

UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS



THIRTEENTH SESSION, 513th
MEETING

WEDNESDAY, 22 AUGUST 1951, at 10 a.m.

PALAIS DES NATIONS, GENEVA

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Arrangements regarding the report of the Council to the General Assembly (E/2081)	307
Relations with the World Meteorological Organization (E/1996 and Add.1/Corr.1): report of the Co-ordination Committee (E/2074)	310
Invitations to non-member States to become Parties to the Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons and of the Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others (E/2009)	311
Methods of international financing of European emigration (E/2019)	311

President: Mr. Hernán SANTA CRUZ (Chile).

Present: Representatives of the following countries:

Belgium, Canada, Chile, China, Czechoslovakia, France, India, Iran, Mexico, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Representatives of the following specialized agencies:

International Labour Organisation, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, World Meteorological Organization, International Refugee Organization.

Arrangements regarding the report of the Council to the General Assembly (E/2081)

1. The PRESIDENT opened the discussion on arrangements regarding the report of the Council to the General Assembly and called attention to the note prepared by the Secretariat (E/2081) and to the draft resolution submitted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (E/L.217), which, if adopted, would entail modification of the present form of the report.

2. Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had asked that the question of the Council's report to the General Assembly be taken up some time before the end of the session, so that the Council should be able to take the necessary decisions fairly early.

3. Rule 13 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly laid down that the agenda for the regular session of the Assembly should include, *inter alia*, the report from the Economic and Social Council. Such a provision could clearly refer only to a report examined and approved by the Council itself. Moreover, other principal organs of the United Nations and the subsidiary organs of the Economic and Social Council themselves always examined and approved reports they submitted to superior bodies.

4. There seemed, therefore, to be good ground for revising the abnormal procedure followed hitherto of leaving it to the Secretariat to draft the report to be submitted by the Council to the General Assembly.

5. Moreover, it was essential that the Council's report should be informative in character and should reflect objectively the Council's discussions. It should not be confined to a presentation of the views of the majority, but should also state dissenting views, at least on the most important questions, so that the various delegations at the General Assembly should be able to form an exact estimate of the way in which the Council had settled the various problems before it.

6. For those reasons, his delegation had submitted a draft resolution (E/L.217).

7. The PRESIDENT said that he wished to give the Council some supplementary information regarding its report to the General Assembly.

8. Under the present procedure, the President had to remain for two weeks after the close of the session in order to prepare the report. If the Soviet Union draft resolution were adopted, he would no longer be solely responsible for the supervision of the report and all members of the Council would also have to remain after the close of the session.

9. He did not believe that any assertions could be made to the effect that the report had not in the past been as objective as the Council had the right to expect. It had been, as far as possible, an impartial account of the actions of the Council and of the adoption and rejection of draft resolutions submitted for its consideration. On important questions, such as that of the representation of China, it had given a summarized account of the views of the various delegations. In general, however, the minority view was not included in the report, as that would also imply the inclusion of the majority view, thus transforming the report into a record of the discussions.

10. The time-factor was a most important consideration since, normally, the General Assembly held its annual regular session approximately six weeks after the end of the Council's session. A longer interval had been provided for in the current year, but circumstances might shorten that period. Preparation of the report was begun during the session, but the report could not be completed earlier than two weeks after the end of the session. A further three weeks were then required for printing, making a total of five weeks. If the method of preparing the report in the form of condensed summary records were adopted, less time would have to be spent on preparation, but more on printing.

11. The President, together with the two Vice-Presidents, was at present responsible for the final approval of the report prepared by the Secretariat. However, in practice, an agreement had in the past been reached with the two Vice-Presidents in order to obviate the need for their remaining in Geneva for a further two weeks, whereby any possible differences of opinion which might arise were discussed at the opening of the General Assembly's regular session and provision made for any corrigenda or addenda to be issued at that time. Hitherto, the case had never arisen, neither had any objection been made by delegations at the General Assembly.

12. He recalled that resolution 177 (VII), which delegated power to the President to prepare the Council's report to the General Assembly in consultation with the two Vice-Presidents and the Secretariat had been adopted at the seventh session of the Council (181st meeting) by 15 votes to none, with 2 abstentions, on the proposal of the Polish representative.

13. Should the Council reject the Soviet Union draft resolution and retain the present arrangement with regard to the report of the Council to the General Assembly, he suggested that the view expressed by the Soviet Union delegation could in part be met, if so desired, by circulating the official records to governments along with the report.

14. Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) believed the proposal submitted by the Soviet Union delegation to be impracticable, since it was evident that it could not be implemented without reconvening the Council after the completion of its work, as the report necessarily entailed considerable time for preparation.

15. His Government had full confidence in the ability and impartiality of the President of the Council, and he believed that past experience had shown the present procedure to be highly successful. He pointed out, furthermore, that the fact that the representative of Czechoslovakia was one of the two Vice-Presidents would ensure that different view-points were represented. His delegation would therefore support the maintenance of existing practice.

16. Mr. OWEN (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Economic Affairs), in reply to a request for further information from Mr. RAO (India), said that the Secretariat had in the past found existing arrangements satisfactory. He called attention, furthermore, to the fact that governments would prefer to receive the report of the Council at an even earlier date than they

could under present arrangements, so that they could brief their delegations to the General Assembly in sufficient time.

17. Mr. EYSKENS (Belgium) pointed out that no one could raise any objections to the first part of the operative section of the Soviet Union draft resolution, which provided that the Council's report "should be of an informational nature objectively reflecting the discussion of the questions considered at the twelfth and thirteenth sessions of the Economic and Social Council". The reports drawn up in previous years had invariably been of that nature.

18. The second part of the proposal, providing that "this report should be confirmed by the Council itself", would, if adopted, necessitate a further meeting of the Council two or three weeks after the end of the session, which was a practical impossibility.

19. Moreover, as suggested in the note by the Secretariat (E/2081), it would always be possible to append to the report the summary records of the Council's meetings. For those reasons, the Belgian delegation could not support the suggestion put forward by the Soviet Union delegation and considered it desirable to continue the former procedure.

20. Mr. BERLIS (Canada) said that, although his delegation was in full sympathy with the principles expressed in the Soviet Union draft resolution, it believed such proposals to be impracticable and would therefore support the maintenance of previous practice with regard to the Council's report to the General Assembly. He believed that the Council had no grounds for complaint that the report had not been essentially informative and objective in the past.

21. Mr. CORLEY SMITH (United Kingdom) supported the statement made by the representative of Canada. It might well take the Council more than two weeks to confirm its report. The most important consideration, in his view, was that, as the Assistant Secretary-General had pointed out, the report should reach governments, and particularly those not represented on the Council, at the earliest possible opportunity.

22. His delegation would therefore support the continuation of the present arrangements and the maintenance of confidence in the Council's officers.

23. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) associated himself with the views expressed by the representative of the Soviet Union. He thought it essential that the General Assembly should be fully informed of the views expressed in the Council and would consequently support the Soviet Union draft resolution recommending that the report should be confirmed by the Council itself.

24. Mr. BERNSTEIN (Chile) supported the statements made by the representatives of the United States of America, the United Kingdom and Canada. He felt that for the report to be confirmed by the Council itself would lengthen the Council's proceedings inordinately.

25. Mr. BORIS (France) said that none of the Council's reports to the General Assembly had hitherto given

cause for complaint. The French delegation at any rate had never had occasion to feel anything but satisfaction with the high degree of impartiality shown by the various Presidents in drafting the reports.

26. Seeing that the procedure followed in the past had given every satisfaction, it hardly seemed necessary to suggest an innovation, still less to add to an already overcrowded agenda the complex question of discussion by the Council of its own report. That would undoubtedly prolong the session by several days and, as previous experience of that procedure had illustrated in other United Nations organs, the result would be a report far less clear than a document drafted by an impartial person such as the President.

27. Again, if the Council did discuss its own report, there was the danger that the session might have to be extended still further simply and solely for the purpose of reporting on the discussions in connexion with the adoption of the report, so that there would be no proper end to the matter.

28. If the Soviet Union draft resolution were to be put to the vote, the French delegation would propose an amendment to the effect that the report should, as in the past, be descriptive, and that the latter part of the sentence referring to confirmation of the report by the Council itself should be deleted.

29. The PRESIDENT noted that the reference in the Soviet Union draft resolution to the fact that the report should be both objective and informational in character would seem to imply that such objectivity had been lacking in the past. Speaking for himself and for his predecessors, he would welcome the inclusion of some mention of the objectivity of past reports if the Council decided to adopt the draft resolution.

