

United Nations

Nations Unies

**ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL**

**CONSEIL
ECONOMIQUE
ET SOCIAL**

E/P.V./31
1 October 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. 2697). The envelope containing the corrections should be marked "Urgent" and bear the appropriate document symbol number.

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE SIXTEENTH MEETING OF THE THIRD SESSION
OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL
Lake Success, New York
Tuesday, 1 October 1946 at 2:45 pm

PRESENT:

THE PRESIDENT: DR. STAMPAR

MR. DAVILA	(Chile)
MR. YANG	(China)
MR. HOFFMANN	(France)
SIR G. SHANKAR BAJPAI	(India)
MR. MATES	(Yugoslavia)

The PRESIDENT: The meeting will come to order.

We will now hear the French translation of the Yugoslav Representative's speech of this morning's meeting.

During the French interpretation, the following Representatives assumed their seat at the Council table:

Mr. Zuleta Angel, Representative of Colombia.
Mr. Malik, Representative of Lebanon.
Mr. Winant, Representative of United States.
Mr. Feonov, Representative of Soviet Union.
Mr. Lebeau, Representative of Belgium.
Mr. Argyropoulos, Representative of Greece.
Mr. Medved, Representative of Ukrainian SSR.
Mr. Noel-Baker, Representative of United Kingdom.
Mr. Arca Parro, Representative of Peru.
Mr. Perez Cisneros, Representative of Cuba.
Mr. Colbjørnsen, Representative of Norway.

MR. DAVILA (Chile): Well, Mr. President, it looks very much like the good old times, when we had such a long debate in the Second Session of the Council, about the method of the appointment of Members of the Commission. I hope we don't have to go into the whole matter again.

My recollection, Mr. President, is that we passed a very definite Resolution, rejecting any form of selection of Members of all Commissions besides the one adopted by the Council. That is to say, that the Members of the

Commission should be Government Representatives and Government appointees. This is the very important principle, Mr. President, as adopted by the Council.

Although there is much to be said in favor of the observation of the Representative of the United Kingdom, that the Members of ^{the} other Commissions that would belong automatically to the demographic Commission are already Government Representatives, I am inclined to accept the amendment of the Representatives of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia as a better safeguard of the principle adopted by the Council than the text proposed.

(During the above remarks, Mr. Riddell, Representative of Canada arrived and assumed his seat at the Council table.)

SIR G. SHANKAR RAJPAI (India): Mr. President, I shall not mention the word "principle" because that seems to arouse passion here. Equally, I shall say nothing about what we decided in the last Session of the Council, because, unfortunately, I was not here.

My approach to this is a purely pragmatic or practical approach. Why is it that we want Representatives of the Economic and Employment Commission, the Social Commission, and the Statistical Commission? Presumably, we want them for the purpose of collaboration -- so that there will be coordination between the work of the Demographic Commission and these other Commissions.

Surely, for the purpose of achieving that object, it is not necessary that the Economic and Employment Commission, the Social Commission, and the Statistical Commission should be represented by Members. In other words, it is not in my judgment necessary that the Representatives of these bodies should have not merely an opportunity to debate and discuss but also an opportunity to vote. I think that surely this is a matter where we can reach accommodation between opposing points of view, without going too deeply into principle or raking up the past, merely by omitting the proposition that the Representatives of these four bodies be Members of the Commission.

That is our view, Sir.

MR. NOEL BAKER (United Kingdom): Mr. President, I want to propose a compromise, on which I have some reason to believe that we can all agree. Even when I disagree with him most, I find Mr. Feonov a most persuasive dialectician, and he and our Chilean Colleague have made me understand that, in their view, the decision taken at the last meeting was that Commissions should consist of Government Representatives, and of Government Representatives only.

I should have argued -- and indeed I think I should still argue -- that if the record were read through, in fact, we should find that the debate which took place was on the point: Should the Members of the Commissions be Government Representatives, or should they be individual experts appointed by the Council on its own authority and responsible to the Council alone? That was the point.

which I thought was discussed. I thought it did not in any way deal with the question -- in my view a different question and a question of great constitutional importance -- should one Commission be represented in another.

Now, I had thought, during the interval when we have all been out of the room, of putting forward a suggestion that we should appoint the twelve Government Representatives and leave the remaining question open until the next meeting, as the thing was new. But, what I hope is a better thought has come to my mind -- namely, that we might agree to appoint twelve people from Governments and three from these Commissions. They would be permanent Members of the Commissions, in the sense that they would always be there and get all the documents and take a full part in the work, but they would not vote. My preoccupation is that they should be there all the time, so that their thought will be formed with that of the other Members, so that they can go back to their own Commissions with a full knowledge of everything that has passed. On the question of voting, I do not attach great importance to that and should be very glad to give it up. If that were satisfactory, I think we might agree.

The PRESIDENT: Will you please propose that as an amendment?

MR. NOEL BAKER (United Kingdom): I would propose an amendment in that sense.

...(During the above remarks, Mr. Papanek, the Representative of Czechoslovakia, arrived and assumed his seat at the Council Table.)...

MR. FEONOV (Soviet Union): Mr. President, the compromise suggested by the United Kingdom Representative would be acceptable to the Soviet Delegation providing that those Representatives of the three Commissions would not be Members of the Commissions, but would be a kind of permanent liaison. With this understanding it would be acceptable.

MR. MATES (Yugoslavia): Mr. President, I highly appreciate the helpful attitude of the Representative of the United Kingdom. I think that it is the understanding of all Members of the Council that a close cooperation between the various Commissions is not only desirable but necessary.

It is very difficult to draw a straight line between the activities of the various Commissions, and it is extremely necessary to have a co-operation which will make out of these Commissions one whole, one system of endeavors to solve economic and social problems. I think that we can easily agree on the proposal of the United Kingdom Representative.

The PRESIDENT: May I ask the United Kingdom Representative to present his amendment.

MR. NOEL-BAKER (United Kingdom): I haven't quite got the text from my Soviet colleague yet, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT: Please don't forget the World Health Organization.

In part, it will be a Soviet proposal.

MR. NOEL-BAKER (United Kingdom): Well, I think, it would run something like this, Mr. President. There is a slight difference of opinion on one point which I will mention.

MR. FEONOV (Soviet Union): A point of grammar.

MR. NOEL-BAKER (United Kingdom): The Economic and Employment Commission, the Social Commission and the Statistical Commission shall have their permanent Representatives -- our Soviet colleague says "to the Population Commission." I should like to say "in the Population Commission," in order to keep close relation between their respective bodies.

The PRESIDENT: And you don't agree to put in ^{the} Health Organization because this is the Organization exactly dealing with population problems.

MR. NOEL-BAKER (United Kingdom): They would have no vote. If we are

agreed on the principle, the President can make the text, I am sure, -the President or the Secretary-General.

The PRESIDENT: Pleased.

MR. ARCA PARRO (Peru): The Health Organization?

MR. NOEL-BAKER (United Kingdom): That takes us into specialized agencies. If we put in the Health, then we've got the ILO, and we have got a number of people. I think we had better be cautious at this moment. Mr. President, the essentials are these: that these three Commissions shall nominate people who will always sit in the Population Commission. They will not be members in the sense that the other Members are, they will not vote, but they will be able to take their whole part in all the proceedings. And I think that Mr. Fecnov and I -- and I hope the rest of the Council -- will be perfectly willing to trust you and the Secretary General to make the text.

The PRESIDENT: Thank you very much for your confidence.

Are there any objections to it? It is approved.

MR. NOEL-BAKER (United Kingdom): Mr. President, if I may just raise one other point? Then I assume that these two Commissions which we have decided to establish today, the Statistical and the Demographic Commissions, will be chosen together with the others when we come to them, to that point on the Agenda.

The PRESIDENT: Next in order is the French amendment to Paragraph 1. The French Representative proposed that a new sub-paragraph should be inserted with the following words: "The effect of changes in the age structure for population on international relations, standards of living and social security."

Do the Members agree to the proposal?

MR. FECNOV (Soviet Union): Mr. President, I just cannot understand what might be the influence of age structure on international relations. May I ask for an explanation by my French colleague?

MR. HOFFHERR (France) (Interpretation from French): Mr. President, I have already said, speaking of the age composition of populations, that this seems to me to be one of the essential phenomena which go to make up the whole problem of population, which is to be the subject of study of the proposed Commission.

I mentioned also the effect of changes in the age composition of the population upon international relations, the standard of life, and social security.

As we know, there are countries with increasing populations and countries with stationary populations. We are concerned also with the whole problem of senescence, the aging of populations, which has effects of many kinds, including effects upon international relations. The aging of a population influences, obviously, the total effectiveness of manpower of a country, affects also questions of taxation and questions of social security.

The aging of a population is at present a problem which faces only certain countries, particularly some European countries, but it may be a subject with which other countries may soon be faced. Perhaps, certain American countries will, at some later time, be faced with this problem of an aging population.

MR. NOEL-BAKER (United Kingdom): Mr. President, I am in great sympathy with the purpose that is in our French colleague's mind.

I spoke of the new branch of medical research into senescence, this morning. If the hoped-for strides are made, perhaps, we may all look forward to an extended period of life. We shall be in this Council for many years, and, then, of course, the peace of the world will be assured.

