

ECONOMIC  
AND  
SOCIAL COUNCILCONSEIL  
ECONOMIQUE  
ET SOCIALE/P.V./33  
2 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 EIGHTEENTH MEETING OF THE THIRD SESSION  
OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Lake Success, New York

Wednesday, 2 October 1946 at 2:45 pm

## PRESENT:

THE PRESIDENT: DR. STAMPAR

MR. LEBEAU	(Belgium)
MR. RIDDELL	(Canada)
MR. DAVILA	(Chile)
MR. CHANG	(China)
MR. YEPEZ	(Colombia)
MR. PEREZ CISNEROS	(Cuba)
DR. PAPANEK	(Czechoslovakia)
MR. HOFFHERR	(France)
MR. ARGYROPOULOS	(Greece)
SIR G. SHANKAR BAJPAI	(India)
MR. MALIK	(Lebanon)
MR. COLBJORNSEN	(Norway)
MR. ARCA PARRO	(Peru)
MR. LEV MEDVED	(Ukrainian SSR)
MR. FECNOV	(Soviet Union)
MR. NOEL-BAKER	(United Kingdom)
MR. FOWLER	(United States of America)
MR. MATES	(Yugoslavia)

The PRESIDENT: The meeting will come to order. We have to discuss now the FAO proposal. We postponed this discussion for today and now we have to adopt the resolution. There is a new proposal submitted by the French Delegation -- Document E/206.

MR. HOFFHERR (France) (Interpretation from French): Mr. President, the French Delegation has suggested an amendment/<sup>the</sup> object of which is to take into account the remarks made yesterday to the Council by the Canadian Representative and it has also for its purpose to consolidate the text which was at the beginning suggested by the United Kingdom and the United States Delegations. We believe that it is for the Council to associate itself with the very interesting task which is now about to be started in the way of international cooperation in the matter of food. I cannot believe that the Council could abstain

from such participation in that action.

The Representative for China stated yesterday how much the inequality of standards of living upset the economic stability of the world. This is the more true when we speak of foodstuffs, the importance of which is well-known. The United Nations should, I believe, take a very active part in the organization of the FAO, and the French proposal leaves it to the Secretary-General to designate two Members, one of which would have to get into contact with the Preparatory Commission for Trade and Employment and the other with the Commission for Economic Affairs and Employment.

After all, the French amendment has no other purpose than to unite into one single text, two texts which were presented previously. This is the purpose of the French amendment which takes into account the statement we heard yesterday from our colleague from Canada.

MR. FOWLER (United States): Mr. President, Mr. Winant hoped to be here at this time to inform the Council that he had an opportunity to communicate with Mr. Mackintosh, who has indicated that he would be agreeable to serving for this purpose, although he could not be there all the time. It was <sup>his</sup> thought that he might be there on appropriate occasions when something of particular importance came up. On that understanding, he indicated his willingness to accept.

- French

The PRESIDENT: It seems to me that the new/proposal is only a simplification of two previous proposals.

Does any Representative wish to speak on the subject? Is there any objection to the French proposal?

MR. FEONOV (Soviet Union) (Interpretation from Russian): Mr. President, yesterday we requested the postponement of the discussion of this question inasmuch as the Soviet Delegation has not yet received instructions from its Government. When I did request to postpone this question I did not imply by that that it should be only postponed from yesterday until today. Actually, Mr. President, we are not yet in receipt of these instructions.

So, the Soviet Union Representative would wish to postpone the discussion until, let us say, the next session of the Economic and Social Council. If it

E/P.V./33

3-5

is impossible to postpone the discussion until such date, the Soviet Union Delegation would not be able to vote for the proposed resolution.

THE PRESIDENT: Are there any more speakers?

MR. FOWLER (United States): Mr. President with all due respect to your characterization of the French proposal as a summarization of the other two, it seemed to us that the wording does not fit the pattern which we have proposed in our resolution with reference to the Chairman of the Economic and Employment Commission. The wording in paragraph 1 states that one of the Representatives would consult particularly with the Chairman of the <sup>and</sup> Economic/Employment Commission. That wordage does not suggest the possibility that the Secretary-General might appoint the Chairman of the Economic and Employment Commission as one of the two representatives.

MR. NOEL BAKER (United Kingdom): Mr. President, I think that the French Delegation has helped us in putting forward this proposal, but I am in agreement with the Representative of the United States that it does more than harmonize previous proposals. In fact, it returns to the proposal which my Delegation originally put forward, namely, that Representatives should both be from the Secretariat. Naturally the French Representative would understand that I would have an inclination to agree with him since we were the original authors of that proposal. His suggestion, one of them, to consult especially with the President of the Economic and Employment Commission would, of course, be an improvement on our original suggestion. But in the course of the debate I can express quite frankly that I have been convinced that it would be better to have the Chairman himself. I still think and hope that an arrangement can be made which will make that work satisfactorily. I should like, on that particular point, to retain the system which we were discussing last time.

As for paragraphs 2 and 3 of the French proposal, I shall of course be perfectly willing to accept them.

MR. RIDDELL (Canada): Mr. President, I feel somewhat embarrassed in entering this discussion again because the proposals that are now before the Council are ones which would result in a very distinguished Canadian of whom we are proud; being given responsibilities which we would very much like to see him fulfill. If the proposals which are now before the Council commend themselves



to the Council, we will not, of course, stand in the way of the adoption of those proposals.

I think it is important however, that there should be no misunderstanding in the Council as to the position of Dr. Mackintosh himself. The Council should not be misled in any way as to the amount of time which Dr. Mackintosh is likely to have available, in view of the fact that he is no longer a civil servant and has returned to his university. I should think that the Council ought to be quite clear on that point and that there should be no possible misconception in that regard.

