

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

UNRESTRICTED

E/CN.1/SR.30
17 June 1947

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

ECONOMIC AND EMPLOYMENT COMMISSION

SECOND SESSION

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE THIRTIETH MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York, on Tuesday, 10 June 1947, at 10:30 a.m.

Present:

Chairman:	Mr. A. P. Morozov	(Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)
Rapporteur:	Mr. I. Lubin	(United States)
Members:	*Mr. E. J. R. Heyward	(Australia)
	*Mr. E. De Selliers	(Belgium)
	Mr. J. Nunes Guimaraes	(Brazil)
	*Mr. L. Kaminsky	(Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic)
	*Mr. J. F. Parkinson	(Canada)
	*Mr. T. Y. Wu	(China)
	*Mr. C. Blanco	(Cuba)
	*Mr. L. Radimsky	(Czechoslovakia)
	Mr. J. Rueff	(France)
	*Mr. P. J. Bjerve	(Norway)
	*Mr. A. Rudzinski	(Poland)
	Mr. R. L. Hall	(United Kingdom)

Specialized Agencies

Representatives:	Mr. E. J. Riches	(ILO)
	Mr. M. Ezekiel	(FAO)

Non-Governmental Organizations

Consultants:	Mrs. L. Speigel	(WFTU)
	Mr. W. Campbell	(ICA)
	Miss T. Sender	(AFL)

OthersSpecialized Agencies

	Mr. Lopez Herrate	(International Bank)
	Miss M. K. Fenn	(WHO)
Secretariat:	Mr. D. Weintraub	

* Alternate for Second Session

Continuation of Discussion on Item 7 of Agenda

The Chairman opened the meeting.

Mr. BJERVE (Norway) stated that the discussion had shown the necessity for dealing with long-term and short-term problems separately. The long-term problem was one of maintaining full employment when capital equipment ruined by the war had been restored, when housing was again adequate for the size of the population and when industrialization had reached a certain stage. This was a matter of perhaps five or ten years. It was the responsibility of the Commission to recommend international action to maintain full employment even for that time. Statistical data were needed and efficient tools of analysis had to be developed.

As to the short-term problem, the Commission should make the necessary recommendations without the collection of new data or comprehensive investigations. He pointed out that Mr. WUBIN (United States) had already referred to the physical needs for reconstruction and the need for inventories. As to the problem of how to reduce and control inflation, the Commission should remember that it was a problem of correct budgetary and monetary methods and their execution. In trying to carry them out, many administrative and political problems would be encountered. It might be hard to create the appropriate social conditions. The Commission might not be able to make recommendations in this field since the differences were so great among different countries. However, he did agree that inventories of resources should be made.

In connection with this item on the agenda and also Item 6, he wished to make a few observations on the problem of unemployment in the short-run. By the short-run he meant one or two years. Unemployment was not only a problem of shortage of materials and capital but tendencies might arise because of ineffective demand in the near future, as was shown in the report of the Secretariat. Ineffective demand in one country might have a depressive effect upon the export industries of other countries, resulting

/in unemployment

in unemployment in those countries. Some countries might have unemployment, not because of scarcities but because of a lack of demand in their own countries and in other countries. The Commission should make recommendations regarding this matter.

Miss SENDER (Consultant for the American Federation of Labor) made some remarks with respect to Item 7 of the Agenda. Those remarks are contained in document E/CN.1/43.

The next speaker was Mr. CAMPBELL (Consultant of the International Co-operative Alliance), whose remarks are contained in document E/CN.1/42.

