

United Nations

**ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL**

Nations Unies

**CONSEIL
ECONOMIQUE
ET SOCIAL**

UNRESTRICTED
E/P.V.89
22 July 1947
English

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL
Fifth Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE EIGHTY-NINTH MEETING

Lake Success, New York
Tuesday, 22 July, at 3:00 p.m.

Acting President: Mr. Jan PAPANEK (Czechoslovakia)

RECEIVED

24 JUL 1947

UNITED NATIONS
ARCHIVES

The PRESIDENT: I declare the eighty-ninth meeting of the Economic and Social Council open.

PROGRESS REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ON THE ONE DAY'S PAY PROPOSAL

Mr. ORDING (Director, International Children's Emergency Fund)

In presenting the Secretary-General's Report to the Council, I would first express the gratification which I am sure is generally felt because of the response which has been registered as a result of this first United Nations appeal for general public support.

Although the time since the last session of the Economic and Social Council has mainly been used for internal administrative preparation and planning, wherever the project has been put to the public favourable response has been received, and the formal decisions already made by the international non-governmental organizations which were given Category A status by the Economic and Social Council, such as the World Federation of Trade Unions and the International Cooperative Alliance, are most encouraging.

It looks as if this project, in meeting such general approval, offers the opportunity to demonstrate unity of purpose and action under the aegis of the United Nations which the peoples today so eagerly seek.

As already stated, the project is still in the preparatory and planning stage. Contacts have been made and consultations have taken place with a great number of organizations and individuals. Detailed preparations are going on for the establishment of the international committee, and thorough consideration has already been given by governments, organizations, and individuals to the best procedure for the establishment of national committees. Full information and publicity on these points will be furnished when final conclusions have been reached and a more complete establishment of machinery can be announced.

The timing of the project is most crucial. On the one hand, the urgency of the need is obvious; on the other hand, nothing could be more detrimental than premature and haphazard action on a scheme of such dimensions and of such an unprecedented nature.

It is now obvious that the establishment of machinery all over the world will take the major part of next fall, and that the actual campaign cannot take place before the early part of 1948. Even this can only be achieved through joint and unrelenting efforts from individuals and organizations, facilitated by governments, all acting with the greatest possible speed.

I am happy about the tentative agreement which has been reached with the Acting Chairman of the Executive Board of the International Children's Emergency Fund on the division of work and on the matter of close co-operation between our two organizations. The common task ahead is so tremendous that the most efficient utilization of existing staff and resources will be needed.

The resolution of the Economic and Social Council at its last session gave the Secretary-General the authority to take the necessary steps to implement the project. The small office established in the Secretariat for that purpose will not, of course, itself attempt to carry out and conduct a campaign of this size. Its purpose will be to facilitate and initiate the establishment of those non-governmental international and national bodies -- and, above all, to obtain the support of the peoples themselves, who alone can secure success.

The approval and stimulus of this Council and its Members will be most important, and I need scarcely say that your advice and any constructive criticism you may wish to make of the plan of action contemplated in the documents before you will be welcomed by the Secretary-General.

Mr. STOLZ (Czechoslovakia): I should like, on behalf of the Czechoslovakian delegation, to say that we fully agree in principle with the proposal of "one day's pay" or, as it is now called, the United Nations Appeal for Children. We think this is a very well chosen name.

Our people, and our Government, will do their best to provide the maximum of financial assistance to this appeal, though the funds cannot be exported in foreign currency due to the present situation.

However, we have some doubt as to whether it is just to appeal for one day's pay only to those who are the wage earners, and not to appeal to all the people whose earnings are not fixed by daily, weekly or monthly pay. If this can be overcome, we agree wholeheartedly with the proposal which is contained in the paper that has been submitted to us.

We are very glad that in this highly humanitarian task the non-governmental organizations, by forming an international committee and taking an active part in these activities, are manifesting their close cooperation not only in the work of the Children's Appeal, but in the work of the United Nations as a whole.

Mr. THORN (New Zealand) : I join with Mr. Ordning in expressing the hope that this appeal will meet with the utmost possible success. Our activities cannot be directed to a more humane purpose, and I trust that the nations of the civilized world will take a proper view of their duties in this matter.

One difficulty has arisen with regard to New Zealand, which I should like to discuss. The last sentence on page 8 of this Report reads like this: "In view of the many months of preparation a world-wide campaign of this sort will necessarily require, it is therefore considered that the collection should take place early in 1948."

Some months ago we received information in New Zealand, not from this Organization, but from a source which we had to respect, to the effect that the appeal would be launched this year. Therefore, we set to work and detailed arrangements were made to launch the New Zealand appeal in November of this year. This was absolutely necessary so as to avoid Christmas which falls in the middle of our summer; and as the New Zealand summer goes on until the end of February and possibly March, if the collection has to be made in 1948, there is little prospect of success in my country unless the appeal can be postponed until about April 1948.

All this, of course, would completely disorganize the plans we have already made, and on which we hope to act in November of this year. In view of this, we feel that we should be encouraged to adhere to our present arrangements. Surely we are the best judges of our own conditions, and it would be better for the children concerned if we in New Zealand could manage the appeal independently and in relation to the special circumstances which exist there. If this is not possible, we will, of course, have to consider whether we can fit our effort into a later date. But this will be very difficult and the result, so far as New Zealand is concerned, may be disappointing.

There is a question I should like to ask with regard to the disposal of the funds. On page 7 of the Report by the Secretary-General, it is stated that the national committees which will be constituted to make this appeal within the various nations should be composed of volunteers. Under the functions of these national committees, sub-paragraph (iii) reads as follows:

"To enter into agreement with the Secretary-General, particularly as regards the disposal of the funds collected by the committee."

