

**ECONOMIC  
AND  
SOCIAL COUNCIL**

**CONSEIL  
ECONOMIQUE  
ET SOCIAL**

E/P.V./29

30 September 1946

English

Unrestricted

NOTE: Any corrections made under Rule 33 of the Provisional Rules of Procedure of 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 FOURTEENTH MEETING OF THE THIRD SESSION  
OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Lake Success, N. Y.

Monday, 30 September 1946 at 2:45 pm

## PRESENT:

THE PRESIDENT: DR. STAMPAR

MR. LEBEAU	(Belgium)
MR. RIDDELL	(Canada)
MR. DAVILA	(Chile)
MR. YANG	(China)
MR. ZULETA ANGEL	(Colombia)
MR. PAPANEK	(Czechoslovakia)
MR. ARGYROPOULOS	(Greece)
SIR G. SHANKAR BAJPAI	(India)
MR. COLBJORNSEN	(Norway)
MR. PATINO	(Peru)
MR. LEV MEDVED	(Ukrainian SSR)
MR. McNEIL	(Soviet Union)
MR. McNEIL	(United Kingdom)
MR. WARREN	(United States of America)
MR. MALES	(Yugoslavia)

The PRESIDENT: The meeting will come to order.

I recognize the Representative of Belgium.

MR. LEBEAU (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): I wish very briefly, Mr. President, to support the remarks of the Representative of France on the subject now under discussion. I would like to remind the Council that during the discussion in Commission of this subject, in the Second Session of the Economic and Social Council the same arguments and examples were brought forward in favor of that position as are brought forward today. I wish, therefore, to oppose the amendment put forward in this connection.

MR. McNEIL (United Kingdom): Mr. President, I am most reluctant to enter into the discussion because this point which our Soviet colleague now offers us has been debated again and again in London, and I am glad to say, has been defeated again and again in London. With the best of will, we cannot accept it because we know perfectly well that we would be excluding

people whose numbers we cannot even remotely visualize. It is very difficult to conceive who did not help the enemy in liberated countries.

Mr. Feonov made remarks with reference to Nuremburg and said that here we would have collaborators. But, that is not precisely so because we have already provided for the exclusion of quislings, traitors and war criminals, and in this same clause we still provide that where it can be shown that there is collaboration, then that person is excluded. I fear that that is where the difficulty lies between us, and I find no way of bridging it. According to normal usages of my country, and the basis of our law, it is obligatory to define an offense, to prove an offense, before that person is accepted as being guilty. I think what we have been asked to do here is to adopt the opposite attitude and accept that these persons should be excluded unless they can give reason why they should be included. I cannot go that far on behalf of my Government. I am very anxious to meet Mr. Feonov and I am very anxious, indeed, to say that I think that the cooperation and understanding which he and his colleagues have displayed toward us in these recent discussions of the last three or four days was of great value, but this is one place where I cannot meet you. I am most sorry, but that is the definite and final attitude of my Government in this matter.

MR. MATES (Yugoslavia): Mr. President, I have to oppose the clause as it stands here, and I will try to put it quite shortly. Before doing so, I wish to emphasize that it is not here the question of a court of law to pass a sentence and punishment to some offender. Therefore, I do not like to treat this case in such words as the Representative of the United Kingdom did, but still if we take this legal form then we read, in the opening sentence: "any other person who can be shown...". The question arises, who has to show; who has to give the proof? It is perfectly evident that the person in question will not try to prove that he has done such and such a thing, which disqualifies him from assistance. Now, probably, in most cases, the Government which has suffered from the collaboration of the person in question will be the partner to decide, which will have proof, and in some cases the organization, the admission of the organization itself.

I am ready to accept that there must be somebody who will give some evidence as to the collaboration. If nobody presents a case, there will be no question at all, but the charge will be collaboration, or as it says here, "assistance to enemy forces since the outbreak of the Second World War in their operations against the United Nations." That is the charge. It is a material fact which can be proved and established. The question of whether it was voluntary or not can be put only as a question of extenuating circumstances, of circumstances which in some cases may excuse the action, the action as cooperation, assistance to enemy forces against the United Nations during the Second World War. Such assistance is the charge. We cannot afford to assist people who have fought and assisted the fight of our enemies against our country and our Allies. But if such person is able to present extenuating circumstances, which are convincing, then in such cases, evidently, we can excuse, but not because the person has not assisted, that we do not consider this as assistance, but only as exceptional measures. If we have put it, somehow, in these words, then the situation would be quite different. To show somebody that he did something voluntarily or not voluntarily will, in most cases, be very difficult and almost

impossible. Therefore, it is not because we wish to insist that people who have been forced and pressed into something against their opinion in an extremely difficult situation should be penalized, but only in order to have, at a future stage -- if it is impossible now -- some provision which would give us a sufficient guarantee that by the procedure which is implied in this formulation, a situation can be created where a considerable number, even of worse cases of assistance in the fight against our Allies, become the concern of the IRO. Having in mind this consideration, in the first place, the Yugoslav Delegation cannot accept the article as it stands.

The PRESIDENT: On Saturday I explained to the Members of the Council that most probably we will be obliged to work even after dinner, but I find some difficulties for the Secretariat regarding transportation, and therefore, I propose we should stay here until seven-thirty this evening and not after dinner. Perhaps we should do it every day. I still believe that we can finish our work by Wednesday night. Any objections?

MR. McNEIL (United Kingdom): Mr. President, I can quite understand the difficulties of the Secretariat. I think they are very real. I should be very much on your side in not meeting tonight, even though that would involve many complications, if this were the only place on the Continent of America where the Economic and Social Council can meet, but I imagine most of the Secretariat live in or near Manhattan, and I suppose it is not out of the bounds of human ingenuity to hire a small room somewhere in the City of New York where we could meet after dinner. I imagine that such a room is already at the disposal of the Security Council. I also imagine that they might be quite willing to meet us in our tremendous difficulties. I have already had the impertinence to tell this Council that unless we manage to find some means of keeping approximately to a timetable, we will quite quickly find ourselves in such a position that no person with any important job in hand would be able to come to the Council. That would greatly detract from the credit of the Council and it would greatly handicap their work. You now say that you feel we may finish Wednesday night. I hope so, because that means.



E/P.V./29  
8-10

that we will still be five days beyond our original timetable. If we finish Wednesday night, well and good, but I should hope that we might manage to finish sooner, and I certainly think that it would be a substantial contribution towards finishing if we meet tonight after dinner.

I do not suggest to you, Mr. President, to a person of your experience, that there is a great deal less talking, a great deal more clear thinking and a great deal more willingness to finish work as it comes towards 1:00 a.m., 2:00 a.m. and 3:00 a.m., and I do hope that this Council will decide to meet until that time tonight if necessary and I suggest that can be arranged in the City of New York.

MR. OWEN (Assistant Secretary-General, Economic Affairs Department):

Mr. President, I think the Members of the Council will realize that the Secretariat of the United Nations which is of quite recent formation does find it extremely difficult within the limitations which it has at the moment to serve this Council as well as we hope to in the future. We do have to work within the limitations of the people we have available.

It would be possible, however, if the Council agrees, to provide a full service for the Council until 6:30 with a break until 8:00, and then a further session tonight between 8:00 and 10:00 in this Chamber. It would still be possible for the Council to go on after the hour of 10:00 provided the Council agrees to dispense with any verbatim record of the proceedings.

DR. CHANG (China): I think that inasmuch as we are going to have maybe two days, if not three days, more we should conserve some of our energy. Furthermore, the teams are not all of the same size. If that had been the case, we could have longer sessions. Then, people could take turns, substitutes could be put in. It happens that my Delegation is not the smallest and there are many that are smaller than mine. Consequently, considering the smaller Delegations, we should not work them too hard. So, I am personally of the opinion that at least for Monday and Tuesday we should stop at 7:00, and if there is a necessity for meetings on Wednesday and Thursday we can continue.

MR. McNEIL (United Kingdom): Wednesday and Thursday!

The PRESIDENT: We will stay here until 7:00 o'clock, or a little later than 7:00.

MR. McNEIL (United Kingdom): I am sorry, but I did not hear you. I don't know what we decided.

The PRESIDENT: We will stay here a little after 7:00 o'clock this afternoon.

MR. McNEIL (United Kingdom): I beg to move, Mr. President, that this Council will remain in session today until we have disposed of all the refugee business.

SIR Girja SHANKAR BAJPAI (India): Mr. President, I beg to oppose the motion which the Representative of the United Kingdom has made.

MR. McNEIL (United Kingdom): I should like a vote. I take the most serious view of this. I cannot imagine how any of my colleagues can laugh at this. I am not suggesting that my Indian colleague is. It doesn't seem to me a light matter at all. I think we are bringing disrepute to this conception of the Council and I have not had one reason offered here except the reason of physical tiredness which I am quite prepared to listen to if we got to a late stage in the discussion and it was obvious we were tired. I would never, for a moment, suggest otherwise than we should adjourn. But there are, in the meantime, no physical difficulties which would present themselves for a dismissal of this business and I formally move in that fashion and ask for a roll call vote.

SIR G. Shankar BAJPAI (India): Mr. President, I am most reluctant to speak in this Council unless there is something to say in defense of one's point of view. Our colleague from the United Kingdom said that he would be happier if we indulged in clearer thinking and less speaking in this Council. I do not presume to speak for the others, but in speaking for the Indian Delegation, I should like to assure him that we probably hold the record for brevity of speech, and I don't think that we have a monopoly of confused thinking.

Sir, he said that the Council will bring disrepute on itself if it does not decide to adhere to what I consider to be an entirely arbitrary timetable. Sir, we are not all in the position of having forty or fifty experts to advise us. I am limited to a team of myself, the Trade Commissioner and a Secretary. We are new in the international field and we haven't the centuries of experience which our friend from the United Kingdom and his colleagues have behind them. It is unreasonable to expect that we should, even if we had the monetary sources, bring teams of forty or fifty here. He said, Sir, that no person of importance would come to this country and go beyond that arbitrary timetable. Of course, Sir, I do not presume to say that anybody in my Delegation has the importance of an Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, but I would like to submit this for his consideration. That we don't belong to the rank of the unemployed, even though we be of the unimportant employed. The position, frankly, Sir, is this, that we are much more likely to bring disrepute on ourselves if we hurry our task and throw upon the smaller Delegations a strain which frustrates them inhospitably; <sup>if</sup> than we spend a day or two longer with our work and do it to the satisfaction of all. That is all, Sir.

