



Friday, 1 August 1952, at 10 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Confirmation of members of functional commissions of the Council (E/2223 and Corr.1 and Add.1 to 4).....	749
Arrangements regarding the report of the Council to the General Assembly (E/L.459) .....	750
Summary of financial implications of actions of the Council (E/2315 and Add.1) .....	750
Adjournment of the session.....	752

*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, Netherlands.

The representatives of the following specialized agencies:

International Labour Organisation, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

**Confirmation of members of functional commissions of the Council (E/2223 and Corr.1 and Add.1 to 4)**

[Agenda item 38]

1. The PRESIDENT invited the members of the Council to confirm officially the persons who had been nominated by their governments as representatives on the functional commissions.

TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

*The Council confirmed the following members of the Transport and Communications Committee:* Mr. Goursat (France), Mr. de Vries (Netherlands), Mr. Foien (Norway), Brigadier-General Mance (United Kingdom) and Mr. Zuberi (Pakistan).

FISCAL COMMISSION

*The Council confirmed the following members of the Fiscal Commission:* Mr. Callebaut (Belgium), Mr. Pérez Cubillas (Cuba), Mr. Qadir (Pakistan), Mr.

Lindahl (Sweden) and Mr. Bartelt (United States of America).

STATISTICAL COMMISSION

2. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that at the beginning of the session, the USSR delegation had stated that it did not recognize the right of representatives of the Kuomintang group to occupy the seat of China in the Council or in any of its functional commissions. Consequently, the USSR delegation could not accept the nomination of Mr. Li as a member of the Statistical Commission.

*It was decided that challenged nominations would be put to the vote.*

*Mr. Li (China) was confirmed by 12 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions.*

*The Council also confirmed the following members of the Statistical Commission:* Mr. Carver (Australia), Mr. Mahalonobis (India), Mr. Idenburg (Netherlands) and Mr. Rice (United States of America).

POPULATION COMMISSION

*The Council confirmed the following members of the Population Commission:* Mr. Hopkins (Australia), Mr. Sauvy (France) and Mr. Carrier (United Kingdom).

SOCIAL COMMISSION

*The Council confirmed the following members of the Social Commission:* Mr. Navajas-Mogro (Bolivia), Mr. Moog (Brazil), Mr. Albornoz (Ecuador), Mr. Hauck (France), Mr. Goutos (Greece), Mrs. Aryana-yakam (India), Mrs. Afnan (Iraq), Mr. Davin (New Zealand), Mr. Salvesen (Norway), Mr. López (Philippines), Sir Oswald Allen (United Kingdom) and Mr. Altmeyer (United States of America).

## COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

3. Mr. BORATYNSKI (Poland) said that his delegation could not accept Mr. Cheng Paonan as the nominee for the seat of China on the Commission on Human Rights.

*Mr. Cheng Paonan (China) was confirmed by 12 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions.*

4. Mr. HSIA (China) said that his delegation could not accept Mr. Birecki as the nominee for the seat of Poland, nor could it accept Mr. Morozov as the nominee for the seat of the USSR.

*Mr. Birecki (Poland) was confirmed by 15 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.*

5. Mr. BORATYNSKI (Poland) explained that he had abstained because the vote concerned a member of his delegation.

*Mr. Morozov (USSR) was confirmed by 16 votes to 1.*

*The Council also confirmed the following members of the Commission on Human Rights: Mr. Dehousse (Belgium), Azmi Bey (Egypt), Mr. Cassin (France), Mrs. Mehta (India), Mr. Malik (Lebanon), Mr. Waheed (Pakistan), Mr. Hoare (United Kingdom) and Mr. Mora (Uruguay).*

## COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

6. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) said that his delegation could not accept Miss Tseng as the nominee for the seat of China on the Commission on the Status of Women.

*Miss Tseng (China) was confirmed by 12 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions.*

7. Mr. HSIA (China) said that his delegation could not accept Miss Novikova as the nominee for the seat of the Byelorussian SSR.