30. Mr. YU (China) said that his delegation would not be prepared to support the Soviet Union draft resolution, since in the past it had been fully satisfied with the nature of the Council's report.

31. He felt bound to say, however, that he could not place his full confidence in all three of the Council's officers, since he believed that his delegation had been discriminated against by one of the Vice-Presidents, who had taken the chair at the session of the Economic Committee immediately preceding the session of the Council itself. He was nevertheless satisfied that, under the guidance of the President himself, the report would emerge as an impartial document and would have the general support of the Council.

32. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia), replying to the assertions made by the Chinese representative, said that, as Chairman of the Economic Committee at its meetings immediately preceding the present session, he had always acted strictly in accordance with rule 47 of the rules of procedure.

33. Miss KALINOWSKA (Poland) supported the Soviet Union draft resolution. She pointed out that the functional commissions of the Economic and Social Council, the membership of which was no smaller than that of the Council itself, did in fact confirm their own

reports. Her delegation had full confidence in the Council's officers. Nevertheless, it thought it desirable for the discussions which had taken place in the Council to be clearly reflected in the report in view of the fact that governments did not have sufficient time at their disposal to study thoroughly the summary records of the Council's session before briefing their delegations for the annual regular session of the General Assembly. She did not believe that the Chilean representative's objection that the Council's work would be unduly prolonged was valid.

34. Mr. ATWAR HUSSAIN (Pakistan) said that his delegation was not prepared to vote in favour of the Soviet Union draft resolution since its acceptance would imply dissatisfaction with past reports, which in point of fact had not been the case.

35. He welcomed the President's suggestion to submit the summary records of the Council to governments together with the report in order to meet the views of the Soviet Union delegation.

36. Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted that the first part of the operative clause of his draft resolution had given rise to no objection.

37. His delegation had never proposed that a special session of the Council be convened to confirm the report. It seemed logical to him that the Council should examine its own report at the end of the present session; such a procedure would eliminate the serious delay which at present occurred before delegations received the report and would enable governments to consider its contents earlier and, not later, as had been suggested.

38. The subsidiary organs of the Economic and Social Council followed the entirely normal method of examining and adopting their own reports, so that all could become acquainted with them, not after a period of several weeks, but immediately at the end of their work.

39. In conclusion, he said that his delegation's proposal was in no way inspired by want of confidence in the officers of the Council or in the Secretariat. His delegation merely wished that the Council should again assume responsibility for its own report. It considered that the objections to its draft resolution were totally unfounded.

40. The PRESIDENT, replying to the Soviet Union representative, said that he had merely referred to the additional time which would be involved in printing the report in the amplified form proposed by the Soviet Union delegation.

41. Mr. INGLÉS (Philippines) said that his delegation had studied the question of the arrangements regarding the report of the Council to the General Assembly with an open mind, since the Philippines delegation, as a new member of the Council, had not had any part in decisions taken thereon previously.

42. His delegation was fully satisfied with the previous reports of the Council to the General Assembly and felt that no changes were called for without good cause.

43. His delegation was aware that reasons of expediency required a different procedure to be adopted by the Council regarding confirmation of its own report from

that followed by the functional commissions of the Council and the Trusteeship Council. His delegation placed its full confidence in the integrity and the impartiality of the President and the Vice-Presidents. However, in order to satisfy other delegations, he believed that it would not be contrary to the Council's procedure for any members who wished to do so to consult the President and the Vice-Presidents while the report was being prepared, on the understanding that the full responsibility did rest with those officers. His delegation would therefore not support the Soviet Union draft resolution.

44. Mr. RAO (India) associated himself with the previous speakers who held that, although the principles of the Soviet Union draft resolution were commendable, the proposals contained therein would prove impracticable because of the short time available between the session of the Council and that of the General Assembly, and the amount of work the Secretariat would have to accomplish in that brief period. He would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

45. Mr. CORLEY SMITH (United Kingdom) welcomed the Soviet Union representative's statement to the effect that his draft resolution had not in any way been intended to cast aspersions on the officers of the Council or to imply criticism of the Secretariat. He considered, however, that the draft resolution, by asking that future reports should be objective, did in fact give that impression, and he therefore urged the Council to vote against it.

46. Mr. CALDERÓN PUIG (Mexico) said that a clear proof of the Council's confidence in its President lay in the fact that he had been re-elected. Furthermore, the fact that the two Vice-Presidents represented the two opposing currents of opinion in the Council would provide an added assurance that the report would be prepared with all due impartiality.

