

United Nations

Nations Unies

ECONOMIC  
AND  
SOCIAL COUNCIL

CONSEIL  
ECONOMIQUE  
ET SOCIAL

E/P.V./26  
28 September 1946  
English  
Unrestricted

NOTE: Any corrections made under Rule 33 of the Provisional Rules of Procedure of 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. 2679). The envelope containing the corrections should be marked "urgent" and bear the appropriate document symbol number.

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE ELEVENTH MEETING OF THE THIRD SESSION  
OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Lake Success, New York

Saturday, 28 September 1946 at 10:30 am

PRESENT:

THE PRESIDENT: DR. STAMPAR

MR. VANDERPUTTE	(Belgium)
MR. RIDDELL	(Canada)
MR. DAVILLA	(Chile)
DR. CHANG	(China)
MR. PAPANEK	(Czechoslovakia)
MR. PARODI	(France)
MR. ARGYROPOULOS	(Greece)
SIR GIRJA SHANKAR BAJPAI	(India)
MR. MALIK	(Lebanon)
MR. THAGAARD	(Norway)
MR. ARCA PARRO	(Peru)
MR. MEDVED	(Ukrainian SSR)
MR. FEONOV	(Soviet Union)
MR. NOEL BAKER	(United Kingdom)
MR. WINANT	(United States)
MR. KRASOVEC	(Yugoslavia)

THE PRESIDENT: The meeting of the Council will come to order.

MR. NOEL-BAKER (United Kingdom): Mr. President, I want first, if I may, to deal with the question of the competence of this Council to deal with these matters which were raised in our discussions last night. Although I have only had placed in my hands, a moment or two ago, the verbatim report of what was said on that subject, I think I have a clear opinion, though I should like to reserve my right to make additional observations a little later.

I cannot myself doubt that under Article 62, paragraph 1, whereby "the Council may make or initiate studies with respect to international economic matters that we have a right to consider the subject. I think even stronger is Article 55 of the Charter which says under the heading "International Economic and Social Cooperation" - Article 55 says: "With a view to the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations... the United Nations shall promote: ...

"b. solutions of international economic...problems".

Sir, that seems to me quite plain. I think under those clauses we can certainly deal with this matter and, like the United States Delegation, I am very glad this has been raised, that the Czechoslovak and Yugoslav Delegations took the initiative in putting it on the agenda. They warmed my heart, if I may say so, when they spoke about the importance of transport in the reconstruction of Europe and of the world.

In our discussions On the Devastated Areas Report some Delegations doubted the utility of references to the importance of transport, but I was glad to note that our Czechoslovak colleague specifically quoted them yesterday.

I have over many months had the experience of constantly calling the attention of my own Government to the vital importance of this factor in reconstruction, and I always find whenever I do it that there is in fact something further, something additional that they could do to what they were doing before, and that they are tending, once a given measure has been taken, to think that that is the end, that the situation is satisfactory. It is still very far from satisfactory. I should say that is probably true.

that improvements in transport which could now be made would still be the greatest single factor towards economic and social recovery in Europe in the next eighteen months. And therefore I heard with great sympathy the plea of our colleagues that the river transport of Europe ought to be improved and that every idle cargo carrier on the River Danube ought to be put into use. I think that proposition applies to every idle cargo carrier by water, rail and road in Europe, and every Government, every Government and all the Governments in cooperation have much still to do.

So far as the rivers are concerned, I agree with our United States colleague that it is unfortunate that the proposals made by the United States Government/<sup>at</sup> Potsdam in July 1945 and again in London in September 1945 for general cooperation on all the rivers of the continent were not taken up.

Now, Sir, perhaps I may deal with the arguments of the Yugoslav Representative which, I think, was supported by other Delegations, that the United States Government in suggesting that the international consideration of the Danube River traffic should be a factor in the settlement made were introducing a political consideration. I do not think that is a charge which ought to be made from the Yugoslav Delegation to the United States Delegation. I think - if I understood his arguments; perhaps I didn't, and if so I will withdraw my statement - that the Yugoslav Representative challenged one of the great technical achievements of European statesmanship during the nineteenth century and did so on political grounds.

