

Ninth session

Item 43

RELATIONS WITH INTER-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

Report of the Co-ordination Committee

The Co-ordination Committee, under the Chairmanship of Mr. J. Plimsoll (Australia), considered Item 43 at its 38th, 39th, 40th, 43rd, 45th and 46th meetings on 23 and 25 July and 4, 6 and 8 August 1949.^{1/}

The Committee had before it the following documents:

Report of the Secretary-General on Relations with inter-governmental Organizations (E/1318 and E/1318/Add.1)

List of inter-governmental Organizations (E/818/Rev.1)

The Committee makes the following recommendations in regard to the 72 inter-governmental organizations listed,^{2/} the respective draft resolutions being annexed hereto:

Possible Termination, Absorption, or Integration:

(12) International Chemistry Office.

(11) International Bureau for Technical Training.

Possible Absorption or Integration to be re-examined later:

(Into United Nations)

(8) Central Bureau, International One Million Map of the World.^{3/}

(37) International Penal and Penitentiary Commission.

^{1/} E/AC.24/SR.38, 39, 40, 43, 45 and 46.

^{2/} For convenience of reference, the same reference numerals in document E/1318 have been placed before the title of each organization.

^{3/} Resolution recommended separately in E/1449, and adopted by the Council on 27 July 1949 (E/1467 - Resolution B).

AUG 30 1949

UNITED NATIONS
ARCHIVES

/(Into ILO)

(Into ILO)

- (57) International Co-ordination Committee for European
Migratory Movements.

(Into future ILO)

- (47) International Customs Tariffs Bureau.

(Into UNESCO)

- (16) International Union for the Protection of the Rights of
Authors and their Literary and Artistic Works.

Establishment of relationships

(By FAO)

- (15) International Institute of Refrigeration.

Development of relationships which have already been established.

(With FAO)

- (3) International Office of Epizootics.

(With UNESCO)

- (9) International Bureau of Education.

Approval of relationships without further action and no change in
status of organization.

(With United Nations)

- (26) Central Commission for the Navigation of the Rhine.^{1/}
(64) Caribbean Commission.^{2/}
(68) South Pacific Commission.^{3/}

(With FAO)

- (2) International Commission of Agricultural Industries.
(4) Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux.
(14) International Council for the Exploration of the Sea.
(18) Permanent International Bureau of Analytical Chemistry of
Human and Animal Foods.
(56) International Wine Office.

(With the appropriate Specialized Agencies)

- (10) International Bureau of Weights and Measures.

Action Postponed until Reports are received from the Secretary-General.

- (13) International Commission for the Scientific Exploration

^{1/} "with the Economic Commission for Europe"

^{2/} "with the appropriate bodies of the United Nations and specialized
agencies"

^{3/} "with the appropriate bodies of the United Nations"

of the Mediterranean Sea.

- (62) International Relief Union.
- (21) Central International Railway Transport Office.
- (22) International Commission of the Cape Spartel Light.
- (23) International Conference for Promoting Technical Uniformity in Railways.
- (24) International Hydrographic Bureau.
- (27) European Conference on Time-Tables.
- (49) International Union for the Protection of Industrial Property.
- (50) International Cotton Advisory Committee.
- (51) International Rubber Study Group.
- (52) International Sugar Council.
- (53) International Tin Study Group.
- (54) Combined Tin Committee.
- (55) International Wheat Council.
- (57) International Wool Study Group.
- (31) Permanent Committee of International Congress on Military Medicine and Pharmacy.

No Action at Present

- (17) International Union for the Protection of Nature.
- (46) Bank for International Settlements.
- (48) International Exhibition Bureau.
- (61) International Central Office for the Control of the Liquor Traffic in Africa.

Discussions to be held with the Organization of American States

- (5) Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences.
- (19) Inter-American Indian Institute.
- (20) Pan-American Institute of Geography and History.
- (28) Office of Inter-American Telecommunications.
- (29) Pan-American Railway Committee.
- (30) Permanent American Aeronautical Commission.
- (32) Pan-American Sanitary Bureau.
- (33) Central Pan-American Bureau of Eugenics and Homiculture.
- (41) Inter-American Juridical Committee.
- (59) Inter-American Trademark Bureau.
- (63) American International Institute for the Protection of Childhood.
- (also) Nutrition Institute of Central America and Panama.

/To be deleted

To be deleted from the List.^{1/}

- (1) International Office of Whaling Statistics.
- (6) International Fisheries Commission.
- (7) International Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission.
- (25) International Ice Observation and Ice Patrol Service in the North Atlantic Ocean.
- (34) Far Eastern Commission.
- (35) International Criminal Police Commission.
- (36) International Institute for the Unification of Private Law.
- (38) United Nations War Crimes Commission.
- (40) Inter-American Commission for Territorial Administration.
- (39) Committee of Experts on the Codification of International Law.
- (42) Permanent Committee of Jurists on the Unification of the Civil and Commercial Laws of America.
- (43) Permanent Committee of Havana on the Comparative Legislation and the Unification of Law.
- (44) Permanent Committee of Montevideo on the Codification of Private International Law.
- (45) Permanent Committee of Rio de Janeiro on the Codification of Public International Law.
- (58) Inter-American Coffee Board.
- (60) Inter-Allied Reparation Agency.
- (65) Commissioner-General's Economic Organization (for South East Asia).
- (66) Inter-American Commission of Women.

To be added to the List.^{1/}

- International Whaling Commission.
- Indo-Pacific Fisheries Council.
- International Committee for Colorado Beetle Control.
- Nutrition Institute of Central America and Panama.

^{1/} List of Inter-governmental Organizations (E/818/Rev.1), prepared in response to Council resolution 128 (VI), and containing names of organizations in the economic, social and related fields which have been established by inter-governmental agreement.

DRAFT RESOLUTIONS

Resolution 1

The Economic and Social Council

Recommends Member Governments, which are also members of the International Chemistry Office, to take steps within that body to bring about its dissolution and transfer its assets and functions if appropriate to other organizations;

Recommends Member Governments, which are also members of the International Bureau for Technical Training, to take steps within that body to bring about its dissolution and transfer its assets and functions to the International Labour Organisation; and

Requests the Secretary-General to render whatever assistance may be appropriate in connection with the foregoing recommendations.

Resolution 2

The Economic and Social Council

Having Considered the Resolution passed by the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission on the relations with the United Nations adopted August 3, 1949,

Continues to Believe that the purposes of the IPCC as set forth in Article 1 of its Constitutional Regulations can be carried out within the United Nations while fully safeguarding the expert and professional character of the work undertaken in this field;

Requests the Secretary-General to enter into consultation with the I.P.P.C. with a view to submitting to an early session of the Council a plan for the eventual integration within the United Nations of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission, taking into account the principles set forth in Section II of the above-mentioned resolution of the I.P.P.C. and the views expressed at the Ninth Session of the Council; and

Invites member governments of the United Nations or of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission to transmit to the Secretary-General by 31 December 1949 any comments they may wish to make on this subject.

Resolution 3

Resolution 3

The Economic and Social Council

Noting that discussions have been initiated on the possible absorption or integration of the International Co-ordination Committee for European Migratory Movements into the International Labour Organisation; and

Noting that discussions have been initiated on the possible absorption or integration of the International Customs Tariffs Bureau into the future International Trade Organization;

Requests the Secretary-General to report in due course to the Council on the progress of the foregoing discussions.

Resolution 4

The Economic and Social Council

Requests the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization to consult with the International Union for the Protection of the Rights of Authors and their Literary and Artistic Works on the question of the future relationship of the two bodies, and to include in its next report to the Council an account of the results of such consultations; and further

Requests the Secretary-General to submit a report on the matter to the eleventh session of the Council.

Resolution 5

The Economic and Social Council

Recommends that working relationships be established by the Food and Agriculture Organization with the International Institute of Refrigeration;

Requests the Secretary-General to render whatever assistance may be appropriate.

Resolution 6

The Economic and Social Council

Notes the understanding reached by the Food and Agriculture Organization with the International Office of Epizootics and approves the establishment of such relationships between them; and

Requests the Food and Agriculture Organization to examine the possibilities of establishing closer collaboration in this field and to include in its next report to the Council an account of the co-operation achieved.

Resolution 7

Resolution 7

The Economic and Social Council

Notes with approval the relationship established by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization with the International Bureau of Education, and

Requests the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization to include in its next report to the Council an account of the co-operation achieved.

Resolution 8

The Economic and Social Council

Notes with approval that relationships have been established by the Economic Commission for Europe with the Central Commission for the Navigation of the Rhine;

Notes with approval that relationships have been established by the appropriate bodies of the United Nations and the specialized agencies with the Caribbean Commission;

Notes with approval that relationships are being established by the appropriate bodies of the United Nations with the South Pacific Commission.

Resolution 9

The Economic and Social Council

Notes with approval that relationships have been established by the Food and Agriculture Organization with the following Organizations;

International Commission of Agricultural Industries,
Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux,
International Council for the Exploration of the Sea,
Permanent International Bureau of Analytical Chemistry
of Human and Animal Foods,
International Wine Office.

