

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Ninth Session

CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FORTY-THIRD MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 4 August 1949, at 10 a.m.

Contents:

1. CALENDAR OF CONFERENCES FOR 1950
(Item 47 of the Council Agenda)
(continued) pages 3 - 3
2. REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL
ON RELATIONS WITH INTER-GOVERNMENTAL
ORGANIZATIONS (Item 43 of the Council
Agenda) (resumed from the fortieth
meeting) International Penal and
Penitentiary Commission (resumed) .. pages 8 - 17
3. PROGRAMME OF WORK page 17

Present:

Chairman:

Mr. PLIMSOLL

Members:

Australia	Mr. CUMES
Belgium	Mr. FENAUX Baron de KERCHOVE d'EXAERDE
Brazil	Mr. MACHADO
Byelorussian SSR	Mr. AGAPOV
Chile	Mr. RODRIGUEZ
China	Mr. TSAO
Denmark	Mr. DAHLGAARD
France	Mr. MENDEZ-FRANCE Mr. de COMMINES
India	Mr. SEN
Lebanon	Mr. AZKOUL
New Zealand	Miss HAMPTON
Poland	Miss CZAPKO
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. BORISOV
United Kingdom	Miss SALT Mr. FOX
United States of America	Mr. KOISCHNIG Mr. HYDE

Representatives of Specialized Agencies:

International Labour Organisation	Mr. COX
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization	Mr. BERKELEY

Secretariat:

Sir Raphael Cilento	Director of the Division of Social Activities
Mr. Humphrey	Director of the Division of Human Rights
Mr. Powers	Bureau of Finance
Mr. Yates	Secretary to the Council
Mr. Sze	Secretary to the Committee

1. CALENDAR OF CONFERENCES FOR 1950 (Item 47 of the Council Agenda)
(Document E/1464) (continued)

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the meeting might continue to discuss Item 47 until the documents for Item 43 had been distributed.

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) felt that the choice of the place where the session of the Commission on Human Rights was to be held should be governed by substantive and administrative considerations, and not by personal or climatic considerations as proposed by the French representative. The fact that the European Office was at Geneva must be taken into account, but no weight should attach to the fact that Geneva was a summer resort. Looking at the empty public galleries, he was not convinced that public interest was a cogent argument in favour of holding the session at Geneva.

It was difficult for the Committee to fulfil its terms of reference, namely, integration and planning, when it had not been informed of the complete schedule of meetings to be held at Lake Success.

Baron de KERCHOVE d'EXAERDE (Belgium) warmly supported the French proposal that the next session of the Commission on Human Rights be held at Geneva. As the French representative had pointed out, there were other factors to be taken into account apart from those of a practical, administrative and financial order. There were weighty arguments of a much more general nature in favour of choosing Geneva. It was very greatly to the advantage of the United Nations that it should stimulate the interest, not only of the American continent, but of other parts of the world too, in the efforts for peace and prosperity which it had set out to bring to a successful conclusion.

He felt that a certain balance should be struck between the increased expenditure involved in holding conferences away from Headquarters, and the advantages which might properly be expected to result from such a course. It would not be desirable from the budgetary point of view to choose places too far away from Lake Success or Geneva; but the expense involved in the case of Geneva would surely not be excessive.

As the Brazilian representative had pointed out at the previous day's meeting, budgetary provision had been made for supplementing the staff by temporary recruitment so as to meet the requirements

of the heavy programme of meetings at Lake Success next spring. If the Commission on Human Rights met in Geneva, that would enable them to effect some economies in that direction.

He did not know exactly what facilities were at the disposal of Commissions at Lake Success, but he had heard that Geneva was the equal of Lake Success in that respect, if not better. In Geneva precious time could be saved, meetings could be held on Saturdays, and, if necessary, could be prolonged.

If the Commission on Human Rights met at Geneva next March, the fact that qualified staff was already available there would help to lighten the work-load at Lake Success.

It should also be remembered that while it was easier for some delegations to travel to Lake Success, some of the European governments found it more convenient and more economical to send their representatives to Geneva.

Hence he was entirely in favour of the French proposal, as there were no sufficiently convincing counter-arguments to justify setting it aside.