The CHAIRMAN speaking as a representative stated that it was important to note that the pertinent articles of the Charter relating to full employment had not been sufficiently emphasized by the members of the Commission. He referred to Article 55 of the United Nations Charter dealing with the task of assisting full employment. He pointed out the degree unemployment had reached in the "thirties". This problem of employment demanded the detailed and continued attention of the Commission since the study of this problem was a basic purpose of the Commission. The problem of full employment was a real question at the present time. Unemployment had reached very high levels in many countries, as could be seen in the figures given in the ILO. Press Inform. Release (ILO/86) "World Employment Remains Low. ILO Figures Disclose". The unemployed must be absorbed into production. In a number of documents, including the document of the International Chamber of Commerce (E/CN.1/W.12) there is a tendency to ignore this task. Full employment is considered a vague and indefinite thing and different terminology was invented to ignore in substance the problem of guaranteeing full employment. It was even said that full employment might not coincide with the nature of a free society. Only those to whom the presence of unemployment with all its consequences was profitable, were interested in defending this policy.

Mr. MOROZOV believed this policy could not find support from the

/Commission.

Commission. When means for the best utilization of the labour force are discussed, the need for recommendations for the liquidation of unemployment should be paid attention to. Mr. MOROZOV referred to Mr. LUBIN's (United States) statement of the previous day. Mr. Lubin had mentioned the desirability of studying the immediate needs of different countries. Data on these emergency requirements should be gathered, according to Mr. Lubin. Mr. MOROZOV pointed out that an Economic Commission for Europe and an Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East had been set up. The Economic Commission for Europe was designed to render assistance to devastated countries of Europe and to give prior consideration to measures facilitating the rehabilitation of members of the United Nations. Would it not be better to find out, in the first instance, the requirements of Europe and Asia and the possibilities of satisfying them through these Commissions? Was some of the information not already available? Mr. MOROZOV referred to the Secretariat document E/208, of 26 February 1947, for consideration. In this document the requirements of various countries were determined financially and also in physical units. Some material had been put forth by the Special Technical Committee in connection with the termination of UNRRA. Mr. Lubin had referred to the urgency of the task but Mr. Morozov believed that the proposal to collect data was in itself a delay. He believed it was not the need for gathering data on requirements which was the problem but how the needs and requirements of different countries were being satisfied, what countries needed help and what aid was being given. He pointed out that Turkey had not suffered from the war and yet had received priority. It seemed that the data on needs of countries, collected by the United Nations, was being ignored by some countries, in spite of the Resolution of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council that assistance should be given without obtaining political and other advantages. This principle should also be applied to loans and credits. The Commission must approve only those loans devoted to economic development
/and reconstruction

and reconstruction and not designed for political and military reasons.

Mr. RUEFF (France) desired to make one technical observation that the Sub-Commission on Employment and Economic Stability should utilize. Preference had been made to inflation, purchasing power and balance of payments difficulties. He believed that there was a basic link between the balance of payments problem, inflation, and the volume of purchasing power. The solution to the balance of payments problem might be found in the solution of the problem of buying power. He suggested that the Sub-Commission should study this lack of equilibrium in studying the balance of payments. Mr. BJERVE (Norway) had mentioned the differences in economic and social conditions in different countries. Mr. Rueff believed recommendations regarding these differences could be made and should be undertaken in investigating the causes for inflation. We must take into consideration global purchasing power in accounting for inflation.

Mr. HALL (United Kingdom) thought that the Commission was agreed on the action required as far as long-term problems were concerned, in that the matter should be referred to the Sub-Commission on Employment and Economic Stability with the Commission's observations and with the relevant documents which the Commission had considered.

With respect to the short-term problem, it was agreed that the problem was still achieving stability, rather than that of maintaining stability. The Commission had not yet gotten to the point at which it had been supposed that it would begin its labours. All the problems referred to were problems still with the world as a result of the war. Essentially, those problems had their roots in physical shortages, which were due almost entirely to the slowness of recovery throughout the world.

There was an acute shortage of primary products, raw materials, and food. But there was also a great shortage of finished goods. The shortage of primary products and finished goods in itself had brought about difficulties in the balance of payments to which several speakers had referred.

