

United Nations

Nations Unies

**ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL**

**CONSEIL
ECONOMIQUE
ET SOCIAL**

P.V./20
21 September 1946
English
Unrestricted

NOTE: Any corrections made under Rule 33 of the Provisional Rules of Procedure for the Economic and Social Council should be submitted in writing within forty-eight hours to Mr. Delavenay in Room AG-026 at Lake Success (Telephone: Fieldstone 7-1100, Ext. 2697). The envelope containing the corrections should be marked "Urgent" and numbered.

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FIFTH MEETING OF THE THIRD SESSION
OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL
Lake Success, New York
Saturday, 21 September 1946 at 10:30 am

PRESENT:

THE PRESIDENT:	DR. STAMFAR	
	MR. LEBEAU	(Belgium)
	MR. MacINTOSH	(Canada)
	MR. FAUSTO SOTO	(Chile)
	DR. CHANG	(China)
	MR. ZULETA ANGEL	(Colombia)
	MR. GUY PEREZ CISNEROS	(Cuba)
	MR. PAPANEK	(Czechoslovakia)
	MR. PARODI	(France)
	MR. ARGYROPOULOS	(Greece)
	SIR GIRJA SHANKAR BAJPAI	(India)
	MR. MALIK	(Lebanon)
	Absent	(Norway)
	MR. ARCA PARRO	(Peru)
	MR. LEV MEDVED	(Ukrainian SSR)
	MR. FEONOV	(Soviet Union)
	Absent	(United Kingdom)
	MR. STINEBOWER	(United States of America)
	MR. MATES	(Yugoslavia)

THE PRESIDENT: The meeting will come to order.

Our Agenda of today is rather heavy but I still believe we can finish it today, because next week we will be extremely busy. I think we will be obliged to have meetings in the morning and in the afternoon to finish with our Agenda. I do hope, very much, that the session will be over by Monday, September 30th. Of course, the Members of the Council are completely free to discuss these matters fully and to take part in the discussion as much as they like under the assumption that the discussion of refugees will be very short indeed, because we have already made a gentlemen's agreement that this discussion on refugees should be confined only to short statements and to new facts. Therefore, we can start the discussion on refugee problems

Monday morning.

The first item on the Agenda is that we request the General Assembly to authorize the Council to request an advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice. I suppose the Members of the Council have read the document and we can now start to discuss this item.

Does any Member wish to speak on this subject?

MR. FEONOV (Soviet Union) (Second interpretation; original in Russian):
Mr. President, the Soviet Delegation would like to propose the abbreviation of the resolution and, in particular, the elimination in paragraph 3 of this resolution of the sentence beginning in the fourth line, "In all of the draft agreements..." and ending with "...between the specialized agencies inter se."

Those two sentences are to be eliminated.

It seems to us that these sentences do not add anything to the substance of the resolution. If they were dropped, we should be saved the trouble of discussing the various amendments that may be put forward regarding those two sentences.

The Soviet Delegation would itself have certain amendments to put forward if these sentences were retained.

The PRESIDENT: Is there any objection to this proposal of the Soviet Delegation?

(No response.)

There is no objection. It seems to me the proposal of the Soviet Delegation is accepted, so the resolution is passed.

SIR Girja Shankar BAJPAI (India): The resolution is passed with the amendment, Mr. President?

The PRESIDENT: Of course, with the amendments. That is clear. Thank you very much for reminding me.

Item 2

The second item is the Addition of New Items to Current Council Agenda.

In your hands you have proposals contained in Document E/152.

The first additional item is from the Delegation of Czechoslovakia: Proposal Concerning the Restoration of Czechoslovakia's Danubian Vessels.

As you remember, at the first meeting we decided that the Yugoslav claim on Danubian ships should be put on our Agenda, and this Czechoslovak proposal is only, it seems to me, one addition to this question. Is there any objection to this proposal for a new item, made by the Czechoslovak Delegation? Does anyone of the Members wish to speak?

(No response.)

There is no objection, so we will include the Czechoslovak request.

Point 2 is from the Delegation of Lebanon: Proposed Resolution on

Is there any objection?

(No response.)

There is no objection, so the Lebanese proposal is accepted.

The third item: Proposal by the United States Government for a Conference on Resource Conservation and Utilization.

Mr. FEONOV (Soviet Union) (Interpretation; Original in Russian): Mr. President, as is known, the proposal of the United States Delegation on this question was submitted during the present session of the Economic and Social Council. It is obvious that this is a question which is both serious and of considerable dimensions.

The Delegation of the Soviet Union therefore, has difficulty in expressing its opinion upon this question until it has received instructions from its Government. I think, in view of the dimensions of this proposition, it is unlikely that Governments will be able to give instructions to their Delegations before the end of the present session.

I have already stated to Mr. Winant, the Chief of the United States Delegation, that I do feel these difficulties and, although I have no objection in principle to the discussion of this question, I would ask the Economic and Social Council to allow the Governments time to study the question raised and to express their opinions, and I would, therefore, like to suggest that the discussion of this subject be deferred until the next session of the Council.

The PRESIDENT: Any other speaker?

Mr. PARODI (France) (Interpretation from French): I will be brief, Mr. President.

The proposal put forward by the United States Delegation does indeed seem to be one of very great importance. It raises a number of important issues. But I regret that I have not received a French text, although I think the English text was distributed on the 14th of September. I am therefore not in a position to express an opinion about it.

The ~~PRESIDENT~~: I think we must all express our disappointment that the documents are not distributed in the two official languages, and I think that this should not be repeated any more. I am going to write, on behalf of the Economic and Social Council, a letter to the Secretary-General to this end.

