UNITED NATIONS

NATIONS UNIES

UNRESTRICTED

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

CONSEIL ECONOMIQUE ET SOCIAL

E/AC.24/SR.45
12 August 1949

Dual Distribution

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Ninth Session

CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FORTY-FIFTH MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Saturday, 6 August 1949, at 10 a.m.

Contents:

dd

Present:

Chairman	Mr. FLEMSOLL

Members:

Australia	Mr. CURES
Belgium	Baron de KERCHOVE d'EXAERDE Mr. CORNIL
Brazil	Mr. MACHADO
Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic	Mr. AGAPOV
Chile	Mr. RODRIGUEZ
China	Mr. TSAO
Denmark	Mr. DAHLGAARD
France	Mr. AMANRICH Mr. de COMMINES
India	Mr. SEN
New Zealand	Miss HAMPTON
Peru	Mr. PIZARRO
Poland	Miss CZARKO
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. BORISOV
United Kingdom	Miss SALT
United States	Mr. HYDE Mr. KOTSCHNIG Miss KERNOHAN
Venezuela	Mr. MASS

Representatives of Specialized Agencies:

International Labour Organization	Mr. COX
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization	Mr. TERENZIO

[redacted]

1. CALENDAR OF CONFERENCES FOR 1950 (Item 47 of the Council Agenda) (Documents E/1464, E/1370, E/1371 - Annex V, E/1402/Add.1,) (Continued)

Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East.

The CHAIRMAN reminded the meeting that the next session of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East had been tentatively fixed for October 1950.

Mr. YATES, Secretary to the Council, stated, in answer to questions put by the representative of India, that he was not in a position to say whether there had been any decision to meet in 1950 elsewhere than at the headquarters of the Commission at Bangkok. As regards the wish of the Commission that it should meet later in the year, it appeared to be fully within the competence of the Co-ordination Committee to discuss the question of the dates of meetings, and make any recommendation it thought fit to the Council. However, up to the present the nature of the programme of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East had made it difficult for the Commission to bring its sessions into line with the normal schedule, and he understood that that would certainly be the case as regards 1950.

Mr. SEN (India) referred to Document E/1370, page 2, regarding the considerations affecting the holding of meetings away from Headquarters, and suggested that it would be better to record in the calendar either that nothing had been decided or that the place of meeting would be Bangkok. As regards his second point, he wished to recommend that all the regional commissions should meet, if at all possible, before the summer session of the Council so as to be able to present their Reports to that session.

The CHAIRMAN formulated the Indian proposal as follows:-

> "Recommends that regional economic commissions should aim at adjusting their programmes so that the sessions of the commissions take place before the session of the Council preceding the regular session of the General Assembly".

He thought that it should be made clear that it was not intended that that recommendation should apply immediately, since there might

not be enough work to justify the regional commissions in holding meetings at an early date in 1950 to comply with it.

Mr. [illegible] (India) agreed that the Chairman's point should be placed on [illegible], but not actually included in the resolution.

The Committee unanimously agreed to recommend that the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East should be held in October 1950 in [illegible] (both date and place tentative).

The Committee adopted the Indian draft resolution quoted above by [illegible] votes 0 with 4 abstentions.

[illegible] on Freedom of Information and of the Press.

The CHAIRMAN reminded the meeting that it had been proposed [illegible] Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press [illegible] on 29 June in Montevideo. (Document E/1464). The [illegible] had proposed that the date be brought forward [illegible] January.

In answer to an enquiry from the Brazilian representative as to when that Sub-Commission had last met and what report it made,

Mr. HUMPHREY, Director of the Division of Human Rights, [illegible] the Sub-Commission's last session had been held at Lake [illegible] from 7 May to 14 June 1949, and that it had recommended the [illegible] session in Montevideo. There had been some [illegible] being held in the first half of April but, in view of the fact that the Economic Commission for Latin America was also to meet in Montevideo, it had been suggested that the Sub-Commission might [illegible] meetings immediately following the session of the latter body.

If it were to meet in January, the Secretariat would not have [illegible] documentation, especially in view of the [illegible] the General Assembly.

Mr. HYDE (United States of America) supported the Danish [illegible] comply with the Secretariat's wishes with regard to the preparation of documents, he was willing that the Sub-Commission [illegible] somewhat later than January 1950 but in any case in time [illegible] it to report to the second 1950 session of the Council.