I should think also, -and I am now making one or two comments about the proposals that are before us - that we ought to make up our minds whether it is Dr. Mackintosh or the Chairman of the Economic and Employment Commission whom we wish to see fulfill these responsibilities. If it is the former, if it is the individual, Dr. Mackintosh, then I should have preferred to see some arrangement by which his responsibilities in this regard would not depend on his somewhat tenuous position as Chairman of the Nuclear Economic and Employment Commission. If on the other hand, it is the Chairman of the Economic and Employment Commission whom we are thinking of in these proposals, then I think we should have in mind the fact that there would not be a Chairman of the Economic and Employment Commission for some time, and we have no idea at this time who that will be. If there is the expectation that Dr. Mackintosh will continue, that expectation depends first of all on Canada being a Member of the Commission and Dr. Mackintosh consenting to act, and in the third place, on his acting as Chairman. That is a somewhat too tenuous series of events. I am not quite clear whether it is the individual or the official that we have in mind in making these proposals.

I should think there ought to be more clarity also on one other question. That is the question of who is to act as the deputy of the man whom the Council names in this regard. I have been making some inquiries in this connection. I have received quite contradictory reports as to the intention in this regard. I am not quite clear that it is the expectation that the deputy shall be a Member

of the Secretariat or that the deputy shall be anyone whom the official named proposes and not a Member of the Secretariat. I think this ought to be cleared up simply so that there shouldn't be any misunderstanding about it.

In regard to the question of principle which I raised yesterday, I still feel personally that it is better practice to give responsibility to the man who actually fulfills the functions. Of course, <sup>if</sup> the Council as a whole is not concerned in this regard I won't press this point.

I now come back to the point where I started. If the Council feels disposed to ask a Canadian who has been a Member of this Council to fulfill certain responsibilities, no Canadian Delegation would wish to stand in the way of the adoption of those proposals.

MR. WINANT (United States): Mr. President, in answering my Canadian colleague, I would like to say that it was the intention of the United States, as I stated when I spoke yesterday, to have the Chairman of the Economic and Employment Commission serve. It is true that Dr. Mackintosh at the present time is Chairman of the Nuclear Commission and, therefore, he would serve. It is also true, as I understood from Dr. Mackintosh, that he probably will not continue after the full Commission is called together. It has been, and is now, the opinion of my Government that the Chairman of the Economic and Employment Commission should be one of the Representatives serving us. Dr. Mackintosh did say that during this intervening period, he could give time to attending meetings but it would have to be for limited periods. The Nuclear Commission will only carry on for a relatively short period and I am certain from what Dr. Mackintosh said that he could represent us during that period.

MR. NOEL BAKER (United Kingdom): Mr. President, I should have thought that the simplest thing to do was to accept the French text, but to have the "Chairman of the Economic and Employment Commission" put back instead of the second suggestion "Representative of the Secretary-General"; otherwise, to accept the French text.

The PRESIDENT: I believe we now have to vote on the resolution proposed by the French Delegation, which is in fact a compromise between the two resolutions presented to the Council by the United States and the United Kingdom. I see that the Representative of the United Kingdom approves the French resolution with certain amendments. Will you please clearly state your amendment?

MR. NOEL BAKER (United Kingdom): I would amend the first paragraph of the French resolution in this sense, Mr. President: In the paragraph numbered (1) in the first line, strike out (2) and insert (1), and in the second line after "Preparatory Commission", put a full stop. Then have a new (2) "advise the Chairman of the Economic and Employment Commission to take part in the work in that capacity".



The PRESIDENT: You are adding one sub-paragraph?

MR. NOEL-BAKER (United Kingdom): That is it.

MR. OWEN (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of Economic Affairs):

May I ask the United Kingdom Representative whether he understands that amendment to include provision for deputies?

MR. NOEL-BAKER (United Kingdom): Yes, I ought to have said also the deputies.

The PRESIDENT: Any other objections to the French proposal? Those in favor of the amendment proposed by the United Kingdom Representative should raise their hands.

MR. RIDDELL (Canada): May I ask if it is now proposed to substitute this for the original proposal we had before us yesterday?

The PRESIDENT: I believe so.

MR. NOEL-BAKER (United Kingdom): That was my intention -- to accept the French text instead of mine.

The PRESIDENT: Please now, those in favor of the United Kingdom amendment to the French proposal should raise their hands. Who is against? Carried.

Now Item F -- United Kingdom proposed resolution concerning agenda of a meeting of experts to prepare for a conference on passports and frontier formalities.

MR. NOEL-BAKER (United Kingdom): Mr. President, this resolution on its technical side speaks for itself and I propose to add nothing to what there appears. On its general importance I would only say a few phrases.

My Foreign Secretary was once asked what he thought, in a few words, was a good foreign policy, and he said if he could have the foreign policy he wanted, it would enable him to go down to Victoria Station any moment, and without any passport, travel to any destination in the world. Undoubtedly, the relaxation of travel restrictions is of the highest importance, and it is of the greatest importance for a large number of countries in Europe that tourism should once more revive. Tourism has already begun to be an important economic factor in Europe, and in the balance of payments problem which we have been considering in the Devastated Areas Report very much might be done to

assist the balance of payments situation for some countries in the greatest difficulties if we could, in the early future, relax some of the present restrictions.

We hope therefore the Secretary-General will be able to arrange this preliminary meeting of experts in the very early future. We hope the conference will follow during this winter and as early in the winter as may be, and that definitive arrangements -- to be accepted by as many Governments as are agreeable, all the remainder standing out -- will in fact be come to. It is with those intentions that I move this resolution.

I want to add one word on the last paragraph, which is not phrased as I would have desired. It is not at all our intention to propose that a new organization shall be created. On the contrary, we think nearly everything that requires to be done can be done through existing organizations, but we thought perhaps the Transport and Communications Commission could consider whether a special travel sub-committee might or might not be useful. I hope, with that explanation, I may remove some grounds of prejudice against my resolution.

