



CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Elections: (a) Election of one-third of the membership of the functional commissions of the Council (E/2275, E/2275/Add.1 to 4, E/L.439, E/L.440, E/L.443)	667
Elections (<i>continued</i>): (c) Election of members of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations for 1952 (E/L.441).....	668
Calendar of conferences for 1953 (E/L.423, E/L.423/Add.1) (<i>continued</i>)...	668

President: Mr. S. Amjad ALI (Pakistan).

Present: The representatives of the following countries:

Argentina, Belgium, Canada, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, France, Iran, Mexico, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Observers from the following countries:

Chile, India, Lebanon, Yugoslavia.

The representative of the following specialized agency:

International Labour Organisation.

Elections: (a) Election of one-third of the membership of the functional commissions of the Council (E/2275, E/2275/Add.1 to 4, E/L.439, E/L.440, E/L.443)

[Agenda item 37 (a)]

STATISTICAL COMMISSION (E/2275, E/L.439, E/L.440)

1. The PRESIDENT drew the Council's attention to the resolution suggested by the Secretariat (E/L.439) concerning the renewal of membership of the Statistical Commission.

2. Mr. MEADE (United Kingdom), Mr. HSIA (China) and Mr. EPINAT (France) supported the Secretariat's resolution.

In the absence of any objections, the resolution (E/L.439) was adopted.

3. The PRESIDENT called for a vote to elect five members to the Statistical Commission.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Hevia (Cuba) and Mr. Kaluga (Poland) acted as tellers.

Number of ballot papers:	18
--------------------------	----

Number of valid votes cast:	18
-----------------------------	----

Required majority:	10
--------------------	----

Number of votes obtained:

Canada	18
--------------	----

India	17
-------------	----

Iran	16
------------	----

Cuba	14
------------	----

Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.....	13
--	----

Having obtained the required majority, Canada, India, Iran, Cuba and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic were elected members of the Statistical Commission.

TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

(E/2275, E/2275/Add.1, E/L.440)

4. The PRESIDENT called for a vote to elect five members to the Transport and Communications Commission.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

At the invitation of the President, Miss Pirasova (Czechoslovakia) and Miss Aguierre (Mexico) acted as tellers.

Number of ballot papers:	18
--------------------------	----

Number of valid votes cast:	18
-----------------------------	----

Required majority:	10
--------------------	----

Number of votes obtained:

France	18
--------------	----

Norway	18
--------------	----

Pakistan	18
----------------	----

China	15
-------------	----

Colombia	14
----------------	----

Having obtained the required majority, France, Norway, Pakistan, China and Colombia were elected members of the Transport and Communications Commission.

SOCIAL COMMISSION (E/2275, E/2275/Add.1 and Add.3, E/L.440)

5. The PRESIDENT called for a vote to elect six members to the Social Commission.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Hevia (Cuba) and Mr. Kaluga (Poland) acted as tellers.

Number of ballot papers:	18
Number of valid votes cast:	18
Required majority:	10
Number of votes obtained:	
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.....	18
Iraq	15
Norway	14
Argentina	13
Brazil	12
Czechoslovakia	12

Having obtained the required majority, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Iraq, Norway, Argentina, Brazil and Czechoslovakia were elected members of the Social Commission.

6. The PRESIDENT reminded the Council that those countries would automatically serve as members of the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund.

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS (E/2275, E/2275/Add.1 and 2, E/L.439, E/L.440)

7. The PRESIDENT called for a vote to elect six members to the Commission on Human Rights.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

At the invitation of the President, Miss Pirasova (Czechoslovakia) and Miss Aguirre (Mexico) acted as tellers.

Number of ballot papers:	18
Number of valid votes cast:	18
Required majority:	10
Number of votes obtained:	
France	17
India	17
Egypt	16
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.....	15
Philippines	12
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.....	11

Having obtained the required majority, France, India, Egypt, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Philippines and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic were elected members of the Commission on Human Rights.

QUESTION OF THE DATE OF ELECTION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION ON NARCOTIC DRUGS ELECTED FOR A LIMITED PERIOD (E/L.443)

8. The PRESIDENT pointed out that the Council had to decide whether the election of the five members appointed for three years should take place in 1952, in which case those members would serve for less than three years, or in 1953, when their term of office would be three and one-third years. If it was decided to hold the elections in 1952, the Council would also have to determine whether they should be held during the cur-

rent session or when the Council met during the seventh session of the General Assembly.

9. Mr. CREPAULT (Canada), supported by Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) and Mr. EPINAT (France), considered that the solution proposed in paragraph 6 of the memorandum submitted by the Secretary-General (E/L.443), to the effect that the elections should be held in 1953, was preferable, in order that the members might serve their full term of office.

In the absence of any objections, the proposal contained in paragraph 6 of the memorandum submitted by the Secretary-General (E/L.443) was adopted.

