

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

CONSEIL ECONOMIQUE ET SOCIAL

E/P.V./36
3 October
English
Unrestricted

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

VERBATIM RECORD OF TWENTY-FIRST MEETING OF THE THIRD SESSION
OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL
Lake Success, New York
Thursday, 3 October 1946 at 8:00 pm

- - -

PRESENT:

THE PRESIDENT: DR. STAMPAR

| | |
|--------------------|----------------------------|
| MR. LEBEAU | (Belgium) |
| MR. RIDDELL | (Canada) |
| MR. DAVILA | (Chile) |
| DR. CHANG | (China) |
| MR. ZULETA ANGEL | (Colombia) |
| MR. CISNEROS | (Cuba) |
| MR. PAPANEK | (Czechoslovakia) |
| MR. PARODI | (France) |
| MR. ARGYROPOULOS | (Greece) |
| SIR SHANKAR BAJPAI | (India) |
| MR. MALIK | (Lebanon) |
| MR. COLBJORN JEN | (Norway) |
| MR. ARCA PARJO | (Peru) |
| MR. MEDVED | (Ukrainian SSR) |
| MR. FEONOV | (Soviet Union) |
| MR. PENSON | (United Kingdom) |
| MR. WINANT | (United States of America) |
| MR. MATES | (Yugoslavia) |

The PRESIDENT: The French Translation, please.

(At this point, the interpreter translated into French the remarks made at the previous meeting by Mr. Fausto Soto, Representative of Chile.)

MR CISNEROS (Cuba): Mr. President, the Representative of the Soviet Union said a few days ago that in international meetings nothing should be of a nature to surprise. Therefore, I would point^{out} that the Economic and Social Council should not surprise us. It obviously works under very different circumstances, both hygienic and anti-social. We have behind us 18 hours of solid work and we are called upon to do intellectual work in the course of

digestion.

This being said, I would suggest that we make a strict application of Rule 54 of the Rules of Procedure, which makes it possible for the President to limit the time allotted to each speaker. I would suggest that this time be limited to five minutes and that on each of the speeches, we only have two speakers for and two against each of the items.

The PRESIDENT: Does the Council agree to this restriction of our Debate?

MR. MATES (Yugoslavia): Mr. President, I think that it is possible to agree to some restriction as to the length of the speeches. I do not think that it is possible to agree to the restriction on the number of speakers. It is possible to have such a limitation in a national parliament; but in a Council where we have 18 Governments represented, it is unfeasible that a Government should be deprived of the opportunity to express its view.

The PRESIDENT: According to Rule 54, the Council may limit the time allowed each speaker, but it does not state about how many have a right to speak. Therefore, I would move that the time limit should be five minutes, if you agree. Does everybody agree to it?

Dr. CHANG (China): Including translation.

Sir G. Shankar BAJPAI (India): Mr. President, I should be prepared to move that we be completely silent provided that an item which we are going to discuss just now, had not already been discussed by others at some length. I trust to your sense of fairness to insure that a proposition which had not been discussed adequately, might in the case of the protagonist of a particular point of view limit the debate to five minutes. I will speak less than five minutes. I generally do.

The PRESIDENT: I am quite sure that the Members of the Council will show the spirit of self discipline as always. So I think we can proceed.

Sir G. Shankar BAJPAI (India): Then, Mr. President, I might have your indulgence and the indulgence of the Council for a few minutes. I should like to speak on the proposal that had been made with regard to the right of the FAO to seek the opinion of the International Court of Justice. The argument urged against that fell into three parts: First, that the ILO has been longer in existence than the FAO. That doesn't seem to me to be an argument of much validity. ^{er} Aft/all, it is nature which determines the birth of a particular organization or man, and because one person is younger than another, that does not necessarily mean that no ordinary rights or legitimate claims are to be denied to him merely because of the accident of time. I do not think that is a particularly strong argument.

The second argument which was used was that the International Labor Office has already concluded a great many conventions; that naturally is the prerogative of age; having lived longer than the FAO, it has had an opportunity to conclude many more conventions than the FAO, but that, Sir, does not mean that the FAO is not empowered under its constitution to make conventions, nor does it mean that in a field of such wide importance as food and agriculture, there are not possibilities of concluding conventions.

As a matter of fact, Sir, I should conclude that there is no other field so important as the field of food and agriculture, and as one who had something to do with the Organization before it came into being, I should like to say that there are such matters as commodity arrangements, for instance, price arrangements, which may invoke the making of conventions, and those conventions would be made by the FAO. Another expression, Sir, which was used for an argument was, "Oh." But how can you put an embryonic organization on the same level as a full-fledged organization?" Sir, the word embryonic has a certain well-known meaning in medical science, and you as a physician, would not need a discourse from me on that subject. What is embryonic? Something which has not come into being. Surely, nobody can say that the FAO has not come into being. If it has not come into being, why did we decide this morning to authorize the Secretary-General to appoint two people in order to attend the especially important meeting which is being convened under the auspices of the FAO. Surely, Sir, that particular argument has merely to be looked at to be discussed as completely absurd and indirect. I do not think that we can base any weight on the assumption that the FAO is in an embryonic state. Sir, the main question that we have to consider is this: What exactly is the nature of the work that a particular organization has to do? I think the antiquity of an organization has very little bearing upon the scope of freedom which we are going to give it.

This Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization, is the first of its kind in the history of international effort. There never has been a Food and Agriculture Organization before. This is an Organization which is concerned with one of the four freedoms which are supposed to be at the base of our Charter, namely, freedom from want. This particular Organization has been called into being to strive to its utmost to rid humanity of the fear of want, and the quality of its work, young as it is -- less than two years old -- the quality of its work is to be judged by the fact that in Copenhagen, not so long ago, we had a meeting where an entirely new proposition was put forward, new, controversial, widely discussed, and broadly accepted by all the nations which attended the conference.

Now, Sir, it seems to me that if an organization in two years of its existence has accomplished a task of such importance and complexity, certainly the whole conscience of humanity is astir on a point of vital importance to mankind, and it is hardly fair to suggest that it cannot in the matter of status compare with the ILO. Why? Because the ILO has been in existence longer than the FAO. I submit, Sir, that considering the quality of the work FAO has done, considering the range of the work it is doing, it ought to be given exactly the same facility for an approach to the International Court of Justice as the ILO.

Mr. LEBEAU (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): Mr. President, in my capacity as Chairman of the Negotiations Committee, it would be for me to defend the opinion of the majority of that Committee, but as the Representative of Chile has already done so -- and perhaps better than I could have done myself -- I shall remain silent on this point.

But still I have another argument to bring up before you, speaking for the majority of the Negotiations Committee, if it were to refuse any specialized agency -- such as FAO, UNESCO, and PICAQ -- that wide clause that was afforded to the ILO. The argument is this:

I believe that the Economic and Social Council must not take into account only those arguments which are brought forward by the specialized agencies, but it has also to take into consideration the interests of the principal organ interested in this case -- and that organ is the International Court of Justice, which must zealously guard its authority.

I believe that it is a general truth that what must be prevented is misuse of such judicial organs as the International Court of Justice. What we must prevent is an inflation in the appeals to that Court for advisory opinions. If we let that go, if the number of such consultative opinions requested from the Court were to increase, it would certainly devitalize the authority of the International Court of Justice itself. I believe that one of our duties is to protect the interests, the authority and the dignity of the organs of the United Nations -- and, in this special case, of the International Court of Justice.

I therefore believe that the Negotiations Committee which, by a large majority, refused to give the new specialized agencies the same far - going rights that were afforded to the ILO, made a wise decision, inasmuch as the ILO has requested that special clause for certain reasons which were brought forward, and which certainly justify the special position accorded to the ILO, as compared to the other specialized agencies.

The PRESIDENT: Are there any other speakers on this subject?

(No response.)

We now have to vote on the United Kingdom amendment to sub-paragraph (a).
You had in your hands Document E/219.

All those in favor of this amendment, please raise your hands.
(showing of hands.)

All those against? (showing of hands.)