MR. McNEIL (United Kingdom): Are we having a formal vote, Mr. President?

The PRESIDENT: Certainly.

MR. PARODI (France) (Interpretation from French): I hope, for personal reasons, Mr. President, that we should adhere to your program as regards our

work today, for this evening's work. I would point out that we have been discussing the question of how we shall order our work for half an hour now and it might be a good thing if we were to begin upon the substance of our task at once, and thus enable us to finish, as you propose, tonight.

MR. PATINO (Peru): Mr. President, I just wanted to ask what is the reason for finishing this work Wednesday, instead of Friday or Saturday?

The PRESIDENT: I am not reporting that we should finish Wednesday. I said only that I am hoping we can finish Wednesday. If not, we will have to work until Friday. It is clear to everybody.

But now, we have to vote on a proposition of the Representative of the United Kingdom.

MR. LEBEAU (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): Mr. President, we Belgians are always prepared to do the job that has to be done, irrespective of the effort that we are called upon to put out for it. For that reason, therefore, I would be prepared to support the attitude of the United Kingdom Representative. I would point out, however, that this proposal would involve the most painful and unfortunate consequences, not only for ourselves, but also for many of our colleagues, and in particular, for the members of the Secretariat concerned. I personally should not like to take the responsibility of asking all these colleagues and the Secretariat to make this supplementary effort in the circumstance. I would point out finally that the situation in which we find ourselves is now a result of the fact that in defiance of the laws of common sense we have situated the Secretariat a distance of 22 miles from New York. It is because of that that we are in the difficult position in which we now find ourselves.

The PRESIDENT: We have to vote now on the proposal of the United Kingdom Representative. Who is in favor of the proposal, say yes. Belgium?

MR. LEBEAU (Belgium): No.

MR. MATES (Yugoslavia): Mr. President, could we have the proposal read out, so that we know quite clearly what we are voting on?

The PRESIDENT: The Representative of the United Kingdom proposed



that we should meet here, after dinner, and arrangements should be made for a meeting in the city, as far as I understood him. May I ask the United Kingdom Representative to phrase his proposal exactly.

MR. McNEIL (United Kingdom): That this Council meet after dinner until such time as the Council decides it must adjourn.

The PRESIDENT: Now we have to vote.

MR. COLBJORNSEN (Norway): Mr. President, I take it, with this formulation, that our United Kingdom colleague has in view that we are sitting continually here at this place.

MR. McNEIL (United Kingdom): I don't think that is at all necessary. I think it much more convenient for our French colleague and the arrangements which he has made, and I am certain it is much more convenient for the Secretariat that we should meet in the city. But I don't attempt to say where we will meet. I will meet anywhere where the work can be done.

MR. TRYGVE LIE:(Secretary-General): Mr. President, I must say that this is quite impossible to arrange a real Economic and Social Council meeting in New York with no notice except from now until 8 o'clock. We have a staff, we have the technical arrangements, but we have to find rooms and so on. I may say, on behalf of myself, that when we established our temporary headquarters at Lake Success, it was with the assumption that the meetings of the Council and Committees and the Sub-Committees should be at the headquarters of the United Nations and the decision<sup>was</sup> taken by me with the legal power given by the Assembly, and I have chosen this place; and as long as the Assembly has taken that decision, I think all the Councils, both this and the Security Council, and all the Commissions have to come to Lake Success.

The Staff of 2,000 members is not such an easy instrument to move from Lake Success to New York. I hope you understand this. It is impracticable and the consequence of it will be of such importance that I, as Secretary-General, must<sup>ask</sup>/all the Representatives of the Economic and Social Council to be reasonable and to accept my reasons.

MR. PARODI (France) (Interpretation from French): I should like to ask the Secretary-General whether the difficulties he referred to will apply also tomorrow, or the day after tomorrow. He referred to material difficulties in view of the short notice between now and 8 o'clock. I wonder if the same kind of difficulties will apply in the case of late meetings tomorrow or the day after tomorrow.

MR. LIE (Secretary-General): Mr. President, I have to find out if it is possible to transfer the Staff and make the technical arrangements. It is a very difficult job to find a new Council room and all the accommodations with which the Representatives really ask us to produce. If you will find accommodations, I think it can be done, but the consequences are such that I will ask the Representatives again not to enter into that line to have meetings of the Council at places<sup>and</sup> other than at Lake Success. As to a Commission or Sub-Committee, that is something else -- when in a hurry.

MR. MCNEIL (United Kingdom): Mr. President, quite plainly in view of the Secretary-General's plea I will be a poor Member of this Council if I did not

withdraw my motion which I will do because of his plea. But I hope the Council will appreciate that I am not concerned with my reputation, not even the reputation of an Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. I am concerned not even as a Member of the United Kingdom Delegation, and I am not the chief Member.

I am concerned as a Member of this Council, anxious that this Council should undertake its work, and we have had more than one example of its inability to meet its time table. Perhaps my line is wrong. Perhaps we should meet longer. Perhaps we should have a shorter lunch, but certainly we are not disposing of our work. However, in view of Mr. Trygve Lie's plea, and which I know he makes most sincerely, of the difficulties, I would be a poor Member if I did not withdraw my motion.

PRESIDENT: As far as I understand, the Representative of the United Kingdom has withdrawn his proposal. So we should continue with our work.

Document E/161, Part 2, paragraph 2; there are no speakers on this.

MR. ARGYROPOULOS (Greece): Mr. President, I just want to say a few words. First of all, I think we must not be concerned with the means of proving a situation, that we have to establish certain principles, and how special cases will be proven. That is a question that does not concern us. As regards those principles, I think that the concrete cases may be very valuable to elucidate our ideas. I would say, and I would if you would allow me -- I would state one case of which I have personal experience.

During the occupation of Greece, the Germans did not have as a rule the aid of either Greek physicians or technicians. Nevertheless, I knew the case of a Greek doctor who is very well-known as a first class patriot who offered his services to the Germans only in order to be able to visit the prisons and give relief to the prisoners. I happened to be then in solitary confinement, in a prison near Athens, and I remained several months without any medical assistance. After that doctor had accepted to take up duty in the prisons, he was able to visit me and I can tell you how much I did appreciate it.

E.P.V./29  
23-25

Well, you think that that man ought to be condemned, because he took up a humanitarian job in favor of helping the Greek prisoners in the prisons. I do not think so, I think that this case is very characteristic and can help to elucidate the general principle.

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

As regards the practical example just quoted by the Greek Representative, Mr. President, it seems quite clear that the doctor in question would deserve help from the United Nations, and that is, indeed, quite clear under the terms of paragraph 2 (b) of the document we are discussing, for this paragraph says in its last phrase ".unless such assistance was purely humanitarian and non-military."

Clearly, in this case the aid given was of a humanitarian type and the type of collaboration with the enemy is thus clearly defined and envisaged in our text.

My second point concerns remarks made by the intervention of the United Kingdom Representative. It is the opinion of the Soviet Delegation that both the formulation in our document here and the explanations put forward in connection with it would permit anyone to ask help from the United Nations and to claim such help until it were proved that he did not deserve that help. In defending this point of view, the United Kingdom Representative said that there was a principle in English law that a person is assumed innocent until he is proved guilty.

The question before us now is not whether a person has violated a law or whether a person deserves punishment, but whether a person deserves or does not deserve help from the United Nations. It is clearly the practice of social organizations to, first of all, ascertain whether need exists, and then if it does exist, to provide the help. That is the usual order, rather than, first, to provide the help and then to ascertain whether the need was really there, whether the person who has received the help really deserved it or not.

Clearly, there is need to prove the need for help before help should be given. I could quote the example of UNRRA, for there a country has to show that it needs aid before it can receive aid from UNRRA. It has to prove its need. There is no question there of giving help first and then deciding afterwards whether that help was deserved or not.



The Soviet Delegation, therefore, would oppose the principle which would allow anyone to claim help from the United Nations and only afterwards for the question to be determined whether that help was deserved or not.

Mr. FEONOV (Soviet Union): Mr. President, I would like to make a correction in the translation.

Mr. President, I said that the example which was mentioned by the Greek Representative here does not apply to that paragraph at all, because it is stated here - if we make an amendment as proposed by the Soviet Delegation, it would read: "...to have assisted the enemy forces since the outbreak of the second World War in their preparations against the United Nations.."

It is absolutely clear that in the case of this doctor whom the Greek Representative mentioned, the United Nations Organization cannot deprive him of the help, because he is not a person who helped the enemy forces in their preparations against the United Nations.

The PRESIDENT: Are there some more speakers on this subject? If not, we have now to decide about paragraph 2 and sub-paragraph (b). The Soviet Delegation, so far as I understood, proposed that the word "voluntarily" should be deleted.

MR. FEONOV:(Soviet Union): ~~Am~~ the last line.

The PRESIDENT: And the last line. Will you please, Mr. Feonov, word clearly your amendment?

MR. FEONOV (Soviet Union): The amendment proposed by the Soviet Union Delegation reads as follows: to delete the word "voluntarily" from the first line of paragraph 2 (b), and to delete the whole third line, that is, "unless such assistance was purely humanitarian and non-military."

The PRESIDENT: We have now to vote on this amendment. Those who are in favor of the Soviet Delegation's amendment please raise their hands. Five. Those who are against it, please raise their hands; 11. It is not carried.

Paragraph 3. Any objections? It is adopted.

Paragraph 4. Any objections? It is approved.

Paragraph 5. Any objections? It is approved.

