

United Nations

Nations Unies

**ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL**

**CONSEIL
ECONOMIQUE
ET SOCIAL**

UNRESTRICTED

E/AC.24/SR.44
11 August 1949

Dual Distribution

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Ninth Session

CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FORTY-FOURTH MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva
on Friday, 5 August 1949, at 3.00 p.m.

Contents:

CALENDAR OF CONFERENCE FOR 1950
(Item 47 of the Council Agenda) (Continued)....pages 4 - 22

Present:

Chairman:

Mr. PLIMFOLD

Members:

Australia

Mr. CUMES

Belgium

Baron de KEROHOVE d'EXAERDE

Brazil

Mr. MACHADO

Byelorussian SSR

Mr. ACAPOV

Chile

Mr. RODRIGUEZ

China

Mr. TSAO

Denmark

Mr. DAHLGAARD

France

Mr. AMANRICH

India

Mr. SEN

Lebanon

Mr. AZKOUL

New Zealand

Miss HAMPTON

Poland

Miss CZARKO

Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics

Mr. BORISOV

United Kingdom

Miss SALT

United States of America

Mr. HYDE

Representatives of Specialized Agencies:

International Labour
Organisation

Mr. COX

United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural
Organization

Mr. TERENCE

World Health Organization

Dr. HAFEZI

Secretariat:

Mr. Owen	Assistant Secretary-General for Economic Affairs
Mr. Humphrey	Director of the Division of Human Rights
Mr. Lukac	Director of the Division of Transport and Communications
Mr. Steinig	Director of the Narcotics Division
Mr. Yates	Secretary to the Council
Mr. Sze	Secretary to the Committee

CALENDAR OF CONFERENCES FOR 1950
(Item 47 of the Council Agenda)
(documents E/1464, E/1370, E/1371, Annex V,
E/1402/Add.1, E/AC.24/W.28) (Continued)

Commission on Human Rights.

Mr. TSAO (China), referring to the proposal which he had made at the previous meeting that the session of the Commission on Human Rights should open on 20 March rather than on 13 March 1950, said that after studying the question further he now recommended postponing the session for two weeks rather than for one week.

Mr. HUMPHREY, Director of the Division of Human Rights, observed that the choice was between allowing the session of the Commission to overlap either with the end of the tenth session of the Council or with the beginning of the session of the Commission on the Status of Women. Since some members of the Commission on Human Rights were also members of the Council, the proposal made by the Chinese representative might be preferable.

Mr. AMANRICH (France) wondered whether, after all, the postponement by a fortnight of the opening of the session of the Commission on Human Rights would not involve further inconvenience. Actually, the overlapping of the end of the Council session and the beginning of the session of the Human Rights Commission was hardly likely to give rise to any great difficulty. Only three members of that Commission sat on the Council; and it had already been suggested that the Council could examine the documentation of the Human Rights Commission at the beginning of its session.

However, he would not press his view, and in order not to delay the work of the committees, did not wish to enter a formal objection to the Chinese proposal.

Mr. YATES, Secretary to the Council, replying to an enquiry from the United Kingdom representative, said that for reasons unconnected with the present discussion a proposal would be put before the Committee that the Economic Commission for Europe should hold its fifth session three weeks later than

originally envisaged, in which case, there would be no overlap between its session and that of the Commission on Human Rights. He understood that a partial overlap of the session of the latter Commission and that of the Social Commission at Geneva would in itself raise no special administrative difficulties for the technical conference services at Geneva. It should be remembered, however, that the total Geneva conference programme had not yet been established, which meant that answers could only be given on the various assumptions stated.

Mr. TSAO (China) pointed out that after the election of new members to the Council, the overlapping of the Council session with that of the Commission on Human Rights might affect more delegations than the three at present concerned.

Miss SALT (United Kingdom) was in favour of the Chinese proposal, in view of the changed intentions of the Economic Commission for Europe, and of the fact that the Chinese proposal would minimize the inconvenience caused to members of the Council who were also members of the Commission on Human Rights.

The Committee decided, by 9 votes to 0 with 4 abstentions, to recommend to the Council that the sixth session of the Commission on Human Rights should open on 27 March 1950.

Transport and Communications Commission.