*Miss Novikova (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) was confirmed by 16 votes to 1.*

*The Council also confirmed the following members of the Commission on the Status of Women: Mrs. Lutz (Brazil), Mrs. Nyein (Burma), Mrs. Figueroa (Chile), Mrs. de l'Official (Dominican Republic), Mrs. Guéry (Haiti), Mrs. Firouz (Iran), Mrs. Tabet (Lebanon), Mrs. Ross (New Zealand), Begum Hassan (Pakistan), Miss Kalinowska (Poland), Mrs. Warde (United Kingdom), Mrs. Goldman (United States) and Mrs. de Urdaneta (Venezuela).*

### Arrangements regarding the report of the Council to the General Assembly (E/L.459)

[Agenda item 40]

8. Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) felt that the Council's report should be so drafted as to make it as convenient as possible for the General Assembly to study the problems which it discussed. In particular, Member States that did not sit on the Council should have no difficulty in finding the Council's views on the various questions. Accordingly, each chapter of the report should begin with a brief summary of the decisions taken on the questions dealt with in the chapter. In addition, each section should conclude with a statement of the measures adopted by the Council and recommended to the General Assembly. Finally, the report

should contain a statement of the Council's decisions rather than an account of the discussion on the various proposals that had been put forward.

9. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) was surprised to hear the United States representative's request that the authors of the report should take no account of views that did not agree with those of the majority. Actually, the report should contain an objective account of the discussion on each problem. For example, in reporting the Council's discussion on item 12 (Report of the Commission on Human Rights (eighth session)) of the agenda, a statement should be included about the views of members of the Council including those of the delegations of India and Lebanon, which had taken part in the discussion.

10. Mr. STERNER (Sweden) observed that the procedure indicated in sub-paragraph (d) of the introduction to the 1950 report (A/1345) quoted in paragraph 1 of the note by the Secretariat (E/L.459) was a compromise between the viewpoints of the United States and USSR representatives.

11. Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) fully supported the provisions of that paragraph.

12. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) agreed with the United States representative that the report should indicate as clearly as possible the recommendations which the Council was making to the General Assembly so as to facilitate the task of the delegations of States that were not members of the Council.

13. The views of certain delegations could easily be learned by reference to the summary records of meetings. Nevertheless, the report should contain an account of the main trends that had developed in the course of discussion. The report should not be a mere list of the Council's resolutions; it should be as stimulating as possible. If that was what was meant by paragraph 1 of the note by the Secretariat (E/L.459) he was prepared to support that paragraph.

14. The PRESIDENT recalled that previous reports of the Council had given the principal views expressed on the various problems before the Council. That was the procedure envisaged in paragraph 1 of the note by the Secretariat (E/L.459) and he proposed that the Council should approve that procedure.

*It was so decided.*

### Summary of financial implications of actions of the Council (E/2315 and Add.1)

[Agenda item 39]

15. Mr. MEADE (United Kingdom) observed that delegations always approached the item under consideration somewhat apprehensively. On the one hand, they were understandably reluctant to discuss in detail administrative and financial questions that were within the competence of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and the Fifth Committee of the General Assembly. On the other hand, some delegations, particularly those of governments which bore a large share of the cost of the economic and social activities of the United Nations, were compelled to reserve their position on the financial implications indicated by the Secretary-General and to suggest possible economies. During the current session the

pertinent documents had not been distributed in time and it had therefore not been possible to study them in detail. Moreover, delegations had not had time to receive instructions from their governments.

16. The United Kingdom delegation wished to congratulate the Secretary-General for his efforts to charge the cost of new projects against existing appropriations. Obviously that required some readjustment of programmes and the United Kingdom delegation hoped that at the Council's next session the Secretary-General would be able to submit additional suggestions for deferring the execution of projects which did not have the highest priority.

17. The United Kingdom delegation approved the suggestion contained in paragraph 1, item L, in annex II to the note by the Secretary-General (E/2315/Add.1), that the study of bilateral and multilateral instruments relating to the status of aliens should be placed in category C.

18. He would be glad if the Secretariat could submit a more detailed estimate of the cost of the study of economic development (section F (3)). He also hoped that the Secretariat would in 1953 meet the expenses of that study from existing resources, as it had done in 1952.

19. He would also like to have some further information on the sum of \$US7,070 which represented the additional cost for 1953 involved by the appointment of a rapporteur on freedom of information (section J (3)). That estimate had been drawn up before the appointment of the rapporteur. The United Kingdom delegation had understood, however, that, if the rapporteur were a member of a permanent delegation, neither fees nor travel expenses would have to be paid.