MR. Arce PARRO (Peru): I consider of great importance the proposal made by the Delegation of the United States for a program for the conservation of resources, and I think as long as we are just debating on the acceptance of this proposal within our Agenda, we would do right in accepting it and opening the debate. I think there will still be time for the different Delegations to consider this important matter at any of the coming meetings of this Council for the next week or so, but in postponing^{it to} a forthcoming session of this Council, we might delay a very important matter which has been installed in time. Therefore, I support the proposal of the United States.

MR. ARGYROPOULOS (Greece): I also want to support the proposal of the American Delegation and to ask to have it inserted in our Order of the Day.

MR. FEONOV (Soviet Union) (Second Interpretation; original in Russian): I do not think, Mr. President, that the postponement of the discussion of this question until the next session of the Economic and Social Council will cause a delay in the calling of the proposed conference. The United States proposal does not suggest that this conference should be convened in 1946 but only at the end of 1947. The Economic and Social Council meets three times a year, and this means, I think, that we should have plenty of time to take a decision of principle without involving a delay in the calling of the conference.

My difficulty is that the Delegation of the Soviet Union does not feel able to express an opinion upon this subject during the course of the present session of the Council. This was my sole reason for requesting the deferment of the discussion of this item.

MR. Fausto SOTO (Chile): Mr. President, I am glad to support the proposal of the United States Delegation. It seems to us that we are not going to discuss in this session the problem itself, but just the means to cope with the problem in the future, in order to have a conference to study it. Therefore, I support the proposal of the American Delegation.

(During the above remarks, Mr. Colbjornsen, the Representative of Norway, assumed his seat at the table.)

E/P.V./20
12-15

MR. STUBBOWER (United States): Mr. President, I think we will all recognize the force of the remarks of the Representative from the Soviet Union that this is a rather substantial item that we have proposed to be added to the Agenda and one that will want a good deal of very serious consideration by this Council. It will take a good deal of work on the part of the Secretariat, should the decision of the Council be as we have proposed, to call this International Conference. In those circumstances, the end of 1947 is not far away. There is always a great deal of work in getting an international conference organized and started.

It would seem to us, therefore, that at least it would be desirable if the Council would decide to put this item on its Agenda for an opening discussion at this session. I am also, of course, hopeful that it will be possible to come to a decision, but even if, for ^{the} reasons put forward by the Soviet Representative, ^{that} this is an item of such substance, that the Representatives did not feel that they could come to a decision at this session, the Secretariat would have had the benefit of our preliminary discussion in the work that it would be carrying on in-between this session and the following session. For that reason, we do hope that it will at least go on the Agenda for discussion.

SIR Girja Shankar BAJPAI (India): Mr. President, I think I speak with a good deal of hesitation on this subject because I am in much the same position as the Representative of the Soviet Union. I have not had an opportunity of referring this to my Government, and, therefore, I have no instructions either as to whether they are completely in favour of the proposal or otherwise. At the same time, it seems to me that unless we take a decision, at any rate, to add this to our Agenda, we would be running the risk of an indefinite postponement of the discussion. Reference has been made to the fact that the Council meets thrice in a year. It has already met thrice during this year. The next meeting will not take place, unless it is an emergency meeting, the next meeting will not be until sometime next year. Now, it may be that we will not be able to pass a final verdict upon the utility or otherwise of this Resolution before this session ends. It may even be that we shall not, because of the character of the Agenda we have already, it may be that we will not be able to discuss it in some detail, but the mere fact that it is added to the Agenda means that it is transmitted to Governments and gives Governments an opportunity for expressing an opinion on the merits or otherwise of the text presented to us for discussion at the next meeting of the Economic Council.

For that reason, Sir, I am in favour of adding the item to the Agenda.

(During the above remarks Mr. Noel-Baker assumed his seat at the Council table.)

MR. NOEL-BAKER (United Kingdom): Mr. President; I hope we shall discuss this matter, I do not know whether it will be possible to arrive at any decision. That is a different matter.

The PRESIDENT: So far as I understand the rule, the Economic and Social Council cannot convene international conferences without consulting Governments. So, therefore, at this session I do not think we can pass any Resolution for convening a conference. The Representatives have to consult their own Governments, and the Secretariat has to consult all Governments together, Members of the United Nations. So now we have to decide if this item should be discussed

discussion for the next session and in the meantime inquire what is the attitude of different Governments, Member States of the United Nations. I think this is a proper issue in this case.

MR. ARRA PARRO (Peru): I just want to make it clear that all we are going to decide now is the inclusion of this proposal on the Agenda, and to decide later on if this conference is going to be actually called or not. That would have to be decided after corresponding debate. I think something of this type was done, accordingly, with the Health Conference. Maybe some position of this type could be adopted in view of the importance of the subject or not, but there is no use in discussing that right now, but just to decide, as the Representative from India has already stated, if we are going to cover it, if we are going to have it within our Agenda or not.

MR. NOEL-BAKER (United Kingdom): Mr. President, for my part I think it more than probable that I should have difficulty in agreeing to summon the conference at this meeting. That is apart from the temporary and transit difficulty connected with Provisional Rule, "T". I think it was, to which you have drawn attention, a matter which I hope will be cleared up in a few weeks by the second part of the First Assembly. But on merits I think it more than probable that I should find it difficult to agree to the summoning of the conference, but I think it would be a pity not to have a preliminary discussion, and I think a preliminary discussion might guide us all very usefully. Even if we took no part in it ourselves, even if we were entirely without instructions; it nevertheless might help us later in consulting our Governments about the line which we thought right to take.

THE PRESIDENT: No more speakers?