MR. LEBEAU (Belgium) (Interpretation; original in French): Mr. President, I wish to associate myself most warmly with the proposal made by the United Kingdom Delegate in regard to the simplification of passports and frontier formalities, and I might add that this simplification is very necessary to the very life of Occidental Europe. Its simplification is not only desirable and difficult to attain because of political reasons or control of personalities, but is due also to a lot of other imperfections. That is why I feel we should push toward agreement on international passports with all the international authority we might achieve. It is with enthusiasm therefore, Mr. President, that I vote for the forming of a commission of experts to resolve the problem which, as I said in the beginning, is of vital importance to the very life of Occidental Europe.



Mr. FEONOV (Soviet Union)(Second interpretation; original in Russian):  
Mr. President, when this question was discussed during the previous session, the Soviet Union Delegation expressed very clearly the considerations why it did not consider this measure desirable, and it does not see at the present time why it should depart from its original position. The Soviet Union Delegation cannot agree to the text as it is contained in paragraph 3 insofar as the creation of an international organization for travel is concerned. Therefore, the Soviet Union Delegation cannot vote for this proposal.

The PRESIDENT: Any other Representatives wishing to speak?

Mr. ARGYROPOULOS (Greece): Mr. President, I consider that if the world is to come back to a more normal situation, and if we do endeavor to develop trade and the economic relations between the nations, it is absolutely necessary to remove some of the impediments which actually exist to communications between nations. If we do not facilitate travel, and if we do not help the tradesmen to be able to go from one country to the other, we can never return to a more normal economic situation in the world. That is why I think it would be urgent to have a conference convened in order to settle those questions especially concerning Europe.

Mr. NOEL BAKER (United Kingdom): Mr. President, I would be very glad to drop paragraph 3, if Mr. Feonov desires it, or I would propose an alternative draft which I think would be open to no objection. I suggest the following paragraph: "Paragraph 3. The Council requests the Transport and Communications Commission to report to the Council without delay on the methods by which the Council can best advise on travel questions." Either adopt that or drop the entire paragraph; I don't care which is done.

The PRESIDENT: Is the United Kingdom Representative in favor of deleting this paragraph entirely or not?

Mr. NOEL BAKER (United Kingdom): Either that or the draft; I do not mind.

The PRESIDENT: I would like to have a definite proposal.

Mr. NOEL BAKER (United Kingdom): My proposal is to have the original paragraph which I dropped.

The PRESIDENT: An amendment to the proposal?

Mr. NOEL BAKER (United Kingdom): I do not insist on it if anybody objects.

The PRESIDENT: Any more speakers on this subject?

We are now ready to take a vote on the United Kingdom proposal, Document E/146, with the amendment as proposed by the United Kingdom Representative to replace paragraph 3.

Who is in favor of the resolution proposed by the United Kingdom Representative, as amended? (showing of hands.)

Who is against? (showing of hands.)

It is adopted.

FRENCH PROPOSAL REGARDING ESTABLISHMENT OF UNITED NATIONS  
RESEARCH LABORATORIES

We will now go to Item (g), French Proposal Regarding Establishment of United Nations Research Laboratory.

(During the above remarks, Mr. Arca Parro, Representative of Peru, left the Council table and was replaced by Mr. Patino; Mr. Winant, Representative of the United States, left the Council table and was replaced by Mr. Stinebower.)

MR. HOFFMANN(France). (Interpretation from French): Mr. President, the French proposal we have before us now, has been dictated to us by several points which have been made in the course of our recent discussions. Only yesterday, the Delegation of the United States spoke to us of the necessity of initiating general scientific and technological studies, and we had before us a proposal by the United States Delegation as to a Conference which would have to deal with the protection of natural resources -- protect the wealth in the world, its primary materials. I believe the Economic and Social Council must respond to that kind of suggestion which is brought before us.

May I recall that in 1920, there was a great international effort tending to affect the workers of the world, to assure for them better conditions of existence. This was, as a matter of fact, an answer to the social responsibility which is imposed upon the nations of the world. In the economic field, there is an equal responsibility which has been showed in the course of our recent discussions. It is only natural that a great effort should be undertaken in order to avoid waste, in order to protect the potential wealth which is at the disposal of the different nations and that, by means of a common international effort.

Only ten years ago, I remember we had a Conference on primary materials in Geneva and my own Delegation found itself in perfect accord with the Soviet Delegation, that the race for primary materials should be put to an end because it was in fact a race for armaments. I believe that in the scientific field, similar efforts should be undertaken in order to bring about a more equal distribution of scientific research, scientific possibilities.



We cannot remain indifferent to the fact that new and powerful inventions are being made all over the world almost constantly in the last few years, and there is another kind of wealth that should be the property of all the nations. In this field, also, we may call upon the international cooperation of all the nations.

I believe that after the social responsibility, and after the economic responsibility, which is a common responsibility, there is a third category of common responsibility -- and that is in the scientific field. We all know that no national program is able to give satisfaction in that direction. We all know that a great many countries have limited means at their disposal. We know that in order to carry out research work in the scientific field, one needs instruments, which are very costly, and in many countries, also my own, we have heard of late many complaints about the extremely poor condition in which our research laboratories are called upon to work and on account of the bad conditions in which our scientists are obliged to work. I, therefore, believe that this field of scientific research should also be brought within the limits of international action.

We have lately seen great efforts. We have also seen these efforts even before the war, when the International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation started its work under the auspices of the League of Nations. Since the war, UNESCO has taken up this very important work, but even during the war we have seen some instances of collective international effort in the scientific field. I believe that research work of that kind is really an international responsibility, and this is what our proposal aims at.

May I recall what has already been stated here -- that our Chinese colleague spoke of one of the essential causes for economic disturbance in the world being the difference in <sup>the</sup> economic development of the world. I believe that the difference that exists from one country to another in the matter of scientific development constitutes a real threat to peace. There are areas in the world which are not sufficiently developed, where there is not sufficient

capital, and no primary materials; and that is one of the ways in which we can work towards a better understanding among nations towards peace and security. This same inequality certainly exists in the scientific field.