47. His delegation shared the view that the Soviet Union draft resolution would prove impracticable although it had no objection to the principles underlying it, which were those that inspired the procedure of all United Nations bodies.

48. Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), noting that certain members had adopted different attitudes towards the two parts of the Soviet Union draft resolution, requested that it be voted upon in two parts.

49. Mr. BORIS (France) said that, if the Council voted on the proposal in two parts, he would maintain his amendment that the first part read: "*Resolves* that the report . . . should be, as in the past, of an informational nature . . ."

50. The PRESIDENT called attention to the fact that to adopt even the first part of the Soviet Union draft resolution would result in a change in the procedure followed hitherto with regard to the preparation of the Council's report to the General Assembly, as it would require a more detailed record of the discussions that had taken place.

51. Mr. EYSKENS (Belgium) said that the addition of the words "as in the past" might lead to the supposition that someone intended not to make an objective report of the discussions of the present session. While it should be clearly stated that all the members of the Council desired an impartial report, it seemed much simpler to reject entirely the Soviet Union proposal; his delegation would vote against it.

52. Mr. BORIS (France) said that, to avoid any misunderstanding, he withdrew his amendment.

53. Mr. CORLEY SMITH (United Kingdom) expressed his appreciation of the French representative's action in withdrawing his amendment, since he believed it was essential for the Council to avoid any ambiguity in its decision. His delegation would vote against the whole draft resolution.

54. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the first part of the operative paragraph of the Soviet Union draft resolution (E/L.217) up to the words: "twelfth and thirteenth sessions of the Economic and Social Council . . ."

Those words were rejected by 14 votes to 3, with 1 abstention.

55. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the final part of the operative paragraph of the Soviet Union draft resolution, which read: "and that this report should be confirmed by the Council itself".

Those words were rejected by 15 votes to 3.

56. The PRESIDENT assured the Council that he would make every effort ensure that the report was impartial, objective and informative, and that it conveyed a clear impression of the points of view expressed in the Council. He had full confidence in the co-operation he would receive from both Vice-Presidents in that duty.

Relations with the World Meteorological Organization (E/1996 and Add.I/Com.II): report of the Co-ordination Committee (E/2074)

57. The PRESIDENT opened the discussion on the report of the Co-ordination Committee (E/2074).

58. Mr. HESSEL (France) recalled that the World Meteorological Organization (WMO), when formed at its first congress in Paris from the very-long-established International Meteorological Organization, had endeavoured to simplify as much as possible the procedure of its agreement with the United Nations and of approval of the draft of a convention on privileges and immunities. In that respect, he paid a tribute to Sir Ramaswami Mudaliar and to the members of the standing committee of the first congress of WMO, which had prepared the draft agreement before the Council (E/1996).

59. His delegation hoped that the relations, which had begun so well, between the United Nations and the World Meteorological Organization would continue to be fully co-operative. It welcomed the entry into the family of the United Nations of an agency almost world-wide in composition.

60. The PRESIDENT declared the discussion closed and put to the vote the draft resolutions contained in the Co-ordination Committee's report (E/2074).

The resolutions were adopted unanimously.

61. The PRESIDENT took the opportunity to express his appreciation for the manner in which Sir Ramaswami Mudaliar had conducted the negotiations with WMO on behalf of the Economic and Social Council.

62. Mr. RAO (India) acknowledged the President's thanks on behalf of Sir Ramaswami Mudaliar, and said that his delegation would have great pleasure in transmitting them to Sir Ramaswami.

Invitations to non-member States to become Parties to the Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons and of the Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others (E/2009)

63. The PRESIDENT opened the discussion on the draft resolution contained in the Secretary-General's report (E/2009).

64. Mr. ZONOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) drew attention to the anomaly resulting from the use of the term "an active member" in the last paragraph of the draft resolution. The only judge of whether a member of a specialized agency had been active or not was the specialized agency itself and yet, in the terms of the draft resolution, it was the Council that addressed invitations to non-member States. The resolution would therefore be more acceptable if the word "active" were deleted.

65. Mr. FELLER (Secretariat) thought the Soviet Union amendment clarified the text of the draft resolution. The reason for the inclusion of the word "active" had been that the Secretary-General had used the same formula as had been adopted by the General Assembly in the Convention on Genocide. The substance of the text would in no way be altered if the word in question were omitted.