Mr. FEONOV (Soviet Union)(Original in Russian; Second Interpretation):

Mr. President, the Soviet Delegation considers it necessary to insist upon its request that the Council should not discuss the subject during the present session, even if such discussion should be of a preliminary character only. I quite understand that no decision of substance as to the calling of the Conference would be taken during the present session, in any case; nevertheless, even a preliminary discussion during this session would have a certain meaning. It would mean that the Secretariat and other organs charged with the preparation of the decisions about the Conference, would be influenced by the discussions which would take place in the Council. These organs would have to take account of the remarks made by the various Delegations in the course of this preliminary discussion. In this case, the Soviet Delegation would be put in a disadvantageous position because, being unable to express its opinion on the subject. It would not be able to have any influence upon the work of the Secretariat or other organs responsible for preparing the decisions upon this subject, between this session and the next session of the Council. In international affairs, the opinion of the Soviet Union, I think, should not be a matter of indifference, and in this case the opinion of the Soviet Union would not have found expression at all.

The Soviet Delegation, therefore, in order to avoid being in a disadvantageous position and for the above mentioned reasons, feels it necessary to insist upon its request that not even a preliminary discussion of this subject should take place during the present session, and that this discussion should be postponed to the next session of the Council.

Mr. PARODI (FRANCE)(Interpretation from the French): I don't know whether I understood rightly the proposal of the Representative of the United States but I understood it ^{to be} /that this subject be placed upon the provisional agenda in order to initiate the procedure of consulting the Governments. If this is the case, and that seems to be confirmed

by the remarks of the Indian Representative just now, I can't see any objection to such a proposal. Its object would be precisely to initiate that consultation of Governments which is desirable, as has already been stated by the Representative of the Soviet Union.

The PRESIDENT: No more speakers?

Mr. NOEL-BAKER (UNITED KINGDOM): Mr. President, I don't want to prolong the discussion but I am a little troubled by the fact that if we do not put this on the Agenda, we may be held, in a certain sense, to be creating a precedent. The paper has already been circulated for a week. It was circulated a week ago today. Our deliberations, I think it likely, will last another week. That is a fortnight. I should have thought that it would be possible for Delegations to have preliminary instructions as to the line which they could take in a preliminary discussion in which it has already been made plain that we were not binding ourselves as to action, and I should be sorry to see an item not put on the Agenda because it was thought that in that time instructions could not be obtained.

I would only further add, with regard to what Mr. Ecnov said, that perhaps the silence of so powerful a Delegation as that of the Soviet Union might influence the action of the Secretariat as much as anything that he might say.

Mr. FEONOV (Soviet Union)(Second Interpretation, Original in Russian):

Mr. President, I was able to communicate the United States proposal to my Government only two days ago. The experts who would be charged with studying the question are busy with the business of the Paris Conference, and I am quite certain that I shall not be able to get instructions of any kind from my Government on the subject during the present session of the Council. I cannot think the United States Delegation would be satisfied with a situation in which the Soviet Delegation would be unable to express its views, even of a preliminary character, on this question.

The PRESIDENT: If there are no more speakers we have to decide about this important matter. It seems to me there are three points of view particularly underlined. First, the point of view of the Soviet Representative, who says clearly that he was able to communicate to his Government the United States proposal only two days ago. And therefore, the Soviet Representative is not able to participate in any discussion at the present time. Other Members expressed the opinion that we should keep this proposal on the Agenda and take it as the initiative to discuss the matter with the Governments and get the attitude of Member States of the United Nations because no conference could be convened without consultation with Member States of the United Nations. The third point of view is that we should discuss at this Session the proposal of the United States Delegation, even in a preliminary way.

Now we have to decide about these three points of view. What Mr. Feonov says is very important, that in the present circumstances his Delegation is not able to express an opinion and to participate in this discussion, and it seems to me everybody agrees that we should all participate in the discussion of such an important matter.

The second point is that we should not refuse entirely; even Mr. Feonov pointed out that he realized the importance of this proposal and he is not altogether against it. So we should have it on the Agenda as a matter for initiating discussion with the Governments and getting the replies.

It seems to me it would be wise to take this second point of view, that

we should keep it on the Agenda but adjourn our discussion until we get the replies from the Governments. In my opinion this point of view would satisfy the majority of the Members of the Council. It will really meet the wishes of the majority so far as I can understand because everybody realizes that this question is extremely important indeed, but we would like to have participation of all Governments concerned, and I think this is a rather strong point of view. If the Members of the Council are in agreement with my point of view and with my summarizing, I will take it as so.

MR. STINEBOWER (United States): Mr. President I wanted to make an inquiry from your able summary. If the second of the three courses that you outlined were adopted, there would be, if I understood it no more discussion and no more presentation of this proposition. I am very hopeful that we will come to a unanimous view on the procedure that we take. I would be very reluctant to see us have a division of opinion as to how we are going to proceed with a matter of such far reaching importance as this item and I would, therefore, be prepared to accept the second course of action which I think was originally proposed by the Representative of France.

If it were possible to get any intermediate discussion before a third session it would be of help to the Secretariat in carrying on its consultations with the Governments, and we should have liked that. We should have much preferred it, but if that seems to be out of the question as far as unanimous agreement around this table is concerned, then I think that we would agree with the second proposal. I repeat, we will accept that part of the proposal although we should have hoped there might have been a previous and non controversial discussion of the item. I should not have thought it would take long and it would be well understood that no total points of view were expressed, but some guidance to the Secretariat, we should have thought, would have been helpful. If that is not the will of this Council, we will go along with the second of the three proposals you have outlined.

MR. MALIK (Lebanon): Mr. President, I simply want to say that if the second course is adopted, it would be, to me at least, a new interpretation of what is meant by putting a thing on the Agenda. I understand that when an item is put on the Agenda, it means that it will be discussed, if time allows of course, but if you put a thing on the Agenda and then you make a proviso that it is not going to be discussed, even if time allows, then it seems to me to be an anomaly if you put it on the Agenda.

The PRESIDENT: As the Members of the Council remember, at the last session of the Council we postponed certain items on the Agenda. So, it means that we can keep it on the Agenda and use it as initiation for consulting governments but it is not necessary to discuss it. We even postponed decisions on certain items on the Agenda from the previous session to this session. So it seems to me that the Secretariat could collect information from the governments in the meantime and we will discuss the matter at the next session. That is how I feel. I think it is the general view that we should adopt this second point of view so that we can dispose of this item.