That is the answer which I would make to Mr. Teonov.

The answer I would make to our French colleague is that which I ventured to suggest this morning, that, perhaps, we might do well to rely on paragraph 6 of the Resolution, and ask the Commission to consider this matter and to report to us at our next meeting.

The PRESIDENT: Is the French Representative satisfied with this explanation?

This amendment is withdrawn.

MR. ARCA PARRO (Peru): Mr. President, this morning I said that on the document, E/182, I presented a proposal as to the establishment of a Clear Demographic Commission, but in view of the fact that the British and American Delegations have agreed on a joint proposal, I did withdraw this proposal. But, at the same time, I asked that within the Nuclear Commission there should be represented the World Health Organization, which should receive consideration.

As long as this proposal has been rejected, or not taken into consideration with the same aim that has been expressed by the British Representative, Mr. Noel-Baker, I should like to draw the attention of the Council to a recommendation that some of the suggestions that are contained within this document E/182, could be considered by the Commission at the time that they prepare the program or framework for the permanent Commission. Particularly, I would like to draw ^{their} attention to the fact that no mention is made in this document about the way in which the Demographic Commission is going to cooperate or coordinate its work with the World Health Organization.

The other document I presented is a reference that the Commission should work along the lines of vital statistics, trends of development in geographic areas of social diseases, epidemics, endemics, and international causes of death and morbidity.

A great part of this work was developed by the technical divisions of ^{old} League of Nations, and I do not think that it would be in the minds of the Commission or any of the Members of this Council that such important work could be dropped off. I think the Commission would be willing to take up and carry on with such work in connection with the World Health Organization.

I wish to call the attention of the new Commission to take up some of the suggestions that would prove of interest.

I do not want to press this as an amendment, because I think we should have a vote on this Resolution right now.

The PRESIDENT: After this discussion, can I declare that the resolution of the Population Commission is adopted with the amendment mentioned under paragraph 2? The Secretariat will prepare a final text of paragraph 2, and I will read it later, tomorrow or the day after tomorrow, if we meet here. In addition to that, I think the Council can authorize me to insert in paragraph 2, "the necessity for collaborating with specialized agencies dealing with population problems." In my opinion this is very important. Do the Members of the Council agree?

MR. COLBJORNSEN (Norway): Mr. President, is it really necessary to insert a reference to the specialized agencies? I think that will be covered by the agreement which is to be entered into between the World Health Organization and the United Nations, according to the standard already adopted. For instance, in the agreement which we concluded at our last session with the International Labor Organization, there is a paragraph as follows:

"Representatives of the International Labor Organization shall be invited to attend meetings of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations and of its Commissions and Committees, and to participate without vote in the deliberations of those bodies with respect to items on their Agenda in which the International Labor Organization has indicated that it has an interest."

Surely, the World Health Organization will indicate that it has an interest in all of the Population Commission's work and as, presumably, a corresponding clause will be inserted in the agreement to be concluded between the World Health Organization and the United Nations, that will really take care of the matter.

(During the above remarks, Mr. Riddell, Representative of Canada, left the Table and was replaced by Mr. Davidson).

The PRESIDENT: I am not willing to prolong this debate, but still I must say that the World Health Organization will be established in permanent

form only sometime by the end of next year. Now, it is only an Interim Commission acting on its behalf. But this Demographic Commission will be established now. I am a little bit of a specialist in population problems, and I know that the World Health Organization deals with such problems very much, and is extremely interested in them. Therefore, I believe that this link is very important in the initial stage of the activities of the Demographic Commission.

MR. Arca PARRO (Peru): I support your proposal.

The PRESIDENT: The resolution of the Population Commission is approved with the amendment mentioned under paragraph 2. The secretariat will help me to prepare a new text for paragraph 2, and later on I will read it; perhaps tomorrow.

~~END OF REPORT~~ OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL REGARDING FAO

The PRESIDENT: Next Item: Proposals of the Secretary-General regarding FAO.

MR. NOEL-BAKER (United Kingdom): Mr. President, the resolution on this subject is proposed by my Delegation. It is contained in document E/197, to which there has been added a corrigendum.

I don't need to defend the resolution. The Council remembers, as it sits, that last June we requested the Secretary-General to give all possible assistance to the Director-General of FAO at all stages in the work on which he was engaged at that time. Since then, as the resolution notes, a most important conference has been held by FAO at Copenhagen on the subject of a World Food Board, and the proposals there put forward are to be studied further at Washington, at a meeting to be summoned before November the first. My Government and I believe the Governments of all the countries represented in this Council are most anxious that the fullest support that we can give should be behind the work on which FAO is engaged. For that reason, we want the Council to be associated with the Conference in Washington.

In our original draft, we proposed that the Secretary-General should nominate two people from the Economic Affairs Department to represent him in

E/P.V./31
23-25

this Preparatory Commission. It was subsequently represented to us by the United States that it might be a better plan to have the Chairman of the Economic and Employment Commission and one Member from the Secretariat.

We were very glad to agree to that arrangement, and I propose that the Council should now adopt it.

MR. HOFFHERR (France) (Interpretation from French): The French Delegation wishes very warmly to support this new Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization, Mr. President. An initiative was taken in this respect towards the end of the 1914-1918 War, arising from a suggestion coming from the French Government as regards the insertion of a clause relating to food deliveries to be inserted in the peace treaties. Later on, at a later stage, a Frenchman was closely involved in an important enquiry into the whole subject of the production and distribution of food. At that time, there was a serious collapse in the organization and prices of food, and there was clearly an urgent need to introduce some measures taking account of the interests both of the producers and consumers. My country has already taken steps, Mr. President, to improve, both from the quantitative and qualitative points of view, the feeding of her population. In this particular, as regards the distribution of food, we have taken measures to see that in the distribution of food, account shall be taken of the interests both of producers and of consumers. We think it desirable that the United Nations should be associated as closely as possible with the Food and Agriculture Organization in this respect. For this purpose, I should like to suggest two amendments to reinforce the participation of the United Nations in the work of the conference. In the first place, I should like, taking account of the American Resolution, to ask the Economic and Employment Commission to keep itself closely informed of the progress of the deliberations of the Preparatory Commission and to advise the Council as to the nature and timing of further measures that may be required in order to ensure progress towards the basic objective. Secondly, I should like to stress the importance of the request that two representatives of the United Nations, to be chosen by the Secretary General and to represent him, should be appointed to cooperate with the Food and Agricultural Organization in this conference. We have thus approved both the principle of close liaison between the United Nations and the Food and Agricultural

Organization and the principle of representation of the United Nations in the Conference.

MR. WINANT (United States): Mr. President, I feel sure that the Council will wish to accept the invitation of FAO to name representatives to the Preparatory Commissions set up to consider proposals for longer-term international machinery with reference to food. It was to first facilitate the Council action that my Delegation presented its resolution. I had not known that my British colleague was also presenting a resolution. It was good of him to alter his resolution, taking into account some of our suggestions. I would like, in turn, to withdraw the resolution of my Delegation and support the revised resolution of the United Kingdom.

I should like to say a word about the competence of having the Council represented by the Chairman of the Economic and Employment Commission. Our representative should, and I am sure you will agree, be a person who can bring before the FAO Preparatory Commission, in the most effective way, the advice necessary in order that the decisions of that Commission can be taken in harmony with a broad pattern of the United Nations for international economic organization. In these matters, the Council is advised principally by its Economic and Employment Commission. Moreover, I believe that it is incumbent on the Economic and Employment Commission to keep itself closely informed of the progress of the deliberations of the FAO Preparatory Commission. We must progress towards the basic objective of preventing in the future the all too familiar experience of inadequate food supplies in some parts of the world, while, at the same time, there are food surpluses in other parts of the world. The Council may have to arrange for further measures to this end. I should like also to stress the importance of the role of the Secretariat. We must count on its active assistance to the Commission. We feel that the problem is important and challenging. Every effort is needed to find a constructive solution.

Y/P.V./31
28-30 .

(During the above remarks, Mr. Riddell, Representative of Canada, arrived and replaced Mr. Davidson; Dr. Chang, Representative of China arrived and replaced Mr. Yang.)

(Mr. Zuleta Angel, Representative of Columbia left the table and was replaced by Mr. Betancur).

MR. RIDDELL (Canada): Mr. President, may I ask one question in connection with this proposal? Depending on the answer, I may or may not wish to make some remarks about the proposal.

I notice that it is suggested that one of the two Members of this Commission be the Chairman of the Economic and Employment Commission. The Economic and Employment Commission has not yet been named and will not be established for some time. I should think it would be very difficult to set up the Economic and Employment Commission before the time that this proposed Preparatory Committee is intended to meet. I was wondering what the intention was as to the individual who should fill this particular post until such time as the Economic and Employment Commission is set up, and at what time it is expected that the Chairman of the Economic and Employment Commission himself will be able to take this post.

MR. NOEL BAKER (United Kingdom): I am very glad to answer the question. My answer is taken from the text of the resolution of the Council on the subject of this Commission which appears on page 512 of the Journal published on the 13th of July. The heading is, "Economic and Employment Commission." It says, "The Economic and Social Council having considered the report of the Economic and Employment Commission," etc., "decides."

