

DRAFTING SUB-COMMITTEE ON DEVASTATED AREAS

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FIRST MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York, Friday 27 September, at 10:30 a.m.

Present:

Chairman: Mr. Stampar

Mr. Vandeputte	(Belgium)
Mr. Mackintosh	(Canada)
Mr. Chang	(China)
H.E. Dr. Papanek	(Czechoslovakia)
Mr. Baumgartner	(France)
H.E. Mr. Argyropoulos	(Greece)
Mr. Kirpalani	(India)
Mr. Parro	(Peru)
Mr. Medved	(Ukrainian SSR)
Mr. Penson	(United Kingdom)
Mr. Feonov	(Soviet Union)
Mr. Winant	(United States)
Mr. Stinebower	(United States)
Mr. Krasovec	(Yugoslavia)
Mr. Aglion	(Secretariat)

Order of the Committee's Work

The CHAIRMAN reminded the Sub-Committee that on the following Monday it would have to submit to the Council a Draft Resolution on the Reconstruction of devastated areas. In order to facilitate discussion of the matter he read the sub-commission's terms of reference as set forth in the Council's resolution of 21 June (document E/66/Rev.2).

He announced that draft resolutions proposed by various delegations had been distributed, and proposed that the Sub-Committee should divide the sub-commission's recommendations into the following groups: (1) urgent problems in the reconstruction of devastated areas, (2) long-term programmes for the reconstruction of devastated areas, (3) establishment of an Economic Commission for Europe. He felt that the drafting committee should

make its decisions now concerning the problems and questions involved.

Procedure Regarding Drafting

Mr. FEONOV (SOVIET UNION) restated his delegation's view that the Council should confine itself to the problem of extending concrete aid to devastated areas and leave long-term policies and the establishment of an Economic Commission for Europe for separate discussion. In view of the fact that the sub-commission, by concentrating on long-term projects, had not fulfilled its duties as set forth in the resolution of the General Assembly of the previous February as well as in the Council's resolution of 21 June (document E/66/Rev.2), the Soviet delegation was submitting a proposal to request the sub-commission to consider new recommendations.

Mr. PENSON (UNITED KINGDOM) pointed out the broad principles on which the sub-commission's terms of reference had been laid down (document E/66/Rev.2 paragraphs 2 and 3) and stated that his Government approved the report as answering the requirements. The United Kingdom preferred to follow the method of the sub-commission in making recommendations on many subjects. Mr. Penson felt that the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union were pursuing the same objectives and differed only in their approach to the problem. He supported the Chairman's classification of the questions as a basis for drafting resolutions.

Mr. STINEBOWER (UNITED STATES) agreed with the general purpose of the Soviet Union resolution on the understanding that it provided for only one part of the work. Recalling that the Report had been a preliminary one, he proposed that the Sub-Committee should request the sub-commission to prepare a new and more specific report concerning the financial requirements and material needs of the devastated areas. He pointed out, that in order to achieve good results, the governments concerned should co-operate with the sub-commission by supplying full information and permitting field trips to their countries.

Mr. PARRO (PERU) stated in reference to Mr. Stinebower's qualified support of the Soviet Union proposal that the Peruvian delegation would also support the proposal if the United States representative would define the

other measures which he desired the Council to consider, especially with regard to some important functions of UNRRA which would not come under the terms of reference of IRO.

Mr. KRASOVEC (YUGOSLAVIA) said that although he had not been against the discussion of broad principles, the Report had shown in its neglect of urgent problems the danger of discussing long-term programmes. After having lost three months, the Sub-Committee should act cautiously and swiftly, concentrating on the most important questions; he therefore agreed with the Soviet Union and United States proposals.

Mr. ARGYROPOULOS (GREECE) expressed his Government's satisfaction with the Report. While the Soviet Union draft resolution would cause new delays by remitting questions submitted to the Sub-Committee to the fourth session of the Council, the United Kingdom proposal advocated the transmission of the Report to the General Assembly and the taking of immediate steps to enact the recommendations of the Report. He felt that the United Kingdom draft resolution would form a good working basis, and proposed that the Sub-Committee, after having discussed the United Kingdom document together with possible amendments, as well as the Chinese amendment, should pass the Report and the Resolution to the General Assembly, so that the latter might take further steps toward the solution of the problem.