MR. FEONOV (Soviet Union): Mr. President, I think that the suggestion that this item should be included on the Agenda, but be discussed at the next session of the Council, would be acceptable to the Soviet Delegation.

MR. ARGYROPOULOS (Greece): Mr. President, I wanted to propose that this point be added to our Agenda and, by a common decision, accept here the point of view of the American Delegation concerning that point in order to be in full knowledge of the points of view of the American Government, which would enable us to transmit to our Governments all details of the question and, at the same time, to postpone a general discussion until the next session.

The PRESIDENT: May I ask the Representatives of the United States if they have anything more to add to the very fine presentation of facts regarding this item?

MR. STINEBOWER (United States): Mr. President, I think that the papers we have submitted are a fairly complete exposition of our ideas on this subject

and we do not have much more to add. If there were such oral presentation, we would of course be able to clarify any questions as might arise in the minds of Members of the Council as to just what it was we had in mind, but at the present time we would be perfectly content to stand on the presentation as it has been made in writing. In that matter we would be quite at the disposition of the Council and abide by whichever decision it decided to take.

The PRESIDENT: I understand that we have to discuss very important matters as these, but I think we can now make a conclusion. It seems to me that I feel the pulse of this Council and, therefore, I propose that we should keep this item on the Agenda but to postpone discussion until the next session. In the meantime, we would consult our governments and find out the attitude of the different governments, Member States of the United Nations. In that way I think we will be in possession of many more facts and we will be able to discuss fully this very important subject. Do the Members of the Council agree to my point of view?

MR. NOEL-BAKER (United Kingdom): Mr. President, partly because I agree with the view that it is desirable to have a unanimous agreement on this question, partly because I do not want any Delegation to feel that it is being placed in a position of difficulty or unfairness, and partly for other reasons which you have expressed that this is a matter of the highest importance on which we should all be able to speak with more authority and knowledge at the next session, I, for my part, would accept the compromise plan which you propose. If you want to get that out of the way, all right, but I want to ask some questions about what it means. Shall I ask them now?

The PRESIDENT: Yes.

MR. NOEL-BAKER (United Kingdom): When we say "consult governments", we mean that we ask the governments. The Secretary-General sends the paper to the governments and asks them to send in their written observations thereon. That is a very important subject. We shall have a very large volume of papers in return. That means not only the governments represented at this table

but all governments.

The PRESIDENT: They are obliged to do so.
not

MR. NOEL-BAKER (United Kingdom): I am/certain that they are obliged to do so, but, in any case, I hope that it means all governments. Does it also mean specialized agencies? As I understand this paper, it deals very largely with matters which a man, sitting in a conference of FAO, representing one of our Governments in matters of food and agriculture, would, I think, feel to belong to the scope of the Food and Agriculture Organization. I think it would be very appropriate if we sent this paper to the FAO, also, and ask for their observations on the matter and perhaps ask them to take part in our discussions when they come.

Mr. Arca PARRO (Peru): I think we are dealing with a matter of principle as well as the subject-matter of the proposal which has to be discussed. I understand that our procedure is that any proposal that is submitted into the Agenda is submitted because it has to be discussed. No other alternative is recognized by any rule of this Council or any Parliament of the world. I do not object if a compromise is taken in this particular case, in view of the arguments that have been presented, but I wish it would be clearly established that any decision that is going to be taken in regard to this proposal will not create a precedent for the future in the ruling of our Council.

The PRESIDENT: I understand the point of view of the Peruvian Representative, but I must underline that my behavior as President is parliamentary, indeed, as far as I am concerned, so there will be no precedent. As President, I think the most important duty of the President is to find a solution. This is, in my opinion, very important indeed. Of course, we can vote on any issue if you like, but I prefer to find a unanimous vote and consent, because this Economic and Social Council is the particular body of the Assembly dealing with many international aspects in the economic and social field. So, therefore, I am trying to find a solution to this case. I believe that the Members of the Council will agree to my proposal that the United States request should be kept on the Agenda and we should consult Governments or Secretariats and Specialized Agencies dealing with such matters and, after consulting Governments and collecting more information and more material on the attitude of different bodies and different Governments, we can with more success discuss this very important matter in the next session. It is with this understanding that we can continue our debate and discuss the next item.

(During the above remarks, Mr. Winant arrived and replaced Mr. Stinebower as Representative of the United States; Mr. Zulita Angel, Representative of Colombia left and Mr. Suarez assumed his seat at the Council Table.)

Item 4

The fourth item is the United States resolution on Welfare Activities performed by UNRRA.

Mr. WINANT (United States): The United States Delegation believes it is important that the Council give consideration at this session to finding a way by which urgent and important functions of UNRRA in the social welfare field may be carried on. These functions relate especially to the welfare of children, but also include advisory assistance to Governments in the development of broad social welfare programs. Certainly these functions should not be allowed, in our opinion, to lapse.

Thank you, sir.

The PRESIDENT: In connection with these proposals, I announced at a previous meeting that UNRRA decided at the Geneva meeting to set up an International Children's Fund, and Dr. Rajchman, who was appointed as Chairman of the Standing Committee to deal with this matter, has asked my permission to appear at this session and to explain his views and his proposal regarding the International Children's Fund.

I think it is a very urgent matter, and I hope very much that the Members of the Council will agree to inviting Dr. Rajchman to speak on this matter.

MR. PAPANEK (Czechoslovakia): Mr. President, we consider this proposal of the United States Delegation as very important.

The services and help rendered by UNRRA in Czechoslovakia were and are, very great. We consider, therefore, that this problem should be discussed here and that we should find a solution for the United Nations to carry on these functions of UNRRA in the social field and the welfare activities.

