

**ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL**

**CONSEIL
ECONOMIQUE
ET SOCIAL**

E/P.V./16
11 September 1946
English
Unrestricted

NOTE: Any corrections made under rule 33 of Provisional Rules of Procedure for the Economic and Social Council should be submitted in writing within forty-eight hours to Mr. Delavenay in Room AG-026 at Lake Success (Telephone: Fieldstone 7-1100, Ext. 2697). The envelope containing the corrections should be marked "Urgent" and bear the appropriate document symbol number.

**VERBATIM RECORD OF THE SIXTEENTH MEETING
OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL
Lake Success, New York
Wednesday, 11 September 1946 at 10:30 am**

PRESENT:

The **PRESIDENT:** DR. STAMPAR

MR. LEBEAU	(Belgium)
HON. MR. MARTIN	(Canada)
MR. DAVILA	(Chile)
DR. CHANG	(China)
H.E. DR. ZULETA ANGEL	(Colombia)
H.E. DR. BELT	(Cuba)
DR. PAPANEK	(Czechoslovakia)
MR. PARODI	(France)
MR. ARGYROFOULOS	(Greece)
SIR GIRJA SHANKAR BAJPAI	(India)
H.E. DR. MALIK	(Lebanon)
MR. COLBJORNSEN	(Norway)
DR. ARCA PARRO	(Peru)
Absent	(Ukrainian SSR)
MR. FEONOV	(Soviet Union)
MR. PHILLIPS	(United Kingdom)
MR. PENROSE	(United States of America)
MR. KRASOVEC	(Yugoslavia)

The **PRESIDENT:** The Council is in session.

We have a wire from our President. "With deep regret I have to inform you that I am unable to preside over this session of the Economic and Social Council. My responsibilities as Prime Minister of Mysore, particularly in view of the acute food situation and important internal problems and the situation in India requiring my presence, make it impossible for me to leave India for the next two months. Please convey my profound apologies to all the Members of the Council. I most sincerely wish the Council to continue and to consolidate the great work it has so well started. Ramaswami Mudaliar, President."

According to Rule 19, the First Vice-President is going to preside at the meeting of this session.

I would like to review the activities of the Economic and Social Council in the period between the last session and this session. As you remember, the International Health Conference has been convened, and the International Health Conference started its work here in New York on June 19th. It was attended by sixty-seven states, and sixty-one states after this successful discussion signed the Constitution and the interim arrangements. I believe that the work of the International Health Conference was most successful.

A special committee appointed by this Council to discuss the matters of financing the new International Refugee Organization, met in London and finished this work and prepared a report to this Council.

In addition to it, the Sub-Commission on the Economic Reconstruction of Devastated Regions and occupied by the enemy met in London, and we expect this very important report by September 18th, or the latest, the 20th.

Before taking up our agenda, I would like to welcome particularly the Director General of UNRRA, Mr. LaGuardia, who is attending this meeting, and I do hope very much that he will be able to tell us something about his impressions in the displaced persons camps, and his general impression as to the situation in devastated regions.

I also welcome the Representative of the International Labor Organization sitting here, and I wish to welcome everybody here

who is attending this meeting and showing his particular interest in the del-
berations of this Council.
According to Rule 12 of our Rules of Procedure, we have to decide today
about our agenda. In your hands I suppose, is the revised agenda Document E/94
Revision I. It includes two y-one items. In addition to it, I have a
letter from the Czechoslovak Delegation asking that the claims for restitution
of the Danube vessels and barges of Czechoslovakian origin, should also be
put on the agenda, but as I received this letter only this morning, the Secre-
tariat was not able to distribute it to the Members.

Now, it is for the Members to decide if all items mentioned in the document E/94/Rev. 1, with the addition of the Czechoslovak proposal shall be taken up for consideration by this Council.

Does any Member of the Council wish to speak on this subject?

SIR Shankar BAJPAI (India): Mr. President, I gather that the paper relating to the Czechoslovakian request hasn't yet been circulated to the Members and I would therefore suggest that we reserve our judgment on this until we have had an opportunity of reading the paper.