Mr. HYDE (United States of America), referring to the proposal that the fourth session of the Transport and Communications Commission should open on 20 March 1950, said that he had gathered from the United States representative on that Commission that in view of the satisfactory progress of the work of that body, it was considering the possibility of holding sessions less frequently than once a year. He would therefore suggest that the Commission meet once every eighteen months and that its fourth session be held late in 1950.

Mr. LUKAC, Director of the Transport and Communications Division, said that to the best of his knowledge the Transport and Communications Commission had never discussed the question of meeting less frequently than once a year.

He thought that the misunderstanding might have arisen from the fact that at the last session of the Commission the view had been expressed that it was inconvenient for the Commission to meet early in any year, particularly where the discussion of matters arising out of the report of the preceding session, which had to be referred to the General Assembly before action could be taken by the Secretariat, was concerned. It had therefore been suggested that the Commission should be convened a few weeks later in the spring; but there had never been any mention of deferring the session until towards the end of the year.

Some of the problems at present before the Commission were urgent, and had been recognized as such by the Council, in the first place, barriers to the international transport of goods and problems of maritime shipping affecting Latin America. Moreover, at its present session the Council had referred to the Commission for the latter's advice the applications of certain non-governmental organizations for admission to consultative status. It would certainly not help the Council's work if the Commission's study of all those matters were deferred for a further six months.

Finally, its terms of reference required the Commission to assist the Council in co-ordinating the work of the specialized agencies in the transport and communications field. It might be expected that those agencies would be discouraged from placing their problems before the Commission if they knew that that would involve undue delay, which would be the case if the Commission were to meet only once in eighteen months. He felt therefore, that the Commission should continue to meet once a year, in the spring.

Mr. HYDE (United States of America) repeated that he had been led to understand that the Commission itself was of the opinion that it should meet less frequently. That, however,

appeared not to be the case. On the other hand, it was true to say that the United States representative on the Commission was of that opinion. He would like to know whether a session of two weeks would be sufficient for the Commission.

Mr. LUKAC, Director of the Division of Transport and Communications, said that so far no session except that of the Temporary Commission had lasted for more than twelve days; he considered therefore that two weeks would be sufficient.

Miss SALT (United Kingdom) pointed out that her delegation was also under the impression that less frequent sessions of the Transport and Communications Commission had been contemplated. The need for the Commission's advice on the admission of certain non-governmental organizations to consultative status was perhaps not quite so urgent as had been suggested, since, as the approval of the General Assembly in the matter was not required, the Council could examine the recommendations of the Commission at either of its two sessions in 1950. She would be willing to support a proposal from the United States representative that the fourth session of the Commission be held in November 1950, if he decided to press the matter.

Mr. HYDE (United States of America) hesitated to press his point, in the absence of a direct recommendation from the Commission. He asked, however, that the fact that the question had been raised should be mentioned in the Committee's report. It would also be useful if the Transport and Communications Commission would state its views on the matter at its next session.

The Committee decided to recommend that no change be made in the date (20 March 1950) proposed for the opening of the Fourth Session of the Transport and Communications Commission.

United Nations Conference on Roads and Motor Transport.

Mr. YATIS (Secretary to the Council), replying to an enquiry from the representative of the United States of America, said that provision had been made in the 1950 budget for the

proposed United Nations Conference on Roads and Motor Transport.

The term "tentative" meant that there had not been an opportunity for consultation with the Interim Committee on Programme of Meetings on the matter. The decision as to whether the Conference should be held would be taken up by the Council when it had before it the recommendations of the World Road Conference due to be held that year.

Mr. LUTAC, Director of the Transport and Communications Division, said that in its last report the Transport and Communications Commission had said that it was desirable that the question of the further steps which should be taken internationally in connection with motor transport, including the question of holding a further conference to deal with certain of them, should be considered by the first World Road Conference which was scheduled to meet in Geneva in August, 1949.

Recently, European Governments had negotiated three draft conventions on customs matters concerning road transport which had been drawn up by the relevant bodies of the Economic Commission for Europe, and many European Governments were anxious to conclude further international conventions in that field in the near future, and had expressed the desire that they should be placed on the agenda of the First World Road Conference. That, however, had proved impossible owing to lack of time and funds. It was therefore probable that the first World Road Conference would suggest the early convening of a second World Road Conference, perhaps even in the first half of 1950. However, as had been said, the Committee would not commit itself by including such tentative mention of the second World Road Conference in the calendar, as the Council would in any case have to take a decision as to whether a second World Road Conference should be held if and when the first World Road Conference submitted appropriate recommendations to it.