MR. ARGYROPOULOS (Greece): Mr. President, I wish to support also, very warmly, the American proposal for the transfer to the United Nations of the functions being performed by UNRRA in the field of social welfare.

I think those functions and the assistance in the rehabilitation of children and adolescents are of the utmost importance and ought not to be interrupted by the fact that UNRRA's work is coming to an end. So I consider that it is absolutely necessary to transfer to some organ those functions and develop them as much as the circumstances allow.

That is why I repeat that I want to back very, very warmly the American proposal.

MR. CHANG (China): The Chinese Delegation is very much interested indeed in the urgent and important matters covered by this resolution. Therefore, we should like to see that it be placed on the Agenda of the Council at this session.

MR. FEONOV (Soviet Union): Mr. President, some of the Representatives spoke on the substance of the proposal, while we are now considering only the inclusion of this question on the Agenda. It seems to me that all that is necessary is to support the inclusion of this item on the Agenda.

MR. Arca PARRO (Peru): I should like to support this proposal.

The PRESIDENT: So everybody agrees?

MR. NOEL-BAKER (United Kingdom): I should like to say this:

Firstly, I am in strong agreement with what you said about getting Dr. Rajchman on the Children's Fund.

But my observation is this: The UNRRA Council adopted two separate resolutions--95 on general relief work, and 103 on the Children's Fund, which they dealt with as quite a separate matter. The United States Delegation has put them together. I do not at all object to that. They can go on the Agenda today, if you like, together, but I think we ought to treat them as separate items on the Agenda.

For example, while accepting everything that appears down to the end of 2-a in the United States Delegation's proposal, I might have a certain difficulty on the procedure with regard to 2-b, and I think it would be wiser to treat the two things as separate items.

The PRESIDENT: Therefore, everybody agrees that this matter shall be discussed under the assumption that Dr. Rajchman's proposals, UNRRA's proposals, to set up an International Children's Fund should be discussed as a special item.

There is no objection.

"5. DELEGATION OF NORWAY
PROPOSAL FOR NEW AGENDA RELATING TO CONSOLIDATED BUDGET AND COMMON
FISCAL SERVICES FOR THE UNITED NATIONS AND SPECIALIZED AGENCIES."

The paper was presented, and I do hope that all the Members have studied it closely and that now we can decide on this matter.

Does any Member wish to speak? (No response.)

Therefore, it seems to me to be the general agreement that we should discuss at this session the proposal made by the Norwegian Representative.

"6. DRAFT RESOLUTION CONCERNING AGENDA OF MEETING OF EXPERTS TO
PREPARE FOR WORLD CONFERENCE ON PASSPORT AND FRONTIER FORMALITIES
TO BE SUBMITTED BY UK DELEGATION TO THIRD SESSION OF ECONOMIC
AND SOCIAL COUNCIL."

You have read this proposal, I am sure. Does anybody wish to speak on this subject? (No response.)

There is no objection.

"7. DRAFT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL
BY FRENCH DELEGATION ON ESTABLISHMENT OF UNITED NATIONS RESEARCH
LABORATORIES."

There is no objection to discussing this matter at the present session; therefore, it is adopted.

On our Agenda, Point 3 "Expenses of Commissions", the Secretary-General has submitted to you a paper on this particular question, and in this paper the Secretary-General pointed out the expenses involved. There are three courses which could be taken, in my opinion, so far as I can see from the paper: That the Members of the Commissions should be paid for traveling expenses and maintenance by their respective Governments; second, that all expenses should be paid by the United Nations; and the third course, that only traveling expenses should be paid by the United Nations and maintenance by their respective Governments.

(During the above remarks Mr. Winant, the United States Representative, left the table and Mr. Stinebower assumed his seat.)

Therefore, this Council, of course, has no right to decide on financial expenditures. This Council can only make recommendations to the Assembly, according to the Charter. Therefore, we have to discuss what to do in this case. Are we going to propose that all expenses should be paid by the Governments, or partly by the United Nations and partly by the Governments, or altogether by the United Nations?

Mr. Owen, Assistant Secretary-General, would like to give a statement relating to this subject.

MR. OWEN (Assistant Secretary-General): Mr. President, the Secretary-General has asked me to make a very brief statement on the subject of this paper. He wishes me to draw the attention of the Council particularly to the present practice which he has authorized, namely, that in accordance with the General Assembly's Resolutions, the cost of transportation, but not the subsistence allowance, of the five Delegates from each Member State in the General Assembly will be paid by the United Nations; and, secondly, that in accordance with the recommendations to him by the Advisory Group of Experts, neither the cost of transportation nor subsistence allowance are paid in the case of persons attending meetings with the Council or Commissions or Sub-Commissions as Representatives of Governments. He took account of the fact that at the last session of the Council a change in principle was made from Members of Commissions acting in their individual capacity as experts and becoming direct Representatives of Governments; thirdly, that in accordance, again, with the recommendation of the Advisory Group of Experts, persons serving as Members of Commissions and Sub-Commissions of Committees, in their personal capacity as experts are paid their cost of transportation and subsistence allowance.

He does not wish, in any case, to trespass upon the authority of this Council, with particular reference to its part in making recommendations to the Assembly, but he wished me particularly to draw to the attention of the Council the very considerable budgetary consequences of any change in the existing procedure.

On the assumptions given in the paper, the cost of paying full travel and

subsistence expenses to Members of Commissions and Sub-Commissions of this Council alone would exceed one-half million dollars annually. If we appoint additional Commissions or Sub-Commissions, the cost will increase in proportion, and this principle will affect very many more Commissions and Sub-Commissions the work of and Committees and other branches of this Organization. He informed me that if all these bodies are taken into account, the total cost may well exceed a million and a half dollars. This fact may be one which the Council accepts and is still prepared to make the necessary recommendations, but in making any recommendation to the Assembly, the Secretary-General is most anxious that this estimate should be fully weighed

Mr. NOEL-BAKER: (UNITED KINGDOM): Mr. President, there are three courses which you have said are possible. I agree with you. I propose formally that the Council should adopt the third. We are very grateful to the Secretary-General for the view which he has put out in this paper and which Mr. David Owen has so ably stated. In fact, those of us who have already supported the course which I am now formally proposing have observed the points to which the Secretary-General has drawn our attention and were not intimidated by them.