MR. COLBORNSSEN (Norway): Mr. President, I am not going to propose any addition to the agenda... I have only a small observation to make. In view of a heavy agenda already, the Secretary-General urged Members to avoid proposing additional items but rather to defer such matters until a later Council meeting unless there was an urgent need for their consideration.

The Norwegian Delegation had intended to propose, as an additional item, the question of the universal adoption of the metric system of weights and measures. This important and long overdue reform is, to my mind, one which is eminently suited to come within the orbit of discussion and recommendation of our Council. However, in view of the situation prevailing with regard to other tasks, and to several matters carried over from our last Council meeting, I, for the time being, am refraining from putting the universal introduction of the metric system before this Council meeting. I just wish to serve notice that this question will be proposed for consideration at a later Council meeting, in which case the Norwegian Delegation will submit the draft proposal for action in the matter.

MR. PENROSE (United States): Mr. President, Mr. Winant has asked me to make two observations on the agenda. The first is that the United States Delegation would like to have the agenda kept open until, say next Monday morning. We quite share the Norwegian Representative's desire to prevent congestion of the agenda but we have one rather small item which will not consume much time of the Council but which it is important should be dealt with at this meeting.

The second observation relates to Item 21, Proposal of the Delegation of

Yugoslavia concerning The Restitution of The Danubian Vessels and Barges of Yugoslav Origin which the German Army Removed to the Upper Danube During the Retreat from Yugoslavia. On that item, I wish to make the observation that the United States Delegation would not feel itself limited to the narrow issues raised by the item as thus defined but would feel free to discuss Danubian questions in the larger setting, if necessary.

MR. FEONOV (Soviet Union): (Second interpretation; original Russian): Mr. President, we have many questions upon this agenda and I think, in order to save as much time as possible for the discussion of the most important and urgent questions, we should try and shorten this agenda. I would suggest the transfer of certain points on this agenda to the agenda of the next session of the Council.

In the first place, I should like to suggest that we transfer Items 12 and 13 to the agenda of our next session. The Economic and Social Council, in the course of its last session, decided to set up certain commissions. It seems to me that the first task of the Council should be to see that these commissions function before proceeding to the creation of other commissions. I suggest, therefore, that we transfer these Items 12 and 13 to the agenda of our next session.

I would make the same proposal as regards Item 17. The position here seems to me to be that the Trusteeship Council has not yet come into operation and therefore, it is premature to discuss the relations between that Council and the Security Council. I suggest, therefore, that we remove Item 17 of the agenda to our next session.

Finally, I suggest that we transfer also Item 15 to the agenda of our next session. During the last session of the Economic and Social Council, the Soviet Union Delegation constantly objected to the discussion of this question. When the question does come up for discussion, we shall insist that the Council do not take a decision at once. In any case, the question is not of any urgency and can quite well wait until the next session of the Council.

By removing these four points from the agenda of the present session,

E/P.V./16
23-30

Mr. President, we shall leave ourselves more time for the discussion of the more important and more urgent questions.

MR. KRASOVEC (Yugoslavia): Mr. President, I do not quite understand the proposals of the Representative of the United States. Does he perhaps mean that the whole question of the agenda is to be postponed, including Item 21? If so, I would be inclined to postpone it so that the representatives would be able to study also the proposals of the Czechoslovakian Delegation which has not been circulated because this is a similar proposal.

MR. PENROSE: (United States) Mr. President, my proposal was not to postpone any particular item on the agenda of 21, but rather to keep the agenda open for an additional small item which we desire to introduce. Secondly, I wish to indicate that we would feel in discussing Item 21, free to discuss broader issues, ^{and} more narrowly confined issues than leads up to a discussion of them.