EW/

E/P.V. 89
27-30

Another section appropriate to that appears in document E/464/Add.1, which was circulated this morning. It reads in part as follows:

"The Secretary-General has been authorized to reach agreement with each country as to the disposal of the national collections."

Is it intended that the Secretary-General will reach agreement with the governments or with the voluntary national committees which will be established?

The PRESIDENT: Mr. Ordning will answer all questions at the end of our discussion.

Mr. McNEIL (United Kingdom): I want, first of all, to say how fortunate the Council has been to have had the distinctive service which Mr. Ordning has rendered to it on this subject. His singleness of purpose, his great energy and his great humanity must be rarely paralleled, and I am very grateful to him for what he has done here, as I am sure every delegation is. In saying that, I hope I make it plain that my government gives the warmest support in principle to this scheme, as we have already done. But there are one or two criticisms of a minor kind, but not of an unsubstantial kind, which I should like to make.

I am particularly disturbed by page 6 of this document which has been presented to us.

As I understand this subject, after it had been raised at the Assembly it was remitted to this Council, and this Council at its last session set forth the principles which should govern the operation of this one-day-pay proposal. The Secretary-General was then authorized to go ahead with the job, and, via Mr. Ordning, he has done so with great expedition, and his response is this document. But, I repeat, the principles ^{of} the one-day-pay proposal were laid down by the Council, and I therefore am a little disturbed by this elaboration of the functions of the international committee which is now placed before the Council.

It looks to me as if we are in danger of creating a very large international non-governmental organization. I notice on page 4 of the same document that Mr. Ordning has already consulted, in addition,

some 750 international non-governmental organizations. That is a fairly substantial number, and the more consultations you have, the more letters you write, the greater the staff you employ, the longer the agenda of the committee you summon.

As our New Zealand colleague has already pointed out, the essence of this scheme is its urgency. The Assembly has considered it, the Council has already considered it once, and I am going to ask Mr. Ordning: Is there any need for this international committee? There is the need, we all admit, of international approval, and so far as the people handling the scheme are concerned, if they think that they need some international approval other than the approval of the Assembly of the United Nations and the assent of this Council, then perhaps they are wise to get some international figures on the head of their letterpress. I do not object to that, although I visualize some difficulties in their selection.

So far as I may be said to be religious, I might confess that I am a Protestant, but I notice that Mr. Ordning, on the instructions of the Secretary-General, is going to consult the Protestants to have one representative on this international committee. I warn Mr. Ordning that, as a good thorough-going Presbyterian, if he comes to tell me he has consulted the Archbishop of Canterbury, I will not consider that he is a representative of Protestants at all, and if Mr. Ordning were to go to the Buddhists, on which I am not an authority at all, I should think his difficulties would become even greater. If he wants a nice list of reputable representatives, international figures, on his letterhead, that is an excellent idea. But to convene a meeting, as I gather from his document he proposes to do, alarms me a little.

Are the donations to the Fund going to carry the expenses of this meeting? Where are the expenses going to be found? Is the Council going to be asked to carry, in the sense of representation, a very large international non-governmental meeting of highly important people who must be treated as princes and what are they going to do?

We know perfectly well that the operation of this business will depend upon the national committees, and the co-ordination should be made here. Let me say frankly that I am satisfied that the co-ordination cannot be in better hands than those of Mr. Ordning and the small Secretariat who have carried forward the work to this point.

I am greatly indebted to my New Zealand colleague for giving the Council a practical example, which is much better than my theoretical argument. Here is New Zealand, a country with a great reputation for this warm, urgent, humanitarian feeling. They took part in the debate; they took part in the deliberations of the Council when my friend Walter Nash was here in February or March. What did they do? Did they wait for the international committee? Not at all. They asked, "What is the most appropriate time to get the money from our people?" They went ahead and made their arrangements.

Is this Council going to tell the representative of New Zealand that he should wait until this international committee meets and decides upon a date in 1948? Not at all. We have decided upon the principle by international agreement; we have internationally approved it. Let us face the fact that we will have to leave the method to the national committees; that Mr. Ordning and his excellent assistants should go ahead on the plans without convening an international committee, and certainly without remitting to them the detailed functions which we have here and which, I fear, may cut across the principles already laid down by this Council at its previous meeting.

It might be the wish of the Council that we just delete page 6, in which case we could probably pass on to the next business. Perhaps that is a little precipitate. If it is felt that we have to have a detail of functions, then I certainly feel that this should be remitted to a committee for most careful study. In the meantime, however, I hope that New Zealand will be authorized to go ahead with its part of the job.

Mr. MENDES-FRANCE (France) (Interpretation from French): As the French delegation had the opportunity to state earlier through persons more-competent than I, as far as this question is concerned, we agree with the principles which are embodied in this proposal.

France gives its warm support to this practical measure which we believe will promote international solidarity among all the countries which have suffered and borne witness to the misfortunes of war. What I am about to say is not intended in any way to diminish the warm support which the French delegation has for this proposal, but I should like to speak on certain points of application, from a practical point of view, particularly as they apply to my country, France.

I think that the contribution under discussion should not have the aspect primarily of a legal obligation. I believe it would be more in conformity with the generous spirit that motivated this project if this contribution were to be made on a voluntary basis. A binding obligation to make this proposed contribution might meet with objections on moral and practical grounds.

France, which was occupied for four years and subjected to totalitarian methods and measures, remembers very well the obligatory deductions which were made from the salaries of its people under the Nazi regime. Accordingly, it would be much better and more democratic if contributions were of a spontaneous and voluntary nature.