The CHAIRMAN asked the representative of the Secretary-General to explain the financial implications of the proposal before the Committee, in accordance with Rule 33 of the rules of procedure.

Mr. YATES, Secretary to the Council, stated that the estimates prepared by the Secretary-General and submitted to the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions had provided for two sessions of Commissions to be held in Geneva in 1950, at a direct extra cost of 16,060 dollars.

When the Commission on Human Rights had proposed that its next session should be held in Geneva, a revised estimate had been drawn up, and appended to the report of the Commission (E/1371, page 110). That estimate which included inter alia expenditure on Staff travel and subsistence which made up the item referred to above, amounted to 27,075 dollars. The direct extra cost of a correspondingly long session at Lake Success, would be 14,445 dollars or 12,630 dollars loss.

Mr. SEN (India) said that while his delegation in principle preferred meetings to be held at Lake Success, it would make an

exception in the present case. The Human Rights Commission would require at least two months to complete its agenda; at Lake Success that would mean overlapping with other meetings, besides placing a heavy burden on Headquarters Secretariat in the period between the tenth and eleventh sessions of the Council.

With regard to the financial implications, he doubted whether an exact estimate of the actual amount involved could be arrived at without taking into account the travel expenses of the various delegations, and breaking down the overall sum among the different countries. The Secretariat staff at Geneva would not be fully employed during the summer months if no Commission were held there. He wished to make no invidious comparisons in respect of climate and hospitality, and was, moreover, of the opinion that the apparent indifference of the public at Geneva might well be explained by the fact that Europeans preferred to get their information indirectly.

Mr. HYDE (United States of America) said that since part of the membership of the Council and of the Commission on Human Rights was identical, considerable difficulty might be experienced by some delegations if the two sessions were held in different places, especially in view of the decision to put back the tenth session of the Council by a week. In the Interim Committee on Programme of Meetings the French representative had invoked the principle of rotation; but the Commission on Human Rights had held its session in Geneva in 1947, whereas the Social Commission had never met there, much as it had wanted to. With regard to congestion, he pointed out that that was just as great a problem in Geneva as at Lake Success. May would be taken up by the Economic Commission for Europe and the Third World Health Assembly; the Thirty-third International Labour Conference was to meet in June, so that the only possible free time was between the end of the tenth session of the Council and the end of April. If the Commission on Human Rights met in Geneva, no other Commission could do so, and, despite the vote taken by that Commission, the Interim Committee could find nothing in the records of the Commission to support its preference, whereas the Social Commission had put forward the valid reason that it wished to meet in Europe and not in America because social problems differed in the two continents and it wished to maintain a fair balance. When asked, by the Interim Committee, the representative of the Department of Conference and General

Services had replied categorically that from the administrative point of view it would be preferable to hold the session of the Social Commission in Geneva.

Mr. BORISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) supported the French proposal and felt that the reasons put forward by the United States representative themselves spoke in favour of Geneva. Looking at the calendar, he saw that the Conferences of the specialized agencies were not due to begin until May, that was, when the session of the Commission on Human Rights would already have come to an end. It was hardly correct to say that the majority of the members of the Commission on Human Rights were also members of the Economic and Social Council; perhaps two or three were, but the overwhelming majority had never been closely connected with the Council. The major reason in favour of choosing Geneva was that the Commission on Human Rights had itself decided in favour of Geneva, by 10 votes to 2.

Sessions of three Commissions were to be held at Headquarters in the early months of 1950, as well as a session of the Economic and Social Council, and the Secretariat would have considerable difficulty in servicing them all if the session of the Commission on Human Rights were added to that list. He agreed with the representative of India that the financial implications were too inconclusive to form a valid argument.

