

**ECONOMIC  
AND  
SOCIAL COUNCIL**

**CONSEIL  
ECONOMIQUE  
ET SOCIAL**

RESTRICTED

E/CONF/POST/PC/W.10  
14 December 1946

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

## COMMITTEE OF GOVERNMENTAL POSTAL EXPERTS

## SUMMARY RECORD OF THE SIXTH MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York, on Friday,  
13 December 1946, at 3:00 p.m.

## Present:

Chairman:	Mr. D. J. Lidbury	(United Kingdom)
Vice-Chairman:	Mr. Jiminez	(Chile)
Rapporteur:	Mr. le Mouel	(France)
Universal Postal Union Observers:	Mr. Fulke Radice	(Vice-Director of the International Bureau)
	Mr. E. Zaldua	(Secretary of the International Bureau)
Secretariat:	Mr. B. Lukac	(Director of the Transport and Communications Division)

1. Statement by the Representative of Sweden Regarding the Composition of the Committee (Document E/CONF/POST/PC/W.7)

Referring to the list of representatives which had been distributed to the Committee, Mr. LAGER (SWEDEN) said that he would like to make a more detailed statement on a point already raised at the previous meeting by the representative of Canada.

In the telegram by which he had informed the Swedish Government that the present meeting would be held to discuss the relationship to be established between the United Nations and the UPU, the Secretary-General had referred to postal experts and had stressed the advantage of nominating experts qualified to discuss the administrative and organizational aspects of the question rather than the purely technical postal aspects.

Other Governments had presumably received a similar invitation.

/To fulfill

RECEIVED

DEC 16 1946

UNITED NATIONS  
ARCHIVES

To fulfill the conditions suggested by the Secretary-General, Mr. Lager felt that the persons nominated should have been, not only postal experts by profession, but also persons having wide experience of the administrative operation of the UPU.

Examination of the list of delegates showed however that of the thirty-eight countries represented, only fourteen or thirty-seven per cent had nominated postal experts. Compared with the total membership of the UPU, the percentage was only sixteen. If account were taken of the fact that to be considered as an international postal expert in the sense of the Secretary-General's invitation representatives should also have some practical experience of the administrative working of the UPU; only six representatives fulfilled the necessary conditions. Of those six, it should be noted that four were at the present time opposed to the establishment of relations between the UPU and the United Nations, or were in favour of the minimum of liaison.

Those six delegations comprised only sixteen per cent of the countries represented on the Committee, and seven per cent of the membership of the UPU - obviously too small a proportion to be representative of the Union.

Mr. Lager stressed the fact that he did not wish in any way to detract from the value of having, among the members of the Committee, the representatives of the twenty-four delegations which did not include postal experts. On the contrary, it was a great advantage for the postal experts to hear their statements on the Charter, on international law, and above all, on the true significance of any decision which might be taken by the UPU on the question of relationship, the duties which would be imposed upon it in regard to sanctions, and other political questions.

Nothing could be more useful than to have a full realization in advance of the consequences of any measures which might be taken.

/He merely

He merely wished to point out that the composition of the Committee did not correspond to the intention expressed in the Secretary-General's invitation, and that therefore any decision at which the Committee might arrive could not be considered as expressing the opinion of the UPU.

In conclusion, the representative of Sweden requested that his statement be included in the record of the meeting.

Mr. KROG (DENMARK) and Mr. HAUG (NORWAY) associated themselves with the remarks of the representative of Sweden.

Mr. van GOOR (NETHERLANDS) also associating himself with the previous speakers, said that, whereas the agenda had clearly shown that the conference was to be one of postal experts, the work had so far been of a political rather than a technical nature. Certain differences of opinion had to be expected, but up to the present the political rather than the postal point of view seemed to have prevailed. If the discussions were to continue in that manner, representatives would be obliged to inform their colleagues in Paris that political considerations were likely in the future to play an important part in the work of the UPU which had come under the guardianship of the United Nations. Mr. van Goor doubted whether either the United Nations or the Union would benefit from such a situation.

The United Nations should seek contact with the UPU with a view to making the best use of its technical experience and skill and not in order to destroy its autonomy.

Since the Union was, under the terms of its Convention, a postal territory rather than an association, it should not be considered on the same footing as other specialized agencies, such as the International Labour Office, which wielded greater authority.