It is quite true that the Assembly decided last time that in order to make things fair as between one Member and another, the traveling expenses of Representatives to the Assembly should be paid, but did not make a similar decision about the consultants. It was not logical. Perhaps some day we shall come to it. We are not now proposing it. It does not, in my view, affect the decision we have now to make. We had not missed the point that the Council made a decision about the capacity in which Members were to serve on the Commissions which we shall appoint, but I think in our last discussion in this session, this present session, we were all agreed that in fact the Members of these Commissions are not working only for their own Governments. Far from that. They are working for the United Nations as a whole. We have also agreed that Governments, if they so desire, can leave the Members of these Commissions entirely alone without giving them instructions at all while other Governments may give them instructions.

We do not know that in fact the system now adopted will last for all time. Perhaps by general agreement we may change it in the early future. We may change it in respect to all commissions, in respect to one or two, or we may even mix the systems within some or all of the commissions. In any case, being aware of that fact ^{and} being aware of the budgetary consequences, I am sure that it would be right for this Council now to recommend to the Assembly, which as you say, is sovereign, to recommend to the Assembly that the expenses of Members of Commissions should be paid by the United Nations on the grounds that those Members

are working for the United Nations as a whole and not for their own Governments alone.

Now, sir, if you want to reduce the cost, of course, we can reduce it by reducing the work. It is very simple. The question is whether we shall serve the economic and social interests of Nations if we do so. We shall not; we shall not. The greatest and most urgent need is to make economies, to save waste in the world today so that our international action in our domain should succeed. I feel certain that it is not by reducing our work that we ought to make economies. Of course, in the end it is the Governments who pay. You can cut it or strike it out of the United Nations budget and leave it to someone else to pay, to the individual Governments. The only thing is that it will be extremely unfair as between Governments and will not conduce to getting the best men or enabling the best men to do the best work. With that object in view, which I think should be paramount in all our minds, I propose that the Council should recommend to the Assembly that we pay traveling and subsistence allowances to one Member of each commission and one expert to assist him.

Mr. LEBEAU (Belgium) (Interpretation from the French): I regret, Mr. President, to have to say that I must maintain the point of view that I expressed here the other day. Who pays the piper calls the tune. And there can be no doubt in this case what decision has been taken. The Assembly in deciding upon the structures of the commissions, laid down the fact that commissions shall be composed of Representatives of each Member of the Organization and shall be appointed by the Council. "The Economic and Social Commissions shall consist of one Representative from each of eighteen Members of the United Nations selected by the Council." That is the text of the decision.

Speaking the other day, the Representative of China attempted to show a difference between the expression "one Representative from each Member" and "one Representative of each Member". The Representative of China needed 11 minutes and 30 seconds to establish this difference and from it he concluded that there was some doubt as to the meaning of the decision. Mr. President, I don't need 11 minutes and 30 seconds to establish that difference. In the French text it is perfectly clear that what is meant in fact is one Representative of each/of the Members of the United Nations. That seems to me perfectly clear. And as the Soviet Representative said a short time ago, the decision is perfectly clear that in fact Members of these commissions are Representatives of Governments.

It is of small importance that certain Governments, including, I think the British Government and my own Government, will not give precise orders to their Representatives and will seek to choose qualified experts, in view of their personal capacities. That is of small importance. In fact the Representatives will be Representatives of/several Governments. And so, as the Governments will determine the Representatives, and the Representative will represent the Government, it is the Government which should pay the expenses of this Representative. In the case of the Assembly, the decision was perfectly clear against this principle that I have enunciated. In the case of the Assembly's decision, the expenses, the travel expenses of five Representatives are to be paid by the United Nations. We, the Belgian

Delegation, fought that decision in the Fifth Commission of the Assembly and we continue to disapprove it. Nevertheless, it was a clear decision as regards Representatives in the Assembly. In the case of Members of the Commissions of the Economic and Social Council, if we reverse the present situation, what, Mr. President, would result? It would mean that the Belgian Government, for instance, instead of paying the travel and subsistence expenses of its Representatives on the various commissions, would have to participate by increasing its contributions to the United Nations, would have to participate thus in the payment of the expenses of Members of commissions in which the Belgian Government is not represented. That, I submit, would be quite an unjust arrangement and I therefore oppose any change in the existing arrangements regarding Commissions of this Council.

Mr. MALICK (Lebanon): Mr. President, I want simply, very briefly, to state my arguments for supporting whole-heartedly the point of view and the proposal made by the United Kingdom Representative. From the point of view of the small Nations, Mr. President, it is not a simple matter what we decide here today. I think it would be conducive to uniformity in treatment, and therefore, to a certain degree of homogeneity among the representation of the various countries, if the United Nations, as a body, assumes responsibility for paying the Members of the Commissions. Also, it will add to the authority of the United Nations, to its sense of independence and of ability to treat commissions and the Members of commissions as though they were its own functionaries and its own servants.

It is very true, Mr. President, that however we interpret the Resolution taken by the Economic and Social Council last June, that the Members of the Commissions will themselves be Representatives of their Governments and their countries. There is no question about that, no matter how we interpret the prepositions "of" and "from". But although they are Representatives of their Governments, they are in the service of the United Nations. Their Governments have delegated them to serve the United Nations. Therefore, they could not represent their Governments in the strict and narrow sense of the term, as

for instance the Representatives to the Councils and to the General Assembly do. They represent their Governments in the service of the United Nations and therefore it is only proper for the United Nations as such, as a unit, as an entity, to assume responsibility for paying their expenses. I think it would be conducive to happiness all around, to uniformity and to strengthening the authoritative hand of the United Nations itself.

