

United Nations
ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL

Nations Unies
CONSEIL
ECONOMIQUE
ET SOCIAL

UNRECORDED

E/AC.24/SR.47
31 August 1949

Dual Distribution

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Ninth Session

CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FORTY-SEVENTH MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Wednesday, 10 August 1949, at 3 p.m.

Contents:

CALNDAR OF CONFERENCES FOR 1950 (Item 47 of
the Council Agenda) (Re-opening of the
Discussion) pages 3 - 21

Present:

Chairman: Mr. PLIMCOLL

Members:

Australia	Mr. JOCKEL Mr. CUMES
Belgium	Baron de FERCHOVE d'EXAERDE
Brazil	Mr. MACHADO
Byelorussian SSR	Mr. AGAPOV
Chile	Mr. GONZALEZ Mr. RODRIGUEZ
China	Mr. P. C. CHIANG Mr. TSAO
Denmark	Mr. DANILGAARD
France	Mr. MANDRES-FRANCE
India	Mr. SEN
Lebanon	Mr. AZKOUK
New Zealand	Miss HAMPTON
Peru	Mr. TORRES-BILCON
Poland	Miss CZARKO
Turkey	Mr. MERAS

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. KOROSOV
United Kingdom	Miss ELLIOTT
United States of America	Mr. KROCHKO
World Bank	Mr. SOTO
International Labour Organization	Mr. SOTO
World Health Organization	Mr. HAFEZI
<u>Secretariat:</u>	
Mr. Humphrey	Director of the Division of Human Rights
Mr. Yates	Secretary to the Council
Miss Todd	Acting Secretary to the Committee

CALENDAR OF CONFERENCES FOR 1950 (Item 47 of the Council Agenda)
(Documents E/1496, E/1496/Corr.1, E/1371 Annex 7, E/1496/Add.1,
para. 6, E/AC.24/W.28) (Re-opening of the discussion)

The CHAIRMAN announced that the Calendar of Conferences for 1950 had been referred back to the Committee by the Council for reconsideration in the light of the fact that the International Law Commission wished to hold its 1950 session in Geneva, and in view of certain administrative difficulties to which attention had been drawn by the Conference Division at Lake Success, which he asked the Secretary to the Council to describe.

Mr. YATES, Secretary to the Council, stated that, in the final co-ordination of the Council programme with other United Nations conference programmes, three main points had emerged.

First, information had been received that the International Law Commission intended to meet in Geneva at the end of May for ten weeks, and would hold approximately one meeting a day. The effect of that meeting on the conference programme of the Geneva Office would be an overlap between the ten-week session of the Law Commission and, successively, the Economic Commission for Europe, the Thirty-third International Labour Conference (due to be held in the Palais des Nations) and the Council's eleventh session. No special administrative difficulties were anticipated beyond the loans of extra interpreters from Lake Success, a moderate amount of additional expenditure for temporary assistance and some tightness in office space.

With regard to the constitutional aspect, the Economic and Social Council, the Trusteeship Council, and the International Law Commission were independent organs, and decisions as to their meetings, in case of conflict, was in the final instance the responsibility of the General Assembly. As programmes were drawn up, they were reported to the Interim Committee on Programme of Meetings and to the Co-ordination Committee (during Council Sessions) for discussion in the light of the interests of the programme as a whole; the Committee should therefore decide to what extent it would take into account the information, received somewhat late, concerning the Law Commission. If its decisions, and those of other competent bodies, necessitated extra credits, the matter would have to be settled finally in the General Assembly.

/Secondly

Secondly, it appeared that the Headquarters work-load in January would be very heavy if staff had to be sent both to Montevideo and to Geneva for the Trusteeship Council, making it difficult to service any additions to the two sessions already scheduled to take place there (Sub-Commission on Discriminations and the Committee on Procedure). That might mean that the period left for one of the Sub-Commissions of the Economic and Employment Commission would have to be abandoned, and no other meeting contemplated for that period. The Conference and General Services Department would prefer a decision requiring the technical conference staff to make only one journey to and from Montevideo.