MR. FEONOV (Soviet Union): Mr. President, after paragraph 5 the Soviet Union Delegation suggests that the following paragraph should be inserted: "Persons who served or are serving in military units or who are in the civil service of a state other than that of their origin"

The PRESIDENT: Are the Members of the Council clear on the proposal made by the Soviet Delegation? We have to vote on it now.

(France)

MR. PARODI/(Interpretation from French): I think that we should ask for further explanation of this proposal, Mr. President. For my part, I do not quite understand it. For instance, in France there were many of my countrymen who worked against the enemy occupying forces in liaison with either the United States services or the British services. The chances and hazards of underground work brought it about that they had contact with these services, and not with French services. They were, however, working in a common cause, and I don't see, therefore, why they should be systematically excluded because their work brought

them in contact with United States and British services, for the help of the United Nations.

Interpretation; original in Russian)

MR. FEONOV (Soviet Union) (Second/ : I think, Mr. President, that I can justify the proposal put forward by the Soviet Union Delegation in a very few words. It is the opinion of the Soviet Union Delegation that persons who during the war served foreign Governments of the United Nations need not be displaced persons in the sense that we are considering, and therefore, need not apply for help from the United Nations as displaced persons. It seems to me that the Governments which these persons served should in reward take care now of these persons.

MR. Zuleta ANGEL (Colombia) (Translation from French): I would ask, Mr. President, whether those persons who gave help in this way to foreign Governments gave help to the Governments of the Countries in which they now find themselves. The point is quite simple, Mr. President, for people who served in the armed forces or the services of the United Nations Governments and are now in the Countries of these Governments, according to the Soviet proposal, they would be helped by the Governments of those Countries. The question therefore is, are these persons in the territory of the Countries which they served?

MR. McNEIL (United Kingdom): Again, Mr. President, we have been unable to reach an agreement with our Soviet colleague. As the French Delegation said it seems to us the effect of accepting the Soviet proposal would mean that in some cases we would be discriminating against the people who gave us aid, people who escaped with us in the same boat, the same train. As one fellow says to himself, "I am not putting on another uniform"; and he does some job at home. The other, his comrade, decides to fight for the United Nations. Then he goes out of uniform. He may not remain in Britain, or America or France. He may be anywhere on the continent of Europe, so that the administrative job, even if we admitted the principle -- which I wouldn't -- that the Government with which he served should be responsible for his maintenance would be extremely complicated. We are grateful, but it does not seem to us that we should, from now on, accept responsibility for this man or this woman. We accepted responsibility while they fought with us, and they were treated as our own.

I am a little bit puzzled altogether by our Soviet colleague's attitude in this matter. I am wondering if he is thinking particularly of these Polish forces who have been closely associated with our command.

If it is any help to him, let me say this: that so far as these Polish forces which fought under British command are concerned, my Government would not seek to have them benefit from IRO or seek IRO help in any way to help them or care for them. They are our responsibility and we have already said so publicly, but these men who have left our forces or who have left the American forces, the French forces, and who now are displaced persons, it would seem to us iniquitous that they should have this peculiar discrimination directed against them; that having given their maximum in assistance to the United Nations, for that same reason they should not enjoy the same benefits of a United Nations Organization such as this one.

The PRESIDENT: If there are no more speakers on the subject, we will vote on the Soviet proposal.

Members who are in favor of the Soviet proposal will please raise their hands.

Those against?

It is not carried.

Any objection to paragraph 6? Approved.

MR. MATES (Yugoslavia): There is an objection. The substance of paragraph 6, sub-paragraph b -- I think we are discussing the whole of paragraph 6.

This substance has been a question of controversy on several occasions where this question of refugees has been discussed. The Yugoslav Delegation has supported an amendment to sub-paragraph b which appeared in several previous documents, with which the Representatives around this table are probably familiar.

Considering the large amount of agreement which has been reached on this question -- and I think the session of this morning has approved of this -- The Yugoslav Delegation is prepared to accept another text, a text which has been submitted at an earlier stage by the French Delegation.

Mr. President, I shall read out this text which I formally move in the name of the Yugoslav Delegation.

"Have been" -- the sentence begins in the middle because the sub-paragraph is linked with the opening sentence: "persons who since the end of hostilities of the Second World War ..."

"b. Have been or are leaders of the movements hostile to the Government of their country of origin, being a Member of the United Nations or sponsors of movements encouraging refugees not to return to their countries of origin and their active assistants, that is to say

"1. Persons who transmit orders of the leaders in order to assist them to gain new supporters.

"2. Persons who act in permanent contact, in concert, with leaders of such movements.

"3. Persons who assist leaders and sponsors of such movement in order to exert pressure on their compatriots with the aim of influencing them.

"4. Persons engaged in propaganda, representing the regime of their country of origin in such a manner as to incite opposition among their compatriots against that regime.



"5. Persons who in general take the initiative in the manner described above."

Mr. President, the first part of this French text -- which I am now moving formally -- is almost the same as the text in Paper E/161, with the addition of "their active assistants". That is to say, leaders and sponsors and their active assistants. All the rest of the text is described in the five points, what is meant under "their active assistants". The text of this amendment can be found in French and in English in Document E/REF/75 which is the Report of the Special Committee on Refugees and Displaced Persons. I understand it is one of the documents which refers to the question we are discussing now.

Those against?

It is not carried.

Any objection to paragraph 6? Approved.

MR. MATES (Yugoslavia): There is an objection. The substance of paragraph 6, sub-paragraph b -- I think we are discussing the whole of paragraph 6.

This substance has been a question of controversy on several occasions where this question of refugees has been discussed. The Yugoslav Delegation has supported an amendment to sub-paragraph b which appeared in several previous documents, with which the Representatives around this table are probably familiar.

Considering the large amount of agreement which has been reached on this question -- and I think the session of this morning has approved of this -- the Yugoslav Delegation is prepared to accept another text, a text which has been submitted at an earlier stage by the French Delegation.

Mr. President, I shall read out this text which I formally move in the name of the Yugoslav Delegation.

"Have been" -- the sentence begins in the middle because the sub-paragraph is linked with the opening sentence: "persons who since the end of hostilities of the Second World War ..."

"b. Have been or are leaders of the movements hostile to the Government of their country of origin, being a Member of the United Nations or sponsors of movements encouraging refugees not to return to their countries of origin and their active assistants, that is to say

"1. Persons who transmit orders of the leaders in order to assist them to gain new supporters.

"2. Persons who act in permanent contact, in concert, with leaders of such movements.

"3. Persons who assist leaders and sponsors of such movement in order to exert pressure on their compatriots with the aim of influencing them.

"4. Persons engaged in propaganda, representing the regime of their country of origin in such a manner as to incite opposition among their compatriots against that regime.

"5. Persons who in general take the initiative in the manner described above."

Mr. President, the first part of this French text -- which I am now moving formally -- is almost the same as the text in Paper E/161, with the addition of "their active assistants". That is to say, leaders and sponsors and their active assistants. All the rest of the text is described in the five points, what is meant under "their active assistants". The text of this amendment can be found in French and in English in Document E/REF/75 which is the Report of the Special Committee on Refugees and Displaced Persons. I understand it is one of the documents which refers to the question we are discussing now.

The PRESIDENT: I must announce that the meeting of the Drafting Subcommittee on Devastated Areas will not take place today.

Are there more speakers on this amendment?

We have to vote now on this amendment. The Members of the Council who are in favor of the Yugoslav amendment should raise their hands.

It is not carried. Four in favor.

Annex II. Any objections?

MR. COLBJORNSEN (Norway): Mr. President, with regard to the figure which is to be put in there after "...a sum of..." we discussed in the Subcommittee the question of what to do in case -- what seems very likely, the new outfit can start operation only, say, first of July 1947 -- in that case there would only be half the calendar year left, and as the budget in the revised form is still made on an annual basis, I take it it is generally agreed that a proportion of the reduction of that figure to be put in here would have to be undertaken. In case this is necessary -- because we have the subsequent provisions, as you will have observed: "Any unspent balance under either heading shall be carried over to the corresponding heading,..." and so on.

In that case, when your Organization starts operation on the first of July, and supposing, as has always been supposed, that their financial year for the new Organization will be the calendar year, just as for the United Nations, then we have to reduce that annual budget figure agreed upon to one-half, and put this new amount, one-half of the annual budget, in here.

I take it that that is generally agreed upon. I should like to have it confirmed from the President.

The PRESIDENT: Any other remarks?

SIR Girja SHANKAR BAJPAI (India): Mr. President, as Chairman of the Finance Committee that the Council has appointed, might I be permitted to say a word?

The PRESIDENT: Certainly.

SIR Girja SHANKAR BAJPAI (India): We haven't yet passed finally on either the administrative or the operational budgets. We have been too agreeably

E/P.V./29

47 - 50

occupied otherwise so far. But we hope to meet as soon as the Constitution has been adopted, and we will complete our work.

Now, Sir, for the information of the Council, I might say that what we are trying to do is prepare a 12-month's budget, not indicating when the financial year is to begin or when the financial year is going to end. I don't profess to be a drafting expert, but I would suggest for the consideration of the Council that possibly we might leave this over until we have completed our labors and then this matter can be examined in the light of our recommendations.

The PRESIDENT. Yes. Thank you. I think we all agree.

Now we have to discuss Article X. It is Document E/184, as proposed by the Financial Subcommittee. May I ask the Chairman of this Committee to explain the Article.



SIR G. Shankar BAJPAI (India): Mr. President, there are just one or two explanatory points that the Council might find helpful. The first is the statement that this Article 10 as revised does not represent unanimity in the Committee and that there has been a difference of opinion. The Soviet Representative voted against this Article, and voted against it for two reasons.

If you will look at E/171, you will find that the Soviet Delegation had proposed first that the administrative expenses of the Organization shall be relatively lower for those countries which have suffered as a result of occupation by the enemy during the Second World War. The Committee, or the majority of the Committee was of the opinion that this was already taken care of by the appropriate body dealing with allocations and that this ought not to be provided for in the constitution.

The second and perhaps even more fundamental point of the Soviet Delegation is set out in paragraph 8 of the document which I have already mentioned, E/171, but for the sake of convenience, I shall repeat it.