In conclusion, the representative for the Netherlands suggested that the Committee should take account of the recommendation of the Temporary Transport and Communications Commission (Journal No. 18, page 251) to the

/effect

effect that, since the Universal Postal Union, as presently organized, appeared to function to the satisfaction of the postal administrations of the governments which belonged to it, only such alterations should be made in the existing machinery as may be necessary to bring it into a minimum relation with the United Nations.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that, though the invitation of the Secretary-General convened a body of experts, the delegations represented on the Committee had been designated by their Governments, whose choice could not be challenged by the Committee. Moreover, it was quite usual for delegations to the Postal Union Congress to be staffed by officials who were not postal experts but were drawn from the diplomatic sphere.

Undoubtedly, the majority of the Committee could not and would not attempt to coerce the minority into adopting a certain course of conduct at the forthcoming Congress meeting. None of the decisions of the Committee could be binding on the Congress which would itself decide what action to adopt with regard to any draft which might be presented to it. A draft prepared by the present Committee would have to be put forward as a substantive proposal to Congress, supported by any delegations which were willing to support it. Other delegations would be free to express their views at the Congress meeting.

The Chairman added that he had hoped that the Committee had been in agreement with the decisions so far made. The part of the draft which had been considered did not seem to be of a controversial or political nature, given the basic principle that the UPU should enter into relationship with the United Nations.

If any representatives were not prepared to support the draft which was finally decided upon by the Committee as a formal proposal, he hoped that they would discuss with their Governments the attitude which they were to take at the Congress meeting.

/With reference

With reference to the remarks of the representative of the Netherlands the Chairman pointed out, in conclusion, that he had himself quoted the same passage from the report of the Temporary Transport and Communications Commission at a previous meeting. In his opinion, the Committee had not, up to the present time, made more than the minimum changes necessary to bring the Postal Union into relation with the United Nations.

Mr. LAGER (SWEDEN) said that he had not wished to criticize the choice of representatives which Governments had made. The present meeting had, however, a special character. Unlike the invitations to Congress meetings, the invitation issued by the Secretary-General had expressed the desire that Governments would fall in with that request.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee would take note of the statements made by the representatives of Sweden, Norway, Denmark, and the Netherlands, which would be appropriately mentioned in the record.

2. Continuation of the Discussion of the Tentative Draft Agreements Prepared by the United Kingdom and French Delegations and by the Secretariat (Documents E/CONF/POST/PC/2/Add.1/Rev.1 and E/CONF/POST/PC/1

Article XI of the Franco-British Draft (Article XIII of the Secretariat Draft)

Paragraph 1

The CHAIRMAN explained that the Franco-British draft had adopted the text of the Secretariat draft except for the words "and to combine their efforts". It had been thought that the deletion of those words would impose less burden on the Universal Postal Union.

DECISION: Paragraph 1 was adopted without comment.

Paragraph 2

The texts of the two drafts were identical.

DECISION: Paragraph 2 was adopted without comment.

Paragraph 3

The Franco-British text had substituted the word "improvement" used in the Secretariat for the word "enforcement" in the original Franco-British  
/text.

text. It had also substituted the words "notwithstanding that the United Nations may concern itself" for the words "without prejudice to the right of the United Nations to concern itself" in the Secretariat draft, as it was considered wiser not to admit that the United Nations had such a right.

DECISION: Paragraph 3 was adopted without comment

Article XIII of the Franco-British Draft (Article XIV of the Secretariat Draft)

The Franco-British text had adopted the text of the Secretariat, with one modification. The words "in the interest of administrative and technical uniformity and" had been omitted, as administrative uniformity was not considered desirable.

DECISION: Article XII was adopted without comment.

Article XIII of the Franco-British Draft (Article XV of the Secretariat Draft)

The Franco-British text had retained only a modified form of paragraph 4 of the Secretariat text, which appeared to impose too heavy a burden on the Universal Postal Union.

DECISION: Article XIII was adopted without comment.

Article XIV of the Franco-British Draft (Article XVI of the Secretariat Draft)

The Franco-British text had adopted the second paragraph of the Secretariat text to maintain reciprocity in case the need for such studies should arise.

DECISION: Article XIV was adopted without comment.

Article XV of the Franco-British Draft (Article XVII of the Secretariat Draft)

Both original drafts had been the same, but the slight change in the revised Franco-British text had been considered advisable in order to ease the working of the machinery.

DECISION: Article XV was adopted without comment.

/Article XVI

Article XVI of the Franco-British Draft (Article XVIII of the Secretariat Draft)

Mr. BODY (AUSTRALIA) remarked that Article XVI and Article IX seemed to overlap.

Mr. TURNBULL (CANADA) suggested that in view of Article XVI, it might be possible to delete Article IX.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Drafting Committee should be instructed to look into the matter if Article XVI was adopted.

DECISION: Article XVI was adopted, subject to modification if necessary by the Drafting Committee.

