

United Nations

Nations Unies

MASTER FILE

**ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL**

**CONSEIL
ECONOMIQUE
ET SOCIAL**

UNRESTRICTED

E/CN.1/SR 87
2 June 1949

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

ECONOMIC AND EMPLOYMENT COMMISSION

Fourth Session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE EIGHTY-SEVENTH MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York,
on Tuesday, 24 May 1949, at 2.30 p.m.

CONTENTS: Report of the Committee on Organization (item 8 of the agenda) (E/CN.1/73);
Rapporteur's Draft Report (Parts I-IV): Economic and Employment Commission Report to the Economic and Social Council on the fourth session of the Commission (E/CN.1/W.60)

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. WILSON	Australia
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. WOULBROUN*	Belgium
	Mr. NUNES GUIMARAES	Brazil
	Mr. ASTAPIENKO*	Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic
	Mr. POLLOCK*	Canada
	Mr. HO	China
	Mr. SILVERIO	Cuba
	Mr. PATEK*	Czechoslovakia
	Mr. de SEYNES*	France
	Mr. SAKSENA	India
	Mr. BOE	Norway
	Mr. MOROZOV	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
	Mr. FEARNLEY*	United Kingdom
	Mr. LUBIN	United States of America

* Alternates

Any corrections of this record should be submitted in writing, in either of the working languages (English or French), and within two working days, to Mr. E. Delavenay, Director, Official Records Division, Room F-852, Lake Success. Corrections should be accompanied by or incorporated in a letter, on headed notepaper, bearing the appropriate symbol number and enclosed in an envelope marked "Urgent". Corrections can be dealt with more speedily by the services concerned if delegations will be good enough also to incorporate them in a mimeographed copy of

Representatives of Specialized Agencies:

Mr. EZEKIEL	Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)
Mr. ROSENSTEIN-RODAN	International Bank for Reconstruction and Development
Mr. HORSEFIELD	International Monetary Fund (IMF)

Consultants from Non-Governmental Organizations:

Mrs. MEAGHER	World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU)
--------------	---

Secretariat:

Mr. CAUSTIN	Secretary of the Commission
Mr. VARLEY	Assistant Secretary of the Commission

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION (ITEM 8 OF THE AGENDA) (E/CN.1/73)
(discussion continued)

Paragraph 8 (discussion continued)

Sub-paragraph (b)

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the proposal of Norway to delete sub-paragraph (b) of paragraph 8 of the Committee's report on organization.

The proposal was rejected by 7 votes to 5.

The CHAIRMAN recalled that the text of sub-paragraph (b) had been slightly amended by the insertion of the word "too" after the word "devoted", in the first sentence.

He put to the vote sub-paragraph (b) of paragraph 8, as amended.

The sub-paragraph was adopted by 8 votes to 5.

Sub-paragraph (c)

Sub-paragraph (c) of paragraph 8 was adopted by 9 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

Sub-paragraph (d)

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) remarked that the wording of sub-paragraph (d) was misleading: the issue was not the frequency of sessions of the sub-commissions, but the nature of their recommendations.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote sub-paragraph (d) of paragraph 8.
The sub-paragraph was adopted by 10 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Sub-paragraph (e)

Mr. HORSEFIELD (International Monetary Fund) suggested that the last sentence of sub-paragraph (b) should be added to the end of sub-paragraph (e), as the substance of that sentence was more closely connected with sub-paragraph (e) than with (b).

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that there was a technical difficulty involved, since sub-paragraph (b) had already been adopted.

Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) proposed that sub-paragraph (e) should be treated as a continuation of sub-paragraph (d), without lettering.

The CHAIRMAN thought that the suggestion was acceptable and, if the text of sub-paragraph (e) were adopted, it might be added to sub-paragraph (d).

He put to the vote the text of sub-paragraph (e).

The sub-paragraph was adopted by 10 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions and was combined with sub-paragraph (d).

Sub-paragraph (f)

Mr. CAUSTIN (Secretary of the Commission) read sub-paragraph (f) as amended at the preceding meeting.

Mr. BOE (Norway) suggested that the first sentence of the sub-paragraph should end after "could be performed more effectively" followed by the phrase "in the manner indicated in paragraph 7 above", and that the remainder of the sub-paragraph, with the exception of the last sentence, should be replaced by the following sentence: "The Commission stresses that it is its intention that a great deal of flexibility in the methods of consultation within the limits of budgetary considerations".

The original text of the last sentence of the sub-paragraph would be retained and added to the above-mentioned amendment.

/Mr. LUBIN

Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) remarked that it was not advisable to delete the substance of the penultimate sentence of the original text, namely, the idea that there was an advantage in having different groups of experts working at the same time on different matters as they arose. He therefore proposed that the last two sentences of the original text should be retained and should follow the sentence proposed by the representative of Norway.