MR. COLBJORNSEN (NORWAY): Mr. President, in spite of the changes we made at the last session in the mode of appointment of commissions or sub-commissions, I think there can be no doubt that the commissions or sub-commissions are advisory bodies of the Council working for the Council, and the members of the commissions and sub-commissions are not working with a view to what benefits their own governments and their own people. On the contrary, I would say that in many cases it is maybe a considerable sacrifice to send representatives to the commissions or sub-commissions. Some of the busy people are taken from their own work at home, and sometimes they are advising steps to be taken, money to be appropriated, expenditures to be incurred on which they cannot and will not profit; they will have to pay. In many cases they are saddling their own people with additional expenses because their money will go to the more unfortunate people lower down in the scale. So I cannot agree at all to the change in the mode of appointment of the commissions and sub-commissions. They are expert advisory bodies of the Council. Therefore I take exception to the words "direct representatives of Governments" which have been used today, but I don't think we should lose time discussing that. The same goes for the "budgetary consequences" used here today. There are no budgetary consequences if we limit the payment of the expenses and allowances to the commission and sub-commission members and don't extend it to their advisers. If we had not made that change the United Nations would have paid all the members and there would be no budgetary consequences.

It seems to me the right thing to say would be that in case we make this change there will be a saving of the budget for the United Nations, but I don't think it is the right place for a saving. There are no budgetary consequences when we limit it to payment of the members of the commissions or sub-commissions. I have said before, at the last session and at this session, that I think there will be appointed real experts, and I cannot agree to the idea that if a man is appointed by a government he is not an expert, but I don't want to elaborate that further.

I am reluctant and in doubt whether it is right to pay expenses of

E/P.V./20
62-65

an adviser to every commission member. I think the commission and sub-commission members will be sufficiently qualified to take care of the work and to do the work without any need of advisers. They are supposed to be their own advisers; they are experts themselves. So I would be inclined to limit the payment of expenses and allowances only to the members of the commissions and sub-commissions, as has always been the practice even though before, the mode of appointment has now been somewhat changed.

If it is the opinion of the Council that advisers should also be paid, I think we should limit it to payment of their expenses and allowances. In special cases it might be right to send two persons but I think there should be a limitation there, and probably that limitation could be done by the Council in a Council Resolution, or it might be left to the discretion of the Secretary-General to decide whether, in special circumstances, also the expenses and allowances for advisers should be charged to the United Nations in addition to the expenses and allowances of the commission or sub-commission members which have always been borne by the United Nations.

Mr. PAPANÉK (Czechoslovakia): Mr. President, I agree with the proposal of the United Kingdom Delegation. Without, however, repeating the arguments for it, I would like to add that the Members of the Commissions are nominated by the Government, in consultation with the Secretary-General, and then approved by this Council. It is not only Governments who are interested, but the United Nations as such. Therefore, the expenses incurred should be paid by the United Nations.

Further, I would like to have clarified the point concerning the Sub-commissions. If this does not apply to the Members of the Subcommissions, I would propose that this principle should apply in the same way for the Members of the Subcommissions.

SIR Girja Shankar BAJPAI (India): Mr. President, most of my colleagues at this table will be familiar with the nursery / ^{conundrum:} "When is a door not a door? When it is ajar.", as is often said. I wish that the question as to when a Member of a Commission is a Representative of a Government and when a servant of the Council or the Commission -- I wish that this particular metaphysical question were susceptible of an equally easy answer. It is not, and I shall not attempt, in spite of my heredity which rather tends me to be metaphysical, at this late stage in our discussion to say which is which.

My own feeling is that the two are not mutually exclusive. Because a person is nominated by a Government, it does not mean that his responsibility is solely to his Government and that he owes no responsibility to the Council. In fact, Sir, if you were to attempt that kind of dichotomy, then the whole basis of the decision which has already been taken as regards the expenses of allowing/Representatives to the Assembly to be paid by the Council, that would be not only entirely illogical but also, in my opinion, mischievous. I think we really have to base ourselves on the assumption that whether we attend a meeting of the Assembly or whether we attend a meeting of the Council or whether we attend a meeting of the Commission or a Subcommission, we are serving a common cause. If we haven't that spirit, I don't think really there is much point in belonging either to the Assembly or any other organ

of the United Nations. I think that belief is the basis on which any decision we take now must be taken. But when I have said that, I haven't said all.

My friend, the Representative of the United Kingdom, said that we must not be frightened by the budgetary principles. Well, Sir, it is easy for my friend from the United Kingdom and even easier for my colleague from the United States just to wave a hand like that and say, "Oh, the budget is of no consequence at all. What is a budget of one million dollars when we have a budget of one hundred million dollars?" I remember a case last year in London when I was talking to a Representative of the United States and some question of seven hundred million dollars had been under discussion, and he said: "What is seven hundred million dollars to the United States? Just like spitting in the Thames."

Well, Sir, I wish all of us were in that position of a happy and sans souci state. We are not, and, therefore, although I would not object in its entirety to the proposal of the Representative of the United Kingdom, I would definitely make an exception on behalf of my Government. I think that although there is much to be said for the principle that the United Nations Organization, as distinct from Governments, should pay the expenses of all Representatives to attend meetings of Commissions and so on, there is a practical limitation, at any rate, on some of us and that practical limitation is imposed by the size of the purse. That is, Sir, a point which I should like to make.

