

United Nations

**ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL**

Nations Unies

**CONSEIL
ECONOMIQUE
ET SOCIAL**

UNRESTRICTED

E/P.V. 65
11 March 1947
English

NOTE: Any corrections made under Rule 46 of the Rules of Procedure for the Economic and Social Council should be submitted in writing within twenty-four hours to Mr. E. Delavenay, Director, Editorial Division, Room CC-87 at Lake Success. Corrections cannot be accepted unless they are accompanied by or incorporated in, a covering letter on the notepaper of the delegation. The envelope containing the corrections should be marked "Urgent" and bear the appropriate document symbol number.

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE SIXTY-FIFTH MEETING OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL
(Fiftieth Meeting of the Fourth Session)

Lake Success, New York
Tuesday, 11 March 1947 at 2:45 pm

PRESENT:

Acting PRESIDENT: Mr. Papanek

Mr. Kaminsky	Byelorussian SSR
Mr. Davidson	Canada
Mr. Cisneros	Cuba
Mr. Radinsky	Czechoslovakia
Mr. Mendes-France	France
Mrs. Mehta	India
Mr. van Kleffens	Netherlands
Mr. Nash	New Zealand
Mr. Moe	Norway
Mr. Tarhan	Turkey
Mr. Morozov	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Mr. Mayhew	United Kingdom
Mr. Stolk	Venezuela

Acting PRESIDENT: The Council will come to order.

The President is detained, but he will be here within a few minutes. He has asked us to begin the session in order to accomplish something this afternoon.

MR. VAN KLEFFENS (Netherlands): Mr. President, as a social question, I trust you will allow me to announce that the Netherlands Government, in the same line of thought as that of the Government of India, and in the same line of precedence established by ourselves, are suggesting the name of a lady for membership of the proposed Sub-Committee on the Prevention of Discrimination and the Protection of Minorities.

REPORT OF THE SOCIAL COMMISSION (Continued)

Now with regard to the Report of the Social Commission, I should like to say that we quite agree with the representative of the United Kingdom with regard to the need of proper delimitation of the functions of the Council, the Social Commission, the Secretariat and the specialized agencies, both in the sense of giving each its due and in that of avoiding duplication and waste of energy and of money.

At the same time, I should like to say a word in defense of the Social Commission, upon whose activities several observations have been made, for it is, after all, the first time they have met, and I think it is understandable that on this first occasion they were anxious to cover the whole field of social affairs.

I should like to make two general remarks, Mr. President, with regard to the Report of the Social Commission. First of all, I should like to express my appreciation of the great amount of good work which was carried out by that Commission, this work being a real contribution to social improvement, especially in this post-war period and in countries heavily stricken by the war which are very much in need of this. In the opinion of the Social Commission, the United Nations should be more active in this field than the League of Nations was -- that is and my second remark --/I agree with that opinion. I welcome the various parts of the Report regarding the great activity of the United Nations Secretariat, for instance, in connection with the training of social welfare personnel and the protection of children and adolescents, in so far as that would not involve duplication of the work of other agencies.

On page 17 attention is drawn to the fact that ⁱⁿ the final resolution passed by the General Assembly on 10 November, the United Nations advisory social welfare goes beyond the scope of UNRRA activities, and we have to ^{deal} here with the

first experiment by the United Nations in rendering practical field service to the peoples of different nations. We hope this experiment will prove to be a success, and will be followed by others which on the one hand will add to the good will towards the United Nations and on the other hand to the increase of general social welfare.

(During the above remarks, Mr. Wu, representative of China; Mr. Fausta Soto, representative of Chile; Mr. Arca Parro, representative of Cuba; and Mr. Hakim, representative of Lebanon, arrived and assumed their seats at the Council table.)

MR. DAVIDSON (Canada): Mr. President, I should have been glad to have let this general discussion go by on the report of the Social Commission without participating in the debate were it not for two particular considerations: first of all, the fact that I myself was a member of the Social Commission and for that reason I feel that I have a measure of responsibility for what is contained in the report of the Social Commission; and secondly, and much more important in my opinion the fact that, as representative of the Canadian Government on this Council, I feel that it is my duty to emphasize the fact that we are regarding the responsibilities of this Council in the social field to be just as important as its responsibilities in the economic field. I feel that there is danger that we may lose sight of the fact that we are ^{an} Economic and Social Council and that equal weight should be attached to each of the aspects of our total programme as a body of the United Nations. I am a bit concerned by some of the indications that we do not all attach an equal degree of importance to the social questions as well as to the economic questions.

In the first place, to illustrate something of what I mean by this remark, in the early days of this session we agreed to the appointment of a committee of twelve to be set up as a social committee of this Council, and neither I myself, on behalf of my country, nor any of the other five or six who were left off that social committee raised any question about that because we felt that in due course we would come to the appointment of an economic committee, also composed of eleven or twelve members, and that we would be on that, and some of our colleagues in this Council chamber would not be on it; so everything would be fair, and equal importance would be attached to both aspects of our responsibilities. But, as the Members of this Council will recall, as soon as we discussed yesterday the question of the establishment of an economic committee, objections were raised to the suggestion that this too should be a committee of twelve members. Economic questions were considered by this Council to be so vitally important, so much

more important than social questions that this Council insisted that we should have a committee of the whole to discuss the report of the Economic and Employment Commission and the auxiliary economic questions which are tied up with that report.

I consider, Mr. President, that in your capacity as the representative of Czechoslovakia, you were quite right--as you are so often are--in your intervention on this point the other day. If the economic issues before this Council are important enough to warrant consideration by a committee of the whole Council, so also are the social issues. And I do not want it thought, for my part, that my Government, in accepting the fact that she was not acquainted to the social committee, was concurring in any suggestion that the social issues on the agenda of our session this time lack equal importance with the economic issues, both in respect of the concerns that occupy my country and in respect of the concerns that should occupy this Council itself.