The amendment is carried, ten votes to seven.

We go now to sub-paragraph (b). The following amendment has been
proposed by the Soviet Delegation --

Mr. FEONOV (Soviet Union): May I read my own amendment, please?

The PRESIDENT: Yes, that would be better.

MR. FEONOV (Soviet Union): Mr. President, we propose to change paragraph (b) in the following way. I will read the amended text.

"The Council adopts the following resolution: The Economic and Social Council having considered the Draft Agreement entered into between its Committee on Negotiations with Specialized Agencies and the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization, recommends, first, to PICAO to take appropriate steps at its first general meeting toward the exclusion of Franco Spain from this Organization, changing, if necessary, its Constitution; to inform PICAO that the agreed Draft Agreement can finally be accepted only on this condition; second, that the General Assembly approve the decision of the Economic and Social Council as stated in (1) above.

The PRESIDENT: Is the Soviet Representative still in favor of a roll call?

MR. FEONOV (Soviet Union): Yes.

(A vote was taken with the following result:)

| | |
|----------------|----------|
| Belgium | No |
| Canada | No |
| Chile | Abstain. |
| China | Abstain. |
| Colombia | No. |
| Cuba | No. |
| Czechoslovakia | Yes. |
| France | Yes. |
| Greece | No. |
| India | NO. |
| Lebanon | No. |
| Norway | Abstain. |
| Peru | No. |
| Ukrainian SSR | Yes. |
| United Kingdom | No. |
| United States | No. |
| Yugoslavia | Yes. |

The PRESIDENT: Not carried.

MR. LEBEAU (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): Mr. President, now that this vote has been taken, I wish to declare solemnly that Belgium has not in its vote voted in favor of Franco Spain, which Belgium hates and abhors. It has only voted in the sense it did in respect of the constitutional aspect.

of the Charter itself. I have made this statement now because this is a public meeting.

MR. ZULETA ANGEL (Colombia): (Interpretation from French):

Mr. President, Colombia willingly follows any decision taken by the General Assembly or by the Security Council in respect of decisions which these two bodies may take in respect to Franco Spain. However, it is my opinion that the Economic and Social Council has no political decisions to take in any way, and that is why I voted against the Soviet amendment.

MR. CISNEROS (Cuba): (Interpretation from French): Mr. President, the Cuban Delegation wishes to associate itself entirely with the statement made by the Representative of Colombia.

The PRESIDENT: Now we have another amendment.

MR. FEONOV (Soviet Union): Other Representatives have made their statements, Mr. President, and I hope I will be permitted to make my statement as well.

It seems to me that the issue before us was quite clear. It is not right to say that the Economic and Social Council has no right to take political decisions, because it is in our terms of reference. What is Human Rights, for example? Purely a political matter. It is in the terms of reference of the Economic and Social Council. One cannot avoid that issue.

It was absolutely clear that before us was a question whether we would support, either directly or indirectly, the Franco Regime by admitting it to associate itself with the United Nations or not, and it is this issue we are avoiding that I am sure public opinion will have the right view as to what country and what Representative will take part when we decide this question, which was really in the view of the Soviet Delegation a question of whether we are to encourage Franco Spain in any possible way or not.

That was the issue before us, and I am very sorry to say that here again the Economic and Social Council takes what seems to me a very wrong political decision.

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

Mr. President, I wish to explain the vote which I have just cast against the Resolution presented to the Council in respect of the relationship to be established between the United Nations and PICA0/^{to}which belongs Franco Spain. My colleagues have explained their votes. I believe I have a right to do so as well. I would refer to Article 62 of the Charter, which in paragraph 2 says: "It may..." -- speaking of the Economic and Social Council -- "...make recommendations for the purpose of promoting respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all."

I believe that this goes sufficiently far to show that no relationship can exist between the United Nations under this Charter and any country in which there is not the slightest respect -- no observance at all -- of human rights and fundamental freedom.

I, therefore, claim, Mr. President, that no relationship can be established -- not even a relationship of a technical character -- with a country like Franco Spain. I believe that the Members of the Council which voted for that Resolution have gone a long way to confirm Franco in the place which he now occupies.

I believe that these are sufficient reasons to explain why I voted against that Resolution. There is no question here as to whether the Economic and Social Council has or has not political functions. It is sufficient to refer to Article 62 of the Charter which shows quite exactly what the responsibilities of the Council are in the political field.

The PRESIDENT: Are there any more speakers?

Mr. ARGYROPOULOS (Greece): Mr. President, I would like to make a remark: That is to say, that each one of the speakers can give the meaning of his vote, but I do not think that any one of us can confer a meaning to the vote of the whole Council.

Mr. WINANT (United States): I would like to make a single exception to what my Greek colleague has just said, and that is to state what everyone here knows: No one around this table is for Franco Spain.

The PRESIDENT: We now have to vote on the second amendment proposed by the United Kingdom Delegation, Document E/219, paragraph B.

Mr. PENSON (United Kingdom): I move my second amendment.

The PRESIDENT: Whoever is in favor of the United Kingdom proposal will raise his hand.

Mr. ZULETA ANGEL (Colombia): We do not have the Document before us. Could we have it?

The PRESIDENT: Document E/219. I mentioned it at the beginning. It gives the same rights to PICA0 as to ILO, to request advisory opinions from the Court of International Justice.

Whoever is in favor of the British proposal should raise his hand. Who is against it?

It is carried.

Now we come to Sub-paragraph C. Are there any objections to it?

It is adopted.

Sub-paragraph D. No objection?

Mr. PENSON (United Kingdom): I now move my amendment C of E/219 which takes the form of an addition to the 4 recommendations on page 4 of E/205, relating to the same arrangements as regards UNESCO.

The PRESIDENT: Whoever is in favor of the British proposal should raise his hand.

(During the above remarks Mr. Kotschnig Representative of the United States arrived and replaced Mr. Winant at the Council table.)

ARCA

DR./PARRO (Peru): I just want to explain why I am voting against this proposal. It is not because I could be against the substance of the subject matter but because, as the Representative of Chile has explained, this is something that has been so fully discussed on previous occasions and now it has been brought up at the last moment giving practically no time for any debate, in some way trying to impose on the situation a very rushed vote on this question. That is why I am voting against it.

PRESIDENT: Those who are in favor of the British proposal, raise your hands.

It is agreed.

I have to announce that the recommendations on page 4 as amended, are approved.

The next item on our Agenda is the report, E/CT.2/10. Who was the Representative of the Negotiations Committee? The United States Representative.

MR. KOTSCHNIG: (United States): Mr. President, in view of the advanced hour and because it is very late, I'll be brief. Last Saturday the Council decided to endorse the Council NGO Committee which originally had been set up as a screening committee for the admission of organizations with a consultative relationship to the Council, with an additional task, the task of acting as the standing committee of the Council which would actually consult with non-governmental organizations on matters within their competence.

It is in this latter capacity that the Council NGO Committee met yesterday with the Representatives of the World Federation of Trade Unions, which included the President and the Secretary-General of that organization. In the absence of the President of this Council, I had the honor to chair this meeting. At the end of the meeting I was asked as Chairman to transmit to the Council a brief report on the proceedings of that meeting. This report, Gentlemen, is before you in this document E/CT.2/10. It has been transmitted to the Council simply for your information. I believe there is no debate necessary, nor certainly is there any decision required.

I do hope, however, that you will find the report encouraging. It does not change in any way the resolution passed by the Council last June, when it decided on the various formalities governing consultative arrangements with non-governmental agencies. It simply spells out some of the things which the Council intended to accord in the way of privileges to these non-governmental agencies.

I would like to call your attention particularly to the last two paragraphs of this report which reflects the spirit in which our negotiations were conducted yesterday.

It states in the penultimate paragraph that the President of the World Federation of Trade Unions stated in the meeting that he would recommend to his Executive Bureau that the working arrangements as outlined in this report should be put into operation in the hope that it would prove wholly satisfactory. Furthermore, I would like to call your attention to the last paragraph which reflects the spirit of our meeting yesterday.