Resolution 10

The Economic and Social Council

Considers it is not appropriate at the present time to take any steps towards the termination, absorption or integration of the Inter-National Bureau of Weights and Measures into the United Nations or a specialized agency; and

/Notes with

Notes with approval the establishment of working relations by the appropriate specialized agencies with that body.

Resolution 11

The Economic and Social Council

Having Noted the fact that a meeting will be held in September 1949 to consider the establishment of a Council for the Mediterranean Sea and Contiguous Waters,

Considers that no decision can be taken, at the present time, on the possible termination, absorption or integration of the International Commission for the Scientific Exploration of the Mediterranean Sea into another body, and

Requests the Secretary-General to report on the matter to the next session of the Council.

Resolution 12

The Economic and Social Council

Having Noted the letter from the President of the International Red Cross Committee to the Secretary-General dated 3 August 1949 (E/AC.24/7),

Decides to defer consideration in regard to the International Relief Union until the next session of the Council; and

Requests the Secretary-General to study the question and to report to the next session of the Council.

Resolution 13

The Economic and Social Council

Decides to make no recommendations at the present time on the possible termination, absorption or integration into another body of the following organizations:

Central International Railway Transport Office,

International Commission of the Cape Spartel Light,

International Conference for Promoting Technical Uniformity in Railways,

International Hydrographic Bureau,

European Conference on Time-Tables,

International Union for the Protection of Industrial Property,

International Cotton Advisory Committee,

International Rubber Study Group,

/International Sugar

International Sugar Council,
International Tin Study Group,
Combined Tin Committee,
International Wheat Council,
International Wool Study Group; and

Requests the Secretary-General to submit a report on any new developments regarding these organizations to a later session of the Council.

Resolution 14

The Economic and Social Council

Decides to take no action at present in regard to the Permanent Committee of International Congress of Military Medicine and Pharmacy; and

Requests the Secretary-General to submit a report to the eleventh session of the Council on the possibility and desirability of closer relations and integration between that body, the World Health Organization and other international bodies.

Resolution 15

The Economic and Social Council

Considers that no action at the present time is required regarding the possible termination, absorption or integration of, or the possible establishment of relationships with, the following organizations;

International Union for the Protection of Nature,
Bank for International Settlements,
International Exhibition Bureau,
International Central Office for the Control of the Liquor Traffic in Africa.

Resolution 16

The Economic and Social Council

Requests the Secretary-General to undertake discussions with the Director-General of the Organization of American States on the future status of the following bodies, including possible relationships with the United Nations or a specialized agency, and to report on the results of these discussions to the next session of the Council;

Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences,

/Inter-American Indian

Inter-American Indian Institute,
Pan-American Institute of Geography and History,
Office of Inter-American Telecommunications,
Pan-American Railway Committee,
Permanent American Aeronautical Commission,
Pan-American Sanitary Bureau,
Central Pan-American Bureau of Eugenics and Homiculture,
Inter-American Juridical Committee,
Inter-American Trademark Bureau,
American International Institute for the Protection
of Childhood
Nutrition Institute of Central America and Panama.

Resolution 17

The Economic and Social Council

Requests the Secretary-General to submit periodically to the Council the List of Inter-governmental Organizations (E/818/Rev.1) as revised from time to time;

Directs that the following organizations be deleted from that List:

International Office of Whaling Statistics,
International Fisheries Commission,
International Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission,
International Ice Observation and Ice Patrol Service in the
North Atlantic Ocean,
Far Eastern Commission,
International Criminal Police Commission,
International Institute for the Unification of Private Law,
United Nations War Crimes Commission,
Inter-American Commission for Territorial Administration,
Committee of Experts on the Codification of International Law,
Permanent Committee of Jurists on the Unification of the
Civil and Commercial Laws of America,
Permanent Committee of Havana on the Comparative
Legislation and the Unification of Law,
Permanent Committee of Montevideo on the Codification of
Private International Law,

Permanent

Permanent Committee of Rio de Janeiro on the
Codification of Public International Law,
Inter-American Coffee Board,
Inter-Allied Reparation Agency,
Commissioner-General's Economic Organization (for
South East Asia),
Inter-American Commission of Women; and that the
following organizations be added to that list:

International Whaling Commission,
Indo-Pacific Fisheries Council,
International Committee for Colorado Beetle Control,
Nutrition Institute of Central America and Panama.

ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCILCONSEIL
ECONOMIQUE
ET SOCIALE/AC.7/SR.47
27 July 1948

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Dual Distribution for Council Members

SEVENTH SESSION

SOCIAL COMMITTEE

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FORTY-SEVENTH MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 27 July 1948 at 10.00 a.m.

| | | |
|--|-----------|--|
| <u>Present:</u> | CHAIRMAN: | Mr. KAMINSKY (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) |
| Australia | | Mr. JOCKEL |
| Brazil | | Mr. GUERREIRO |
| Canada | | Dr. DAVIDSON |
| Chile | | Mr. MAQUEIRA |
| China | | Mr. CHA |
| Denmark | | Mr. DICH |
| France | | Mr. KAYSER |
| Lebanon | | Mr. HELOU |
| Netherlands | | Mr. van HEUVEN |
| New Zealand | | Mr. SUTCH |
| Poland | | Mr. ALTMAN |
| Turkey | | Mr. TARHAN |
| Union of Soviet Socialist Republics | | Mr. KULAGENKOV |
| United Kingdom | | Mr. RUNDALL |
| United States | | Mr. STINEBOWER |
| Venezuela | | Mr. PEREZ PEROZO |

N.B. Will delegates who wish to have corrections made to the Summary Record please submit such corrections in writing to the Secretariat, Room C-436, within 24 hours of distribution of the Summary Record.

Also present:

Representatives of Specialized Agencies:

International Labour Organization Mr. METALL
World Health Organization Mr. HOWELL

Representatives of Inter-governmental organizations:

Preparatory Commission of the
International Refugee Organization Miss BAYERSTOCK

Consultants from Non-governmental organizations:

World Federation of
Trade Unions Miss SPIEGEL

International Federation
of Christian Trade Unions Mr. VANISTENDAEL

Secretariat:

Mr. LAUGIER Assistant Secretary-
General for Social Affairs

Sir RAPHAEL CILENTO Director, Social Activities
Division

Mr. MESSING-MIERZEJEWSKI Secretary of Committee

The CHAIRMAN welcomed the Chairman and the Rapporteur of the Social Commission and invited the Rapporteur to take his place at the Committee table.

DISCUSSION ON THE REPORT OF THE THIRD SESSION OF THE SOCIAL COMMISSION (Item 15 on the Council Agenda) (Document E/779)

The Rapporteur of the Social Commission took his place at the Committee table.

The RAPPORTEUR of the Social Commission stated that the Report of the Social Commission submitted to the members of the Council differed from Reports submitted at the preceding sessions in its greater length. The Commission felt that the work of the Council would be expedited if the main trends of the Commission's discussions were outlined in the Report; that would also put representatives in a better position to judge of the intrinsic value of the decisions taken and recommendations made.

There was a second factor which would promote efficient discussion; the President of the Council had addressed a letter to the Chairman of the Commission, expressing the desire that draft texts of any resolutions which the Commission might propose for adoption by the Council be included in the Report. Such drafts would be found in the body of the Report and in annex II (Document E/779).

There had unfortunately been considerable delay in distributing Summary records of the meetings, which had much impeded the work of the Commission (see Document E/779, page 3).

On the other hand the work of the Commission had been greatly furthered by the preparatory work carried out by the Commission's Advisory Committee on Planning and Co-ordination. At the sixth session of the Economic and Social

Council some doubt had been expressed as to the usefulness and advisability of setting up such a Committee. The majority of the members of the Commission had however expressed the view that the Committee had fully justified its establishment; and many of its recommendations had been adopted. The Commission had not succeeded in completing its agenda at its second session. That unsatisfactory situation would have recurred at the third session had it not been for the work done by the Planning Committee and its analysis of the Commission's programme of work.

Since the Commission's work was not purely technical, but covered various fields of activity, the organization of its work was not easy; nevertheless, the purely organizational phase could now be considered ended. It was generally felt, therefore, that the Advisory Committee should not be perpetuated as such. An agenda committee had been set up in its stead, consisting of seven members who would meet in 1949 for not more than five working days shortly before the next session of the Commission. That Committee would have to study the draft agenda of the fourth Session and advise the Commission thereon. The Commission was well aware that both from the organizational and budgetary points of view the number of Committees and Sub-Commissions should be limited to the greatest possible extent, and that the establishment of such a body as the Agenda Committee must therefore be based on sound grounds. In the present instance the experience of the previous three sessions of the Commissions suggested that such a step would be fully justified, particularly in view of the current rule, introduced in the

interests of economy, that the Commission should sit only once a year. It was obvious that preparations for that single session must be as thorough as they could be made.

Although it was universally recognised that in current circumstances economy was highly desirable, the Commission wished again to raise with the Council the question of the frequency of the Commission's meetings. The field of competency of the Commission was so wide and important that it hardly seemed desirable that discussion of all the subjects involved should be compressed into one single annual session. He asked whether it were logical that the Commission, as an advisory body of the Council, should meet less frequently than the Council itself. The Commission shared the conviction that the Council had a very important task to fulfil in the social field; it was therefore hardly right that the Council should be deprived of a report on the Commission at one of its two annual sessions. If the Commission were in a position to hold two regular sessions at least each year it would be the better able to promote and improve the handling of social matters.