Sir, it was in 1815 that the Vienna Congress settled the principle of freedom of traffic on international rivers and Article 108 and Article 109 of The Treaty of Vienna of 1815 dealt with the matter. They laid down "the powers whose territories are traversed by the same navigable river engaged to regulate by common consent everything regarding its navigation." And they agreed to appoint commissions to do it. And they declared: "Navigation of the rivers referred to in the preceding Article along their whole course from the point where each of them becomes navigable to its mouth shall be entirely free and shall not, as far as commerce is concerned, be prohibited to anyone, due regard being had to the regulations for the policing of navigation, which

regulations shall be alike for all and as favorable as possible to the commerce of all nations."

Sir, in the year 1856 a Commission was set up to regulate the traffic on the Danube, and the Commission had very wide powers. It could carry out works; it could lay down regulations, It was entirely responsible for the ipolice.

All that:- after the last war, and in the intervals between the wars, while there were certain troubles about some sections of the river, and it did not work quite as well in some ways as the earlier conventions, nevertheless all of those same basic principles were maintained, and on the other rivers of Europe, particularly on the Rhine, the thing worked much better still.

Sir, this was declared to be, in 1856, part of the public law of Europe. It was done for the benefit of Europe as a whole. The Mission represented Europe as a whole like the Universal Postal Union. It was genuine international government of a developed kind, immensely to the benefit not only of Europe but of the world at large. Broadly speaking, political considerations were excluded. Every nation profited; no one profiteered. It is that great technical achievement which has, in our view, now been set aside for political reasons, and we should like to see that taken up and the whole thing dealt with together.

My Government always had a very great interest in this matter. We have been a signatory to all these conventions. We were represented, if I am not wrongly informed, in the Commission established in 1856. We have had a large traffic on the Danube including a very considerable number of vessels, the exact numbers of which before the war I would not like now to say, though I know they were really considerable. The freedom of navigation on the Danube was never more urgently required than it is now. And I would say in answer to Mr. Feonov -- if I understood his observations last night -- that this is not like the river Mississippi. The river Mississippi is a national river. I don't know what laws apply to the Mississippi. I do know that in my own country where the rivers are a little less broad than they are in this country, before the war foreign postal vessels used to come to the very center of the country -- to the very center of the country. They had perfectly free admission to come and compete with our own vessels there, and they did so. But this is an international river.

The United States proposal -- and now I come to the substance of what is put before us -- seems to me fair to all concerned. I don't always agree

with the United States Delegation; I don't always vote with them when I think they are wrong and I say so without hesitation. On this occasion, broadly, I think they are right. We accept the proposal. It does not seem to me to be put in the form of an ultimatum; it seems to me to be put in broad and statesmanlike terms in a very friendly way, proposing a solution that would be fair to all.

The principles of the pool ~~we~~ we applied with our shipping all through the war to the immense advantage -- to the immense advantage of those countries who had the less easy access to the sea. How much sea-ocean borne material would ever have arrived in the northern waters or in the Persian Gulf if it had not been for the principle of the pooling of shipping in the common interests of all, with a program of needs which was carried out for the benefit of the Allied cause. Sir, we are still fighting the war against chaos which Nazism produced. I think that the principle put forward is one, as I have said, / <sup>that</sup> is friendly and fair to all, hostile to none. I see no reason why it should cause delay or prevent the restitution of these vessels before the winter comes on. I think that would lie in the hands of the Delegations who took part in the conference, and it might be possible in the course of a week, if we agree to summon a conference now, that general ~~overall~~ agreement could be met. I hope the conference will meet. I should, of course, expect, and indeed demand, that my Government should be represented in it, because as I have said, we have always been deeply interested in the Danube River and we are still.