In other words, what we have called the Nuclear Economic and Employment Commission has in reality been the Economic and Employment Commission. We shall now extend its Membership, but our intention would be that the present Chairman of the Commission, who has functioned so far, should go to this meeting in Washington at the end of October and then, when the Commission is extended in accordance with what we shall do today or tomorrow, when it is extended, then, if there were a new election of Chairman, if the Chairman were changed - perhaps he will be the same - if he were changed, then he would take over the duty of representation in this Preparatory Commission.

MR. RIDDELL (Canada): Mr. President, I would like to make two comments in terms of that reply. The first one is based on expediency, and the second one on principle. Noel Baker has said that in the interim, the Chairman of the Nuclear Economic and Employment Commission should act.

As you know, the Chairman of that Commission is a Canadian. We are very gratified that this distinguished Canadian, in whom we ourselves have great confidence, should be indicated as the person who might fulfill this responsibility for the Council. I think, however, that it might be the part of wisdom to consider whether or not the suggestion is practicable. At least, I think that the man in question himself should be consulted as to whether or not it will be physically possible for him to fulfill the responsibilities which are being laid to him. My impression is that he has not been so consulted. He has been, until quite recently, a civil servant in Canada who has now been lost to the Civil Service--we very much regret to say--and he has returned to his University and unfortunately had to leave his post with the Canadian Delegation here in order to take up his duties with the University. I am sure, you, Mr. President, will sympathize with him very greatly on the dilemma he found himself in when his classes called him.

I should think it would be very unlikely that he would be able to add these responsibilities to others which he will already have in connection with his duties on this Council, in the time that this work must be done. But I think that he himself must answer for that, and before a decision is made to name him to that particular post, I think that his answer should be sought.

Now that leads me to the second point that I have to raise, and that is the point of principle. I noticed that it is suggested in the text that each of these representatives may appoint an alternative. I presume that it may be the feeling that if Dr. Mackintosh wants to stay with his students, indeed he should--that it will be possible for him to appoint an alternative to do the work for him. Now, then, we come to the point of principle. It seems to me that the responsibility should lie with the person who is going to do the work. If Dr. Mackintosh, or whoever else is named to this post, is going to be in some city of Canada or elsewhere, and the work is going to go on in Washington, the responsibility should lie with the person who is actually at that post.

It is suggested that the Secretary-General can appoint a deputy, as he will indeed need to do. But the Secretary-General can appoint a Member of his staff.

The situation is rather different in the case of a representative of a country whom, I presume, in this case would be appointed from the Members of the Secretariat, and in that case the relationship would be very different. The chain of responsibility would be quite different from the case that would exist when the Secretary-General appointed one of his own staff. It seems to me, that although I am very sure that the Canadian Government will wish to assist in every way possible in this task and that Dr. Mackintosh also - if it is indeed he who is considered in this particular connection - will do all that he can, the responsibility under item 2 here should lie actually with the person who is going to do the work.

It seems to me therefore, that the expedient thing to do would be for you to name a Member of the Secretariat who would have special responsibility, it may be, for keeping in touch with the Economic and Employment Commission, its Chairman, and who would nevertheless, have the responsibility in this case.

I think I would have preferred the original United Kingdom text which laid that responsibility clearly with the Secretariat. I have been considering the matter rather hastily during the lunch hour. There may be a good deal of virtue in associating the responsibility of Members of the Secretariat with the two bodies who are named, that is, the Preparatory Committee of the International Trade and Employment Conference and the Economic and Employment Commission. I think it might be possible to revise the text a little bit to do that if the principles were decided that the responsibility was to lie with the people who actually attend the meetings.

MR. NOEL BAKER (United Kingdom): Mr. President, I must apologize publicly to the Council for the failure of the British Commonwealth of Nations to carry through the necessary consultation among its Members. I greatly regret the embarrassment which we have so caused to the Canadian Delegation. I think, myself, that the best plan would be to consult Dr. Mackintosh and to leave it to him to settle who should represent the Commission over which he presides. I am sure he will find some means for consulting his colleagues in the Commission - not now a very large body - and they could agree.

The PRESIDENT: There are no more speakers on this subject.

MR. COLEBJORNSEN (Norway): Mr. President, I think it is worthwhile to point out that in adopting this Resolution the Council does not pronounce any opinion on the question of whether a World Food Board should be established or not established. What we are doing is that we continue with a further study of the matters, on the proposal put forward by the Director-General of the Food and Agriculture Organization, as well as other proposals which may be put forward. But we are not pronouncing, and we are not discussing today, and we are saying nothing, about the substance matters. I am not entering into this question, but I should only like to mention that the proposals put forward to the International Conference on Trade and Employment, by the United States Government, contain ideas which, in many respects, go contrary to the ideas of the Director-General of FAO. For instance, their proposals to the International Conference on Trade and Employment, contain prohibitions, proposed prohibitions against practically all sorts of international price agreements, while the World Food Board proposal can, in certain respects, be conceived as leading to a sort of world cartel, and of course between these basic points, there is a difference, a rather large difference.

I don't think, of course, we can discuss that here now. We are all agreed that we must do something effectively, in the form of long-term measures, to have the food surpluses of the world channeled into regions where they are needed. But with regard to the Organization, the organizational

measures, the Organization to adopt it for that purpose - whether it should be a World Food Board, or whether it should be a totally different form of organization, we reserve our opinion. We are not discussing this today. We don't pronounce any opinion on that today. We only hear recommendations. We only send the Secretary-General or his Representative to the meeting in Washington in order to study the matters further, but without any specific instructions, and without taking any position in that question of whether a World Food Board should be established or not.

MR. FETENOV (Soviet Union): Mr. President, I wonder if there is any chance of postponing consideration of the decision on this matter because we received the papers only today and we have had no time to consider them. I must say that I am not acquainted with the situation at all. I am absolutely ignorant of it.

MR. RIDELL (Canada): Mr. President, there may be a good deal of virtue in the suggestion which has just been made that further consideration be postponed. I quite agree that if we are to end our sessions tomorrow we can't postpone it for long.

In any case, I would like to make another remark in this connection and, again, I am looking for a clarification of the proposal that is before us. Before I suggest an alternative or support another alternative, I would like to make sure that my misgivings are well founded. I am very certain that the Canadian Government and the Canadian Delegation here will be very gratified to find Dr. Mackintosh serving in this capacity. Nothing could please us more. We would be glad to facilitate that service in any way we possibly could. There is no hesitation on our part in that connection; it is simply on the grounds of practicability. I am sure his gratification will be very real in this matter and will be even greater because it is supposed to leave to him the matter of discovering some means by which he can be represented-- whether through a Member of the Secretariat or through somebody of his own choice, leaves him a very wide range of selection in the matter.

I have a feeling however, that the question of principle remains. It seems to me that it is very curious to name as the Representative of this Council or a body the Chairman of a Commission which has not yet come into existence and, then, suggest as an alternative the Chairman of a Commission which will never meet again and then name as the person a man whom we are not certain will actually be able to go. There is a definition of the philosophy that it is like "looking in a dark room for a black hat which isn't there".

I am not sure that at this moment we are doing something which is not real. If this is a practical suggestion, of course, the Canadian Delegation has no

objection whatever and is quite pleased to have Dr. Mackintosh fill this particular role. It seems to me that it would be much more practical to name somebody who could actually do the job and give him this responsibility. I still have misgivings in this connection.

THE PRESIDENT: Rule 53 says: "During the discussion of any matter, a Representative may move the adjournment of the debate. Any such motion shall have priority in the debate. In addition to the proposed motion, one Representative may speak in favor and one against the motion."

MR. FEONOV (Soviet Union): Mr. President, I should not want to request you to put the postponement to a vote. I just asked whether there is any chance of getting general agreement on that. So, I would like to hear the views on that matter, but it is not a request for a formal vote.

MR. WINANT (United States): Mr. President, may I suggest that we postpone this matter until tomorrow. We would at least have a chance to call up Dr. Mackintosh.

MR. NOEL BAKER (United Kingdom): I think Mr. Feonov is fully justified in asking for a postponement. Our paper is dated only yesterday and I do not think he has had a chance to consider it.

THE PRESIDENT: Do the Members agree? So, the debate on this item is postponed until tomorrow.

(During the above remarks, Dr. Chang Representative of China, left the table and was replaced by Mr. Yang).

The PRESIDENT: The next item is the terms of reference and composition of subcommissions of the Economic and Employment Commission. A special Drafting Subcommittee was established for this purpose. You have Document E/200 in your hands. Does any Member wish to speak on this subject?

MR. NOEL BAKER (United Kingdom): Mr. President, I just want to say that we regret that it has been decided not to appoint a Balance of Payments Subcommittee at this stage, but we fully accept it and hope the Council will accept the proposal without amendment and without discussion.

MR. FEONOV (Soviet Union) (Second Interpretation; Original in Russian): Mr. President: the Soviet Delegation cannot accept the Resolution concerning composition of subcommissions, because this Resolution lays it down that the subcommissions will in fact be composed not of Representatives of Governments, but of private individual experts. It is the opinion of the Soviet Delegation that the rules governing the composition of commissions should be applied also to the composition of subcommissions. What was right in the case of commissions must be right also in the case of subcommissions, and these principles should be applied in full.