"All operational expenditure shall be met by those countries which receive refugees and displaced persons.

"The expenses connected with the repatriation and maintenance of persons displaced by Germany from countries that were Victims of Fascist aggression, shall be placed to the account of Germany."

This proposal also did not find favor with the majority of the Committee. Those, Sir, are the points on which the Finance Representative of the Soviet Union thought it necessary to vote against the text of Article 10, presented to you in E/184.

Finally Sir, I should like to point out that our French colleague in the Committee abstained from voting on Article 10 because the French Representative, both here and in the Committee has consistently held the view that contributions for large-scale settlement should be voluntary and not obligatory. That is a point on which the majority was not in favor of the French view.

MR. SOTO (Chile): Mr. President, we have not received this document before. I just have taken one and have had no time to read it. May I have a moment to read it?

The PRESIDENT: I am sorry, but this has been in circulation only for three days.

MR. ZULETA ANGEL (Colombia) (Interpretation from Spanish): I would like to ask, Mr. President, whether you prefer that we vote on the document as a whole or paragraph by paragraph.

The PRESIDENT: We are voting paragraph by paragraph. Article 10, Finance, paragraph 1. Are there any comments? Are there any objections to this paragraph?

Paragraph 2(a). Any objections to this paragraph? Sub-paragraph (b)? It is approved. Sub-paragraph 3?

MR. FEONOV (Soviet Union): The Soviet Delegation already proposed to add to that paragraph the following words: "The proportion of the share in the administrative expenses of the Organization shall be relatively lowest for those countries which have suffered as the result of occupation by the enemy during the Second World War." The rapporteur already mentioned that the Soviet Delegation insisted upon that point. As it is to be decided now, I must say that the Soviet Delegation still considers it necessary to add to paragraph 3 the words I have just mentioned.

The PRESIDENT: Have all the Members followed the amendment proposed by the Soviet Delegation? Are there any speakers on this subject? Then we have to vote on it. Who is in favor of the Soviet proposal? Please raise hands. There are five in favor. Who is against? There are seven against. It is not carried.

MR. PAPANEK (Czechoslovakia): Mr. President, could I ask clarification on paragraph 2(a) that contributions may be payable in kind or in such currency as may be provided for. Does that include the expenses or assistance of a Member Government to refugees that are being paid by their country? I just wish to have it clarified. That is the proposal that the Czechoslovakian Delegation submitted to the Sub-Committee.

SIR G. SHANKAR BAJPAI (India): Mr. President, the Czechoslovak Representative has indicated the first document, E/170, which runs as follows: "The help and assistance given by a Member Government to genuine refugees and displaced persons leaving their country with the consent of the authorities of their country of origin should be considered as a contribution to the IRO and deducted from the share due by the Member to the IRO".

The Committee gave a full consideration to this, but was unable to accept the proposal on the ground that it would be impossible to attempt any precise estimate of what contribution had been made in this fashion.

THE PRESIDENT: The Czechoslovak Representative wishes to make a formal proposal.

MR. PAPANEK (Czechoslovakia): I shall have to reserve the position of my Government.

THE PRESIDENT: Paragraph 4.

MR. LEBEAU (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): I wanted just to point out, Mr. President, there is a discrepancy <sup>between the English</sup> and the French texts of this clause. The English ends with this phrase: "subject to the requirements of the constitutional procedure of such Member", whereas the French says: "sous reserve de procedures prevues par son droit constitutionnel."

THE PRESIDENT: Which wording do you prefer?

MR. LEBEAU (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): The French text should be: "sous reserve des exigences de son droit constitutionnel."

THE PRESIDENT: I think, according to this change, we can adopt paragraph 4.

MR. MATES (Yugoslavia): Mr. President, I would like to say something about paragraph 4. Mr. President, during the discussion in the Financial Sub-Committee, the Yugoslav Representative had the opportunity to state the point of view of his Government concerning payment of contributions on question of resettlement and re-establishment, whether it be in large-scale schemes or any other scheme, having this in mind. We cannot accept paragraph 4 as it stands, because paragraph 4 evidently would impose an obligation to contribute to such expenditures as resettlement and re-establishment.



In previous discussions the point of the Yugoslav Delegation has been sufficiently clearly stated, so I do not feel either obliged or find it necessary to take the time of the Council to make a long speech on this subject. The only possible solution of this problem would be to accept the whole scheme, as I understand it, from paper E/171, however, with one change. In this Soviet proposal, in point 8, which I would accept as an amendment to paragraph 4, I think that the words "all operational expenditures" should be changed to the "resettlement and re-establishment expenditures shall be met by those countries which receive refugees and displaced persons."

"The expenses connected with the repatriation and maintenance" -- maintenance being the most important and overwhelming item in operational expenditures -- of persons displaced by Germany from countries that were victims of Fascist aggression shall be placed in the account of Germany."

Now, having in view this quite different distribution of the burden, having the burden of maintenance and repatriation put on those who are responsible for the whole problem as it is now, and the comparatively minor burden of resettlement and re-establishment of those countries who are receiving displaced persons, and which, in the light of the budget and figures available, would rather decrease than increase the share of those countries in the budget as a whole, would be <sup>a</sup>more logical, in the view of the Yugoslav Delegation, system of the distribution of the burden.

Mr. President, I think the simplest way for me to get out of this complication is to move formally the adoption of point 8 in paper E/171, with the change of the word "operational" in the beginning of point 8 with "resettlement and re-establishment."

Mr. PARODI (France) (Interpretation from French): I wish simply to make a reservation on behalf of the French Delegation on paragraph 4 and to say that I shall abstain from voting on this paragraph.

Mr. FEONOV (Soviet Union) (Second interpretation; original in Russian): Point 4, Mr. President, is unacceptable to the Soviet Delegation. The Soviet Government cannot take upon itself the obligation to contribute to the operational expenses of the Organization and for the following reason:

In the first place, the Soviet Government has to give help and aid of every kind to millions of persons who have already returned to Soviet territory from foreign territories. These persons are now receiving help, and they will continue to receive help, and need help for some years to come.

In the second place, the Soviet Government is bound to help those, who during the first period of the war - the period of enemy advance - withdrew from the interior of the country, and are now returning to the western zones to their former places of residence. This is a large scale population movement involving millions of persons, and if the aid given is to be of any effect, the sums required must be very considerable indeed.

The Soviet Government, in the third place, not only not rejects Soviet Nationals desiring to return to Soviet territory, but will welcome them and will give them the help they need. Since the Soviet Government is thus compelled to incur very heavy expenditure for millions of persons of Soviet citizenship who are already receiving help, the Soviet Government is unable to accept the obligation to contribute to the operational expenses of persons, including some hundreds of thousands of persons still in Germany.

For these reasons, Mr. President, the Soviet Delegation insists upon the proposals made by the Soviet Representative in Committee.

Mr. McNEIL (United Kingdom): Mr. President, no one can be unaware of the difficulties of such countries as the Soviet Union. My Government and I are not. When the Contributions Sub-Committee met in London, it of course took special note of such circumstances as those to which my Yugoslav colleague referred and those to which Mr. Feonov now refers, and the scale of contributions were deliberately framed to take care of that. Byelorussia,



Poland, Ukraine, The Soviet, and Yugoslavia, were all given readjustments to try and meet the burdens which everyone agreed they had to carry. But, it seems to me that it is quite impossible for anyone here to say, "This part of the budget I will take, and this part I will not". The facts are that we are sitting under a resolution from the Assembly. The resolution said that maintenance, repatriation, resettlement, and the establishment - these were all parts of the same problem, and different methods of tackling the same target. It seems to me that obviously every country has a right to decide whether or not it is coming into this Organization, but if it is coming into the Organization, then it must take its share of the cost of and the obligation, /it must accept the rules which are set upon Membership of the Organization.

Clearly, of course, it is quite/competent for our Yugoslav colleague to move the amendment he has moved, which I will resist. But, once that decision is taken, I am afraid that this must be considered as an international organization; the methods of treating it must be international and, of course, the budget must be accepted as a whole and internationally shared. That is why we think we have a right to insist upon that view, since the authority of the Assembly quite clearly sets forth the problem in that kind of language.

MR. WARREN (United States): Mr. President, my Government concurs completely in the views just expressed by our United Kingdom colleague. Clearly, the Organization which we are planning to establish would not be international in character if each Member were to pick and choose among the expenditures to which that Member would contribute.

Without repeating any of the arguments or the point of view which has just been expressed, I would like to add the comment that the Yugoslav proposal would, in effect, negate all the efforts of the Organization to accomplish its objectives. If that were the universal view of the Members, there would result an organization with contributions solely to administrative expenditures. Clearly, if you have an organization solely with a staff, it can do very little to accomplish the enormous tasks which lay before the IRO.

To place the burden of all resettlement and re-establishment costs on the countries of origin, would really be to fail to distribute that burden equitably among the various Members, but it also would place such a burden on the countries of reception that no movement would take place.

The other proposal is that the expenditures of maintenance and repatriation should be borne by the German economy. As was explained by the report of the Financial Committee in London to the Sub-committee here, <sup>every</sup> possible expense that can be conceivably borne by the German economy has been eliminated from the budget that has been proposed. The budget, therefore, consists of those net expenditures which must be borne by other sources than the German economy, and I think that every resourcefulness has been used in placing every possible item of expense on the German economy to the extent that it can be borne.

It seems to me that this retention of the present text which, incidentally, is identical with the text that was adopted by the Council at its last meeting, is the crux of the whole question as to whether or not an IRO is to be established. Therefore, I attach extreme importance to the necessity and wisdom of maintaining the present text. The proposals contained in the Yugoslav resolution would completely negate the effort and objectives of the Organization by providing or resulting in a completely impossible structure.

E/P.V./29  
67-70

(During the above remarks Mr. Betancur, Representative of Colombia, arrived and replaced Mr. Zuleta Angel at the Council table.)