Sir, I would again urge that this proposal should be considered quite free from political considerations, on its merits as an effort to make now a great step forward in organizing the transportation in an area where transportation can still do much to save the peoples of Europe from the sufferings which they would otherwise endure.

MR. PAPANEK (Czechoslovakia): Mr. President, several Representatives mentioned in their observations, problems, and proposed their solutions which have no connection with the restitution of our vessels. Others suggested that the question of restitution of the Czechoslovak-Danubian vessels be referred to the International Court of Justice or that it should be settled under Article 33 of the Charter. The Czechoslovak Delegation wishes to state that the Czechoslovak Government considered this matter a purely economic one whose immediate settlement would help tremendously the rehabilitation of Czechoslovak economy, and always expected and expects that it would be settled in the most friendly way.

The Representative of the United States himself stated very clearly that the Czechoslovak ownership of the vessels is not contested and that there is no doubt that Czechoslovakia has the right to have these vessels restituted. Furthermore, I would like to state, as far as the nationalization of Czechoslovak enterprises is concerned, that the Czechoslovak Government did not refuse to compensate American owners of properties in Czechoslovakia which fall under the nationalization program. All of them have been or will be compensated according to the loss. The settlement of this problem has been slowed down because there are many properties which our Government feels were owned before September 29, 1938, and even during the war, by Germans and Hungarians, and today are owned by citizens or corporations of allied countries. However, after clear title of allied ownership is established, compensation will follow.

The Czechoslovak Government had the honor to inform the Government of the United States accordingly, several months ago, and asked it to inform American owners to file applications in due form. As far as I know, only two applications were presented by the claimants, and are considered. Although this question of nationalization has no connection whatsoever with the Danubian vessels, I mention it in order to make clear Czechoslovakia's entirely fair approach to this question.

MR. VANDEPUTTE (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): Mr. President in a very few words, I would like to state the opinion of my Delegation on the matter which is now before the Council. The question of competence of the Council has been raised. It has been raised on the contention that there are certain assets today the possession of which is legally contested. I do not believe that the competence of this Council should be questioned in this matter. We feel, in the economic field, that the Council has very wide powers, has a very wide scope and is perfectly fit and able to deal with such matters.



Therefore the question of competence should, in our opinion, not be contested on legal grounds. Furthermore, the debate has been considerably widened - and in my opinion usefully so - by the resolution suggested by the United States Delegation. There is no doubt that reconstruction of Europe would be considerably furthered if we could come to a normal situation as far as navigation on the Danube is concerned, and at the earliest possible date. We all agree that the situation is not normal today and does certainly impair Europe's prosperity. Therefore, the United States proposal, which suggests the convening of a conference on the matter, is in our opinion an excellent one and the Belgian Delegation strongly supports the early convening of such a conference.

The PRESIDENT: There are no more speakers on my list.

Mr. WINANT (United States): Mr. President, in view of some of the statements made at this table yesterday, I feel obliged to add a few additional comments.

The Soviet Delegation wondered why the United States was making a proposal concerning freedom of navigation on the Danube but was making no such proposal concerning navigation on American rivers. The answer is clear. Navigation on American rivers is not interrupted; navigation on the Danube is interrupted. Furthermore, the only navigable river of international concern bordering on the United States, the St. Lawrence, is freely open to navigation by vessels of all nations.

As one of the occupying authorities in the territory bordering the Danube, we are interested, as are Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia and, we trust, the Soviet Union, in restoring the free circulation of all Danubian vessels throughout the whole length of the river. The Czechoslovakian and Yugoslavian question which has been raised here involves only about two hundred vessels out of the total of approximately eight hundred vessels now located in the United States zone. So far as we know, these eight hundred vessels represent but one third of the present Danubian fleet. It is for that reason we presented our proposal.

