding day's session on the question of narcotics.

The Soviet Union delegation was doubtful as to the wisdom of continuing consultant services, in view of the fact that those functions were of a temporary character; indeed Resolution 58 of the General Assembly, relative to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration had stressed both the urgency and the temporary character of such services. The necessity for them arose from the effects of the war, and assistance had been directed to devastated countries in need of help in various fields of social reconstruction. He had the impression that consultants were provided not only for devastated and backward countries, but for any country which wanted them. Thus the programme had been expanded beyond its original framework. At present, when the devastated countries were rapidly improving their economic systems and had already been given assistance, the Soviet delegation was of the opinion that the question of the financing of the consultant services by the United Nations should be re-examined. It feared that it was a case of unwise expenditure. If the current programme were retained, expenditure should devolve upon the

governments requesting assistance.

In view of the need for economy, the Soviet Union delegation believed that the consultant services should be abandoned. He would therefore move the following amendments to Resolution I:

1. In the first paragraph, sub-paragraph (a), delete the word "fiscal".

2. Insert a new sub-paragraph to read as follows:

"That the Secretary-General should furnish all Members of the United Nations with a full report on the definite work of the advisers in various countries from 1946 to the present time so that the Social Commission may at its Fourth Session study this report and any comments thereon which may have been received from the Governments of Members of the United Nations."

3. Substitute for the first paragraph, sub-paragraphs (d) and (e), a new sub-paragraph worded as follows:

"That the Secretary-General be guided in 1949 by the principle that all expenditure for the advisory services should be charged to the account of the governments of countries requesting such advisory services."

Mr. RUNTALL (United Kingdom) stated that he would not again put forward the proposals with regard to the financial participation made by the United Kingdom at the last session, which had then been rejected. He emphasised however that the United Kingdom delegation laid great store by the increased financial participation of the receiving countries. He endorsed the conception put forward by the representative of Canada of a self-supporting scheme, and was glad to note from

the Secretary-General's report that the participation of governments had increased. Endorsing the Canadian amendment, he himself moved the following amendment to section (d): insert the words "and should report from time to time to the Council on the success of his efforts" after the word "Governments".

With regard to the question of co-ordination, the Secretary-General's Committee on Co-ordination had set up a working party to examine the fellowships programmes of the United Nations and the Specialized agencies. He suggested that the Social Committee consider drawing the attention of the Committee on Co-ordination to that item.

Mr. KAYSER (France) supported the resolution as a whole and made the following observations on the proposals made during the discussion.

Some of the Danish representative's proposals should be accepted and even if not made the subject of formal resolutions, the Secretary-General should give them his attention since a number of delegations had approved them. For example the Commission should indicate the countries most suited to receive or to furnish advisory welfare services and to send Fellows. The Danish representative's suggestions concerning the financial aspect of the question were also interesting because of the regional connection which might exist between those furnishing the services and those receiving them. On that point his delegation wished to see an equitable sharing out of the services from the threefold point of view of the nationality of the consultants sent, of the nationality of the Fellows, nominated and of the recipient countries.

As far as the financial aspect of the question was concerned his delegation thought it desirable that the

recipient countries should share in the expenses. Their effort, however, should not result in a reduction of that of the United Nations but should permit its extension. They should in fact avoid discouraging economically weak countries, and inducing them not to ask for the help of the United Nations.

He pointed out a certain contradiction between two of the U.S.S.R. amendments, the one which requested the Committee to take immediate decisions and the one which requested the Secretary-General to submit a full report on the work of the consultants so that the Social Commission might deliberate upon it. Such a report might be useful but if that suggestion were taken up no important decision would have to be taken until the report had been submitted to the Commission.

Mr. CHA (China) supported the Social Commission's recommendations to the Economic and Social Council. With reference to the question of finance he did not feel that the figure given in document E/828, namely \$670,186, was a large figure. Far more money had been spent on one day of war. During the first World War one major country had spent \$20,000 a minute which amounted to \$28,800,000 per day for each major country. During the second World War the daily expenditure in a major country had been seven times greater, amounting to \$201,600,000 per day; in another major country the expenditure had been five times greater, amounting to \$144,000,000 per day. Meanwhile the figure proposed for the consultant services was \$670,186 per year, which was a very small figure in comparison.

Referring to paragraph (c), he thought that the words "at least equal" did not constitute a good precedent.

The Chinese delegation supported the resolution as submitted by the Social Commission together with the Canadian amendment to paragraph (d).