A subcommission of private experts, in our opinion, would not be able to carry out a really effective piece of work. In all international organizations discussions of many questions are the result of compromises and these are inevitable because different countries have different and sometimes conflicting points of view and interests. An expert, however, is called upon to state his expert knowledge on certain questions. He can change his position, he can change his opinion, only if he can be convinced that it is mistaken. Only then can he renounce his position or change it. A subcommission, however, will be called upon to give recommendations, many of which will necessarily be in the nature of compromises, and I cannot see, for the reasons already given, how a commission consisting of experts can reach compromises. A compromise means a departure from a position originally adopted, in other words, it means the recognition of the mistaken character of one's position to some extent. A subcommission of experts

would be unable to reach compromises and therefore unable to do a real job of work. It would be able to reach no decisions unless, under the name of experts, the Members were really Representatives of Governments.

For these reasons Mr. President, which are of a purely factual character, the Soviet Delegation believes that the same principles should be applied to the composition of subcommissions as are applied to the composition of commissions.

(During the above remarks Mr. Winant, Representative of the United States left and was replaced by Mr. Stinebower; Dr. Chang, Representative of China, returned and replaced Mr. Yang.)

MR. ARGYROPOULOS (Greece): Mr. President, when we first discussed the question of the composition of the commissions there were two opinions facing each other. The one advocated composition of the commissions by experts, and the other by Representative of Governments.

The Commissions are, so to say, policy-making bodies. So, of course that discussion was very logical, and I must say that I was, too, inclined not to consider only the composition of the Commission in a purely technical way, but I consider that the Commissions had to take into consideration also the interests of the countries which were represented on them. But, the Sub-Commissions are not policy-making bodies. The Sub-Commissions are purely technical bodies which have to study specific matters and submit recommendations to the Commissions. So I do not think that at the level of the Sub-Commissions we have to make compromises of a political nature. The Sub-Commissions will have to work on a purely technical basis, and be the advisers of the Commissions, submit their recommendations and the results of their studies to the Commissions. That is why I think that since we have determined the representation on the Commissions as having to be representative of the States, of the countries, and not purely technical, we ought to have the Sub-Commissions composed of technical members who are able to study technical matters and advise the Commissions on them.

MR. COLBJORNSEN (Norway): Mr. President, I apologize for speaking again, but as Acting Chairman of the Committee on Economic Matters, which considered this question, I feel obliged to say a few words.

First, I should like to say in regard to the "expert question" here discussed, that nowhere and at no time has this Council decided that the Commissions should not consist of experts. What we have decided is that countries should be selected. The Council is selecting countries, and they appoint their Representatives. These Representatives appointed by the Governments, may be Government officials, or private persons. They may be bound by instructions, or they may do whatever they like. That is up to the Governments. Presumably I should think the Government will appoint experts. So do not let us lose any more time on that question.

Now, with regard to the selection of Governments I, myself, spoke about that in our last Session, and I think it is a good principle. But even such a good principle can be exaggerated and carried a little too far. I quite agree with my colleague from Greece. When we come down to these small working groups, then the question of the principle of selecting

E.V.P.I

(minutes of meeting of the E.V.P.I. (52-55) 52-55

... Governments will not apply, and cannot apply, so successfully any measures...

I submit, there is nothing in our previous decisions with regard to the six Commissions previously set up, which prevents us from constituting the Sub-Commissions from selecting the Members of the Sub-Commissions in the way proposed in this report.

We considered these matters very carefully, and at great length in our Committee, and we reached unanimity in many things, for instance, with regard to the terms of reference of the two Sub-Commissions set up. But, unhappily, we did not quite reach unanimity with regard to the appointment of Members of the Sub-Commissions, and also not with regard to the subsequent paragraph (c), containing provisions for the inviting of special experts from their various inter-governmental agencies. There was a minority there who could not vote for these proposals. But the matter was really very thoroughly thrashed out, and I should think that we really need not repeat here all the arguments pro and con which we had in our large Committee.

With these words, I should like to recommend the adoption of the "draft resolution of the Sub-Commissions as reported."

Mr. FEONOV (Soviet Union) (Second interpretation; original in Russian):

I regret, Mr. President, that I do not agree with the remarks of the Norwegian Representative and of the Greek Representative. The Greek Representative said that Commissions might well consist of Representatives of the Governments, because Commissions have to decide political questions. I submit, Mr. President, even Commissions do not have to decide political questions. Commissions are the organs of the Economic and Social Council, and their function is to give advice to the Economic and Social Council. The Council may, at certain times, perhaps, be called upon to take decisions of a political character; but really the General Assembly is the only organ which has the function of making political decisions. I do not think, therefore, that one can establish the fundamental distinction that the Greek Representative suggests between Commissions on the one hand, and Sub-Commissions on the other, in this connection. The Greek Representative also said that in such small bodies as Sub-Commissions, it might be unnecessary to reach compromises--compromise solutions might not be necessary.

I have my doubts on this. I think, on the contrary, that compromise solutions will often be necessary. I would refer in particular to the terms of reference of the Economic and Employment Commission. Part of the terms of reference, "A-3" lay down that the function of this Commission shall be to give advice as to the most appropriate means of promoting full employment and economic stability. These are very important questions, and I very much doubt whether agreement could be reached upon them without compromise.

A Commission consisting of experts will be unable to reach such a compromise. Every expert belongs to his own economic school. He shares the conceptions and opinions of that school, and he will not in general see any reason to renounce these opinions, in order to reach a compromise. An expert will ask why he should renounce the opinion which he holds to be correct, in order to reach a compromise. And the result will be that no effective decisions would be taken if the Commission consisted, or Sub-Commission consisted, of experts. And so I believe that no practical decision could be taken by a Sub-Commission unless it were composed of Representatives of Governments, and this is because Governments are interested in achieving results, in finding common ground; whereas the expert is interested

primarily in the points of view and the opinions which his training has taught him to adopt.

For these reasons, Mr. President, the Soviet Delegation insists that Sub-Commissions consist not of experts, because they will be unable to produce practical results, but of Representatives of Governments.

Mr. PAPANEK (Czechoslovakia): Mr. President, without repeating the arguments already presented here in favor of the composition of the Sub-Commissions by the Representatives of Governments, I would like to add that the past experience teaches us that we should base our decisions on them. If we go into the League of Nations' work in the past, we can find many instances that there were conferences or committees which were composed of experts. These always produced many documents and recommendations but only very few of them were accepted because they were proposed by experts. And I think that we should draw conclusions from this and avoid such experiences and therefore, adhere to the same principle that we have in the composition of the Commissions. That would avoid complications also because, as it was already said here, it will mean that in the Sub-Commissions composed of experts all their deliberations, all their decisions will be revised in the Commission or in the Council because those who took these decisions were not responsible to the respective Governments.

Mr. MALIK (Lebanon): It seems to me that this whole question of expert opinion versus Government opinion raises a very deep issue, namely, whether there is an objective truth independent of Governments and Government opinion. The argument has been put forth that only Government Representatives may agree by reason of compromise whereas experts cannot agree because they are not prepared to compromise. I find that this is an untenable position because it seems to me that the exact opposite is the case. You will not find at present, Mr. President, a dazzling amount of agreement and compromise among Government Representatives in international conferences. All too often, they inflexibly refuse to compromise their point of view precisely because they are under specific instructions; whereas, experts, on the other hand, when they meet, if they have full regard for the objective truth of the point under discussion, they are bound to agree in the long run after a long enough discussion.

We know that that has been the case in many a scientific conference in the past. Scientists met in their various congresses and conferences and discussed all sorts of problems. Finally, if they have real regard for the objective truth they finally come to an agreement. And therefore, it seems to me that when experts meet, they are bound by the very profession of respect for the truth to agree in the end if they find the truth; whereas, when they meet and do not agree it isn't because there is not an objective truth to which they can agree but it is rather because they are antecedently indoctrinated in certain points of view which prevent them from agreeing.

It seems to me therefore, Mr. President, that it is precisely for the sake of unanimous agreement on the various issues that would be brought up before the Sub-Commissions that we must have experts in their own individual capacity in action, rather than Government Representatives who are under specific instructions. Therefore, I say and I repeat, that here we are dealing with a far deeper issue, namely, the issue of whether there is an objective truth, quite independent of any Government or Government opinion.

MR. STINEBOWER (United States): Mr. President, I want to support the suggestion of the Representative of Norway that we do not repeat all of the arguments which we have heard both in this Council on numerous occasions, and in the ad hoc Committee which is reporting to you today, and in its Sub-committee.

We have heard those arguments many times and we know each other's views very well and I doubt if we shall change many of those views in the course of this short debate. In the views of some of us, if the same pattern is to be followed regarding the composition of the sub-commissions as of the commissions, we might as well not have the sub-commissions. But we could just as well have sub-committees of the commissions themselves, composed of the membership of the commissions. I do not, however, intend to go into the arguments of those who favor these commissions being composed of experts in their personal capacity. I want to point out a few compromises that have been made. If I understand Mr. Feonov correctly, he defined an expert as one who cannot agree with his fellows, who cannot compromise. I should like to see us put to the test here, around this table, whether we have more ability to compromise than the experts he fears. The ad hoc Committee was in full agreement on two points. It was in agreement that these two Sub-commissions should be small and be seven persons in number. It was agreed also at that time, despite this debate, that those seven persons should be persons who were technically qualified in the fields of those two Sub-commissions. The only disagreement existed in the method of selecting these seven technically qualified persons. Should they be selected because they were known to be qualified, or should they be selected because certain Governments should be represented on the Sub-commission, and then we should look to the Governments to name us a qualified expert?