It has been intimated that the United States is attempting to delay consideration of the restitution question by setting November 1st as the date for the Vienna meeting. The United States is prepared to meet in Vienna next week or any time or place the other interested States desire. We hope this Council will approve our proposal and that the interested States will participate in the proposed meeting. We are convinced that this is the only means of solving the economic problem with which the Central European States are confronted as a result of the interruption of traffic on the Danube. The mere restitution of those vessels which are held by the United States would not of itself solve the problem.

If the Economic and Social Council and the interested States do not see fit to accept the United States proposal we see no alternative to returning this whole question to diplomatic negotiations between the United States and the interested States. Since, as our French and Peruvian colleagues have pointed out a mere dispute between nations over the disposition of property is not a proper subject for adjudication by the Council.

(During the above remarks Mr. Cisneros, Representative of Cuba, and Mr. Zuleta Angel, Representative of Colombia, arrived and assumed their seats at the Council table.)

Mr. FEONOV (Soviet Union) (Second interpretation; original in Russian):  
We have heard today the Representative of the United Kingdom declare that the United States proposal is fully justified on the basis of Articles 62 and 55 of the Charter.

Mr. President, I would like to draw the attention of the Council to the fact that the United States Delegation has not placed this matter as clearly as it was stated in these texts of the Charter. If the United States Delegation claims that the Economic and Social Council is the competent organ to discuss this problem, why then did the United States Delegation not ask for its inclusion in the Agenda of the Council meeting? The more so as it seems to have prepared this matter very carefully and to even have drafted proposals. It is quite obvious in my mind that the United States proposal is merely meant as a counter-measure against the suggestions made to the Council by the Yugoslav and Czechoslovak Delegations. What is, in fact, the aim of the proposal made to the Council by the United States Delegation? It seems to us that it is to avoid examination by the Council of the claims formulated by the Yugoslav and Czechoslovak Delegations.

The United Kingdom Representative has cited Articles 62 and 55 of the Charter. I would in my turn refer to Article 107 of the Charter which says:

"Nothing in the present Charter shall invalidate or preclude action, in relation to any state which during the Second World War has been an enemy of any signatory to the present Charter, taken or authorized as a result of that war by the Governments having responsibility for such action."

May I say that in the Soviet Zone of Occupation certain measures have been taken by the military command of the Soviet Army and that no changes are possible in these measures which have been taken by the Soviet command and that for reasons stated in Article 107 of the Charter. There is one more reason which I add today to those I have given yesterday for claiming that this Council is not justified in discussing this matter. I believe that this is not a question on

which the Economic and Social Council is really competent. <sup>The</sup> /United Kingdom Representative has referred this morning to certain decisions which were taken in connection with navigation on the Danube in the course of the last century. Well, Mr. President, events move quickly. They are different today from what they were in the last century and the events of that last century are diversely appreciated. Some people, who are conservatively minded, look on these events favorably; others may have different opinions. My opinion is, for instance, India which became a British Colony in the course of the 19th century, may not, perhaps, today appreciate the fact that for events which happened in the last century, she is now a British Colony. As I say, changes are continual and modifications are a characteristic of history.

But I now come to the fundamental aspect of the whole problem. I claim that the Economic and Social Council has received a request for assistance from the Yugoslav and Czechoslovak Governments. That assistance was in connection with the restitution of the Danubian vessels now in the American Zone of Occupation. They have asked for these ships to be returned to them. These claims were based on economic reasons. They form, in my opinion, no legal problem whatsoever because the ownership of these vessels is not contested in the least. Why then should the restitution of these vessels now be delayed? What is there to justify such a delay?

The United States Delegation claims that the whole problem is interlocked with the general aspect of navigation on the Danube, and is connected with agreements to be concluded with all Governments interested, the Soviet Government included.