The problem of dollar shortages was just a reflection of the physical lack of balance. The United States was producing at unprecedented levels. Its goods were being sent abroad at an extraordinary rate, but the countries that wanted those goods, with physical recovery delayed, had not yet reached the point where they could export goods in sufficient quantities to pay for the imports which they required. All those problems went back to the problem of recovery.

He still felt uncertain about the course of action which the Commission should take. The problem had been discussed at its First Session, and it was his impression that the problem had been handed over to the Economic Commissions for Europe and for Asia and the Far East which had been set up originally to study it, as a result of the Economic and Employment Commission's recommendation to the Economic and Social Council.

He felt that, having created machinery to study the problem, the Commission had to give its machinery a chance to work.

The problem seemed to him not so much one of collecting information as of determining action. As the Chairman had pointed out, data were available on needs. The problem was to devise means by which available supplies could be brought into relation with available resources.

Therefore, the attention of the Economic Commissions for Europe and for Asia and the Far East should be called to that problem, in relation to the work of the Economic and Employment Commission.

He was not sure how much further this Commission should go. It could not be uninterested in the problem, nor indifferent to it, but if, as he thought, the problem was mainly one of recovery, he was uncertain as to what type of recommendation the Commission could submit to the Council without either repeating or conflicting with its previous recommendations already accepted by the Council.

Mr. LUBIN (United States) noted that all of the Commission's discussions had been concentrated on the point brought up by the Representative from

/Great Britain,

Great Britain, namely, not how to maintain stability but how to obtain it.

The first problem, the short-term problem, was to make recommendations as to what action might be taken to bring world production to such a point where there could be a free flow of trade, and where other factors interfering with economic stability would be eliminated.

There was still the long-term problem of what type of machinery was needed in order to maintain stability once it should have been obtained.

Mr. PARKINSON (Canada) said that he had refrained from intervening in the discussion because, like many members, he had found it difficult to separate short-term from longer-term problems, and because he had been worried somewhat lest the Commission overstep the boundaries of its own jurisdiction and offer to the Council observations on matters already referred to other Commissions.

There existed the danger of confusing the short-term problem created by the war with the long-term problem as it had existed in the 1930's and as it might arise again once recovery had been achieved.

He was inclined to agree with the Representative from the United Kingdom, that it was difficult, on the basis of the facts at the disposal of the Commission, and taking into account the fact that other Commissions had been set up, to make short-term recommendations.

With regard to the work, studies, and terms of reference of the Sub-Commission on Employment and Economic Stability, he subscribed heartily to the views of the Representatives of Belgium and the United Kingdom, that the large trading countries of the world had a very heavy responsibility in maintaining employment and income, and that they must avoid doing anything which would have the effect of exporting unemployment.

Many countries were dependent on international trade, and unemployment spread rapidly from one country to another through the operations of the free market. The difficulty of dependence on the free market was the tendency for cyclical trends to spread in a cumulative manner and to produce

/exaggerated

exaggerated results from small beginnings. Countries such as Australia, Canada, countries in Latin America, were all aware of the dislocations resulting from unemployment in large trading countries due to changes of income in export trade.

All members of the Commission knew that beginnings of recession give rise to measures of restriction in trade which tend further to exaggerate the consequences of the initial dislocations.

Under those conditions, sources of international lending dried up, producing further aggravation. Countries producing raw materials and food for export were the hardest hit by a primary fall in prices.

In giving the Sub-Commission on Employment and Economic Stability its terms of reference, the Commission had charged it with a very serious responsibility. While the problem of such a cyclical movement as had appeared in the 1930's did not exist at the present time, nevertheless the possibility of its reappearance did.

He would suggest that the Sub-Commission's recommendations should not be too general. It would be difficult and, in his opinion, even incorrect to reach general conclusions for application to countries both highly developed and under-developed.

With respect to the question of wages, for example, some countries could not raise wages in their food industries, when importing countries needed food.