There is in certain countries a lack of scientific instruments. The national budgets are, in many cases, very limited, and they cannot lead to good results in the scientific field. I believe that here again lies international responsibility. No country should have a monopoly of scientific research and achievement. There is a field in which direct help and assistance can be brought to a great many countries.

If I only think of the observatories, is it not to be regretted that the Northern Hemisphere is rich in observatories, whereas the Southern Hemisphere lacks such installations? Yet we know how important they are, from a weather forecast point of view and of what importance a weather forecast is for navigation, both maritime and air navigation. We know it is important in the matter of harvests. I must recall here what is imagined for the future, that the scientists will be able to sit down, merely press a button, and obtain a modification of the atmospheric situation.

I think that this really opens up new lines of thought which might help to insure international security.

If, for instance, we take the matter of erosion, which has caused such terrible calamities to agriculture, and if we take all other forms of alteration of the situation of the earth and if we see what a threat such changes may form for the international system of communications, I really do believe that here is a field in which much can be done.

Another field in which international cooperation in scientific research could be extremely useful is in the war against diseases, against epidemics. We know what tuberculosis means to the world. Our South American colleagues will be here to confirm what I say. The war against that disease is not merely a matter of prophylactics; it needs further exploration. I believe in this way also a very useful work could be achieved.



There is another matter I want to mention which belongs to the field of scientific research. Is it not terrible that in certain countries the matter of housing is very much developed but remains on a national field, and other countries are not able to find it possible to profit by the experience acquired in the other countries, that they should be ignorant of the efforts undertaken in this respect by other nations? In this connection, every country has its problems, and if these problems are shared, and if their study is undertaken on an international basis, they will reach a solution much earlier. This will, I believe, help very much in combating that psychosis of war, and, therefore, the threat of war itself.

There is in the world a great quantity of unrest. People are certainly disturbed by the inequality which exists from one country to the other. There is a very large field of work in human research, which will certainly lead to the solution of many a particularly difficult social problem.

Therefore, gentlemen, I submit this proposal of my Delegation, and I would suggest that the Council take the opinion of authorities in the field.

In this respect, I would suggest M. Laugier, the Assistant-Secretary General, whose name has been associated with so many enterprises in the field of scientific research.

These are suggestions which the Council should study very carefully.

I believe that in this common effort, carried out in mutual understanding and in full friendship, should become a very important factor in the war against ignorance, against sickness, and against human misery.

DR. CHANG (China): Mr. President, the Chinese Delegation has the honor and pleasure of supporting this French proposal most heartily.

There is no need for me to add anything to the already lucid and generous statement made by the distinguished Representative of France. Therefore, I would like to see an explorative effort made by the Secretariat along this line of promoting cooperative research efforts in the world under the auspices of the United Nations.

Mr. MALIK (Lebanon): Mr. President, my country is in the happy position of realizing from experience the importance of reaping the fruits of international intellectual collaboration. We have in Beirut a first class French University, and also a first class American University, which have been in operation in my country for nearly a century, now. On the campuses of these two great institutions you have professors and scientists from many nations, working in peace and friendly cooperation. The beneficent results of the combined activities of these two institutions of higher learning, so far as the entire Middle East is concerned, are perfectly incalculable. If you remove the influence of these two universities on the life of the Near East, you will have removed the strongest single intellectual factor in the Near East, and you will have radically changed its character.

We are, therefore, I say, in the happy position of reporting most favourably on the great success of one of the most unique experiments in the field of international intellectual collaboration. During this very war, Mr. President, which has just ended, in Beirut, in our laboratories on the campuses of these two universities, an anti-typhus serum was prepared and used by the Allied armies throughout the Middle East for tens of thousands of soldiers.

Small nations, Mr. President, often do not have the resources and the facilities for the establishment and operation of research institutions of sufficient size. If such institutions, therefore, are provided by the United Nations, they may serve first as training places for the research workers of small nations themselves, and secondly, as centres where problems of these small nations may be studied scientifically and the research projects on these problems carried out. Great help may thus be rendered to small nations who otherwise do not have the resources and facilities to undertake research for the solution of many of their problems. If these United Nations laboratories, therefore, are located in some of the less developed regions, they will prove to be one of the best and most powerful means of bringing science and its fruits to these regions, thus contributing more than anything else to

the development of such less developed regions.

Consequently, Mr. President, I find myself in the most happy position of supporting wholeheartedly the French proposal.

MR. ARGYROPOULOS (Greece): Mr. President, I want to associate myself with the Representatives who have paid a tribute to the French initiative in this matter. I think it is one of the most fruitful forms of international collaboration, and therefore I support it most strongly.

MR. NOEL BAKER (United Kingdom): Mr. President, I only want to support the resolution very warmly. It is a resolution for a study to be made for the United Nations, and I should like, if I may, also, personally to thank the French Representative for the speech which he made this afternoon, and which I found of great value.

I think the case is really made by the history of the atom, but he gave many other examples that would convince us all. He mentioned meteorology. I am convinced that there is no subject in which there is so great a scope as meteorology for collective international efforts for the benefit of many different classes of workers and professional experts throughout the world.

I hope that this work will be pressed forward and that it will prove fruitful.

(During the above remarks, Mr. Steinbower, Representative of the United States, left the table and was replaced by Mr. Kotschnig.)

MR. FEONOV (Soviet Union) (Second interpretation; original in Russian):  
Mr. President, the French Delegation has undoubtedly put forward a proposal of a definitely humanitarian character, and thereby has won the exceedingly good wishes of a great number of Delegations.

However, the Soviet Union Delegation, recognizing the humanitarian character of the French proposal, and having studied very carefully the draft resolution, in spite of these good humanitarian ideas feels that there are certain practical considerations which make it very difficult to implement this measure, and feels that this measure would hardly be of actual help, because this science actually comprises a good many hundreds of different branches. Even if the question arose of creating research laboratories for the United Nations for just the basic branches of this science, it would involve such a tremendous expense and such a great number of personnel that I cannot see how the United Nations will be able to foot the bill.