I believe that the problem is entirely different. Today we have not to deal with the navigation on the Danube as a whole, but merely with the claim for restitution formulated by the Yugoslav and Czechoslovak Governments, and I believe it is impossible for this Country to ignore the requests that were made to it by these two Governments. There is an attempt to widen the problem, to widen its scope and thereby to drown these two claims in the whole problem of the Danubian navigation. What is then the real aim of the United States proposal, if it is not to delay the examination of these two claims? I believe the Council must answer these claims now and cannot accept that these matters should be delayed for such reasons.

The Economic and Social Council is not in a position to ignore claims that were put before it by two Member States. What is the reason why the restitution of these vessels is requested? The United States Delegation feels that the navigation on the Danube should be free and should be brought to a normalization. But does the restitution of these vessels oppose such a normalization of the navigation on the Danube? I claim it does not. In fact the restitution of these vessels constitutes even a partial solution of the general problem in which the United States Government seems so interested. I do not believe that we should be justified if we do not view the matter on this angle. But even if we attempt to put ourselves in the place of the United States Government, we must confess that the restitution of these vessels is in fact a partial solution of the whole problem. In what way would the restitution of the vessels in any way hinder free navigation on the Danube? I do not think that is possible. The vessels which would then be restituted would be immediately used for the transport of goods along the Danube and would, therefore, help in the reconstruction of the war-devastated areas.

The  
which the Economic and Social Council is really competent. /United Kingdom Representative has referred this morning to certain decisions which were taken in connection with navigation on the Danube in the course of the last century. Well Mr. President, events move quickly. They are different today from what they were in the last century and the events of that last century are diversely appreciated. Some people, who are conservatively minded, look on these events favorably; others may have different opinions. My opinion is, for instance, India which became a British Colony in the course of the 19th century, may not, perhaps, today appreciate the fact that for events which happened in the last century, she is now a British Colony. As I say, changes are continual and modifications are a characteristic of history.

But I now come to the fundamental aspect of the whole problem. I claim that the Economic and Social Council has received a request for assistance from the Yugoslav and Czechoslovak Governments. That assistance was in connection with the restitution of the Danubian vessels now in the American Zone of Occupation. They have asked for these ships to be returned to them. These claims were based on economic reasons. They form, in my opinion, no legal problem whatsoever because the ownership of these vessels is not contested in the least. Why then should the restitution of these vessels now be delayed? What is there to justify such a delay?

The United States Delegation claims that the whole problem is interlocked with the general aspect of navigation on the Danube, and is connected with agreements to be concluded with all Governments interested, the Soviet Government included.

I believe that the problem is entirely different. Today we have not to deal with the navigation on the Danube as a whole, but merely with the claim for restitution formulated by the Yugoslav and Czechoslovak Governments, and I believe it is impossible for this Country to ignore the requests that were made to it by these two Governments. There is an attempt to widen the problem, to widen its scope and thereby to drown these two claims in the whole problem of the Danubian navigation. What is then the real aim of the United States proposal, if it is not to delay the examination of these two claims? I believe the Council must answer these claims now and cannot accept that these matters should be delayed for such reasons.

The Economic and Social Council is not in a position to ignore claims that were put before it by two Member States. What is the reason why the restitution of these vessels is requested? The United States Delegation feels that the navigation on the Danube should be free and should be brought to a normalization. But does the restitution of these vessels oppose such a normalization of the navigation on the Danube? I claim it does not. In fact the restitution of these vessels constitutes even a partial solution of the general problem in which the United States Government seems so interested. I do not believe that we should be justified if we do not view the matter on this angle. But even if we attempt to put ourselves in the place of the United States Government, we must confess that the restitution of these vessels is in fact a partial solution of the whole problem. In what way would the restitution of the vessels in any way hinder free navigation on the Danube? I do not think that is possible. The vessels which would then be restituted would be immediately used for the transport of goods along the Danube and would, therefore, help in the reconstruction of the war-devastated areas.

is free  
In the Soviet zone of occupation, the navigation on the Danube/and I do not believe that the United States Delegation is justified in claiming that this is not so. The United States Delegation seems much more interested in the complete aspect of the problem rather than in the reconstruction of the devastated areas and in the justified claims brought before the Council by Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia.

