

**ECONOMIC  
AND  
SOCIAL COUNCIL****CONSEIL  
ECONOMIQUE  
ET SOCIAL**

UNRESTRICTED

E/C.4/SR.4  
12 January 1948

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

## INTERIM COMMITTEE ON PROGRAMME OF MEETINGS

## SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FOURTH MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York, on Tuesday,  
7 January 1948, at 11.00 a.m.

## Present:

Chairman: Mr. Jan PAPANEK

Dr. T. Y. Wu	(China)
Mr. J. de Folin	(France)
Mr. I. Kamenev	(Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)
Mr. J.A.C.C. Alexander	(United Kingdom)
Mr. L. Hyde	(United States)

Secretariat: Mr. Yates	(Division of Co-ordination and Liaison)
Sir Raphael Cilento	(Social Activities Division)
Mr. L. Herman	(Conference Division)

## ADJUSTMENTS IN THE CALENDAR OF MEETINGS (documents E/C.4/9, 10 and 11).

1. Meetings of the Permanent Central Opium Board and the Supervisory Body  
(document E/C.4/11)

The Committee agreed that the meetings of the Permanent Central Opium Board scheduled for 19-23 April, August and November should begin on 14 June, 27 September and 8 November, and that the meetings of the Supervisory Body scheduled for the first half of September and November should begin on 4 October and 15 November. It was understood that the changes, which would meet the wishes of the bodies concerned, would not create difficulties for the Secretariat.

2. Co-ordination Committee (document E/C.4/10)

The Committee agreed that the third session of the Co-ordination Committee should be held in Geneva, commencing 15 January 1948 in view of the impossibility of assembling the Directors-General of the agencies concerned in New York on 21 January as previously contemplated. It was pointed out that the effect of the revised decision on the budget would be limited to Secretariat costs.

/3. Economic Commission

3. Economic Commission for Europe (document E/C.4/10)

The Committee agreed that the next session of the Economic Commission for Europe should be held in Geneva from 31 March to 10 April, in place of the sessions previously scheduled in January and May. It was pointed out that the members of the Commission had been consulted informally and were understood to be in agreement with the revised dates, having regard to the budgetary decisions of the General Assembly.

4. Transport and Communications Commission (document E/C.4/10)

The Committee agreed to postpone the opening of the second session of the Transport and Communications Commission from 5 April to 12 April, with a view of achieving a more even distribution of work for the conference services in Geneva. It was understood that the Secretariat would notify the members of the Commission without delay.

5. Sub-Commission on Employment and Economic Stability (document E/C.4/10)  
Sub-Commission on Economic Development ( )

Mr. YATES (Secretariat) pointed out that both the Sub-Commissions of the Economic and Employment Commission had met since the Interim Committee had provisionally decided that their 1948 sessions should be held in August. Both had made recommendations regarding the dates of their next meetings. The suggestion of the Sub-Commission on Employment and Economic Stability that it should convene in Geneva in March 1948 would create great difficulties for the Secretariat, though a session in March at Lake Success would be possible.

Mr. ALEXANDER (United Kingdom) considered that the two sub-commissions should meet in August as previously agreed, thus giving both the sub-commissions and the Secretariat more time to complete their work.

Mr. de FOLIN (France) approved of the suggestion of the Sub-Commission on Employment and Economic Stability that it should meet shortly before the Economic and Employment Commission, in order that it might be able to present an up-to-date report to the latter.

! Mr. WU (China) agreed with the United Kingdom representative.

Mr. HYDE (United States) felt that, if practicable, the wishes of the sub-commissions should be granted. However, since the programme for March was already heavy, both sub-commissions might perhaps be scheduled in June. Though their reports could not then be submitted to the main Commission before the July session of the Council, the Council would at least be able to form an opinion of and have the benefit of their work without waiting till 1949.

Mr. HERMAN (Conference Division) pointed out that it would be impossible for the conference services of the Secretariat to service a session of more than one of the sub-commissions in June, in view of the already heavy

/programme

programme for that month.

In reply to Dr. WU (China), Mr. HYDE (United States) expressed the belief that the sub-commissions had not themselves requested that their sessions be held simultaneously.

Mr. ALEXANDER (United Kingdom) was willing to agree that one of the sub-commissions (preferably the Sub-Commission on Employment and Economic Stability) should meet in June, and one in August.

His delegation considered that as much time as possible should be allowed to elapse between the last sessions of the sub-commissions held in December 1947 and the next sessions to be held in 1948. The world economic scene could be expected to be greatly clarified within the next few months, but the changes would not be sufficiently apparent by March. By June, developments might however be sufficiently advanced for the sub-commission to supplement its earlier findings.

Moreover, whether a sub-commission met in March or in June, its report would still be considered at the July session of the Council.

Mr. de FOLIN (France) felt that it would be preferable for the report of the sub-commission to be submitted in the first place to the Commission and not directly to the Council.

Mr. KAMENEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) considered that the wishes of the sub-commissions should be acceded to and pointed out that their reports could thus reach the Council through the normal channel of the Commission. He could not accept the point of view of the United Kingdom delegation, since he felt that the sub-commission itself should be the best judge of the situation.

After some further discussion, in which it was pointed out that the Sub-Commission on Employment and Economic Stability had as yet made no report, the Committee agreed that the Sub-Commission on Economic Development should meet at Lake Success in June, in accordance with its request, and that the Sub-Commission on Employment and Economic Stability should meet at Lake Success in August, on a date to be decided by the Secretary-General.