Miss SALT (United Kingdom) said that, in the opinion of her delegation, there was not sufficient evidence that a second United Nations Conference on Road and Motor Transport would be required to justify its inclusion in the calendar submitted by the Committee to the Council. She pointed out that the supposition that this Conference would be held rested on a purely hypothetical basis. If the draft calendar were to include any meeting which there was some possibility another body would recommend, it would become quite unmanageable.

After a short discussion, the Committee unanimously decided to recommend that the date of the proposed Second World Conference on Roads and Motor Transport should not be included in the calendar itself, but that it should be stated in a note at the end thereof that there was a possibility that it might be necessary to hold such a conference in 1950.

Social Commission.

Miss SALT (United Kingdom) recalled that the decision to hold the forthcoming session of the Social Commission at Geneva had been taken under the impression that the Economic Commission for Latin America would be sitting at Montevideo simultaneously. Since that was not the case, and part of the United Nations headquarters staff would not be absent from Lake Success, she formally proposed that the fifth session of the Social Commission be held there.

Mr. YATES, Secretary to the Council, replying to questions by the representatives of India and Belgium, confirmed that it would be possible to service an overlap of the two sessions at Geneva, provided that a session of the Economic Commission for Europe or other conference was not being held at the same time. In fact, the calendar set out in Document E/1464 included a proposed overlap of one week between the sessions of the Economic Commission for Europe and the Social Commission. A statement of the relative costs of holding a longer session than heretofore of the Social Commission in 1950 at Lake Success and at Geneva appeared on page 4 of Document E/1402/Add.1; some adjustment of expenses for temporary assistance on the Geneva budget might be necessary.

Mr. HYDE (United States of America) enquired whether there was a discrepancy between the statement made by the Secretary to the Council and the opinion expressed by the representative of the Department of Conference and General Services at the fifteenth meeting of the Interim Committee on Programme of Meetings (Document E/C.4/SR.15, page 18) to the effect that if the Commission on Human Rights met at Geneva no other Commission could meet there at the same time without creating considerable difficulty.

He considered that sessions should be held at Headquarters unless there were some special reason for not doing so. It had already been agreed that the Commission on Human Rights should hold its next session at Geneva, and that that session should be at least twice the normal length. Moreover, he understood that there

was a proposal afoot to hold one of the 1950 sessions of the Council itself at Geneva. Matters were reaching a point where one wondered if the Headquarters of the United Nations were really at Lake Success. Geneva, it was true, offered facilities which ensured that the additional expense involved was kept to a minimum, but there could not fail to be some additional expenditure. Furthermore, it was not conducive to a high standard of work for the Secretariat to be constantly moving around. Another objection to the decision was the fact that, although the Economic Commission for Europe might not be holding its session at the same time as the proposed dates for the Social Commission, the World Health Organization would be holding its Third Assembly at Geneva in May 1950. He therefore strongly supported the view expressed by the United Kingdom representative.

Mr. BORISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republic) said that, in the light of the discussion, a session of the Social Commission at Geneva could hardly give rise to any special difficulty. The representative of the Secretariat had intimated that it would be possible, provided that the session of the Economic Commission for Europe was put back for a fortnight, which seemed reasonable.

He did not share the fears of the United Kingdom representative that the centre of gravity of the United Nations might shift to Geneva if other technical commissions held their sessions there. Such fears were groundless, since of nine Commissions, only two were to meet at Geneva.

Furthermore, it would appear that by adopting such a programme, a better distribution of the work load between the Geneva Office and Headquarters, where five Commissions were to hold their sessions in the spring, would be achieved. Hence it would seem to be actually in the interests of the United Nations' work that the Social Commission should meet at Geneva.

Mr. YATES, Secretary to the Council, stated that, even though the World Health Organization might ask for the loan of

some of the Geneva staff, he was informed that the Geneva technical conference services anticipated that no great difficulty would arise from the fact that the World Health Assembly was held at that time.

Replying to the United States representative, he added that the representative of the Department of Conference and General Services at the Interim Committee had been speaking on the assumption that the Economic Commission for Europe would be in session from 8 to 20 May. Whereas it would be impracticable to superimpose two sessions of functional commissions on a session of the Economic Commission for Europe, it would not be impossible to service an overlap between the two functional commissions on the assumption that the Economic Commission for Europe or other bodies would not be holding their meetings at the same time.