Thirdly, the work-load for early May, particularly the week beginning 8 May 1950, was also very heavy, including as it did sessions of the following Commissions: Human Rights, Social, Narcotics, Statistics, Status of Women, Economic and Employment. Were the session of the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press put back from January to that period the strain would be further increased by the dispersal of staff over three continents.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the three points on which the Committee must take decisions were:

- a) the date of the session of the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press;
 - b) repercussions of the date and place of the session of the International Law Commission; and
 - c) congestion of work during May, 1950.
- a. Date of the session of the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press.

The Session of the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press had originally been recommended for 19 June; the Committee had however advised that it should be brought forward to January in view of the six-weeks' rule. The alternative now seemed to be to revert to 19 June (after the Economic Commission for Latin America) or to convene the Sub-Commission on 15 May (before that Commission).

Mr. MENDES-FRANCE (France) shared the Secretariat's view that it would be advisable for budgetary reasons to place very close together the dates for the meetings of the two bodies which were to convene at Montevideo.

/Since the

Since the Economic Commission for Latin America was to meet on 29 May 1950, he thought that 15 May might be assigned to the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information. That would satisfy one of the conditions mentioned by the Secretariat.

Since that change was likely to make the programme for May still heavier, it might perhaps meet with objections. However, a session of the Economic and Employment Commission was planned for the same time and it must not be forgotten that the Council had not yet taken a decision with regard to that Commission; to judge from opinions frequently expressed in the Council, it might be called upon to meet at the beginning of 1950.

Should such a decision be taken, its effect would be to leave the period from 8 to 19 May free, and it was for that reason that the French delegation proposed that the Montevideo session of the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information open on a date around 15 May.

Mr. MACEDO (Brazil) supported the view that the Sub-Commission should convene shortly before the Economic Commission for Latin America, both for budgetary and for substantive reasons, since it did not consider that the problem was as urgent as had been suggested.

As regards the announcement of the date of the International Law Commission, he thought on principle that if the Committee had taken its decisions for valid reasons, it should not hasten to reconsider them the moment another organ entered the field, but should insist on its own schedule, state its case to the General Assembly, and leave it to that body to take the final decision.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that, while the Council was not obliged to defer to the wishes of any other organ, it could always waive its rights in the interests of co-ordination.

Mr. KOTSCHEWIG (United States of America) was of the opinion that the session of the International Law Commission would interfere very little with the programme as drawn up.

With regard to the date of the session of the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press, he fully supported the proposal of the French representative, pointing out that the original United States view had been that it should be held before the Economic

/Commission

Commission for Latin America. He thought, however, that the choice of 15 May, imposing as it would a firm terminal date on a Sub-Commission which had a very heavy agenda, might unduly restrict its work.

It might be better if the opening date were to be brought forward to 8 May.

Mr. YATES, Secretary to the Council pointed out that as although there would be considerable advantages in opening the session of the Sub-Commission around 8 May, some consequential change in the rest of the calendar for May would then be more than ever necessary in order to lighten the work-load.

Mr. AZKOU (Lebanon), speaking as a member of the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press, thought the month of May would be most suitable in view of the programme of work assigned to that Sub-Commission.

He recalled that, during the discussion in the Sub-Commission itself, the suggestion that the session might take place in January had been opposed for two reasons: first, it would have been impossible for some experts to take part in a meeting to be held in January, and, secondly, since the duration of session was not to have exceeded 11 days, a second session would have had to be arranged in order to get through the very heavy programme of work.

His delegation would therefore agree to 15 May as the opening date, but would prefer the session to begin on 8 May, which would allow it a little more time.

Miss SAIT (United Kingdom) thought there should be some preliminary discussion of how the work-load in the second week in May could be lightened, assuming that the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press were also scheduled for that date. Would the fact that the same Division of the Secretariat was required to service the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and the Commission on Status of Women mean that any substantial change must be made to the programme?

Mr. HUMPHREY, Director of the Division on Human Rights, said that it might be advisable for the Commission on the Status of Women to meet somewhat earlier.