Furthermore -- and I believe this is the most important consideration from a practical point of view -- an obligatory system of contributions might discriminate between the salaried classes, on the one hand, and the classes which derive their income from sources other than salaries.

The representative of Czechoslovakia has made reference to this point, and the French delegation supports his stand fully. I believe his argument is another against the creation of a system of obligatory contributions.

The next point on which I wanted to speak is of special interest to France. It is inspired by temporary conditions which, although temporary, are rather pressing. These conditions are of an economic and financial nature. France will not be in a position in the near future to transfer into foreign exchange all the contributions which will have been received from voluntary contributors -- that is, from workers. Therefore, we believe the best policy for France would probably be not to effect the transfer of moneys but rather to use the contributions for the purchase of either merchandise or services.

I should like to recall that a suggestion to this effect has already been made by Professor Debray. He has also stated that it was intended to create in France a pediatrician center, and I believe this shows an effective manifestation on the part of France to participate in this international movement towards solidarity.

Mr. THORP (United States): I think we all realize the tremendous undertaking which is involved in this appeal for children. Certainly I, for one, want to commend the energetic efforts on the part of the Secretary-General and others, who have helped to advance this project to the point at which we can actually see in some realistic form the shape it may take.

However, there is one point about which there appears to be some confusion, and I think it is very important that this point be cleared up. I should regard it as a rather fundamental point. I am particularly disturbed by one sentence in document E/464/Add.1, paragraph (f),

AC/gpr

E/P.V.89
43-45

sub-paragraph 1, the second sentence of which reads: "...Approaches to non-governmental bodies with a view to raising funds will be undertaken by UNAC, which will therefore assume the handling of publicity for this purpose." The reason that disturbs me is that it seems to establish the principle that UNAC itself will go out into the fund-raising business. The concept which has appeared in other documents is that the UNAC, an international agency, is one which establishes the objectives and stimulates the various countries themselves to undertake the carrying out of the appeal.

I believe that anyone who thinks about this for a few moments will appreciate that this job cannot be standardized. It has to be done in different ways in different countries. That being true, it seems all the more necessary to place the weight of responsibility on the countries themselves.

You have heard of one problem: that of New Zealand. Let me outline briefly the problem in the United States. A number of years ago, the citizens of the United States found themselves exposed to an increasing number of appeals for charitable purposes, year after year. It came to be a tremendous burden, in terms of time and energy. The average citizen felt that he was unable to make a proper choice as among the various appeals. Gradually, therefore, we developed ways of having single appeals to the public in behalf of many different agencies. In most localities, that single appeal is called the Community Chest Drive.

More and more appeals have been developing in the foreign field. The American agencies which work in the foreign field have reached the conclusion that in that field, too, there should be a single appeal to the American people in behalf of many different claimants. The idea was that on some basis such as the making of contributions through a year's time, month by month, American citizens could plan their total personal contributions to foreign relief. For those who wished to give specific assistance, of course, there would still be many opportunities to do so through other channels.

You can therefore see the problem that is created for the United States by this specific appeal in connection with funds for children. After some discussion and considerable negotiation, the established American agencies in the field have agreed to include the International Children's Emergency Fund as one of the claimant agencies, shall we say, in the overall appeal for foreign relief. That is the form in which we feel the United States should make its contribution in connection with this appeal.

Of course, that is a very special and specific situation which will undoubtedly not be repeated in any other country.

In order to work out this kind of problem, it is obviously necessary that the country involved have the responsibility, and that it be told that it must make its plans in a way which will contribute most to the accomplishment of our general purpose. I should therefore like to stress the point which was made by the representative of the United Kingdom: that, in this case, the international agency has a very real function, the function of stimulating the various countries and assisting them in the formulation of their plans, but that in no case should it move into an individual country and take over the responsibility. If this is to be a successful undertaking, the responsibility will have to be placed squarely on the countries themselves, and the national committees will have to recognize their responsibilities.

I believe that the responsibility of the United Nations is to start the project and do all it can to help it along, but in no way to relieve the individual countries of their specific responsibility for carrying it through. I would therefore express the earnest hope that, as regards the agreements which are entered into and the way in which this project is carried out, the spirit of the operation will be one of placing squarely on the national committees the responsibility for carrying the project through in their own countries.

Mr. MOROSOV (USSR)(Interpretation from Russian): The sacrifices which have been made by the Soviet Union in the second world war are common knowledge, and it is also known how all the peoples of the Soviet Union have contributed to the efforts made to reconstruct the territory devastated during the war, a territory which covers a considerable part of the whole territory of the Soviet Union. At the same time, the Soviet Union has to foot the bill for taking care of the children, the mothers, and the invalids.

Because of these considerations, the Soviet Union will not participate in the "one day's pay" appeal. The Government and the workers have to reconstruct the devastated homes, and, at the same time, they have to take care of the children, the mothers, and the invalids. Because of this, the Soviet Union will abstain from voting on this question.

Mr. DAVIDSON (Canada): I should like to join with those who have expressed their appreciation of the tireless efforts of Dr. Ordning in this field of activity. I should also like to say, on behalf of the Canadian Government, just one or two words with regard to the Report which is before us this afternoon.

As yet, I am not in a position to enlarge upon any details in so far as plans in my country are concerned, because the matter is still under consideration. Canada is going to watch with interest to see the extent to which this proposal becomes, in keeping with its original purpose, a genuine world-wide international appeal supported by the peoples of all the countries of the world, and directed to the benefit of the children of the various parts of the world who are in need.