He suggested that it meet immediately before the Economic Commission for Latin America, that was from 15 to 26 May 1950.

Mr. HUMPHREY, Director of the Division of Human Rights, pointed out that under the six weeks rule reports would have to be in the hands of the Council by 23 May. If the Sub-Commission was convened before the Economic Commission for Latin America, its session would come at a time when the Division of Human Rights was particularly busy with the Commission on the Status of Women. Either solution presented difficulties.

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) suggested that a certain latitude might be allowed with regard to the interpretation of the six weeks rule, for example, the Council might take the Sub-Commission's Report at the end of its session, thus giving ample time for governments to study it.

Mr. BORISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) considered the six weeks rule inapplicable in the present case, since it was a question of a Sub-Commission responsible to a Commission, and not directly to the Council.

Miss SALT (United Kingdom) supported the Danish proposal and pointed out that in practice the Sub-Commission did report direct to the Council. The work of the Sub-Commission would suffer considerably if it had to overlap with other Commissions serviced by the same Division of the Secretariat. It might be better to hold the meeting in January, and to ask the Secretariat to do the best it could in respect of documentation. She reminded the meeting that any change of date would call for consultations with the Government of Uruguay; that could perhaps be left to the Secretary-General in consultation with the Interim Committee on Programme of Meetings.

Mr. AMANRICH (France) observed that the Committee was meeting a lot of difficulties; while the Danish proposal seemed satisfactory from the point of view of the six weeks rule, it would oblige the Committee to make a complete change in the Calendar of Conferences for 1950. Would it perhaps be possible to hold the session of the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press one week

earlier, that was from 12 June onwards, and not from 19 June as planned.

If that change were made it would be possible to avoid both the drawbacks of the Danish proposal and the difficulties envisaged by the Secretariat in the event of the Sub-Commission's session being held before that of the Economic Commission for Latin America.

Mr. HYDE (United States of America) was disposed to favour the Danish proposal, as he wished to avoid submission of documents to the Council after it had begun its session.

Mr. HUMPHREY, Director of the Division of Human Rights, pointed out that the question of documentation was very important, particularly as the services of certain members of his Division would be required in connection with the discussion of the Draft Convention on Freedom of Information in the General Assembly. Moreover, if the Sub-Commission met in January, it would clash with the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, also serviced by his Division. If it met in the first half of April it would overlap with the Commission on Human Rights. The French proposal seemed the most acceptable from that point of view.

Mr. SEN (India) felt that it should be left to the Secretary-General to take the decision, and, if necessary, temporarily to transfer additional personnel to the Division on Human Rights.

He proposed that the Council should express its appreciation of the invitation extended by the Government of Uruguay to the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and the Press to hold its next session at Montevideo, and should request the Secretary-General to enter into negotiations with that Government in order to determine, in consultation with the Interim Committee on Programme of Meetings, [illegible] it would be at all possible to convene the Sub-Commission in [illegible] 1950.

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) doubted whether personnel could justifiably be sent to Montevideo for ten days only, on two separate occasions.

The CHAIRMAN recapitulated the proposals before the meeting:

the Danish proposal that the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and the Press meet in January;

the Indian amendment that the Government of Uruguay be consulted in that connection;

the United States proposal that the Sub-Commission meet immediately before the Economic Commission for Latin America;

the French proposal that it meet on 12 June; and

the proposal contained in the Calendar of Conferences for 1950.

Mr. YATES, Secretary to the Council, pointed out with regard to the French proposal, that the possibility should be kept in mind that the session of the Economic Commission for Latin America might last for more than a fortnight; it would, therefore, be safer to suggest 15 June rather than 12 June.

Mr. DAHLGAARD (Denmark) withdrew his proposal in favour of that of the Indian representative.

The Committee adopted the proposal of the Indian representative by 7 votes to 2 with 5 abstentions.

Economic and Social Council

After a short discussion in which Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) and Mr. RODRIGUEZ (Chile) took part,

The Committee decided to recommend to the Council that the Spring session of the Economic and Social Council, opening on 7 February 1950, should be scheduled to last six weeks.

The CHAIRMAN stated that since the Indian proposal was to be considered not as a separate resolution, but as a paragraph in Document E/AC.24/W.28, that document should now be considered as approved as amended in the course of the discussions on the calendar of conferences for 1950.