/Mr. MENDES-FRANCE

Mr. MENDES-FRANCE (France) having withdrawn his proposal, and Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) having indicated that the date he had proposed was not rigid,

The Committee decided, by 14 votes to 0, with 4 abstentions to recommend that the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press be convened at some date between 8 and 15 May, but as early as was possible, the actual date to be determined by the Interim Committee on Programme of Meetings after consultation with the Government of Uruguay.

The CHAIRMAN asked the Committee's opinion as to the incorporation in the draft resolution to be recommended for adoption by the Council of the sub-sentence in the third paragraph of Document E/AC.24/W.28, reading: "and that the fourth session of the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press should be held in Montevideo, provided that the costs thereby incurred by the United Nations shall not exceed those which would be incurred if the session were held at Headquarters".

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) objected that the retention of that paragraph would imply that the Committee was dictating to a Member State what costs it should meet, whereas no such principle had been approved by the General Assembly.

The CHAIRMAN pointed to the precedent created by the holding of the last session of the Commission on the Status of Women in Beirut.

Mr. SEN (India) said that, in spite of the precedent quoted by the Chairman, he still thought it would be wrong to take a decision conditional upon the willingness of the Government of Uruguay to meet the additional expenditure involved. That Government should be left entirely free to decide as it wished. If, however, it was considered that some reference must be made to the financial implications of the decision to hold the session of the Sub-Commission in Montevideo, he suggested that the phrase "it being understood that" be substituted for "provided that ...".

Mr. GONZALEZ (Chile) remarked that document E/AC.24/W.32 contained some draft resolutions adopted after discussion of the calendar of meetings.

/It was therefore

It was therefore that document, and not draft resolution E/AC.24/W.28, which should, in his opinion, be taken into account.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that, by deciding that the session of the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information should be held in May instead of in January 1950, the Council had rendered inoperative the paragraphs, referring to the session of the Sub-Commission, of the draft resolution in Document E/AC.24/W.32, since there was no longer any question of the Secretary-General's negotiating with the Government of Uruguay on the possibility of holding a session in January 1950. He had therefore proposed that the Committee revert to the form of words used in Document E/AC.24/W.28. The Committee might, however, also insert paragraph 5 of the draft resolution in Document E/AC.24/W.32, expressing appreciation of the offer of the Uruguayan Government.

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) suggested that the Council had referred the matter back to the Committee for consideration of its practicability, and not for substantive re-consideration. He wished it to be recorded that it was the opinion of his delegation that, unless the General Assembly should decide otherwise, the Council had no right to impose on any Member State the burden of expenditure arising out of the holding of sessions of its subordinate bodies. Clearly, in the present case, no problem of feasibility was involved, since the Government of Uruguay had expressed its willingness to defray the additional costs.

Mr. MENDES-FRANCE (France) observed that they were in the midst of a constitutional discussion and called the attention of the Brazilian representative to the fact that neither the Council nor the General Assembly had the right to impose financial obligations on any State Member of the United Nations whomsoever.

The discussion seemed to him to be of no practical value, since there was agreement as to the facts, namely that the Government of Uruguay had invited the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press to hold its next session at Montevideo, and that all representatives were ready to accept that contribution to the work of the United Nations.

He proposed that the discussion be closed, and added that his delegation would vote for the amendment submitted by the representative of India, which was so worded as to make the text of the draft resolution (Document E/AC.24/W.28, paragraph 3) less rigid.

/Mr. GONZALEZ

Mr. GONZALEZ (Chile) considered that it would be premature to close the debate, since the Committee did not actually have before it any draft resolution on which it could vote. Document E/AC.24/W.28 was not really a draft resolution, but a note drawn up by the Chairman of the Co-ordination Committee: Document E/AC.24/W.32 on the other hand, reproduced the text of the draft resolutions adopted by the Co-ordination Committee at its forty-fifth meeting on 6 August 1949. To avoid prolonging the debate further the Chilean delegation would itself sponsor the resolution appearing in Document E/AC.24/W.32 making only one change, namely, the substitution of the word "May" for the word "January" in the last line of the last paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee vote first on the amendment proposed by the Indian delegation: secondly, on the relevant portions of paragraph 3 of the draft resolution contained in Document E/AC.24/W.28; and finally, on the proposal of the representative of Chile, if the latter chose to press the matter.