MR. ARGYROPOULOS (Greece): Mr. President, I completely agree with the points of view of the United Kingdom and the United States Delegations, according to which the contributions to this Organization ought to be international, since the Organization is international. That is why, in spite of the very critical, financial, economic and exchange situation of my country, I, until now, limited myself to certain remarks concerning the scale of contributions that have been worked out, foreseeing that my country would contribute to the expenses. Nevertheless, as I pointed out already there are some days ago, if/a number of countries with other contributions from the Organization, countries who are in a far better position than our country in is,/a comparable position, I would be hardly understood in my own country if I didn't make a reservation concerning this Article.

I repeat, that is not due to the fact that I refuse to admit the principle of the international contribution. Not at all. I am in favor of that principle. But, I could not involve my country in expenses which will be a very heavy burden for her in spite of the much smaller scale of contributions in comparison with other countries, if much stronger, economically and financially speaking, much stronger countries are not going to contribute to those expenses.

That is why I regret very much to be obliged to make a reservation as to Point 4 of this text of Article X.

The PRESIDENT: We have now to vote on the Yugoslav amendment.

MR. MATES (Yugoslavia): Mr. President, it was not my intention to make any lengthy explanations of the position of the Yugoslav Delegation. I tried to refrain from any explanations for the sake of brevity. It is not my intention even now to make any lengthy explanation. I would like only to point out, in a few words, our position. I shall not speak on the active contributions, in expenses and in money, which have been necessary to handle a considerable number, hundreds of thousands, of people who have been moved back into Yugoslavia in conditions of great hardship, as to the economic and financial and exchange situation of my country. But in the future, Yugoslavia, as well as other countries of origin of displaced

persons and refugees, will, in the question of contributing to the care and maintenance of displaced persons and refugees, have a very large share. According to the estimates which are submitted by the financial Sub-Committee there amount approximately one-third of all refugees and displaced persons in Europe who will be taken off the burden of the international Organization, and who will become the care of their Governments when they have returned to their countries. I do not say that this will necessarily involve those countries to the same extent of expenses as if those persons would remain in the camps. But still, for those few countries who are all devastated by the war, and have been victims of aggression, and have been occupied during the war, there still will be an important burden. And in so far as the General Assembly has clearly put in its resolution that this is an international problem, the adoption of the Yugoslav Resolution would not mean that, in the future, as well as it was in the past and in the present, the countries of origin will not contribute materially in the attempt to solve this problem.



Therefore, I think that it would be very difficult to explain in the countries of origin that they have, in addition to costs and expenses they will have to make in providing for the first care and establishment of returning displaced persons and the share in the administrative department of the Organization, that those countries will have, in excess of all this, to contribute for the resettlement and the reestablishment of displaced persons in other countries. Besides, there is another consideration of a political nature. In the light of the Constitution as it stands now, the reestablishment and resettlement schemes include persons who participate actively in activities hostile to the Governments of their countries of origin. That is to say, that in spite of the difficulties of our country and of the share we will have in the solution of this problem, we shall be compelled to contribute for the reestablishment and resettlement of all the enemies of our country's Government.

Concerning the question of care and maintenance which, in our view, has to be put on the burden of a German economy, the Germans will have to pay for it, we feel that this is a just claim which we have to make. We do not ask anybody but the Germans to pay for what they are guilty of.

Concerning the question of the lack of internationality of the Organization, if we do not contribute to certain expenses and if a large part of this expense is put on the Germans, may I say that we have had international organizations, for instance, UNRRA, where our country only contributed to administrative expenses, has been a Member of the Organization, and no one has been in doubt that UNRRA is an international organization. Furthermore, there has been another international problem, and it exists still; that is, the rehabilitation and relief to countries who have been occupied by the common enemy, whose economies have been shattered, and their efforts to contribute as much as they could to the cause of the United Nations. This problem has also been recognized as an international problem. But still, we have seen that the international contribution toward the solution of this problem has been a very small proportion of the whole amount of the problem.

The help and assistance which countries who were invaded and occupied during the war have received on an international basis is only a small part of the damage which has to be repaired. Now, what appears out of it? That in spite of this assistance, in spite of reparations, the main part of making good the damage which has been done by the Germans and their allies or their satellites we each placed on the burden of the countries who have been the victims of the war.

And now, another problem which is minor in scope to the problem to which I have referred. We again shall contribute actually more in proportion than any other country because the burden for the care of those who return remains on our shoulders. It is not a voluntary contribution. We are ready to accept it as an obligation which is compulsory, whereas receiving countries, in any case, are contributing voluntarily. They may receive or they may not receive settlers, but we shall, and we take it as an obligation to accept repatriates.

In the light of all these considerations, I think it is quite clear that our attitude is not a result of the lack of international spirit in our Government or of our people. It is merely that we feel that those who are guilty have to pay. That is Number 1. Secondly, that all others should have a share in what we consider as a fair consideration, and I submit that our proposal will not make us avoid having a share in this international problem and we are ready to take it.

(During the above remarks Dr. Chang, Representative of China left the table and was replaced by Mr. Yang; Mr. Zuleta Angel, Representative of Colombia replaced Mr. Betancur at the Council table.)

The PRESIDENT: May I ask the Yugoslav Representative how he is proposing his amendment.

MR. MATES (Yugoslavia): Well, I can give it to you now. It is on the paper E/171. It is the paper which gives the proposal of the Soviet Government into which I will introduce this amendment.

"All resettlement and reestablishment expenditures shall be met by those countries which receive refugees and displaced persons. The expenses

E/P.V./29  
78-80

connected with the repatriation and maintenance of persons displaced by Germany from countries that were victims of Fascist aggression, shall be placed to the account of Germany."

The PRESIDENT: The Representatives who are in favor of the Yugoslavian amendment shall raise their hands. Those against?

The vote is three to five and it is not carried.

MR. FEONOV (Soviet Union) (Second Interpretation; Original in Russian):

Before we vote upon the Soviet proposal, Mr. President, I should like to say a few words of explanation. After my recent explanation, some Representatives remarked that the refugee problem is an international problem to be dealt with by an international organ and therefore all Members of the Organization should take part in the solution of this problem.

I have already stated, Mr. President, that the Soviet Union is already shouldering huge expenses in connection with this very international problem. We are dealing with millions of persons who are refugees and who are therefore a part of this international problem. In fact, we do constitute this international problem. The greater part of the problem, therefore, the international problem of refugees and displaced persons is already being shouldered by the Soviet Union which is dealing with millions of these persons. The Organization is proposed to deal only with some hundreds of thousands of persons and even of these the Soviet Government is prepared to take charge of those who are Soviet citizens and so it cannot be said, Mr. President, that the Soviet Union by not contributing to the operational expenses of the Organization, is not taking its share of the expenditure required in the solution of this international problem of refugees and displaced persons.

The PRESIDENT: May I ask the Soviet Representative to put in wording his proposal?

(During the above remarks Mr. Papanek, Representative of Czechoslovakia, left the Table and was replaced by Mr. Stolz.)

MR. FEONOV (Soviet Union): "All operational expenditure shall be met by those countries which receive refugees and displaced persons.

"The expenses connected with the repatriation and maintenance of persons displaced by Germany from countries that were victims of

Fascist aggression, shall be placed to the account of Germany.

"The share in the expenses of the Organization shall be effected not only in United States dollars but also in those currencies in which the actual expenditures of the Organization are effected, i.e., in German marks, Austrian schillings, etc."

I am not quite sure of that last line as to whether it is not repeating what has generally been accepted.

The PRESIDENT: The Soviet proposal is perfectly clear. Who is in favor of this proposal? There are three votes in favor.

Who is against? Six against.

The proposal is not carried.



Paragraph 5. Are there any objections to it? (No response.) Since there are no objections, it is approved.

Paragraph 6. Are there any objections to it? (No response.) It is approved.

Now we have to go back to document E/161, Article 16. This is after Article 15. This heading was omitted, and it is corrected in a special document.

SIR G. Shankar BAJPAI (India): I was merely going to request you, Mr. President, to ask the Members of my Committee to turn to a pleasurable somewhat task at the end of a/tiresome task, to examine the budget and what remains of our report.

The PRESIDENT: May I ask the Members of the Financial Sub-Committee on Refugees to go to Committee room 3 and to continue deliberations on the budget, if possible.

We will continue now with Article 16, paragraph 1. Are there any objections? (No response).

Paragraph 2.

MR. WARREN (United States): Mr. President, I do not know whether you referred to numbered paragraph 2. If you did, I have something to say about it.

The PRESIDENT: It is paragraph 2 of Article 16, on page 12, document E/161.

Have you anything to say?

MR. WARREN (United States): Do you mean Article 16 at the bottom of the page or Article 15 at the top of the page?

The PRESIDENT: Yes, but this is corrected. You have a covering note explaining the correction. It starts with paragraph 1: "The English and French texts of the Constitution shall be regarded as equally authentic."

MR. FEONOV (Soviet Union): Mr. President, I understand that it has been agreed that five languages should be regarded as equally authentic, but only owing to a technical error, three of them were omitted.

The PRESIDENT: Yes. This is corrected in a covering note. It is

already corrected in a covering note to this text.

Paragraph 2.

MR. WARREN (United States): Mr. President, we were having a discussion on this Article and this paragraph when we adjourned the other day, and the discussion and action were not completed.

There was confusion in the amendment which was adopted, which now appears on page 12 of E/161, and the paragraph, as it now appears, is defective, because it contains reference to Chapter 2 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, which has no pertinency in the matter of advisory opinion, which is the subject of the present paragraph. I, therefore, suggest, Mr. President, that we return to the language of the original text in E/92, which reads as follows: "Subject to Article 96 of the Charter of the United Nations and to Chapter 2, which is the Statute of the International Court of Justice, any question or dispute concerning the interpretation or application of this constitution shall be referred to the International Court of Justice unless the General Council or the parties to such dispute agree to another mode of settlement."

There are two matters involved, Mr. President: One, the matter of a dispute between the Members concerning the interpretation of the Constitution; the other, the matter of requesting advisory opinions from the International Court of Justice.