There was the further consideration that were the Commission authorised to meet twice a year, the sessions could be made shorter than the Third Session, and the increase in cost would be relatively small, particularly in view of the advantages which might be expected to accrue from the adoption of such a procedure.

The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to examine the documents before it and to make suggestions as to methods of work. He asked the Secretary to describe the documents.

Mr. MESSING (Secretary), after reading a list of the documents submitted to the Committee, assured representatives that the Secretariat would give every possible assistance where documents were concerned.

Mr. SUTCH (New Zealand) suggested that the best method of work would be for the Committee to consider the resolutions one by one, rather than to hold a general discussion on them. When it had examined the Resolutions, the Committee could proceed to examine those sections of the Report which embodied no resolutions. He believed that that procedure would shorten the Committee's work.

Mr. DAVIDSON (Canada) supported the suggestion made by the representative of New Zealand and suggested further that consideration of the Resolution on Migration should be deferred to a later stage, in view of the fact that the Commission on Population had also drafted a resolution on the same subject.

The CHAIRMAN accepted the procedure proposed by the representative of New Zealand and Canada.

RESOLUTION I: PROGRAMME RESULTING FROM RESOLUTION 58 (I)
OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY (DOCUMENT E/779 ANNEX II PAGE 41)

Mr. van HEUVEN (Netherlands) said that General Assembly Resolution 58 (I) envisaged very important activities in the social field, and that its implementation would mean the promotion of social progress and higher standards of living. The Commission recommended the continuation of the advisory social welfare services; that recommendation raised the question of finance, and the recommendation that efforts be made to secure increased financial participation on the part of recipient Governments was welcome. It would be

desirable for countries to be able to contribute up to fifty per cent of the expense involved. But countries in difficult economic positions might be unable to meet that expenditure if it were too high. He felt therefore that, with a view to the implementation of the programme, the present arrangements should be maintained, but that the Secretary-General should endeavour to secure increased financial participation from Governments.

Mr. DICH (Denmark) said that his delegation considered the advisory social welfare services to be a useful branch of the social activities of the United Nations and deserving of the Council's interest. In order to ensure the best possible results, while yet giving due weight to the financial aspect of the matter, he would make the following proposals.

He did not believe that the present arrangement, by which countries were able to choose the country of destination of their nationals holding United Nations fellowships, was wholly satisfactory. It was not certain that every country had complete knowledge of the best foreign possibilities for the study of various social problems. He believed that a better method would be to authorise the Secretariat or a special Committee to make a study to determine which countries were most suitable in that regard and to establish priority between them. Such a Committee would naturally take into account the wishes expressed by the country sending out fellows, but it should be empowered to propose and, if necessary, take a firm decision on, which country or countries might be chosen as fields of study in the social sphere.

If his point of view met with support within the Committee, he would possibly later propose an appropriate amendment.

With regard to the financial aspect, he did not propose to examine the question from the point of view of the most economical application of the funds of United Nations. His main reason for stressing the matter was that, as was well known, cheapness and waste went together. Countries would make better use of the fellowships or the consultant services if they had to pay more for them. Furthermore, it would only be possible to keep requests within reasonable limits if the recipient countries had to make a reasonable contribution towards expenses. He believed, however, that the differences in the financial situations of various countries must be taken into consideration, and that wealthier countries should be asked to contribute more than poorer ones.

Measures should be taken to cut down travelling expenses; and countries should be encouraged to apply for services, and especially for consultants, from countries which were not too remote geographically.

It would be advisable for the Resolution to include a directive to the Secretary-General upon the principle of scaling subsidies. He asked in any case that that point be incorporated in the records.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States) said that the United States Delegation had followed with great interest the discussion on the advisory social welfare services, and had carefully studied the Resolution submitted to the Council by the Social Commission in its report and discussed in the Secretary-General's paper (Document E/828). The United States Delegation was prepared to support the continuation of the advisory social welfare services in 1949. The Report of the Social Commission established the need for the

continuation of the services and indicated that the programme rendered great assistance to Governments; it formed indeed one of the most important activities of the United Nations in the social field. The advisory social welfare services represented an important means by which the United Nations provided services to underdeveloped areas, as requested by the Council. In accordance with the same Resolution of the Council, special emphasis had been laid in the programme on child welfare. Consultants provided to Governments had also rendered assistance in making the studies of social welfare administration requested by the Council in its Resolution 43 (IV).

The United States Delegation believed that, thanks to the extensive study of that programme undertaken by the Social Commission, it was unnecessary for the Council to study in detail the Commission's recommendations concerning the nature of the services and methods of administration. The United States Delegation accepted the Social Commission's recommendations on those points. The use of United Nations funds for that purpose was not only fully justified, but necessary, since it provided an important means of promoting social reconstruction in devastated areas and social advancement in under-developed areas. No other agency provided services in that field.

His Delegation noted with satisfaction the substantial financial participation of receiving countries. It was important to note however that that participation did not in fact represent any substantial reduction in the basic costs of the programme. Such economies in the use of United Nations funds as could be effected in that manner should be applied for meeting outstanding requests for

services, especially requests from countries that had not previously received assistance but which stood in need of them.

The United States Government was prepared to support the adoption of the Resolution submitted by the Social Commission and was willing to play its part in helping to carry the services forward for another year. It was prepared to support the programme for 1949 on the same financial basis as was adopted in 1948 - that was, \$670,186. He would therefore propose the deletion of the words "at least" in paragraph (e) of Resolution I, and that the figure in the financial estimate be rounded off at \$675,000 (Document E/779/Add.1).

Mr. DAVIDSON(Canada) commended the quality of the Report presented by the Social Commission and believed that it augured well for the future progress of the Commission. The work of the Commission, however, would only be effective if it could hold two sessions a year.

With regard to the Resolution, the Canadian Government viewed the programme with sympathy, believed that its continuation in 1949 was justified, and was prepared to contribute to the cost. He considered that the administrative policies and procedures were reasonably satisfactory, and that the programme could be continued on the same lines as in the past. He himself had had experience with the candidates sent to Canada and considered them to have been well selected and capable of taking full advantage of the opportunities given them for observation and the gathering of information. He had, however, certain reservations to make with regard to the last two sections of the resolution - (d) and (e). Progress had been made towards the achievement

of the aims set out in (d) but, as the representative of the United States had noted, the participation of the recipient governments constituted only a paper contribution. Any extension of the programme was therefore impossible, and he would recommend that every means be sought to make the programme self-supporting. He therefore proposed that the words "and intensify" be inserted after the words: "That the Secretary-General continue..." in section (d).

With regard to (e) he wished to indicate that the Canadian Government did not think it desirable that a definite sum, as proposed by the representative of the United States, should be indicated for appropriation by the General Assembly. He believed the time had come when the appropriation should be reduced, and while no such reduction as would cripple the programme should be made, a token reduction was worth considering. Countries should take an increasingly greater share in the financing of their programmes.

Disagreeing with the statement of the United States' representative that there were no other agencies working in that field, he referred to specialised agencies and non-governmental organizations in his own country and in the United Kingdom with programmes of fellowships, consultant services and seminars. The problem for the United Nations was one of co-ordination; he believed that in future the Secretariat would have to act as a clearing house for governments, specialized agencies, and non-governmental organizations in programmes of that kind. While, in due course, the financial participation of the United Nations would become minimal, the Secretariat should make a maximum contribution in the role of a clearing house. Some financial support was certainly justified and while he thought

a figure of \$500,000 might appropriately be submitted to the General Assembly, he did not wish definitely to specify a figure at that juncture. He therefore moved the deletion of paragraph (e) in Resolution I.

Mr. KULAGENKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) expressed the opinion that the documents before the Committee did not describe in sufficient detail the extent of the work done. He questioned the use of United Nations funds for the services described in the resolution. A great deal had been heard about the necessity for economy, as for instance at the preceding day's session on the question of narcotics.

The Soviet Union delegation was doubtful as to the wisdom of continuing consultant services, in view of the fact that those functions were of a temporary character; indeed Resolution 58 of the General Assembly, relative to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration had stressed both the urgency and the temporary character of such services. The necessity for them arose from the effects of the war, and assistance had been directed to devastated countries in need of help in various fields of social reconstruction. He had the impression that consultants were provided not only for devastated and backward countries, but for any country which wanted them. Thus the programme had been expanded beyond its original framework. At present, when the devastated countries were rapidly improving their economic systems and had already been given assistance, the Soviet delegation was of the opinion that the question of the financing of the consultant services by the United Nations should be re-examined. It feared that it was a case of unwise expenditure. If the current programme were retained, expenditure should devolve upon the

governments requesting assistance.

In view of the need for economy, the Soviet Union delegation believed that the consultant services should be abandoned. He would therefore move the following amendments to Resolution I:

1. In the first paragraph, sub-paragraph (a), delete the word "fiscal".

2. Insert a new sub-paragraph to read as follows:

"That the Secretary-General should furnish all Members of the United Nations with a full report on the definite work of the advisers in various countries from 1946 to the present time so that the Social Commission may at its Fourth Session study this report and any comments thereon which may have been received from the Governments of Members of the United Nations."