The second point along a similar line that concerned me was the suggestion made this morning that we might dispense with a general debate on the report of the Social Commission and that we proceed to a section-by-section discussion of the various parts of the Social Commission's report. If the report of the Economic and Employment Commission justified two full days of debate in Plenary Session with participation by, I think, almost every Member of this Council, plus reference to a committee of the whole Council after that two days of debate, then surely we should insist on full plenary sessions of the Council on a full debate with full consideration of the broad problems in the social field which are the concern not only of the Social Commission and of the Council, but also the concern of all humanity throughout the world today.

That explains, Mr. President, the reason for my participation at this stage in the debate on the Social Commission's report. I am going to reserve my comments on points of detail to a later stage, when I expect that the report of the Social Commission will be referred to the Social Committee, at which eleven

Members of the Council will officially be privileged to participate and at which, on behalf of the Canadian Government, I will insist, if I may, on taking my place at that Committee table in order to present the views of Canada on the various points which come up for the Committee's consideration. That ruling was given by the President the other day and, I think, is generally accepted, that even the six or seven who are not on the committee have full right to participate in that Social Committee without, of course, the right to vote.

I do want to say, before concluding my remarks, one or two things about the report itself and a number of things that were said, particularly by the representative of the United Kingdom this morning.

The United Kingdom representative said, in what I thought was a very clear and concise statement, many things with which all of us would, I am sure, agree. He sounded in fact a note of hope to persons like myself who are much more wedded to the social than to the economic field, when he suggested, by implication at least, that the day might even come when economists would be an extinct kind of humanity. I was given new hope by that concept, and I have been given new encouragement in the session this afternoon by the fact that we have, giving support to the President, some of the staff of the Secretariat who are concerned primarily with the Division of Social Affairs and social questions rather than economic questions.

(During the above remarks, Mrs. Woodward representative of the United States arrived and assumed her seat at the Council table.)

I felt that the representative for the United Kingdom, in his remarks on the terms of reference of the Social Commission, was being realistic and practical. But I also could not help thinking back to the very broad, ^{and very ambitious} terms of reference that we agreed to give to the Economic and Employment Commission and its Sub-Committees. Again, I think it is a matter of emphasis that while we should all be in favor of a practical, realistic achievement in the work of the Social Commission, we should equally be conscious of the need for setting up long-range objectives in the Social Commission. We should not forget the horizons in the social welfare field, as well as the pathway before our feet; and we must, I feel, consider both aspects of that problem. I think these aspects can be resolved and reconciled. I think they can be resolved and reconciled by the establishment of terms of reference which will project in the future the course along which our Social Commission will have to travel; and by then establishing, as our Social Commission endeavors to do, a practical workable order of priority in the problems of the Council that the Commission itself would undertake to achieve in the near future.

Now, as I recall the meetings of the Social Commission, one of the first problems that they did undertake was the problem of priorities in items on their agenda. And it was generally the consensus of opinion that the question of priorities broke down into two main sections.

First of all, there was the transfer of certain activities from the League of Nations. There was the job of taking over from a body that had previously carried on certain functions that we were anxious not to let fall to the ground. It was recognized that high on the list of priorities, so far as the Social Commission was concerned, must be the transfer of those responsibilities, the assumption of them, and their incorporation into the work of the

United Nations, so that the work that had been carried on in a number of fields by the League of Nations would not fall to the ground.

The second list of subjects that were considered to be of great concern and high in the order of priority were certain emergency problems such as the taking over of certain UNRRA functions and the work connected with the establishment of the International Children's Emergency Fund, which is going to be on the Council agenda on Friday of this week. That was accorded a priority because we felt in the Social Commission that here were practical problems that concerned us today and in the course of the next few months ahead; that we must not neglect those and get off into alien and impractical discussions in regard to the broader objectives in our entire terms of reference. However, in considering that priority should be attached to those two groups of problems, we did not lose sight of the fact that there are broader, long-range considerations that we must take into account in maintaining our interest in and responsibility for the whole field of social advance and progress with which that Commission should be concerned. I wanted to make that remark, Mr. President, simply for the purpose of setting into the proper perspective, from our point of view, the reasons why we feel that it is a good thing that the Social Commission should have ambitious terms of reference, not narrow terms of reference.

It is a good thing that we should, of course, have within those ambitious terms of reference a sense of ^{will} practicability that / make it possible for us to do the things that we need to do in practical terms, while still keeping our eyes on the distances to which we hope we may aspire on some future occasion.

I am almost entirely in accord with what the United Kingdom representative had to say on the perhaps unfortunate wording of the Social Commission's report

in some respects. I think that the Social Commission clearly had no intention of taking unto itself the prerogatives of this Council or of higher bodies in presuming to instruct the Secretariat to do a lot of the things which the Report says it instructs them to do. I think a slight distinction may be made between two things there. One is a smaller type of job that the Secretariat is requested to do which, I think, involves merely a routine reference to the Secretariat. It is not important enough, in my opinion, to require reference up to the Council and down again in order to let the line of instructions clear. There is, however, a second type of assignment to the Secretariat which, I think, involves a recommendation to this Council before the Secretariat should undertake broader and more ambitious problems. And I think that if the Social Commission had not prepared its Draft Report in the last dying hours of its session, and had had time to give more careful attention to the niceties of drafting, it would undoubtedly have come to the conclusion that words like "requesting" the Secretariat to do the small jobs, and "recommending" to the Council that the Secretariat^{be} asked to do the larger jobs would have been the way in which the text would have been finally worked out.

Now, Mr. President, I want to say just one final word about one final aspect of this Report and I do so with a little diffidence. However, I feel obliged to do so because of the remarks which United Kingdom representative made this morning, with a certain degree of justice, in regard to the way this Report deals with the problems of the specialized agencies. I have checked privately, in the course of the last few days, with a number of the persons present and delegations here who are Members of or who participated in the Social Commission. I believe them to speak for themselves. I can only say for myself that I was surprised to find the Annex Report of the Secretariat on the Specialized Agencies actually included as part of the Report of the Social

Commission to the Economic and Social Council.