My country has made a not insignificant contribution to the International Children's Emergency Fund itself, and it was with some difficulty that I sat in silence this morning while comments were made about the contributions of other governments, whose contributions I thoroughly respect and appreciate.

But I would draw the attention of the Council to the fact that the two-line reference in this morning's Report to the contribution of the Canadian Government to the International Children's Emergency Fund represents the largest contribution per line, per word, per capita, and per community resources that has been contributed to the Fund.

We in Canada have a history of supporting international effort in the field of international relief about which, I think, I can remind the Council without presumption. We stated that principle at the time of the last Assembly. We felt it was through genuine international organization and action that we could best and most wisely make our contribution to the needs of suffering children in these countries.

It was because the International Children's Emergency Fund represented, in our judgment, the clearest approach to the kind of organization we had in mind that we announced the contribution to which I have referred. But, so far as this "one day's pay" proposal is concerned, I should like to remind the Council of something which I think was in the mind of the sponsor, Dr. Ordning, when he brought this to the attention of the Assembly and of Members of the Council at the time we discussed this in March of this year. That is, that one of the fundamental values of this "one day's pay" appeal, altogether apart from the monetary considerations involved, and altogether apart from the actual amount of financial assistance that may be forthcoming for the children, is the universality of the idea, the fact that it represents something in which all the countries of the world can join, and in which all the peoples of the world can partake.

Canada is anxious to assure itself of the fact that that concept is going to be carried forward in terms of the attitudes of the peoples of the world, and for that reason Canada proposes to wait and see the extent to which the universality of this idea is carried forward among the peoples of the world before she makes her final decision as to the extent to which she will be able to participate in this undertaking.

The second point to which I should like to refer is rather one of detail, but it harks back to the reference made by the representative of the United Kingdom this afternoon to the international committee.

I, too, am concerned about the possibility of a large semi-permanent international organization, top-heavy and expensive, being created. I am somewhat in doubt as to what the purpose of an international committee of this size could be.

We accept willingly, on the one hand, the arguments advanced by various representatives this afternoon to the effect that the main responsibility of raising funds must fall upon the shoulders of the national committees in each country. We accept, on the other hand, the argument that the lines of policy, to some extent, at least, have already been laid down, and that the Secretariat, with the able assistance of Dr. Ordning and his particular group of staff, can be relied upon to see that these principles are carried through in practice in each country.

I am, however, concerned about the possibility that that will not be quite enough. While it is certainly not my intention to support any large international organization which is going to cast a great deal of money, I am concerned about the possibility ^{that} there will be problems of principle and detail still to be decided in the creation of this world wide collection of funds. I do not think the Council has as yet laid down the lines of policy on all the points which conceivably might have to be dealt with, and I cannot see

that this Council has given a sufficient degree of instruction to the Secretariat to enable the Secretariat, without some sort of small advisory committee, to carry through the lines of policy in relation to the appeals in the various countries in the manner in which we may like to see these appeals carried forward.

May I just use one illustration, and I am sure that the representative of the United States will not think I am using this for the purpose of casting any aspersions upon his particular form of organization, about which I know something because it relates more closely, perhaps, to that which would have to take shape in our country than the form in any other country.

I am concerned about this kind of problem. Assuming that the appeal which we now know as UNAC is going to be merged with appeals of other kinds in other countries, is there going to be any means of having the Council or the United Nations say with what kind of appeals the appeal on behalf of the International Children's Emergency Fund is going to be merged, or is that a matter which will be determined entirely by the country itself? For example, is it going to be permissible to merge the appeal of the International Children's Emergency Fund with purely domestic appeals? I cannot recall anything in the lines of policy we have laid down thus far that covers that specific point, although naturally, I think it should be understood that if it is to be combined with any other appeals, it will only be with other appeals that have the same import.

It seems to me that points of that kind have to be worked out in the next few months.

Another consideration that has to be thought of is, what percentage of any combined fund raising efforts should accrue to the International Children's Emergency Fund in order to justify the turning over of this very powerful medium of appeal, an appeal on behalf of the children of the world, for the use of other organizations with whom the International Children's Emergency Fund appeal has been combined?

I mention these points simply to indicate certain points where I think the Council has given no clear line of direction as yet. Dr. Ordning may have the answers to these questions and other questions which may come up from time to time, but I do think that either this Council should try to give some further lines of direction to the Secretary-General in connection with his negotiations with national committees in the various countries, or else that there should be a small watch-dog committee -- if you want to call it that --

EW/tp

E/P.V.89
57-60

and the smaller the better, but the more effective the better -- to help the Secretary-General in working out decisions on lines of policy consistent with what this Council itself would lay down if it were in session and able to deal with these problems in the course of the next few months.

For that reason, it seems to me we should give some consideration, not so much to the elimination of page 6 concerning the functions of the committee but to the revision of that section of the Report in particular in such a way as will bring it down to a more reasonable size, to limit more definitely the functions, but also assuring that there will be some adequate small body in existence to carry on this work and to advise the Secretary-General along certain of the lines that I have outlined this afternoon.

Mr. SEN (India): I shall be very brief. We have been making excellent progress, and I have no desire to retard that.

Firstly, I must remind the Council about the policy of India on this subject. That policy was clearly stated during the Fourth Session of the Council, and there is no need for me to repeat the statement sentence by sentence.

Briefly, it was that India has about thirty-five million children, and their needs must come first. We shall not be able to support the fundamental scheme for reasons which have already been stated more than once.