Mr. GUERREIRO (Brazil) thought that the Advisory Social Welfare Services constituted a useful form of activity and a valuable propaganda medium for the United Nations. They were of particular benefit to under-developed countries and war-devastated areas. It was essential that they should be continued in the following year, and if possible given a permanent character; consequently means should be provided for their continuance and, if practicable expansion. Other budget items should be reduced before any economies were made in that respect.

Nevertheless, recipient governments should make increasingly large contributions, according to their powers, to the operation of the services, although the main financial responsibility should continue to rest with the United Nations.

The Brazilian delegation supported the resolution in its present form.

Mr. HELOU (Lebanon) supported the draft resolution of the Social Commission and would if need be agree to the amendment proposed to sub-paragraph (d) the effect of which would be to request that the Secretary-General continue and intensify his efforts to bring about increased financial participation on the part of recipient Governments.

The co-operation which had been initiated in that field had proved very useful and very efficacious and even its secondary aspects were not negligible.

Concern about financial aspects which had been expressed during the debate was fully justified. Certain economies, however, might prove to be ruinous and the total elimination of the financial participation of the United Nations in the advisory social welfare services would be against the United Nations spirit of co-operation. The

considerable reduction in the participation of the United Nations was worthy of consideration, but not immediately, as a certain length of time would have to elapse before economies could be usefully effected.

His delegation had no difficulty in accepting the United States amendment to sub-paragraph (e), especially as other delegates had proposed much more sweeping economies than the United States representative.

Mr. KULAGENKOV (U.S.S.R), replying to the French representative's charge that the two amendments presented by himself were mutually contradictory, stated that it would be entirely natural for the Secretary-General to submit to members a full account of the work of consultants so that such work might be studied by the Social Commission at its next session. It was clear that the work mentioned should be subjected to periodical evaluation. No such assessment had been attempted up to the present, and it would be well if that task were confided to the next session of the Social Commission.

The CHAIRMAN, speaking as the Byelorussian representative, thought that there should be no reluctance to consider the question of economy in the United Nations budget, in so far as that was affected by the expenditure on Social Welfare Services.

Whilst \$670,000 did not represent a large sum, any increase of that amount might tempt certain recipient governments to relax their own efforts in regard to social services within their territories.

In citing large figures for wartime expenditure, the Chinese representative had indicated, wittingly or unwittingly, the road which national governments should

follow, that is to say, they should strive to consolidate and extend their own social welfare services. Whilst that had been the aim of the Soviet Union Government, the same development had not been evident in a large number of countries, which had, if anything, increased their military expenditure. Whilst preserving the advisory functions of United Nations, they should not countenance the continued depletion of funds in favour of individual national budgets. The United Nations should assist the various governments, but in making the best possible efforts according to their own capacities, those governments would be adopting the most direct, the boldest and the most realistic solution.

He supported the amendments submitted by the Soviet Union representative.

Mr. PEREZ PEROZO (Venezuela) emphasized the extreme importance of the resolutions submitted by the Social Commission. The situation in Venezuela, an under-developed country led him to hope that the Council which had given prominence to economic problems caused by the war, would place more emphasis on social matters.

His delegation wanted the advisory social welfare services to be continued in 1949 as the Report of the Commission requested.

As for the financing of those services, the main source of disagreement, he thought it just that the recipient countries should contribute, as much as possible to their financing. However, in consideration of the fact that certain countries were not in a position to meet the expenses of the programme established the Secretariat might perhaps share out the expenses on the basis of the contributive capacity of recipient countries.

In short, his delegation supported the Social Commission's draft resolution, the co-operation of the United Nations being unnecessary if the countries receiving advisory social welfare services had to pay for all the assistance given them.

Mr. ALTMAN (Poland) supported the Social Commission's resolution and thought that the advisory services should be continued in 1949, while reserving his country's attitude with regard to 1950. He noted with satisfaction that the financial participation of States receiving those services was increasing. Sub-paragraph (d) of the resolution dealing with the question pleased him since it emphasized the United Nations desire for economy. For the same reason he was not opposed to the United States amendment to sub-paragraph (e). He also supported the U.S.S.R. proposal concerning the submission at the fourth session of the Social Commission of a report by the Secretary-General on the work of the consultants.

Mr. JOCKEL (Australia) observed that the Australian delegation, in common with most others, recognised that this was a valuable part of United Nations activities. The Australian Government would welcome fellows, particularly from the undeveloped areas of South-East Asia.