Now, I think ^{the} United Kingdom representative would agree that his qualms, the concern that he has about what the Social Commission said regarding its relationship with specialized agencies, are largely based on the document which is in the Annex rather than in the text itself. I tried to follow him this morning as he was discussing the Report and the Annex. The only point in the Report on this subject which I found him taking specific exception to was that on page 24, where the Commission sets forward three points, a, b, and c, as different practical methods of co-operation according to questions involved.

The third of these reads as follows: "Finally, in dealing with questions which do not fall within the scope of any specialized agency, the Commission should assume direct responsibility." I think he read into that a suggestion that the Commission should, as it were, freeze the functions of specialized agencies where they are today and take on its own shoulders directly the full responsibility for the development of any future programmes. I think, for my part--I can say on behalf of the Commission--that was farthest from the Commission's mind. The Commission, as I recall the discussion centering around that topic, was simply making the declaration that where specialized agencies were already operating in the field, we could generally leave to them the work which it is their proper responsibility to carry out; that we would have a right to say to them that, in our opinion, there are certain problems in their fields of responsibility which require attention and which, perhaps, have not been given sufficient attention at the present time. But in point c, where there is no specialized agency in the field, the Commission should have--and I think it should have--a much more direct responsibility for seeing that something is done to meet the problems that are not covered by those

specialized agencies.

Apart from that, Mr. President, I gather that the United Kingdom representative was concerned more with the implications in the Annex of the Report rather than with the Report itself. In that connection, I have gone over the summary record of the meeting and I am bound to say that neither the summary record nor my recollection of what went on at the meetings gives me any reason to think that it was in the Commission's mind to include this particular Annex as part of the Report.

I admit that in the Report itself you do find a line which suggests that the Commission adopted the Report. On page 24, after the Commission refers the Report to the Secretariat and sets forth these points, a, b, and c, that I have mentioned, there is this sentence: "The Commission adopted this Report and request the Secretariat to transmit it to the Economic and Social Council."

That may have happened in the last hours of the session. All that I can say is that I do not recall its happening. We were pressed for time. In the summary record which led up to this discussion, I recall nothing of that kind which would suggest that the Commission itself went on record as saying this Annex should be a part of the Report itself. On January 27th, in the afternoon, the Commission had its discussion of this, and while I do not want to take the Council's time by reading the full statement, it will be seen from that document that we discussed at that time two reports by the Secretariat on working relations with specialized agencies and non-governmental organizations.

We had a statement initially from the Rapporteur of the Commission, M. Hauck, the representative from France, which, I think, if the United Kingdom representative would take the trouble to read the summary record, he would find coincides very largely with his views, as he expressed this morning, on the relationship which should exist between the Social Commission and the specialized agencies.

If I may, Mr. President, I will read just a few words from this:

"Mr. Hauck drew the Commission's attention to working relations with specialized agencies (document E/CN.5/4), which traced the history of the question and described the manner in which, in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations, working relations had been established between the United Nations and ^{the} specialized agencies. He stressed the fact that in its collaboration with the specialized agencies the Commission was governed by agreements signed by the President of the

Economic and Social Council and the specialized agencies, and ratified by the General Assembly. The Commission welcomed the agreements, and fully recognized the fact that its work could not be conducted effectively without close cooperation with the specialized agencies, some of which had a long record of achievement. . . .

"With respect to practical methods of co-operation, Mr. Hauck quoted sections A, B, and C of the third paragraph of page 13, document E/CN.5/4." Those are points A, B, and C as they are contained in the Social Commission's Report.

"In the case of social questions which were the primary interest of any specialized agency. . .", and then he goes on and explains the significance of these three points, and wound up by declaring that the ". . . best basis for cooperation was goodwill and understanding on both sides, awareness of one's own limits. . .", and a few other words of homey philosophy. "The Commission and the Secretariat have no desire in any way to restrict the independence and the field of activity of the specialized agencies. Mr. Hauck expressed his assurance that co-operation between the Social Commission and the specialized agencies would proceed in a fraternal spirit."

At that point there were interventions by the representative at that Commission of the International Labour Organization, who expressed her pleasure at Mr. Hauck's remarks and said: ". . . the Social Commission could count upon her Organization to give full co-operation." That intervention was followed by an intervention from the representative of UNESCO, who agreed with the Secretariat's suggestions in document E/CN.5/4 with respect to cooperation and with Mr. Hauck's observations, and stressed again the importance of cooperation on a basis of equality between the Commission and the specialized agencies themselves.

That, Mr. President, is very largely the summary of the discussion that went on when this Report on specialized agencies was first considered. With the exception of an intervention of the United States representative, Mr. Altmeyer, who stressed the point that the Commission did not have control over specialized agencies and that the words "control", "directing", and "direction" should be left out of the original Secretariat Report, there was almost no further discussion of the Report on specialized agencies at that time. An understanding was given at that time that these words, "direction" and "control", and so on, would be removed from the Report and the Report would be amended.

The question came up again for discussion on the 30th day of January in the morning session -- the discussion and vote on the proposed resolution. It was agreed at this previous session, Mr. President, not to my recollection at all, that the Report would be adopted or annexed to the Report, but as the result of the very brief discussion on the document, a resolution would be prepared by the Rapporteur for inclusion in the Report of the Commission itself. That is the resolution which ultimately finds its place in this Report on page 24. When this resolution was later brought up for discussion on January 30th, there was again discussion of the terms of the resolution itself and discussion again of the words "control" and "direction" to establish clearly, I think, in the minds of all Members of the Commission, the fact that we were not setting ourselves up as a control over specialized agencies; we were setting ourselves up on the basis of our responsibility for co-ordinating the work of specialized agencies in certain areas where they have joint functions and responsibilities and in the other respects mentioned in points a, b, and c of this document. Finally, the resolution was agreed to.