SOCIAL COMMISSION

Mr. HYDE (United States) explained that, in the opinion of the United States representative on the Social Commission, the position in regard to the dates of meeting of the Committee on Planning and Co-ordination and of the Commission itself had considerably altered in the light of the budgetary decisions of the General Assembly. Since it was now very unlikely that more than one session of the Social Commission would be held in 1948, it was important that the Commission should be able to complete its consideration of the Committee's report at its forthcoming session. A

/sufficient

sufficient interval must therefore be allowed between the end of the Committee's session and the opening of the session of the Commission, to enable the Committee's report to be circulated and studied. He suggested an interval of from four to six weeks.

Sir Raphael CILENTO (Social Activities Division) reviewed the tasks entrusted to the Committee on Planning and Co-ordination, the importance attached to its work and the desirability, as explained by the United States representative on the Commission, of allowing a sufficient interval for the report of the Committee to be circulated to the other members of the Commission and to the various specialized agencies concerned. He understood that several members of the Commission felt that a firm policy, rather than a tentative programme, could thus be decided upon before the close of the session of the Commission.

He pointed out, however, that funds might have to be made available to cover the additional cost of travel of the seven members of the Committee, should a considerable interval elapse between the two sessions, and double journeys be necessary.

Mr. de FOLIN (France) considered that the budgetary aspect of the matter and the other engagements of the members of the Committee should be carefully considered. It was not at all certain that all the members would be able to travel to New York for one session, return to their countries and then come back to New York in a few weeks time for the session of the Commission. He therefore considered that members of the permanent delegations to the Council should be allowed to sit as alternates on the Committee if necessary, but he understood that the Commission had felt that the members themselves should sit.

Mr. ALEXANDER (United Kingdom) agreed that the timetable of the members of the Commission must not be disregarded and therefore considered that the shortest possible interval should elapse between the two sessions. An interval of from four to six weeks appeared to him excessive. He believed that the points raised by the United States representative could be met if the session of the Committee, which could probably complete its work in one week, were scheduled to open ten to twelve days before the Commission met.

In reply to the representative of France, Sir Raphael CILENTO (Social Activities Division) explained that the Commission had felt that since a point on its agenda had been referred to the Committee for discussion, it could best be studied by persons who were members of the Commission, had followed its discussions and were thoroughly familiar with its work.

From the strictly legal point of view, however, a duly appointed alternate could undoubtedly replace the member.

/Mr. HYDE (United States)

Mr. HYDE (United States) agreed that in accordance with Rule 11 of the Commission's Rules of Procedure a regularly designated alternate could replace a member. It should be possible to find an alternate who was familiar with the work of the Commission; such a solution would also reduce the cost of holding the session at a date not immediately preceding that of the opening of the session of the Commission.

It was agreed that an interval of at least four weeks would be desirable between the two sessions. After some discussion of the dates of the sessions in relation to the remainder of the calendar and to the agenda of the Council, it appeared however impossible to arrange this without disrupting much of the already agreed programme for 1948.

Mr. KAMENEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) suggested that, if no other solution could be found, it might be wise to prolong the session of the Social Commission and cancel the session of the Committee.

After a further exchange of views, the Committee agreed that the Committee on Co-ordination and Planning should meet from 8-18 March and the Social Commission from 5-22 April 1948.

In reply to the United Kingdom representative, Sir Raphael CILENTO (Social Activities Division) stated that should members be obliged to return to their countries between the two sessions, the additional travel expenses would be met by the United Nations, and some readjustment in the funds available for other economic and social conferences would be thereby necessitated.

#### REPORT OF THE INTERIM COMMITTEE TO THE COUNCIL (document E/C.4/W.1)

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the draft report would have to be revised in the light of the decisions taken at the present meeting.

Dr. WU (China) asked whether any communications had been received under paragraph (b) of the Committee's terms of reference, or whether any comments had been made by the Co-ordination Committee. He suggested that a meeting of the Interim Committee should be held to discuss the questions raised in paragraph (b).

Mr. YATES (Division of Co-ordination and Liaison) replied that no written observations or suggestions had been received. The draft calendar prepared by the Interim Committee at its previous meetings had been put before the Co-ordination Committee in October last; it had been generally acceptable and had given rise to no discussion. The more recent documents of the Interim Committee would, in their turn, be communicated to the Co-ordination Committee when it met in Geneva on 15 January. The general question of the construction of the calendar was on the agenda of that meeting.

After a further exchange of views, the Committee agreed that its Report,  
/revised

revised in the light of the decisions taken at the present meeting, together with the calendar of meetings, should be circulated without delay. If any written suggestions or observations were subsequently received, a further meeting of the Committee would be held and an addendum issued to the report.

It was agreed that the Secretariat would produce for the members of the Committee a paper setting out the financial implications of the calendar as revised. If, on receipt of the document, any member wished a further meeting to be held, such a meeting would be called. If it were called, paragraph (b) of the terms of reference would also be put on its agenda.

Mr. de FOLIN (France) stated that the French delegation's agreement to the calendar, and in particular to the ratio of meetings to be held at Lake Success and in Geneva, was governed by the assumption that the seventh session of the Council would take place in Geneva.

The meeting rose at 1.50 p.m.

-----