I am advised that this draft, which I have just read, is satisfactory to the Secretariat and to the United Kingdom Delegation, which was active in proposing one of the amendments in the Sub-Committee. The draft which I suggested would provide both for decisions by the International Court on disputes concerning the interpretation and application of the Constitution and for advisory opinion, unless the Council or the parties to the dispute agreed to other modes of settlement.

(During the above remarks, Mr. Papanek, Representative of Czechoslovakia, returned and replaced Mr. Stolz at the Council table; Sir G. Shankar BAJPAI, Representative of India, left the Table and was replaced by Mr. Kirpalani.)

~~THE PRESIDENT~~: Any speakers on the subject of this amendment? We have now to vote on the United States amendment. Those Members in favor of the amendments please raise their hands; 13. Those against; non. It is adopted.

Article 17, paragraph 1(a). Any objections? No objections!

Sub-paragraph (b); no objections?

Paragraph 2; no objections?

Paragraph 3; no objections?

Paragraph 4; no objections?

Therefore, Article 17 is adopted.

(During the above remarks, Mr. Yang, Representative of China, left the table and was replaced by Mr. Wu.)

Now, we have to go back to the Preamble. The French Representative wishes to make an amendment.

MR. PARODI (France) (Interpretation from French): The amendment of the French Delegation is simply an application of the idea which I put forward in a previous meeting; namely, at the end clause in this Preamble, that is in the fifth paragraph, that is before the words, "have agreed" we should insert "and as far as possible be usefully employed in order to avoid the harmful and anti-social consequences of prolonged idleness".

THE PRESIDENT: Is there any objection to this amendment? Those Representatives in favor please raise their hands; 12. Against; none. It is adopted. Therefore, I declare the Draft Constitution is approved by this Court.

MR. FAUSTO SOTO (Chile): Mr. President, my Delegation is in approval of this Draft Constitution by the Economic and Social Council and vote in favor of it. But, I should like to refer to the remark I made before about the reservation of my Government, and I don't want to repeat it again, but which was established in Document E/129. I accept the approval of this Document with that reservation for my Government.

THE PRESIDENT: Many Delegations expressed their reservation as to certain Articles and certain paragraphs and sub-paragraphs. Of course, they will be inserted in our procedure.

MR. MATES (Yugoslavia): Mr. President, I understand that your statement concerning the approval of the Constitution, referred to the approval of all

Articles of the Constitution and all paragraphs of the Constitution. It is a pleasure that the majority of the Articles and paragraphs have been approved unanimously. However, certain Articles and paragraphs have been approved by a majority vote.

If the question of the approval of the Constitution as a whole is presented, I feel obliged to make a statement on behalf of the Yugoslav Delegation, as much as it is the custom that in questions if there is a difference on some minor point, a Delegation might approve the whole, in spite of disapproval of the part. It is as well an understanding attitude that the Delegation, if the point in which it had a different view from the majority is a major point of principle, the Delegation must take care of the Document as a whole.

The statement of the Yugoslav Delegation is that the Yugoslav Delegation opposes the Constitution as a whole because it contains certain provisions in the Constitution as well as in Annex 1, which the Yugoslav Delegation cannot accept.

I shall refer, in particular, to the difference in Article X of the Constitution, which we have discussed this afternoon, and which gives provisions of a financial character; and, furthermore, with a different view and reservation of the Yugoslav Delegation in paragraph 2 of part I., section (a) of Annex 1 "Definitions", and to paragraph 2 and 6 of part II of Annex 1 "Definitions". These points, in particular, are in the view of the Yugoslav Delegation, points of major principle, and that is the reason of our negative vote for the Constitution as a whole.

Mr. WARREN (United States): Mr. President, may I suggest that in view of the fact that the Resolution of the General Assembly of the 12th of February 1946 on Refugees and Displaced Persons is referred to so frequently in the document that it be printed at least with the document and preferably be attached as Annex 3, when the document is either presented to Governments, to the public, or to the General Assembly. I have just counted at least six references to the Resolution of the General Assembly. Anyone reading the Constitution would not be able to read it intelligently without a copy of the Resolution of the General Assembly attached to it. It is essential to a complete document. I am quite willing, if it meets the assent of the Council, to leave the mechanics of that to the Secretariat, but from the point of view of a document which has to be considered by Governments and by legislative bodies, it would seem necessary that the Resolution of the General Assembly be attached to the document so that the Government authority which has to consider it would have a complete document before it in official form.



MR. MEDVED (Ukrainian S.S.R.) (Second interpretation; original in Russian):

In connection with the question of voting the whole of this Constitution of the International Refugee Organization, Mr. President, I regret to say that the Ukrainian Delegation will not be able to vote in favor of this Draft Constitution.

The Ukrainian Delegation wishes to make this declaration and also to reserve its right to present to the General Assembly certain amendments which it has already presented but which have not been accepted by the Council. Our amendments are all included in Document 138 of which I spoke at some length on behalf of my Government at previous meetings. But the proposals made by other Members of the Council in connection with the Constitution have been adopted and have led to some improvement in the Constitution as compared with the original Draft put forward at the Second Session of the Council. But certain principles have not been adopted, have not been incorporated in this Constitution, some proposed paragraphs have not been accepted.

I shall not take up the time of the Council explaining my reasons for this position, Mr. President, but I do wish to deal with one or two points. First of all, as regards Article 2, "Functions and Powers", we have proposed a new subparagraph (b) to read as follows: "To undertake in all camps a reregistration of refugees and displaced persons in conjunction with the Representatives of their Countries of origin being Members of the United Nations, the results of this reregistration lists of names being sent to the Governments of their Countries of origin that are Members of the United Nations." We consider that these lists are absolutely indispensable but because some Delegations -- and notably those of the United States and the United Kingdom -- oppose this proposal, the proposal was not adopted by the Council. As a result, other paragraphs which have been adopted and which concerned this aspect of refugees and displaced persons' treatment are reduced to a mere formality.

We do not wish to help war criminals. That is generally agreed and understood. The war criminals, even if they are included in the category of displaced persons, should not receive the help of the International Refugee Organization. That is agreed. In general, displaced persons, it is said, are not

war criminals but practice shows, and we know that in fact there are many war criminals concealed in these camps and these persons are receiving the help of the authorities. They are receiving international help. At a previous meeting I was able to give a number of names of such persons and these names were not contested by anybody.

The Ukrainian Government and other Governments of the Countries of origin of these persons are in a position to know better than the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom who are the persons who took part in the burning down of Ukrainian villages, the maltreatment of Ukrainian women and children, and collaboration with the Fascist invaders in the Ukraine. But while the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom have access to these lists because the persons concerned are largely in their zones of occupation, the lists are kept secret and are not communicated to the Ukrainian Government. If we had these lists, Mr. President, the lists of the names of war criminals who are hiding in these camps, we could do a good service to the cause of the democracies, we could do something which all democracies must desire to be done, namely, we could have these persons handed over and delivered to proper punishment, to hanging that they deserve.

It seems to me that the International Refugee Organization in its Constitution should at least envisage the possibility of measures of this kind. War criminals are at this moment receiving help in the displaced persons and refugees camps and they will continue to receive this help unless some decision is taken regarding the establishment and communication to the proper authorities of these lists of displaced persons. I have no doubt that the majority of the inmates of displaced persons camps are honest people who, under the influence of hostile propaganda, are delaying their return home. But it should be possible through the establishment of these lists and their communication to the Governments concerned, to link these people with their relatives at home to enable them to correspond directly with their people at home. It would be possible through these lists to establish a direct link between these displaced persons and their folk at home and in this way, to hasten their return. In this

way, too, therefore, the absence of lists, the keeping secret of these lists is hampering repatriation although we know that repatriation is one of the principal solutions of the problem of refugees and displaced persons.

We have also proposed, Mr. President, that all persons being repatriated should be provided with the necessities, food and so on, for their journey and for a period of a few days after their arrival home. The proposals put forward by the United Kingdom Delegation led to the elimination of this proposal and the Draft Constitution as it stands, does not provide for any kind of help of that kind for persons being repatriated. This too, would constitute a very great help and encouragement to persons considering going home, and the absence of this help would be a hindrance to the carrying out of a repatriation program.

It is clear, Mr. President, that persons who have voluntarily collaborated with the Germans have no right to any kind of help, but it seems, to me that the second part of sub-paragraph (d), Part 2 in this Document, as it stands contains a contradiction, for it does allow help to be given to these persons who have voluntarily collaborated with the Germans. The Draft Constitution as it stands, is clearly self-contradictory in this sense, and it does not provide us with any guarantee that help will not be given to war criminals and collaborators.

For all these reasons, Mr. President, the Ukrainian Delegation cannot vote in favor of the Constitution as a whole until provision is made to see that help shall not be given to collaborators and war criminals.

(During the above remarks Mr. Parodi, Representative of France, left the table and was replaced by Mr. Hoffherr; Mr. Davila returned and replaced Mr. Fausto Soto as Representative of Chile.)

(Norway):

MR. COLBJORNSEN / I wonder whether we could not cut short the business of reservations which some of our colleagues are indulging in rather freely. We are forwarding recommendations to the General Assembly where the substance of the matter will no doubt again be thoroughly discussed, particularly those provisions which entail financial obligations for the Governments and for the United Nations. The final decisions will be taken by the Assembly subject to ratification by

the Member States.

Our decisions are thus really the referendum, both to our Governments and to the United Nations. We cannot bind the Delegations of our Governments to the General Assembly and we are not binding them. Therefore, these reservations that are being put forward now are hardly needed.

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

In order to facilitate the meeting of an agreement upon the Draft Constitution of the International Refugee Organization, the Soviet Delegation has been obliged to act without receiving precise instructions on certain points from its Government. It would like to do this because the time is too short for the instructions to be obtained, but the Soviet Delegation will act in this way only because it will <sup>be</sup> free, in the General Assembly Session, to express any opinion it thinks with the view to reaching a solution. It will not be bound by any compromises that have been accepted here in this Council.