The Council had made no financial recommendations to the Assembly the previous year, and there was therefore no reason why they should depart from their established practice.

He supported the amendments submitted by the Canadian representative.

Mr. SUTCH (New Zealand) pointed out that the Advisory Social Welfare Services were in fact the fundamental activities of the Social Commission of the Economic and Social Council. Members should note that they were sitting on a Social as

well as on an Economic Council. Since the end of the war there had been a tendency to overlook that fact and to acquiesce in a gradual reduction of social expenditure. At the same time expenditure for economic programmes had been steadily rising. Whilst not maintaining that the latter expenditure should be reduced, he thought that it should not be given such importance as to impede the activities of the social side.

The remarks made by the Chinese representative were timely and cogent. Nations had spent freely, without great demur, during war time. They should therefore reflect carefully before reducing appropriations for peace time projects destined to increase the social welfare of common men and to raise living standards in many regions.

It was only just that where a country could pay for the facilities extended to it by the United Nations, it should do so; on the other hand, the majority of the countries covered by the scheme lacked the necessary foreign currencies to send visitors abroad. Members should realise that any improvement in the social welfare of wide masses of the world's population would strengthen the foundations of universal peace.

The Resolution should therefore be left in its present form. The words "at least" had been inserted in paragraph (e) for good reason. So far from anticipating reduced expenditure for the scheme, the Social Commission had intended that the funds should be increased. However, in the absence of exact estimates for the coming year, it had not set down a particular sum, but had adopted the wording now before the Committee. The sort of expansion it envisaged was the extension of the Welfare Services activities

to "other areas", as suggested by the United States representative. In particular, the Social Commission had in mind newly emerging countries and other areas in South East Asia. These regions would be in urgent need of United Nations experts and their advice. The programme concerned not only fellowships but consultants and seminars.

He agreed with the Byelorussian representative that Governments had a responsibility to develop their own social welfare programmes.

He supported the Soviet Union proposal that the word "fiscal" should be deleted in paragraph (a). Similarly he agreed with the Canadian representative that the words "and intensify" should be inserted after "continue" in paragraph (d). The Social Commission had omitted such a reference in its own text since it did not wish to cast a reflection on the efforts hitherto made by the Secretary General, and it had preferred a more indirect phraseology. However, the words proposed by the Canadian representative would serve to impress the Council's wishes on recipient countries. For the same reason he supported the United Kingdom suggestion that a phrase passage should be inserted requiring the Secretary General to "report on the success of his efforts". There was no doubt that the Secretary General would supply such a report, but the text proposed would be a reminder to recipient governments of the grave view taken by the Council in this matter.

The Soviet Union's representative's suggestion that reports should be made on the work of consultants was superfluous in that this would certainly be done in any event; the Secretariat would furthermore gather the Committee's views from these summary records.

The New Zealand Government would not agree to a deletion of paragraph (e), nor to a deletion of the words "at least".

Mr. DAVIDSON (Canada) stated that the explanations offered by the New Zealand representative justified the reasons for which he had advanced his own amendment to paragraph (e). The purpose of this amendment was to leave the whole question of 1949 appropriations open until due discussion of this item's relation to the remainder of the budget had taken place at the General Assembly.

The Representative of the Lebanon had appeared to interpret this amendment as an indication of the Canadian Government's desire to withhold all funds from the advisory social welfare services. This was not the purpose of his amendment. The exact amount should be decided by the General Assembly.

Sir Raphael CILENTO (Director, Division of Social Activities), referring to the proposal that the Resolution should provide for a report on the activities of consultants and on methods used in furnishing advice to governments, stated that such a review was already provided by Study B, which the Secretariat had been instructed to prepare both by the Social Commission and the Economic and Social Council. This Study would be completed and a report submitted at the next session of the Social Commission in May 1949, and it would deal in detail with advisable and desirable methods of supplying advisory welfare services and advice to all governments.

In regard to finance, the Secretariat was of the opinion that governments were at present paying as much in local currency as was within their powers, and were in any case contributing substantially more than they had done the

previous year. Members of the Council should realise in this regard that governments were required to make no contribution at all towards services provided by Specialized Agencies and that on at least one occasion a government had refused to participate in a United Nations programme on the grounds that no such financial contribution was required for a similar programme organized by a Specialized Agency.