MR. KRASOVEC (Yugoslavia): Mr. President, I am against the proposal of the representative of the United States. I insist upon putting Item 21 on the agenda, for many reasons. First of all, the question of the Danubian people and all these legal questions, the problem of the Danube has nothing to do with the question of the restitution of our property which has been seized. This is quite a separate question. This is one thing.

Secondly, we consider the whole thing very urgent and should like to have this matter settled before the Danube is frozen again, to prevent further damage in our economic life and in our reconstruction, and not only of our country but of all neighboring countries. We think that just the Economic and Social Council is the place where we have to put the matter on the agenda if we wish, and we do wish it. We wish to settle this question in a friendly and peaceful way. We have exhausted all means of direct negotiations. For one year and a half we have asked for the ships and we have been promised, month after month, restitution, but until now these ships still sit in ports of the Upper Danube.

We were told at the beginning that the vessels and barges could not be returned because of mines. The mines have been removed. We have been told later that the ships could not be given to us because there was ice on the Danube that the Danube was frozen. This reason also lasted some months.

Later we were told that the ships could not be returned because we are not the legitimate owners. We proved with all possible documents that the ships were owned by our private individuals and our State companies.

Later we were told that the ships could not be returned because some bridges were broken, and so on.

Finally, when no such legal and economic and technical reasons were given we were told in some more or less official way that this was connected with the problem of shipping on the Danube generally.

THE PRESIDENT: May I ask the Representative of Yugoslavia to discuss these matters when the Item will be put forward in our agenda.

MR. KRASOVEC (Yugoslavia): Mr. President, I just want to explain. I thank you for your remarks, but I must answer that I must explain why this matter is urgent, why this matter cannot be delayed. That is, in order to avoid further damage to our reconstruction. This Council is just the place where it should be dealt with.

Our proposal contains sufficient points to explain what damage in the reconstruction has been made by not restoring these ships. For all these reasons, I urgently propose to all the Honorable Members of the Council to accept this item on the agenda of this Council. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: With full respect to the Representative of Yugoslavia, I think that the Representative of the United States did not propose postponement of the discussion. He simply stated that he will use this opportunity to widen this subject. Of course, nobody is going to prevent him in this. I think that our Yugoslav colleague misunderstood him. I do not think that the United States Delegation is against any full dress debate of this subject. I so understood the United States Representative in this manner.

MR. PAPANEK (Czechoslovakia): Mr. President, I wanted to have the explanation concerning the point of view of the United States Representative. You have given it to us and he suggests that the agenda should be open until next Monday, if I understand it correctly, and in that case the Czechoslovak proposal would be included in that agenda.

MR. FEONOV (Soviet Union) (Second interpretation; original in Russian):

Mr. President, I think the fear expressed by the Yugoslav Representative is not altogether without foundation. We do not know at the present stage how far the United States Representative proposes to widen the question included in the provisional agenda at the request of the Yugoslav Representative. From what we have heard, it would seem to follow that the United States Representative proposes to raise the whole question of navigation on the Danube. If that is so, it seems to me the question placed on the agenda by the Yugoslav Representative runs the risk of being drowned in this much wider question. It is my opinion that the question of navigation upon the Danube is not really intimately linked with the question raised by the Yugoslav Representative. I think it would be a good thing if the Council could hear from the United States Representative exactly what the United States Delegation means by widening the question placed upon the agenda at the request of the Yugoslav Representative. The Council will then be in a position to decide whether this question really constitutes a new independent item; if so, whether the Council should discuss it, and if the Council is to discuss it, then the Members of the Council have time to be informed of the situation and to obtain the opinions of the Governments which they represent.

MR. PENROSE (United States): Mr. President, I think the Yugoslav Representative was under a misunderstanding originally which led to this rather prolonged discussion involving certain subject matter which perhaps is not quite appropriate for discussion on the agenda. I think the question can be quite satisfactorily dealt with if the agenda is left open, on the understanding of course that the items here are approved except in so far as any of the suggestions for postponement are adopted.