At that point, the Chinese representative raised a question as to whether or not certain conclusions in the Report might be reproduced as a footnote. The statement given by the Rapporteur at that point was that the resolution should be kept short, and that it would be more convenient to add annexes to the Report of the Commission.

That was the statement by the Rapporteur, that it would be more convenient, but there is no record, that I can see, which would commit the Commission, apart from its own endorsement of this final document itself. There is no record of any discussion in which the Commission clearly expressed its desire to have the entire Report included as an annex to, and a part of, the Social Commission's Report.

I think, to make it perfectly clear, Mr. President, that in saying this I am not commenting on the merits of the Annex itself. I am simply trying to make the position clear, so far as the Social Commission is concerned.

I, for my part, still do not regard the Annex as being part of the Report. I regard the resolution which the Social Commission passed on its relations with specialized agencies as being the basis of the Social Commission's attitude towards specialized agencies. I consider that that was the only stand, the only action, which the Social Commission took with regard to specialized agencies themselves or with regard to this document that has now been annexed to the Report.

I think that covers everything, Mr. President, that I would like to say at this particular point, except to refer to one point to which I made reference in the debate on the Economic and Employment Commission. It will be noted that the Social Commission did not carry out at this last meeting the request of the Economic and Social Council to set up a sub-commission on child welfare. In my own view, one of the reasons why it did not do so, among others, was its

confusion, its lack of clear direction and precise instructions as to how it should proceed to establish a sub-commission, as to the formalities that it should go through, as to the kind of people it should select, as to the countries that it would be entitled to draw from, and so on. I merely mention this to point out that in this Report, as in other reports that we have considered and will still have to consider, we will find this question of sub-commissions coming up again and again. I do not think that question will be clarified. I do not think the Commissions will be able to get on with the work that is expected of them, operating through the sub-commission machinery, until such time as this Council lays down much clearer directions than it has to date on the way in which the sub-commissions should be set up on a uniform basis applicable to all nine Commissions themselves.

MR. ARCA. PARRO (Peru): Mr. President, I agree with most of the remarks and comments that have been made so far on this Report from the Social Commission, but I should like to confirm that, in spite of the opinions that have been expressed as to the importance of the social field in our work and, in some way, the thinking that we are over-emphasizing the economic aspects of our work, I should like to say that, according to the British and Canadian representative, in trying to emphasize the social field of the general scope of our Council, they have expressed hope in the possibility that economists before long will become an extinct specimen.

I would like to join in such hopeful thinking, provided that social problems will be so rightly solved that there will be no need for those experts, such as economists, to collaborate with the social workers in shaping new means of production and distribution as part of the general scheme for better standards of living. I should think that social workers will, for a long time, require the very humble collaboration of this, in some way, minimized importance of the economists.

I think it is the economic phenomenon itself that calls for the collaboration of those two groups of people, the economists and the social workers, or sociologists, whatever you want to call them. There is no use, I think, in over-emphasizing the importance of the work of either one, but it is right, I think, to call the attention of the Council to some of the resolutions that are recommended by our Commission as to some of the practical means of doing something to improve living conditions in different parts of the world. That is really the main concern of this Council. In one way or another we are fighting for it. That is why so often we find recommendations coming from different Commissions, advising this Council to recommend to do such-and-such kind of work, and as long as most of the speakers have commented

in a general way on the whole context of this important report, I should like to confine myself just to one of the aspects. I refer to: "Programme of Future Activities of the Secretariat." It is on Page 22, Chapter VI.

According to the Commission, this future work will deal mainly with the following points: Standard of living; social security in the various countries, including particularly family allowances, social insurance, social assistance and other specific measures to ensure a minimum family income.

"c. Care and rehabilitation of disabled and handicapped persons, with particular reference to war disabled." In fact, this seems to be a very ambitious plan which might cover a very large part of the work that will be entrusted to our Secretariat.

As one of the first steps in this ambitious plan that is presented to the Council, the Commission recommends a concrete resolution on the kind of work that could be done or should be done in what is called the under-developed countries and areas. The Commission resolution reads: ". . . instructs the Secretariat to study the problem of standards of living in under-developed countries and areas . . ." That is the first part of the resolution. I should like to comment on this.

If I am not mistaken, I think that the wording is erroneous, because it reads "to study the problems of standards of living". In my humble opinion, standards of living are not problems in themselves; standards of living are objective facts. Certain problems may arise as a consequential question out of a given standard of living. We know that a low standard of living might be a factor contributing to social problems in different ways. However, what is it that we recommend to be studied? It is not standards of living as a problem by itself. That is an objective question. We require certain types of factual information. That is not a problem. It would be a problem from the technical point of view if we did not have good statisticians to get such information. The next step, once we have established the standard of living as such, is a study of the social problems.

So, I move a formal proposal to amend this text in this way: "The Social Commission instructs the Secretariat to study the standards of living in under-developed countries and areas and the consequential problems." Why? Because, if we link those two elements, standard of living and under-developed countries or areas, it is implicit that the type of standard of living that you are going to find in those areas will be a low standard of living and we know the problems that arise from such conditions prevailing in a given country.

So, those are really two questions to be studied, standards of living, gathering factual information an objective study, and the consequential problems could be studied along different lines. We do not need to point out, to enumerate those problems. We believe that the Secretariat will gather qualified experts who will know what they have to do. That is my concrete recommendation on this paragraph.

The second part of the resolution, which is a consequence, I think, of this recommendation, reads: "Instructs the Secretariat . . . to draw up detailed suggestions as to the ways in which the Secretariat staff and experts on nutrition, public health, education, housing and social assistance employed by the specialized agencies and other organizations, could contribute to its solution." I really do not understand -- at least I do not agree with this wording.