The Secretariat had endeavoured to enforce the rule that governments should pay according to their economic situation and were therefore already carrying out certain of the instructions contemplated by members. In contributing annual funds to the extent of \$670,000, approximately, the United Nations was bearing costs envisaged under Article 55 of the Constitution, and were financing the spread of social services in a large area of the world which until recently had been entirely ignorant of the social services developed elsewhere. In the opinion of the Secretariat, therefore, that sum could not be considered large, nor could it be regarded as a suitable item for progressive reduction.

On a vote being taken, the Soviet proposal, supported by the New Zealand Representative, that the word "fiscal" be deleted from paragraph (a) was adopted by 9 votes to 4 with no abstentions.

Mr. KULAGENKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that before voting on paragraphs (d) and (e) the Committee should consider his own proposal that the Secretary-General should submit a report on the work of consultants in the various countries. This study was long due and would be of interest not only to members of the Council but to all other members of the United Nations.

The CHAIRMAN stated that since this text constituted a new section of the Resolution it would be voted on once the Committee had disposed of the remaining amendments.

On a vote being taken, the Soviet Union proposal that paragraph (d) be deleted and that the following passage be inserted in its place:

"That the Secretariat be guided in 1949 in the administration and provision of Advisory Social Welfare Services by the financial grant of the countries requesting such consultative services"
was rejected by 13 votes to 2 with 2 abstentions.

On a vote being taken, the Canadian Representative's proposal that paragraph (e) be deleted was rejected by 9 votes to 7 with 1 abstention.

On a vote being taken, the Canadian Representative's proposal that the words "and intensify" be inserted after "continue" in paragraph (d) was adopted by 11 votes to 1 with 3 abstentions.

The United Kingdom Representative's proposal that the words "and should report from time to time to the Council on the success of his efforts" be inserted after "Governments" in paragraph (d) was accepted by 14 votes to none with 3 abstentions.

The United States Representative's proposal that the words "at least" be deleted in paragraph (e) was rejected by 8 votes to 6 with 3 abstentions.

The Soviet Union Representative's proposal that the following passage be added to the text of the Resolution:

"That the Secretary-General submit to all Member Governments a complete report on the work of the

consultants in the various countries from 1946 until the present time, in order that the Social Commission at its Fourth Session may be able to study that report and any comments thereon which may be made by Member countries of the United Nations". was adopted by 8 votes to 4 with 5 abstentions.

In answer to an enquiry by the Chairman, Mr. KULAGENKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that he wished the additional passage he had proposed to be inserted before paragraph (d).

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) suggested that in that case the items containing a recommendation to the General Assembly should be kept separate from those containing instructions to the Secretary-General. Thus, paragraphs (a), (b), (c) and (f) of the text as amended should be placed before paragraphs (d) and (e).

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Secretariat should produce a new draft, arranged in the sequence suggested by the United States Representative and incorporating small drafting amendments suggested by the representatives of Turkey and New Zealand.

This was agreed.

Mr. MESSING-MIERZEKEWSKI (Secretary) read the following amended text of the Resolution:

"THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

HAVING NOTED the recommendation of the Social Commission contained in its Resolution of 20 April 1948 on the Advisory Social Welfare Services,

RECOMMENDS to the General Assembly:

(a) that the Advisory Social Welfare Services be continued during 1949;

(b) that the programme should include the same basic services as were carried on in 1948;

(c) that in the administration of the programme, the policies and procedures carried on in 1948 be continued, as adapted in accordance with recommendations made by the Social Commission at its Third Session;

(d) that the Secretary-General submit to all member countries a complete report on the work of the consultants in the various countries from 1946 until the present time, in order that the Social Commission at its Fourth Session may be able to study that report and any comments thereon which may be made by member countries of the United Nations;

(e) that the Secretary-General continue and intensify his efforts to bring about increased financial participation on the part of recipient governments and report from time to time to the Council on the success of his efforts;

(f) that the funds to be provided for the services in 1949 should be at least equal to those appropriated for 1948.

On a vote being taken, the Resolution as amended was adopted by 13 votes to none with 4 abstentions.

Mr. DAVIDSON (Canada) had abstained from the vote because he did not recognize the validity of the provision contained in paragraph (e) and he reserved his delegation's right to raise the matter at a later stage.

Mr. RUNDALL (United Kingdom) had voted against the Soviet Union representative's proposed new text for paragraph (c) on the grounds that the report envisaged was already in course of preparation by the Secretariat and would be submitted to the next session of the Social Commission.

Mr. KULAGENKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) had abstained from the vote on the Resolution as a whole since the proposals he had submitted would merely aid the greater participation of national governments. He reserved his delegation's right to return to the matter at a later stage.