He thought that the two papers (document E/CN.1/35 and document E/CN.1/37) produced by the Representatives of the United Kingdom and the United States, between them provided an enormous scope for investigation and study by the Sub-Commission. He had read both papers, and he thought that, while they hinted at some of the right answers, no one would suggest that they were exhaustive.

From the long-term point of view, the Sub-Commission on Employment and Economic Stability had a very important task to perform.

/Mr. EZEKIEL (FAO)

Mr. EZEKIEL (FAO) pointed out that in the FAO document (E/CN.1/W.11, Section C,) specific action relating to maintaining full employment and economic stability was recommended. It cited the danger that certain countries producing food might go in for restrictive measures during the onset of a depression, which was also mentioned by Mr. PARKINSON (Canada). The Preparatory Commission on World Food Proposals had considered this problem and did not feel the time had come to set up a Food Board to maintain agricultural supplies but it did recommend adoption of policies of agricultural price stabilization and the use of international commodity arrangements.

On page 6 of document E/CN.1/W.11 the Preparatory Commission recommended the creation of a World Food Council of the Food and Agriculture Organization to co-ordinate and review agricultural production, to ensure adequate returns to the producer and to tender advice to member governments. The setting up of such a Council was on the agenda of the next session of the FAO, and Mr. Ezekiel wondered if this Commission should recommend and endorse this action.

Mr. DE SELLIERS (Belgium) stated that the Commission was agreed that the long-term problem should be referred to the Sub-Commission. However, reference had frequently been made to the danger of a depression soon and this might take place before the Sub-Commission was ready. He wanted to emphasize the need for making recommendations regarding the short-term problems to the next Council Session. Referring this problem to the two Economic Commissions for Europe and for Asia and the Far East conflicted with the urgency of the problem. The two Commissions would deal with regional problems but there were more general aspects which would come under the jurisdiction of this Commission. There was a difference between the general problem of economic stability and reconstruction and the problems of a regional character. There could not be economic stability without reconstruction, and this Commission could make recommendations about methods

/of aiding

of aiding reconstruction in certain countries. We could also ask the Council to favour the sending of missions of United Nations experts to countries with reconstruction needs and to advise them on fiscal and labour policies. That the surplus countries should aid this policy could be recommended to the Council. These recommendations should make it clear that this was necessary for stability.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Commission consider this problem, as follows. The Council had asked the Commission to submit a report as to the most appropriate forms of maintaining full employment and economic stability. Certain members of the Commission did not think the Commission was now in a position to do this and wanted to refer the problem to the Sub-Commission. Other members thought that on some matters the Commission could give recommendations to the Council. A vote could be taken as to whether the Commission considered it feasible to submit certain suggestions at this session to the Council.

Mr. HALL (United Kingdom) pointed out that certain views on proposals for maintaining full employment and stability had been made but no specific recommendations had been put forth. It had only been decided to refer the long-term problem to the Sub-Commission.

The CHAIRMAN said he did not object if the members thought it was premature to put this matter to a vote.

Mr. PARKINSON (Canada) thought the decision should be deferred. If recommendations other than broad general views that would be ineffective could be sent to the Council and if these recommendations could command the widespread support of the Commission, then he believed these recommendations should be put forward. He suggested that the Commission could examine the kind of recommendations which some of the members thought it should put forward. Perhaps a small committee could formulate the kind of recommendations in view or perhaps the members could circulate informally the kind of recommendations they had in mind. He was anxious not to abandon the responsibility of making recommendations to the Council if they could be made now.

Mr. KAMINSKY (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) called attention to the fact that time was needed to study the documents presented for the consideration of the Commission. Then too, each document had a different approach. No specific recommendations with regard to detailed problems which were called urgent had been forthcoming. He pointed out that overlapping in the course of the Commission's work must be avoided, as for instance, in the problem of reconstruction of devastated areas, which was being studied by other bodies. Would it not be more reasonable for further work, which was needed for the report of this Commission to the Council, to be done by the Sub-Commission?