20. The United Kingdom delegation furthermore hoped that the 1953 budget funds would suffice to cover a large part of, if not all, the additional costs estimated for 1953, namely \$US88,000. The Secretary-General could perhaps offer suggestions for modifying the work programme with that end in view.

21. The United Kingdom delegation would also like to have some details on the additional costs of \$US21,000 and \$US25,800 in connexion with the Economic Commission for Europe (E/2315/Add.1, paragraph 2). The draft budget of that regional commission was a very large one, totalling \$US1,969,000, which it would be preferable not to increase still further.

22. The document presented by the Secretary-General showed that the maximum of additional costs relating to new work was estimated at \$US36,000 for 1952 and \$US88,000 for 1953. On the other hand, expenses resulting from purely administrative decisions adopted by the Council at its current session would reach the considerable estimated total of \$US269,000 for those two years, and, if the General Assembly approved the resolution for the adoption of Spanish as a working language of the Council, the total would reach \$US625,300. The United Kingdom delegation was concerned at that large additional expenditure and wished to reserve its position on those estimated costs, as on all the other additional costs listed in annex II to the note by the Secretary-General (E/2315/Add.1).

23. He congratulated the Secretariat on the preparation of document E/2315, which contained much information of great usefulness to the Council. His Government might in due course offer suggestions for improvement of the method of presentation. He considered, for example, that the Secretariat might give details regarding the cost of the various projects undertaken by the regional economic commissions, in particular by the Economic Commission for Europe. It would also be desirable to standardize the method of presentation in the various sections, so as to bring out clearly the cost entailed by each of the Secretariat's activities classified by function.

24. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) expressed his satisfaction with the document concerning the financial implications of measures taken by the Council (E/2315 and Add.1), which represented a definite advance over any similar documents previously produced by the Secretariat. Those documents would enable the Council to consider its programme more realistically than in the past. They had come rather late, however, and he hoped that in the future the Council would have before it the documents regarding financial implications at the beginning of a session, so that the delegations might study them at their leisure.

25. Certain figures seemed at first sight to be particularly high. Thus, \$US1,890,000 was provided for the Economic Commission for Europe, whereas in the 1952 budget the appropriation for that Commission had not exceeded \$1 million. The United States delegation consequently reserved the right to make a statement on that subject to the Fifth Committee of the General Assembly, after making a thorough study of the question. He also considered that detailed estimates should be presented under the various headings, following the method used for the budget of the United Nations rather than only giving the total costs. As it was, the estimates for the regional economic commissions were not detailed enough.

26. With regard to the estimated additional costs for 1953, which amounted at the maximum to \$US88,140, he agreed with the United Kingdom representative that it was hoped that the Secretary-General could absorb that relatively small sum in the 1953 budget funds.

27. Finally, he noted that an increase of \$US620,000 was planned for the budget of the Council for administrative activities. He wished to reserve his Government's position on any increase in the costs.

28. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that his delegation had always favoured a sound financial administration and the best possible utilization of the United Nations' budget. That position remained unchanged, and the USSR delegation considered that the costs resulting from measures recommended by the Council should be included in the United Nations budget. His delegation would accordingly oppose any expense calculated to raise the budget of the United Nations.

29. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) referred to the United Kingdom representative's remark that certain governments took a relatively large part in financing the Organization. He wished to point out that the burden of contributions to the expenses of the United Nations was equally heavy for all Members, inasmuch as the

Committee on Contributions distributed the total costs of the United Nations among the Member States according to a scale based upon the ability to pay and the national income of each of them. He therefore did not entirely share the view of the United Kingdom representative on that subject. He was convinced of the need for an economical administration of the United Nations budget, and in that connexion he wished to reserve his delegation's position both with regard to the additional costs and to the general composition of the 1953 budget. He took note of paragraph 3 of annex II to the note by the Secretary-General (E/2315/Add.1), which directed the Council's attention to the resolution concerning the use of Spanish as a working language and indicated that the final decision lay with the General Assembly.