The Committee approved the draft calendar (Document E/1464) as amended, for recommendation to the Council.

Mr. HYDE (United States of America) reminded the meeting of the United States reservation with regard to Document E/1370, and proposed that the following text be adopted either for insertion in Document E/AC.24/W.28, or as a separate resolution;

"The Economic and Social Council calls the attention of its Functional and Regional Commissions to the principle that insofar as their terms of reference permit all sessions should be held at their headquarters, except in cases where special considerations outweigh the administrative and budgetary advantages".

Mr. AMANRICH (France) asked whether the proposal submitted by the United States representative was relevant to the consideration of Item 47. If it were, he would have certain remarks to make.

The CHAIRMAN ruled that the United States proposal was in order, as it laid down general principles arising out of the consideration of the 1950 calendar.

Mr. AMANRICH (France) recalled that during the discussion of Item 34 of the Council Agenda the Committee had reached agreement on certain principles which were to govern the location of the headquarters of the specialized agencies. Following a vote by roll-call, the Committee had made a recommendation on the subject, which appeared in Document E/1470, and he wondered whether it would not be advisable to adopt a similar wording in the present case.

To reconcile the various points of view, the French delegation thought it should submit a fresh text which differed somewhat from the United States proposal, but came nearer the Committee's original recommendation:

"The Economic and Social Council draws the attention of the functional and regional commissions to the fact that insofar as their terms of reference permit, they should hold their sessions at their Headquarters, it being understood that special or over-riding considerations may outweigh the administrative and budgetary advantages of holding sessions at Headquarters".

Mr. BORISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring to the Indian proposal just adopted, suggested that in implementing it the Secretary-General should take into account the negotiations he had already held with the Government of Uruguay.

He saw no necessity for adopting the United States draft resolution now that the discussion of the calendar had been completed. Was it intended to re-open the debate? The Committee had in fact considered each case on its merits, and enunciation of general principles seemed unnecessary at the present juncture.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ (Chile) asked for clarification of the terms "functional commissions" and "commissions techniques"; the former appeared in the United States draft resolution, and the latter in the French amendment thereof.

The terms of the resolution submitted by the United States representative seemed to suggest that the functional and regional commissions of the Council should hold their sessions at their respective headquarters, which would mean that practically all the 1950 sessions should be held at Lake Success and not at Geneva.

If that interpretation was correct, he was in favour of the draft resolution, but he would prefer it to be voted upon separately and not regarded as an amendment to Document E/AC.24/W.28.

In view of the fact that the Calendar had been approved, he wondered whether it would not be necessary to provide that the resolution, if adopted, should not come into effect until 1951.

Mr. HYDE (United States of America) felt that it was more important for the Committee to complete its work than to discuss his resolution; he therefore withdrew it.

Mr. AMANRICH (France) accordingly withdrew his alternative draft.

The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the fact that the Secretariat would communicate the programme to Lake Success for observations before it was presented to the Council. He also expressed the appreciation of the Committee for the work of the Interim Committee on Programme of Meetings, in presenting a draft which had necessitated little change.

2. REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ON RELATIONS WITH INTER-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS (Item 43 of the Council Agenda) (Resumed from the forty-third meeting)

(a) Resolution on International Penal and Penitentiary Commission (Documents E/AC.24/W.29, E/AC.24/W.30/Rev.1) (Resumed from the forty-third meeting)

Miss SALT (United Kingdom) introducing the United Kingdom amendment (Document E/AC.24/W.30/Rev.1) to the United States draft resolution (Document E/AC.24/W.29), pointed out that the United Kingdom was proposing the deletion of the second paragraph of that resolution, since it tended to close the door to further negotiations, which, she knew, was far from the intention of the United States delegation.

The suggested new fourth paragraph was intended to give some indication as to where negotiations should start. A time limit had been inserted, since comments were more likely to be received if a definite date were stipulated for their reception.

Miss KERNOHAN (United States of America) accepted the United Kingdom amendments contained in Document E/AC.24/W.30/Rev.1. She anticipated the matter would be referred to some future session of the Social Commission to enable the latter to review the plan for integration in connection with the priority of the Commission in the field of prevention of crime and the treatment of offenders.

Mr. SEN (India) also supported the United Kingdom amendment.