The French Representative has given us an example of research done in tuberculosis, but it is generally known that tuberculosis, when it is being studied, has always to be considered in regard to the country where it has developed, because it has its very definite special reasons which are dependent on local regions and local material conditions. It cannot be examined abstractly from outside of the country where the tuberculosis is rampant.

There are other conditions besides the medical conditions which might help in the development of tuberculosis, and those conditions can be material social, or otherwise. Even the small countries would hardly benefit from such a proposal, because as I heard it stated, it was not contemplated to create the laboratories in the small countries, but it was simply a matter of creating an international laboratory in the most appropriate places. Actually, if such international laboratories were created, it might take away some of the strength that the national organizations might have, in trying to develop research laboratories on a national scale. It would hinder the national development.

The Soviet Union Delegation feels also that on an international scale the development of these research laboratories should only be done jointly with the development of these laboratories within each country.

Of course at that time the individual competent experiences which would be brought forth during the various conferences and of the scientific publications, would help. But, it also seems that when the scientific research laboratories, if they were created, we cannot expect to see the best scientists work in these laboratories -- at least this is not justified by past practice.

I would feel that the expenses and the energy which has been demanded from the personnel which has been attached to this task would not prove that the results are sufficient for such an expanse of energy and money.

Insofar as the health of the national laboratories is concerned, I feel that that is an entirely different question which should be considered on its own merits and separately, because of all these considerations, Mr. President, the Soviet Union, recognizing the humanitarian aspect of the French proposal, feels that this proposal is not sufficiently practical and would undoubtedly not be able to justify the hope which some Delegations have built on this proposal.

Mr. FEONOV (Soviet Union): I am in doubt, Mr. President, whether one of the passages of my speech found its place in the translation. I would like to repeat it. Speaking of international cooperations in the scientific field, I said that the real international cooperation in this field would be effective only if the national science is being developed. At the same time, it should be coordinated with the international cooperation through the international conferences, then scientific research and some other means.

Mr. DAVIA (Chile): Mr. President, I wish to express my warm support of the French proposal to lay the foundations at least for a United Nations Research Laboratory. This proposal is so important that I was afraid it might be withdrawn, as the very wise Norwegian proposal was withdrawn this morning. I guess, Mr. President, that we will some time in the future feel proud that this Council and its Members were associated with the birth of such an international world institution as the one proposed by the French Delegation.

The PRESIDENT: Any more speakers on this subject?



MR. MEDVED (Ukrainian SSR); (second interpretation, original in Russian): Mr. President, I wish to apologize to you and my colleagues for taking the floor now, but in view of my personal close relations with scientific work, I would like to make a few remarks for practical consideration.

Undoubtedly, the exchange of scientific experiments and data is a very important feature for progress at all times. There has been a wide exchange of scientific data and information which has taken place at the present time, and definitely it is something which is very much needed to achieve progress. However, <sup>the</sup> form in which this exchange has taken place has depended a great deal upon technical development and scientific development. The results of these developments are printed quite rapidly in the form of books, magazines and journals. They are distributed very rapidly among the scientists of various countries. I could add that for myself, excepting the period during the war during which, of course, communications were almost interrupted, I could receive scientific journals two or three months after their publication and familiarize myself with all of the articles written on questions of interest to me. I am sure that all scientists were in the same position.

It is certainly true that all results of universal scientists should be directed toward the welfare of all people and we should all try to do this and to lead the developments of science to that end.

I appreciate fully the position taken by the French Representative in trying to find the method and means to achieve scientific cooperation. No one speaks against the principle of this idea. When I speak at the present time, I am not rising against the principle but simply because of the practicability of the French proposal, I feel that this proposal does not guarantee the achievement of what we would all desire to see achieved. I have a doubt that the creation of these laboratories would help to develop international science.

So that if, in accordance with the good wishes of many, a laboratory was created as a solution for the realization of the high ideals we have all expressed, I feel that the creation of that one laboratory would not be effective enough.

I would like to call your attention to the fact that modern science has many different shades in various branches. In physics alone there are a hundred different problems which are being studied. In chemistry there is a synthesis of organic chemistry and two or three hundred other problems. I myself in Urainia represent medicine, and I could say that in Urainia alone we have forty-two research laboratories which are concerned with medicine alone and that for all other types of research we have two hundred other institutions. When we speak in terms of laboratories we would have to create a thousand of them to take care of the various specialized branches of science. We were given as an example the case of tuberculosis, and it was suggested we might create a laboratory for tuberculosis. I should like to mention here that in Urainia we have four institutions dealing with tuberculosis; in the Soviet Union we have twenty-two institutions dealing with tuberculosis, and in the United States there are as many as forty institutions dealing with tuberculosis, and throughout the whole world there are a good many laboratories and institutions struggling against tuberculosis. Do we feel that by creating one laboratory we might create one that would be better than all these well established institutions and laboratories? I certainly don't think so. These laboratories and institutions specialize in the various aspects of tuberculosis surgery, lung surgery, of certain other phases of tuberculosis, etc. In other words, the question arises, what will this particular laboratory of the United Nations do? Will it establish working papers in which it would publish the various news of the latest data gathered or discoveries made by the various laboratories? In that case I don't feel that we would need a laboratory. What we need is a good central library which would compile all the data and all the news of research and proceed to distribute it.

The second argument advanced in favor of creating such a laboratory - and at this stage I would like to apologize to the French Representative, because I do definitely respect his idea and the only thing I am speaking about now is the practical applicability of his idea - was that there is at the present time a definite difficulty in housing. Let us therefore establish a laboratory on housing in the United Nations. The question arises, is such laboratory needed because people have forgotten how to build? I believe that in 1946 everybody still knows how to build. It is not because they need particular advice as to how to build, but what they need is money and material in order to be able to build and to liquidate the housing crisis. They will not do so by means of a laboratory. I can say this is like cupping a dead man.