There was mutual agreement that if the cooperative spirit which had prevailed throughout the first meeting between the World Federation of Trade Unions and the Committee on Non-governmental agencies continued throughout the future, it should be possible to arrive, on the basis of existing agreement, at a close and fruitful cooperation between the Council and the World Federation of Trade Unions, assuring the World Federation of Trade Unions that it would be able to contribute constructively to the work of the Council.

I feel I express the feeling of all the Members of the NGO, of the majority of those Members, that we made a good start yesterday in our task of consulting with this great organization of workers of the world.

The PRESIDENT: I think that all Members of the Council are very happy that negotiation with the World Federation of Trade Unions is so satisfactory. We all hope that Representatives of all the World Federation of Trade Unions will participate in our discussion and our work.

Now the next item is the question of Danubian vessels, namely, proposal by the Yugoslav and Czechoslovak Delegations. As you remember, we had a full discussion on this matter and we decided that only voting should take place. You have in your hands, I suppose, the Draft Resolution proposed by the Yugoslav Delegation, this is Document E/193; and the Draft Resolution proposed by the Czechoslovakian Delegation, E/194; and later, during our discussion, the Greek Delegation proposed a Resolution under E/191.

The Peruvian Representative raised the question of the competence of the Economic and Social Council. May I ask the Peruvian Representative if he has any amendment or particular proposal.

MR. ARCA PARRO (Peru): Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity you give me and I just want to say that this question has been debated at great length at our former meeting, and as long as this proposal was fully supported by the Chilean Delegation, and we still think that conditions have not changed, I would not like to add any other arguments to this matter and would like to just ask the President if he would be kind enough to put the vote this previous question.

The PRESIDENT: The Peruvian Representative proposed that this question is not in the competence of the Economic and Social Council. The Yugoslav and Czechoslovak Delegations, supported by some Delegation, proposed a resolution based on Article 62 of the Charter. As the Peruvian proposal is farthest removed from the original, we have to vote on it.

MR. MEDVED (Yugoslavia): Mr. President, I think that it would be possible to have a rather lengthy discussion on this complicated matter of the procedure, but I declare in the name of the Yugoslav Delegation / that the Yugoslav Delegation does not put any stress on what resolution is voted first. We will absolutely comply with your decision as to the order of the votes because whatever resolution is taken earlier or later, it is quite evident

from all the resolutions that a clear answer to the attitude of the Yugoslav resolution will appear even if the voting is not taken on it.

The PRESIDENT: According to the rules of procedure, we have to vote first on the Peruvian proposal.

Members of the Council who are in favor of the Peruvian proposal...

MR. ARCA PARRO (Peru): Roll call please.

MR. MALIK (Lebanon): Mr. President, may we hear the text of the proposal once again and know exactly what we are voting on?

The PRESIDENT: The Representative of Peru proposed that ^{the} Council should vote that the matter of Danubian vessels, as stated in the Czechoslovak and Yugoslav proposal, is not in the competence of the Economic and Social Council.

The Yugoslav Representative asked for ^a roll call. A roll call will be taken.

Those in favor of the Peruvian Proposal will vote "yes"; those against, "no".

| | |
|----------------|-----------|
| Belgium | No |
| Canada | No |
| Chile | Yes |
| China | Yes |
| Colombia | Yes |
| Cuba | yes |
| Czechoslovakia | No |
| France | No |
| India | Yes |
| Greece | Abstained |
| Lebanon | No |
| Norway | Yes |
| Peru | Yes |
| Ukraine SSR | No |
| Soviet Union | No |
| United Kingdom | No |
| United States | No |
| Yugoslav | No |

MR. PARODI (France): You missed one.

The PRESIDENT: All right, we will start again.

SECRETARY-GENERAL: You called them too fast for us.

The PRESIDENT: I will call them again.

| | |
|----------------|-----------|
| Belgium | No |
| Canada | No |
| Chile | Yes |
| China | Yes |
| Colombia | Yes |
| Cuba | Oui |
| Czechoslovakia | No |
| France | No |
| Germany | Abstained |
| India | No |
| Indonesia | No |
| Norway | Yes |
| Peru | Yes |
| Ukraine SSR | No |
| Soviet Union | No |
| United Kingdom | No |
| United States | No |
| Yugoslav | No |

The PRESIDENT: It is not carried.

MR. ARCA PARRO (Peru): The score please.

The PRESIDENT: It is not carried.

SECRETARY-GENERAL: Eleven, no; six, yes; one abstention.

Now we have to vote on the Yugoslav Resolution, Document E/193. A roll call was asked, so it will be taken.

| | |
|----------------|----------|
| Belgium | No. |
| Canada | No. |
| Chile | Abstain. |
| China | Abstain. |
| Colombia | Abstain. |
| Cuba | No. |
| Czechoslovakia | Yes. |
| France | Abstain. |
| Greece | Abstain. |
| India | No. |
| Lebanon | No. |
| Norway | Abstain. |
| Peru | No. |
| Ukrainian SSR | Yes. |
| Soviet Union | Yes. |
| United Kingdom | No. |
| United States | No. |
| Yugoslavia | Yes. |

The Yugoslav Resolution is not adopted.

MR. FEONOV (Soviet Union): May I know what the result is, Mr. President?

The PRESIDENT: 4 in favor of the Resolution; 8 against the Resolution; 6 abstentions.

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

That makes 19 votes in all.

The PRESIDENT: I am sorry, but our mathematics is quite all right.

Now, we have to vote on the Czechoslovakian Resolution, Document E/194.

A roll call was asked, so it will be taken.

| | |
|----------------|----------|
| Belgium | No. |
| Canada | No. |
| Chile | Abstain. |
| China | Abstain. |
| Colombia | Abstain. |
| Cuba | No. |
| Czechoslovakia | Yes. |
| France | Abstain. |
| Greece | Abstain. |
| India | No. |
| Lebanon | No. |
| Norway | Abstain. |
| Peru | Abstain. |
| Ukrainian SSR | Yes. |
| Soviet Union | Yes. |
| United Kingdom | No. |
| United States | No. |
| Yugoslavia | Yes. |

4 in favor; 7 against; 7 abstentions.

Now, we have to vote on the Greek proposal.

MR. FEONOV (Soviet Union): Mr. President, the Resolution presented by Greece was not discussed at all. The case itself was not explained. When we heard the application from the Czechoslovakian and Yugoslavian Governments, we had been informed of the long negotiations taking place between the Governments. That was not the case as regards the Greek Resolution. Nothing was stated to us when this Resolution was presented, so I do not think it would be proper to vote on that Resolution at all.

MR. ARGYROPOULOS (Greece): Mr. President, the explanation of the case is contained in my proposal to the Council. If it has not been discussed, that is not my fault. That is because no objection has been made. Nevertheless, I request that the vote be taken exactly as for the other requests.

MR. FEONOV (Soviet Union): Mr. President, in my speech when we discussed that matter, I stated how the Greek Resolution could be qualified at that time when the proposal was presented because it was presented in such a way that the interested party was not given an opportunity to answer.

MR. ARGYROPOULOS (Greece): Mr. President, I presented my proposal in quite a regular way. If I presented it late, I explained the reasons for it. That was because I only received the information from my Government the evening before the question was brought before the Council, and that is why I did not present my proposal earlier. That has been already declared and I do not think it is necessary to insist on that. Meanwhile, there are many days which shall elapse, and if any information had to be taken, I suppose it would have been taken if one wanted to take it. So, I maintain that we must vote on it exactly as the others.

MR. MATES (Yugoslavia): Mr. President, I am not speaking on any question of substance, but on the question of procedure. In the case of the Yugoslav and Czechoslovak Resolution,^a question has been put before the Council on an issue which was a point of view of ownership and which was out of dispute. Ownership was established and both parties have made it quite clear that there was no doubt about it and consideration of the economic merit of the question has been put before the Economic and Social Council. In the case of the Resolution submitted by the Greek Delegation, the case is quite different. So far, we have had no proof, no statement from the Government from which the ships are requested, or that the ships really exist at all, or that they are Greek. Therefore, without prejudice to the actual facts as they are, I think that it is a question which has to be investigated and if the investigation gives sufficient evidence, first-hand evidence, then the Economic and Social Council has a clear legal case to be able to give its opinion on the economic merit of the question. I therefore think that it is quite clear that the Greek Resolution is out of order. I do not put this as a point of order to ask for the ruling of the President, but I am putting this in the form of a suggestion, and I think that the Greek Representative himself, will realize the argument.