I think the idea is to recommend that the Secretariat should have a group of experts along those different lines, nutrition, public health, education, housing and so on, experts employed by the different specialized agencies, who could contribute to its solution. Solution of what? I think we have to read this linked with the next paragraph, the third part of the resolution, which reads as follows: "The Commission suggests that the Secretariat should be prepared at the request of any United Nations Member, to assist in carrying out co-ordinated plans for rational or regional campaigns to raise the standard of living". That is another question. But what is the use of this group of experts? What are they going to study? What are they going to do? Are they going to do some field work? Are they going to attack a given problem, or are they just going to do theoretical work based on information that is to be gathered?

I think this part requires certain explanation from the Rapporteur, or one of the Members of the Commission, maybe, as to the scope of the kind of work that they expect, because the wording is really not quite clear. "Draw up suggestions as to the ways..." Well, how can they make suggestions if they do not actually do the field work? Such work, sometimes done hundreds and even thousands of miles away from the spot, where no factual information has been gathered, is really not worth the money that is spent. If such a thing is going to be done once more in the United Nations under the auspices of this Council or any of the specialized agencies, I do not think it is really worth doing.

If we really desire to promote research or investigation on the spot and have first-hand information out of which we may suggest something concrete, maybe these words will do. But the kind of work is being done by different parts of the University--I am not minimizing the effort and collaboration of the universities--but who understands and appreciates this kind of work? In this particular case we are confronted with something outside the academic field. We are supposed to show the rest of the world our concrete proposals. Are we going to be able to do that? Do we really mean to spend the money this year, or are we going to say that the budget of the United Nations is so short that we have even had to fire five hundred employees? We cannot do that. What is the use of this discussion? What is the use of gathering here twice a year just to approve a resolution that we are not going to enact? We could meet only once a year and save part of the money we are spending for sitting around here and talking so much, and provide a concrete programme for the Secretariat to work by and the ways and means to do it. ,

That is the point on which I want an explanation from the Secretariat,

as to how this resolution is going to work. What is the plan? If it is just for the sake of passing a new resolution on this problem, which is so similar to many that I find in different reports, I will not support it, but if the Secretariat can show me how they expect to develop it, I will be the first to support it. But I will have to stop speaking on this matter until an explanation is forthcoming from the Secretariat.

MR. NASH (New Zealand): Mr. President, there has been during the discussion some criticism of the Social Commission in that they have covered too wide a field. I do not think it is possible to cover too wide a field in connection with social matters. It is the social purpose in the end which brings into being the United Nations. The Security Council is there for achieving something to enable us to reach that social end. The economic section of this Council is a body set up to enable us to bring into being commodities and services and to exchange them, one with the other, for a social end. The social objective of this Council is to me the only purpose of the United Nations -- to enable us to live longer and more healthily than we would have done if there had not been a United Nations. That is the only reason, as I see it, that we require a Security Council, because some predatory people might stop us from achieving our end. That is why we require these economists. And it might be that there are some good economists -- it might be. But that does not alter the fact that we would not have been very far now if there had not been some good economists in the past.

But there is one note in general in the criticism by the United Kingdom representative, that there is quite a lot in the report that could be quietly and nicely and gently criticized. There are, however, other points in connection with it. It may be that there were some parts of the ground that they could ensure with more firmness rather than covering a greater area. I think that would have been justifiable, but there is no criticism in reality coming to the Social Commission in the width of their perspective. It is only a case of trying to put down what part of the perspective, as they saw it, should come out more openly and clearly.

I take it in reading this that the objectives are international, economic and social cooperation, and I am not saying it lightly when I say that all these rules, all the agencies -- the Security Council, the Trusteeship Council, the International Court of Justice, the FAO, and the ILO-- are all to achieve these ends and nothing else: ways and means of improving living standards so that the people of all countries can live together longer, more healthfully and more happily. There is no other purpose, as I see it, for all the agencies that have been set up in what we call the United Nations. And it is good to emphasize that these social needs are universal needs. They are not for the delightful living standards that you and I enjoy in this wonderful country called the United States. It does not mean that everybody has got to eat as much as they eat here -- they wouldn't live long in some countries if they did -- but I think, again looking at the United Nations, that our objective, outside the social factor that I have talked about, is a more equalized standard of living.

We cannot continue as united nations unless we do progress to a more equalized living standard throughout the world.

I was once privileged to attend another conference at which subjects were dealt with much more controversially, but then it was being debated -- I don't think it should have been the case, as it was a socialist conference -- that the first charge on all the wealth created shall be the care of the aged, because we wouldn't be where we are if it had not been for the older people who had built the foundations; the care of the young, because if you don't look after the young there is no future for the world, the care of the ailing, because that care is Christian, or religious, or spiritual, or whatever term you may use for all decent human acts; and care for all engaged in the production of essential items. That is the purpose of life. I cannot see any better or wider purpose.

If I could for one moment talk about the little country that I am privileged to represent here, I would say that we have tried to achieve that end in that country in what we call a social security system, and we don't think we can hold it ourselves unless it is put into operation in other countries too. We cannot hold high living standards at the expense of low standards.

In that part of the world, it is true to say that there is no fear of poverty. Not in any sense is there any fear of poverty in that country.

We are trying to extend it a little in that we have already reached agreement with Australia for reciprocal arrangements under which we will look after their nationals under our social security system so long as they look after our nationals if they go to Australia, under their social security system. And we are talking with our colleagues from the United Kingdom, Canada, and other parts of the world with regard to extending this reciprocity.

We will have some difficulty in connection with migration. But it is true to say, with some minor qualification, that whatever the nationality is of a person that comes into our country, he will qualify for all the benefits after a certain time, the same as everyone else. There is a period of twenty years in connection with age benefits. We had to have that because we thought all the old people of the world might come our way. We wanted some young people too. But I felt that this, just for the moment, ought to be said, that this is the objective of the whole United Nations.