Well, Sir, this text is not a pure text of either kind. It does provide that each Sub-Commission shall be composed of seven persons selected by the Commission. But it also provides that those seven persons shall be selected in consultation with the Secretary-General, and in the report that accompanies this text, it is pointed out that this is in no small part to take care of the fact

that the Commission itself might not know all of the best qualified experts in the world, particularly, those who do not customarily come to the attention of the persons who read English and French. Therefore, it would be well for the Commission to take the advice of the Secretary-General; to consult with the Secretary-General in selecting their candidates.

Finally, it is provided also that these persons must be appointed with the consent of the Government of which the person is a national. That is another point of compromise, if you will call it so, although no one regarded it as such in the Committee. We regarded it as good sense.

Once again, it is provided that not more than one person may be selected from any single country. In the ad hoc Committee, there was the view expressed that it would not be a wise rule to lay down universally, although some persons would have liked to have laid it down as a general rule. It was felt that there may come up technical subjects from time to time in which there will be a high concentration of the best technically qualified personnel in a few countries. But with respect to these Sub-commissions, which are the only ones in point, the Sub-commission on Employment and Economic Stability and the Sub-commission on Economic Development, the Committee was in complete agreement that no country has a monopoly on experts in these subjects. It is widely spread and therefore it is once again, agreed as to the wisdom of this rule that no more than one person shall be selected from any single country. All I wish to suggest by this, Mr. President, is that this text itself represents a compromise between two extreme views. I would like to see us accept it if possible without further debate.

MR. MEDVED (Ukraine S.S.R.) (Second interpretation; original in Russian):

Mr. President, I have no intention of entering upon a long discussion here as to the absolute truth of the objective character of the matter or what is not the objective character of the matter. This would entail a long discussion, a philosophical one, which would take us very far, and take up much of the time of the Council. I shall confine myself to purely practical considerations. After all, what is our aim and our purpose? We wish to have sub-commissions which are composed, as they should be, and in a position to do effective and useful work. I believe that the Soviet Union proposal serves that purpose. It is that a sub-commission should be composed of Representatives of States and Governments. It is necessary to say that we can ask all the Governments concerned to supply fully competent persons in the various fields, people who have the full knowledge which is required by the Economic and Social Council, and then, I believe, our common wish will be fully respected.

There are a number of advantages in having the sub-commission composed of Government Representatives. In the first place, there will be as many countries as there will be members in the sub-committee; therefore, each Member bringing into the Commission his own personal knowledge--and we know that scientists often have an abstract kind of knowledge--they will, in addition, bring the experience of their various countries. Therefore, in the Commission we shall have the representation of expert knowledge and of experience acquired in the various countries that will be represented in the Commission. Therefore, we are bound to obtain, by that means, practical results inasmuch as we shall have the full use of the experience acquired in the different countries.

We have several examples in our own Council. If we take, for instance, the matter of devastated areas, we know that there were two opinions represented in that debate. There were actually two groups that formed; one under the leadership of the Ukraine, and the other was led by Mr. Noel Baker. Now what happened? There were recommendations brought before the Council, and these recommendations were in the end rejected by both these groups. That would have led to the formation of a new sub-commission, if such a thing happened. We would then have, in the Council, again, difficulties in coming to a compromise solution.

Furthermore, the need of these Commissions is not purely of a scientific character. We certainly need that experience acquired in the various countries, and if the Commissions are composed by Government representatives, we shall not see just one interest represented in the Commission, but it will be the interest of various Members of the United Nations. The recommendations these Members will be able to make will, in the end, lead to compromise solutions which will be acceptable to all. It will lead to what, in diplomatic language, is known as mutual understanding. Here is true objectivity. This is surely not a purely scientific matter, but a practical consideration having very great importance.

This is the way in which effective work can be carried out in the Commissions of the Council, and I believe that the Commissions should be composed of Government Representatives.

(During the above remarks, Mr. Cisneros, Representative of Cuba, left the Table and was replaced by Mr. Blanco.)

There are two points that we must not forget. In the first place, not all countries have reached the same degree of economic development.

If we appoint Representatives of Governments, we shall have the Commissions, the Representatives of these countries, in these countries in which there are various degrees of development, and that also will be a beneficial factor to the work of the Commission. Secondly, we know that economic science is not a universal science. The principles of economics differ rather widely, one from the other, and therefore, all shades of economic opinion will be represented in the Commission, if it is formed by people named by their Governments.

The Soviet Union proposal leads to effective work. There can be no doubt of that. It leads to the knowledge of objective truth, and also assures the Council of the presence of every possible expert opinion. I believe the composition, as suggested by the Soviet Union Delegation, has the best chances of reaching recommendations that will be acceptable to all the Members of the Council. The Soviet Union proposal takes into account past experience. I believe that it is the right suggestion, one we all need, and therefore I fully support it.

MR. NOEL BAKER (United Kingdom) : Mr. President, I agree with Mr. Foenov's views that in the last resort it will be the Assembly which will form policy, and we shall usually be in the position in this Council of forming a judgment on what our Commissions presented to us and then recommending it to the Assembly for final adoption and action. I agree with very little else that he said. With Mr. Stinebower, I find it difficult to believe that experts are less good than politicians at compromise. If so, all I can say is, God help the experts! But it has been my experience in a government system which is riddled with expert committees, the experts never find any difficulty in making recommendations. They pour them out. And I should have shrewdly suspected that the same was true of the Soviet Union, or of any other government system in the world. I differ, I think, from Mr. Foenov's whole conception of compromise. I do not feel when I make a

compromise, as we did about the composition of commissions last June, that I have admitted that I have been in error. Not at all. I am making a working arrangement in order to get on, because we cannot agree on the system, and we must do something. That is why we have majority votes, and that is why a vote of ten to nine, or nine to eight, is often held in democratic institutions to be sufficient justification for doing something which is objectionable to a minority, but which brings you a practical result.

Sir, I accepted the decision in June about the composition of the Commissions. I have not raised it again, but if I am asked to say that that was an admission of error, I will say very frankly that I think that would be a retrograde step in international practice. And that leads me to say that I was a little surprised at what our Czech colleague said. He argued that if we were to have a system of expert committees, then, of course, we should argue again and again the same points as they come up before the Council. Remembering what has happened about refugees since last August among Government Representatives, I find his argument a little difficult to follow. I am absolutely convinced that if, last January, we had appointed a body of experts, they would have made a plan which this Council would have accepted, and the Refugee Organization might have been working long ago. As for what he said about the League of Nations institutions, well, there we have had committees of all kinds, some of Government Representatives, some of experts, some that were mixed. No one who knows the history of these institutions will doubt that the expert and mixed committees made a very great contribution to the practical results which were obtained, and that very often it was easy for Governments to accept something which came from an expert body, when they could not have accepted it if it came from a body in which they had already committed themselves, as a Government, against the proposal that was put forward.

Sir, I do not want to go any further with the general argument, except to repeat what I have said before. While I accept this decision on the composition of commissions, and I agree with our Norwegian colleague's

interpretation of what the decision was. It is my belief that in times to come -- not now, but in the future -- we shall unanimously agree to change our system, because we shall find that the other technique may prove to be much better. That is not now the issue. The issue is what we are going to do about the subcommittees which will report to the Commissions of Governmental Representatives. If we appoint subcommittees of Government Representatives, would it not be extremely difficult to keep them down to seven? Have you not, Mr. President, had the greatest difficulty in keeping our drafting committees down to anything less than eleven, twelve, thirteen or fifteen, with constant proposals that they should be extended? If you start on the governmental basis, you are in that difficulty. And it is really right that these subcommittees should be small bodies, which can put forward practical solutions. I add this further consideration, that if the subcommittees were to be of Government Representatives and were kept small, then they will be inadequately representative of the Governments. Now, I do hope that we can agree on what so many Representatives have supported, namely, the system which our Committee has put before us, and that we can adopt this paper.

(During the above remarks, Mr. Riddell, Representative of Canada, left and was replaced by Mr. Davidson; Mr. Davilla, Representative of Chile, left and was replaced by Mr. Fausto Soto.)

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

Mr. President, I wish to make just one remark. Mr. Noel Baker said in his remarks that if one were to follow my line of argument, it would mean that he had made a mistake as regards the subject he mentioned in his speech. I would point out however that I was referring to experts and expert commissions. I don't think Mr. Noel Baker would count himself an expert. He is, rather, a Government Representative and my remark made reference to experts and would not seem to me to apply to Mr. Noel Baker.

The PRESIDENT: The debate is closed. There are no more speakers. We now have to decide Document E/200, Section A, Sub-paragraph (a) and Sub-paragraph (b) -- are there any objections?

...(No response)...

It is adopted.

Section B, Sub-paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (d).

MR. MATES (Yugoslavia): Mr. President, the controversial point is Sub-paragraph (a) of Section B. It will not be possible to select it because it will be awkward to oppose some other provisions which are not controversial.