He suggested, however, that the words "Having taken note of" should be replaced by the words "Having considered".

Mr. CUMES (Australia) proposed the insertion in the last paragraph of the United States draft resolution, of the words "of the United Nations or of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission" after the words "Member Governments".

Mr. SEN (India) thought that the Australian amendment might create an undesirable precedent

Miss KERNOHAN (United States of America) being assured by the CHAIRMAN that many precedents existed within the United Nations for

the Australian amendment, stated that she would not necessarily oppose it.

With regard to the Indian amendment, she felt that the Committee had not in fact considered the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission's Resolution in substance, and that the expression "Taking note" might therefore be more appropriate. However, she had no strong feelings in the matter.

Miss HAMPTON (New Zealand) pointed out that support for the United States draft resolution was based on the assumption that there was complete duplication of function in the field at issue. Negotiations had been initiated in 1947 because it had been realized that there was, in fact, a danger of overlapping, but subsequent discussion at the time of the General Assembly had demonstrated that a basis for co-operation did exist. It had become apparent, however, when the matter came before the present Committee, that some delegations preferred integration to co-operation. The New Zealand delegation did not believe integration was essential, or that it was desirable for the United Nations to assume primary responsibility in the field, even though it was called upon to consider certain social aspects of the matter.

Referring to Sir Raphael Cilento's statement, she pointed out that neither the general feeling in the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission, nor the terms of its Resolution, were conducive to integration. Co-operation was the relationship that they themselves preferred.

Turning to the United States draft resolution she said that if it were to be acceptable to New Zealand two amendments would be required. It seemed to her that the fourth paragraph fulfilled the intention of the United States delegation to keep the door open for future negotiations, but the third paragraph seemed purely an expression of the United States point of view. She therefore proposed deletion of the third paragraph. She further proposed that in the new fourth paragraph suggested by the United Kingdom delegation, the words 'Secretary-General to enter into' be replaced by the words 'Social Commission to continue', and the words 'the eventual integration within' in the fourth line be replaced by 'further co-operation between', the remainder of the paragraph being deleted.

Miss CZARKO (Poland) referred to the fact that Poland had originally been opposed to any co-operation between the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission and the United Nations, not because they disapproved of an organization working in that field, but because Franco Spain had been a member of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission, and because of a certain lack of activity on the part of the Commission. The situation had now changed; Franco Spain was no longer a member, and there had been a considerable increase in the activity of the Commission, which had held three congresses in which countries not members of the United Nations had taken part. The Polish delegation therefore felt that conditions existed for possible co-operation, and would oppose the United States draft resolution, which was directed at the virtual termination of the Commission.

Mr. SEN (India) re-iterating his amendment, pointed out that the Committee could hardly spend so much time on a resolution without considering it. As regards invitations to countries non-members of the United Nations, he felt that the only precedents were those in which governments had been specifically invited by name, and not en masse. With regard to the point of view put forward by the New Zealand and Polish delegations, he thought the meeting could hardly reverse the whole trend of its discussions, which was, in fact, towards integration.

Mr. CORNIL (Belgium) was glad to note that the New Zealand representative had stressed the need for co-operation, an idea by which the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission had constantly beeninspired in the course of the recent discussions. He thanked the representative of Poland for having paid a tribute to the work done by that Commission in the last three years.

Since 1946 the Commission had constantly been asking to co-operate with the United Nations; if differences of view existed between the two organizations, they must be due simply to a misunderstanding. In any case they had nothing to do with the principle, but only with the form, of co-operation.

However, the Commission had constantly insisted on the need for preserving its technical character. The assistance of countries which were not members of the United Nations was also indispensable to it, and integration would deprive it of their help.

As for the question of duplication, that appeared to him still less justified since the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission had taken part in the conference held in the Palais de Chaillot, the object of which had been to co-ordinate its activities with those of the United Nations.

The Belgian delegation strongly supported the New Zealand amendment.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ (Chile) moved the closure.

Mr. BORISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) and Miss SALT (United Kingdom) having spoken against the motion,

it was put to the vote and defeated by 9 votes to 3 with 1 abstention.