On the broader issues, I do not wish to enter into discussion of this particular Item 21 at this stage. I do not think the Council would approve my entering into a full discussion of Item 21 now, which would be necessary in order to give a complete reply at this stage to the Soviet Representative. The United States Delegation is perfectly willing to discuss this subject

fully when it is reached on the agenda, and we hope we may reach a friendly settlement. What we wish to point out, however, is that in raising that, we shall have to raise certain related issues which are closely tied up with the Yugoslav proposal, and that if those related issues are discussed, it may help to solve the problem which the Yugoslav Representative wishes to have dealt with at this Council meeting.

MR. KRASOVEC (Yugoslavia): Mr. President, I have stressed in my speech just at the beginning that we separate those two questions. The question of the Danube regime is one question, and the question of seizing foreign property is quite a different question, and therefore, I wanted to have a separate point. I have not yet heard a fuller explanation from the Representative of the United States as to how he does connect these two questions, and it would be perhaps for this reason well that we discuss both point 21 and the point of widening this question later when the United States Delegation will propose this widening, because then we shall see clearly how the Representative of the United States wants those two questions to be connected. At the same time, we shall later see the Czechoslovakian proposal. I would be inclined therefore, to have the whole of this question postponed a little, but reserve my rights to propose again the additional discussion.

MR. FARODI (France) (Interpretation from French): Mr. President, I wish to support the proposal made by the United States Representative that it would be desirable to have the possibility for us to add new questions to the Provisional Agenda, at least for a few days to come.

As regards Item 21, I am tempted to share the point of view expressed by the Representative of India, that we need further clarification on this question.

I would like to raise a question, purely from the floor, with a view to obtaining information, and this question would be addressed particularly to the Representative of Yugoslavia. I wonder whether the question of restitution really falls within the competence of the Economic and Social Council? If this question is taken as part of the wider question of Danubian navigation, perhaps it does fall within the competence of this Council. But the question of restitution in itself would seem to me to be rather a juridical or legal question than an economic question. I just raised the question, Mr. President, with a view to clarification.

SIR Girja Shankar BAJPAL (India): Well, Mr. President, since it has been announced that I want your attention for a moment, I will speak. It occurs to me that what we have before us at the moment is Item 21 as it is worded. Now, the Representative of the United States has asked that the Agenda be kept open until Monday. It seems to me that if the Representative of the United States has any modification of the wording or the scope of Item 21 to suggest, it will be open to him to do so between now and Monday next. As to what exactly will be in order for discussion under Item 21, when Item 21, as now worded, comes up for discussion, is, I submit, Mr. President, a question which cannot possibly be answered now. I have very little experience in this Council, but I am not devoid of parliamentary experience. It seems to me that the question as to what is relevant and what is not relevant to a particular question for purposes of discussion can only be answered when the question is being discussed.

MR. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom): Mr. President, I think we must all be very grateful to the Representative from India for the clarity and inescapable logic of his last remarks, and with your permission, Mr. President, I would

like to go on to make some comments on the suggestions which the Soviet Delegation made about the withdrawal of some items from the Agenda.

The Soviet Delegation suggested that the United Kingdom proposal dealing with the League Means should be withdrawn. When I introduced this item, Mr. President, at the last session, I stated that we did not attach urgency or great importance to this item, and I am prepared to agree that this item should be taken last. I have also carefully considered with my Delegation, in the light of what my Soviet colleague has said, whether we can withdraw it. But for the moment I would like to keep the item open, and I think this fits in with the arrangement that the Agenda should be open until next Monday.

When I come, Mr. President, to the next suggestions of the Soviet Delegation, which were that the items dealing with the Fiscal and Demographic Commissions should be withdrawn, I am not able to take quite the same attitude. My Delegation attaches the highest importance to getting the organizational work of this Council going, and no one will say that the Fiscal Commission is as important as the work of many of the other Commissions of the Council. But nonetheless, it is an important piece of technical apparatus for considering economic problems, and I would suggest that we try, if possible, to deal with it at this Council, and that we, at any rate, keep it on the Agenda for the time being.