3. Substitute for the first paragraph, sub-paragraphs (d) and (e), a new sub-paragraph worded as follows:

"That the Secretary-General be guided in 1949 by the principle that all expenditure for the advisory services should be charged to the account of the governments of countries requesting such advisory services."

Mr. RUNTALL (United Kingdom) stated that he would not again put forward the proposals with regard to the financial participation made by the United Kingdom at the last session, which had then been rejected. He emphasised however that the United Kingdom delegation laid great store by the increased financial participation of the receiving countries. He endorsed the conception put forward by the representative of Canada of a self-supporting scheme, and was glad to note from

the Secretary-General's report that the participation of governments had increased. Endorsing the Canadian amendment, he himself moved the following amendment to section (d): insert the words "and should report from time to time to the Council on the success of his efforts" after the word "Governments".

With regard to the question of co-ordination, the Secretary-General's Committee on Co-ordination had set up a working party to examine the fellowships programmes of the United Nations and the Specialized agencies. He suggested that the Social Committee consider drawing the attention of the Committee on Co-ordination to that item.

Mr. KAYSER (France) supported the resolution as a whole and made the following observations on the proposals made during the discussion.

Some of the Danish representative's proposals should be accepted and even if not made the subject of formal resolutions, the Secretary-General should give them his attention since a number of delegations had approved them. For example the Commission should indicate the countries most suited to receive or to furnish advisory welfare services and to send Fellows. The Danish representative's suggestions concerning the financial aspect of the question were also interesting because of the regional connection which might exist between those furnishing the services and those receiving them. On that point his delegation wished to see an equitable sharing out of the services from the threefold point of view of the nationality of the consultants sent, of the nationality of the Fellows, nominated and of the recipient countries.

As far as the financial aspect of the question was concerned his delegation thought it desirable that the

recipient countries should share in the expenses. Their effort, however, should not result in a reduction of that of the United Nations but should permit its extension. They should in fact avoid discouraging economically weak countries, and inducing them not to ask for the help of the United Nations.

He pointed out a certain contradiction between two of the U.S.S.R. amendments, the one which requested the Committee to take immediate decisions and the one which requested the Secretary-General to submit a full report on the work of the consultants so that the Social Commission might deliberate upon it. Such a report might be useful but if that suggestion were taken up no important decision would have to be taken until the report had been submitted to the Commission.

Mr. CHA (China) supported the Social Commission's recommendations to the Economic and Social Council. With reference to the question of finance he did not feel that the figure given in document E/828, namely \$670,186, was a large figure. Far more money had been spent on one day of war. During the first World War one major country had spent \$20,000 a minute which amounted to \$28,800,000 per day for each major country. During the second World War the daily expenditure in a major country had been seven times greater, amounting to \$201,600,000 per day; in another major country the expenditure had been five times greater, amounting to \$144,000,000 per day. Meanwhile the figure proposed for the consultant services was \$670,186 per year, which was a very small figure in comparison.

Referring to paragraph (c), he thought that the words "at least equal" did not constitute a good precedent.

The Chinese delegation supported the resolution as submitted by the Social Commission together with the Canadian amendment to paragraph (d).

Mr. GUERREIRO (Brazil) thought that the Advisory Social Welfare Services constituted a useful form of activity and a valuable propaganda medium for the United Nations. They were of particular benefit to under-developed countries and war-devastated areas. It was essential that they should be continued in the following year, and if possible given a permanent character; consequently means should be provided for their continuance and, if practicable expansion. Other budget items should be reduced before any economies were made in that respect.

Nevertheless, recipient governments should make increasingly large contributions, according to their powers, to the operation of the services, although the main financial responsibility should continue to rest with the United Nations.

The Brazilian delegation supported the resolution in its present form.

Mr. HELOU (Lebanon) supported the draft resolution of the Social Commission and would if need be agree to the amendment proposed to sub-paragraph (d) the effect of which would be to request that the Secretary-General continue and intensify his efforts to bring about increased financial participation on the part of recipient Governments.

The co-operation which had been initiated in that field had proved very useful and very efficacious and even its secondary aspects were not negligible.

Concern about financial aspects which had been expressed during the debate was fully justified. Certain economies, however, might prove to be ruinous and the total elimination of the financial participation of the United Nations in the advisory social welfare services would be against the United Nations spirit of co-operation. The

considerable reduction in the participation of the United Nations was worthy of consideration, but not immediately, as a certain length of time would have to elapse before economies could be usefully effected.

His delegation had no difficulty in accepting the United States amendment to sub-paragraph (e), especially as other delegates had proposed much more sweeping economies than the United States representative.

Mr. KULAGENKOV (U.S.S.R), replying to the French representative's charge that the two amendments presented by himself were mutually contradictory, stated that it would be entirely natural for the Secretary-General to submit to members a full account of the work of consultants so that such work might be studied by the Social Commission at its next session. It was clear that the work mentioned should be subjected to periodical evaluation. No such assessment had been attempted up to the present, and it would be well if that task were confided to the next session of the Social Commission.

The CHAIRMAN, speaking as the Byelorussian representative, thought that there should be no reluctance to consider the question of economy in the United Nations budget, in so far as that was affected by the expenditure on Social Welfare Services.

Whilst \$670,000 did not represent a large sum, any increase of that amount might tempt certain recipient governments to relax their own efforts in regard to social services within their territories.

In citing large figures for wartime expenditure, the Chinese representative had indicated, wittingly or unwittingly, the road which national governments should

follow, that is to say, they should strive to consolidate and extend their own social welfare services. Whilst that had been the aim of the Soviet Union Government, the same development had not been evident in a large number of countries, which had, if anything, increased their military expenditure. Whilst preserving the advisory functions of United Nations, they should not countenance the continued depletion of funds in favour of individual national budgets. The United Nations should assist the various governments, but in making the best possible efforts according to their own capacities, those governments would be adopting the most direct, the boldest and the most realistic solution.

He supported the amendments submitted by the Soviet Union representative.

Mr. PEREZ PEROZO (Venezuela) emphasized the extreme importance of the resolutions submitted by the Social Commission. The situation in Venezuela, an under-developed country led him to hope that the Council which had given prominence to economic problems caused by the war, would place more emphasis on social matters.

His delegation wanted the advisory social welfare services to be continued in 1949 as the Report of the Commission requested.

As for the financing of those services, the main source of disagreement, he thought it just that the recipient countries should contribute, as much as possible to their financing. However, in consideration of the fact that certain countries were not in a position to meet the expenses of the programme established the Secretariat might perhaps share out the expenses on the basis of the contributive capacity of recipient countries.

In short, his delegation supported the Social Commission's draft resolution, the co-operation of the United Nations being unnecessary if the countries receiving advisory social welfare services had to pay for all the assistance given them.

Mr. ALTMAN (Poland) supported the Social Commission's resolution and thought that the advisory services should be continued in 1949, while reserving his country's attitude with regard to 1950. He noted with satisfaction that the financial participation of States receiving those services was increasing. Sub-paragraph (d) of the resolution dealing with the question pleased him since it emphasized the United Nations desire for economy. For the same reason he was not opposed to the United States amendment to sub-paragraph (e). He also supported the U.S.S.R. proposal concerning the submission at the fourth session of the Social Commission of a report by the Secretary-General on the work of the consultants.

Mr. JOCKEL (Australia) observed that the Australian delegation, in common with most others, recognised that this was a valuable part of United Nations activities. The Australian Government would welcome fellows, particularly from the undeveloped areas of South-East Asia.

The Council had made no financial recommendations to the Assembly the previous year, and there was therefore no reason why they should depart from their established practice.

He supported the amendments submitted by the Canadian representative.

Mr. SUTCH (New Zealand) pointed out that the Advisory Social Welfare Services were in fact the fundamental activities of the Social Commission of the Economic and Social Council. Members should note that they were sitting on a Social as

well as on an Economic Council. Since the end of the war there had been a tendency to overlook that fact and to acquiesce in a gradual reduction of social expenditure. At the same time expenditure for economic programmes had been steadily rising. Whilst not maintaining that the latter expenditure should be reduced, he thought that it should not be given such importance as to impede the activities of the social side.

The remarks made by the Chinese representative were timely and cogent. Nations had spent freely, without great demur, during war time. They should therefore reflect carefully before reducing appropriations for peacetime projects destined to increase the social welfare of common men and to raise living standards in many regions.

It was only just that where a country could pay for the facilities extended to it by the United Nations, it should do so; on the other hand, the majority of the countries covered by the scheme lacked the necessary foreign currencies to send visitors abroad. Members should realise that any improvement in the social welfare of wide masses of the world's population would strengthen the foundations of universal peace.

The Resolution should therefore be left in its present form. The words "at least" had been inserted in paragraph (e) for good reason. So far from anticipating reduced expenditure for the scheme, the Social Commission had intended that the funds should be increased. However, in the absence of exact estimates for the coming year, it had not set down a particular sum, but had adopted the wording now before the Committee. The sort of expansion it envisaged was the extension of the Welfare Services activities

to "other areas", as suggested by the United States representative. In particular, the Social Commission had in mind newly emerging countries and other areas in South East Asia. These regions would be in urgent need of United Nations experts and their advice. The programme concerned not only fellowships but consultants and seminars.