Mr. JOCKEL (Australia) had abstained from the vote since he believed that no directions should be given in regard to the Budget for 1949 until the matter had been discussed by the General Assembly. There was no need to depart from the Council's wish in this respect.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States) had voted for the Resolution as a whole, but he reserved his delegation's right to re-assert its opinion, during discussions on the Budget in the General Assembly, that the funds provided for 1949 should not exceed those forthcoming in 1948.

The CHAIRMAN, in his capacity as Byelorussian representative, had also abstained from the vote.

Mr. MAQUIEIRA (Chile) reserved for his delegation the same right as had been claimed by the United States delegate. In the view of his delegation the 1949 Budget should not exceed that of 1948.

Mr. RUNDALL (United Kingdom) made the same reservation.

Resolution III: Prevention of Crime and Treatment of Offenders (Document E/779, page 42)

The CHAIRMAN remarked that in paragraph 3 of Document E/779/Add.1, it was stated that the funds required for the convening of a group of internationally recognized experts would be somewhat in excess of the \$10,000 mentioned. No appropriation to that effect had been made in the United Nations Budget.

In reply to a question asked by Mr. KULAGENKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Sir Raphael CILENTO (Director, Division of Social Activities), stated that the sum mentioned was solely an estimate for the expenses incurred by the convening of the group of experts mentioned in paragraph 2 of Resolution III.

Mr. DICH (Denmark), on a point of order, stated that a meeting of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission was due to be held at Berne on 2-7 August, 1948. Consideration of the Resolution might therefore be postponed until the results of that meeting were available.

Mr. RUNDALL (United Kingdom) supported the Danish representative's proposal since he understood that the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission was about to draft a new clause in its Constitution whereby Franco Spain would be excluded from its membership.

Sir Raphael CILENTO (Director, Division of Social Activities) stated that a recommendation had been adopted in 1946 to the effect that the Social Commission should enter into consultation with the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission in order to discuss on a wide international basis action to be taken for the prevention of crime and the treatment of offenders. Before this consultation had been commenced, however, the attention of the General Assembly had been drawn to a resolution prohibiting consultation with organizations including Franco Spain in their membership. The question as to whether Franco Spain was in fact a member of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission was examined by the United Nations Legal Department, which concluded in February 1948 that that country had ceased to be a member of the Commission in question. At its sixth session, the Council nevertheless

referred the matter to the Social Commission with the request that it should take whatever action it considered appropriate.

At its third session held in April 1948, the Social Commission adopted a resolution regarding relationships between the United Nations and the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission (Document E/779, page 21). The President of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission had offered to appear at that meeting of the Social Commission, but it had been decided by the latter Commission that there was no evidence that the President was competent to represent his Organization. The President was therefore interviewed by the Steering Committee of the Social Commission and no further action was taken.

The Director of the Division of Social Activities consulted consecutively the President of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission at New York and its Secretary General in Geneva.

Accordingly the Secretary General of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission on 29 April 1948 circulated a letter to the members of his Commission in regard to its relationship with the United Nations, containing a proposed declaration for the modification of paragraphs 2 and 18 of the Constitution. The letter stated that if the majority of the Commission's members signalled their assent to the amendments proposed by returning, duly signed, an annex provided, those amendments would come into force.

By virtue of the amendments proposed, Article 2 would read as follows: "The Commission shall be composed of delegates of the various countries admitted by a two-thirds majority vote of its members and willing to concur in the aforementioned work."

Article 18 would be supplemented by the addition of the following clause "The same shall apply in case a two-thirds majority of the Commission's members shall vote for the exclusion of the member."

Of the 26 members of the Commission, 23 had sent back the signed annex signifying their concurrence in the amendments so that the two articles now had the form indicated above.

The Secretary General of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission had formally notified him of that fact for transmission to the Secretary General of the United Nations, and had asked him to state that the Commission or officers with appropriate authority, would be available for negotiations with the Council if such negotiations were considered desirable at present.

The resolution before the Committee referred to "International and national organizations which had interests and competence in this field." This reference would include the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission and also five organizations which already had consultative status with the United Nations. It would also include any working groups or other organizations of a national character acceptable to the various Governments. These would come within paragraph 1. and possibly also in the advisory body mentioned in paragraph 2.

If the members of this advisory body were drawn from all parts of the world, it was estimated that the greatest cost entailed would amount to \$10,250. This however was a guess as the location of such members was naturally still undetermined.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.