30. Mr. BORIS (France) drew attention to the fact that the debate on the financial implications of the Council's activities had taken place although no French texts had been distributed. He had refrained from making a statement on the subject, as he had not wished to hold up the proceedings. But he would like to point out to the Council that that failure was one more proof of the faulty working of the Headquarters services. He wished to make it clear that the unsatisfactory functioning of those services in no way reflected upon the devotion to duty of members of the Secretariat. He merely wanted to point out that the members of the Council did not receive at Headquarters the services they were entitled to expect.

31. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) supported the Argentine representative's statement. He took note of the fact that the General Assembly would decide as to the possible use of Spanish as a working language, as indicated in paragraph 3 of annex II to the note by the Secretary-General (E/2315/Add.1). He disagreed with the way in which that document had been drafted: it gave the impression that the Secretariat, in submitting its estimate, had been content to make a simple statement instead of presenting accurate calculations, and that the Secretary-General had wished to warn the Council of the effects of adopting Spanish as a working language. The Secretariat ought to have proceeded otherwise. Moreover, he questioned the accuracy of the estimate.

32. He also pointed to an apparent lack of precision in certain calculations, which in his opinion allowed an excessive margin of safety. He would have liked to have more accurate figures.

33. Mr. GEORGES-PICOT (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Social Affairs) replied to the questions of the United Kingdom and the United States representatives.

34. He explained that the Secretariat would not be able to provide more accurate estimates concerning the study of economic development until the experts had been appointed; only then would it be possible to make estimates taking into account the exact total of the experts' travelling expenses. Information would in any case not be available until the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions had submitted its report.

35. The question of the costs involved in the appointment of a rapporteur on freedom of information was

being studied. Those costs would be cut down as far as possible.

36. In reply to the United Kingdom representative, who had expressed the hope that the budget funds would suffice to meet a large part of the additional costs, he said that it would not be possible to give a proper answer without the Advisory Committee's report.

37. With regard to the additional estimates concerning the Economic Commission for Europe, he explained that the Secretariat had provided all the necessary information in document E/2187/Add.1. The additional costs arose out of the use of Russian as a working language.

38. With reference to the question raised by the United States representative regarding the regional commissions, he stated that the Secretariat would endeavour to submit more detailed estimates for those commissions. He also pointed out that the considerable apparent increase in the allocations to the Economic Commission for Europe was due to the fact that the estimates included the general services usually charged to the budget of the United Nations European Office at Geneva.

39. Lastly, he drew the Council's attention to the fact that the entry "nil" for several items in annex II to the note by the Secretary-General (E/2315/Add.1) indicated that the costs relating to the projects in question had been met from the funds in the current budget.

#### Adjournment of the session

40. The PRESIDENT announced that the Council had exhausted its agenda.

41. He would not comment in detail on what the Council had or had not achieved; the delegations were the best judges of that. Nevertheless, before the close of the session, he would like to state his main impression, which was that the Council had deferred definitive decisions to a later date and had confined itself to preparing the way for future activities. He fully appreciated the Council's efforts, and did not for a moment believe that the delays encountered could have been avoided. His only purpose in making that observation had been to stress the fact that the urgent problems facing the world in the field of economic development and international trade and the question of monetary instability and inflation called for immediate measures. In those circumstances, it would be over-optimistic to think that by setting up a further group of experts to examine a particular question or requesting the Secretary-General to prepare another working document the Council had accomplished the maximum of which it was capable. The Economic and Social Council was the organ entrusted by the Charter with the task of creating, under the authority of the General Assembly, the conditions of stability and well-being necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations. He would be failing in his duty if he did not declare his conviction that the Council's activities and prestige would be jeopardized unless it managed to translate the conclusions of its many reports and studies into specific measures. In particular, the Council should take bolder action for the development of under-developed countries.

42. He then pictured the march of the United Nations forces of peace, the vanguard in the struggle against poverty, ignorance and injustice. History would acknowledge that the twentieth century had established the dignity of man and had recognized his fundamental liberties.

43. He expressed his thanks to members of the Council, to the two Vice-Presidents who had assisted him in his work, to the Chairmen of the committees and working parties of the Council, to the Assistant Secretaries-

General and to all members of the United Nations Secretariat who had taken part in the work of the Council.

44. After a number of members of the Council had paid a tribute to the exemplary manner in which the President had directed their discussions and expressed their thanks to the staff of the Secretariat, the PRESIDENT declared the fourteenth session of the Council adjourned.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.