As regards the Population Commission, that, in our view, is a Commission of very considerable importance. Its work is closely related to that of the Economic Commission, the Statistical Commission, and the Social Commission, and we know from experience how difficult it is, what delay is liable to occur, in setting up these pieces of international machinery, although they may be of a technical nature. We have been in operation for nine months and we haven't yet got our Commissions actually functioning. I hope, therefore, that the Population Commission will be dealt with this time, at this session of the Council, and that we will succeed in setting up this valuable Commission.

MR. ARGYROPOULOS (Greece): Mr. Chairman, I feel that I must agree with our French colleague when he states that it may be questionable if that question falls within the framework of our discussion. Of course, that can only be judged when we know exactly what it concerns. That is why I would like to ask you to have the documents distributed to us as quickly as possible, in order to be able to judge exactly of the purport of the question and of the acceptability of the discussion of the question by our Council. At the same time, we will be able then to judge of the opportunity of extending the debate and enlarging the question, so much more so as perhaps there may be also other interests of other countries involved in that same point. In order to be able to form a definite opinion concerning it, I repeat, I would ask that the necessary documents be distributed to us as quickly as possible.

The PRESIDENT: I can answer immediately that the Yugoslav document has been distributed among the Members under E/9. I think if the Representative of Greece would read this document, I think he will find that there is plenty material in it to decide about this item 21.

MR. ARGYROPOULOS (Greece): Mr. President, I don't see that document among those which have been given to me and I wonder whether there ^{are} any omissions.

The PRESIDENT: I am sorry but I am not responsible for the distribution of documents. As you know I signed this document, but as I am now President I don't take any part in the discussion.

MR. FEONOV (Soviet Union) (Second interpretation; original, ^{in Russian}): I would like to propose Mr. President that we leave item 21 as it stands and when we come to discuss this item, we shall have an opportunity of hearing the proposal of the United States Delegation. The Council will then be in a position to decide whether it wishes to discuss the proposal of the United States Delegation under item 21 or not. I think the Representative of India shares this opinion.

As regards my proposal for the shortening of the agenda of the present session, I would like to make it clear that the Soviet Delegation did not propose that certain items be withdrawn from discussion by the Economic and

Social Council altogether. It proposed only that certain items be transferred from the agenda of the present session to the agenda of our next session.

MR. LEBEAU (Interpretation from French) (Belgium): I think, Mr. President, the difficulty in which we find ourselves comes from the existence and the attempt to observe Rule 12 of our Rules of Procedure. This Rule states that the first item upon the agenda is the adoption of the agenda. You have very properly attempted to apply this Rule, Mr. President, but there is nothing more difficult than the adoption of an agenda, because it leads inevitably to the discussion of the substance of each item, because before deciding upon the adoption of an item, its receivability, its scope, and its other qualifications have to be examined.

This difficulty has led the Belgian Delegation on other occasions to doubt the wisdom of Rule 12 and to doubt the practicability of Rule 12 of our Rules of Procedure. Our difficulty, then, is not a new one at all. We were faced with it in the Second Session of the Council held in May of this year, and at that time, if I remember rightly -- the Secretariat will correct me if I am wrong -- we got out of our difficulty through a proposal of the President that we should not adopt the agenda but that we should simply consider the agenda as a list of questions with which the Council was seized, because they were submitted to the Council by the General Assembly. We decided, then, to proceed to the examination of these questions, one by one, without pronouncing ourselves upon the agenda as a whole. The receivability of each question was then discussed as the question came up.

I think, Mr. President, that this is the wisest and most practical course, and I should like to propose, therefore, that we close now the present debate, that we decide not to adopt the agenda, that we consider the items now before us as a list of which the Council is seized, and to which other items, including those of the Czechoslovak Delegation, that announced by the United States Delegation, and possibly others, can be added at a later time. I suggest that we take this step and that we discuss these questions according to your choice, Mr. President, or according to the selection made by the Secretariat in document E/115. I wish to make

a formal proposal in this sense.