The PRESIDENT: Sub-paragraph (a) -- those in favor please raise hands. --

MR. MALIK (Lebanon): Point of order. I want to ask a question about that particular paragraph. Mr. President, it seems to me that the two sub-commissions --

The PRESIDENT: The discussion was closed.

MR. MALIK (Lebanon): Well, I have an objection to it and I can only make it clear by explaining. I was going to say that the character of the two Subcommissions is not the same. In the first Subcommission it just says the Commission shall establish it on economic employment stability. In the second we have the statement that the Subcommission should be on economic development, et cetera, and there is the proviso, namely, that there should be particular attention to the inadequate development of the work. Therefore, the two Subcommissions do not have quite the same character. With this in mind,

it seems to me that the limiting of the membership of the second Subcommittee to the same number as that of the first Subcommittee is not fair because it will be clear that in the concrete apportioning of membership in that Subcommittee, these very areas regarding which there is a particular attention paid in the very composition of the Subcommittee, are very likely not to be represented. The seven Members who will compose that Subcommittee will, in all likelihood, be precisely those regarding whom that special clause does not apply to. So it seems to me that seven Members would be sufficient for the first Subcommittee; seven Members -- for that very discrepancy which exists between the two characters of the two Subcommittees -- will not be sufficient for the second Subcommittee.

The PRESIDENT: With full respect to the Representative of Lebanon, I must say that I clearly stated that the debate was closed. We discussed these matters for almost two hours. Now we have to vote "Yes," or "No." There is no time now to discuss it.

The PRESIDENT: Of course, if the Lebanon Representative wishes to make an amendment now, immediately, we can vote on it, but I already declared before that the debate is closed.

Will you put forward your amendment?

MR. MALIK (Lebanon): Yes, Mr. President. I would prefer to make an amendment. The amendment would read as follows: that "(a)" would become two sections. The first "(a)" would be exactly the same as this "(a)" -- "A Sub-Commission on Employment and Economic Stability". We will replace the first two words "A Sub-Commission". The two words "Each Sub-Commission" would be replaced by the phrase: "The Sub-Commission on Employment and Economic Stability" -- and then have it read exactly as you have it there.

Then my second one in mind would read: "The Sub-Commission on Economic Development shall be composed of nine persons", etc.

(During the above remarks, Mr. Fausto Soto, Representative of Chile, left the Table and was replaced by Mr. Davila.)

The PRESIDENT: Those in favor of this proposal should raise their hands.
Not carried.

Sub-paragraph "(b)", page 2.

SIR G. SHANKAR BAJPAI (India): Mr. President, you haven't yet put "(a)".

The PRESIDENT: I put the amendment and it is not carried.

Yes, Sub-paragraph "(a)". We have to vote on it. Those in favor of the text of Sub-paragraph "(a)", as it stands in the Document, should raise their hands.

Those against.

It is approved.

Sub-paragraph "(b)". Those in favor should raise their hands.

Those against.

Unanimously approved.

Sub-paragraph "(c)".

MR. FECNOV (Soviet Union): Mr. President, the Soviet Delegation would suggest, to insert in the second line of paragraph "(c)", the following

words, after the word "agencies" -- to insert "and non-governmental agencies". The same words "and non-governmental agencies", we would suggest to insert in the 5th line of this paragraph, again after the word "agencies".

MR. HOFFMANN (France) (Interpretation from French): I wish to support the amendment suggested by the Soviet Representative. I see no reason to restrict, as this text does, the participation of non-governmental organs, in the work of these Commissions. Since the Commission should make every effort to obtain all the experts and advice and help that they need, we should place no limit by preventing them from getting the help of the non-governmental organizations as well as the governmental bodies.

MR. COLBJORNSEN (Norway): Mr. President, we discussed that question also in the Committee, and as you/see, non-governmental agencies are included under "(d)": "Experts, including experts nominated by non-governmental agencies, may be invited"; and further: "to be present for purposes of consultation". While under "(c)", with "inter-governmental agencies", experts are invited from the inter-governmental agencies, and they are to participate regularly.

As you will have noticed, this is the same distinction which we made at our last Session, between specialized agencies and non-governmental organizations, when we considered them. I don't want to go into that substance matter again, but for the Norwegian Delegation at least, the deciding factor last year was this: that if we invite non-governmental organizations to participate regularly, we really would give them greater rights than Member States of the United Nations.

And I think also the San Francisco Charter itself is quite clear on this point. So we made the distinction at our last Session, when we discussed this whole matter in larger context, of participation without vote for inter-governmental agencies, while non-governmental agencies are put on a , so to say, consultation basis. Of course this is another matter, but there is a parallel.

I do not think we can do it any other way than proposed here without raising again the whole large question which we decided, preliminarily at least, at our last session, and without running into very large difficulty in regard to Member States who are not represented on these Sub-Commissions and, also, not without running into large difficulties with regard to the San Francisco Charter itself. So, I will recommend that we adopt the text as contained in the Council's Draft Resolution here.

MR. MALIK (Lebanon): Mr. President, on a point of order. I have the highest respect for the President. I am sure you, Sir, know that I have always submitted to your rulings. However, I must observe that you closed the discussion in my case and left it open in other cases where you thought it was more worthy of your kindness. On account of the fact that I was not represented in the Sub-Committee which took up this whole question, I probably had ^{more} / right to represent here the point of view which I tried to represent; whereas, this other point under discussion has been discussed, at least to my knowledge, half a dozen times already.

The PRESIDENT: I must say that I declared the debate closed only on two occasions. I expected the Representative of Lebanon to take an opportunity to represent his case when we discussed this problem. But now the Representative of Norway simply takes the opportunity of my very liberal point of view in this meeting and starts the discussion again. I want to say that the Representatives are showing very little order in the case of discussions so, again, I declare that the debate is closed. Of course, every Representative is entitled to present amendments in spite of the fact that we have discussed this matter several times. Why the Representative of Norway spoke for ten minutes, I do not know. I must remind the Representative of Lebanon that my position is extremely difficult. I must ask you to stick to the rules and, also, why, when the President announces that the debate is closed, only then do you put forward amendments in spite of the fact that you have plenty of time and opportunity to submit amendments during the discussion.

SIR G. SHANKAR BAJPAI (India): Mr. President, I would like to make

a point of order. I submit it with all respect to you and you must have noticed that not only I, but everyone speaking for my country, have always shown the utmost respect for the Chair. My point of order is this: I submit that when you declare the debate closed, you cannot consistently -- if I may be permitted to say so -- permit the moving of amendments after the debate has been declared closed. If you allow an amendment to be moved, in that case the Council must have an opportunity of considering the reasons for and the reasons against the amendment.

MR. COLBJORNSEN (Norway): Mr. President, the Soviet Representative proposed, after the close of the debate, an amendment which had not at all been mentioned before. I submit that it has always been my understanding that if, after you have declared the debate closed, you permit a wholly new amendment to be put forward, that in fact means that there will have to be at least some very brief discussion on it, and that is the reason why I spoke.

MR. FEONOV (Soviet Union): Mr. President, in order to avoid discussion of the question, I would make this suggestion, that paragraphs (c) and (g) regarding experts should be deleted completely. That would not preclude the Sub-Commissions from inviting experts. My reason for this suggestion is this. When I made the first suggestion I had in mind the World Federation of Trade Unions. I am sure that at the General Assembly, the question of relations between the Economic and Social Council and the World Federation of Trade Unions will be discussed again. The present text would preclude the World Federation of Trade Unions from coming into proper relations with these two Sub-Commissions, so, to have the doors open to these two Sub-Commissions, if the decision which the General Assembly would take would be positive, I think it would be better to delete these two paragraphs (c) and (g).

MR. NOEL-BAKER (United Kingdom): Mr. President, when Mr. Feonov says he is sure the question of the World Federation of Trade Unions will be discussed in the Assembly he makes me feel sure also that it will be. I take his word for it, and I noted as a comment on the proposition which has been put forward today that Government Delegations do not reopen questions which they have previously discussed and settled.

Having said that, Mr. President, I accept Mr. Feonov's proposal to delete these two paragraphs, with the addition however, which I hope he will accept, that we put them in a footnote to this resolution, giving in the footnote an explanation that the Council intends to make its decision on them after the debates which have taken place in the Assembly.

(During the above remarks, Sir G. Shankar Bajpai, Representative of India, arrived and replaced Mr. Kirpalani at the Council table.)

The PRESIDENT: Those in favor of the Soviet proposal will please raise their hands. Seven. Those against? Carried.

MR. ZULETA ANGEL (Colombia) (Interpretation from French): May I take it that the Soviet amendment is approved with the understanding contained in the statement just made by Mr. Noel-Baker?

The PRESIDENT: Any objection? Paragraph (c), page 2--any objection? Approved.

The next item on our Agenda is the report of Refugees (Finance) Sub-Committee.

MR. HOFFMANN (France) (Interpretation from French): Mr. President, the Secretary-General has already received a letter from Mr. Winant concerning the terms of reference of this Financial Sub-Committee. I should like to ask whether you consider it necessary, in view of this, to proceed with the discussion.