MR. ARGYROPOULOS (Greece) Mr. President, I am not intending to prolong this discussion. I merely want to state that the proofs are in the facts, and if one wanted to ascertain the facts, the necessary time existed in order to do so. That is all I want to declare and I won't go back on the matter. Besides that, I only want to say that I wish to have the same treatment as was given the Yugoslav and Czechoslovak proposals, and it has to be put to a vote exactly as the other two proposals were, because I do not think, Sir, that there are two ways and two means in this Council. There is only one way and one means, and that is why I insist, as a matter of principle, that the request be put to a vote.

MR. FEONOV (Soviet Union): Mr. President, I insist that no time was given at all for an answer, first of all. That perhaps is only the formal reason, since debate is closed on the matter, and even if debate were permitted tonight,

which is not the case, but even in that case, everybody must understand that a request sent from here to Moscow, followed by the request to several countries where the occupational authorities are and then the investigation on the spot and the response to Moscow and to here -- that will take more than just a few days, so it is absolutely clear that the request that was presented, as I stated already, by the Greek Representative, the presentation of the request was made in such a way that I was given no possibility to answer at all. In this case, I cannot see how the Council can vote and take any decision on it.

MR. ARGYROPOULOS (Greece) (Interpretation from French): I would merely state that the debate is not closed because it is going on.

The PRESIDENT: The Debate is going on only because I mentioned the Greek Proposal. As President of this Council, I must remind the Members of the Council that the Greek proposal was made abruptly when the question of Yugoslav and Czechoslovak vessels were to be brought into the discussion. As president, I expected that the Greek Delegation would send up some proofs as to the property of those vessels. We have ^{had} plenty of time, about a fortnight, but I did not get any Document in this respect. Therefore, I think that the objections of the Soviet Delegation are quite right because the Greek case is not the same as the Yugoslav and Czechoslovak cases. It is perfectly clear that the vessels contained in the proposal of the Yugoslav ^{and Czechoslovak} Delegations are the property of Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia. It is clear to everybody because the occupational forces declared it definitely. In the case of Greek vessels, there is no proof as yet that this is property of nationals of the Greek State. Therefore, this case in my opinion is quite different from the Yugoslav and Czechoslovak cases.

MR. ARGYROPOULOS (Greece): Mr. President, first of all, I must reply to that, that the proofs are very easy to obtain. The proofs are in the Registers of the Greek Consulates of Braila and Galatz, and they are at the entire disposal of the Russian authorities. So, as I have said, time enough has elapsed since, and if one had wanted the proofs, one could have found them.

But, Mr. President, with all the respect I have for the Chair, I would wish the Chair not to take a definite position in a specific case which is before the Council.

The PRESIDENT: I did not take any definite position. I did not propose any solution. But, as President, I am obliged to explain certain proposals. I think that I have shown complete objectivity during this Session, and I must refuse to admit any comment.

MR. PENSON (United Kingdom): I am sure, Mr. President, that all of us have been impressed throughout with the complete impartiality and objectivity of all your remarks.

I should like, however, to appeal to my Greek colleague and ask him whether he would not be prepared to withdraw or postpone his proposal, because, although he is perfectly entitled, as others are, to bring it before us, I still feel that the facts are not quite the same, and that there is a certain difference in the value and quality of the evidence that is before us. I am in no way pre-judging the issue, but I would suggest that it might be better for him to withdraw or postpone what he has brought before us.

MR. ARGYROPOULOS (Greece): Mr. President, I have clearly explained my position since the beginning. It is a position of principle. I do not like any differences to be made between different Delegations. I do not expect my proposal to be carried, since the other two have been rejected. But, if I require a vote, it is in order to mark exactly the equality of position. That is why I do not feel like withdrawing my demand to the Council, because that would be as if I were to say that my proposal was not right, while the others were. I think it is a matter of principle on which, unhappily, I very much

regret that I cannot retire my proposal.

MR. PARODI (France) (Interpretation from French); Mr. President, I should like to express myself in support of the statement made by the United Kingdom Representative. I should merely wish to add one word, in an attempt to explain to our Greek colleague what the difference is between his position and those of the Czechoslovak and Yugoslav Delegations.

The ownership of the vessels in the Czechoslovak and Yugoslav cases has never been discussed. It has been established right at the beginning. The proofs of the Greek ownership, on the other hand, are, as the Greek Representative has told us himself, to be found at Braila and Galatz. Viewed from Lake Success, it is not so easy to accept this as proof of ownership. That is the difference that exists between the positions of the Delegations, and therefore I do believe that there is no inequality of treatment between one Delegation and another.

MR. MATES (Yugoslavia): Mr. President, I fully understand the difficult position of my Greek colleague, and I understand that it is difficult for him to withdraw the resolution he has proposed. Perhaps we could help the Greek Representative in this way:

The Chair could take the sense of the Council -- whether the Representatives around the Table are ready to take a vote on the proposal. I, as the first, would declare that, as this is a legal litigation, I am not able to cast my vote, because I do not know whether these vessels exist at all.

In this way, perhaps, the Greek Delegation will have satisfaction that his resolution has not been rejected, but simply has not been discussed, because the matter was not presented in a clear way, in the only way in which the Council Representatives would be able to cast their votes -- whether these votes be positive or negative.

Mr. ZULETA ANGEL (Colombia) (Interpretation from French): Mr. President, I would support the suggestion of our Yugoslav colleague.

Mr. LEBEAU (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): Mr. President, I have the greatest sympathy with our colleague from Greece in the difficult position in which he finds himself, but I believe the matter is purely a question of procedure. It is a question as to the treatment which the Council affords to a proposal brought by one of its Members, and I believe it is clear that the discussion is not finished.

The Soviet Representative, who has clearly been called upon in the Greek proposal, has explained that he is not in a position to make a statement in one sense or another because he has not the information he needs. In these conditions I believe the Council should consider that this is not the proper time to consider this question. We cannot finish the discussion; we cannot vote on it. If the Council cannot accept my point of view, then we might act upon the suggestion of our Yugoslav colleague and first of all take a vote as to the question whether the Council is ready to vote on the matter.

Mr. ARGYROPOULOS (Greece) (Interpretation from French): Mr. President, as I always have done, I shall submit to the decision of the Council. I would just add two words in answer to my French colleague a few minutes ago. I would state that no Delegation produced any title of ownership in connection with the vessels in question. None of them submitted such titles, and as to the proof of Greek ownership of the vessels, I have stated that they can be found in the registers which are now in the Greek Consulates in the two cities I have named. It would be quite easy to consult these books. I would say that before the war Greece owned 117 tugs and elevators on the Danube. That is a well-known fact. If the whole case did not stir up so much noise, it was merely because nobody knew they existed. But it is a fact that the registers could be consulted. There are Romanian authorities and Soviet authorities on the spot; we have nobody on the spot, no Consulate in that country, but it would have been very easy to go into the question and to find out whether proof of ownership actually exists. I would not like there to remain a shadow of doubt as to the truthfulness of my remarks in connection with the

vessels.

The PRESIDENT: I don't think the Council has time now to enquire into the ownership of the Greek vessels. I must ask the Members of the Council if they agree now to take a vote on this Greek proposal. Will those in favor of taking a vote please raise their hands? Three. Those against? The vote will not be taken.

Mr. ZULITA ANGEL (Colombia) (Interpretation from French): In this session?

The PRESIDENT: In this session, of course.

Mr. FEONOV (Soviet Union): Mr. President, I would like to know what that means -- in this session.

The PRESIDENT: Today.