Coming to the actual report, I find that the international committee as listed here certainly will not meet with general approval. Firstly, the United Kingdom representative pointed out with a good deal of force and humour that it is top-heavy and expensive and will not serve any useful purpose. I think, however, that his criticism about national committees not being able to function without the international committee coming into force was perhaps not entirely justified. I think the idea was that the national committees would go ahead with their job until the international committee was formed, but even so, I quite see the strength of his argument, that this sort of international committee would be completely unworkable and expensive. On the other hand, I find the Canadian suggestion of an advisory committee extremely attractive, and I think we should ^{give the} really/organization here at the United Nations some sort of advisory body which will have the necessary weight and authority to induce the national committees to undertake their great and responsible work. They will then be able to advertize their campaigns for relief in a suitable manner with that authority back here at the United Nations.

There is another aspect, the question of allotment. For instance, this Council will have to decide at one stage or another--perhaps this Council will decide, or perhaps some other organization will decide--how much is to go to the International Children's Emergency Fund and how much to other bodies. This advisory committee will be of great use in advising us here in the Council as to the allotment.

There may be all different types of difficulties and questions arising from day to day in the work of the national committees. If we have some sort of liaison between New York and the national committees, the national committees will be able to progress much more effectively in their work than they would if there were merely a Secretariat organization here with some official in charge of it. For these reasons, I think an advisory committee of a small size--not more than eleven or twelve--would be extremely desirable, and I should certainly suggest that as a formal proposal.

If, on the other hand, the Council decided not to have that type of advisory committee but to have the international committee, I should have to make one or two minor remarks.

If we examine the composition as it is written in document E/464, page we find under religious groups, "one each, after consultations with Protestants, Catholics, Jews, Mohammedans, Hindus and Buddhists." I fail to see why the Christians should have two denominations, Protestants and Catholics, while all the others have one each. First, the Christians have certainly many more than two denominations, and, as for Hindus and Buddhists, I can assure you that there are millions and millions of different denominations. That is only a minor comment, because so far as religious groups are concerned, I do not think they are of much use any way.

Therefore, I suggest that the Committee should be altered in its present composition. We should have an advisory committee consisting of eminent individuals -- whatever that may mean -- and then we should have twelve people selected entirely at the discretion of the chief of that organization, and they may be recruited from the national committees or may sometimes be recruited from outside agencies. If we have an advisory body like that, which will naturally be confirmed by the Council at its next session, then we shall create a mechanism which will have sufficient weight and authority to say, "No" to the national committees, and the national committees will not lose sight of the various appeals which will go out from the United Nations from day to day.

The PRESIDENT: I will now ask Mr. Ordning to answer some of the questions that were raised during the meeting.

Mr. ORDING (Director, International Children's Emergency Fund):

First, I want to thank you all for the positive interest you have shown in the project before us. I would like to say that no one perhaps more than myself has been aware of the many problems which have been touched upon by the representatives around this table. May I say that I am not astonished that the two main points coming out of any such discussion were, first -- and most encouraging -- that everyone agreed in principle; and second, just as natural, that everyone would also like to ask for some adjustments in practice. I think this is the very problem we have before us: Will it be possible to stick to this principle to which we all agree and at the same time adjust it to the circumstances in each country, as much as is necessary to have the effort succeed, but not so much that it would destroy the principle?

MF/gpr

E/P.V. 89
64-65

I feel that we have gone very far toward success in this respect, and I am sure that this discussion has contributed very much to this end. I shall try briefly to go through the main points which have been raised.

The first question raised was concerning the collection and contributions. The representative of Czechoslovakia rightly stressed that, although we have talked, and are talking, about a "one day's pay" collection, the idea is not, and has never been, that this collection should be limited only to wage earners; it is universal in all respects. Everyone should be in it according to his means.

Also, it is quite clear that, in spite of having the one day's pay as a slogan, we have no world government, and this is not world taxation; it is a question of voluntary agreement. It is a question, not of obligatory contributions, but of a voluntary decision by the people themselves on how and what to contribute.

It is hoped, however, that it should be for people in the different branches and walks of life to agree on certain common measurements, such as a tentative suggestion as to what might be contributed by all concerned without too great difficulty. However, that question is left open so that the people themselves can discuss it and arrive at a decision.

The next question relates to contributions in kind and services, as was mentioned by the representative of France. We are very much aware of the importance of such contributions in kind and services. I should like to stress at this time, in order to make it quite clear, that it is our idea that countries such as India and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, which are in such great need themselves, should not be excluded from participation in the contributions because of such need. However, this matter will have to be discussed further and I shall not go into details at this time.

Nevertheless, the idea behind the entire matter, as was stated by the representative of Canada, is that it should be world-wide. Then again, we must take into consideration the fact that countries which are in need will not be able to contribute the money collected in their own countries. The money collected will be needed for their own purposes, and the contributions outside those countries may be token contributions. However, they may be important since it is necessary that we consider this as a joint effort for a common purpose. Therefore, contributions in kind and services are surely important. As a matter of fact, the Resolution passed by this Council at its last session expressly stressed the importance of reaching an agreement between the Secretary-General and the countries concerned as to the disposal of the collections, taking into consideration the problem of foreign exchange and other problems of a similar nature.

A question was raised with regard to the disposal of the funds in the event that agreement was reached between the Secretary-General and the country concerned, namely, whether it meant the government or the national voluntary committee. As you may be aware -- and some of the representatives may remember our discussions during the last session of the Council -- we consciously used the words "agreement with the country" in the Resolution. It does not state to what extent it should be the government or the national committee, for the very simple reason that it is obvious that the national committee, which will have the main responsibility for the collection in each country, will definitely be interested in the disposal of the funds collected. Those who contribute to a fund are likewise interested in knowing what they are contributing to and are anxious to take part in the discussions with reference thereto. That is why the word "country" was mentioned.