The Committee adopted by 12 votes to 2 with 1 abstention the proposal of the representative of India that the words "it being understood ... will" be substituted for the words "provided that ... shall" in the text proposed by the Chairman.

The Committee adopted by 12 votes to 4 the following paragraph for insertion in the resolution contained in Document E/1496:

"Decides that the Fourth Session of the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press should be held in Montevideo, it being understood that the costs thereby incurred by the United Nations will not exceed those which would be incurred if the session were held at headquarters".

Mr. SEN (India) explained that he had voted for his amendment to the draft resolution but against the draft resolution itself, because in his view it was not necessary for the Committee to include any clause referring to the costs incurred. If, however, such reference were included, then he would prefer it to take the form which he had proposed.

Mr. AZKOU (Lebanon) said he had voted against the proposal, because he felt that, having decided that the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press should meet at Montevideo, the Committee was not entitled to stipulate that the additional expenditure should be borne by the host government.

/The CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN, replying to Mr. GONZALEZ (Chile), pointed out that the vote of the Committee which he (Mr. Gonzalez) had quoted and which figures on page 20 of Provisional Summary Record E/AC.24/SR.44, actually referred to the third session of the Economic Commission for Latin America, which was also to be held in Montevideo.

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) supported the contention of the representative of Chile that the Committee had in fact approved the suppression of any reference to costs in connection with the Montevideo session of the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and the Press. The draft resolution contained in Document E/AC.24/W.28 which contained a proviso relating to costs had been discarded by the Committee in favour of the draft resolution in Document E/AC.24/W.32, in which no mention was made of the question of costs. It might therefore be understood, by implication, that the Committee had decided to omit the clause in question. Since, however, it had now decided to re-insert the clause in an amended form, he did not propose to discuss the matter further.

The Committee unanimously agreed to include in its draft resolution an expression of its appreciation of the offer of the Government of Uruguay.

- b) Repercussions of the date and place of the session of the International Law Commission; and
- c) Congestion of work during May, 1950.

The CHAIRMAN explained that the President of the Council had considered that there were two factors which might lead the Committee to wish to re-consider the arrangements made for holding the sessions of certain Commissions in May. The first was the decision of the International Law Commission to meet at Geneva at the end of May 1950 for a session lasting about ten weeks, at the rate of about one meeting a day. The second factor was the extremely heavy strain which would be placed upon the Secretariat and the technical services by the fact that no less than seven commissions or sub-commissions would be meeting in early May.

Mr. KOTSCHEG (United States of America) considered that the decision of the International Law Commission would raise no great difficulty, since that body would not begin its session until most of the other Commissions had finished theirs. Moreover, it appeared to be its intention to hold only one meeting a day, presumably for only five days a week; that should not place an excessive burden on the technical services at Geneva.

A far more important consideration was the fact that three bodies, all of them serviced by the Division of Human Rights would be holding sessions at roughly the same time in three different continents, namely, the Commission on Human Rights at Geneva, the Commission on the Status of Women at Lake Success and the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press at Montevideo. He did not wish to elaborate on the difficulties that that situation would create, or to repeat the arguments already advanced by his delegation, but would confine himself to proposing that, in view of the difficulties involved, the Committee recommend that the sixth session of the Commission on Human Rights be held not at Geneva but at Lake Success.

Mr. MEINHES-FRANCE (France) recalled that the Council, having been informed by the Secretariat that the International Law Commission wished to hold its session at Geneva at the end of May, had decided in plenary to refer back the Calendar of Conferences for 1950 to the Coordination Committee, with the request that the Committee consider whether that unforeseen circumstance was likely to affect the programme already drawn up. Those were the sole grounds on which the Committee could go back on the decisions it had taken. There was, however, no reason to suppose that the new circumstance would give rise to any serious difficulty. The United States representative himself had just admitted that the holding of a session of the International Law Commission at Geneva would not appreciably alter the situation, since the session was to begin during a quieter period, the critical period being that between the end of April and the end of May. The United States representative had also stated, as had also the Secretary to the Council, that the Commission intended to meet only once a day. Hence, there seemed no need to go back on the decisions taken.