Miss SALT (United Kingdom) said that none of the arguments adduced was strong enough to persuade the United Kingdom Delegation to abandon its position that meetings were best held at Headquarters. That position was based on the increased expenditure and the decreased efficiency which resulted from meetings being held away from Headquarters. She deprecated the tendency to consider that more prestige attached to meetings held away from Headquarters, or that to meet elsewhere than at Lake Success was a kind of prize to be awarded in rotation. She agreed with the Brazilian representative that meetings must not be looked on as holiday tours. She also feared that the overload might be transferred from Lake Success to Geneva, where the Secretariat was obviously less well fitted to cope with it. One point which had not yet been mentioned was that the

Sub-Commission on the Prevention of Discrimination and the Protection of Minorities had asked to meet in the same place as the Commission on Human Rights, and the Committee had already decided that that Sub-Commission should meet in New York at the beginning of 1950. The Commission and the Sub-Commission were closely related, and it would be advisable for them to maintain a certain liaison and continuity through the permanent delegations at Lake Success.

She asked the representative of the Secretary-General if the financial estimates he had just given orally might be circulated as a document before Item 47 came up in plenary, and also enquired whether the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions had considered those estimates, and whether the Secretary-General was in possession of its comments.

Mr. YATES, Secretary to the Council, replied that the financial estimates which he had mentioned as having been submitted to the Advisory Committee were contained in Section III of the budgetary estimates for 1950. The comments of the Advisory Committee had not yet arrived in Geneva, but the information could be obtained. The estimates relating to the Commission on Human Rights and the Social Commission were contained in Documents E/1371 (page 110) and E/1402/Add.1, respectively, which had been circulated.

Mr. HYDE (United States of America) replying to the representative of the Soviet Union, pointed out that the Commission on Human Rights might well continue into May, and that he had in any case referred to the Economic Commission for Europe as well as to the specialized agencies. Moreover, the Department of Conferences and General Services had told the Interim Committee that if the Commission on Human Rights met in Geneva it would not be possible for any other Commission to do so.

Mr. TSAO (China) supported the views put forward in favour of the session of the Commission on Human Rights being held at Lake Success.

Mr. CUMES (Australia) suggested that, in view of the importance of the principles involved, the vote should be taken by roll-call.

The result of the vote was as follows:

In favour: Belgium, Byelorussian SSR, Denmark, France,
India, Lebanon, New Zealand, Poland,
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Against: Australia, Brazil, Chile, China, United
Kingdom, United States of America.

The proposal that the Committee recommend to the Council that the
next session of the Commission on Human Rights be held at Geneva
was adopted by 9 votes to 6.

The Committee unanimously agreed to defer further discussion
of the Calendar of Conferences for 1950 (Item 47 of the Council Agenda).

2. REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ON RELATIONS WITH
INTER-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS.
(Item 43 of the Council Agenda)
(Resumed from the Fortieth Meeting)

International Penal and Penitentiary Commission (resumed)
(Documents E/1313, E/AC.24/6, E/AC.24/W.25, W.27 and W.29)

The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the meeting to Document E/AC.24/SR.40, pages 10-15, and recalled that at a previous meeting, the United States had submitted a proposal (Document E/AC.24/W.25). The International Penal and Penitentiary Commission during its present meeting at Berne, had expressed its views in a Resolution adopted on 3 August 1949 and circulated as Document E/AC.24/6. He asked Sir Raphael Cilento, Director of the Division of Social Activities, who had attended the meetings at Berne, to report to the Committee thereon.

Sir Raphael CILENTO, Director of the Division of Social Activities, gave an outline of the constitution of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission and of the development of its relationship with the United Nations. The Commission, which had been established by the first International Prison Congress held in London in 1872, was made up of representatives of 26 governments, 15 of which were Members of the United Nations, admitted by a two-thirds majority vote of members. The Commission's relations with Japan had been broken off.

According to Article 1 of its Constitution, the Commission's purposes were:

"to study questions relating to the prevention of crime and the treatment of delinquents, in order to advise governments on measures to be taken to prevent breaches of the criminal law and for the development of their penitentiary systems according to the most progressive and best adapted models, with a view particularly to the educational treatment and social readjustment of criminals and delinquents."

It had been one of the technical agencies in that field formally recognized by the League of Nations.

Negotiations to establish its relationship with the United Nations (details of which were given in Document E/CN.5/113) had been initiated in 1946, and, at its sixth session, the Economic and Social Council, by Resolution 112 (VI) F of 10 March 1948, had requested the Social Commission to consult with the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission. The United Nations had in the meantime set up a special section of Social Defence within the Division of Social Activities, to assist the Social Commission (since action was the major practical issue), and consultation was now only necessary with a view to establishing co-operation.