Mr. FEARNLEY (United Kingdom) was in favour of the Norwegian amendment. In regard to the flexibility in the method of consultation, he thought it advisable to imply that a saving in United Nations expenditure and in experts' time could often be achieved by having recourse to written communications rather than to conferences.

Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) suggested that the following words of the Norwegian amendment: "The Commission stresses that it is its intention that a great deal of flexibility" should be replaced by the words: "The Commission stresses the necessity for a great degree of flexibility".

The CHAIRMAN stated that if there were no objection the change would be made.

He put to the vote sub-paragraph (f) of paragraph 8, as amended.

The sub-paragraph was adopted by 9 votes to 3, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 9

Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) proposed that the introductory words of the paragraph: "The Committee decided that its present terms of reference" should be replaced by the words "In the opinion of the Commission, its present terms of reference".

The CHAIRMAN stated that if there were no objection the change would be made.

He put to the vote paragraph 9 as amended.

The paragraph was adopted by 10 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Paragraph 10

Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) proposed that the first words of the second sentence: "It was therefore agreed that the Commission

/should"

should" should be replaced by the words: "It is therefore of the opinion that the Commission should".

The CHAIRMAN stated that such a change was acceptable.

He put to the vote the text of paragraph 10.

The paragraph was adopted by 10 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Paragraph 11

Mr. POLLCK (Canada) recalled that the Committee had decided to delete the word "urgent" in the last line of the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN stated that if there were no objection the word "urgent" would be deleted.

Mr. BOE (Norway) asked if paragraph 11 were to be interpreted as limiting the terms of reference of the Commission and if, for instance, functions not specifically stated in the paragraph were beyond the limits of the terms of reference. In such a case he considered that the paragraph too closely restricted the terms of reference. It would cover the agenda of the Commission for the next session, but would not adequately provide for the work over a long period of time.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the paragraph, if it were read in conjunction with paragraph 9, need not be interpreted as the representative of Norway had suggested.

Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) recalled that the Committee, in order to avoid giving such an impression as that mentioned by the Norwegian representative, had intentionally used the words: "should be more specifically directed to", in the first sentence.

The CHAIRMAN put paragraph 11 to the vote.

The paragraph was adopted by 11 votes to 3.

Paragraph 12

Sub-paragraph (a)

Mr. POLLCK (Canada) thought that a drafting change should be made in the text of the sentence beginning "In cases where presentation of reports to the Commission by the Secretariat would mean that they would

be out of date by the time they were considered by the Council"; as it read, it gave the impression that the Secretariat, rather than the reports, would be out of date.

The CHAIRMAN stated that, if there were no objection, that part of the sentence would be re-drafted.

Mr. FEARNLEY (United Kingdom) suggested the insertion, in the second sentence of the sub-paragraph, of the words "when the work warrants it", after the introductory words "This would mean that". The Economic and Social Council might meet three times a year and, according to the text of sub-paragraph 12 (a), the Commission would have to do likewise. The insertion of the above-mentioned phrase would obviate such a necessity.

Mr. WOULBROUN (Belgium) asked the United Kingdom representative who, in his opinion, should decide whether or not the work warranted a meeting, or what procedure he had in mind for such a decision.

Mr. FEARNLEY (United Kingdom) replied that the Commission could say whether or not it had sufficient work to require a meeting and could recommend to the Economic and Social Council that a meeting should be called. On the other hand, if the Council had sufficient work to be done to warrant a meeting, it might request that one should be held.

Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) suggested that, instead of the phrase proposed by the United Kingdom, the word "normally" should be inserted in the first part of the second sentence, which would then read: "This would normally mean that meetings".

Mr. FEARNLEY (United Kingdom) pointed out that the meaning of the word "normally" was questionable. He preferred his own wording.

The CHAIRMAN considered that the wording of the paragraph left some doubt as to when the work would warrant a meeting. The Council should decide when a meeting was necessary. Some provision

must be made to authorize the Chairman of the Commission, or some other person to decide when the work required that a meeting be held.

Mr. FEARNLEY (United Kingdom) thought that, if accumulated work or some unforeseen event made a meeting necessary, the Secretary-General could recommend to the Programme Committee that a meeting should be called. The Committee could then consider the matter, in the light of that request, and take a decision. A certain flexibility was already allowed, and the United Kingdom amendment would not alter that flexibility.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the report only made recommendations to the Council. If those recommendations were not acceptable, the Council could reject them.

Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) supported the suggestion of the Canadian representative, but thought that the wording "frequently meetings would have to be held" might solve the problem.

Mr. FEARNLEY (United Kingdom) accepted that suggestion as a compromise.

Mr. POLLCK (Canada) agreed to the compromise, provided that the word "usually" should be used instead of "frequently" in the United States amendment.

Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) remarked that the sentence would be improved, if it read: "This would mean that the Commission would usually have to meet ..."

The CHAIRMAN said that, if there were no objection, the change would be made.