I therefore ask myself what is behind the proposal of the United States Delegation, why are these ships retained, why are they not restituted? I believe there is only one possible explanation to that fact. By keeping these vessels, the United States Government has a means of pressure brought upon Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia in the defense of certain interests. The interest of the United States is not directed towards the reconstruction of devastated areas. Mr. Winant said today that the navigation on the American rivers is free and, therefore, my comparison was wrong. I would say here and would make it quite clear that if I mentioned American rivers yesterday, it was in a different connection altogether. I was referring to the international pooling of navigation which is suggested by the United States Delegation. That is where I made my comparison. The United States seems to wish to participate in that pool, and we have heard today that the United Kingdom wishes to participate in it. What I said is, why is it that nothing is suggested about the pooling of shipping on the American rivers in which the Soviet or the Yugoslav Governments might take a part?

I would also notice that every time we discuss this matter, new arguments are brought up to explain why the ships are not being restituted. Every day we hear new arguments.

Yesterday we heard one more which, if I am not mistaken, was the seventh or even the eighth reason given why these ships are not restituted. This, I believe, shows clearly that the standpoint of the United States Delegation is not justified, and those who are trying to justify it have certainly different motives.



MR. FEONOV (Soviet Union): Mr. President, I have two corrections in the translation. When I mentioned India, I did not express any opinion of my own. I just said that the event which happened a long time ago may not now be welcomed by the Indian people. That is the first correction.

Secondly, I did not say that the United States was acting in self-interest in general. I said that in this particular case the United States was acting in self-interest.

MR. KRASOVEC (Yugoslavia): Mr. President, may I explain our viewpoint to some of the remarks of the United States Representative made yesterday and today.

First of all, I am really surprised that the United States Delegation put the question of the release of ex-enemy vessels together with the question of the release of Allied vessels.

I think that the question of the release of Yugoslav and Czechoslovak vessels is something other than the release of the Hungarian or Rumanian or Austrian or German vessels. Then it was quoted yesterday, the United States Representative said, "The United States Government would point out that at present the basic obstacle to Danube traffic lies not in the failure to reconstitute shipping by the United States authorities but in the existing restrictions blocking navigation on the Danube." This is Document E/P.V./25, page 42.

Without referring to what has already been said by the Soviet Representative about the present conditions on the Danube, I would like to stress the following.

First, I think that the United States authorities knew when we answered their note to receive our fleet that this Delegation was probably sure that it will have a possibility to get the ships through the Soviet occupation zones in Hungary and Austria, otherwise the Delegation wouldn't have gone to Frankfurt or to Linz or to Regensburg.

Secondly, the contact of our vessels was established already last year between Czechoslovakian and Yugoslav ports. There can't be as an excuse that of the not being established an identity that vessels could not be restituted. But, even if that were the case, we have a large river traffic on the Danube and Zava within Yugoslavia and no matter what juridical and legal condition exists upon the rest of the Danube, these vessels could have served for our inland river transportation in Yugoslavia and everybody could have known that we were in a position also in such a case to get the fleet through the Austrian and Hungarian zones.

For that I must--and I yesterday already explained the reason--that our experts asserted that no technical obstacles were of such character to prevent the navigation.

I consider that the statement of the United States Representative "the United States has persistently sought the fullest consideration and solution of all the problems which have prevented the maximum use of the Danube and the available shipping on it." I think that this statement cannot be taken seriously.

Yesterday we have heard a new reason, maybe the seventh or eighth, about the refusal of the restitution of our ships. It was the reason of yesterday of seizing the American property in Yugoslavia. May I be allowed to make just a few remarks on it. There was not accepted, there was not issued a law of nationalization in Yugoslavia, but there exists a law of confiscation of the property of collaborators and war criminals. But this confiscation can be carried out only through law suit before a legal court, before a regular court, and before this court everybody has a right to defend his point.