Now to come to the next point, the question of meteorological stations. It is certain at the present time the data from various stations is being distributed throughout the various countries. Each meteorological station is using not only the data it has compiled, but also the data received from other meteorological stations. So we should not limit ourselves to such a primitive approach. And then I do not agree that the development of science can only proceed successfully through international organization. How about some of the well known scientists who have worked in the past, as for example, Curie? Do you believe for one moment the personnel of the Scientific Department of the Johns Hopkins Institution, whom I respect particularly, will leave that institution and come to work in this particular laboratory? I do not think so. If we address ourselves to such a scientist he will say at that time that they have printed in such and such paper their data and you will find there the results. Therefore the only type of scientist the help of whom we would secure would be the average scientist, and we would simply involve ourselves in tremendous expense, and at the same time work under the doubt that it might not help to develop science or even to achieve one discovery.

If I could believe for one moment that through the medium of this one laboratory we could help in achieving at least one discovery, I would vote

for it without reservation, but I sincerely doubt such results.

I wish to remind the Council once more that the United Nations is not one Government or one nation; it is a cooperation of nations, and the United Nations cannot hope to concentrate into one academy all the known scientists throughout the world. Actually I feel it would rather harm science, and I feel therefore we should set this proposal aside. If, on the other hand, this proposal concerned exchange of experiments and exchange of data, I would literally vote with both hands; I would not only use one hand, I would use both hands because it is quite clear that progress in any field, and particularly in science, is based on cooperation between the nations. But I am against the creation of one laboratory in the United Nations because I feel that it would not completely achieve the results which we all hope to see achieved.

(During the above remarks, Mr. Parodi, Representative of France, replaced Mr. Hoffherr at the Council table.)



MR. MEDVED (Ukrainian SSR) (Second interpretation; original in Russian)  
Mr. President, when a mistake is made in the interpretation of what

Mr. Feonov has said, he has the possibility of correcting it himself, because he understands the translation. I have been told that the French translation has interpreted my words as saying that the proposal, from the French, was not a serious one. It is certainly not what I intended to say. I have the greatest respect for the French Representative, and I do recall that in the past at another time, due to a poor interpretation, there have been a conflict with another Representative. I have the greatest respect, once more, for the proposal advanced by the French Representative. I feel that the principle is a very high one, but it is simply a question of practical applicability. I will not take up the medical part of my expose, because I feel that probably the interpreters are not doctors. However, I would like to clarify once more another point of my speech, and that is concerning the housing problem. I do not intend to resolve the scientific conception of the housing problem, but I still will say that in order to solve the housing problem, it is primarily necessary to get the necessary financial means and the material to solve that problem.

THE PRESIDENT : We have five more speakers. I would like to propose to the Members of the Council that we should continue our debate on the various items, take dinner here, and start with the election of Commissions after dinner. Our agenda is still heavy. I think we can finish it by tomorrow very easily, but we should elect the Members of Commissions today. If you do not agree with me that the elections of Members should take place after dinner, we can adjourn our discussion of the French proposal until tomorrow and start with the election of Commissions now.

Are the Members in favor of my proposal that we should adjourn our discussion on the French proposal until tomorrow and elect the Members of the Commissions now?

There is general agreement. Thank you. We will start our discussion on the French proposal again tomorrow.

Now, prepare your hearts for the election of the Commissions, because



it is a rather difficult task. You have in your hands a paper prepared by the Secretariat, E/151/Add.1, and it has been distributed. It has been in your hands for about two hours.

This document will be read now in English and in French.

The text of the document is as follows:

#### PROCEDURE ON ELECTION OF COMMISSIONS

##### NOTE BY THE SECRETARIAT

1. The term "majority required" in the first sentence of Rule 42 is defined in Rule 37. It should be pointed out that the requirement of a simple majority would not necessarily determine an election; for instance, if the Council, which has eighteen Members, is electing a twelve-Member Commission, as many as twenty-one candidates might obtain ten votes each.

The Council may therefore wish to adopt the following solution:

Where the number of candidates obtaining the majority required in Rule 37 is greater than the number of places to be filled, the candidates receiving the most votes up to the number of places to be filled shall be elected.

In the case of a tie among those candidates receiving the smallest number of votes of those receiving at least ten votes, there shall be a ballot for the remaining places to be filled among those so tying.

2. As regard the timing of the process of electing "nominating states", there are two choices open to the Council:

(a) to proceed to complete the election of "nominating states" for each Commission before proceeding to the next Commission;

(b) to take a first ballot on each Commission in succession, and then to return to the first Commission and fill up the remaining places, and then to the second Commission, and so on.

-----

(During the above remarks, Mr. Kotschnig, Representative of the United States left the table and was replaced by Mr. Stinebower; Mr. Noel Baker, Representative of the United Kingdom, left the table and was replaced by Mr. Phillips; and Mr. Riddell, Representative of Canada, left the table and was replaced by Mr. Davidson.)

MR. PARODI (France) (Interpretation from French): I regret to say that this is a document which in its French text is un-understandable. I do not understand it. I suppose it is a translation. I would suggest that translations be made in a better way. Anyway, there is a Paragraph 3 which I very much regret to say I do not understand. I do not see the difference between the two methods suggested and I would like some clarification on this point.

MR. LIE (Secretary-General): Mr. President, if there is a bad translation, maybe it is because we have too many of our interpreters and translators in Paris.

MR. PARODI (France) (Interpretation from French): I would say to the Secretary-General that it is perhaps true that Paris is undertaking unfair competition with Lake Success; but this does not take away the fact that the text that I have before me is not understandable to me and I would like some explanation.

The PRESIDENT: Now, we will proceed to elect States to the Economic and Employment Commission. The Economic and Employment Commission consists of fifteen Members. Now, I will announce which States will be nominated: Australia, Belgium, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, France, Greece, India, Iraq, Netherlands, Norway, Philippine Commonwealth, Poland, United Kingdom, United States, Soviet Union, and Yugoslavia.