MR. PENROSE (United States): Mr. President, I do not wish to prolong this discussion, but on Item 21 I would like to express agreement with the views of the Representative from India and the Representative from France, and we are quite willing to accept Item 21 on the understanding that it is to be treated as an economic issue and not as a simple juridical issue. That means that related economic questions will inevitably come within the orbit of the discussion.

Second, as regards the proposal of the Soviet Representative for the postponement of certain items until the next Session, I would like to suggest that we might reach an agreement at an intermediate position between his and that of the United Kingdom Representative by placing those four items at the bottom of the agenda to be discussed if time permits at this Session; if not, to be left over to the next Session.

MR. Arca PARRO (Peru): I just want to support the proposal made by the Belgian Representative. I think that is the wisest way to finish this long debate, and we do not have time for long debates.

MR. KRASOVEC (Yugoslavia) Mr. President, we can now agree with the Representative of the United States. All the Economic and Social Council can do is to consider the economic aspect of the matter and to make a recommendation from the economic point of view, and this appears clearly from our proposal which has been circulated.

SIR GIRJA SHANKAR BAJPAI (India): Mr. President, since the wisdom of a fellow-countryman of mine has been invoked, perhaps, I might follow in his footsteps though not possibly as wisely as he would have given it.

It seems to me that in the course of the discussion today, we have had four suggestions made: A suggestion for elucidating the agenda, a suggestion for adding to the agenda, a suggestion for subtracting from the agenda, and then a suggestion for postponing the agenda. I think it is quite obvious that we cannot, being fair-minded people, choose as between these different courses and give them a certain order of priority, especially

as it does not seem very likely that we shall reach an agreement on the relative priority to be given to these four different processes.

I submit, therefore, that there is much to be said for the point of view of the Belgian Representative, but I would rather narrow it to the extent of proposing that today, with your guidance, we come to some conclusion on the Provisional Target Timetable printed at the back of Document E/115. The first part deals with suggestions for Wednesday, 11 September, 1946. Item 1 -- which is marked with an asterisk and which has already been the subject of prolonged debate -- naturally, we will not pronounce upon today. But, could we pronounce upon the rest, Items 2 and 3? Could we proceed in that order?

Dr. CHANG (China): Mr. President, it seems as though we have already spoken enough on this matter of agenda. The general trend is to agree with the suggestion made by the Belgian Representative and later on supported by the Indian Representative. I would also support this suggestion, and especially, to be concrete, to adopt this as our target time-table, with the exception of Friday, September 13 - Item 2. In considering the ^{organization of the} /Demo-graphic Commission, I think the suggestion of the United States Representative as well as the Representative of the Soviet Union to have the organization of the six commissions, which already started working, first, and then to put the organization of the other commissions - not necessarily to postpone them until the next session, but to put them toward the end of this session/^{is good.} In case time allows, we shall proceed with the discussion of the organization; if not, we shall postpone them until the next session.

Therefore, Mr. President, I should like to save time and propose the adoption of this provisional target time-table for the rest of this meeting, with the deletion of Item 2 from the Friday-proposed agenda. Furthermore, Mr. President, just in order to clarify this in our mind, I really think there are two categories of problems before us at this session, one, proper organization, which is not yet finished. Therefore, we should proceed with the discussion of the Economic and Employment Commission, and later on, with the organization and the election of the commissions and the expenses of the commissions. That is on the organizational side, category one. And then, in category 2 we might call them "the current problems", the problems that must be tackled, namely, the Refugees and later on the devastated areas and health, and so forth. They are the current problems and, therefore, these two categories should be carried on side by side.

Therefore, I agree. I rather see the advisability of following such a schedule.

Mr. FEONOV: (Soviet Union): Mr. President, in order to save time, I would like to express my agreement with the suggestion made by the United States Representative on the Soviet Union proposal concerning the agenda. As to the suggestion made by the Belgian Representative, I cannot possibly

E/P.V./16
62 - 65

see how we can conduct our business and program or work without having accepted the agenda. It seems to me that it would be better to accept the agenda now and to leave it open for any additional suggestions after a certain date which we are to fix later.