Now, as far as I am informed some American property was seized immediately after the liberation because it was administered by the authorities or by the administration which was there during the occupation, and as far as I know in some connection with the occupation authorities. Of these, the American enterprises, as far as I know, we have already returned. One is the Standard Oil Refinery in Prague -- and I am not yet well informed what happened with the other -- but I think that also the other was restituted.

I would point out the following: That our governments' representatives state in some negotiations with the American Representatives in Belgrade they uttered the following words: "That we didn't proceed in the same way as the United States has proceeded with us." The United States has seized our ships and in reply to it we didn't seize the American property in Yugoslavia. I think that this reply which was many times used in Belgrade is clear enough to clarify the six or seven or five reasons for keeping our ships.

Now, I would like to make the following observation: Some days ago we have had a discussion on the report of the Subcommittee on Devastated Areas. It was seen in this discussion that the debate referring to long-term proposals hinders or defers solution of the most urgent and concrete help of most concrete problems. I think that the same thing, the same objection would be applied to the present discussion.

The proposal for the conference in Vienna, if anything else, would defer the question of the restitution of our ships.

There are some new points in the American resolution of yesterday -- some of them were not known to me -- and I do not know still the attitude of my Government towards them. I only know one thing clearly, that our Government has toward Danubian problems the following attitude: "Danube to the Danubian people," and I know, I conclude from that that these questions are political questions and have to be treated therefore not in the Economic and Social Council. Political questions

for which delegations which will attend the conference must be prepared. I sincerely doubt whether all delegations which will be called to the Danubian Conference in Vienna, if it is convened, will be prepared within some weeks. Besides, some of the countries which should attend this conference, if all Danubian countries have to attend it, have not yet concluded the Peace Agreement, such as Hungary and Rumania. So, I think you see how much this proposal of the American Representative would complicate the whole matter and how much this proposal would again defer the restitution of our vessels. At least it would defer the restitution for after this winter because during the months of December and January the Danube is usually not navigable.

Now this question is urgent also for other reasons. I said yesterday that the method of keeping foreign property in order to press for such solution of different problems is a very dangerous international precedent, and the note our Embassy in Washington handed yesterday to the State Department showed it clearly. I won't be long and I will mention only some important points of this note which I shall later circulate.

On August 21 the detachment of American Military Police at Linz blocked up that port where Yugoslav vessels were situated, tanks were placed in the winter quarters. After blocking them up, American soldiers in battle dress seized the Yugoslav craft and apprehended members of Yugoslav crews, ordering them to proceed with their vessels up the stream. These vessels were then brought from Linz to Bavaria. Some of our people of the crews have been arrested and kept together with ordinary criminals and questioned several times night and day, questioned in the presence of a major of the ex-Yugoslav Royal Army who was also questioned; and the questions referred to the political outlook of the people to the relations between the United States of America and the Soviet Union, and to the attitude towards Marshal Tito and so on. One officer was arrested and was falsely charged with having carried a dynamite cartridge

which was allegedly found when he was arrested on this barge. But when he was arrested, he was arrested in the presence of American soldiers, and there wasn't found anything. During their inquisition and questioning, several things happened, so some silver and gold objects disappeared. These Yugoslav citizens were searched by the German police and it was the same police which were there during the occupation.

These Yugoslav citizens were searched by the German Police and it was the same Police which were there during the occupation, and one of our people recognized among these Police, SS men, which they had personally known, as they had been ill-treated by these same men during the occupation.

Besides, in the new places where these ships are now, there is in the vicinity, a camp of Yugoslav immigrants, Chetniks, and other war criminals, who moved freely about the town, and immediately after the arrival of the Yugoslav craft, they swarmed on board - to the knowledge and approval of the American authorities--all over the vessels, and started the most furious campaign against Federal leaders of Yugoslavia and its members, torturing members of the group, and threatening to kill several members among them.