Mr. WU (China) agreed with the Delegates for Canada and the United Kingdom and said that he could not vote on this matter at present but he thought that some recommendations perhaps could be formulated by the Secretariat.

Mr. DE SELLERS (Belgium) pointed out that the principal difficulty seemed to be the kind of recommendations the Commission should formulate. He thought a drafting committee, as proposed by the Delegate for Canada, should be set up.

Mr. LUBIN (United States) pointed out that there were two ways of solving the problem - either a drafting committee could be set up, or mention of these discussions could be made in the final report of the Rapporteur.

A vote was taken on the Canadian proposal to form a small drafting committee. This proposal was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the drafting committee be composed of three members.

Mr. WU (China) recommended that the committee be composed of the Delegate for Canada who had put forward the proposal, the Delegate for Belgium who had seconded the proposal, and the Rapporteur, the Delegate for the United States.

Mr. RADIMSKY (Czechoslovakia) recommended that the Delegate from the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic be a member of the committee.

Mr. KAMINSKY (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) thought the

/committee

committee should be larger since time was short and much work had to be done. Since representative points of view should be heard, he thought five members for the committee might be a more appropriate number.

Mr. RUEFF (France) proposed as a compromise a committee of four members. Since four members had already been nominated, he suggested Mr. PARKINSON (Canada), Mr. DE SELLERS (Belgium), Mr. LUBIN (United States), and Mr. KAMINSKY (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic).

This was agreed.

Mr. RUEFF (France) suggested that when the Sub-Committee reported on the short-term problem, the Rapporteur should report on the long-term problem at the same time.

Discussion on Item 2 of Agenda

The CHAIRMAN thought the question of the rules of procedure (Item 2 on the Agenda) could be discussed, with some members reserving the right to return to the discussion if they had no final views on the subject.

Mr. LUBIN (United States) read the report of the drafting Sub-Committee, composed of Mr. KAMINSKY (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), Mr. NEERU (India) and Mr. LUBIN (United States) (document E/CN.1/W.20).

The CHAIRMAN called for remarks concerning Rule 3.

Mr. HALL (United Kingdom) supported the consolidation of Rules 3 and 4 (document E/327, page 6).

Rule 3 was adopted as set forth in document E/CN.1/W.20, and Rule 4 was deleted.

Rule 14 (Document 327, Page 8)

Mr. LUBIN (United States) read Rule 14 (document E/CN.1/W.20, page 2).

The CHAIRMAN wondered whether such a rule were necessary.

Mr. LUBIN (United States) replied that the Sub-Committee recommended that the rule be retained.

The CHAIRMAN wished to have the Commission consider that point. Did it not lead to the practice that in certain cases certain members, perhaps even
/the majority,

the majority, of the Commission would have to come under the workings of that provision, and might it not cause additional and unnecessary correspondence? He called the attention of the Commission to that point in connection with the Economic and Social Council's ruling regarding a system of alternates.

As he understood it, the Economic and Social Council had recognized the necessity of setting up a system of alternates because in the case of a number of Commissions, some members had not been able to attend their first sessions. In setting up a system of alternates, the Council had decided that the alternates were to have the same rights as members, including the right to vote. The amendment drafted by the Sub-Committee would alter that.

Perhaps it would be better to make an amendment starting with the words "If a member or his alternate"; or perhaps it might be better to delete Rule 14 from the Commission's Rules of Procedure.

Mr. LUBIN (United States) said that this question had been discussed by the Sub-Committee and that the majority of the Sub-Committee had given definite consideration to the fact that alternates were available under the new rule. Because of the very fact that alternates were permitted, it became all the more important that Rule 14 remain.

Mr. RUEFF (France) supported Mr. Lubin's observations. He thought that absenteeism was dangerous.

Mr. HEYWARD (Australia) supported the retention of the rule.