Mr. FEONOV (Soviet Union): It is not on the Agenda of the Council.

The PRESIDENT: Now we have document E/192.

Mr. MATES (Yugoslavia): With your permission Mr. President, I will make a short statement.

Mr. WINANT (United States): Mr. President, could I ask my Yugoslav colleague a question?

Mr. MATES (Yugoslavia): I give way to the Representative of the United States.

Mr. WINANT (United States): I understood the debate was closed. I am simply asking if the statement to be made by my Yugoslav colleague is a statement in relation to a point of order, or has it anything to do with the debate?

The PRESIDENT: Of course, I don't know what the Yugoslav Representative is going to say.

Mr. MATES (Yugoslavia): In the course of the deliberations of this session of the Council as well as in previous sessions, it has happened that a vote on some measures has been taken, and then one or more Representatives -- after the vote had been taken on an issue -- have made a short statement for the record without opening the debate. My statement will be of this nature, and it is a short statement of the Yugoslav Delegation in connection with the question which has just now disappeared from our Agenda. Mr. President, in spite of the fact that this is no new thing I am introducing, but a practice which has been practiced on many occasions, I am completely in the hands of the Chair and of the Council as to whether I am entitled to make this short statement for the record or not. If the decision is unfavorable, I shall comply with that decision.

The PRESIDENT: As the Members of the Council remember, I did not prevent any Member of the Council from giving a short statement. Therefore, the Yugoslav Representative is entitled to give a short statement if he likes.

Mr. MATES (Yugoslavia): Mr. President, the Government of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia submitted to the Economic and Social Council the question of the detention of Yugoslav Danubian vessels in the United States zone of occupation in Austria and Germany which is a very important problem in the rehabilitation and reconstruction of Yugoslavia.

The Yugoslav Government will consider this significant decision of the Council in the light of all relevant circumstances and undertake such further steps or measures as it may deem fit. To the Economic and Social Council, however, the Yugoslav Delegation addresses the following statement:

It will be very difficult in view of this decision for the Yugoslav people to understand that the activities of the United Nations in the field of reconstruction of devastated areas are undertaken with serious intentions to assist substantially the efforts of the people in its hard reconstruction work. The first request for mere moral support in a case which even does not

imply any material assistance from abroad, but only the restitution of our own property, has been defeated. It has been defeated, but in our eyes it is not a defeat for our country; it is a defeat for the Council.

We regret deeply that the Council did not find its way clear to recommend economic sense in this case in which a great power uses the advantage of its position and of German looting in order to exert economic and political pressure on our beleaguered country, depriving it of its own essential means of transportation.

We regret this attitude but we are convinced that everybody concerned will sooner or later realize that a similar attitude is not only harmful to the development of the United Nations Organization and harmful to the friendly relations between nations but also condemned to failure.

I would point out, Mr. President, that the French verbal translation which has been made, is not absolutely correct on certain points. I will not insist on a verbal translation now but the official translation will, I hope, be correct.

Mr. KIRPALANI (India): Mr. President, It is not my desire to provoke any argument or debate. I should merely like to seek clarification from you with regard to the effect of the vote of the Council on the proposal of the Greek Delegation in Paper E/191. If I understood it rightly, the vote was taken merely on the question whether the Council was ready to vote on the proposal. The Council indicated its unwillingness to vote. Now, I should like to be quite clear as to what happens to this proposal: does it remain on the Agenda, because I take it it has been properly brought on the Agenda? Does it lapse with the close of this session? Does it get carried forward?

The PRESIDENT: I said clearly that the Council is not ready to vote on this resolution because the ownership of the Greek ships is not perfectly proved. Any Delegation which desires to submit new proposals in regard to proof of ownership of property is completely entitled to raise the question at any session later, but no decision will be taken today.

Mr. WINANT (United States of America): Mr. President, it is not possible for me to answer the attack made on my Government by the Yugoslav Representative without engaging in debate. If we agreed that the debate would stop, I would rest my case on what was said during the debate.

The PRESIDENT: Now we have in our hands Document E/192, Draft Resolution submitted to the Economic and Social Council by the United States Delegation regarding international traffic on the Danube River. This proposal was submitted by the United States Delegation during our discussion on the Danube vessels under the proposals of the Yugoslav and Czechoslovak Delegations. I asked the Council explicitly if this should be taken up during this session, The Council agreed.

Mr. FEONOV (Soviet Union): In connection with this Resolution, Mr. President, I would like to make a very short statement. First of all, I cannot see how the decision is accepted. How can this Conference be called against the wishes of the interested Governments? Then, as to the occupying authorities --

Mr. WINANT (United States of America): Mr. President, I would like to raise a point of order. I understood that you had closed the debate.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I declare that the debate is closed.

Mr. FEONOV (Soviet Union): I do not want to continue the debate. I just want to say that if the Resolution is accepted it cannot be effectuated because it cannot be obligatory for the occupation authorities. It would so be considered by the Government of the Soviet Union.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I want to remind the Members of the Council that international conferences could be convened by the Economic and Social Council only after consultation with the Governments concerned. This is a matter of principle. Now we have to decide on the Resolution proposed by the United States Representative. That is, if the Council is going to endorse an International Conference on Danube Traffic. This is after the explanation I made.

(At his point, Mr. Petar Yuberinor replaced Mr. Mates as Representative of Yugoslavia, at the table.)

According to the Rules, the Economic and Social Council can convene conferences only on the basis of consultation with interested Governments. With that in mind, we will vote on the proposal of the United States Representative.

Mr. WINANT (United States of America): I ask for a roll call.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Roll call please. Those who are in favor of convening the Conference, after the explanation that has been made, will vote "yes", those who are against, "against". The roll call will take place.

| | |
|----------------|---------|
| Belgium | Yes |
| Canada | Yes |
| Chile | Yes |
| China | Abstain |
| Colombia | Abstain |
| Cuba | No |
| Czechoslovakia | No |
| France | Abstain |
| Greece | Yes |
| India | Yes |
| Lebanon | Yes |
| Norway | Abstain |
| Peru | Abstain |
| Ukraine SSR | No |
| Soviet Union | No |
| United Kingdom | Yes |
| United States | Yes |
| Yugoslavia | No |

Mr. PRESIDENT: Yes, 8; No, 5; Five abstentions.

Mr. CISNEROS (Cuba) (Interpretation from French): I wish to explain the vote and point out that the Cuban Delegation has voted "no" on all proposals made after the Peruvian proposal had been defeated, because it believes that the Peruvian proposal was the only sensible one

The PRESIDENT: The Resolution of the United States Representative is approved and will be submitted to the Secretary-General to act on according to the rules

Mr. ZULETA ANGEL (Colombia) (Interpretation from French): Mr. President, I wish to state that I have abstained from voting on all these proposals because it seems to me that the Council is not competent to deal with these matters.

THE PRESIDENT: You have in your hands Document E/208, The Establishment of a Uniform Style, for Resolutions of the Council. I think we all should approve it. It is always better to have a uniform style for our resolutions. It is accepted.

MR. FEONOV (Soviet Union): Mr. President, there are two documents here. One is on the first sheet of paper.

The PRESIDENT: You are referring to Document 208.

MR. FEONOV (Soviet Union): On page 2 is stated an example of the resolution.

So then must we consider it as our resolution and not as an example -- we cannot consider it as our resolution, but only as an example.

The PRESIDENT: Yes, of course.

DR. ARCA PARRO (Peru): Mr. President, I would like to make a remark on this proposal. I think it is a very important one, but I think it is time to say a few words about the way the documents of the Council should be counted. We were told not long ago by the Secretary-General of the enormous number of documents that are printed and published every day, and no wonder we are getting so confused about all the papers that are being given to us every day, and I think in order to prevent this confusion, the Secretary-General as long as this proposal has already been made, is thinking about some system of classification of documents according to the subject matter. We can keep on going with a single sign like this -- E/208 -- and maybe to five thousand or ten thousand. I think there are means of having as many or at least, as few groups to classify the different documents according to the subject matter. So it would be easier to make a "5" and, of course, all the papers that are related to the subject of Refugees or Devasted Areas will be under a certain number and given a letter. It would be much easier for everybody to handle them and to use at any moment. This is just a very superficial suggestion, of course, that I am making on this matter, but which the personal experience of the Secretariat, I know, will be much better acquainted than myself.