Mr. AMANRICH (France) thought it was preferable that the Social Commission should hold its fifth session at Geneva. In the first place, the Secretariat representative had said it was possible. Secondly, the Secretariat services would undoubtedly be more overloaded at Lake Success, where five sessions were to take place simultaneously. As for the attitude of his delegation towards the general principle involved, that was well-known, and he would not restate it.

Mr. BORISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) drew the attention of the United States representative to the fact that the World Health Organization had its own Secretariat, and would probably not have to rely on assistance from the United Nations. He recalled that at Geneva in 1948, the seventh session of the Council and the First World Health Assembly had taken place almost simultaneously, without giving rise to any difficulties.

Mr. HYDE (United States of America) pointed out that, although only two Commissions would be meeting at Geneva, their sessions would be so lengthy that it was tantamount to holding four normal sessions.

The CHAIRMAN, replying to a question put by the Indian representative, said that the Social Commission had decided to hold its fourth session at Geneva for a number of reasons, including the desire to bring representatives in closer contact with methods and institutions in the social field different from those to be found in the United States of America (see Document E/C.4/SR.15, page 15).

Baron de KERCHOVE d'EXAERDE (Belgium) shared the opinion of the Soviet Union representative, and pointed out that those who favoured Geneva for the fifth session of the Social Commission had no intention of depriving Lake Success of its title of United Nations Headquarters. He also agreed with the view that it would be a good thing if the sessions of certain commissions whose work had a strong social and humanitarian bearing could be held from time to time at Geneva. His delegation would therefore prefer that the Social Commission should meet at Geneva.

The Committee rejected by 7 votes to 5 with 2 abstentions the United Kingdom proposal to recommend to the Council that the fifth session of the Social Commission be held at the headquarters of the United Nations.

The Committee adopted by 8 votes to 6 the Chairman's proposal to recommend to the Economic and Social Council that the Social Commission hold its fifth session at Geneva.

Commission on Narcotic Drugs.

Mr. STEINIG, Director of the Narcotics Division, explained that the Commission on Narcotic Drugs had taken a formal decision which had been approved by the Council to hold a session of five weeks, three weeks of which would be devoted to examination of the unified Convention on Narcotic Drugs, which was being prepared by the Secretariat.

The date suggested for the session was based on the calculation that governments should be allowed two and a half months in which to examine the new draft convention, which should be ready for

circulation by the end of January 1950. To hold the session earlier than 10 April would reduce the amount of time governments would have for studying the Convention. The Commission would also have two reports to examine, namely, that on the chewing of the coca leaf, and that on the results of the conference of opium-producing countries which was to be held in Turkey. The holding of a session on the date proposed would enable the six weeks rule with regard to documentation to be complied with.

The Committee unanimously decided to recommend to the Economic and Social Council that the session of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs open on 10 April 1950.

Statistical and Population Commissions.

After an assurance from the Secretariat that the dates proposed in the calendar for the sessions of the Statistical and Population Commissions were satisfactory to the divisions concerned, the Committee approved them.

Commission on the Status of Women.

Mr. HUMPHREY, Director of the Division of Human Rights, reminded the Committee that the decision to hold the session of the Commission on Human Rights a fortnight later would mean that the meetings of that Commission would overlap with the session of the Commission on the Status of Women. If the latter Commission commenced its session on 15 May 1950, such an overlap would be avoided, provided the Commission on Human Rights did not sit for longer than seven weeks. Such a decision would however render it impossible to comply with the six weeks' rule.

Mr. HYDE (United States of America) pointed out that the Commission on the Status of Women usually sat for two weeks only. If it also held a two weeks' session in 1950 commencing on 8 May, its report would be ready approximately in time.

Mr. BORISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that the United States proposal for reducing the duration of the session of the Commission on the Status of Women could not be very acceptable to that Commission. He thought it would be advisable to adhere to the period provided for in the calendar.

Mr. HYDE (United States of America) observed that the closing dates, in parentheses, in Document E/1464, were not in any way final. He did not wish to impose an arbitrary shortening of its session on the Commission on the Status of Women.

Mr. AMANRICH (France) pointed out that his delegation attached great importance to the six-week rule. While not having any very fixed ideas as to the time when the session of the Commission on the Status of Women should begin, he would not like that Commission to be obliged to extend its work beyond the date provided for, in order that the six-week rule should not be impaired. He would therefore have no objection to the Commission's beginning its session a week later, provided it were able to finish its work in two weeks.