He might, of course, invoke the rules of procedure and the Council's customary method of conducting business, to support his view that, once a question had been decided, the debate should not be re-opened, unless

/new facts

new facts came to light; but he preferred to appeal to the Committee and to request it to consider the facts realistically. The Committee had taken decisions after a lengthy discussion, and he himself saw no valid reason for altering them. The United States representative had pointed out that the Human Rights Division would have to service three sessions running simultaneously in three different parts of the world. That remark might, perhaps, have been more profitably made earlier. In any case, it seemed an easy matter to get around the difficulty by deciding, for example, that the Commission on the Status of Women should hold its session at Geneva and not at Lake Success, so as to prevent the services of the Human Rights Division being unduly dispersed. Furthermore, to relieve the Secretariat of the United Nations Office at Geneva, the Committee might go back on its decision regarding the Social Commission and decide that its session should be held at Lake Success.

But frankly, the question at issue was not merely one of relieving the Secretariat. The United States representative was mainly concerned to persuade the Committee, and subsequently the Council, to go back on the decisions they had taken regarding the Commission on Human Rights. A number of delegations, however, attached the greatest importance from the political point of view to that Commission's session being held at Geneva. The Commission's work in connection with the Declaration on Human Rights and the draft conventions would not really be fully effective unless it was given the widest publicity on a truly international scale. It was absolutely essential that the largest possible number of countries should feel the impact of such meetings and come to know the views of the highly qualified experts taking part in the Commission's work. Three years had passed since the Commission had met in Europe, and in the interval it had always held its sessions in the United States of America. He felt that it was not too much to ask that once in three years the Commission should meet at Geneva, particularly in view of the importance of the outcome of its work. Furthermore, the Human Rights Commission had itself agreed by 10 votes to 2 to ask that its next session be held at Geneva. Those 10 votes had not all been cast by representatives of European countries, but by experts from every continent, who realised how essential it was for the Commission's work to be universally known, and to pervade all the countries of the world. The French delegation therefore considered it extremely important that the Human Rights Commission should hold its 1950 session in Europe.

/The question

The question was somewhat different in the case of the functional commissions. Their work was, of course, important, but they were not political commissions, and psychological and moral factors did not in their case play such an important role.

He had not so far referred to the convenience of members of the Commission, but he did feel that that aspect should not be overlooked. If the most eminent experts were to be asked to participate in the Commission's work, they should not be prevented from doing so. It was, for instance, very difficult for Professor Cassin, who had played such an important part in the Commission's work, to forsake all his national duties and go to Lake Success at least twice a year, since, besides the Human Rights Commission, he had also to attend the General Assembly. Professor Cassin had so far managed to do that, but it would be difficult for him to continue. Professor Cassin's case was only one example; many experts were in the same position. As several sessions had been held in the Western hemisphere, he hoped that the experts from that part of the world would not object to coming to Europe in 1950. Mrs. Roosevelt herself had clearly understood the position, since she had abstained from voting.

In those circumstances, therefore, the French delegation urged the Committee, far more forcefully than it would have done in cases involving other Commissions, not to go back on its decision, but to allow the Commission on Human Rights to hold its next session at Geneva.

Furthermore, the French delegation would not object to certain changes being made in the programme, if need be, but it was against allowing administrative considerations to jeopardise the prestige and effectiveness of the work of the Human Rights Commission, since the effect of such a policy would be much too serious.

Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) explained that the proposal submitted by his delegation could not have been submitted three days previously, since it concerned a decision taken that very afternoon. It was justified primarily on the ground that there would be practical difficulties for the United Nations Secretariat in servicing three conferences held in three different continents simultaneously. The arguments adduced by the French representative

/in favour of

in favour of holding the sixth session of the Commission on Human Rights at Geneva left his delegation unconvinced. Unlike the Social Commission, that Commission had already met once in Europe. The Commission on the Status of Women had held its last session in Beirut and should not be converted into an itinerant Commission. As for the French representative's emphasis on the need for publicity for the Commission on Human Rights, that was an argument in favour of holding the sixth session in New York, where radio and press coverage was infinitely superior to corresponding facilities at Geneva. He profoundly regretted the inconvenience caused to notable men like Professor Cassin, who were obliged to absent themselves from their countries so frequently, but thought that the meeting-place of a conference should be determined on the basis of objective considerations. He therefore maintained his formal proposal that the 1950 Session of the Commission on Human Rights should be held at Lake Success.

Mr. AZKOU (Lebanon) pointed out that, when referring back the Calendar of Conferences for 1950 to the Co-ordination Committee, the President of the Council, in common with the majority of representatives, had been under the impression that the decision taken by the International Law Commission might affect decisions previously taken. Actually there had been no debate on the question in the Council. Hence, before continuing the discussion, it might be advisable to determine what decisions would be affected by the emergence of the new fact. If the representative of the Secretary-General foresaw no major difficulties, it might perhaps be unnecessary to re-open the debate.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that, as both he and the Secretary to the Council had announced at the beginning of the meeting, the Draft Calendar of Conferences in 1950 had been referred back to the Co-ordination Committee by the Council so that it might be reviewed in the light of three observations transmitted from Lake Success by the Secretary-General, namely: that there would be considerable difficulty in preparing the documentation for the session of the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press by January 1950; that the International Law Commission proposed to meet at Geneva in the summer of

1950; and that the programme for the beginning of May 1950 was overloaded. The calendar had been referred back to the Co-ordination Committee unconditionally, and at the plenary meeting the previous evening the United States representative had reserved the right to re-open the question of the calendar in the Committee.

Mr. YATES, Secretary to the Council, replying to the Lebanese representative, said that the President of the Council had been unaware when making his announcement at the previous day's meeting of the details of the session of the International Law Commission, namely, that it would hold its session from the end of May 1950 and for ten weeks thereafter. It would thus coincide with the fifth session of the Economic Commission for Europe, with the thirty-fifth International Labour Conference and with the eleventh session of the Council. The President had, however, referred to other questions raised, which were those mentioned by the Chairman of the Committee, relating to the work-load in January and May 1950.

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) said that, although he had voted the previous day against holding the session of the Commission on Human Rights at Geneva, he now supported the point of view expressed by the French representative, because he himself had been opposed to the re-opening of the discussion. In his view, the pre-arranged schedule should be adhered to, since it had been common knowledge that the International Law Commission had decided to meet at Geneva in May 1950. The only difficulty arising from that decision was that connected with the provision of interpreters. If, in fact, the whole discussion was to be re-opened, his delegation would be obliged to re-consider its position with regard to all questions on which a vote had been taken.

Mr. TSAO (China) said the Co-ordination Committee was obliged to accept the Council's instruction to review the Draft Calendar of Conferences in 1950. The main question before the Committee was whether the sessions of the Commission on Human Rights and the Social Commission should be transferred to Lake Success. With regard to the French representative's reference to the political importance of holding the session of the Commission on Human Rights at Geneva, he would point out that the Commission had already held one session there. Furthermore, the Declaration of Human Rights had been adopted by the

General Assembly in Paris, and the Conference on Freedom of Information and of the Press had also been held in Geneva, so that the various aspects of human rights had, in his view, received sufficient publicity in Europe. Despite his profound respect for Professor Cassin, he must remind the French representative that many other highly qualified persons were being continually inconvenienced in the same manner, since no member of any Commission was a professional member, and all had exalted responsibilities to discharge in their own country. In conclusion, he supported the United States proposal that the sessions of the Commission on Human Rights and of the Social Commission should be held at Lake Success.