66. Mr. INGLÉS (Philippines), while in no way opposing the Secretary-General's draft resolution, recalled that on previous occasions his delegation had voiced its opposition to the admission of certain non-member States to membership either of the specialized agencies or of the United Nations. Since then, however, those countries had been admitted to certain specialized agencies in the face of his Government's opposition. His delegation stressed, therefore, that in approving the Secretary-General's draft resolution, it had in no way withdrawn its objections to the admission of those countries to membership in any of the specialized agencies.

67. The PRESIDENT declared the discussion closed.

68. Noting the general agreement that the word "active" in the last paragraph of the draft resolution should be deleted, he put the draft resolution, thus amended, to the vote.

The resolution, as amended, was unanimously adopted.

Methods of international financing of European emigration (E/2019)

69. The PRESIDENT opened the discussion on the Secretary-General's report (E/2019) and said that two draft resolutions had been submitted on the subject, one by the United States delegation (E/L.222) and the other by the delegations of Chile, Mexico and Peru (E/L.223).

70. Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) said the multilateral aspects of the migration problem had been under consideration for several years by the Council, the International Labour Organisation, the Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA) and other United Nations bodies, by the foreign ministers of the United States, the United Kingdom and France together with their experts, and finally by the Organization for European Economic Co-operation (OEEC) and the Council of Europe.

71. So far, the only multilateral assistance accorded to large-scale migration had been provided by the International Refugee Organization (IRO), but that, being an emergency operation, had been limited to the repatriation, transport and resettlement of refugees and would terminate by the end of the current year.

72. The question before the Council was no longer the emergency aspect of the migration problem, but the long-term one of finding ways and means of financing the continuing movement of Europeans to other parts of the world. The United States had always taken an active interest in migration problems and considered that its European aspect required action by the Council. However, as the Secretary-General's report had been published only recently, there had hardly been sufficient time for governments to study the important questions it raised with the care they deserved. The administrative, financial and policy questions involved would be fully discussed at the Migration Conference to be held in Naples under the auspices of the International Labour Organisation, when the governments concerned would all be present.

73. So far, those governments had received no specific proposals for discussion, but his delegation assumed that the Conference would consider operational plans for meeting the problem of the type and scope of the organization required, its cost, and how the cost would be met. His delegation felt unable to act on the matter until the conference had been held and more information had become available. The Council, therefore, should not attempt to discuss the substance of the report, and the recommendations contained in it, at the present stage. Before the Council could make long-term decisions, it should have the benefit of the experience of all interested agencies. In particular, the memorandum dated 5 March 1951 from the Director-General of the International Refugee Organization (IRO) to the IRO Council, entitled: *The Experience of the IRO in the Field of International Migration Operations*, should be submitted to the Council and to governments. Besides that document, IRO should be requested to supply any specific comments it had to make on the Secretary-General's report.

74. The Council should also take advantage of the experience of the International Labour Organisation in formulating long-range migration plans. Of all the specialized agencies, the International Labour Organisation had shown the keenest interest in migration problems, having learned much from its Preliminary Migration Conference in 1950, from its co-operation with OEEC in the migration field and from its many studies on migration and manpower. If the Secretary-General's report were transmitted to the International Labour Office with a request to it to submit its comments and recommendations in the light of the forthcoming Migration Conference at Naples in time for consideration at the fourteenth session of the Council, governments would have before them detailed information and suggestions on which to base their final decisions. Since the Migration Conference would meet at Naples in October 1951 and since the Governing Body of the International Labour Office would meet in late November, it should be possible for the International Labour Office to formulate its recommendations and comments so that they might be distributed to the Member States well in advance of the next session of the Economic and Social Council.

75. To that end, the United States delegation had submitted a draft resolution (E/L.222) which it hoped would be accepted by the Council.

76. Mr. ROCHEFORT (France) noted that the voluminous report submitted by the Secretary-General dealt with only one of the aspects of the tremendous problem of excess population in Europe—namely, that of financing emigration.

77. The statement made at the 510th meeting of the Council by the Director-General of the International Labour Office, as well as the work of the various conferences that had dealt with the question of European emigration, among them the conference of experts held in Strasburg, showed the extreme complexity of the problem, the various aspects of which differed greatly in character.