(During the above remarks, Mr. Winant, Representative of the United States, arrived and replaced Mr. Stinshower at the Council table.)

The PRESIDENT: This paper was circulated only today and is rather voluminous and very important. Therefore I propose that we should take it into consideration tomorrow morning. Do you agree?

Now the report of the Council Non-Governmental Organizations Committee.

DR. CHANG (China): A point of order Mr. President. I did not understand how we disposed of this report.

The PRESIDENT: We will take it tomorrow morning.

DR. CHANG (China): We will have a chance of suggesting amendments?

The PRESIDENT: Yes, certainly. It is document E/189.

MR. WINANT (United States): Mr. President, I would like to speak on the first part of the report if I may. The United States Delegation supports the resolution which, if adopted, will give the International Chamber of Commerce consultative status on paragraph 1(a) of part IV of the report on arrangements for consultation with Non-Governmental Organizations. It will be remembered that this resolution follows closely another resolution introduced on June 21st by the United States Delegation. At that time we expressed ^{our} willingness to have consideration of that resolution deferred in order to give the fullest possible opportunity to Members of the Council to acquaint themselves with the scope of the International Chamber of Commerce.

Three months have elapsed since that time and I am glad, after giving careful consideration to the United States proposal, that the Council Non-Governmental Organization Committee has satisfied itself that the Organization meets the requirements under which Non-Governmental Organizations may be brought into consultative status with the Council and its Commissions.

I therefore move that the resolution before us be adopted and that the necessary action be taken to establish consultative relationships with this representative Organization of business. I feel convinced that in moving this resolution, I am acting in the best interests of the Council itself.

MR. FEONOV (Soviet Union); Mr. President, the Soviet Union Representative at the Committee raised an objection against the establishment of relationship between the Economic and Social Council and the International Chamber of Commerce.

The Soviet Union Delegation here again wishes to raise its objection, on the ground that, first of all, the International Chamber of Commerce is closely connected with Franco-Spain. One of the Vice-Chairmen of this Organization is a Representative of Franco-Spain.

It is true that according to the telegram received from the International Chamber of Commerce, the Spanish branch of the International Chamber of Commerce is not active, but it is not this matter which we should take into account. The fact is that there is such a branch in the International Chamber of Commerce, and it may be active at its own choice, and there is a Vice-Chairman of this Organization from Franco-Spain -- on this ground alone, the Soviet Union Delegation considers it necessary to object to the establishment of relationship with this Organization.

Then, there is another point. As everyone knows, there is to be a World International Trade Conference, which will consider the question of the establishment of the International Trade Organization. In this connection, it is not yet quite clear what will be the role and the functions of the International Chamber of Commerce and to what extent those functions might be changed as the result of the decisions of the International Trade Conference. That is the second consideration.

For these reasons, Mr. President, the Soviet Union Delegation proposes to postpone the establishment of relationship with the International Chamber of Commerce until, first, the position of the International Chamber of Commerce is sufficiently clarified by the decisions which would be taken by the International Trade Conference, and not earlier than the time when this Organization will get rid of Franco-Spain.

MR. NOEL BAKER (United Kingdom): Mr. President, I think there is some force in the observation made by Mr. Foonov about the International Trade Conference negotiations which will start in London in a few days' time, but not, I think, sufficient force to outweigh the view which was adopted by a large majority in our Committee, which is embodied in this report.

Therefore, on that point, while I think it is arguable, I would myself support the report.

With regard to Franco-Spain, that, of course, is in principle the same issue that we debated on Civil Aviation the other day, in principle. In fact, it is not in practice quite the same, ^{for} the following reasons, as I understand them: firstly, that the Spanish branch has been proved not to be active at all, and that since the beginning of the war the connection has been purely nominal; secondly, that the staff at Paris throughout the war worked strongly for the Resistance Movement; and thirdly -- perhaps most important -- that, as I understand it, the International Chamber of Commerce now includes members from the Soviet Union, who will be able there to raise the issue of Franco-Spain.

(During the above remarks, Mr. Riddell, the Representative of Canada, returned and replaced Mr. Davidson at the Council table; Mr. Zuleta Angel returned and replaced Mr. Betancur as Representative of Colombia; Sir Girja Bajpai the Representative of India, left and was replaced by Mr. Kirpalani; Mr. Stinebower, the Representative of the United States, left and was replaced by Mr. Kotschnig.)

THE PRESIDENT: Are there any more speakers on this subject?

MR. LEBEAU (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): I wonder, Mr. President, whether we could not, perhaps, agree now that whatever decision we may take regarding the International Chamber of Commerce, the decision shall be subject to revision after the holding of the World Trade Conference.

Are there any more speakers?

MR. FEONOV (Soviet Union): Mr. President, I do not think that the suggestion made by the Belgian Representative is acceptable to us, because, as I stated, there are two reasons on which the Soviet Delegation objected to the establishment of the relationship: one is the International Trade Conference; and the second is the relationship of this Organization with Franco Spain.

Here is a copy of the telegram in which is mentioned the Spanish branch of the Chamber of Commerce. It is stated here: "That Section is not in good standing, having defaulted its dues.....Spain's Representatives as Vice-President and Council Members are merely nominal." That is stated here. But if it is so, it is the choice of those Members of the Council and the Vice-President from Spain.

The Soviet Delegation cannot agree to the establishment of relations with such an Organization which has among its Members, Franco Spain, as we many times stated here. We are not ready, and do not want to depart from this standing.

THE PRESIDENT: Are there any other speakers on this subject.

(No response.)

The debate is closed.

We have to vote now, first, on the Soviet amendment, the Soviet proposal, which is on page 4.

Those who are in favor of it, will please raise their hands.

Six.

Those against.

It is not accepted.

We have to vote now on the proposal proposed by the Committee on Arrangements for Consultation with Non-Governmental Organizations.

This is on page 1, Document E/189, the resolution under Figure 1.

Those who are in favor of this resolution should raise their hands.

MR. FEONOV (Soviet Union): Mr. President, is it the whole resolution we are now voting on?

The PRESIDENT: We are voting on the resolution proposed by the Committee on Arrangements for Consultation with Non-Governmental Organizations. This is Document E/189, Paragraph 1.

Is it clear now to every Member?

Those who are in favor of this resolution should raise their hands.

Those who are against.

Carried.

Now, the second resolution of the Sub-Committee --- this is page 4 -- the International Democratic Federation of Women, which is the largest Organization and comprises 81,000,000 women and 41 countries, and The World Democratic Federation of Youth, which comprises 45 millions and 61 countries.

MR. FEONOV (Soviet Union): Mr. President, while agreeing to the necessity of careful consideration of all the applications -- and they are very numerous -- the Soviet Delegation thinks that the two Organizations just mentioned by you -- that is, The International Democratic Federation of Women, and the World Democratic Federation of Youth -- should be considered as those with whom the Economic and Social Council should establish the relationship immediately, because it seems to us that it is rather important that the Economic and Social Council should have this kind of relationship with the World Organization representing tens of millions of women and tens of millions of youth. The biggest Organizations of this kind, and the best known in the world now, are these two above-mentioned Organizations.

Therefore, it seems to us it would be proper to decide that the Economic and Social Council should come into proper contact with these two Organizations, while, as regards the others, the Committee should have them brought under careful consideration before any decision is taken.

The PRESIDENT: Does any other Member wish to speak on this subject?

MR. KOTSCHNIG (United States): Mr. President, the United States Delegation is much in sympathy with the proposal made by the Soviet Representative. At the same time, we feel that this Council is hardly in a position to vote on this Resolution. The applications of the two Organizations mentioned in this Resolution have not been discussed by the Council in the NGO Committee. We do feel that before the NGO Committee itself has acted on this matter, it is, perhaps, too early for the Economic and Social Council to take a vote.

I might recall at this point, that towards the end of the last session of the Economic and Social Council, the United States Delegation introduced a resolution suggesting that action be taken on the candidature of the International Chamber of Commerce. At that time the Soviet Representative very properly suggested that we ought to be given more time to consider this application. In the light of this intervention, the United States Delegation withdrew its resolution at that time, on the understanding that the Council and the NGO Committee would give early consideration to the application of the International Chamber of Commerce.

Now, the situation now is almost identical, and I would suggest that, and ask our Soviet Representative whether he would not be willing to accept the same procedure and to have the matter referred to the Council and the NGO Committee before consideration, and I would add, at the earliest consideration, so as to submit a proposal to this Council which has the full support of the NGO Committee.

MR. FEONOV (Soviet Union): Mr. President, I don't think that the situation now is identical to that as when we requested to postpone consideration about the relationship with the International Chamber of Commerce. I must say, by the way, that our intuitions did not deceive us with regard to the International Chamber of Commerce.

Now, the position in regard to these two Organizations is that the question has already been discussed at the Committee, so it is not presented here without any consideration beforehand. I don't think that could be

considered as anything new; and those Organizations themselves are very widely known.

MR. NOEL BAKER (United Kingdom): Mr. President, I would have difficulty in making an exception in favor of these two Organizations in view of the fact that 54, I understand, have applied, and that our Committee has agreed, the majority of them agreed, that all should be postponed, all the remaining 54, apart from the International Chamber of Commerce, with which we have dealt. It is not only that. There are, it is estimated, according to reputable lists, 250 Organizations which have not yet applied at all, but which may apply in the early future.