Mr. PARKINSON (Canada) thought that the absence of members should be reported to the following session of the Commission, rather than to the Economic and Social Council.

Mr. RUEFF (France) wished only to point out that the Commission was interested in having permanent members. He did not think the system of alternates should be encouraged.

The CHAIRMAN, speaking as a representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics again drew the attention of the Commission

to the fact that the Economic and Social Council had considered exhaustively the question of alternates after hearing all opinions pro and con, and it had decided that alternates should have the same rights as members.

From that point of view, he would like to have the rule changed to start: "Should a member or alternate". He emphasized the fact that alternates must be considered to have full rights to partake in the work of the Commission.

Mr. DE SELLERS (Belgium) declared that members were selected in part because of their particular knowledge of certain economic questions. A member who had himself regularly replaced by an alternate, therefore, would not be carrying out the intention of the Council which elected him. For this reason, he was in favour of retaining Rule 14.

Mr. LUBIN (United States) wished to say that if the Commission amended the rule as had been suggested by the Chairman, it would be better not to have it at all. He could not conceive of a situation arising in which a member would be absent for two consecutive sessions. Some assurance should be provided that members would attend regularly. As time went on, the work of the Commission would deal with problems held over from one session to another. The very nature of economic stability made it a continuous problem.

Mr. PARKINSON (Canada) asked whether it would not be possible for the Economic and Employment Commission to make a provision for permanent alternates, thus insuring some continuity.

Mr. RADIMSKY (Czechoslovakia) wished to know how the question had been solved in the rules of procedure of other Commissions; or was this the first Commission to adopt such a rule?

Mr. WEINTRAUB (Secretariat) said that the rule governing all other Commissions was the one which had been adopted by the Economic and Social Council, at its last session, with respect to alternates.

The CHAIRMAN further explained that since this was the first Commission to have a Second Session, there were no precedents to follow.

/He called

He called for a vote on the adoption of Rule 14 as stated. The rule was adopted.

Mr. KAMINSKY (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) wished to know whether the rule would be retroactive.

The CHAIRMAN explained that all rules became effective from the moment of their adoption.

Rule 17 (Document E/CN.1/34)

Mr. LUBIN (United States) read the rule as amended in document E/CN.1/W.20.

Mr. RUEFF (France) opposed the amendment, asserting that the main requisite for chairmanship was continuity, and that the system of rotating chairmen from week to week was very poor. He suggested that the Commission adopt a rule similar to that adopted by other Commissions. The Social Commission, for example, seemed to have only one vice chairman. Was it necessary for the Economic and Employment Commission to have two?

Mr. LUBIN (United States) replied that the question of two vice chairmen had been discussed thoroughly by the Sub-Committee, which had based its amendment on the assumption that the Commission desired to have two vice chairmen.

In connection with Mr. RUEFF's (France) first point, Mr. Lubin suggested that the word "sessions" be substituted for "weeks".

The CHAIRMAN had some doubts as to the correctness of the amendment. He thought that the absence of a Chairman should be considered as a special case. In the amended rule it would appear that the alphabet would be the guiding point in choosing a vice chairman. In those cases where there would be two vice chairmen, the second one would be merely nominal.

Mr. LUBIN (United States) pointed out that the Sub-Committee's amendment in effect said that the vice chairmen would alternate. If the Chairman were absent from one session, the first vice chairman to serve would be the one whose country's English alphabetical order were the lower; but

/at the next

at the next absence of the Chairman, the vice chairman whose country were higher in alphabetical order would preside.

Mr. DE SELLIERS (Belgium) wondered whether it would not be possible to decide that when the Chairman were absent the odd-numbered sessions (e.g., 1, 3, 5, 7) would be presided over by the vice chairman whose country's alphabetical order came first, and the even-numbered sessions would be in charge of the other vice chairman.

Mr. HEYWARD (Australia) thought that the suggestion of Mr. De Selliers (Belgium) removed any discrimination which might be thought to be imposed by the English alphabet.