In August 1948 the Council had adopted Resolution 115 (VII) C, which laid down that:

"in view of the importance of the study on an international basis of the problem of prevention of crime and treatment of offenders, the United Nations should assume leadership in promoting this activity, having regard to international and national organizations which have interests and competence in this field and making the fullest use of their knowledge and experience."

Following the adoption of that Resolution, a meeting of the principal international organizations specializing in the field had been held in Paris on 15-16 October 1948. It had been attended by representatives of the following international bodies.

- The Howard League for Penal Reform.
- The International Association of Penal Law.
- The International Bureau for the Unification of Penal Law.
- The International Criminal Police Commission.
- The International Institute of Statistics.
- The International Law Association.
- The International Penal and Penitentiary Commission.
- The International Union for Child Welfare.
- The Nordic Associations of Criminologists.

Representatives of the International Labour Organisation, the World Health Organization, and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization had also attended the meeting, and the Division of Social Activities of the United Nations Department of Social Affairs had acted as the Secretariat. A unanimous Resolution had been adopted which provided for the establishment of a committee, made up of representatives of the principal international organizations in that field, to meet under the auspices of the United Nations and to maintain close liaison with the organizations concerned. A meeting of their permanent representatives in New York and of representatives of the specialized agencies concerned had been convened on 30 March 1949, and had outlined methods of co-operation within the framework of the United Nations study programme. A group of internationally recognized experts had been set up, subject to budgetary limitations, to advise the Secretary-General and the Social Commission.

It was in that field that the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission considered itself specially competent, and it had therefore asked whether, while maintaining its autonomy, it should act in that relation to the United Nations, enlarging its field of activity by holding regional conferences and extending its membership.

It had recently been recognized that some degree of duplication of work might now exist between the United Nations and the Commission, and the United States Government had recommended (Document E/AC.24/W.25 of 23 July 1949) that Member Governments which were also members of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission should take steps within the Commission to bring about its termination and the transfer of its assets and functions to the United Nations. The United States draft resolution had been forwarded to the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission, which had discussed it at its meeting on 1 August 1949, which had been attended by representatives of Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Holland, Italy, Luxembourg, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and the United States of America, several of which countries were not Members of the United Nations. Discussion had centred around the desire of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission to maintain: its autonomy and assets; its individual character as an expert body prepared as such to admit Members of the United Nations; its headquarters in Europe,

the greater part of its activity having originated in, and being still carried out in, Europe; and, its quinquennial world conference, extended if possible by regional conferences. It was apparent, however, that the meeting had been resolutely opposed to any language suggesting termination, absorption or integration of activities, and the words "within the framework of the United Nations" and similar expressions had been deleted from the United States proposal.

The Commission's resolution, which had been adopted by 9 votes to 0, with 5 abstentions, was now before the Council.

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) felt that the question at issue was whether the United Nations should share its responsibility with an organization which was not only largely regional, since 21 of its 25 members were European countries, but also included several countries which were not Members of the United Nations. The United Nations had a responsibility to continue its work in that field. The countries concerned were free to retain their organization, since they financed it, but the Council should recommend to those States that were members of both the United Nations and of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission not to spend money on what was merely a duplication of functions. He considered the proposals put forward by the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission in its Resolution unacceptable, and reserved his right to comment on them later in the debate.

Mr. SEN (India) agreed with the United States representative that this was a test case of whether the Co-ordination Committee really could co-ordinate. The International Penal and Penitentiary Commission was obviously duplicating United Nations, and he agreed with the representative of Brazil that Countries Members of both bodies should be recommended to withdraw from the Commission, or, alternatively, that the Secretariat should be instructed to exclude the organization's field of competence from its own activities.

Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) regretted that the Resolution adopted by the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission led to the depressing conclusion that after two and a half years of negotiations no common ground had been found on which

that organization and United Nations could meet. He appreciated the valiant effort made to reach agreement at Berne, but it was clear that the Commission wished to retain its identity and to become something in the nature of a minor specialized agency, a solution which the Economic and Social Council could not support. It had repeatedly been made clear in the Social Commission and in the Council that the objective of penal and penitentiary reform would best be served by the integration of the work of the Commission with that of the United Nations, and he regretted that the Commission should have been unwilling to take that line, particularly since there was no valid reason why agreement should not be reached. It should be possible to meet the Commission's desire to preserve its expert character, but he emphasized that that should be done within the framework of the United Nations. Duplication of work would be inevitable if the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission persisted as an autonomous body only vaguely related to the United Nations.

The prevention of crime and the treatment of delinquents was as subject to which the United Nations had allotted high priority, and work in that field could not be divorced from other social activities, prosecution of which was a United Nations responsibility under the Charter. His regret was heightened by the fact that the work of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission itself would be adversely affected. Governments that were members of both bodies were forced by the attitude of the Commission to choose between the two Organizations. So far as his government was concerned, there could be no doubt about its attitude. As a Member of the United Nations, it would support the work undertaken by the United Nations, rather than the Commission, thus accentuating the regional character of the Commission.

He drew the attention of the meeting to the United States draft resolution in Document E/AC.24/W.29 (which replaced Document E/AC.24/W.25) and explained his reasons for the conclusions reached in the second paragraph thereof. It had become apparent at Berne that the Commission did not wish to be brought "within the framework of the United Nations" since it had specifically deleted that phrase. The language of subparagraph II (1) of paragraph XII of the Commission's Resolution had been altered from the original text, which had suggested that the Commission

should act as a body of experts within the United Nations, to the present wording, in which reference was made to a "re-organized" International Penal and Penitentiary Commission. He himself believed in experts and felt, moreover, that such a body of experts could include countries non-members of the United Nations, but the suggestion of an International Penal and Penitentiary Commission re-organized as a form of inter-governmental, or specialized agency, was unacceptable.

The United States Delegation at Berne had introduced an amendment, which had proposed that the body of experts should function under the Economic and Social Council and be serviced by the United Nations Secretariat, but that had also been rejected. It was obvious that the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission did not wish to become part of the United Nations, but simply to maintain a loose relationship, perhaps entailing financial assistance. The language of the second paragraph of the United States draft resolution might be rather strong, but it must be ascertained on what basis agreement was to be reached.

The third paragraph had been inserted in order to reassure the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission that the expert character of the work undertaken would be fully safeguarded. The fourth paragraph left the door open for further proposals from the Commission. He had no objection to the insertion of the phrase: "after further consultation with the Secretary-General of the United Nations" in the fourth line (after "IPPC"), if the meeting so wished. The final paragraph provided an opportunity for governments to state their opinions on the matter.

He felt that the United States draft resolution had the advantage of leaving the door open for further proposals, while pointing out that the resolution received from the Commission did not provide a satisfactory basis for future relations which would bring to an end the protracted and costly negotiations that had now been dragging on for nearly three years. His statement should not be interpreted as meaning that the United States Government was antagonistic to the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission. On the contrary, it fully appreciated the usefulness of the work accomplished by the organization in the past. It wished only to avoid duplication of function, and to lighten the financial burden on governments, with a view to ensuring effective action on a world-wide basis in the field under discussion.

Mr. FOX (United Kingdom), said that if he presented certain amendments to the United States draft resolution that was due not to any difference of opinion as to the ends to be achieved, but rather to a misunderstanding. It was misleading to imply, as the United States representative had done, that the blame for the three years protracted negotiations rested solely on the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission. The original suggestion for relationship with the United Nations had come from the Commission itself, which, at its 1946 Conference, had adopted a detailed Resolution expressing a desire to establish contact and suggesting ways of making that contact effective. It had waited three years to hear the views of the United Nations on the proposals transmitted to the latter, but had received no reply whatsoever. The present conference in Berne had decided to submit another Resolution in the hope of calling forth an expression of the United Nations' views.

He agreed that if the experience and work of the Commission was to be of any use to the United Nations it must be brought within that body's framework. If the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission were informed that the only acceptable solution was to place itself within the framework of the United Nations it might reconsider its position.