Of course, it may vary in each country as to what body will actually deal with these matters. As to any such agreement, there must be an understanding with the government or the foreign office concerned. However, if such countries desire to bring the national committees directly into the consultations, this Resolution does not preclude that method of procedure. On the contrary, the matter is open for discussion and is flexible in order to meet the different situations in various countries. The Members of the Council did not at that time know what the best procedure would be, and I suppose that no Member can give the exact answer to this problem at the present time. Nevertheless, we are ready to discuss that with every country concerned.

The next question is a very important one. It deals with the relationship between the national committees and the machinery on the

international level. However, I should first stress that this entire project could never have come as far as it has and would surely not succeed if it were not for the fact that we have tried to keep our eyes down to the grass roots in this country, which merely means that this mission cannot be fulfilled through the establishment of rigid rules and decisions on the top. It can only succeed by having the people from the very lowest local levels act according to their own voluntary decisions.

This means that we shall try -- and this is surely the purpose of my small office -- to facilitate action by others rather than to decide anything for them. Such being the case, it means that the national committees would be more important than the international committee.

It is gratifying to learn from more of the representatives as to how they appreciate the importance of having existing relief organizations brought into the picture and given the opportunity to participate. I know of and appreciate the work which has already been done in this country and others with regard to this problem, namely, the problem of having a unified, overall drive where all who are eager to participate in such relief work can find their places. That is one of the reasons why the formation of national committees will vary from country to country.

I also wish to stress that it is not our idea that either this small office at the Secretariat or the international committee should move into countries and try to relieve the national committees of their very heavy obligations. Surely, we should be eager to see to it that these obligations are, as much as possible, given to others rather than to this international committee.

In this connection, I wish to make one observation which I feel to be important. It will serve to clarify the remarks made by the representative of the United States with regard to document E/464/Add.1, where it is stated: "Approaches to non-governmental bodies with a view to raising funds will be undertaken by UNAC, which will therefore assume the handling of publicity for this purpose." He is quite right in his concern if UNAC is here interpreted to mean the small office at the Secretariat.

However, this is one of the matters which I should like to clarify. In this case, UNAC is not meant to cover only that office. On the contrary, it is meant to encompass all the machinery: first of all, the national committee, as well as the international committee and the small office of the Secretariat. In other words, it takes in the whole appeal as such. In order to prevent any such misunderstanding with regard to this document, we ought to introduce some other words which will make this matter quite clear.

With regard to this point of elaborate machinery, I should like to make it clear that when I have used the term "UNAC," I have had in mind the fact that it was the name of the total appeal, the name of all machinery at all levels.

I shall now speak on the matter of the international committee. I know that when we dealt with this problem at the First Session of the Economic and Social Council, there were, partly in the session but also in the discussions with delegations personally, some doubts raised as to the advisability of having such an international committee. I felt, however -- and I think it was the general feeling of the Secretariat -- that out of those discussions there came a general agreement

that in spite of the problems involved, there was a need for an international committee. I do not hesitate to say -- and I can give some arguments for this -- that it was generally felt that if we have no international body to represent an international appeal of this nature, it would be very difficult to succeed in working it out according to its world-wide aspects and its international purpose. There must be some concrete body in which we can embody this international approach.

I also wish to state that it should not be semi-permanent. I do not know where the representative of Canada finds any words which would indicate such an idea. Surely, we are all acting upon a resolution which is based on a temporary project. Personally, I have never had the idea that this body should be permanent or semi-permanent.

The question of compensation is, of course, quite important. However, I do not intend to go into the details here. I can only assure the representative of the United Kingdom that I am very much aware of all the problems which he raised and, in addition, some others.

Also, I assure the representative of India that I am happy to receive any advice that may be forthcoming on additional problems that have not yet been considered, and I am sure there are many problems that have still not been dealt with.

However, there is one feature of this project which is particularly noteworthy--namely, the idea that we make an effort here to have non-governmental organizations all over the world, and persons acting in a non-governmental capacity, join in the furtherance of a common purpose. It is generally felt that if this idea is to be realized, we must find some *modus operandi* by which we can get in touch, and work together, with people on a non-governmental basis. Accordingly, we must find ways and means of creating machinery which is non-governmental in character. To my mind, this is a very important consideration. It is against the philosophy of voluntary private contribution to give to governmental bodies.

It has been stressed many times--and I think we all understand the problems inherent in this emphasis--that if this is to be a non-governmental world-wide effort by individuals and organizations everywhere, we must make it clear that there are ways and means by which non-governmental groups can operate efficiently and express themselves effectively. This is why I feel that an international voluntary non-governmental committee is important.

At an earlier stage of the discussion we mentioned that the proposed committee might be limited to eleven or thirteen members. However, weighty arguments were advanced to the effect that it was important to establish direct liaison with every country which participated in this project. It was generally agreed among those who discussed the question that the best way to achieve such direct contact would be to have the chairman of each national committee, or his alternate, participate in these meetings.

At this point I should like to say to the Members of this Council that, although their background may suit them for estimating the problems involved in a project like this, in the course of the past few months I have learned still more than they. I am so well versed in this subject, that if this project succeeds, as I am confident it will, it is of paramount importance that we establish machinery consistent with the complexities of the problem we face.