Whilst I applaud what the representative from Byelorussia had to say with regard to this and the width of some of the subjects that they have not dealt with as well as they could, I am certain that the Commission, as such, was covering too wide a scope to get inside the recommendations for this Council to get some work done of the type that we want to have covered--a field that is tremendously helpful and useful.

There is one other thing that I would like to say. I am glad, Mr. President, to see another lady at the Council table, one who has done a remarkable job in the United States in connection with social affairs. I use this opportunity to say again--personally from New Zealand--welcome to our lady colleague from that great country called India.

That is all I had to say. I go back to the beginning to say that the report

cannot be too wide if we can get down to some work being done from it. There is no limit to the width of the social question because that is life itself. All other agents and specialized agencies are brought into being for the purpose of achieving what I call "the social end", enabling people to live long, healthy, happily, interestingly individual lives.

The PRESIDENT: Thank you.

(At this point Sir Ramaswami Mudaliar arrived and assumed his seat as President of the Economic and Social Council, replacing Mr. Papanek, the Acting President.)

(During the above remarks Mr. Stinebower, representative of the United States, arrived and replaced Mrs. Woodward; Mr. Phillips, representative of the United Kingdom, arrived and replaced Mr. Mayhew; Mr. Papanek, representative of Czechoslovakia, replaced Mr. Radinsky at the Council table.)

MR. PAPANEK (Czechoslovakia): Mr. President, the representative of Canada and New Zealand have already expressed the importance of the social work, and I agree fully with what they told us as to how they feel about it. However, I would like to add a few words as to how Czechoslovakia feels about the work of the Social Commission.

The Czechoslovak delegation considered the establishment of the Social Commission as of great importance. The needs for it are great, as can be seen from problems before us. Up to the present the economic side of human relations was emphasized with the result that social problems were seen only as a reflection of the economic. We must, however, look upon them as a factor in the determining of living standards. The economics must be co-ordinated with the social needs in order to eliminate the necessity for humanitarian private care of destitute people. This aim is clearly stated in the Charter of the United Nations. The work of the Social Commission can be defined as, first, to help where there is acute need for it, whether the needs are a result of war or not, but with emphasis on devastated areas and on occupied countries; second, to establish a long-range social programme or policy which will rank equally with economic policy.

The Czechoslovak delegation welcomes the Social Commission's report, concentrating on tasks whose purpose is to heal the wounds of war. The Report stresses rightly the organization of social services for the training of social workers, for taking over the social functions of UNRRA, to help children and adolescents, etc. Of all these problems, that of care for children is most urgent and important. They are the greatest and most innocent victims of the war. My country is doing here the utmost in alleviating the most terrible and critical situation in spending, for example, during this year, 1947, about five hundred million crowns just for the care of children.

In addition to these emergency problems there is another general, yet urgent one. It is true that our President this morning emphasized that we will discuss it under a special item. But I would like to mention it at least-- ^{is} that/ housing. Housing is not, in our view, primarily an economic problem, a question of investment, raw materials and profits. It is, in our view, primarily a social problem. We have to recognize the fact that people cannot work effectively and live as human beings if they are housed in homes that do not provide at least a certain necessary shelter. The housing problem and its solution is as important as that of food and clothing. It must be solved, and the sooner the better. It is well that the Social Commission tackles the problem first. The Social Commission has not as yet formulated the second part of its programme. Here the United Nations and the Social Commission can render especially great services in helping to understand the social measures already introduced in some countries, and in helping to implement them where they are unknown, yet needed. It is not always true that social progress follows economic development as a matter of course. Disparity between the two can cause deep social disturbances. In some countries social insurance, health accident and disability and old age, is functioning well. It would be desirable to have the Commission make a comparative study of such legislation, make the results accessible to countries where such institutions have not yet been introduced.

Our country is keen to apply experiences and methods used in other countries; for instance, under training of impaired workers in the field of industrial hygiene and safety measures in industry, mines, and agriculture. Results obtained could be, without great expenses, used by taking them over and co-ordinating them.

The Czechoslovak delegation welcomes the provision of the resolution for special advisory services in social work in States requesting such services, and where it is still needed now that the work of UNRRA has come to an end.

Czechoslovakia asked for several such advisors ^{for these services} in our country. I hope,

Mr. President, to be in complete agreement with this Council when I assume that the main task of this Council is to lay down the great lines of the social policy and to co-ordinate the activities of the specialized agencies, using their services in the best possible way. We have, however, to consider very carefully the work performed until now, and to see whether it would be desirable to introduce new trends and new points of approach. In this way we could contribute to the social progress by unifying and uniting the experiences of the past with the modern outlook. This would also facilitate the task of the Secretariat. Thank you.

The PRESIDENT: There are still three speakers on the general discussion. I propose to adjourn the discussion at this stage and to resume the discussion at the next sitting on Friday. I would like to present the Report of the Committee on Procedural Questions, E/321, dated 11 March 1947 which was placed on the table of the honourable representatives this morning.

This is the Report of the Committee which this Council appointed to consider the recommendation of the General Assembly in regard to the methods of procedure whereby any item of the agenda proposed by non-governmental organizations in Category {a) can be brought on the agenda of the Council. I had hoped to present it last week, but it has not been possible to do so, and I now present this Report for the consideration of the Council.

MR. MOROZOV (USSR) (Interpretation from Russian): Mr. President, I thought that in so far as changing the rules of procedure for the Economic and Social Council, we should limit the changes to the rights of the specialized agencies to include certain questions on the agenda, and also to include the rights which some non-governmental agencies would have. I thought that we start our job there, inasmuch as first of all the discussion of these rules of procedure was not included on the agenda, and that some of the rules of procedure have not been confirmed as yet by the Economic and Social Council.