You have in your hands the ballot paper.

MR. COLBJORNSEN (Norway): Mr. President, you read out correctly Norway as proposed, but I should like to say that Norway is omitted in the list of countries, so I should like to ask my colleagues to put in Norway there between Netherlands and the Philippines.

The PRESIDENT: This omission was made by other people and not by myself.

You have ballot paper in your hands and I would like to ask the Representatives to write on the paper.

DR. CHANG (China): Mr. President, several Representatives around me have suggested that we might use this sheet and check on it instead of writing fifteen separate names. Some of us may have handwriting which may not be extremely legible.

The PRESIDENT: Considering that some writing is rather difficult to read, perhaps it would be quite all right to use these papers and to sign for which States you are voting or you can write other States, too. What would the Members like to do? I think it is perhaps more practical to use this paper.

DR. CHANG (China): Mr. President, may I just make it clear. It is really a suggestion by the distinguished colleague to my right who said that he wanted me to speak. Instead of using the white ballot, we can use this one -- that is the first thing. The second thing is that instead of checking States which may be very indistinct, we simply cancel out the ones that we do not want. Then the rest of it will be simpler. Cross out lines through the names we do not want. It is not at all signed. This is secret balloting.

The PRESIDENT: Secret balloting.

(United States) Mr.

MR. STINEBOWER: President, we heartily support the suggestion made by the Representative of China, but we do want to call attention to the omission of the name of Norway. We have had an omission here and we want not to see the balloting with a default; so if we do use the ballot, we at least want to write in Norway, if we want to vote for Norway.

The PRESIDENT: Dr. Chang always has big ideas. Thank you very much.

MR. PARODI (FRANCE (Interpretation from French): I regret, Mr. President, that I have to speak again, but I have before me a list in English and another one in French and I see that they are not the same lists.

The PRESIDENT: You must understand that I cannot be Secretary and President.

MR. LEBEAU (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): Mr. President, having considered very closely the two lists I have before me, in French and in English, I notice that they actually do correspond to each other. There are nineteen names included on both lists. The only difference is that the order does not correspond. There is a different alphabetical arrangement.

The PRESIDENT: After that explanation, I think we can vote now.



Sir G. Shankar BAJPAI (India): Mr. President, I just want to get one point clear. The ballot paper was to have been handed to each Representative. These lists have been handed all around.

I think it is best that somebody should call each country by name, so that we go and cast our vote; otherwise, there may be more than one person voting.

(At this point, the Members of the Economic and Social Council cast their ballots for the Members of the Economic and Employment Commission.)

The PRESIDENT: May I ask the Representative of Chile and the Representative of Peru to find the results.

Now, the Transport and Communication Commission.

The following States were proposed for the Transport and Communication Commission, which consists of fifteen Members: Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, France, Greece, India, Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Poland, Soviet Union, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom, United States and Yugoslavia.

The lists will be distributed immediately.

DR. CHANG (China): Are we voting for the Transport Commission?

The PRESIDENT: No - only prepare yourself.

The PRESIDENT: Now that the case is here, we can vote.

Transport and Communications.

(At this point the Members of the Economic and Social Council cast their ballots for the Members of the Transport and Communications Commission.)

The PRESIDENT: Now, the Statistical Commission. The Statistical Commission is composed of twelve members. Will you take into consideration that there are twelve members, so you have to put only twelve names, otherwise your vote will be null and void. Document E/217 is in your hands, and contains the nominations of the following States: Brazil, Canada, China, Denmark, France, India, Mexico, Netherlands, Norway, Turkey, Ukrainian SSR, Soviet Union, United Kingdom, and United States. But, you have to vote for twelve, please.

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

(During the above remarks, Mr. Arca Farro, Representative of Peru, left the Council Table and was replaced by Mr. Fatino.)

We will now vote for the Statistical Commission.

(The Representatives of the Member States then cast their ballots for the Statistical Commission.)

You have in your hands the States nominated for the Commission on Human Rights. The Human Rights Commission consists of eighteen members. Please take this into consideration. You have to propose eighteen States. Do not make a mistake and propose more than eighteen. Please prepare for the voting.

You could also now prepare for voting for the Members of the Commission on the Status of Women - and be very careful! There are fifteen Members of this Commission. Be firm!

Mr. STINEBOWER(United States): Are we now on the balloting for the Commission on the Status of Women?

The PRESIDENT: No, on Human Rights. I am just asking you to prepare for voting on the Commission on the Status of Women.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States): In connection with the balloting on the Commission on Status of Women, there seems to have been a mistake in preparing this ballot. Among the countries that have been nominated is Mexico, but Mexico has been inadvertently omitted in the list as circulated.

The PRESIDENT: In document E/212, add Mexico, in the Commission on Status of Women.

Remember that Human Rights has eighteen Members, the Status of Women has fifteen Members.

Now, will you please cast your votes for the Commission on Human Rights.

(The Representatives of the Member States then cast their ballots for the Commission on Human Rights.)

MR. PATINO (Peru): I noticed that in document 214, Panama which was proposed by the Latin American countries, has been omitted.

THE PRESIDENT: Who? 21 what?

MR. PATINO (Peru): 214.

THE PRESIDENT: In which Commission?

MR. PATINO (Peru): The Fiscal Commission.

THE PRESIDENT: I will announce that, but will you please tell me when the vote on the Fiscal Commission comes up? I will accept the correction.

Members of the Council, may I announce the result of the election of the States who are Members of the Economic and Employment Commission.

Belgium	- 16 votes
Canada	- 16 votes
China	- 16 votes
Cuba	- 16 votes
France	- 16 votes
India	- 16 votes
United States	- 16 votes
Soviet Union	- 16 votes
Australia	- 15 votes
Brazil	- 15 votes
United Kingdom	- 16 votes
Czechoslovakia	- 14 votes
Norway	- 14 votes
Byelorussia	- 13 votes
Poland	- 12 votes

Fifteen Member States were elected. Two votes are not valid.