78. The report submitted by the Secretary-General made a very valuable addition to the information already gathered, but the French delegation was not in a position that day to deal with the substance of the problem on the basis of a report that had been so recently distributed and which would have to be closely examined by the French Government's technical experts.

79. Mr. VEYSEY (United Kingdom) agreed with the previous speakers that the report by the Secretary-General constituted a welcome contribution towards the solution of the problem of European migration. It was, however, complex and voluminous and needed a more thorough examination than had been possible in view of its recent distribution. The problems it treated were only part of a much greater complex of problems.

80. As stated in paragraph 11 of the report, the views expressed at the thirteenth session of the Council would be available for use at the Migration Conference to be held by the International Labour Organisation at Naples in October 1951. It seemed best, therefore, to ask the International Labour Organisation to bring the report

to the attention of the Migration Conference to be held at Naples, since the governments and organizations concerned would be in a much better position to discuss it. At the present stage, his delegation doubted whether any government had had time to formulate final views on the matter, particularly as regarded the establishment of an international fund, on which much more information was needed.

81. Mr. ADARKAR (India) agreed with the views expressed by previous speakers that the late receipt of the Secretary-General's report hardly allowed governments to reach any definite conclusion at the present stage.

82. The Indian delegation, on previous occasions, had expressed the view that it was undesirable to raise funds by means of an international agency for the purpose of furthering European migration and that the problem of migration should be approached from a global rather than a continental viewpoint, the acute situation in the densely populated areas of Asia being simultaneously considered.

83. It was regrettable that those views had passed unnoticed both in the Council and elsewhere and that the objection which had been raised during the Council's last session to resolution 308 C (XI) requesting the Secretary-General to consult the International Labour Organisation and prepare a study of the methods of international financing of European emigration had not been taken into account.

84. It seemed, however, that the report had gone too far; not, of course, through any fault of the Secretary-General. It not only exposed the basic facts of the situation, but formulated detailed recommendations referring particularly to the needs of the Latin-American countries. Thus at the very beginning of the report, in paragraph 2, the Secretary-General had quoted a resolution of ECLA, whereby the Commission noted that immigration could play an important role in the economic development of Latin America and recognized the seriousness of the problem created by the existence of surplus populations available for immigration from Europe. It was symptomatic, if not tragic, that the Economic Commission for Latin America, which was governed by the provisions of the United Nations Charter, should recognize only the European problem of migration and remain completely indifferent to the same problem in Asia and the Middle East.

85. Similarly, the description of the position adopted by the International Labour Organisation, outlined in paragraphs 7 to 11 of the report, and in particular the memorandum (EMC/11(a)) circulated by that body to governments concerning the best form of international co-operation to further European migration, did not indicate that the International Labour Organisation was fully seized of similar problems in Asia and the Middle East.

86. In paragraphs 141 to 143, the programmes and policies of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development had been described, in particular its hope that migration projects would be presented to it for financing. There was no possible objection to that, provided those projects were considered on an inter-

national basis. However, it was stated in paragraph 145 of the report, "Although the Bank is prepared to provide financial assistance for migration projects, no government of an immigration country, with the exception of Australia, has to date presented to the Bank a formal request for a loan to finance directly or indirectly any aspect of migration." In answer to that request, the Bank had granted a loan to Australia which, it was agreed, helped indirectly towards the solution of its migration problems. It was further stated in paragraph 148 that the Government of Australia was not using the money made available by the Bank to pay for the transfer of migrants, nor to meet other direct costs involved in migration, but that the loan was predicated on the fact that continued immigration would require additional capital to meet immediate strains on the economy. His delegation had no quarrel with Australia's immigration policy; the determination of such a policy was only part of its sovereign rights. However, it was a matter of extreme regret on moral grounds that an international organization should assist a policy based on discrimination directly or indirectly by making grants for purposes connected with migration.

87. In paragraph 154, the report stated that the Export-Import Bank of Washington was ready to make loans for migration purposes and had in fact already granted such a loan to Israel for the specific purpose of absorbing economically a large number of immigrants. There was no objection to such loans, since the bank in question was a national and not an international organization. Similarly, the work of the National Credit Institute for Italian Work Abroad was described in paragraph 170 of the report. There again there seemed no objection to a national organization making loans for the benefit of its own nationals abroad.