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that the question of the number of times the Commission should meet must be decided by the Economic and Social Council and that, during the last session of the Council, the rule that documents

should be presented six weeks before the meeting should be enforced. The paragraph under consideration was not in line with that procedure.

The representatives of the UNITED STATES, CANADA and the UNITED KINGDOM each proposed a further change of wording in the second sentence, but subsequently withdrew their suggestions.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the text of sub-paragraph (a) of paragraph 12, as amended.

The sub-paragraph was adopted by 11 votes to 3.

Sub-paragraph (b)

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote sub-paragraph (b).

Sub-paragraph (b) was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Sub-paragraph (c)

Mr. BOE (Norway) remarked that the wording in sub-paragraph (c) might suggest a comparison between what could be saved on the one hand and what could be expended on the other hand. However, the outlays might be greater than the savings. It should be pointed out that such additional expenditure would result in more effective work, in the interests of the United Nations. An additional sentence to that effect should be added.

Mr. de SEYNES (France), in reply to Mr. Boe, suggested that the words "but points out that" should be deleted, in order to prevent any comparison between savings and outlays.

Mr. BOE (Norway) suggested that, in addition to the proposed deletion suggested by the representative of France, the sub-paragraph would be further amended by the addition, after the words "against these outlays", of the words "however, in addition to the expected gain in accomplishment".

The CHAIRMAN put sub-paragraph (c) to the vote, as amended by the deletion proposed by the representative of France, with the additional phrase proposed by the representative of Norway, and the amendment after experts "and any additional meetings of the Commission".

Sub-paragraph (c) as amended, was adopted by 9 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions.

/Sub-paragraph (d)

Sub-paragraph (d)

Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) pointed out that the word "means" might give the impression that the Council was devising methods for obtaining funds.

The CHAIRMAN agreed to the deletion of the words "means and". The Chairman put to the vote sub-paragraph (d), as amended. Sub-paragraph (d) was adopted by 10 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

Paragraph 13

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that he had presented views to the Committee on Organization, to be found in document E/CN.1/W 48, but that the draft report had not set out fully the proposals to be found in his paper and that furthermore since the Commission had decided to eliminate its sub-commissions, items 3 and 4 of his paper had not been discussed by the Committee. He therefore requested that the introductory sentences of paragraph 13 should indicate that the dissenting members of the Commission felt it necessary to define the aims of the Commission and its sub-commissions. He wished that the proposal contained in E/CN.1/W.48 be reproduced in its entirety.

The representatives of BYELORUSSIA and CZECHOSLOVAKIA supported the viewpoint expressed by the USSR representative.

The CHAIRMAN asked the Commission to decide whether it would include in the report the viewpoint expressed by the representatives of the USSR, Byelorussia and Czechoslovakia, as a substitution for the first three lines of paragraph 13.

Mr. LUBIN (United States of America), Rapporteur, in agreement with the USSR representative suggested the following wording for the USSR amendment to paragraph 13: "The members of the Commission for Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics disagreed with the recommendations of the Commission and considered it necessary to define the aims of the Commission and its Sub-Commissions in the following manner."

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the inclusion in the draft report of the USSR amendment to paragraph 13.

The inclusion of the USSR amendment was agreed to unanimously.

The Chairman, in concluding the discussion of the report, put to the

The text of the report of the Committee on Organization was adopted by 10 votes to 4.

RAPPORTEUR'S DRAFT REPORT (PARTS I-IV)
ECONOMIC AND EMPLOYMENT COMMISSION REPORT TO THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL
ON THE FOURTH SESSION OF THE COMMISSION (E/CN.1/W 60)

Introduction and Parts I and II

The CHAIRMAN stated that the heading and paragraph 1 were accepted. Paragraphs 2, 3, 4, and 5 would be read at the final reading, and Parts I and II need not be read.

Part III

Paragraphs 1 and 2

The CHAIRMAN stated that he regarded paragraphs 1 and 2 as adopted.

Paragraph 3

Mr. FEARNLEY (United Kingdom) suggested that "latter" should be substituted for "Commission's".

The CHAIRMAN accepted that amendment and stated that the paragraph as amended, was adopted.

Paragraph 4 and Annex A

The CHAIRMAN stated that paragraph 4 and Annex A were adopted.

Part IV

Paragraphs 1 and 2

The CHAIRMAN stated that paragraphs 1 and 2 were adopted.

Paragraph 3

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that Annex B had been approved by the Commission.

Footnote to paragraph 3

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked the Chairman whether the footnote expressed the opinion of the alternates for the member from Poland.

The CHAIRMAN replied that the footnote had been requested by the alternate for the member from Poland, and added, that since the member for Poland was not present, the Commission could retain the footnote for the time being, and ascertain the views of the member for Poland.

The Chairman stated that the consideration of the footnote would be deferred, and that he regarded paragraph 3 as adopted.

The meeting rose at 4.55 p.m.