He agreed with the Byelorussian representative that Governments had a responsibility to develop their own social welfare programmes.

He supported the Soviet Union proposal that the word "fiscal" should be deleted in paragraph (a). Similarly he agreed with the Canadian representative that the words "and intensify" should be inserted after "continue" in paragraph (d). The Social Commission had omitted such a reference in its own text since it did not wish to cast a reflection on the efforts hitherto made by the Secretary General, and it had preferred a more indirect phraseology. However, the words proposed by the Canadian representative would serve to impress the Council's wishes on recipient countries. For the same reason he supported the United Kingdom suggestion that a phrase passage should be inserted requiring the Secretary General to "report on the success of his efforts". There was no doubt that the Secretary General would supply such a report, but the text proposed would be a reminder to recipient governments of the grave view taken by the Council in this matter.

The Soviet Union's representative's suggestion that reports should be made on the work of consultants was superfluous in that this would certainly be done in any event; the Secretariat would furthermore gather the Committee's views from these summary records.

The New Zealand Government would not agree to a deletion of paragraph (e), nor to a deletion of the words "at least".

Mr. DAVIDSON (Canada) stated that the explanations offered by the New Zealand representative justified the reasons for which he had advanced his own amendment to paragraph (e). The purpose of this amendment was to leave the whole question of 1949 appropriations open until due discussion of this item's relation to the remainder of the budget had taken place at the General Assembly.

The Representative of the Lebanon had appeared to interpret this amendment as an indication of the Canadian Government's desire to withhold all funds from the advisory social welfare services. This was not the purpose of his amendment. The exact amount should be decided by the General Assembly.

Sir Raphael CILENTO (Director, Division of Social Activities), referring to the proposal that the Resolution should provide for a report on the activities of consultants and on methods used in furnishing advice to governments, stated that such a review was already provided by Study B, which the Secretariat had been instructed to prepare both by the Social Commission and the Economic and Social Council. This Study would be completed and a report submitted at the next session of the Social Commission in May 1949, and it would deal in detail with advisable and desirable methods of supplying advisory welfare services and advice to all governments.

In regard to finance, the Secretariat was of the opinion that governments were at present paying as much in local currency as was within their powers, and were in any case contributing substantially more than they had done the

previous year. Members of the Council should realise in this regard that governments were required to make no contribution at all towards services provided by Specialized Agencies and that on at least one occasion a government had refused to participate in a United Nations programme on the grounds that no such financial contribution was required for a similar programme organized by a Specialized Agency.

The Secretariat had endeavoured to enforce the rule that governments should pay according to their economic situation and were therefore already carrying out certain of the instructions contemplated by members. In contributing annual funds to the extent of \$670,000, approximately, the United Nations was bearing costs envisaged under Article 55 of the Constitution, and were financing the spread of social services in a large area of the world which until recently had been entirely ignorant of the social services developed elsewhere. In the opinion of the Secretariat, therefore, that sum could not be considered large, nor could it be regarded as a suitable item for progressive reduction.

On a vote being taken, the Soviet proposal, supported by the New Zealand Representative, that the word "fiscal" be deleted from paragraph (a) was adopted by 9 votes to 4 with no abstentions.

Mr. KULAGENKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that before voting on paragraphs (d) and (e) the Committee should consider his own proposal that the Secretary-General should submit a report on the work of consultants in the various countries. This study was long due and would be of interest not only to members of the Council but to all other members of the United Nations.

The CHAIRMAN stated that since this text constituted a new section of the Resolution it would be voted on once the Committee had disposed of the remaining amendments.

On a vote being taken, the Soviet Union proposal that paragraph (d) be deleted and that the following passage be inserted in its place:

"That the Secretariat be guided in 1949 in the administration and provision of Advisory Social Welfare Services by the financial grant of the countries requesting such consultative services"
was rejected by 13 votes to 2 with 2 abstentions.

On a vote being taken, the Canadian Representative's proposal that paragraph (e) be deleted was rejected by 9 votes to 7 with 1 abstention.

On a vote being taken, the Canadian Representative's proposal that the words "and intensify" be inserted after "continue" in paragraph (d) was adopted by 11 votes to 1 with 3 abstentions.

The United Kingdom Representative's proposal that the words "and should report from time to time to the Council on the success of his efforts" be inserted after "Governments" in paragraph (d) was accepted by 14 votes to none with 3 abstentions.

The United States Representative's proposal that the words "at least" be deleted in paragraph (e) was rejected by 8 votes to 6 with 3 abstentions.

The Soviet Union Representative's proposal that the following passage be added to the text of the Resolution:

"That the Secretary-General submit to all Member Governments a complete report on the work of the

consultants in the various countries from 1946 until the present time, in order that the Social Commission at its Fourth Session may be able to study that report and any comments thereon which may be made by Member countries of the United Nations". was adopted by 8 votes to 4 with 5 abstentions.

In answer to an enquiry by the Chairman, Mr. KULAGENKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that he wished the additional passage he had proposed to be inserted before paragraph (d).

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) suggested that in that case the items containing a recommendation to the General Assembly should be kept separate from those containing instructions to the Secretary-General. Thus, paragraphs (a), (b), (c) and (f) of the text as amended should be placed before paragraphs (d) and (e).

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Secretariat should produce a new draft, arranged in the sequence suggested by the United States Representative and incorporating small drafting amendments suggested by the representatives of Turkey and New Zealand.

This was agreed.

Mr. MESSING-MIERZEKEWSKI (Secretary) read the following amended text of the Resolution:

"THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

HAVING NOTED the recommendation of the Social Commission contained in its Resolution of 20 April 1948 on the Advisory Social Welfare Services,

RECOMMENDS to the General Assembly:

(a) that the Advisory Social Welfare Services be continued during 1949;

(b) that the programme should include the same basic services as were carried on in 1948;

(c) that in the administration of the programme, the policies and procedures carried on in 1948 be continued, as adapted in accordance with recommendations made by the Social Commission at its Third Session;

(d) that the Secretary-General submit to all member countries a complete report on the work of the consultants in the various countries from 1946 until the present time, in order that the Social Commission at its Fourth Session may be able to study that report and any comments thereon which may be made by member countries of the United Nations;

(e) that the Secretary-General continue and intensify his efforts to bring about increased financial participation on the part of recipient governments and report from time to time to the Council on the success of his efforts;

(f) that the funds to be provided for the services in 1949 should be at least equal to those appropriated for 1948.

On a vote being taken, the Resolution as amended was adopted by 13 votes to none with 4 abstentions.

Mr. DAVIDSON (Canada) had abstained from the vote because he did not recognize the validity of the provision contained in paragraph (e) and he reserved his delegation's right to raise the matter at a later stage.

Mr. RUNDALL (United Kingdom) had voted against the Soviet Union representative's proposed new text for paragraph

(c) on the grounds that the report envisaged was already in course of preparation by the Secretariat and would be submitted to the next session of the Social Commission.

Mr. KULAGENKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) had abstained from the vote on the Resolution as a whole since the proposals he had submitted would merely aid the greater participation of national governments. He reserved his delegation's right to return to the matter at a later stage.

Mr. JOCKEL (Australia) had abstained from the vote since he believed that no directions should be given in regard to the Budget for 1949 until the matter had been discussed by the General Assembly. There was no need to depart from the Council's wish in this respect.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States) had voted for the Resolution as a whole, but he reserved his delegation's right to re-assert its opinion, during discussions on the Budget in the General Assembly, that the funds provided for 1949 should not exceed those forthcoming in 1948.

The CHAIRMAN, in his capacity as Byelorussian representative, had also abstained from the vote.

Mr. MAQUIEIRA (Chile) reserved for his delegation the same right as had been claimed by the United States delegate. In the view of his delegation the 1949 Budget should not exceed that of 1948.

Mr. RUNDALL (United Kingdom) made the same reservation.

Resolution III: Prevention of Crime and Treatment of Offenders (Document E/779, page 42)

The CHAIRMAN remarked that in paragraph 3 of Document E/779/Add.1, it was stated that the funds required for the convening of a group of internationally recognized experts would be somewhat in excess of the \$10,000 mentioned. No appropriation to that effect had been made in the United Nations Budget.

In reply to a question asked by Mr. KULAGENKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Sir Raphael CILENTO (Director, Division of Social Activities), stated that the sum mentioned was solely an estimate for the expenses incurred by the convening of the group of experts mentioned in paragraph 2 of Resolution III.

Mr. DICH (Denmark), on a point of order, stated that a meeting of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission was due to be held at Berne on 2-7 August, 1948. Consideration of the Resolution might therefore be postponed until the results of that meeting were available.

Mr. RUNDALL (United Kingdom) supported the Danish representative's proposal since he understood that the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission was about to draft a new clause in its Constitution whereby Franco Spain would be excluded from its membership.

Sir Raphael CILENTO (Director, Division of Social Activities) stated that a recommendation had been adopted in 1946 to the effect that the Social Commission should enter into consultation with the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission in order to discuss on a wide international basis action to be taken for the prevention of crime and the treatment of offenders. Before this consultation had been commenced, however, the attention of the General Assembly had been drawn to a resolution prohibiting consultation with organizations including Franco Spain in their membership. The question as to whether Franco Spain was in fact a member of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission was examined by the United Nations Legal Department, which concluded in February 1948 that that country had ceased to be a member of the Commission in question. At its sixth session, the Council nevertheless

referred the matter to the Social Commission with the request that it should take whatever action it considered appropriate.