Elections (continued): (c) Election of members of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations for 1952 (E/L.441)

[Agenda item 37 (c)]

10. The PRESIDENT called for a vote to elect seven members to the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations. He drew attention to the existing composition of the Committee and to the fact that members could serve only while they were members of the Council (E/L.441).

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Hevia (Cuba) and Mr. Kaluga (Poland) acted as tellers.

Number of ballot papers:	18
Number of valid votes cast:	18
Required majority:	10
Number of votes obtained:	
France	18
United States of America.....	18
Uruguay	18
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.....	17
Sweden	17
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.....	15
China	15

Having obtained the required majority, France, the United States of America, Uruguay, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Sweden, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and China were elected members of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations.

Calendar of conferences for 1953 (E/L.423, E/L.423/Add.1) (continued)¹

[Agenda item 36]

11. Mr. BORIS (France) introduced his delegation's proposal that the Council should hold its 1953 summer session in Geneva (E/L.423) and commended it for adoption principally on the grounds that, by using the facilities available in Geneva, the Council could work more efficiently and economically.

12. Reviewing the background of the decision taken in September 1951 to hold the current session at Headquarters, he noted that Geneva had been rejected as the place of meeting by a tie vote of 7 to 7, with 4 absten-

¹ See 640th meeting.

tions, and after a cogent plea by the United States representative to bring the Council to the new Headquarters building. The experience of the current session permitted members to evaluate the wisdom of that decision. Not only had the Council been hampered in its work by the extreme heat of the New York summer, but the services of the overburdened Headquarters Secretariat had proved inadequate and the productivity of the Council had been seriously reduced. The last two factors had impelled the delegation of France to propose that the 1953 summer session should be held in Geneva; its draft resolution was in no way based on considerations of personal comfort.

13. Theoretically, the Headquarters Secretariat should be capable of servicing the three Councils even if they were meeting simultaneously; in practice it could do so only if additional staff were engaged. Consequently, during the busy period of the Council's session, when so many other United Nations bodies were meeting concurrently, the services which the Secretariat had been able to render the Council had been less effective than at Geneva. Moreover, if more Council committees had held meetings simultaneously, the preparation and translation of the extensive documentary material required would have virtually brought the Council's own work to a standstill. The idea that all meetings of United Nations organs could be concentrated at Headquarters was wholly impracticable; the facilities available should be used properly and the Headquarters staff must not be overburdened.

14. In connexion with the financial implications of holding the 1953 summer session at Geneva (E/L.423/Add.1), Mr. Boris noted that one-half the total expenditure would have to be applied to the recruitment of temporary staff and that, precisely because that personnel would be temporary, the cost to the Organization was 35 to 40 per cent higher than it would be normally. However, the services of the Geneva staff could not be compared to those furnished at Headquarters; the expenditure necessitated by the engagement of temporary personnel could ultimately be eliminated only by establishing a larger permanent staff at Geneva.

15. Finally, it would be conceded by all that no hard and fast rule requiring that all meetings should be held at Headquarters had ever been laid down. On the contrary, President Truman, in laying the cornerstone of the new building, had specifically stated that the establishment of the permanent headquarters in the United States did not mean that United Nations organs would never meet outside that country. The members could not fail to realize the moral importance of holding meetings of the Council, a principal organ of the United Nations, in various countries, and particularly in Europe, at the crossways of the world. The representative of the United States himself, in arguing that the 1952 summer session should convene at Headquarters, had envisaged the possibility of a 1953 session away from Headquarters, conceivably in the Middle East or the Far East. With the sixteenth session in Geneva, the Council would be enabled to execute one of its basic tasks more effectively: the maintenance and strengthening of its relationships with the specialized agencies and non-governmental organizations, many of which had headquarters in Europe.

16. Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) asked the Council to consider its decision on the French proposal very carefully, bearing in mind its effect on public opinion in Member States and throughout the world. The general public would hardly appreciate a decision involving a minimum expenditure of more than \$US154,000 merely on grounds of adverse climatic conditions and the personal comfort of the members of the Council.

17. It should be recalled that before the thirteenth session, the United States had consistently abstained from voting on the place of meeting of the second regular session of the year in order to avoid creating the mistaken impression that, as the host country, it felt that preference should be given to New York. The United States delegation had voted with the majority to hold the twelfth session at Santiago, Chile, and had actively worked for the approval of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions as regards the necessary funds. The success of the Santiago session had fully vindicated that decision. The United States delegation was firmly convinced that the Council should, from time to time, meet in areas outside North America and Europe. Occasionally, sessions should be held in the Middle or Far East to enable the members realistically to appraise the problems of those countries, which looked forward most earnestly to United Nations assistance in their economic and social development and to promote a fuller understanding by their peoples of the benefits of international co-operation.