My second point is this: I regret that although we have reached compromise agreements on many points, divergencies still exist between us on some points, and some points of importance. For instance, we are still in disagreement as regards the Sub-Commission on Lists of Refugees and Displaced Persons to the Governments directly concerned. This majority decision, the decision taken by a majority vote on this question, shows a lack of confidence in the Governments concerned and has undoubtedly done harm to the cause of repatriation. We are disagreed also upon other questions, including that of contributions to the operational expenses of the Organization. On the other questions, too, there are divergencies between us. The Soviet Delegation therefore finds it necessary to vote against the Draft Constitution as it stands at present.

MR. PEREZ CISNEROS (CUBA) (Interpretation from French): I wish, Mr. President, to associate myself with the remarks we have just heard from the Representative of Norway. Those remarks define very clearly the meaning that we attribute also to the Draft Constitution to be submitted to the General Assembly for its consideration and approval.

I would only add that, during the general discussion of this Draft Constitution, the head of the Cuban Delegation has put forward a number of objections to the Constitution. Some of those objections still hold good and particularly, our objections in respect to Article X.

The Cuban Delegation wishes therefore to reserve the position of its



Government as regards Article X of the Draft Constitution.

The PRESIDENT: The Draft Constitution of the International Refugee Organization is adopted with reservations presented by the different Delegations.

MR. FEONOV (Soviet Union): Would it not be appropriate to vote on the Draft Constitution as a whole, put the Draft Constitution as a whole to a vote?

The PRESIDENT: I have been asked by the Secretariat to prepare the final text of the Draft Resolution as amended, and when we have seen it, when we have received it, we will vote upon it as a whole.

The debate is now closed. Now, we have to take into consideration the document presented to us by the Standing Committee of UNRRA on the General Fund. It is Document E/187. We listened to the explanation of Mr. LaGuardia, and I think, on the basis of his explanation, the Resolution as amended, we could approve.

(During the above remarks, Mr. Noel-Baker, Representative of the United Kingdom, returned and replaced Mr. McNeill; and Mr. Winant, Representative of the United States, returned and replaced Mr. Warren at the Council Table).

MR. WINANT (United States): Mr. President, the welfare of the people, and particularly the children, in the war-torn countries is of great concern to the United States.

With the impending cessation of certain UNRRA activities in these countries we believe it imperative that emergency action be taken in this session of the Council to provide for continuing certain important welfare services and activities, especially those relating to children, and that action be taken to utilize the funds which may be made available for this purpose.

The United States Delegation presented a resolution on this subject last week. After conferring with the Secretariat, it appeared desirable to make the original resolution more specific. The revisions suggested have been incorporated in Document E/141 - REV.1. This paper you now have before you. My statement is directed to it.

The revised resolution refers to two resolutions adopted by the Council of UNRRA: The first, No.95, instructed the Director-General of UNRRA to consult with appropriate authorities of United Nations with a view to considering the desirability of transferring to the United Nations UNRRA's Welfare functions, exclusive of those relating to displaced persons. It refers specifically to functions in the social welfare field, such as those concerned with the problem of undernourished and orphaned children, the named and the handicapped, as well as advising on community services and the training of skilled personnel.

The second resolution, No.103, is also concerned with services to children and proposes that the residual assets of UNRRA, together with any gifts which may be made by Governments, voluntary agencies, individuals, and other sources, would be utilized for the benefit of children and adolescents. It further suggests that such purpose might be served by the creation of an International Children's Fund to which such assets and gifts would be transferred. The resolution also provided for a Standing Committee of UNRRA to prepare recommendations in agreement with the Economic and Social Council; (a) On the steps which should be taken to organize effectively, and without delay, the

proposed activities; and (b) On the response which might be obtained from the several possible sources of funds.

These resolutions relate to urgent and immediate needs requiring prompt consideration by the Economic and Social Council and the Social Commission. At both the meeting of the Temporary Social Commission and the recent session of the Council of UNRRA, it was agreed that prompt action in behalf of children and other welfare services of UNRRA was necessary. The Social Commission may not be meeting for some time, and the welfare services of UNRRA will soon be discontinued. Therefore, the resolution provides that the Secretary-General should consult immediately with the Director-General of UNRRA and take other steps, with a view to the United Nations' assuming certain urgent and important functions in the field of social welfare, special consideration being given to children. The Secretary-General is asked to undertake such studies and investigations and to formulate such recommendations, as he may deem necessary, to assist in reaching a conclusion concerning measures that might be undertaken by the United Nations, to submit recommendations to the General Assembly regarding any matters requiring its authorization or special financial provision, and to take such other action, under the terms of the resolution, as he deems desirable.

Under the resolution, he would make his report available to the Social Commission at its first meeting, on the action he has taken. In addition, the resolution would require the Social Commission at its first meeting to make recommendations on the way in which United Nations can most effectively: (1) Carry on essential functions performed by UNRRA in the field of Social Welfare; (2) On the manner in which the United Nations can assist in the rehabilitation of children and adolescents, and on the best use in an international program of funds made available for this purpose.

UNRRA has rendered great service to countries faced with overwhelming problems of social reconstruction. At the request of Governments UNRRA has given advice and assistance in organizing services for the handicapped, the aged, the orphaned, and destitute children, for supplementary child feeding, in

restoring social welfare institutions, and in training social welfare personnel. UNRRA has furnished personnel to serve as consultants to national authorities in the restoration and development of permanent social welfare programs, has made information available to the Governments concerning many phases of relief and rehabilitation, and has been active in coordinating the services of voluntary agencies. All of these welfare services require the use of welfare specialists, who, through training and experience have developed the necessary know-how relative to the maximum utilization of community resources in assisting individuals and family to meet their economic problems. This skill is as important in the social field as industrial know-how is in the field of physical production.

These welfare services must not be allowed to lapse, and trained personnel must not be allowed to disband, while people continue to be in acute need, and resources for social assistance and social service are still in the process of reconstruction.

It is especially important that we take action to relieve the distress and promote the welfare of children in countries which have suffered from the tragedy of war. Their need is acute. Since they represent the hope of the future, their plight will have the first attention of each Government in its effort to promote the welfare of its people. However, there is need for international cooperation to provide supplementary assistance.

We have before us today, in addition to the United States resolution, a proposal of the Standing Committee of UNRRA that the Council adopt a resolution on an International Children's Emergency Fund. I wish to endorse the establishment of a Fund which would consist of any residual assets of UNRRA, together with any gifts which may be made by Governments, voluntary agencies, individuals, and other sources. This does not involve financial commitment by the United Nations or its Members. However, I believe we would all agree that the United Nations, in the Economic and Social Council especially, have an obligation to make certain that machinery established for this purpose by the United Nations is appropriate

for the purpose it is intended to serve and is properly related to all of our other activities to promote human welfare.

This problem comes before us as we are bringing to a close our current Session. Therefore, we cannot now give full and final consideration to the required international machinery. However, what we can do, and I believe should do, is request the General Assembly at its coming Session to arrange for the creation of a voluntary fund to be subject to the control of the Economic and Social Council.



MR. HOFFHERR (France) (Interpretation from French): Mr. President, the French Delegation wishes to state its approval in principle of the draft proposal for the creation of an International Youth Fund to give help to children coming from countries that were victims of aggression. It seems to me that this is a subject which is worthy of an international effort, and I wish to welcome the generous initiative that has been taken in this respect.

I have, however, one or two points to make in connection with the financial aspect of the problem. Certainly, an exchange of views will be needed, and it seems to me that in order to secure the help that we shall need we should envisage one or two changes of form in this Document. I would like to propose two changes of form.

As regards the first paragraph, instead of speaking simply of an international organization we should speak of creating the necessary financial resources, obtaining the necessary financial resources. As regards the second resolution, I propose that we should speak not of the creation of an organism but of organizing the distribution of resources, the distribution of the funds collected.

(During the above remarks, Mr. Riddell Representative of Canada, left the table and was replaced by Mr. Davidson).

MR. ARGYROPOULOS (Greece): Mr. President, it is with great satisfaction and even with a great sense of relief that I welcome the proposal which lies before us concerning the rehabilitation of children and adolescents. It is hopeful to see the national collaboration directed toward the reaching of such a noble goal, which besides its humanitarian character, is of an outstanding social interest. Everybody, of course, realizes the importance of the child in society. Everybody knows that from the children of today depend the generation of tomorrow, but nobody who has not been, since the war, in one of the devastated countries which suffered as much as mine from enemy occupation and devastation can be aware of the acuteness of the problem of the children. It is difficult to imagine the thousands and tens of thousands of dark tragedies which disclose themselves day after day among the young, among those innocent and tender beings who are not responsible for the evils of this world.

UNRRA has already done much in that field, but there is still much to be done. It would be disastrous if UNRRA's activities were interrupted. I think that it is of the utmost importance that they be continued and even developed and raised to an international and social function.

That is why I support very warmly the proposal which has been submitted to us and wish that it may give most brilliant results.

~~MR. FEONOV (Soviet Union):~~ <sup>Soviet Union</sup> The Delegation supports the draft resolution proposed by the UNRRA Standing Committee. Mr. President, the clock shows that it is already past seven o'clock.

MR. NOEL BAKER (United Kingdom): Mr. President, as the United Kingdom Delegation desires to sit until midnight I am not inhibited at all by the clock.

I support both the resolution contained in paper 141 which I understand was moved by Mr. Winant and the resolution in 187 about the children's fund which you have moved.

I should like to say on the first that I welcome it warmly, that the more the work of UNRRA is merged with that of the United Nations, the more will people understand that UNRRA was the beginning of a long continuing task which the United Nations will carry through, I hope, to a successful conclusion.

On the children's fund, I would only like to say on the first paragraph, on the form, that I am glad that it is very elastic, that the money is to be used for the benefit of children and adolescents of countries which were victims of aggression because how it is used will, of course, depend no doubt in considerable measure on the amount of money which is found. That must be certain. Therefore it is right that it is elastic. I want to emphasize the point.

On the second paragraph, I venture to hope that those who drafted the resolution for the Assembly will aim at the maximum simplicity in the machinery which they create.