MR. LEBEAU (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): Mr. President, I have only seen this paper this last minute, because it became lost in the great mass of documents that I have before me, but even so, I am in a position to state that there is a contradiction between the last sentence of the second paragraph and the third paragraph. Our Soviet colleague has already pointed out this contradiction. The last sentence of paragraph 2 says, "... a draft resolution which is appended, illustrates the style proposed." So this is an example. But in the third paragraph, it is said that a draft resolution to bring this system into effect is appended. So we are obviously asked to accept a resolution bringing this new system into effect. Well, if that is so, I have very serious misgivings and objections to several parts of the text. It is said, for instance, that a standard type of resolution is absolutely required and will be up to the Secretariat - - paragraph 2 -- to make such purely stylistic changes in the style of the resolution. I do not believe that we can accept this. Not all resolutions bear on similar subjects. Differences may be necessary and I do not believe that the Secretariat is entitled to make any such changes which might affect the fundamental aspect of the various resolutions. This is a matter which requires due consideration. We are not ready to discuss it now. It is not on the Agenda of the Council, and I would suggest that it be adjourned.

MR. LIE (Secretary-General): I certainly agree.

The PRESIDENT: The President is in a very difficult position, because he receives normally hundreds and hundreds of resolutions. It is rather a difficult question. I believe we can postpone it.

(During the above remarks, Mr. Mates, Representative of Yugoslavia, returned and replaced at the Council Table, Mr. Yuberinor.)

THE PRESIDENT: You have in your hands Document E/208, The Establishment of a Uniform Style for Resolutions of the Council. I think we all should approve it. It is always better to have a uniform style for our resolutions. It is accepted.

MR. FEONOV (Soviet Union): Mr. President, there are two documents here. One is on the first sheet of paper.

The PRESIDENT: You are referring to Document 208.

MR. FEONOV (Soviet Union): On page 2 is stated an example of the resolution.

So then must we consider it as our resolution and not as an example -- we cannot consider it as our resolution, but only as an example.

The PRESIDENT: Yes, of course.

DR. ARCA PARRO (Peru): Mr. President, I would like to make a remark on this proposal. I think it is a very important one, but I think it is time to say a few words about the way the documents of the Council should be counted. We were told not long ago by the Secretary-General of the enormous number of documents that are printed and published every day, and no wonder we are getting so confused about all the papers that are being given to us every day, and I think in order to prevent this confusion, the Secretary-General as long as this proposal has already been made, is thinking about some system of classification of documents according to the subject matter. We can keep on going with a single sign like this -- E/208 -- and maybe to five thousand or ten thousand. I think there are means of having as many or at least, as few groups to classify the different documents according to the subject matter. So it would be easier to make a "5" and, of course, all the papers that are related to the subject of Refugees or Devasted Areas will be under a certain number and given a letter. It would be much easier for everybody to handle them and to use at any moment. This is just a very superficial suggestion, of course, that I am making on this matter, but which the personal experience of the Secretariat, I know, will be much better acquainted than myself.

MR. LEBEAU (Belgium)(Interpretation from French): Mr. President, I have only seen this paper this last minute, because it became lost in the great mass of documents that I have before me, but even so, I am in a position to state that there is a contradiction between the last sentence of the second paragraph and the third paragraph. Our Soviet colleague has already pointed out this contradiction. The last sentence of paragraph 2 says, "... a draft resolution which is appended, illustrates the style proposed." So this is an example. But in the third paragraph, it is said that a draft resolution to bring this system into effect is appended. So we are obviously asked to accept a resolution bringing this new system into effect. Well, if that is so, I have very serious misgivings and objections to several parts of the text. It is said, for instance, that a standard type of resolution is absolutely required and will be up to the Secretariat -- paragraph 2 -- to make such purely stylistic changes in the style of the resolution. I do not believe that we can accept this. Not all resolutions bear on similar subjects. Differences may be necessary and I do not believe that the Secretariat is entitled to make any such changes which might affect the fundamental aspect of the various resolutions. This is a matter which requires due consideration. We are not ready to discuss it now. It is not on the Agenda of the Council, and I would suggest that it be adjourned.

MR. LIE (Secretary-General): I certainly agree.

The PRESIDENT: The President is in a very difficult position, because he receives normally hundreds and hundreds of resolutions. It is rather a difficult question. I believe we can postpone it.

(During the above remarks, Mr. Mates, Representative of Yugoslavia, returned and replaced at the Council Table, Mr. Yuberinor.)

MR. FEONOV (Soviet Union): Mr. President, is it postponed until tomorrow?

The PRESIDENT: No, the Session will be closed today, I can assure you

The French Delegation proposed the following resolution in Document E/204: "The Economic and Social Council recommends (1) that the General Assembly authorize transfer to UNESCO of the property rights of the League of Nations in the International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation, this transfer to be completed upon the coming into force of the Agreement between the United Nations and UNESCO; and (2) That the Preparatory Commission of UNESCO and the International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation be requested to inaugurate conversations now with a view to accomplishing as soon as possible after the establishment of UNESCO the transfer of the resources and functions of the Institute to UNESCO in accordance with Article XI, paragraph 2 of this Constitution."

Any objections to it?

MR. FEONOV (Soviet Union): Mr. President, the Soviet Delegation is very hesitant to accept this suggestion. Actually, it means that the United Nations should transfer its property to one of the Specialized Agencies. I do not think that that should be considered acceptable. We know that the Specialized Agencies are different organizations, not an inseparable part of the United Nations. These are the organizations with their own budgets and the organizations which have members, not Members of the United Nations. So, I do not see how it could be accepted by the Economic and Social Council. The Soviet Delegation cannot support such a proposal.

The PRESIDENT: Any more objections?

SECRETARY-GENERAL: I have had some conferences with the Representative of UNESCO about this question and I am very much in favor of a solution by which UNESCO and the United Nations could be able to use the property of the International Institute. I think that the property in some way would be useful to the United Nations and UNESCO in the work which they have to do. I have

held the view that we should not give away any property which belongs to the United Nations, but I should like to give way in this case, since the property will be used for the same cause and the same purposes which we all work for. I think that would be in order. That is why I have prepared a proposal which I can accept, and it is the following:

"The Economic and Social Council recommends that in view of the future transfer to UNESCO of the functions and activities of the International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation that:

1. The preparatory commission of UNESCO and the Institute be requested to undertake at this time negotiations for this purpose.
2. The Secretary-General be authorized to study and to report to the next meeting of the General Assembly concerning the conditions under which it will be appropriate to utilize the assets of the League of Nations in the International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation, bearing in mind the respective requirements of the United Nations and of UNESCO."

If that would be agreeable to you all, we can accept it.

MR. PARODI (France) (Interpretation from French): Mr. President, if I understand the text submitted by the Secretary-General, it is merely to the effect that a study be taken and a report submitted to the General Assembly as to the way in which these assets will be utilized. In fact, this does not solve the problem for the time being. It merely calls for a study and a report. I have, therefore, no objection to raise and accept the text as submitted by the Secretary-General.

The PRESIDENT: Is the text submitted by the Secretary-General acceptable to the Members of the Council? Are there any objections? The text is approved.

Now, one of the last items; the Confirmation of Commissions. It was suggested to me that perhaps the Secretary-General could consult the Chiefs of Delegations attending the meetings of the General Assembly as to the proposals

for the membership of the different Commissions elected yesterday. It was also suggested that some arrangements should be made for the convening of an ad hoc meeting of this Council to confirm nominations, if such will be made. I will be absent from New York and there will be no President here, and no Vice President. Therefore, if the Council agrees that such an ad hoc meeting should be held, we must now discuss how it should be done. In this case, I would propose that the Council for this specific purpose should appoint an Acting President for this Special Meeting. There will be no Session of the Council. There will be only a special meeting to confirm specific nominations made by the Governments for the different Commissions.