88. The part played by the IRO was summarized in paragraph 224. That body had been instituted for the purpose of assisting refugees in whatever way it could and, if migration was deemed to be one of those ways, then it was justified in promoting migration. However, assistance should be granted to refugees purely on the basis of their refugee status and not on that of their European status. If that policy were followed, no moral or constitutional objection could be raised.

89. There was no evidence in the report to show that the Secretary-General had felt it necessary to consider the basic question as to whether the activities it outlined were constitutionally justifiable. He had not been requested to do so; but, in view of objections previously raised by the Indian delegation, he might possibly have considered the matter, particularly as one of the purposes of the United Nations outlined in Article 1 of the Charter was: "To achieve international co-operation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion".

90. It might be argued that there was no evidence of discrimination, since the United Nations, and in particular the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Labour Organisa-

tion, were ready to assist migration schemes in any part of the world. That contention, however, did not fit the facts. The only areas of the world suitable for immigration were in America, Africa and Australasia and especially in the countries of Canada, Australia, Latin America and Central, South and East Africa. It was precisely in those countries, however, that immigration laws were strictest and most exclusive for all who did not belong to a particular continent or to a particular race. It was indeed unfortunate that the world's resources were not distributed proportionately to its population. For example, Java, where individuals owned farms hardly bigger than a pocket handkerchief, was a close neighbour of Australia, whose total population was only 7.5 millions but whose area was twice as big as that of India. In Western Australia, which occupied two-fifths of the whole continent and which was equivalent in size to India, there were 450,000 inhabitants, of whom 250,000 were concentrated in Perth and the balance of 200,000 scattered sparsely throughout the rest of that vast state. It might be argued that there were considerable tracts of desert in Australia, but they constituted by no means the major part of the country. He had spent two months in Australia and was convinced, even on the basis of the most conservative estimates, that it was possible to accommodate 50 million immigrants in Australia. The maximum estimates made by Australians themselves spoke of the possibility of absorbing 250 millions. Yet the surplus population of Java was not allowed to migrate there.

91. From the legal and constitutional point of view, Australia was perfectly justified in pursuing such an immigration policy; so was the Union of South Africa, at whose hands India had suffered much, in spite of the fact that Indian emigrants had been invited there. The Indian position on that question had always been clear. India had burnt its fingers in the past in such countries as the Union of South Africa, Mauritius and Fiji. However, the Indian delegation, quite apart from its own migration problem, could not support with an open mind any attempt to set up an international agency or a revolving fund on the lines recommended by the Secretary-General in a manner which ran counter to the provisions of the United Nations Charter.

92. Mr. OWEN (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Economic Affairs) felt some explanation was required by the Indian representative's statement. In that connexion, it was important that the Council should recall that the action taken by the Secretary-General in preparing his report on methods of international financing of European emigration had been in response to a specific Council resolution adopted in 1950, after a considerable debate which had centred on the special problem of European emigration needs. It would therefore have been outside the terms of reference given by the Council for the Secretary-General to have taken any action on the wider questions of migration mentioned by the Indian representative.

93. The Indian representative had also raised the constitutional question as to whether the Secretary-General had considered it within the terms of the United Nations Charter to make recommendations calling for

expenditure in certain sectors of the world when it was plainly observable that acute problems existed in other areas containing States Members of the United Nations. The Secretary-General had not considered that question formally, but the Indian representative would agree that many problems appeared in certain areas of the world on which the United Nations had to take specific action from time to time. Such action in no way implied discrimination against countries in other parts of the world where similar problems existed. It was therefore scarcely possible to say that a recommendation which implied that the regional aspects of a problem should receive special treatment was in any sense at variance with the United Nations Charter.

94. In offering that explanation, he sought in no way to give the impression that the Indian representative was not wholly within his rights in drawing attention to the wider aspects of the problem, which was indeed very

grave in that region of the world in which he (the Indian representative) had a special interest.

95. Mr. ADARKAR (India) thought the Assistant Secretary-General's explanation as to the precise work undertaken was quite satisfactory. Where he (Mr. Adarkar) differed from him was on the constitutional issue. It was well known that the United Nations undertook activities on a regional basis and that such regional problems were discussed as they arose in the regions, but the particular report before the Council, by limiting itself to a specific policy of preferring that a certain part of the world should be favoured from the point of view of emigration and by not approaching the problem on a global basis, was discriminatory. He would like to ask both the Secretary-General and the Council whether the United Nations could provide constitutional support for such an approach.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.