Mr. BORISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) expressed his surprise at the introduction of the United States draft resolution, which meant virtually the liquidation of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission and the transfer of its assets and functions to the United Nations. The revised United States draft resolution was substantially the same as the original one, and took no account of any progress made in the discussions; Sir Raphael Cilento had made it clear that the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission had not agreed to the original United States resolution, which it had rejected by 8 votes to 0, and could therefore hardly be expected to find the revised draft acceptable.

He felt, moreover, that the United Nations would be assuming unnatural functions in taking over those of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission, which was a body engaged in highly technical and scientific research into the problems of criminology and the treatment of delinquents; the assumption of any functions not in keeping with its nature would naturally mean additional, unjustified expenditure for the United Nations.

The International Penal and Penitentiary Commission included a number of countries which were not members of the United Nations. In spite of that, however, the United States draft resolution sought to create what was a very dangerous precedent for the United Nations, that of imposing its own wishes on an organization, and ignoring completely those of the organization itself.

If duplication existed, it must be because the United Nations was trespassing on the territory of the Commission in question, particularly as the matters with which the latter dealt were far from restricted to the social field. In short, he considered that the United States proposal raised a question beyond the competence of the Committee. The Committee should merely take note of the situation without adopting a resolution. He would therefore oppose the United States draft resolution as amended by the United Kingdom delegation.

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) maintained that it was clear that the United Nations was doing identical work, and could not be expected to relinquish its project because an organization which was largely European in scope was covering the same ground. The United Nations could not, of course, determine the integration or liquidation of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission, but, on the other hand, it could not share its responsibilities in the field or abandon its own programme. The organization in question should be treated in exactly the same way as the other sixty-nine organizations were being treated. He moved the closure, so soon as the list of speakers was exhausted.

The motion was adopted without objection.

Mr. MARTIN HILL, Director of Co-ordination for Specialized Agencies and for Economic and Social Matters, replying to the criticism that no action had been taken by the Secretary-General in reply to the original letter of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission in 1946, stated that the requests of that Commission had been referred to the Social Commission which, for reasons indicated by the representative of Poland, had advised against any consultations being initiated; that decision had been approved by the Council in March 1947 and again in March 1948. On the latter

occasion, however, the Council had considered that the change in the situation referred to by the Polish representative made it possible for the Social Commission to enter into consultations with the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission. Since the Council had already begun discussion of the general issue of the formal relationships to be established with inter-governmental organizations, the Social Commission had confined its consultations to the question of establishing good working relationships. The results of those consultations had been described by Sir Raphael Cilento.

He was anxious for a clarification of the terms of reference under which the Secretary-General was expected to negotiate under the United Kingdom amendment. Unless he were corrected, he would assume, first, that the Secretary-General should take into account not only the principles ennunciated in Section 2 of the Commission's Resolution and the views expressed in the Committee and Council, but also any comments that might be received from governments Members of the United Nations and the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission; secondly, that negotiations should be carried out within the framework of existing United Nations machinery (he reminded the meeting that the seventh session of the Council had requested the Secretary-General to convene a group of internationally recognised experts on the question of prevention of crime); and thirdly that, taking into account the variety of views expressed by representatives and the fact that the principles formulated by the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission might not all be fully consistent with the idea of integration as foreshadowed in the United States draft resolution, the instruction to "take into account" those views and principles must be very broadly interpreted.

He also asked with reference to the suggestion made by the United States representative, whether it was desired that the Secretary-General should present his plan to the Social Commission before reporting to the Council.

Miss KERNOHAN (United States of America), replying to the last point, thought that it should be left to the Secretary-General to determine, in the light of the stage negotiations had reached, to which organ his proposals should first be referred. She would leave it to the good judgment of the Secretary-General to safeguard the prerogatives of the Social Commission in the matter.

She accepted the Indian amendment, but felt that the New Zealand intervention raised the fundamental issue, that of co-operation as opposed to eventual integration, which made it impossible for her to accept it.

She would have no difficulty from the technical standpoint in proving duplication of function by a reference to the work programmes of the two bodies, if the Committee wished her to go into the matter. The New Zealand amendment, suggesting that reference be made to the Social Commission, was unacceptable, since that organ had undertaken the work at an earlier stage, and the arrangement had been found impracticable.

Re-iterating the United States standpoint that it could not give ward on the question of eventual integration, she informed the meeting, as the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission had already been informed, that the United States probably would not continue its contribution to the Commission beyond 1950, and that that action was motivated solely by a desire to see the authority of the United Nations, as laid down in Council Resolution 155 (VII) C, properly maintained.