H.E. DR. ZULETA ANGEL (Colombia): (Interpretation from French): Mr. President, according to Rule 44 of our Rules of Procedure, which is as follows-- I would like to read it to the Council: "During the discussion of any question, a Representative may ask for the adjournment of the debate. This motion has priority. In addition to the author of the motion, one speaker may speak for and another against the proposal." It seems to me, Mr. President, that if the proposal of the Belgian Representative does constitute a proposal for the adjournment of the debate upon the adoption of the agenda, we should apply this Rule 44, and we should proceed to the vote immediately upon the Belgian proposal.

If I am wrong in my interpretation of the Belgian motion, and it does not constitute a motion for the adjournment of the debate, then I suggest that Rule 46 of our Rules of Procedure should be applied. Rule 46 states that at any time a Representative may call for the closure of the discussion, even if other Representatives have expressed a desire to speak. If a Representative asks to be allowed to speak in order to oppose the motion for closure, two speakers only may be authorized to speak. If, therefore, the Belgian proposal does not call for an adjournment of the debate, I wish, myself, to propose that the Council close this debate under the terms of Rule 46

The PRESIDENT: I think that all Members of the Council agree that this debate should be closed. Therefore, I do not see any reason for voting on it. It is, in fact, Rule 53 which should be applied, and I am asking now the Members of the Council if anybody wishes to speak on this subject, the proposal of the Colombian Representative.

MR. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom): Mr. President, before we proceed to a vote on this matter, I, on my part, would like a little clarification of the Belgian proposal. I think Mr. Lebeau put his proposal forward with the understanding at that time that we were in a difficulty in settling our agenda, and he adduced what seemed to me to be quite a substantive proposal, namely, that we should alter one of our rules of procedure. I want to ask him now how far he thinks it is still necessary to get us out of any difficulty,

because it seems to me that we are not in a difficulty. It seems to me that the Council is of the opinion that we should adopt items 1 to 21, and that we should shift items 12, 13, 15 and 17 to the end of the agenda. For my part, I am prepared to agree, as our Soviet colleague is too. Thirdly, I think the general opinion is that we should keep the agenda open for additional items until Monday. If that is so, I would ask our Belgian colleague whether it is necessary to introduce what seems to me rather a substantive question. Before I conclude, I would just ask one question about the agenda. I see that the Refugees' Committee is down for Thursday afternoon. A number of us have had the documents only a relatively short time. Some Delegations have their people, who deal with this, still on the way, delayed by weather. I believe the Ukrainian Delegation, who took a notable part in the proceedings, has not arrived as yet at all. I wonder whether that item could not be postponed until Saturday afternoon.

HON. MR. MARTIN (Canada): Well, I think, Mr. President, that we ought to let the Belgian Representative reply to the query put by the United Kingdom Representative. I had hoped that by joining the trend which the Representative for China had referred to, in indicating my support of the proposal of the Belgian Representative, I would help to bring this question to the conclusion I know we all want.

(Interpretation from French):
MR. LEBEAU (Belgium): My proposal, Mr. President, was aimed at
at
avoiding the present stage of a prolongation of the debate upon the merits
of each question upon this provisional agenda. In this way, I thought
we might get out of the difficulty of procedure in which we find ourselves,
but if as the United Kingdom Representative suggests that at least
some of the difficulties are now removed, I have no objection whatever
to withdrawing my proposal.

The PRESIDENT: I think we all agree that this debate on the agenda
should be concluded now, and may I make the following proposals.

That all items put in the agenda in document E/94 Revised 1, should
be taken up, and the Soviet Representative agreed that Items 12, 13, 15 and
17 should be put at the end of our agenda, and we will see if we have
plenty of time to discuss it at this session.