18. The reasons invoked by the United States representative against holding the 1952 summer session at Geneva were applicable to the decision regarding the 1953 meeting. The efficiency of the Council's operation was seriously impaired by the constant movement of its secretariat and its member delegations from one part of the world to another. The inadequacy of Secretariat servicing at the current session and the strain placed on delegations was a direct consequence of the holding of both 1951 sessions away from Headquarters so that there had been insufficient time and opportunity to organize and co-ordinate the preparatory work effectively. Should the Council continue the pattern of frequent meetings outside Headquarters, it could not expect to eliminate the inevitable delays in the preparation and translation of documents and in their transmission to governments.

19. Frequent changes in the place of meeting also had adverse effects on the maintenance of the necessary communication and consultation between delegations and the Secretariat in respect of such operational programmes as those of technical assistance and Korean relief and rehabilitation, which must necessarily continue to be directed from Headquarters. Certain governments which had not found it expedient to maintain a full staff of economic and social experts at Headquarters, when their permanent delegations moved from New York to Geneva or Paris, inevitably broke the essential liaison which should be continuous with the Secretariat responsible for the execution of operational programmes.

20. Earlier decisions to hold Council sessions at Geneva had been motivated primarily by the physical circumstances that the Headquarters building and facili-

ties were not completed. Those factors were no longer relevant. An air-conditioned building had been provided, the operation and maintenance of which was costly, and much public criticism had already been directed against the United Nations on those grounds. It was precisely on financial grounds that the proposal to meet at Geneva would be most strongly attacked.

21. The Council had already spent more than half a million dollars unnecessarily by moving about. The 1951 Geneva session had cost an additional \$US185,000 or \$US35,000 more than the original estimate. Adoption of the French proposal would mean a minimum expenditure of an additional \$US154,200 for a six-week session and \$US19,000 for each week beyond that. The final sum might more nearly approximate to a figure of \$US185,000. At a time when governments were complaining strongly of the high cost of the United Nations and experiencing increasing difficulty in obtaining approval for legislation sanctioning payment of their pledged contributions to the Organization, such a decision would be an irresponsible action on the part of the Council. Surely it was more important for the \$US154,200 to be spent on programmes of technical assistance, UNICEF and other economic and social aid designed to improve the living standards of all peoples. Should the Council decide to meet at Geneva in the summer of 1953, it would become difficult, if not impossible, to hold future sessions in the Middle or Far East.

22. The United States delegation would give careful consideration to the French proposal. It felt, however, that the Council should not ignore the fact that the United Nations had only recently occupied the Headquarters buildings, that it had not yet utilized the facilities they offered to the fullest or permitted the Headquarters Secretariat to become permanently installed and to organize its administrative processes.

23. Bearing in mind that the Council had not met in New York for three successive sessions and without prejudging the place of future meetings, he appealed to the members to appreciate the moderate but compelling reasons which justified the holding of the sixteenth session at Headquarters.

24. Mr. NUÑEZ PORTUONDO (Cuba) stated that his delegation would support the French draft resolution (E/L.423).

25. Mr. FENAUX (Belgium) regretted that the newly-established World Meteorological Organization had been unable to predict the weather in New York during the Council's session and considered that the calendar of conferences should be fixed in accordance with the abnormal conditions of the New York summer. Although it was true that high temperatures were registered in Europe, nothing like the sustained heat and humidity of New York prevailed there.

26. From the administrative point of view, it had to be taken into consideration that 1951 had been an exceptional year of transition from the temporary to the permanent Headquarters; but although 1952 might be regarded as Headquarters year, there could be no objection to holding a session away from New York in 1953, especially when productivity was at stake.

27. Moreover, the arguments in favour of holding Council sessions at Geneva set forth in the Secretary-General's memorandum on the programme of conferences (E/2298) clearly showed the advantages of maintaining relations with the European Office, which was, in effect, another headquarters of the United Nations. The services at Geneva were in no way improvised and were generally acknowledged to be excellent. Those conditions would no doubt enhance work output, which was synonymous with economy. In that connexion, he recalled that his delegation had a well-deserved reputation for reducing costs whenever possible.

28. He would support the French draft resolution (E/L.423).

29. Mr. MEADE (United Kingdom) stated that his delegation's position on the matter was well known. The additional expenditure involved in transferring the Economic and Social Council to Geneva could be devoted to more useful purposes and the work involved in moving large quantities of documents seemed to be unnecessary. Another strong argument for not leaving New York was the existence of the new Headquarters building with special facilities for the Council. Moreover, it seemed to be pessimistic to anticipate another heat wave in the summer of 1953.

30. He would vote against the French draft resolution.

31. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) considered that the experience of the eleventh and thirteenth sessions had shown the desirability of holding the Council's sessions at Geneva, for other reasons besides climate and economy.

32. He would support the French draft resolution.

33. The PRESIDENT put the French draft resolution (E/L.423) to the vote.

The French draft resolution was adopted by 8 votes to 5, with 5 abstentions.

34. Mr. GOROSTIZA (Mexico) explained that he had abstained from voting because his country's term of membership in the Council would expire at the end of the year and his Government had not yet decided to stand for re-election. He therefore did not feel entitled to take part in the decision.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.