We cannot have a situation in which our personnel can only take practical action by formal decision of an international body such as this. The machinery of the project must not be dependent on one single body, but should be able to function on a freer basis. These are some of the arguments which I think are effective in urging an international committee to be established on a broad basis to co-ordinate policy for the entire project. I am sure if the Council were to take into consideration the heavy weight of obligations on the shoulders of the Secretary-General, it would realize why the Secretary-General is not too happy about assuming the responsibility of making policy decisions, on which the representative of Canada touched in part. It is not only desirable but also necessary that the Secretary-General have some body or agency besides him, a kind of international committee, for example, which can assist him in this important task, so that authoritative, purposeful, and stimulating decisions in matters of policy may be handed down.

As regards the subject of expenses, I would only say that, compared with the magnitude of the problem, the Council must agree that the administrative set-up which has been handling the project up till now hardly measures up to the difficulty of the problem. If the small staff here at headquarters is to be enabled to fulfil its arduous tasks, it will require initially the weight of authority and the advice of an international committee of the kind I have mentioned.

We come now to the question of timing. This question involves the problem posed by having a particular country proceed with such speed as to be far ahead of the other participating countries. We all appreciate the fine progress that New Zealand has made, and we all agree that speed is of the essence. I am sure that, in the discussion between the Secretariat and the representatives of New Zealand, a solution to the difficulty raised will be found, for there can be but one guiding consideration: to benefit the needy children as soon as possible.

On the other hand, this appeal has two purposes: first, to meet the needs of the children as soon as possible; secondly, and equally important, to meet these needs in such a way that we demonstrate the unity of action of people everywhere. It is not for the sake of unity alone that we must act together; it is also for the purpose of feeding the children, for by such unified action we can achieve far more than we could otherwise achieve.

If this project is to live up to its expectations, there are some indispensable principles to which it must adhere: It must be international. It must include everybody, both countries and people. It must be non-governmental. It must fall under a common title. It must be an effort under the aegis of the United Nations. It must have perfect timing. The question of timing applicable to all countries does not mean that every country will only act on one day. Certainly not. Here again it must be flexible, but it should be possible, within the limits of flexibility, to have one day fixed by the Secretary-General on which the collection may be made. This day would symbolize everywhere the unity of effort of this project. I think a solution can be found also for the problem which is presented by the necessity of taking action as soon as possible.

We all agree that it is an ambitious and difficult task we are undertaking, but I feel that this discussion has reflected the true spirit of give-and-take and of compromise which must precede the unity of effort

AC/EC

E/P.V. 89
74-75

of give-and-take and of compromise which must precede the unity of effort toward which we are all striving.

In conclusion, I should like to say that the wording in the document under discussion is not and cannot be final. The Secretary-General welcomes all offers of advice and all suggestions. We in the Secretariat hope that we shall be able to consult with every one of the representatives in this Council regarding their respective problems. We regret that we did not have time to speak with the Members of the Council before this matter came up before the Council, which was originally our intention. The Council moves fast, indeed, and we appreciate that speed. However, we shall be eager to follow up this subject after this meeting has adjourned.

The PRESIDENT: After this thorough discussion of the Report, in the course of which many useful proposals have been placed before the Council, it seems to me that there are two possible ways to dispose of the subject. One method would be to refer it to the Social Committee. However, the discussion has been very thorough and it does not seem to me that it is necessary to go through it again. I would therefore suggest that a small committee be appointed to prepare a draft resolution incorporating all these suggestions, so that the Secretariat may be able to consider them. I should like to know which of the two possible methods the Council would prefer to adopt.

The proposal to form a small committee was adopted.

The PRESIDENT: I suggest that the composition of the Committee be as follows: Canada, New Zealand, China, Czechoslovakia, and Chile.

The countries proposed by the President were appointed to the Committee.

The PRESIDENT: This Committee will consider all the suggestions and proposals that have been presented to this meeting this afternoon, and will present a draft resolution which will be discussed at the proper time.

Mr. SEN (India): I am most grateful to the Council for this agreement, but I should like to point out two more minor points. One is, that this Advisory Committee should have the power to co-opt Members, without vote, if this is agreed. There may be some people who have taken a keen interest, and whose contributions to our Advisory Committee would be extremely valuable, and I do not think it would be proper to exclude such people altogether. The Advisory Committee should have the power to co-opt Members, not exceeding five in number, at any particular time. My second suggestion occurred to me when going through the list of functions which this Committee has to perform. I think it should be left to the Committee to find out what its functions ought to be, because if we are going to discuss this point by point, it will take a good deal of time and probably no useful result would be obtained. I think it would be much better and much healthier to leave this to the Committee to decide.

The PRESIDENT: This suggestion will be taken into consideration, and I hope that all the Members of the Council, if they are asked, will help this small Committee in its drafting of the necessary resolution.

I do not think that we should change into a Social Committee at this hour, but before adjourning, I should like to give the Members an idea of our plans for the next two days.

PLAN OF WORK FOR THE NEXT THREE DAYS.

The PRESIDENT: We begin tomorrow morning with a discussion of item 17 -- the Report of the Second Session of the Economic and Employment Commission. Then we shall discuss item 19 -- the Progress Report of the Secretary-General on the financial needs of the devastated countries. After that, we shall discuss item 23 -- the Report of the Secretary-General on the reconstruction of Ethiopia and other devastated areas, and so on.

Finally, we shall discuss the final text of the resolution we have already adopted concerning the Report of the Fiscal Commission, which will be presented for final adoption by the Council.

Then, if we finish this in plenary session, we will turn first of all into the Social Committee and dispose of the questions that were referred to that Committee, or into the Economic Committee, and dispose of the questions that will be reported, or are reported, to the Economic Committee. When we finish the Report of the Economic and Employment Commission

there may be others. That will keep us occupied tomorrow and Thursday. We have to keep in our minds the question of whether we are technically able to discuss it because of the French text, but I hope that on Friday everybody will be ready to discuss the Report of the Economic Commission for Europe, or the Report of the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press. If possible, we shall discuss both. That will be the programme for the next three days.