Sir, on the purpose of the fund, Mayor LaGuardia told us this morning about what had been done in the City of New York with child feeding. In the presence of the Secretary-General and of the Norwegian Representative- perhaps it is not

for me to mention the Oslo Breakfast-- but when I want to Norway in the years before the war, they used to tell me that it was owing to the Oslo Breakfast that the children were on the average five inches taller than their parents, and certainly it is the long experimentation in nutrition upon which so much of FAO and other things have been founded, the new science of food management. The long process of experimentation begun by Dr. Rajchman and the Health Section in Geneva in 1925 was largely carried through with your cooperation, Sir, on children and has proved that with children the right feeding does give you an immense result.

So we don't know how much money is going to be raised. The appeal is to all kinds of people. It is going to be to governments. I cannot today-- I wish today--I cannot today give any pledge that my Government will make a Government contribution, I am certain that there are people in my country who will make a generous private response and that exchange difficulties will not prevent that response from being made practically effective. Sir, I am sure that in other countries a fund of great proportions can be found even if no government made contributions.

The Director General of UNRRA told us this morning that he would start the business with \$550,000, in substance. I remember how in 1922 in Greece, a million and a half refugees were fed for the better part of a year by the American Red Cross Society who came in a moment of absolute disaster and did what no one else then could have done.

I was told by the Chairman of the UNRRA Committee of the Assembly, Congressman Sol Bloom, the other day that he proposed to support this Children's Fund on his own initiative, to give himself, a thousand dollars, and to find a thousand others who would do the same. I have never met anybody who had heard of Mr. Bloom not carrying through something which he undertook. I am sure that this Fund is worth doing. Let's not deceive ourselves. Fascism is not dead in Europe. It is not dead in other continents. The passions of war are not dispersed and every act of violence that goes on, every act of intolerance, every act of revenge--however justified--fans the flames on which Fascism feeds. Those who are dangerous to the world, the most dangerous of all in years to come are between the ages of ten and



E/P.V./29  
124.130

eighteen today. This Fund, Sir, I hope will save them and the world  
from what our generation has gone through.

(At this point Mr. Winant, Representative of the United States, left the Council table and was replaced by Mr. Altmayer).

Mr. COLBJORNSEN (Norway): Mr. President, I am very thankful to Mr. Noel Baker for his mentioning of an Oslo breakfast which, as you know, was instituted for school children a long time ago in the Capital of my country. I think it is generally admitted that this was a pioneer enterprise in the moral and social care of children, and it has been a very great satisfaction to us to see that the same system has been adopted now in many other countries.

It goes without saying, Mr. President, that I am in general agreement with the content of that proposed Council Resolution. I should only like to ask whether we are not discussing E/141, revision 1, and also E/187 revision 1, because especially with regard to the last document there is, as you will have noticed, a considerable difference in the text from the previous unrevised edition.

I have only one brief remark to make with regard to the revised edition of E/187, paragraph 2, at the end. I wonder whether the words, "the necessary international machinery for this purpose" are really necessary. What we are doing is recommending that the General Assembly arrange for the creation of an International Children's Emergency Fund. I am afraid that if we use this expression, "the necessary international machinery," then someone might get, or people reading might get the idea that we are establishing, going to establish a sort of elaborate organization, a big organization, perhaps a sort of new specialized agency again.

If I may say so, Mr. President, one of the secrets also, I think, of the Oslo breakfast was that money appropriated for the Oslo breakfast, for breakfast for children, really goes into the children, it is used for the children, and not for establishing a new organization. If we are establishing here an international machinery, then I am afraid that, perhaps, a big part of the money from the Fund will go to feed the machinery, and not to feed the children.



I think the words, " the necessary international machinery" are not really needed. Why not just cut it out, and with a draft resolution, for transmission to the General Assembly, establish the Fund. I take it what is really meant here is that the Organization and the management of a fund, the auditing of a fund, and so on, really does not need any elaborate machinery. So, as I say, I am in agreement with the proposed resolutions. The revised editions. I only propose to strike the words, " the necessary international machinery for this purpose, " and just put, "the Fund" there.

MR. ZULETA ANGEL (Colombia): The United Kingdom Delegation's seat, Mr. President, has been occupied in the course of the day by four or five different persons. It is for that reason, perhaps, that the British Delegation is prepared to sit until midnight. That does not, however, apply to your place, Mr. President, or to that of the Secretariat or other Delegations.

DR. CHANG (China): Mr. President, the Chinese Delegation heartily supports the resolution. While we help the children, the children can help us. Confucius said, "A great man is he who has not lost the heart of the child." Therefore, we hope that in doing this, we may all be benefited.

MR. ARCA PARRO (Peru): Mr. President, I just want to say that I agree with the remarks made by the Representative of Norway, but just to a certain extent, because the establishment of a Fund of this nature, in order to do a given task in the relief of children requires certain organization. Now I don't know up to what limit we could just create the Fund and not establish a corresponding office. Of course, it will be up to the management of this office to engage just the indispensable number of employees. Any amendment that could be agreed to on this point should be very carefully taken.

MR. HOFFHERR (France) (Interpretation from French): The remarks that I made a few moments ago, Mr. President, were based upon my reading of the French text. I notice however that the English text is different. The French text is "des recommandations visant a creer un organisme international les ressources necessaire charge de la gestion dudit fonds", whereas the English text is "with a view to the establishment of international machinery for the administration of such a Fund." My remarks apply to the French text only. They do not seem to apply to the English text.

MR. FEONOV (Soviet Union): Mr. President, the translation of French into French is not very helpful. That has just happened. So could it be possible that the French text will be translated into English so that those Representatives who do not possess a knowledge of French would be able to compare the texts?

MR. DAVILA (Chile): Mr. President, we so thoroughly enthusiastically agree on this motion that we are depriving ourselves of the pleasure of voting on it. I will vote <sup>on</sup> the motion with the Amendment by the Norwegian Representative.

The PRESIDENT: So far as I understand, there are no possibilities of establishing the Fund without making provisions for a separate administration for the distribution of the Fund. I am also a Member of the Standing Committee and I know that there is nobody in this Standing Committee who would agree to establish a large machinery for this purpose or a new specialized agency at all. I think that this Standing Committee would be confirmed by the Assembly; of course, somebody must be there to collect money, to collect material and to distribute it. If we would delete the international machinery for this purpose, it would be wrong, in my opinion. Therefore, I would propose that we should approve this Resolution. It is an understanding and under the assumption that no specialized agency will be established, but only a simple machine to carry out this work, to distribute material and to collect the Fund; under that assumption I beg the Members of this Council to adopt this Resolution as it stands and to adjourn our meeting.

MR. LIE (Secretary General): It is only fair for me to say in regard to the Resolution, to the Members of the Council, that the Secretary General has to prepare the Draft Resolution for the Assembly and I promise you that, from my side, there will not come any Draft Resolution which will create any new machinery. I hope to find an office which will have the approach that is already working and can do the work.

MR. HOFFHERR (France): (Interpretation from French): I wish only to say that the French Delegation would approve the United Kingdom text provided that "international machinery" is replaced by some such expression as -- so that the French translation is brought into line with the English text.

MR. NOEL BAKER (United Kingdom): I should like to support your proposal that we adopt the Resolution. I am in sympathy with the preoccupation in the mind of our Norwegian colleague, when I said I hoped the machinery would be as simple as possible. But unless this Fund is under the auspices of the United

Nations, we must consider the relationship to the Social Commission, a very important matter. We must have some small appropriation on the budget to put before the Assembly and I hope, therefore, it may stand as it is.

MR. COLBJORNSEN (Norway): Mr. President, after listening to you and to the Secretary General, I withdraw my proposal.

The PRESIDENT: Thank you very much.

MR. ALTMAYER (United States): Mr. President, I should like to call attention to the fact that there are two resolutions.

The PRESIDENT: Yes, I know it very well.

MR. ALTMAYER: (United States): They are inter-related.

The PRESIDENT: Any more Members of the Council agree to the Resolution proposed? I declare the Resolution E/187, Revision 1, is adopted and stands.

MR. ALTMAYER (United States): No, Mr. President, E/141.

The PRESIDENT: I very well know parliamentary procedure, I can assure you.

Our agenda for tomorrow:

At 10:00 am, the Committee on Negotiations with Specialized Agencies, in Conference Room 1.

At 10:30 am, a Plenary Session in the Council Chamber. We will finish Monday's Agenda if necessary. It certainly is necessary, as you see. Then, a report of the Secretary-General called for by the Resolution on Assistance to FAO. Third, report of Committee on Terms of Reference of Sub-commissions of the Economic and Employment Commission.

At 2:00 pm, Devastated Areas Sub-committee, Conference Room 1. If possible, <sup>at</sup> we will meet/2:45. I will announce in the morning in the Plenary Council Session-- first finish at the afternoon Plenary Session the morning Agenda, if necessary. Second, a report of the Refugees Finance Sub-committee. Third, the Lebanese proposed resolution on sponsorship of a World Statistical Congress. Fourth, the Norwegian proposal relating to the Consolidated Budget and Common Fiscal Services for the United Nations and Specialized Agencies. Fifth, the United Kingdom proposed resolution concerning the Agenda of the Meeting of experts to prepare for a world conference on passport and frontier formalities.



E/P.V./29  
143-145

Sixth, the French proposal regarding the establishment of United Nations Research Laboratories.



At the same time, I must remind the Members of the Council that Wednesday, morning or afternoon, the election of the Members of the different Commissions established by the Council will take place. Therefore, may I ask the Members of the Council to submit their nominations to me, at the latest, tomorrow night or evening before we adjourn, and to hand them directly to me.

Therefore, we will discuss tomorrow the United States proposal as mentioned already.

There is some misunderstanding, that I omitted this proposal. Usually I am taking everything into consideration, but you must understand my position. I am sitting here from 10 o'clock in the morning to late at night, and many Delegations can be changed, of course. They have some other alternates, but I have no alternate at all, because the Second vice-President is ill. What can I do? Therefore, please, you must take into consideration my physical inability to stay here for twenty-four hours.

Therefore, I am adjourning this meeting.

(The meeting adjourned at 7:43 PM )