Article XIX of the Secretariat Draft

The CHAIRMAN warned the Committee that this Article, although innocent in appearance, raised serious controversial issues. The International Bureau was a purely administrative body and had no authority to make arrangements in the name of the Universal Postal Union. He suggested that this paragraph should be deferred for consideration next week, as it might prove to be the most difficult paragraph in the agreement.

Mr. TURNBULL (CANADA) asked whether the Article was necessary, since the first paragraph of Article XVI provided for any action that might be necessary to make the agreement effective. If the Committee agreed that that was the case, there would be no need to defer it for discussion and it could be deleted immediately.

Mr. le MOVEL (FRANCE) supported the proposal of the Delegate for Canada that Article XIX should be deleted. It was stated in many Articles of the draft agreement under discussion that every effort would be made to achieve closer co-operation, but no mention was made as to who was to do that. It was not for the Committee to solve that problem now, however, so he would agree to the Article in question being deleted.

Mr. JIMINEZ (CHILE) supported the proposal of the Canadian Delegate.

/The CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN invited the views of the Secretariat upon the matter.

Mr. LUKAC (SECRETARIAT) stated that the Secretariat would not press the point. Article XIX had not been inserted with the idea of making any new arrangements but merely to provide technical and administrative channels to facilitate co-operation between the two organizations. When Articles XVI and IX are considered by the Drafting Committee, it might be possible to add a paragraph to the effect that the two organizations would take all necessary measures to render co-operation effective.

DECISION: Article XIX of the Secretariat Draft was deleted.

Article XVII of the Franco-British Draft (Article XX of the Secretariat Draft)

Mr. TOMLINSON (UNITED STATES) pointed out that the word "review" was used in the Franco-British text instead of "revision" in the Secretariat text.

The CHAIRMAN said that the word "revision" should be substituted for "review".

DECISION: Article XVII was adopted, as modified above.

Article XVIII of the Franco-British Draft (Article XXI of the Secretariat Draft)

The texts of the two articles were identical.

DECISION: Article XVIII was adopted without comment.

As the approval of non-controversial Articles was now finished, the Chairman invited the views of the Committee as to whether it should adjourn, or remain and examine Article II.

Sir Harold SHOEBERT (INDIA) was in favour of adjourning, as Article II represented grave problems which would be better discussed on Monday, when the Committee was more rested. Mr. PODESTA (ARGENTINA) preferred to proceed with the discussion.

The CHAIRMAN suggested a compromise. He had discussed the matter with the Vice-Chairman and the Rapporteur, and the latter would like to tell the meeting what was proposed and leave it to Members to consider during the week-end.

/Mr. le MOUËL



Mr. le MOVEL (FRANCE, RAPPORTEUR) explained that Article II stated the principle that applications for adhesions would be received by the Bureau and transmitted to the General Assembly for approval. Such close liaison between the Universal Postal Union and the United Nations seemed to him unsatisfactory, since it involved great delay when there was a need for rapid action. Under the present convention applications for adhesion were filed in the Bureau and the Swiss Government notified all countries. The Charter of United Nations provided for only one session of the General Assembly each year, which would mean considerable delay before applicants could be accepted. He had thought it wise, therefore, to find a compromise, which he submitted for consideration by Members. It must be borne in mind that adhesion to UPU and admission as a Member were two different things. Even if the independence of a country were not established, that country could, practically speaking, adhere to UPU and the population of the country would at once benefit by all international postal privileges. Membership, however, was different, in that a country took on certain duties and acquired certain rights. No harm would be done if applications for membership were delayed, so long as adhesion could be arranged without delay.

He proposed the following new paragraph to be inserted at the beginning of Article II:

"Adhesion to the Universal Postal Union will be governed by the provisions of the Universal Postal Union".

Paragraph 1 of the Secretariat draft would follow as paragraph 2.

Mr. BODY (AUSTRALIA) asked for an explanation of the difference between adhesion and membership.

The CHAIRMAN explained that any country could adhere to the Postal Convention, but Member countries were those listed on page 11 of the Convention and those appearing in Article VIII who had been given the

/right

right to attend the Congress by direct vote of Congress.

Mr. BRAMSON (POLAND) said that he had no objection to the amendment to Article II proposed by the Rapporteur.

Mr. MOURSI (EGYPT) did not accept the second paragraph, i.e. the first paragraph of the Secretariat draft.

Mr. EUSTACE (UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA) stated that if Article II were to go through, he would have to make reservations on behalf of his government, for he foresaw difficulties.

Discussion of Article II was adjourned until the next meeting.

The meeting rose at 5:00 p.m.

-----