I also thought that the provision which called for the creation of a committee for the agenda of the Economic and Social Council was not valid and there would be no necessity for creating such a committee, because whether the authors of this particular suggestion wanted it or not, it would be tantamount to substituting the committee for the Economic and Social Council. The Economic and Social Council is the only body which should have full rights to do whatever it pleases to its agenda. It can solve the agenda question by itself, and it should make any disposal as to the various proposals to go on the agenda itself.

Therefore, I would suggest that rules 13 and 14 which have been proposed and formulated here should not be approved, and only limit the discussion and changes of the rules of procedure by rules 9 and 10.

The PRESIDENT: Are there any other remarks on this Report? Or would the Council like to take it at a later stage?

MR. STINEBOWER (United States): Mr. President, I have no desire to force any Member to take action which he is not prepared to take today, but as I understand it, this is the final form of a document which was circulated to us some days ago, with the request that any Member of the Council who had any

amendments to send in, should send them in in writing. I assume, therefore, that we have had an opportunity to consider this document, and it would be one more item off our agenda if we could move on this afternoon. I would not want to push that over the objection of any Members who found themselves unfamiliar with it.

The PRESIDENT: I put it to the Council then that this Report may be adopted.

Those who are in favour of it please raise their hands.

(There was a show of hands.)

Those who are against it please raise their hands.

(There was a show of hands.)

The Report is adopted.

MR. MOROZOV (USSR) (Second interpretation; original in Russian):

Mr. President, I would like, now that formal obstacles have been moved aside, to raise the question which was to be placed on the agenda as a result of the activity of the World Federation of Trade Unions. I am informed that the representative of this Organization is to leave New York shortly, and I believe that the Economic and Social Council is very much interested in the question that he has raised.

Therefore, Mr. President, I formally move that this question be placed on the agenda, and that the date for the discussion of this question be set.

The PRESIDENT: It has been moved that the subject regarding trade unions and the paper which was circulated earlier to the Council at the instance of the WFTU be placed on the agenda. According to the rules of procedure just adopted, normally that would go before an Agenda Committee, but we have not yet elected an Agenda Committee, and this subject has been pending, at least in circulation before the Members of the Council, for some time.

In view of the fact that the Agenda Committee has not yet been elected, it is for the Council to decide whether that subject should be placed on the agenda of the Council, as an exceptional case in this instance. The proposal that has been made by the USSR representative is that that subject should be placed on the agenda of the Council. What happens to that subject when it is taken up for consideration is another matter. It is for the Council to decide. The proposal of the USSR representative that this should be placed on the agenda is for the Council to decide whether it should be accepted or not.

(During the above remarks Mr. Mendes-France, representative of France, was replaced by Mr. Boris at the Council table.)

MR. VAN KLEFFENS (Netherlands): Mr. President, I read in Rule 11 that before the Secretary-General places an item proposed by a specialized agency or a non-governmental organization of the type referred to in Rule 10 upon the provisional agenda, he shall conduct, through that agency or organization, such preliminary consultation as may be necessary. I do not want to create any difficulties with regard to this WFTU proposal, but I do not honestly think that we can treat a non-governmental organization, whichever one it is -- I am not speaking with regard to the WFTU at all at the moment, but any such organization -- more lightly than a specialized agency. I would therefore suggest that, first, the Secretary-General or his Deputy carry out such preliminary consultation with the WFTU on this point, as is provided by our Rules.

MR. PAPANÉK (Czechoslovakia): As this document has been distributed by the Secretary-General, there is a very strong presumption that the preliminaries were carried on between the Federation and the Secretariat. Because there was no precedent for it and there was no special procedure for it, we have to assume that it was the normal way to do it. Therefore, I support the proposal that it should be put on the agenda of the Council.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to make a statement at this stage. Rule 11 refers to consultation by the Secretary-General before he places an item on the provisional agenda. As a matter of fact, the Secretary-General and myself have had certain consultations with this Organization, but the matter was referred to us after the provisional agenda had been prepared. We tried to find out on what authority ^{of the WFTU} this subject was introduced by the Secretary-General, and we were satisfied that it was on the authority of an organ of the WFTU which was competent to propose this subject as an item of the agenda of the Economic and Social Council.

However, the stage at which the Secretary-General has to consult is the stage at which he prepares the provisional agenda. Therefore, that rule does not apply. The stage at which the matter has to be further considered is by the Agenda Committee, according to the new rule which we have adopted. I said, in the course of my preliminary remarks, that on this particular occasion the Agenda Committee has not yet been constituted and, therefore, if the Council unites as a special case because the Agenda Committee has not yet been constituted, it might bring the subject on to the agenda at this stage. This is an exceptional measure.

MR. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom): Mr. President, the strictly legal position on this, of course, as you yourself have said, is that the Agenda Committee has to be set up and the item has to be referred to the Agenda Committee. We are in a rather special circumstance in the sense that we have this proposal before us. In a sense, the WFTU got off before the pistol shot and they put this item in. Now, they gave notice of it some time ago, but they only put in there the word "considered". This is a long document containing a number of important proposals that need very careful consideration. That only came in a relatively short time ago, and any representative who might say that he had not taken cognizance of it because a new procedure had been arranged for dealing with it, would be standing strictly on his legal rights. I want to say that I do not propose to take that position. But I do take the position that it is an important document. It is a document that contains a lot of far-reaching proposals. My suggestion would be that it be admitted on the agenda as the last item on the agenda. I do not think that I could agree to its admission at an earlier stage on the agenda, because of the far-reaching proposals in it which I am sure the representatives will want to take full cognizance of and give careful consideration to between

now and the end of the agenda.

MR. VAN KLEFFENS (Netherlands). Mr. President, I only want to say that since some preliminary consultation has taken place, which I regard as absolutely necessary, whatever the rules are, in order to establish beyond any doubt the authenticity of an application of any organization of this type, I am perfectly satisfied. I shall vote for admitting it on the agenda. I would propose that we leave the time when we shall deal with it to you, Mr. President, taking into account all the relevant elements, including the convenience of the representative of the WFTU.