MR. MATES (Yugoslavia): Mr. President, it is very likely that we shall be in the situation you have just depicted, but I think that perhaps the Representative from Colombia could give us information concerning the probability and the possibility of the Second Vice-President attending this special meeting.

MR. ZULETA ANGEL (Colombia) (Interpretation from French): Mr. President, I am very sorry having to state that the Second Vice-President finds himself in the utter impossibility of leaving Colombia in order to reach New York.

The PRESIDENT: I do not think we shall have any difficulty to elect a presiding officer for this particular meeting only, because this meeting would be held only with the understanding that no other items would be discussed. To discuss some other items, a special session must be convened.

DR. CHANG (China): Mr. President, may I suggest that the present Representative of Colombia should be requested to take the chair for that special meeting.

MR. FEONOV (Soviet Union): Mr. President, I am really sorry, I did not quite understand what has been suggested. Is it a special meeting now being discussed, and when?

The PRESIDENT: I will explain it to you immediately. According to our conclusion the Members of the Commission could be appointed and confirmed by this Council upon nomination made by Governments. So it was suggested that the Secretary-General may ask the Chief Representatives attending Assembly Meetings to inquire about the possibility for nominations. It will greatly facilitate our work -- I do not know if it will be workable -- but if the Secretary-General is able to get nominations from Governments for this specific purpose, a special only meeting should be convened under the Presidency of the honorable Representative of Colombia to confirm the nominations made by Governments; only to facilitate the measure, nothing else.

MR. MATES (Yugoslavia): Mr. President, I warmly support the proposal of the honorable Representative from China, as to the nomination of the honorable Representative of Colombia, as acting President of this special meeting.

MR. ARCA PARRO (Peru): I second it.

The PRESIDENT: But with the understanding that this meeting is only convened to confirm the nominations, but no other items will be discussed.

So it is now in order.

MR. ZULETA ANGEL (Colombia) (Interpretation from French): Mr. President, I am extremely thankful for the great honor which has been bestowed upon me, and I would particularly thank my colleagues from China, Yugoslavia, Peru, and all the other Members of the Council who have accepted the suggestion made.

The PRESIDENT: Now the last item; the date of the Fourth Session. You have in hand Document E/225 presented by the Secretary-General. According to this proposal the next session should take place between 15 and 28 February next year.

Dr. CHANG (China): There is another document -- E/224.

Before commenting on it, may I particularly express sincere appreciation for the great and courteous consideration on the part of our Soviet colleague in using English in our deliberations this evening. Aside from my sincere respect for his high personal qualities -- even though he is a Government Representative, he also has personal qualities -- and, especially in appreciation of the great courtesy of his not using his great, beautiful language, otching krassivaia, I shall not speak in Chinese.

So, very quickly, I am proposing something which I think my Soviet colleague would like to have instituted -- namely, a plan, if not a five-year plan, for our meetings. Instead of having this haphazard way of meeting at all times of the year. As we all realize, we have just completed the election of the Members of the Commissions, so we shall be having at least an eleven-ring circus going.

By the eleven rings, I mean the eight Commissions just elected, the Narcotic Commission, the Refugee problem and the Devastated Areas. We shall have at least eleven, if not more.

Now, if these various Commissions are going to meet on the average of two times every year, I really can envisage the terrible mess we shall be in during this coming year. So, I am suggesting these two things -- although, as a matter of fact, I claim no originality in this; it came out of a discussion with our most patient and objective President.

The first point is:

"In order to assist members of the Council and the Secretariat in making plans for the work of the Council and its Commissions during 1947," somebody suggests "that the Secretary-General should be asked to prepare a calendar of sessions for the year, indicating approximately when meetings of the Council and of the Commissions and Sub-Commissions will take place. It would, of course be understood that this calendar would not be binding on the Council or the Commissions but would serve as a useful guide in making forward plans."

That is one part of it.

This is the second part:

"Rule 2 of the Rules of Procedure prescribes that the Economic and Social Council should meet 'not less than three times a year.'" Somebody "considers that if the Council is to carry out its heavy programme of work it will be necessary to hold four sessions..." and instead of "a year", we say "to hold four sessions in 1947."

We do not know how this will work; we can go on in an experimental spirit. I think in 1947 we shall have our busiest year, because all these various new Commissions will be meeting, and they will be submitting requests, reports, for us to make decisions on. So, I think, instead of "a year", I change it to "1947." That means that for next year we will try out this idea of having four sessions next year. At the end of next year, if we want to try something else, we may then change.

(Continuing reading document E/224) "... at approximately three monthly intervals. If it is generally agreed among members of the Council that four regular meetings should be held..." -- then just delete "each year" -- somebody "suggests that the Secretary-General should make appropriate provision in the calendar suggested above."

As a matter of fact, the plan is like this: to have four sessions next year -- approximately, one in February, one in May, one in August, and one in November. Then, with our eleven circuses going, it would be divided approximately into two groups -- one group sandwiched in between, let us say, before February and before August; another group sandwiched in before May and before November. Thereby, the Council will be discussing, say, only five or six reports at one time, instead of maybe eight, nine or eleven all mixed together.

Also, we must remember that the specialized agencies are to take part in our discussions. It would be extremely useful for them to know ahead of time as to when we are going to meet. Then, they will be able to arrange their meetings accordingly.

So, from all these various points of view, I think it is altogether appropriate and necessary that we should have a plan for this coming year, &c.

E/P.V./36
83-85

meeting, I should rather think, around the middle of each of these months. I have a reason for that "middle," because the middle of August will be just about two to three weeks before the General Assembly, so I should suggest, roughly speaking, about the middle of February, the middle of May, the middle of August and the middle of November, and having the other Commissions sandwiched in between. I think with that sort of a plan we can get somewhere.

Thank you.

SECRETARY-GENERAL: Mr. President, as far as I can see from the note by the Secretariat, there is no difference between the Chinese Representative and me about the timing of the session of the Council. I propose the time between the 15th and 28th of February. I have given the reasons for the proposal. I agree with the Chinese Representative that it would be very helpful to have a calendar of sessions for the year, but I must look into the international program in the widest scope because I must think about all the organs of the United Nations, and not only all those organs, but also we must be able to plan international cooperation. I will be working with that problem now, and I shall be very glad to give you a proposal for a calendar for the first session, but then I would recommend to the Council very strongly not to decide today to have four sessions. We can look into the question and can prepare a tentative calendar so you can take the final decision, if you want to have three or four sessions, at the first session in February. I understand this is in my report and maybe I will say yes, but I would like to have all the facts of 1947 before I invite you to decide on four sessions. If you decide on four sessions tonight, you have the right to do so, and we would do our best, but I would like very much, at this time, to have a chance to consider all sides of this suggestion.

MR. PARODI (France): Mr. President, I believe, in any case, we could request the Secretary-General kindly to take into account the suggestions made by our Chinese colleague because they seem to me particularly wise. They can be taken into account and also the fact of how desirable it would be that at each session of the Council we should have a smaller number of questions and documents before us. We could perhaps work better if we were able to concentrate on a smaller number of items at each session.

MR. FEONOV (Soviet Union): Mr. President, the USSR Delegation supports the first fifty percent of the Chinese Resolution. As to the second fifty percent, the Delegation finds itself in difficulties. It seems to us that we have such frequent meetings that it is difficult now to accept the suggestion that the meetings of the Economic and Social Council

should be more frequent than we have them now.

We must take into consideration that other international bodies are in existence and some of the Delegates are travelling continually without seeing their families from one international conference to another.

DR. CHANG (China): Mr. President, I am very much tempted to support the resolution introduced by my Soviet colleague that not only Representatives and Members of Commissions should be considered in regard to their families, but also their consorts. However, that is not on the agenda. I do, however, to save time, accept all so far said. Let us pass the first one, namely, that we suggest to the Secretary-General that he do such a thing. Then, in regard to the second, I accept my French colleague's suggestion that they may serve as a basis for consideration. That is my second point.