The CHAIRMAN asked that the Representative from Belgium state his proposal in its entirety.

Mr. DE SELLIERS (Belgium) explained that at each odd-numbered session, one vice chairman would be called upon to replace the Chairman if he were absent. At each even-numbered session, the other vice chairman would be called upon to replace the Chairman if he were absent. At the first session from which the Chairman were absent, the vice chairman whose country's initial letter appeared first in the English alphabet, would serve.

Mr. HALL (United Kingdom) thought that the choice of the first vice chairman to preside should be determined by lot.

The CHAIRMAN had no objection to Mr. Hall's proposed amendment.

Mr. DE SELLIERS (Belgium) wondered whether it could not be added that the drawing of lots would take place immediately after the election of both vice chairmen.

The rule was adopted with the amendments suggested by the representatives of the United Kingdom and the United States.

Rule 54 (Document E/CN.1/W.20)

Mr. LUBIN (United States), explaining the new rule which appeared in document E/CN.1/W.20, Rule 54, stated that in the rules of procedure of the Economic and Social Council there was a provision regarding resolutions,

/amendments

amendments and motions of a substantive character. This rule had not appeared in the provisional rules of procedure of the Commission. In accordance with a proposal of one of its members, the Representative from the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the sub-committee had added the new rule.

Mr. RUDZINSKI (Poland) stated that among the rules of the General Assembly and of the Security Council, there was no rule that advance notice of twenty-four hours had to be given in the case of amendments. He thought that the word "amendments", therefore, should be deleted.

Mr. IUBIN (United States) suggested that the Commission second the suggestion of the Representative from Poland.

The CHAIRMAN directed the attention of the Commission to the fact that in the rules of the Economic and Social Council, reference was made to "resolutions, amendments and motions". He saw no reason for the Commission to deviate from that phrasing.

Mr. KAMINSKY (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) wished to follow the decision of the drafting sub-committee and to keep the wording of that rule intact.

The CHAIRMAN asked the representative from Poland whether he would insist on his suggestion.

Mr. RUDZINSKI (Poland) did not insist.

The CHAIRMAN thought that the purpose of Rule 54 was to give the members of the Commission time to familiarize themselves with all important documents connected with any proposed recommendations, amendments, or motions. In many cases amendments might be more important than the rules themselves.

Mr. DE SELLERS (Belgium) said that if the words "of a substantive character" applied to "amendments", he believed it was a good rule. He wondered whether the order could not be reversed so that the phrase would read, "Resolutions, motions and amendments of a substantive character".

/Mr. IUBIN

Mr. LUBIN (United States) thought that if this were done it would appear as though the phrase "of a substantive character" modified only the word "amendments". The sub-committee wished the phrase to apply to resolutions and motions, as well as to amendments.

Mr. HEYWARD (Australia) suggested that a comma be placed after "resolutions", after "motions", and after "amendments". In that way, "of a substantive character" would apply to the three words.

There being no objections, the rule was adopted with the changes suggested by the Representatives from Australia and Belgium.

Rules 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 1 (document E/CN.1/34) were adopted without change.

Rule 2 (Document E/CN.1/34)

Mr. HEYWARD (Australia), with regard to Rule 2, wondered whether there should not be added, after "with the concurrence of the Secretary-General" the words "who shall take account of the views of the Chairman." He did not like the change from the original rule (document E/327, page 6), because it seemed to him that the Commission was losing its character of a specially chosen body, and he thought that the dates of sessions should be fixed in consultation with the Chairman.

Mr. LUBIN (United States) agreed with the recommendation of the Representative from Australia, and thought the Commission should suggest that the amendment read, "...in consultation with the Chairman and with the concurrence of the Secretary-General."

Mr. WEINTRAUB (Secretariat) quoted from document E/431, in which it was stated that the Secretary-General was to submit to the Council, at its last session each year, a draft calendar drawn up in consultation with the Co-ordinating Committee.