Mr. FEONOV (SOVIET UNION), in reference to Mr. Parro's speech, stated that the Soviet delegation had not brought up the question of certain UNRRA functions because it had intended to include that matter in a separate resolution. Answering Mr. Argyropoulos' objections to the Soviet Union proposal, he pointed out that the United Kingdom draft resolution would cause even more delay since it was concerned with long-term projects. He criticized the United Kingdom draft on the basis of procedure, and as for the substance of the resolution, it would later be met by strong opposition from the Soviet Union. He would not object if the Secretary-General composed and transmitted to the General Assembly a résumé of the facts assembled by the sub-commission, but could not agree that the Council should accept the recommendations.

Mr. VANDEPUTTE (BELGIUM) proposed, in order to meet both the short-term and the long-term problems, that the Committee should (1) recommend in the first part of its resolution to the Assembly the creation of a new organization to continue the work of UNRRA in Europe and elsewhere, as suggested in the United Kingdom draft resolution (document E/173 part 4), (2) include in the second part of its resolution the sub-commission's recommendation for the establishment of an Economic Commission for Europe to solve the specifically European problem of industrial reconstruction. To obtain a shorter and more readily agreed on text, he suggested that the Committee should dispense with the secondary resolutions of the sub-commission and United Kingdom drafts which could be included in the terms of reference of the Economic Commission for Europe once the latter had been set up.

The CHAIRMAN requested the members of the Committee to limit themselves to the practical question of drafting since most of the views had already been expressed at the meeting of the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BAUMGARTNER (FRANCE) said that from a technical point of view it would be an error to distinguish between the long-term and short-term problems. He agreed with Mr. Feonov that urgent problems should be provided for, and that for many economic questions international action was needed. He warned the Sub-Committee that preliminary and final reports usually duplicated each other and yielded similar results. It was inevitable that the report should have been disappointing in certain respects. The Committee should find a method of procedure and study it.

Mr. KIRPALANI (INDIA) endorsed the United States attitude toward the Soviet Union proposal and supported the United Kingdom and Chinese draft resolutions. The matters referred to in parts 2, 3 and 4 of the United Kingdom draft needed immediate attention. He proposed that the Sub-Committee should use the United Kingdom draft resolution as a working paper, since it gave an adequate summary of the sub-commission's recommendations.

Mr. PAPANEK (CZECHOSLOVAKIA) favoured the immediate solution of urgent problems. He saw no difference between the United Kingdom and Soviet Union

proposals except for their methods of procedure. Since it was too late to make specific proposals for aid to devastated areas, he proposed that organizations functioning at present should continue with their work while the sub-commission, in conjunction with other organizations, would prepare a specific resolution for the next session of the Council. Furthermore, before adjourning, the Council should emphasize the necessity of meeting as soon as possible after session of the General Assembly. In this manner long discussions could be avoided while the problem would be solved before the termination of UNRRA.

Mr. AGLION (SECRETARIAT) stated that the Secretariat could complete a study of the needs of devastated areas on the basis of available material before the opening of the General Assembly.

Mr. WINANT (UNITED STATES) explained that if an Economic Commission for Europe were established, it would attain the objective of the Soviet Union in solving urgent problems.

In view of the help that his country had extended in the past to various relief organizations, he thought it regrettable that a member of the Council should have questioned the motives of the United States in helping devastated areas. Quoting passages from his statement of 25 September, Mr. Winant said that his government favoured the Economic Commission for Europe as the most effective means of putting into effect the Council's Resolution of 21 June.

Mr. PENSON (UNITED KINGDOM) proposed that the Committee should first examine the United Kingdom draft, select from it certain resolutions dealing with short-term problems, then examine those dealing with long-term problems, after that, discuss the Economic Commission for Europe, and finally take up the Chinese proposal. He believed that with such procedure there would be ample opportunity for discussion and amendments.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the delegates who had presented the United Kingdom, the Chinese and the Soviet Union proposals should seek an agreement on the most important issues.

Mr. FEONOV (SOVIET UNION) supported the Chairman's proposal.

The Chairman's proposal was accepted.

The meeting rose at 12:30 p.m.