The Committee adopted by 10 votes to 3 with 1 abstention the proposal of the United States representative to recommend to the Economic and Social Council that the session of the Commission on the Status of Women be held from 8 May to 19 May 1950.

Economic Commission for Europe.

Mr. OWEN, Assistant Secretary-General for Economic Affairs outlined the reasons which had been put forward to him by the Executive Secretary of the Commission in favour of holding its fifth session three weeks later than originally planned

At the fourth session of the Commission a resolution had been adopted requesting each of the technical committees, and the Executive Secretary himself, to report to the fifth session on the future programme of work of each of the technical committees. Those reports were to be circulated to governments two months in

advance. Some of the committees would meet for final consideration of their individual reports as late as January 1950, and the Executive Secretary himself would, of course, wish to have the maximum time at his disposal for drafting his own report. Moreover, in view of the very important nature of that documentation, it would be desirable, if possible, to give governments more than the stipulated two months in which to study the reports.

Furthermore, it was essential that the third Annual Economic Survey of Europe should be in the hands of governments well before the fifth session opened. The necessary late arrival of statistical data for the last quarter of 1949 would make it virtually impossible to complete and circulate the survey long enough in advance if the Commission met earlier than the proposed date of 29 May.

He added that it was not anticipated that the fact that the Economic Commission for Latin America would be meeting at the same time would give rise to any difficulty. It was inevitable that regional commissions should meet at roughly the same period of the year, and since only small number of senior officers from Lake Success were called upon to attend them, work at Headquarters would not suffer to any appreciable extent.

Miss SALT (United Kingdom) formally proposed that the fifth session of the Economic Commission for Europe open on 29 May 1950.

Mr. YATES, Secretary to the Council, in reply to a query from the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, agreed that it would not be possible for the report of the Economic Commission for Europe to be available six weeks before the Economic and Social Council sat. The Council had found in the past that it was not always practicable for the regional commissions to meet sufficiently in advance of the Council sessions for the documents to be distributed six weeks in advance. It would presumably wish to consider the report in spite of its late appearance, though that was for the Council itself to decide.

The Committee adopted by 11 votes to 0 with 3 abstentions the proposal of the United Kingdom representative to recommend to the Economic and Social Council that the Economic Commission for Europe commence its 27th session on 29 May 1959.

Economic Commission for Latin America

Mr. RODRIGUEZ (Chile) said he had some remarks to make in connection with the resolution in document E/AC.24/W.28.

In conformity with Council resolution 106(VI) establishing the Economic Commission for Latin America, the latter had decided at its last meeting in Havana to hold its next session at Montevideo.

His delegation supported that decision, its opinion on the matter being strengthened by the fact that the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press was also to meet shortly afterwards in Montevideo and would thus be able to make some use of the services of the members of the Secretariat who would be servicing the session of the Economic Commission for Latin America. It was, however, unable to accept the concrete condition, governing the holding of the two meetings, laid down in paragraph 4 of the draft resolution in Document E/AC.24/W.28, namely "provided that the costs thereby incurred by the United Nations shall not exceed those which would be incurred if the session were held at the headquarters of the Commission".

Resolution 106 of the Council creating the Economic Commission for Latin America provided that the Commission should have its headquarters at Santiago de Chile, where its first session should be held, and that it should decide at each session upon the place of meeting for its next session, with due consideration for the principle of rotation.

Subsequently, there was a recommendation by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, contained in Document E/1370, which had been accepted by the Secretary-General and which had provided the basis for drafting the relevant paragraph of Document E/AC.24/W.28.

The Advisory Committee's recommendation, however, had not been endorsed by any resolution either of the Council or the General Assembly, and was therefore purely a recommendation by the Secretary-General devoid of any mandatory force whereby it could be invoked as binding on a host country.

The Chilean delegation wished to be clearly understood on that point. Nothing could be more gratifying to his country than that all the sessions of the Economic Commission for Latin America should in fact be held at the Commission's headquarters at Santiago. Since there was a Council

decision on the matter, however, that decision must be fully respected. The meeting place for the sessions of the Commission must accordingly be chosen in rotation and unconditionally.