She concluded that the resolution before the Committee continued to leave the freedom of decision as to its future work with the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission in the first and last instance.

Mr. de COMMINES (France) recalled the United States representative's statement that the Social Commission had concluded that the work of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission and that of the United Nations duplicated each other.

From the purely theoretical standpoint, that statement might be true, but before a decision was taken, would it not be well to ensure that the technical character of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission could be safeguarded?

Furthermore, was the Committee sure that every effort had been made to reach agreement?

The United Kingdom representative had pointed out that the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission had been waiting for

three years for proposals to that end, and that there was no reason to believe that it would be opposed to an agreement.

The French delegation considered therefore that it should be left to the Secretary-General to negotiate with the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission on precise and detailed bases with a view to determining by mutual agreement whether integration or co-operation could be achieved, without detriment to the technical work of the Commission.

When the negotiations had been completed and governments had communicated their views, the Secretary-General would be in a position to form a judgement, but the Committee should take the greatest care not to influence that judgement.

He proposed that in the third paragraph of the United States draft resolution (Document E/AC.24/W.29) the words "Continuesto believe" should be replaced by the words "Considers it desirable to examine whether."

With regard to paragraph 2 of the United Kingdom amendment, he proposed that the expression "a plan for the eventual integration" should be replaced by the words "a common plan for close collaboration or possible future integration".

In that way the Committee would leave the door open for fresh negotiations, while expressing the desire that they should result in a final agreement.

Miss KERNOHAN (United States of America) regretted that she could not accept the French amendments.

The Committee rejected the New Zealand amendment, to delete the third paragraph of the United States draft resolution, by 10 votes to 5 with 1 abstention.

The Committee rejected the first French amendment by 8 votes to 2 with 5 abstentions.

The Committee rejected the New Zealand amendments, to the United Kingdom amendment to the United States draft resolution, by 9 votes to 3 with 4 abstentions.

The Committee rejected the French proposal to reword the fourth paragraph by 9 votes to 2 with 5 abstentions.

The Committee adopted the Australian proposal to insert the words "of the United Nations and of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission" after the words "Invites Member Governments" in the last two paragraphs by 6 votes to 3 with 5 abstentions.

The Committee adopted the United States draft resolution as amended by the United Kingdom and Australian proposals and by the Indian proposal to replace the words "Having taken note of" by "Having considered" in the first paragraph, by 10 votes to 5 with 1 abstention.

(b) Resolution on International Relief Union (Document E/AC.24/7).

The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the Committee to the letter received from the President of the International Red Cross Committee (circulated as Document E/AC.24/7) asking that discussion be re-opened on the decision already taken by the Committee regarding the International Relief Union.

Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) thought that due weight must be attached to the source of the request, and proposed that the question be re-opened, but not necessarily to enable a decision to be taken at the present session.

Mr. de COMMINES (France) supported the United States proposal.

The Committee agreed by 8 votes to 2 with 4 abstentions to re-open the question of the decision taken with regard to the International Relief Union.

CALENDAR OF CONFERENCES (resumed from the earlier part of the meeting)

The CHAIRMAN called the attention of the Meeting to the new text of the Resolutions circulated in Document E/AC.24/W.32, and to the revised draft calendar of conferences.

Mr. BORISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) preferred the retention of the original mention of the Sub-Commission on Employment and Economic Stability in the revised calendar of conferences,

feeling that any other action would prejudge the decision of the Council.

The CHAIRMAN agreed that only changes made by the Council would be final.

He added that he had been asked for an interpretation of the second paragraph of the proposal of the representative of India on the meeting of the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information (reproduced as the last paragraph of the first resolution in Document E/AC.24/W.32). He believed that it was open to only one interpretation though he did not think that that interpretation represented the intention of some of those who had voted for it.

He ruled that it meant that the meeting would be held in any case in Montevideo, and that the negotiations would be directed to determining whether the Government of Uruguay would be prepared to defray the increased expenses involved in holding a meeting in January and thereby make such a meeting possible.

The Committee accepted the Chairman's ruling without dissent.

The Committee unanimously adopted the Resolution contained in Document E/AC.24/W.32.

The meeting rose at 2.5 p.m.