Mr. MOROSOV (USSR) (Second interpretation;; original in Russian):

With reference to the statement of the President in which he suggested that the Report of the Economic Commission for Europe be examined this week by the Council, I feel there is no need to adopt such abnormal procedure, inasmuch as the Report of the Commission will be distributed or is being distributed at the present time. However, it is not known when this Report will reach the respective governments. Therefore, I feel it would be premature to undertake a discussion of this Report this week. I feel that it would be a more normal procedure to have this Report considered next week. I should like to hear the opinion of other Members of the Council on this point.

Mr. MCNEIL (United Kingdom): I want to embarrass neither my Soviet Union colleague nor the President. I do not want to embarrass representative of the Soviet Union the/if he has no instructions, and I want to take this opportunity to say that much less do I want to embarrass the President, because his handling of the Presidency has been precise, expeditious and fair; the expedition particularly attracts me.

However, if our Soviet Union colleague finds himself in an impossible position I would give way to him but I would say that he is making a very reasonable criticism of the Secretariat. I cannot understand why time and again here we find such a labourious and lengthy process in the issuing of documents. This document has been in preparation rather more than a week. My Soviet Union colleague does not have it and neither have I; it is somebody's business to push on with this.

However, when I have said that -- and I cannot say it irresponsibly -- I also suggest to my Soviet Union colleague that he is not quite in as bad a position as he suggests he is, because after all, the proceedings at Geneva were in public -- sometimes in much too much public -- and my

Soviet Union colleague was represented by one of his distinguished colleagues who took a leading part in all the discussions. The conclusions of the Commission in Geneva are quite straightforward and fall into three categories. I cannot believe that, with his ingenuity and his customary ease here, he is going to be in any difficulty in discussing the Commission's Report now or after he receives it.

I repeat that I do not want to embarrass him, but I think that since we have started so well, all of us ought to make a great effort to adhere to this very good time table which the President has laid down. I hope that my Soviet Union colleague perhaps will consider the matter over-night and tell us whether he will be able to follow the time-table that the President has asked us to adhere to. I should like that very much; my Government would also, and I expect most of us would, but I repeat that I will not be party to anything that embarrasses him or puts him in what he considers to be an unfair position.

For the first time, this Council is claiming the glory of being a quick-moving and a decisive body. Do not let us part easily with the reputation that we have gained so precariously.

Mr. THORP (United States): Is it at all possible for the Secretariat to complete the French translations of the items that were on the agenda today, items 11 and 12 on our original agenda, in time for us to discuss them on Friday? I think that those of us who had the English copies perhaps feel that there may be a process in which our knowledge as of the present time will diminish if we put it off too long and, therefore, it might be desirable if we could have those two items for discussion on Friday. It is entirely a matter of when the French translations can be completed.

The PRESIDENT: I am informed that both of these documents are rather long, and if other documents are to be translated and made ready for us, it is possible that only one of these documents will be completed.

Since there are objections to one of the items, perhaps we shall try to find from among the items listed on our agenda those which we can dispose of without any difficulty. I shall inform the Council tomorrow in that regard. I see no objection to having the Report of the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press discussed on Friday.

Mr. McNEIL (United Kingdom): I do not object to that at all. I hope, however, that perhaps my Soviet Union colleague will try to meet me in the way that I have offered to meet him, by agreeing that if we offer to take the other items, perhaps we may discuss the Report of the Economic Commission for Europe on Saturday. I hope very much that he will do that.

But may I draw the President's attention to another point, and I want to make it clear that I am not in any sense criticizing him. It is quite inexcusable that we have not the French translation of the document listed in item 11 of the agenda, the transfer to the United Nations of functions previously exercised by the League of Nations. I am told that document is dated 11 or 12 June. I am told further that that document in English has been in the possession of the delegations for at least ten days and possibly for fourteen days. I want to say very strongly that there is no excuse for the delay. Any commercial organization on this earth could have the whole of the authorized version of the Bible translated and circulated in fourteen days. Excuses are repeatedly presented. I do not want to be bad tempered about this, but it is inexcusable and I hope there is some one listening to me, who however much he may

EW/gpr

E/P.V.89
89-90

object to my language, will find time to discover why there are these repeated, interminable and unjustifiable delays.

The PRESIDENT: I hope that, after all the interventions concerning the texts, the Secretariat will treat the Council better than it has until now.

Mr. SEN (India): I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the United Kingdom representative, and also bring out the same point on instructions from my Government.

The distribution of documents has been extremely unsatisfactory. It seems to us that the Government of India does not get anything until the very last day before the opening of the session. The result is that we do not get instructions in time, and this haphazard selection of subjects at the last minute throws all our papers into confusion. All our alternates and advisers have to be in attendance doing nothing just on the off-chance that some of the subjects will be taken up. This is extremely unsatisfactory.

What is more, if this Council cannot act unless both French and English translations are out it is better that the Secretariat should not distribute English documents, because some people will be very eager to work and others will have to sit down and do nothing. It is better to hold the English distribution until the French translation is ready.

The PRESIDENT: May I suggest that the Committee on Rules of Procedure meet tomorrow afternoon at 2:45 p.m. The place of the meeting shall be announced tomorrow morning.

After this discussion, I can assume that there is agreement that tomorrow morning there will be a discussion of items 17, 19, 23 and the final text of the resolution pertaining to the Fiscal Commission. If there is some new development or a possibility of discussing other matters, we shall inform the Members of the Council.

The meeting rose at 5:45 p.m.