Therefore, the Commission's views would already have been taken into account when the Secretary-General submitted the draft calendar to the Council.

/The wording

The wording might be changed so that it would include "who shall take account of the views of the Chairman".

The CHAIRMAN thought it might be better to submit that rule to the consideration of the Economic and Social Council, in order that it might decide the question of fixing sessions, since the Council's resolutions (document E/431) did not state that the Council would fix the date of each session.

Mr. LUBIN (United States) saw no objection to having the Council fix the dates of sessions with the concurrence of the Secretary-General, if the Secretary-General were to consult with the Chairman of the Commission before acting.

The rule was adopted as amended.

Rule 5 (Document E/CN.1/34)

Rule 5 was adopted with the addition of the phrase "who shall take account of the views of the Chairman" after "with the concurrence of the Secretary-General".

Rule 13 (Document E/CN.1/34)

Rule 13 was adopted as read.

Rule 8 (Document E/CN.1/34)

Mr. HEYWARD (Australia), referring to Rule 8, suggested that the word "other" be deleted.

Mr. RUDZINSKI (Poland) wished to call the attention of the Commission to the fact that in the Charter of the United Nations, the word "members" was always written with a capital "M".

The rule was adopted, with the amendments of the Representatives from Australia and Poland.

Rule 9 (Documents E/CN.1/5)

Mr. HEYWARD (Australia) suggested that the following amendments be made to Rule 9 (document E/CN.1/5):

In Section (c) to add "and a non-governmental organization

/in category A"

in Category A", after "specialized agency";

In Section (e) to substitute "and" for "or".

The rule was adopted with the amendments of the Representative from Australia.

Mr. KAMINSKY (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) asked for clarification in connection with Rule 6 (document E/CN.1/5). He wished to know whether the phrase "unless the Chairman shall otherwise determine" should be deleted.

It was agreed to delete the phrase.

Consideration of Item 8 of Agenda

Mr. WEINTRAUB (Secretariat) referred the Commission to document E/CN.1/33, in which the Commission was informed of the activities of the Secretariat with respect to certain resolutions adopted by the Economic and Social Council and by the Commission.

With respect to Section A, consultations continued within the Secretariat concerning methods of lending technical assistance, and work was progressing on a pamphlet being prepared for the consideration of the Commission.

With regard to paragraph 2 of Section D, discussions were continuing with the International Monetary Fund, and progress had been made with respect to methods of proceeding.

The budgetary limitations mentioned in paragraph 3 of Section D would especially affect the rate of progress of work in connection with various possible analytical approaches. These would probably have to wait for recommendations which the Commission might make with regard to work.

In connection with Section F, the Secretariat had thought that the Commission might wish to invite the Secretary-General of the International Emergency Food Council to attend a meeting of the Commission. But the Commission might wish to request the Secretariat assign such personnel as it could to the preparation of a report, regarding commodities in short supply, which might then be submitted to the Sub-Commissions on Employment

/and Economic

and Economic Stability and on Economic Development.

With respect to the problem of surplus commodities in prospect, the Commission might wish to refer any problems in the field to the Interim Co-ordinating Committee for International Commodity Arrangements, which had been established at the last Session of the Economic and Social Council.

With regard to Section G a sample copy of the document, "Index of Work Projects" had been distributed informally to the members of the Commission, and comments were invited by members of the Commission as individuals.

Section H might also require some action on the part of the Commission.

This arrangement was an outgrowth of the desire on the part of the Economic and Social Council to insure that action on Housing and Town Planning be taken by the Social Commission in co-operation with the Economic and Employment Commission.

No action was suggested with respect to Section I, but Mr. Weintraub wondered whether the Commission might not wish to take into account the fact that the Conference would be meeting some time in 1948, and that it would be discussing problems relating to Item 5 of the Commission's Agenda.

The meeting rose at 3:08 p.m.