The Commission is appointed.

Now, will you please prepare yourselves for the Social Commission?

The Social Commission is composed of eighteen members. Please don't forget that. Document E/215 is in your hands. Will you please prepare for voting?

Will you please now cast your votes on the Status of Women, Commission?

Has every Member voted?

I will announce the results of the election of the Members of the

Transport and Communication Commission:

Chile	-	18 votes
China	-	18 votes
France	-	18 votes
India	-	18 votes
Netherlands	-	18 votes
United States	-	18 votes
Norway	-	17 votes
United Kingdom	-	17 votes
Brazil	--16	16 votes
Egypt	-	16 votes
Soviet Union	-	16 votes
Czechoslovakia	--1	15 votes
Union of South Africa	-	15 votes
Poland	-	14 votes
Yugoslavia	-	13 votes

All votes are valid.

The previous votes that have been declared invalid have been so declared because they contained nineteen Members.

Now, will you please prepare yourselves for the Social Commission and keep in mind that the Social Commission is comprised of eighteen members. Document E/215 is in your hands.

I think you will agree with me that we should appoint two more to help with the counting of the votes. We will arrange for one more table and that will facilitate our examination of the ballots. May I ask the Representatives of Czechoslovakia and Belgium to help?

(At this point Mr. Lebeau, Representative of Belgium, and Mr. Papanek, Representative of Czechoslovakia, left the Council table to assist in counting the votes.)

The PRESIDENT : We are voting now for the Social Commission.

Twelve Members of the Statistical Commission are elected:

China	17 votes
France	17 votes
India	17 votes
Norway	17 votes
United Kingdom	17 votes
Canada	16 votes
Mexico	16 votes
Netherlands	16 votes
United States	16 votes
Soviet Union	15 votes
Turkey	12 votes
Ukraine	12 votes

Twelve Members are elected . One vote invalid.

(As the vote on the Statistical Commission was announced, Mr. Yang, Representative of China replaced Dr. Chang at the table; Mr. Loverdos, Representative of Greece, replaced Mr. Argyropoulos; Mr. Radimsky, Representative of Czechoslovakia replaced Mr. Papanek; Mr. Riddell, Representative of Canada, replaced Mr. Davidson.)

Now will you please prepare your papers for election of the members of the Fiscal Commission? The Fiscal Commission consists of fifteen members, so be careful; otherwise your votes will be declared invalid.

MR. PATINO (Peru) : Mr. President, I would call your attention to Panama in this connection.

The PRESIDENT : To this list Panama should be added -- document E/214.

The PRESIDENT: I will announce the results of the election to the Human Rights Commission consisting of eighteen Members:

Belgium	18 votes
Chile	18 votes
France	18 votes
United Kingdom	18 votes
Australia	17 votes
China	17 votes
Egypt	17 votes
India	17 votes
Uruguay	17 votes
United States	17 votes
Philippine Commonwealth	16 votes
Soviet Union	16 votes
Lebanon	15 votes
Panama	15 votes
Byelorussia SSR	14 votes
Iran	14 votes
Ukrainian SSR	14 votes
Yugoslavia	13 votes

All votes valid.

Now, will you prepare yourselves for the Population Commission. The Population Commission consists of twelve Members. Do not vote for more than twelve.



I announce the election of the Members of the Social Commission:

Canada	18 votes
China	18 votes
Denmark	18 votes
France	18 votes
Netherlands	18 votes
United States	18 votes
Czechoslovakia	17 votes
New Zealand	17 votes
Peru	17 votes
Union of	
South Africa	17 votes
Colombia	16 votes
Ecuador	16 votes
Greece	16 votes
Poland	16 votes
Soviet Union	16 votes
United Kingdom	16 votes
Yugoslavia	14 votes
Iraq	12 votes

All votes were valid.

The results of the election of the Members to the Commission on the

Status of Women. All votes were valid.

United Kingdom	18 votes
India	18 votes
Australia	17 votes
Denmark	17 votes
France	17 votes
Soviet Union	17 votes
United States	17 votes
Venezuela	17 votes
Costa Rica	16 votes
China	16 votes
Turkey	16 votes
Syria	15 votes
Mexico	14 votes
Byelorussia	12 votes
Guatemala	11 votes

The PRESIDENT: The election of the Members of the Fiscal Commission:

China	17	votes
Colombia	17	"
France	17	"
United States	17	"
Belgium	16	"
Soviet Union	16	"
United Kingdom	16	"
Cuba	15	"
Czechoslovakia	15	"
India	15	"
New Zealand	15	"
Union of South Africa	15	"
Lebanon	13	"
Poland	13	"
Ukrainian SSR	12	"

Fifteen Members elected.

One Commission more, and you will be free.

The President: The Agenda for tomorrow:

We will conclude our session tomorrow sometime in the afternoon, with good speed and good friendship.

First, we have to draw lots and to find out which Members of the Commissions should serve for two years, which for three years and which for four years. The Secretariat will prepare the material for this, and it will be very easy indeed. We will continue our discussion of the French proposal, devastated regions, Draft resolution of Specialized Agencies, adoption of IRO Constitution as a whole, amendment to terms of reference of Population Commission, and voting on Danube vessels.

We must also set the time for our next session.

A little more patience and you will be informed about the result of our election for Membership to the Population Commission.

Population Commission:

France	- 18 votes
Peru	- 17 votes
United Kingdom	- 17 votes
Soviet Union	- 16 votes
Australia	- 15 votes
Brazil	- 15 votes
Canada	- 15 votes
China	- 15 votes
United States	- 17 votes
Netherlands	- 14 votes
Ukranian SSR	- 14 votes
Yugoslavia	- 12 votes

There are twelve Members elected. All votes were valid.

(The Meeting adjourned at 7:20 P.M.)