I still believe that we can finish our discussions by the end of
this month and at the same time, I am very satisfied with our discussion
this morning, in spite of the very great delay, because such discussions have
importance in clearing up certain points, and I was particularly happy
about the statement made by the United States Representative who said very
clearly that he believes that the difficulties with Yugoslavian steamers
and barges will be frankly settled, and I am quite sure that such settlement
will be reached.

It is now already too late, and I hope very much that you will agree
to this agenda as proposed with this alteration made by the United States
Representative, the United Kingdom Representative and the Soviet Union
Representative.

This afternoon, we will meet at 2:30 at the same place and I will
ask Mr. LaGuardia to speak on matters of refugees because this is one of the
very important questions to be discussed at this session, and I think it
will be extremely useful to hear his very valued comments and impressions
and I hope the Representatives will adopt this agenda and come back again
at 2:30 to the same place. There are dining rooms here for Representatives,
but there are only fifty places available, I must remind you.

DR. CHANG (China): I still think we need some sort of target program to go by; otherwise, we won't know what we are going to discuss at the next session or the next two or three days. Shouldn't we, Mr. President, just to have an understanding, that except for the two items already commented on, namely, Friday, Item 2, Demographic Commission which should be naturally postponed and the other, a Refugee Committee may be postponed for one day in view of the fact that the documents are not yet thoroughly digested. Aside from those two exceptions, we should follow this target program as far as we can. If that is the case, we should like to know after Mr. LaGuardia's - I am sure most energetic statement - what are we going to do this afternoon; because we may have to prepare ourselves in case Items 18 and 19 should be brought up, and we should do something in preparation. Or shall we keep on discussing that problem tomorrow morning?

The PRESIDENT: No, but this document E/115 is timed for this week, and this afternoon, first of all, we will listen to the speech of Mr. LaGuardia. Of course, we cannot discuss immediately the question of refugees, but I'm quite sure that it will be extremely useful for the Council to study the documents on the basis of Mr. LaGuardia's speech, but this afternoon, we will discuss Item 2 on today's program, and thirdly, how should we discuss the matters of refugee problems - in plenary session or in Subcommittee. I think these two items will be discussed this afternoon.

DR. CHANG (China): Item 18 and Item 19.

The PRESIDENT: Yes, 18 and 19 and the procedure of refugee problems.

DR. ARCA PARRO (Peru): Mr. President, I wish just to ask that in regard to Mr. LaGuardia's speech, maybe he could make that speech right now without postponing it to this afternoon.

The PRESIDENT: It is a quarter to one. It is rather late. I would prefer to have him deliver his speech this afternoon. I think we will have very much more time.

MR. COLBJORNSEN (Norway): I wish to support my colleague from Peru. I think we are only being in session about one and a half hours and we can surely endure this speech of Mr. LaGuardia right now. I think we should do that, especially since there is going to be no discussion afterwards. And with regard to this afternoon's work, I propose that we should also take Item 20, preferably before Items 18 and 19. I am referring to "Payment of expenses of members of Commissions" because postponing the decision on that matter, on that may depend matters and questions of subcommissions and so on. I think this matter of expenses of commissions is very simple and we can very well finally dispose of this matter this afternoon, which will facilitate and expedite our further deliberations.

SIR Girja Shankar BAJPAI (India): Mr. President, I would like to support your suggestion that we adjourn until this afternoon. I have had the privilege of hearing Mr. LaGuardia before and nobody will dispute his energy, but I think we all agree that he should not on this occasion sacrifice perspicuity to brevity. I think we should give him ample time to expound on a question which is of great complexity and also of great interest and as our Norwegian colleague said with regard to the energy of the audience, I would like to tell him that not being fed on fish, but only on vegetables, my energy is not equal to his.

DR. ARCO PARRO (Peru): In view of the remarks made by my colleague from India, I think Mr. LaGuardia's speech will be just as interesting this afternoon.

The PRESIDENT: Members of the Council, we will meet at 2:30 this afternoon. The meeting is adjourned.

(The meeting adjourned at 12:40 p.m.)