The other point is this: We are asked now not merely to consider the proposition that Members of Commissions should be paid, but we are also asked to consider the additional gesture of generosity, and that additional gesture of generosity is that experts should be paid. Now, Sir, I am perhaps in the fortunate position of being not only slightly familiar with the English language but more expertly familiar with my own. We have a common saying amongst us, that when you invite a notable to your home from some distance, be prepared not only to pay the expenses of the notable but, also, the expenses of the servant; and since the servant is the servant of a

notable, therefore, pay also the expenses of the servant of the servant. That seems to me to be carrying generosity too far. In what capacity do these gentlemen come to the Commission? Not as Representatives of the Governments. No, that is the thesis which we have heard very ably and forcibly maintained. No, they come here to serve the Council. All right, they come to serve the Council on the Commission. But as what? A gentleman at large? A dilettante with no opinion on any subject except large and broad views, a general knowledge of a certain subject? A professor once described general knowledge as general ignorance. If that is the test that is going to be applied to the selection of Members of the Commission, they should not come at all. I do in this particular respect maintain that our Norwegian colleague is right; namely, that if a person's services are required for the Commission when we deal with a certain subject and ~~expert~~, then he must have some knowledge of that subject and he should not need the assistance of another expert.

That being so, my position, in summary, is this: I cannot at this stage in its entirety support the proposition that Members of Commissions should be paid by Governments because I think that even though I am not frightened, I am quite stout-hearted, that I might have some concern on the effect of this decision on the budgetary position.

My second point is that in ~~no~~ circumstances can we agree to the expenses, not merely of the Members of the Commission but the experts, being paid. I know, Sir, that the sentiment around this table is possibly overwhelmingly in favor of the proposition which my friend, Mr. Noel-Baker, has made. Therefore, it may be that I am fighting for a lost cause, but, Sir, coming, as I do, from the University of Oxford, as distinct from the University of Cambridge, which has long fought for lost causes, I am not in the least daunted.

MR. MacINTOSH (Canada): Mr. President, I have only this to say, that the Canadian Delegation finds itself largely in agreement with the Belgian Delegation on this point. I cannot, myself, accept arguments in favor of making payments from the treasury of the United Nations, which were rejected when they were put forward as justification for the particular methods of selection. We would not object to some kind of arrangement for the pooling of transportation expenses purely on the ground of equalization, but we do think that the expenses of the people who are Delegates or Representatives should be paid by the Organization or Governments whom they represent, and who have retained in their hands the right of selection. I do not think we should delude ourselves that the formal provision for approval by this Council and for consultation by the Secretary-General means more now than it was fully explained that they meant last June.

MR. STINEBOWER (United States): Despite the effort of my friend from India to anticipate my position, I want to prove far more economic-minded than he and associate myself completely with the remarks just made by the Representative of Canada.

In the first place, I should like to make an observation that it is somewhat reassuring, if we could really believe that it would stick, to hear these remarks that have been made this morning about the lack of any difference between a Member of a Commission appointed by Governments and individuals appointed as experts in their personal capacity. If there is so little difference, I am at a great loss to understand the great heat that was engendered in our discussion at the last session of the Council, when we were determining the nature of the composition of these Commissions, but it is true that by definition we did agree to a formula which makes it fairly clear that the Members of Commissions do serve in a dual role. They are both Representatives appointed by Governments and, in many cases, may be subject to instruction by them, although that is not necessary, but they are also servants of this Council, advisors, and, as such, are entitled to be regarded as having something of an international role. We would therefore be in agreement with the suggestion that both the United Nations and the

Member Nations from which these Representatives come, should share in bearing the expenses of Members to Commissions. We propose that that be done in this way: That the transportation of Members of Commissions be credited against the annual contributions of the country from which they come, the Government which they represent, against their annual contributions to the United Nations, rather than having them paid directly by the United Nations. They would be incurred by the Governments and treated as a credit against their annual contributions. We would think that that is largely to be defended on the ground that distances are unequal and there is a good deal of inequality and inequity in burden from those who have to come half-way around the world, as compared to those who have to come, for example, only from Washington or Ottawa.

Therefore, this principle of pooling expenses against the United Nations budget for transportation--we would agree with it. We would not be inclined to agree with the suggestion that subsistence of such Members be paid by the United Nations. That might well be the portion to be borne by the Governments from which these Members come in earnest of their interest in participation of the work of these Commissions. Furthermore, there is not the same inequality. The subsistence is all incurred in the same city at one time. There is no difference due to mileage. There is greater difficulty in controlling expense accounts of that kind by the Secretariat when the persons who are receiving those accounts are not subject to authority. There is a good deal of administrative difference between paying subsistence allowance to Commissioners, on the one hand, and paying them to Members of the Secretariat of the United Nations, on the other.

Finally, we would be very much opposed to paying either transportation or subsistence expenses of any advisors. We do not elect to these Commissions, by whatever device, Members and alternate Members and advisors, such as we do in the Council and in the General Assembly. We elect Members of Commissions. If they elect to bring with them one more advisor, that is for them to decide, but we are looking for the Members of this Commission to give us expert advice. We are not looking for just front people who will bring a lot of advisors with them.

I should also add that, as far as the United States is concerned, and in partial reply to Sir Girja, the United States Government would be very glad to send some of its experts to Commissions from time to time and allow them to share in the relative munificence of United Nations subsistence allowances, or even the subsistence allowances of some of the Members around this table, but we are quite prepared to send them on the modest subsistence allowances and think we will get good service from them.

The PRESIDENT: Members of the Council, we have four speakers more. It is rather late. Therefore, I should like very much to ask you to take lunch now. It is already prepared in the building. We will meet again at 2:30 here.

MR. MATES (Yugoslavia): Mr. President, is there any lunch in the restaurant?

The PRESIDENT: Yes, it is prepared for this specific purpose.

MR. MATES (Yugoslavia): That is very kind of you, indeed.

The PRESIDENT: The Members will meet again at 2:30. I am very sorry, but we have to finish our Agenda today. We will meet at 2:30 sharp here.

(The meeting adjourned at 1:10 p.m.)