MR. KAMINSKY (Byelorussian SSR) (Interpretation from Russian): Mr. President, in connection with the discussion of this question, it seems to me that the tendency has arisen among some of the Members of the Council to the effect that the creation of a Committee for the agenda of the Social and Economic Council limits, to a certain extent, the activity of the Council in so far as resolving the questions which should be placed on its agenda.

I believe that this interpretation is not correct. The Committee for the agenda is simply the working organ of the Council. The Council has full freedom to take its decision in regard to the agenda. Therefore, the formal listing of the Committee for the agenda would not preclude the Council/ at the present time /from putting any item on the agenda which it would want to include.

Therefore, Mr. President, I most strongly support the proposal which has been tabled by the representative of the USSR to include this item on the agenda now.

MR. BOPIS (France) (Interpretation from French): I agree with the stand taken by the representative of the United Kingdom when he stated that we should know all the facts of the question. I do consider that inasmuch as the representative of the World Federation of Trade Unions has informed us that he is to leave New York before the end of the Session and we should want to hear all the facts pertaining to the question, we should set an early date to hear the debate.

MR. NASH (New Zealand): Mr. President, there is one point ^{yet} in connection with the rules that has not/been mentioned; that is, the provision in Rule 67 that if one Member of the Council objects, the procedure proposed cannot be carried out.

The PRESIDENT: I will now take the vote of the Council. If one Member objects, we shall decide what happens after the objection is raised.

The question is whether the draft resolution proposed by the WFTU shall be placed on the agenda of this Session.

Those who are in favour of it will please raise their hands.

MR. NASH (New Zealand): Mr. President, haven't you got to first suspend your rules? It says here, "A rule may be suspended." You cannot vote until you have suspended the rules to enable us to vote.

The PRESIDENT: It says, "The notice may be waived if no Member objects." So far, I have received no objection from any Member.

MR. NASH (New Zealand): The point of that, Mr. President, is the rule of procedure may be suspended. You are deciding to suspend the rule of procedure that the Agenda Committee shall consider this. That, I take it, sir, in ordinary procedure, is the motion; that the rules providing for the Agenda Committee to consider all items going on the agenda shall be suspended.

The PRESIDENT: Yes.

MR. NASH (New Zealand): That is the motion.

The PRESIDENT: The first question I have to put is whether any Member objects to the rule of procedure being suspended, notwithstanding the fact that twenty-four hours notice has not been given.

Does any Member object on the ground that twenty-four hours notice has not been given?

MR. NASH (New Zealand): I submit to your ruling, Mr. President. I also submit that only the / acceptance of your ruling can possibly allow this to be done because it is a defiance of the rules of the Council. The rules of the Council say that a rule may be suspended. Then the job, if you want to suspend the rule, is to move that that rule shall be suspended.

The PRESIDENT: That is the next proposition that I am going to put.

MR. NASH (New Zealand): That the rule be suspended?

The PRESIDENT: Yes. No objection having been taken on account of lack of twenty-four hours notice, the next proposal is that the rule of procedure relating to the Agenda Committee considering this matter may be suspended.

Those who are in favour of suspending that rule will please raise their hands. (There was a show of hands.)

Those who are in favour of that rule being suspended will please raise their hands. (There was a show of hands.)

Those against suspending the rule.

A small number have voted for suspension of the rule and a still smaller number against. Therefore, the suspension of the rule is adopted.

MR. NASH (New Zealand): Mr. President, I submit that is entirely wrong in accord with the rules of this Council. The first motion to be put is that the rule be suspended and if one person votes against that, the rule cannot be suspended.

The PRESIDENT: What is the rule that the honourable representative from New Zealand is quoting?

MR. NASH (New Zealand): Number 67, Mr. President:

"A rule or procedure may be suspended provided that twenty-four hours notice of the proposal for the suspension has been given."

That provides how it can be. But if the notice is then given for it to be suspended for immediate attachment or immediate operation, then the vote has to be taken; and one Member can stop the suspension without twenty-four hours notice. After twenty-four hours notice, the majority decides.

The PRESIDENT: That is so.

MR. NASH (New Zealand): We then have to move that that rule which bars this motion being taken shall be suspended. I submit that is the first motion.

MR. MOROZOV (USSR) (Interpretation from Russian): Mr. President, it seems to me that such a simple question which has been raised here in the Council is being complicated and there is no foundation for these complications.

It seems to me that Rule 11 -- which has been so amply quoted here -- has no connection whatever with the case we are discussing at the present time. Rule 11 deals simply with the provisional agenda which is to be drawn up prior to the work of the Economic and Social Council. I submit that the agenda of the Economic and Social Council has not only been accepted but half of it has already been resolved and dealt with. In addition to this, I feel that the Committee on the Agenda is only to consider such questions as would appear on the agenda of the Economic and Social Council at its next Session. Therefore, in this case, Rule 11 is not applicable.

In no sense whatever does the application of any rule of procedure concern us at the present time in this case. Rule 11 is simply speaking of a new agenda; whereas here, we are speaking of the inclusion of the question raised by the World Federation of Trade Unions.

Therefore, I submit, Mr. President, that we could end this discussion and simply include the question which has been raised by the World Federation of Trade Unions into our agenda. I believe that by artificially complicating our discussion, we are not following out the resolution of the General Assembly which permits the non-governmental organizations to place items on the agenda.

The PRESIDENT: I do not want the Council to be tied up in these matters. Therefore, I should like to adjourn the consideration of this question at this stage.

Tomorrow the Economic Committee of the Council as a whole will meet, and all the economic items--the Report of the Economic and Employment Commission, the relevant parts of the Trade and Employment Conference Report, and the Report of the Transport Commission--will be taken up. At 2:45p.m. tomorrow the Narcotics Commission will also meet. The Social Committee will consider the Narcotics Commission's Report.

The meeting of the Council is adjourned.

(The meeting adjourned at 5:33 p.m.)