Mr. BORISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) regarded the United States proposal to review earlier decisions of the Committee as quite unconstitutional, and expressed his astonishment at the methods employed by the United States delegation. The pretext for that proposal was the fact that the International Law Commission had decided to meet at Geneva; but its session would take place at a time when there would be little pressure of work there. Furthermore, the Commission was a subsidiary organ of the General Assembly and not of the Council, and should not therefore be used to justify an overall review of the Committee's decisions unless, as the Lebanese representative had said, its session conflicted with sessions of other commissions. The other arguments adduced by the United States representative were quite unacceptable to the Soviet Union delegation, which could see no reason whatsoever for reconsidering the calendar. Some weight must be given to the French representative's argument that the Commission on Human Rights had itself decided by 10 votes to 2 to hold its session at Geneva. He would also recall that the Co-ordination Committee itself had taken a similar decision by 9 votes to 6.

Mr. KOESCHNIG (United States of America) said that there could be no doubt that the present discussion was quite in order, because three new elements which amply justified a review of the calendar had arisen since the previous decision taken by the Committee, namely: that the International Law Commission proposed to meet in Geneva; that the Council had also agreed to hold its eleventh session at Geneva in the summer of 1950; and that the meeting of the Sub-Commission on

Freedom of Information and of the Press at Montevideo had been transferred to May 1950. A decision by the Co-ordination Committee would assist the work of the Council, the more so since time was running short. His delegation therefore hoped that a vote could be taken on the United States proposal, and he wished to emphasize that his delegation was not given to re-opening discussions in plenary on matters on which a decision had previously been taken by one of the Council's committees, and did not intend to do so on the present occasion, even if the Committee's decision was contrary to its views.

Miss SALT (United Kingdom) agreed with the United States representative that the present discussion was quite constitutional. While regretting the necessity for reviewing the calendar, she welcomed the opportunity of examining questions in the Co-ordination Committee which would otherwise have had to be discussed later in plenary. The United Kingdom delegation, like that of the United States of America, was prepared to abide by any decision taken by the Co-ordination Committee.

With regard to the French representative's reference to the transfer of the session of the Economic and Employment Commission to January 1950, her delegation continued to support that proposal but thought it should only be included in the calendar subject to whatever decision might be taken in plenary with regard to the future of that Commission. Secondly, with regard to the meeting place of the session of the Commission on Human Rights, she considered the United States arguments in favour of Lake Success to be irrefutable. She disagreed with the French representative's emphasis on the political importance of holding that session in Europe, and, while appreciating the inconvenience caused to certain eminent personalities who had to attend conferences at Lake Success, reminded the Committee that similar inconveniences would arise no matter where such conferences were held.

She wished formally to propose that the fifth session of the Social Commission should also be held at Lake Success, the decision to hold it at Geneva having been reached by a very narrow majority. That proposal she made, not on the grounds advanced by the United States delegation, but on the ground that a tree could not be expected to bear fruit if it was constantly being transplanted. Furthermore, the

/Social Commission

Social Commission intended to hold one long session extending up to the month of May 1950, which would leave an interval of two months before the eleventh session of the Council, during which members of the Secretariat who had been transferred from Lake Success could not be fully employed at Geneva. In the circumstances, certain indispensable members of the Secretariat would be obliged to undertake four trans-atlantic journeys if they were to service the sessions of both the Social Commission and the Council. She might add that, while it was true that the estimated cost of a three weeks session of the Social Commission at Geneva was only 6,000 dollars, any extension of that period would cost 400 dollars per week at Geneva as compared with an additional 100 dollars per week at Lake Success.

Though no guidance was as yet available from the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, the Council must avoid the risk of having a proposal rejected on the grounds of excessive cost.

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) said that since discussion was approaching a deadlock, his delegation wished to propose a compromise solution in order to facilitate the work of the Committee. Since the main difficulty seemed to be that two Commissions were scheduled to meet simultaneously at Geneva his delegation proposed that the Commission on Human Rights should meet at Geneva and the Social Commission should meet at Lake Success.

Mr. GONZALEZ (Chile) seconded the proposal submitted by the Brazilian delegation.

Mr. MENDES-FRANCE (France) said the French delegation could not remain deaf to an appeal for conciliation. Could it know, however, whether the United States and United Kingdom representatives shared the view of the Brazilian representative?