At its third session held in April 1948, the Social Commission adopted a resolution regarding relationships between the United Nations and the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission (Document E/779, page 21). The President of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission had offered to appear at that meeting of the Social Commission, but it had been decided by the latter Commission that there was no evidence that the President was competent to represent his Organization. The President was therefore interviewed by the Steering Committee of the Social Commission and no further action was taken.

The Director of the Division of Social Activities consulted consecutively the President of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission at New York and its Secretary General in Geneva.

Accordingly the Secretary General of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission on 29 April 1948 circulated a letter to the members of his Commission in regard to its relationship with the United Nations, containing a proposed declaration for the modification of paragraphs 2 and 18 of the Constitution. The letter stated that if the majority of the Commission's members signalled their assent to the amendments proposed by returning, duly signed, an annex provided, those amendments would come into force.

By virtue of the amendments proposed, Article 2 would read as follows: "The Commission shall be composed of delegates of the various countries admitted by a two-thirds majority vote of its members and willing to concur in the aforementioned work."

Article 18 would be supplemented by the addition of the following clause "The same shall apply in case a two-thirds majority of the Commission's members shall vote for the exclusion of the member."

Of the 26 members of the Commission, 23 had sent back the signed annex signifying their concurrence in the amendments so that the two articles now had the form indicated above.

The Secretary General of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission had formally notified him of that fact for transmission to the Secretary General of the United Nations, and had asked him to state that the Commission or officers with appropriate authority, would be available for negotiations with the Council if such negotiations were considered desirable at present.

The resolution before the Committee referred to "International and national organizations which had interests and competence in this field." This reference would include the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission and also five organizations which already had consultative status with the United Nations. It would also include any working groups or other organizations of a national character acceptable to the various Governments. These would come within paragraph 1. and possibly also in the advisory body mentioned in paragraph 2.

If the members of this advisory body were drawn from all parts of the world, it was estimated that the greatest cost entailed would amount to \$10,250. This however was a guess as the location of such members was naturally still undetermined.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

UNITED NATIONS

NATIONS UNIES

ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCILCONSEIL
ECONOMIQUE
ET SOCIAL

UNRESTRICTED

13

E/AC.7/SR.47/Corr.1
5 August 1948

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Dual Distribution for Council Members

SEVENTH SESSION

SOCIAL COMMITTEE

Corrigendum to Document E/AC.7/SR.47

The United States Delegation asks that the following correction be made:-

Page 10, lines 10 - 12:

insert a fullstop after the words "Resolution 1", delete the remainder of the sentence and substitute the following:-

"This would also entail a small change in the financial estimate which provided for \$675,000 (document E/799/Add.1)."

UNITED NATIONS

NATIONS UNIES

UNRESTRICTED

ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL

14

CONSEIL
ECONOMIQUE
ET SOCIALE/AC.7/SR.47/Corr.2
5 August 1948

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Dual Distribution for Council MembersSEVENTH SESSIONSOCIAL COMMITTEECorrigendum to Document E/AC.7/SR.47

The Chinese delegation asks that the following
correction be made:

Page 15,
lines 28
and 29;

delete the words "he thought that the words
'at least equal' did not constitute a good
precedent", and substitute the following:
"he stated that he was opposed to the
deletion of the words 'at least'."

Dual Distribution for Council Members

SEVENTH SESSION

SOCIAL COMMITTEE

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FORTH-EIGHTH MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 27 July 1948, at 3 p.m.PRESENT:

| | |
|--|--|
| <u>Chairman:</u> | Mr. KAMINSKY (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) |
| Australia | Mr. JOCKEL |
| Brazil | Mr. GUERREIRO |
| Canada | Mr. DAVIDSON |
| Chile | Mr. MAQUEIRA |
| China | Mr. CHA |
| Denmark | Mr. DICH |
| France | (Mr. LAMARLE Mr. BUGNARD) |
| Lebanon | Mr. HELOU |
| Netherlands | Mr. van HEUVEN |
| New Zealand | Mr. SUTCH |
| Poland | Mr. ALTMAN |
| Turkey | Mr. TARHAN |
| Union of Soviet Socialist Republics | Mr. BORISOV |
| United Kingdom | Mr. RUNDALL |
| United States | Mr. STINEBOWER |
| Venezuela | Mr. PEREZ PEROZO |

N.B. Will delegates who wish to have corrections made to the Summary Record please submit such corrections in writing to the Secretariat, Room C-436, within 24 hours of distribution of the Summary Record.

Representatives from Specialized Agencies:

World Health Organization Mrs. HOWELL

Consultants from Non-governmental Organizations:

World Federation of United Nations Associations Mr. ENNALS

Secretariat:

Sir Raphael CILENTO Director, Social Activities Division

Mr. MESSING-MIERZEJEWSKI Secretary of the Committee

CONTINUATION OF DISCUSSION ON THE REPORT OF THE THIRD SESSION OF THE SOCIAL COMMISSION (Item 15 on the Council Agenda) (Document E/779).

Resolution III.

Mr. RUNDALL (United Kingdom) recalled that at the previous meeting he had supported the Danish representative's suggestion that consideration of the Resolution III should be temporarily postponed. In view of the explanation given by the Director of the Social Activities Division, the Committee might agree that the difficulties arising in connection with Spanish membership of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission had been overcome, since that body had now regularised its position. It might therefore be possible to discuss the question of its participation in such a committee of experts. If it were so agreed he wished to propose an amendment to paragraph 2 of the Resolution by the insertion of the words, "including representatives of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission", after the words "recognized experts" in the third line, because his delegation considered that the best use should be made of the specialized knowledge of that Commission which was the only organization dealing with the vital problem of prisoners' rehabilitation. If the Social Commission was to cover the whole question of the prevention of crime and the treatment of offenders it could not dispense with such expert knowledge in that particular branch of penology.

Mr. SUTCH (New Zealand), as Chairman of the Social Commission, pointed out that discussion on the participation of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission in the committee of experts was irrelevant. It was only one of the numerous organizations in the field of

criminology with which the Social Commission would be working at Secretariat level. The undue prominence given to it had only arisen as a result of the question of Spanish membership. He considered that reference to "representatives" rather than "a representative" in the United Kingdom amendment was unfortunate in view of the fact that some other organizations might be represented by one member only. He would therefore prefer that the United Kingdom amendment should read "including representation from the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission."

Mr. DICH (Denmark) said that although the statement of the Director of the Social Activities Division was of interest he was not convinced that further discussion would be fruitful. It would be preferable to postpone the matter until the end of the coming session of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission, so as to wait for the result of their work. He therefore formally moved the postponement of the discussion.

Mr. DAVIDSON (Canada) supported the Danish motion for temporary adjournment of the debate, since the position of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission would be made clear at the end of its next session and would inevitably have certain repercussions upon their decision as to whether an expert committee should be constituted.

Mr. CHA (China), speaking against the motion for adjournment, thought that the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission should not be treated on a different footing from other organizations which, he understood, were five in number.

The Danish motion for a temporary adjournment of the debate was rejected by ten votes to three.

Mr. LAMARLE (France) said that his delegation recognized the importance of the question under discussion and that as crime had tended to increase since the war (as proved by statistics) it was prepared to welcome any action to assist the study of the question, and to vote for the unamended text of Resolution III, (page 42 of Document E/779).

However, he saw no reason why the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission should receive special treatment by being the only organization mentioned in the Resolution.

He was in no way hostile to that organization to which, incidentally, his country belonged, but as had been pointed out quite rightly by the representatives of New Zealand and China, there were other organizations besides the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission which studied the same questions. He would mention, among others, the Howard League for Penal Reform, the International Association of Penal Law and the International Criminal Police Commission.

The prominence enjoyed by the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission with the members of the Council was due to the fact that it did not comply with the conditions laid down by the Economic and Social Council since Spain was one of its members. That state of affairs did not seem to justify priority treatment.

Mr. RUNDALL (United Kingdom) accepted the New Zealand representative's proposed wording of his amendment, and pointed out that the prominence given to the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission was not due exclusively to the Spanish issue; it was specifically mentioned by name in Annex IV, Part II, paragraph 3, on page 55 of the Report,

relative to the work programme of the Division of Social Activities, where it was stated that consultations would be opened at once with the Secretariat of that body. It was owing to its unique qualifications in the field of rehabilitation that he would press his amendment to paragraph 2 of the Resolution.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) found the whole section of the Report dealing with the Prevention of Crime and Treatment of Offenders satisfactory. He had no very strong views on the United Kingdom amendment. Although his Government fully appreciated the value of the work of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission, of which it was a member, he wondered whether it was necessary for it to receive special mention in the Resolution, since its co-operation could be obtained by the normal methods of consultation. There was nothing to be gained therefore, by adopting the United Kingdom amendment.

Mr. LAMARLE (France) regretted being obliged to dispute the correctness of the judgment of the United Kingdom representative who claimed that the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission held pride of place over other associations of the same kind. He was well aware of the merits of that organization since his country was a member of it and that fact enabled him to state that it held no priority over the others.