He therefore proposed the deletion of the second paragraph from the United States draft resolution, and the replacement of the fourth paragraph by the following text: "Requests the Secretary-General to continue discussion with the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission with a view to submitting to the Council at its tenth session a plan for the eventual integration within the United Nations of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission."

Sir Raphael CILENTO, Director of the Division of Social Activities, asked whether the reference to the tenth session in the United Kingdom amendment could be replaced by "at an early session" or "at the eleventh session."

He also pointed out that the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission might feel itself committed by the Resolution it had adopted, since it had specifically rejected a position "within the framework of the United Nations", and that negotiations on that basis

might therefore prove difficult. He asked whether it might not be possible to find some other formula on which negotiations might be more promisingly based.

Mr. FOX (United Kingdom) agreed to the substitution of the words "to the eleventh session" for the words "to the tenth session". He felt, however, that it was for the Commission itself to decide whether it could re-open negotiations on that basis or not.

Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) disclaimed any intention of suggesting that the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission was to blame for the length of the negotiations. He was aware that the Commission had received no direct communications from the United Nations, but the United States delegation had in fact tabled a resolution which, had it been adopted, would have given the Commission some idea of what the United Nations expected; that draft resolution had been opposed by the United Kingdom representative.

With regard to the second United Kingdom amendment, he was in favour of Sir Raphael Cilento's first formula, namely, "at an early session", unless the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission were to reconsider its decision at its current session, in which unlikely case the matter could be referred to the tenth session of the Council.

Mr. de COMMINES (France) had no intention, in view of the lateness of the hour, of commenting at length on the United States draft resolution and the amendment thereto submitted by the United Kingdom representative. He would point out, however, that his delegation would welcome the deletion from the United States text of anything which might be interpreted as censure of the Resolution adopted by the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission (Document E/AC.24/6).

While it was not surprising, for the reasons given by the United Kingdom representative, that the terms of that Resolution were not completely convincing, the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission should be allowed to re-consider together with the Secretary-General the conditions for co-operation or integration.

His delegation supported the United Kingdom proposal to delete the second paragraph from the United States draft resolution; he

thought however that the new text to replace the fourth paragraph should be drafted by the Secretariat.

The final text should specify that the Secretary-General's report would cover not only any further proposals which might be put forward by the Commission but also those which the Commission had already submitted.

Mr. BORISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked that no decision be taken on the subject before representatives had had time to acquaint themselves with the United States draft resolution and the United Kingdom amendments. He suggested that the question be deferred until Saturday.

Mr. FENAUX (Belgium) said that, after having heard the tributes paid to the work of International Penal and Penitentiary Commission, he had listened with particular interest to the statements made by the United States representative, of which he approved with some slight differences of interpretation.

Referring to the views expressed by the Brazilian representative, he emphasized that the Commission was not a specifically European or regional body, and that its members included such important countries as the United States of America, Japan and Argentina. Its membership comprised seven non-European countries, and its universal character was beyond dispute.

The organization still retained its justification for existence, he considered, and should be given a certain measure of autonomy in order that it might complete the important tasks which it had undertaken.

With regard to the links which should exist between the Commission and the United Nations, he did not find the work of the conference at Berne altogether satisfactory. A formula should be sought which would satisfy both parties and take account of the principles of autonomy and integration alike.

Many arguments could be advanced in favour of autonomy, seeing that fusion with a body entrusted with far wider tasks might involve the loss of all the advantages afforded by specialization. The government representatives had gained extensive experience in the study

of penal problems, and their assistance could not be foregone without prejudicing the results accruing from the Commission's scientific and technical composition.

The Commission included eleven countries not members of the United Nations, and had at its command inter alia a qualified staff and a library. It was also responsible for publishing several periodicals.

His delegation was prepared to accept the United States draft resolution, subject to the amendment proposed by the United Kingdom and French representatives.

3. PROGRAMME OF WORK.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the next day's meeting continue to consider the Calendar of Conferences. It would also have before it a letter from the President of the International Committee of the Red Cross asking for reconsideration of the decision taken with regard to the International Relief Union.

He proposed that, as the Soviet Union representative had suggested, the debate on the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission be continued on Saturday.

The Committee unanimously adopted the Chairman's proposals.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.