Neither was there anything against the Uruguayan Government paying the balance of expenditure if it wished to do so, although that should not for the moment be regarded as a precedent. To agree that the holding of the meeting in Montevideo should be subject to the willingness of the Uruguayan Government to meet the extra costs involved was, however out of the question. He therefore formally proposed that the resolution contained in Document E/AC.24/W.28 be amended by the deletion from paragraph 4 of the words: "provided that..... were held at the Headquarters of the Commission".

Mr. HYDE (United States of America) said that he understood that the Economic Commission for Latin America had desired to hold its third session in August or September, 1950. With regard to the decision to hold it at Montevideo, he was not in favour of making a practice of holding sessions elsewhere than at headquarters of the Commission, but in view of paragraph 15 of Council Resolution 106(VI) just quoted by the representative of Chile, the Council could do nothing about it, except to express the view that such moving around should be minimized even when, as in the case under consideration, the additional costs involved were met by the host country. He, therefore, supported the proposal of the Chilean representative, but suggested that the fourth paragraph of the resolution should simply read "Decides that its regional economic commissions should each hold one session in 1950", the rest of the paragraph being deleted.

Miss SAIT (United Kingdom) agreed with the objection raised by the representative of Chile to the conditional clause included in the fourth paragraph of the Resolution on the Calendar of Conferences of 1950, but suggested that since, according to Document E/1364, page 3, the assumption of additional expenditure by the Uruguayan Government was still under negotiation, it would be inadvisable as a matter of principle for the Council to give final approval to the holding of the session at Montevideo without having the definite financial implications of that decision before it. Perhaps the Chilean representative would agree to substituting a phrase such as "subject to the approval of the General Assembly of any additional expenditure involved", for the conditional clause.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ (Chile) was unable to accept the United Kingdom representative's proposal. The position, he thought, was clear: if the Economic Commission for Latin America held its session at Montevideo, the

additional expense would amount to 17,120 dollars. The Government of Uruguay might agree to defray those expenses, but that was not certain; and if it did not, the United Nations would be obliged to defray them. It was regrettable that the Secretary-General had entered into direct consultation with the Government of Uruguay when there had been no reason to do so, since neither the Economic and Social Council nor the General Assembly had taken a decision on the subject.

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) agreed with the proposed date for the session of the Economic Commission for Latin America. There could be no question of the right of that Commission to hold its sessions in other cities of Latin America than Santiago de Chile if it so wished. The fact that the Uruguayan Government was willing to pay the additional expenses of a session held in its capital, as the Government of Cuba had already done on another occasion, established a good principle, since the temptation to encourage commissions to wander round the globe would be decreased, if host countries realized that they might have to meet the additional expenditure involved. So far, it was chiefly Latin American countries which had volunteered to meet such expenses. It must, of course, be understood that the Uruguayan Government was not obliged to meet such expenditure.

He suggested that the paragraph in question should end at the words "in 1950", and that the question of holding sessions elsewhere than at the headquarters should be dealt with in a separate paragraph of the resolution, since the Committee was dealing with a general principle and not merely with a specific case.

Mr. AMANRICH (France) said that in his view the Committee was not required to deal with the financial implications of the resolution before it. He would therefore support the amendment proposed by the representative of Chile, as modified by the United States representative. He could not, for similar reasons, accept the United Kingdom representative's proposal.

In addition, he considered that the Committee might note with satisfaction the fact that the Government of Uruguay had agreed to bear any supplementary expenses incurred by holding a session of the Economic Commission of Latin America at Montevideo.

Mr. OWEN, Assistant Secretary-General for Economic Affairs, explained that the decision on the original recommendation of the Economic Commission for Latin America that its session be held in the second half

of 1950 had been taken without due consideration for the necessity for the Commission to submit its report to the Summer session of the Council. He hoped the Committee would recommend a date sufficiently early in the year to permit that body to submit its report in time.

The Secretary-General was in consultation with the Government of Uruguay, which had agreed, in principle, and as a freewill offering, to defray the additional costs of holding the session in Montevideo. That offer of Uruguay, however, established no precedent. As a matter of fact, the additional expenditure involved might not exceed 4,000 to 5,000 dollars, owing to the economy in travel and other expenses which would be effected by holding the session of the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information almost immediately afterwards.