Mr. P. C. CHANG (China) said that although he regarded the arguments expounded by the United States representative in favour of transfer to Lake Success as irrefutable, he rejected, in the same spirit of compromise as evinced by the Brazilian representative, the United Kingdom proposal that the sessions of both the Commission on Human Rights

and the Social Commission should be transferred to Lake Success.[^] He would propose that the Commission on Human Rights should once more meet at Lake Success and that the session of the Social Commission should be held at Geneva.

Mr. KOISCENIG (United States of America) regarded the Chinese representative's proposal as wise in view of all the circumstances, and suggested that votes should be taken on the Brazilian and Chinese proposals in that order. The adoption of the Brazilian proposal would, of course, invalidate the Chinese proposal, but if the latter came to the vote the United States delegation would vote in favour of it for the reasons which he had repeatedly put to the Committee.

Mr. P. C. CHANG (China) said that the United States proposal that the Commission on Human Rights should meet at Lake Success should be voted on first under the rule of precedence, and asked whether the Brazilian representative would agree to that procedure.

Mr. MENDES-FRANCE (France) regretted that the debate had taken such a turn. The Committee had before it two proposals, namely: one by the representative of Brazil and one by the representative of China. Those two proposals, which represented compromise solutions, could not fully satisfy all delegations, but they would enable agreement to be reached. Besides, the earlier United States proposal had been withdrawn by the United States representative himself.

He asked the Committee to confine its attention to the Brazilian and Chinese proposals. If other representatives went on submitting new proposals, the French delegation would be obliged to re-assert its rights and to urge that both Commissions should meet at Geneva, as had been previously decided after lengthy discussions and on the basis of weighty arguments which had not been refuted. The United States representative claimed that his arguments had not been answered; that was not entirely true; he (the representative of France) had not only refuted those arguments, but had also made proposals designed to remove any difficulties which might arise out of the new facts of which the Committee had been seized that day.

/With regard

With regard to the Chinese delegation's proposal, he pointed out that the same arguments did not apply in the case of both Commissions. Apart from the fact that the Commission on Human Rights was justified in wishing to return to Geneva after a considerable lapse of time, there was no United Nations organ in Geneva dealing with human rights. It would, of course, be desirable for the Social Commission too to meet at Geneva, but the International Labour Organisation did admittedly deal with social problems. The French delegation therefore preferred that it should be the Commission on Human Rights which should meet at Geneva.

On the point of procedure he fully supported the United States representative's proposal. It seemed logical that the Brazilian proposal should be put to the vote first. If it were rejected, then a vote should be taken on the Chinese proposal.

Miss SALT (United Kingdom) disliked the procedure adopted and considered that it was an unsatisfactory way in which to take decisions. She was, however, willing to vote on the compromise solutions proposed by the representatives of Brazil and of China, provided they were submitted in the order suggested by the representative of the United States of America.

Mr. BORISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that the prolonged discussion which had taken place on the question of the meeting place of the session of the Commission on Human Rights had no doubt given great satisfaction to those representatives who had been in the minority when the decision to recommend holding the session at Geneva had been taken by the Committee. Since no new arguments had been put forward, he was obliged to draw the conclusion that the fact that the International Law Commission would also be meeting at Geneva in May 1950 had been used as a mere pretext for re-opening discussion. He proposed, therefore, that the Committee report that it found no reason to review its previous decision with regard to the session of the Commission on Human Rights.

The Committee rejected by 7 votes to 3 with 6 abstentions the proposal of the Soviet Union representative that the Committee report that it found no reason to review its previous decision with regard to the next session of the Commission on Human Rights.

/The Committee

The Committee adopted by 10 votes to 2 with 5 abstentions the proposal of the Brazilian representative to recommend to the Economic and Social Council that the sixth session of the Commission on Human Rights be held at Geneva and the fifth session of the Social Commission be held at Lake Success.

After some discussion, the Committee unanimously agreed to leave a decision on the dates of the fifth session of the Social Commission until the Council had decided on the future of the Economic and Employment Commission and its two sub-commissions.

The meeting rose at 7.35 p.m.