Now one very important economic thing, from the economic point of view: On the second of September, Austrian workmen, under supervision of orders of the local American occupation authorities, started the dismantling and carrying away of machines from the Yugoslav workshop which has been left at Linz, and to unload the barges which contain Yugoslav goods. The proceeding during the unloading was such that, according to information received, 75 percent of the materials and machines, in unloading, had been destroyed or had become unuseable.

We had handed a note of protest to the State Department and I think that this note shows how dangerous could be the further keeping of our Fleet in that zone.

I should like to make some remarks on the subject of competence. I think that the denial of the competence of this Council to discuss most urgent economic matters, economic matters which are entitled to be dealt with, for instance, in the Resolution on the Reconstruction Commission, that such denial is only to avoid a clear reply upon our Resolution, because it is, I think, for a Representative of any democratic government, very difficult to agree that, for



economic reasons, our Fleet, which is our property, is not to be restituted, and by restitution, help our national economy, help our reconstruction. I think that a Representative who has clearly followed our explanation must agree that such a restitution, and immediate restitution, is an important economic necessity.

It is a question, as I said, only of the recommendation. The Economic and Social Council has not the right of the execution, however. It is a question -- I repeat again -- only of the recommendation, upon which recommendation our Government has to contact again with the Government of the United States. And I think, after Mr. Winant's remark of this morning about the renewal of diplomatic contact between Yugoslavia and the United States, I think that even the Delegation of the United States would vote for our proposal, after which we shall again have diplomatic contact for this matter and arrange all the necessities for the restitution of our Fleet.

The PRESIDENT: Before the translation takes place, I must inform the Council that there are three speakers on my list, the United Kingdom, Lebanon, and Peru. I was asked by Dr. Chang that the meeting be adjourned at one o'clock to enable the Drafting Group on Devastated Regions to meet before our meeting in the afternoon. Therefore, I would like to ask the Members of the Council -- because we are in delay -- if we should meet tomorrow morning.

And Chile, too.

MR. MALIK (Lebanon): Can we discuss this point, whether we can meet tomorrow, before the translation?

The PRESIDENT: Yes. I am asking because it is very important to inform the Secretariat. It would be very late to inform them at seven o'clock in the evening. Therefore, I am raising this question.

MR. MALIK (Lebanon): If you would permit me, I would be opposed to meeting tomorrow. I think it would be better to rest a day and carry on more strenuously during the week. I think it would be better for everybody concerned not to meet tomorrow but to meet Monday.

MR. ARGYROPOULOS (Greece): I agree with our colleague from Lebanon.

Sept. 28, 1946  
am

Mr. ARGYROPOLOUS (Greece): I agree with our colleague from the Lebanon.

THE PRESIDENT: It seems that the suggestion made by the President is rejected.

Mr. NOEL BAKER (United Kingdom): Mr. President, I don't want to embarrass any Representative who has made arrangements for tomorrow, and I happen to know that some of our colleagues have important public duties which they have to perform tomorrow. It is no question of private convenience - if it were only private convenience I would think it right to sit tomorrow - but as Representatives do have work they must do outside the Council and some have arranged that, I think we ought to accept it. I don't know whether it would suit those Representatives to sit late tonight instead of tomorrow.

THE PRESIDENT: We shall meet on Monday morning as usual, but we sit tonight until 7. We will start at 2:45 sharp after lunch today, and in the meantime the Drafting Committee will convene and will have plenty of time to reach agreement.

(After the above discussion interpretation of the remarks of the Yugoslav Representative was given.)

(Interpretation)

Mr. KRASOVEC (Yugoslavia): I wish to make a correction. I did not say there was an exchange of notes, but that the note in question had been delivered yesterday to the State Department in Washington.

THE PRESIDENT: The meeting is adjourned until 2:45 exactly.

(The meeting adjourned at 12:53.)