Addressing his remarks to the representative of the Secretariat, he stated that the latter should have had in his files, for some weeks now, studies relating to the prevention of crime and the treatment of offenders, which had been submitted by other organizations which deserved to be considered on the same footing as the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission.

Mr. RUNDALL (United Kingdom) in reply to the French representative, stated that he did not claim any preferential treatment for the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission, but merely wished to draw attention to the valuable contribution it could make to the work of a committee of experts. He would like to be reassured that the constitutional point regarding the exclusion of Spain had now been settled by the receipt of affirmative replies from 23 of its member governments with respect to the proposed amendments to its Constitution.

Sir Raphael CILENTO (Director, Social Activities Division), speaking subject to correction, stated that he believed the Constitution of the Commission had now actually been amended so far as articles 2 and 18 were concerned.

Mr. BORISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether there was any legal basis for the Social Commission recommending the creation of such committee of experts. Could it, in its terms of reference, advise the creation of a consultative body, since it was only a consultative body itself?

Sir Raphael CILENTO (Director, Social Activities Division) pointed out that the Social Commission could not set up such a body itself, but it was perfectly appropriate for it, under its rules of procedure, to request the Economic and Social Council to do so.

Mr. BORISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that it was clear from the reply of the Director of the Social Activities Division that the Social Commission was competent to make recommendations within its terms of reference, but that in the matter before them the recommendation was both unusual and contrary to its terms of reference.

It would be undesirable for the Economic and Social Council which had already created the Social Commission as a consultative body to deal, among other subjects, with the question of the prevention of crime and treatment of offenders, to set up another such body in the same field. It would lay a further and entirely unwarranted financial burden to the United Nations budget. If the Social Commission was unable to carry out the work assigned to it, it could call upon all the expert advice available. Under Rule 19 of the Rules of Procedure of the Functional Commissions of the Economic and Social Council, the Social Commission could set up such committees, composed of members of the Commission, as it deemed necessary and refer to them any questions on the agenda for study and report, but it could not create separate organs to deal with problems involving questions of principle. A procedure for consultation with non-Governmental and inter-Governmental organizations had now been established, and it was a mistake to create a special advisory organ of experts from such organizations.

With regard to the United Kingdom amendment, it was undesirable to accord special treatment to the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission, amounting to discrimination against other organizations in the same field, in view of its questionable policy with regard to the presence of Spain as a member. The pressure to give it a privileged standing should be resisted, and the decisions of the Council should be restricted.

He therefore proposed that Resolution III as a whole be deleted. He would himself be submitting at the appropriate

time a resolution on the prevention of crime and treatment of offenders in connection with Paragraph 55 of the Report.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the submission of such a resolution could be done at any time.

Mr. PEREZ-PEROZO (Venezuela) defining his delegation's position, recalled that at the time the Economic and Social Council had discussed the desirability of entering into consultations with the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission, his delegation had opposed such consultations so long as the said Commission had not made a final decision regarding the question of excluding Franco Spain. Later, when the Legal Department of the United Nations, to which the question had been submitted, had stated that the said Commission was not complying with the Council's requirements, his delegation had considered that from the legal point of view the question was not settled. His doubts had been confirmed by the cautious attitude of the Social Commission at the meetings last April. He therefore agreed with the Danish representative that it would be advisable to defer discussion of the present question until the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission had made it known that it had modified its statutes to permit the exclusion of Franco Spain. In view of the extreme importance attached to the question by his Government, he would have to declare himself in favour of the retention of the present text of the draft resolution.

Mr. JOCKEL (Australia) observed that the Soviet Union representative had raised some important points. The Secretary-General had power to consult or call experts and he would like some clarification as to the budgetary limitations referred to in Paragraph 2 of the Resolution. He felt the purpose of the resolution was to make financial provision, and that the provision that yearly meetings of a permanent Committee of Experts be convened was too ambitious a programme.

The CHAIRMAN, speaking as representative of Byelorrussia, pointed out that the question of budgetary limitations need not cause them concern. It was a matter for the Secretary-General.

Mr. HELOU (Lebanon) was of the opinion that the question of the prevention of crime was too important to permit of any stinginess and he further considered that when it was a question of setting up a group of experts one could not take too many precautions and too much advice.

Contrary to the contention of the representative of the USSR, he could not find in the Rules of Procedure any provision prohibiting the setting up of a group of experts, since it was the Economic and Social Council which had the responsibility for taking decisions, and therefore the clause of the Rules of Procedure invoked had no legal weight. He supported the view of the representatives of the United Kingdom and New Zealand, and declared himself in favour of their joint amendment which, by mentioning in the text of Resolution III the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission explicitly referred to in the text of the work programme for the Division of Social Activities on page 55

of Document E/779, were only adding certain supplementary details.

Mr. ALTMAN (Poland) recalled that the Polish delegation to the Social Commission had maintained that consultations with the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission could not be held until that Organization had given notice of the modification of its statutes permitting the exclusion of Franco Spain. For that reason he opposed the amendment submitted by the representative of the United Kingdom. He also wished to point out that his delegation was not convinced of the necessity of setting up a group of experts.

Mr. DAVIDSON (Canada) asked whether there would be any difference between consultation with such a Committee of Experts and the normal procedure of consultation between the United Nations and inter-governmental organizations. On the assumption that the constitutional question of membership of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission was satisfactorily settled it might apply for recognition as a Specialized Agency; provision for consultation through a Committee of Experts before that question was settled would render the position unduly complicated. It was for that reason that he had been in favour of adjourning the discussion until the position of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission was clarified. In addition it might be advisable to amend Paragraph 2 so that the Committee should be convened to meet in 1949 after which it could be decided whether it should be maintained as a permanent advisory body or whether the necessary consultations could be held thereafter with existing organizations through normal channels.

Mr. LAMARLE (France) wished to state, in connection with certain points raised by the representative of Canada, that certain of the organizations he had mentioned in his previous speech included at least two which, like the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission, were inter-governmental organizations. The first had its headquarters in Europe, namely the International Criminal Police Commission; the second had its headquarters at Quebec, namely the Association of American Chiefs of Police. Both had about the same inter-governmental structure as the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission and that was a decisive reason for not giving any of them a priority status. He would like to ask the representative of the United Kingdom whether, since he felt it necessary to mention the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission, he saw any objection to mentioning all organizations having the same status.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States) stated that he would vote in favour of the Resolution because it was the view of his delegation that the Social Commission should use expert advice in the field of criminology as long as it was necessary. It would be too much to expect that members of the Social Commission would have the wide range of specialised knowledge in all the fields dealt with by the Commission. Representatives nominated by governments would tend to be experts in social welfare problems rather than criminology. The establishment of a Committee of Experts on that subject would therefore, in his opinion, be desirable and necessary. The United Kingdom amendment was, in his view, superfluous.

Mr. RUNDALL (United Kingdom), replying to the French representative, who certainly had a more thorough knowledge of these questions than he had, said that if the organizations he (the French representative) had mentioned could provide leading experts in the field of rehabilitation of prisoners he would agree that they be mentioned in Paragraph 2 along with the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission.

The CHAIRMAN, speaking as representative of the Byelorussian SSR, felt that the Resolution was indefensible on constitutional and legal grounds. There was no precedent for the creation of such a special Committee of Experts which would be contrary to the purposes of the Charter and the rules of procedure of the Economic and Social Council. The Secretary-General was free to call upon the advice of non-governmental or inter-governmental organizations and there was no need for any Resolution empowering him to do so. The adoption of the Resolution would contravene the established procedure of the Economic and Social Council, and he would therefore vote against it.

Mr. LAMARLE (France) wished to point out, for the benefit of the representative of the United Kingdom, that if the latter would agree to a list of the associations in question, he was prepared to vote in favour of his amendment.

Mr. RUNDALL (United Kingdom) stated that as he was not convinced that the organizations mentioned by the French representative could provide the best experts required he could not agree to their inclusion in Paragraph 2.

Mr. LAMARLE (France) observed that since the United Kingdom representative had admitted the defectiveness of his knowledge on this subject, it was impossible under such

conditions to accept his amendment.

Mr. JOCKEL (Australia) noted that it would be difficult to proceed with the creation of a Committee of Experts until they had consulted the Organizations concerned as to the work they were doing and as to whether the necessary experts could in fact be assembled.

Mr. LAMARLE (France) stated that the Australian representative had expressed the view he himself held when he observed that the adoption of the proposed text was tantamount to asking the Council to set up a group of experts without knowing what organizations would be called upon, and he refused to vote in favour of the text without being enlightened on that point.

The United Kingdom amendment for the insertion of the words "including representation from the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission" after the words "recognized experts" in Paragraph 2 was then put to the vote, and rejected by 9 votes to 3 with 5 abstentions.

Mr. DICH (Denmark) agreed with the Canadian representative that the question of the creation of a permanent Committee of Experts could not be settled at present and therefore proposed that the words "in 1949" be substituted for the words "not more than once a year" after the words "to convene" in paragraph 2.