Now, if we make a decision about one of these Organizations, it may bind us to take parallel action with regard to other Organizations which have applied, or which even have not yet applied, and the number of Organizations we may be admitting to relationship of some kind by this precedent which we now create may be very considerable.

Sir, on that ground, I find it very difficult to agree to what Mr. Tsonov now proposes. Moreover, I must add that these two bodies have only been in existence for a year. I understand that the Committee has not really seriously discussed their composition, the solidarity of their membership and organization. I know from personal experience how very easy it is to create one of these coordinating movements. I have done it myself, which brings in, under one general banner, a large number of organizations, and then, you may do it for a short campaign. We did it in England in 1935, and then, after 18 months, one particular job being done, the thing disintegrates into nothing at all.

I think it needs careful examination, and particularly with regard to the Women's Organizations, when we know that 17 have applied, and 13 have not applied. I think it would be a difficult task to select one out of that number at the present moment and make a decision in its favor.

I therefore arrive at the conclusion which the majority of the Committee arrived at, that it is really better to postpone this.

The PRESIDENT: No more speakers.

MR. KOTSCHNIG (United States): Mr. President, before you take a vote on the Soviet proposal, if that was your intention, I would like to say two things here. I did not have the pleasure of meeting Mr. Feonov in the NGO Committee and therefore he may not be fully aware of the fact that there was no discussion on this proposal. The applications were introduced by the Soviet Representative in the Committee, but the Committee itself did not discuss the proposal but on the contrary voted at that time that all applications should be referred to the next Session of the Council. Now that is just a matter of fact.

My second point is this. My Delegation would not want to vote against the Soviet proposal at this time, and possibly not later on. We would not want to vote on this action because we may decide that this proposal ought to have our full support. But we are not in a position to vote at the present time. Therefore, if it would be considered in order, I would introduce an amendment stating that the Soviet proposal be referred to the NGO Committee for their consideration and for report to the next session of the Council. I don't know if such a motion would be in order.

The PRESIDENT: Of course we have to vote now on this issue. There is the Soviet proposal that the International Democratic Federation of Women and the World Democratic Federation of Youth should be admitted in a consultative capacity under paragraph 1 (a).

MR. ZULETA ANGEL (Colombia) (Interpretation from French): Point of order. Mr. President. Rule 44 of the Rules of Procedure says that during a discussion, any Representative may ask for the adjournment of the debate. United States Delegation has asked for an adjournment of the debate and according to the Rules of Procedure, I think he should have priority over any other Representative's intervention. I think United States Delegation's proposal for adjournment should be dealt with first.

The PRESIDENT: I didn't consider the proposal made by the United States Delegation as a motion for adjournment. I took it into consideration as an amendment to the Soviet proposal. Therefore, we have to vote first on the amendment of the Soviet proposal.

MR. ZULETA ANGEL (Colombia) (Interpretation from French): If it was an amendment, it should also have priority as an amendment.

The PRESIDENT: I consider it as an amendment to the Soviet proposal, but if the Members of the Council believe that this is a proposal for adjournment, I cannot oppose that, certainly, as President. But apparently I don't know the Rules of Procedure at all. It seems to be so.

MR. ZULETA ANGEL (Colombia) (Interpretation from French): If it is an amendment, Mr. President, then we should vote first on the American proposal.

MR. KOTSCHNIG (United States): Mr. President, just to make myself clear, I did not propose an adjournment of the debate. I proposed an amendment to the Soviet proposal demanding that the Soviet proposal be deferred to the NGO Committee for early consideration and for a report at the next session of the Economic and Social Council. That is my amendment, and I hoped it would be voted upon.

The PRESIDENT: So the United States Representative does not consider that as a proposal for adjournment.

MR. KOTSCHNIG (United States): Well, it amounts to the same thing.

MR. ZULETA ANGEL (Colombia) (Interpretation from French): There is also Rule 60, Mr. President, which reads as follows: "When an amendment revises, adds to, or deletes from a proposal, the amendment shall be voted on first, and if it is adopted, the amended proposal shall then be voted on."

MR. NOEL BAKER (United Kingdom): I am not very clear about the procedure. My difficulty arises from the fact that I am not sure that what the United States Representative proposes is really an amendment to the report. In my view, it states in different language just what the report itself states in paragraph 2 at the bottom of the paper E/189 where the Committee says, "We have come to the conclusion that we should not proceed at this session to make recommendations on the various applications in order to allow ourselves

the opportunity for more study." I think in different language that is what the United States Representative is proposing. In other words, his suggestion is not really strictly an amendment, whereas there can be no doubt that Mr. Feonov's proposal is an amendment to the report. Therefore, I think that with respect to Mr. Feonov's proposal it ought to be voted on first.

SECRETARY GENERAL: Mr. President, I hope you will excuse me for saying a few words about this matter. I have had some experience now with regard to procedural matters in the Security Council. It has been my experience there with the Rules of Procedure which you yourselves have adopted that the following would apply.

I am of the opinion that you can take it from three angles. If you start with the Committee's report, that is in effect a postponement in cooperation with the proposal from the Representative of the Soviet Union. So in my mind, with the Rules of Procedure which we have adopted, the Committee's report has to be voted on before Mr. Feonov's proposal.

If you take the American proposal, I think that is a postponement in the same way. So that has to go before the Soviet proposal. And if it is postponement, which it is in fact, you must vote for that first. That is the Rules of Procedure both for this Council and for the Security Council. I think Article 59 is absolutely clear on that.

The PRESIDENT: I still believe that according to Rule 59, "If two or more amendments are moved, the Council shall first vote on the amendments furthest removed in substance from the original proposal." The original proposal is the proposal of the Committee. And so it proposes a new proposal farthest removed in substance from the original. Therefore, I propose that we should vote first on the Soviet proposal. The United States Representative simply repeated what was already said in the Committee report.

Mr. Zuleta ANGEL (Colombia) (Interpretation from French): I withdraw my request that we should vote first on the United States' proposal.

The PRESIDENT: Those in favor of the Soviet proposal raise their hands.
Who is against? Eight.

It is not carried.

Mr. FEONOV (Soviet Union): Mr. President, may I make a very short statement?

The PRESIDENT: Please.

Mr. FEONOV (Soviet Union): One cannot escape noticing that the majority of the Council readily admitted the establishment of relationship with Franco-Spain through the Civil Aviation Organization and the International Chamber of Commerce. At the same time, when the question comes to its decision about the establishment of relationship with two giant democratic world organizations, the Council was hesitant in its decision.

The PRESIDENT: The debate is closed now. The document E/189, "Report of the Committee on Arrangements for Consultation with Non-Governmental Organizations" is approved.

The PRESIDENT: The Agenda for tomorrow:

Ten o'clock in the morning. Drafting Subcommittee on Devastated Regions.
Conference Room No. 1.

Ten thirty, Plenary Meeting, Report of Refugee Finance Subcommittee,
(a) Refugee Interim Arrangements; (b) Council's Action on Resolution Relating
to Assistance to FAO. Other items not finished today.

Eleven o'clock, Meeting of Standing Consultative Non-Governmental
Organization Committee. Conference Room No. 7.

Discussion of World Federation of Trade Unions.

Afternoon Session: 2:45 o'clock. Plenary Session. Election of
Nominating States for Economic and Employment, Transport and Communications,
and
Statistics and Human Rights. Social Status of Women, Fiscal/Population
Commission.

May I ask the Members of the Council to submit their proposals for
nominations not later than 11:30 o'clock tomorrow morning.

(c) Report of Committee on Specialized Agencies.

(During the above remarks, Mr. G. Perez Cisneros replaced Mr. Blanco as
Representative of Cuba.)

MR. G. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba) (Interpretation from French): I would like
to ask, Mr. President, in the name of the Cuban Delegation, that the Secretariat
prepare and circulate at the time of the first meeting of the Council tomorrow
morning, a list of the candidatures that have been received, in order that we
may proceed in the afternoon with this list at hand and not unprepared. May we
have the candidatures themselves?

The PRESIDENT: We have very few nominations. Therefore, I propose
that we should wait until 11:30 o'clock, when you will be informed about the
nominations.

MR. MALIK (Lebanon): Mr. President, does that mean that candidacies will
be open until 11:30 o'clock?

The PRESIDENT: Yes, until 11:30 o'clock, because we established today

and
the Fiscal/Population Commissions. Therefore, I am now setting 11:30 as the
deadline for the nominations.

MR. NOEL BAKER (United Kingdom): Mr. President, May I ask that we make
every effort, if it is physically possible, to discuss the report of the
Devastated Areas Committee tomorrow?

I should be most reluctant to leave that over until the last moment. It
is by far, from my view, the most important practical task of the Council. My
Government is resolved that this shall lead to results in European reconstruction.
It is to come before the Assembly in three weeks, and I hope we shall have
adequate time for its debate. That means that we should try and get to it
tomorrow, if we can.

The PRESIDENT: A small working group is preparing a Draft Resolution
and I think that some agreement will be found. Therefore, I believe we can
discuss it tomorrow afternoon.

After this very strenuous and very fruitful day, I am adjourning the
meeting.

...(The meeting rose at 7:15 o'clock p.m.)...