Miss SALT (United Kingdom) said that, in view of the fact that no additional expenditure would be involved, she would withdraw her amendment, at the same time expressing the appreciation of her Government of the generosity of the Government of Uruguay.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ (Chile) pointed out that the Economic Commission for Latin America had its own Secretariat which, in view of its work, was required to make frequent visits to the various South American countries, thus rendering inapplicable in the present instance, the Brazilian representative's earlier remarks concerning "globe-trotting" on the part of the United Nations Secretariat. It should also be made quite clear that no additional movement of staff was involved, as claimed by the Assistant Secretary-General, Mr. Owen, since those sessions would require the assistance of no more than one or two senior officials of the United Nations Secretariat.

Furthermore, he saw no reason to alter the date of the session of the Commission, since, according to Document E/1464, the Secretary-General anticipated that almost all the documentation would be completed in time, including the Survey on Latin America. The essential thing was that the Commission should meet before the summer session of the Council in order to enable that organ to receive the Commission's report and examine its work with due care.

Referring, in conclusion, to the various interpretations which appeared to exist regarding the final passage of paragraph 4 of Document E/AC.24/W.28, he was convinced, although he could not regard himself as an English expert, that they implied an obligation.

Mr. BORISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether the fourth paragraph as amended was to be interpreted as meaning that host countries in general were to defray any additional expense involved in arranging session of the Economic Commission for Latin America away from Santiago de Chile.

The CHAIRMAN replied that the amendment, if adopted by the Committee, would be made in the knowledge that a host country had offered to defray any additional expenditure in the specific case at issue.

Mr. SEN (India) considered that the Committee should put nothing on record that might suggest approval of the principle of balancing budgets by the voluntary contributions of host governments. He was sceptical of the desirability of accepting that practice as a general principle, since it would make it almost impossible for organs to refuse offers of hospitality, and was, in addition, contrary to the spirit of the rule that sessions should be held whenever possible at Headquarters.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ (Chile) said that the Government of Uruguay had agreed in principle to defray the additional expense, but had not yet given its final consent, as might have been understood from the remarks of the Assistant Secretary-General for Economic Affairs.

The Committee unanimously decided to recommend to the Economic and Social Council that the third session of the Economic Commission for Latin America commence on 29 May 1950.

The Committee decided by 11 votes to 0 with 3 abstentions to delete the sections of the fourth paragraph of the draft resolution in Document E/AC.24/W.22, following the words "hold one session in 1950".

Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press.

Mr. DANNEBERG (Denmark) recalled that the last session of the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press had failed to deal with questions of substance after a prolonged discussion on procedure. He therefore proposed that the fourth session of the Sub-Commission be held in mid-January 1950, so that any decisions it

might come to could be implemented in the course of the coming year.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out the complications which such a change would involve, and stated that it would, in particular, necessitate a revision of the estimated financial implications, if the session were to be held in Montevideo.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ (Chile) was unable to accept the Danish representative's proposal. It would be difficult at that stage to alter the dates fixed for the bodies which were to hold their sessions at Montevideo, since the Secretary-General had already held consultations with the Government of Uruguay and since, as Document E/1464 indicated, an agreement in principle had already been reached. A change of programme might have serious financial repercussions, and he therefore considered it preferable to adhere to the dates fixed.

Mr. HYDE (United States of America) was of the opinion that the date of a session could not be made dependent on the fact that a country had issued an invitation for it to be held on its territory. It was essential to avoid further delay in the work of the Sub-Commission, and, in the absence of any other proposal, he supported the proposal submitted by the representative of Denmark.

Mr. AMANRICH (France) agreed that in view of the fact that certain preparations had already been made, it appeared difficult to alter the dates. If, however, there was no risk of the session of the Economic Commission for Latin America lasting longer than the period anticipated, would it not be desirable to advance the date of the session of the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press by one week?

The CHAIRMAN recommended adjournment of a decision on account of the absence of any statement on its financial implications.

Mr. HYDE (United States of America) while signifying his agreement in principle, reserved the right of his delegation to introduce an amendment to the draft resolution referring to the general principle of holding sessions at headquarters.

Mr. YATES, Secretary to the Council, explained in reply to an enquiry from the Indian representative, that a date in October had been recommended for the fifth session of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East to meet the requirements of that body since it did not seem that the work programme of the Commission would allow of a satisfactory session before that date.

The Committee unanimously decided to recommend to the Economic and Social Council that the session dates appearing in Document E/1464, pages 6 and 7, other than those on which specific decisions had already been taken, or had been deferred, be adopted in principle.

The meeting rose at 6.45 p.m.