My third point concerns a date for the next session. Instead of saying February 15th to February 28th, which will probably mean March 1st, let us just say, about February 15th. By that I mean that it will not be without prejudice if you adopt my four-session plan, especially the 15th of August, because that will give two or three weeks before the General Assembly.

I still believe my Soviet colleague, after thinking it over...I am not going to argue the case at this time -- will come to see the wisdom of it, although it may cause him to do such much traveling, namely, with this sort of regularity we can get something simplified, and then all your specialized agencies will fix their dates according to our schedule. If we keep ourselves floating the specialized agencies don't know what to do. UNESCO will fix November, and then somebody else, and we have to fix our schedule according to their plans. We are the Economic and Social Council of ^{the} United Nations; we are supposed to co-ordinate. Consequently it is very important that we have a master plan and let them fix their program according to ours. I am not going to speak any more but I think the suggestion is very strong although there is no vote.

The PRESIDENT: There will be no voting on this matter.

I have a small item. As you know, we have to submit the report of the Economic and Social Council to the Assembly, and this report is under preparation by the Secretariat.

I would like to ask you to authorize me to see this report and to approve it.

DR. ARCA PARRO (Peru): Mr. President, in order to save time, like the Chinese Representative, I would like to speak in my own language.

(Second interpretation; original in Spanish): Mr. President, I would like to say a few words countering my Chinese colleague, using my own language. I will, in the first place, say that personally I will be extremely glad if the authority which you have asked for is granted you.

Secondly, I will say that we have worked in the present Session of the Economic and Social Council under the Chairmanship of a Professor/Medicino, who has certainly worked very hard. We have certainly worked also with the utmost satisfaction under your Chairmanship. We all recall the previous Sessions of the Economic and Social Council which were under the Chairmanship of Sir Ramaswami Mudaliar, and we must say that however highly we appreciated his Chairmanship, we are extremely pleased and satisfied with the results we have obtained under your Chairmanship.

MR. PARODI (France)(Interpretation; original in French): Mr. President, I think we have come to the end of our task. We have certainly had a very long, a very strenuous, and in some cases a very difficult Session.

I must say that we all admire the complete objectivity with which you directed our efforts, and I will recall the words of our Chinese colleague when he spoke of the "exemplary patience" which you have shown. You have also shown considerable endurance, both intellectual and physical.

We are all extremely grateful to you, Mr. President, for the way in which you conducted our debates during this Session, and I wish to express this opinion as my own, and I am quite sure it is the opinion of all my colleagues.

MR. SAULETA ANGEL (Colombia)(Interpretation; original in French): Mr. President, the Colombian Delegation wishes to join in everything that has

been said as to your Chairmanship during this Session and whatever will still be said.

MR. FEONOV (Soviet Union): I think that a feeling of appreciation would be better expressed in one's own language, so permit me to say a few words in Russian.

(Mr. Feonov continued speaking, in Russian) (Second interpretation; Original in Russian): It is certainly easier to express one's appreciation best in one's own language. I will therefore say in Russian how much I personally, and I am quite sure my colleagues also, have appreciated the very wise, and the generally remarkable way in which you have presided over all our discussions in the course of this Session. We all know that we have known difficult moments. I believe it is due exclusively to your masterful Chairmanship that we have succeeded in overcoming these difficulties even at times when the situation was rather delicate. I am quite sure that I am speaking in the name of all my colleagues in expressing to you, Mr. President, our very profound and sincere thanks for the way you have conducted this Session of the Economic and Social Council.

DR. CHANG (China) Mr. President, I think it is nothing but appropriate that one of the five official languages, namely, Chinese, should be heard, and I am sure the translators will be able to translate.

(Dr. Chang then continued speaking, in Chinese)

I think I will ask my colleague, Dr. Yang, to interpret.

DR. YANG (China) (Interpretation of Dr. Chang's remarks): I am happy to be in the same crowd with our distinguished interpreters--

Mr. President, I feel particularly happy in congratulating the Council for its success because I can claim a good part of the success myself since I was the person who nominated the Honorable President, Dr. Stampar. So, I can claim to have a share in what he has succeeded in doing. I am therefore particularly happy in congratulating this Council for having such a splendid Chairman to preside over our deliberations.

DR. CHANG (China): I have another sentence yet, please. I think, considering the late hour, I will continue in English, but we must not, Mr. President, forget our Secretariat. The Secretary-General and all the Secretarial Staff have worked most devotedly and therefore they deserve a vote of sincere thanks from all of us. Furthermore, some of us have enjoyed

the special hospitality of the Navy Cars. Therefore, may we ask the Secretary-General to send a note of appreciation on our part saying what courteous drivers they have been, these boys. I think a letter from us would be the proper thing to do.

Then, last of all, Mr. President, may I congratulate the Council for one thing very particularly. A while ago, about an hour ago, I went out and talked to one of the Members of the Secretariat. I said, "Have meetings here ever been held so late?" He said, "Once the Security Council."

I said, "How late?" He said, "Eleven o'clock."

So, Mr. President, I congratulate the Council for having broken that record.

MR. WINANT (United States): I join with the others in thanking you for your kindness and your good sense and especially for what you have done in trying to bring us together, those who come from your part of the world and those who come from my part of the world and all of us here. I know how much that has meant in the weeks we have been here.

I would like to second the motion of our Chinese colleague. It really belongs to all of us, in thanking the Secretariat. I know the long hours they have spent and their competence in serving us at this Session. I particularly appreciate it as including the sailors, and I hope that in writing your letters, Mr. President, you won't forget the United States Marines.

The PRESIDENT: May I propose closure of debate?

At this late hour, before announcing the closing of our session, I would like to thank you in a few words, for the words of appreciation, for your help, and very fine spirit which you have shown during this session. I attended the meetings of three sessions of this Council. As you know, my dear country is retiring from Membership of the Economic and Social Council at the end of this year and perhaps, this is the last session and last meeting. I am attending at this table.

But through all my life, I will remember the days I spent with you in discussing international problems in the field of economic and social cooperation. I believe there is no hope for the world if we are not able to create economic and social security. I believe that this Council will do something to this end.

I learned a great deal in these three sessions. I learned a great deal about real background and real spirit in international cooperation. Sometimes, I became dissatisfied, but I never lost my belief in our common sense. Thank you very much, Members of this Council for the friendship you have shown during this session and for the collaboration.

I thank you, Mr. Secretary-General and Members of the Secretariat. I can assure you that later on as I am leaving this place, I will always do my best to improve international relations as far as I can. Of course, I will confine my activities mostly to health matters, but how much the health matters are important in human life, every one of you know.

And now, I must declare that our session is closed and to thank you all for everything you did during this session.

Mr. LIE (Secretary-General): Mr. President, I thank you for the kind words to the Secretariat and to me and I thank the Chinese Representative and the Representative of the United States for the kind words, in appreciation of the tasks of the Secretariat, I will express the personal thanks to the President for his patience and for his understanding of our difficulties. It is not easy to be President of a Council like this. I hope you will forgive all our faults.

May I say that I have been with you before in a few sessions at this time during the last week. I think I have the right to say a few words to the Council as a body, as an organ of the United Nations today. What has impressed me most of all, is the spirit of agreement which I have found in this Council. It is of great importance at this time when the world has to look at difficulties, and many times disagreements, and we can listen to harsh words. This Council met and had quite opposite points of view about some questions, but the results I think, are the best ones in the history of the United Nations until today. Therefore, if the public all over the world in all countries could have listened to you all the time, could have seen you in the last week when you found each other over the difficulties and in agreement, I think the world -- I think people in all towns of the world would feel much happier. I think I have a right to congratulate this session of the Economic and Social Council for the work it has fulfilled, and especially you, Mr. President, you, Dr. Stampar -- I think I express the hopes of all the Secretariat and of all our colleagues here at this table too to see you back again at the table next year. I thank you for what you have done for the United Nations as an Organization.

The session is closed.

(The meeting then adjourned at 11:30 PM)