On the Chairman's suggestion for a vote to be taken on the Soviet Union proposal for the deletion of Resolution III as a whole, Mr. Sutch (New Zealand) intervened on a point of order and stated that according to their rules of procedure the Soviet Union proposal was not an amendment but a direct negative. If the Soviet Union representative

was not in favour of the Resolution as a whole he should vote against it but he was out of order in submitting its total deletion as an amendment.

Mr. BORISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) then withdrew his original proposal and submitted an amendment for the deletion of Paragraph 2 of the Resolution.

The Soviet Union proposal for the deletion of Paragraph 2 of the Resolution was rejected by 12 votes to 4 with one abstention.

The Danish amendment to delete the words "not more than once a year" in paragraph 2, and to substitute "in 1949" was put to the vote and adopted by 9 votes to 3, with 5 abstentions.

Mr. JOCKEL (Australia) proposed that the beginning of paragraph 1 be amended to read "the Economic and Social Council endorses the view of the Social Commission that, in view of the importance, etc".

A vote was taken immediately and the amendment was adopted by 9 votes to 1, with 7 abstentions.

The Resolution as a whole was then adopted by 14 votes to 3.

Mr. BORISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) read the text of a proposal by his delegation for restricting the work programme in regard to the prevention of crime and treatment of offenders to certain specific types of question - those on which agreements between international organizations already existed, e.g. measures against war-mongering; those relating to the crime of genocide; and those on which international conventions already exist, e.g. slavery, narcotics, prostitution, obscene publications, etc. These questions should be given priority by the Social Commission.

Pending distribution of the text of the Russian resolution in English and French, the representative of the Soviet Union agreed to postpone formal proposal until the next meeting.

The CHAIRMAN, passing on to the fourth resolution - Transfer to the United Nations of the Functions exercised by the French Government for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic and the Suppression of Obscene Publications - pointed out that a new draft had just come in (Doc.E/AC.7/W.30) and was at that moment being distributed. It was agreed that the same procedure - postponement until the next meeting - might be useful in order to give delegates an opportunity of studying the document.

Replying to an inquiry by the representative of Venezuela, the CHAIRMAN explained that the application of the Rules of Procedure governing such postponements arose only when there was an objection to discussing a document not issued in time for adequate study. He then turned to the next Resolution, No. 5: Draft Convention of 1937 for Suppressing the Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others.

Mr. BORISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that in the USSR the social roots of such common plagues of the capitalist world as prostitution and procuring were lacking; the USSR therefore did not see any need to take part in such a convention. He also stated that in the unlikely event of persons accused of aiding prostitution taking refuge in the territory of the USSR, the question of their extradition could be settled through the usual diplomatic channel.

Mrs. HOWELL (World Health Organization) read out to the meeting the text of a comprehensive resolution adopted by the World Health Assembly at its first Session, and bearing directly on the question under discussion. It covered all aspects of venereal disease control, suppression of traffic in women and children, abolition of legal recognition of prostitution, etc. Proposals for a special division of the World Health Organization to deal with venereal disease and for an expert Advisory Committee on the matter were also referred to.

The CHAIRMAN announced that the Resolution would be noted and recorded in the proceedings of the Committee.

Mr. BUGNARD (France) stated that his delegation was obliged to make certain reservations with regard to the draft Convention of 1937 appearing on page 43 of Document E/779, as the French Government considered that the procedure proposed in the draft resolution was calculated to cause considerable delay in the international adoption of the Convention.

His Government was submitting an amendment to that resolution which he would briefly summarise. The written text would be distributed to the members of the Committee at the next meeting. He thought, however, that the information he would give orally would be sufficiently explicit to serve as a basis for discussion on the proposed resolution.

Mr. RUNDALL (United Kingdom) endorsed the French proposal. As the resolution, and particularly paragraph A, stood at present, he was unable to support it. —The serious increase in prostitution as a result of the war

called for immediate action. If the 1937 Draft Convention as amended were accepted now, they could go on later to consider improvements in existing legislation.

Sir Raphael CILENTO (Director, Social Activities Division) at the request of the New Zealand representative explained the various steps taken by the Secretariat to discover the views of governments, women's organizations and other bodies as to whether the 1937 Draft Convention should be signed now as it stood or amended. The present resolution was the outcome of these consultations, it being felt that governments would not be willing to sign the present draft if they knew that work on a new version was proceeding. Paragraph B of the resolution was intended to secure action by nations if necessary on defective national legislation during the interim period.

Mr. DAVIDSON (Canada) found the resolution acceptable in the light of Sir Raphael's clarification. Wide control and promptness of action were the objectives, and he would not wish to hamper them.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) expressed similar views. The advantage of accepting a slight delay now in order to amend the Convention thoroughly, rather than merely improving certain technical details, would be seen clearly within a year or two.

The Meeting rose at 6 p.m.

Dual Distribution for Council Members

SEVENTH SESSION

SOCIAL COMMITTEE

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FORTY-NINTH MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Wednesday, 28 July 1948 at 3 p.m.

Present:

CHAIRMAN:

Mr. KAMINSKY (Byelo-
russian Soviet Socialist
Republic)

| | |
|--|----------------------------------|
| Australia | Mr. JOCKEL |
| Brazil | Mr. GUERREIRO |
| Canada | Mr. DAVIDSON |
| Chile | Mr. MAQUEIRA |
| China | Mr. CHA |
| Denmark | Mr. DICH |
| France | Mr. MENDES-FRANCE Mr. BUGNARD |
| Lebanon | Mr. HELOU |
| Netherlands | Mr. van HEUVEN |
| New Zealand | Mr. SUTCH |
| Peru | Mr. MACKELLENIE |
| Poland | Mr. ALTMAN |
| Turkey | Mr. TARHAN |
| Union of Soviet Socialist Republics | Mr. KULAGENKOV |
| United Kingdom | Mr. RUNDALL |
| United States | Mr. STINEBOWER |
| Venezuela | Mr. PEREZ PEROZO |

N.B. Will delegates who wish to have corrections made to the Summary Record please submit such corrections in writing to the Secretariat, Room C-436, within 24 hours of distribution of the Summary Record.

**ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL**

**CONSEIL
ECONOMIQUE
ET SOCIAL**

E/AC.7/6
18 March 1947

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

SOCIAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FOURTH MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York, on Monday, 17 March 1947 at 11:30 a.m.

Present:

| | | |
|------------------|-------------------------|--|
| Chairmen: | Sir Ramaswami Mudaliar | (India) |
| Members: | Mr. Kaminsky | (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) |
| | Mr. Davidson | (Canada) |
| | Mr. Fausto Soto | (Chile) |
| | Dr. Chang | (China) |
| | Mr. Osuna | (Cuba) |
| | Mr. Radinsky | (Czechoslovakia) |
| | Mr. Royer | (France) |
| | Mr. W. Wahajuddin Ahmad | (India) |
| | Mr. Malik | (Lebanon) |
| | Mr. van Heusen | (Netherlands) |
| | Mr. Nash | (New Zealand) |
| | Mr. Moe | (Norway) |
| | Mr. Arca Parro | (Peru) |
| | Mr. Borisov | (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) |
| | Mr. Phillips | (United Kingdom) |
| | Mr. Stinebower | (United States of America) |
| | Mr. Zuloaga | (Venezuela) |

Rapporteur for the Social Commission:

Mr. Wilson (New Zealand)

Secretary of the Committee:

Mr. Yates

Secretariat: Mr. M. Milhaud

Acting Director, Division of
Social Affairs

Report of the First Session of the Social Commission (E/260)

The CHAIRMAN explained that the tentative draft Resolutions (Annex A) proposed in relation to the text of the report merely reproduced the recommendations of the Social Commission report, and were intended to assist

/in concentrating

MAR 25 1947

**ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL**

**CONSEIL
ECONOMIQUE
ET SOCIAL**

E/AC.7/6
18 March 1947

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

SOCIAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FOURTH MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York, on Monday, 17 March 1947 at 11:30 a.m.

Present:

| | | |
|-----------|-------------------------|--|
| Chairman: | Sir Ramaswami Madhwaraj | (India) |
| Members: | Mr. Kaminsky | (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) |
| | Mr. Davidson | (Canada) |
| | Mr. Fausto Soto | (Chile) |
| | Dr. Chang | (China) |
| | Mr. Osuna | (Cuba) |
| | Mr. Radimsky | (Czechoslovakia) |
| | Mr. Royer | (France) |
| | Mr. W. Wahajuddin Ahmad | (India) |
| | Mr. Malik | (Lebanon) |
| | Mr. van Heusen | (Netherlands) |
| | Mr. Nash | (New Zealand) |
| | Mr. Moe | (Norway) |
| | Mr. Arca Parro | (Peru) |
| | Mr. Borisov | (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) |
| | Mr. Phillips | (United Kingdom) |
| | Mr. Stinebower | (United States of America) |
| | Mr. Zuloaga | (Venezuela) |

Rapporteur for the Social Commission:

Mr. Wilson (New Zealand)

Secretary of the Committee:

Mr. Yates

Secretariat: Mr. M. Milhaud

Acting Director, Division of
Social Affairs

Report of the First Session of the Social Commission (E/260)

The CHAIRMAN explained that the tentative draft Resolutions (Annex A) proposed in relation to the text of the report merely reproduced the recommendations of the Social Commission report, and were intended to assist /in concentrating

MAR 25 1947