

ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCILCONSEIL
ECONOMIQUE
ET SOCIALE/AC.6/SR.39
25 August 1948

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Dual Distribution for Council MembersECONOMIC COMMITTEESUMMARY RECORD OF THE THIRTY-NINTH MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Wednesday, 25 August 1948, at 10.15 a.m.

Contents:Pages

- | | | |
|----|--|--------|
| 1. | REPORT OF THE SECOND SESSION OF THE
TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
(Item 12 of the Council Agenda)
(Continued) | 3 - 7 |
| 2. | REPORT OF THE UNIVERSAL POSTAL
UNION (Item 27 of the Council Agenda) | 7 - 11 |

N.B. Will delegates wishing to have corrections made to the Summary Record please submit such corrections in writing to the Secretariat, Room C.436, within 24 hours of distribution of the Summary Record.

RECEIVED

10 SEP 1948

UNITED NATIONS
ARCHIVES

11 P.

Present:

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile)
Australia	Mr. WALKER
Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic	Mr. SMOLIAR
Canada	Mr. HALSTEAD
China	Mr. HSIAO
Denmark	Mr. IVERSEN
France	Mr. CLERMONT-TONNERRE
Netherlands	Mr. RIEMENS
New Zealand	Miss HAMPTON
Peru	Mr. MACKEHENIE
Turkey	Mr. SARPER
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. MOROZOV
United Kingdom	Mr. WARNER
United States of America	Mr. COPPOCK
Venezuela	Mr. CORIAT

Representatives of Specialized Agencies:

Universal Postal Union	Mr. RADICE
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development	Mr. LOPEZ-HERRANTE

Secretariat:

Mr. Lukac	Director, Division of Transport and Communications.
Mr. Dumontet	Secretary of the Committee.

1. CONTINUATION OF DISCUSSION ON THE REPORT ON THE SECOND SESSION OF THE TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION. (Parts of the Report left by the Economic Committee for later consideration: Draft Resolution No.9 in Document E/789) (Item 12 of the Council Agenda) (Documents E/789 and E/AC.6/W.32).

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)

stated that both the amendments which he had informally submitted at the preceding meeting were now embodied in document E/AC.6/W.32, the second amendment appearing in the last sentence of the text of that document:

"Give data concerning the increase or decrease of the amount of foreign investments in transport and communications of the trust territories for the last five years."

The CHAIRMAN agreed that document E/AC.6/W.32 combined the two amendments which the USSR delegation had submitted verbally on the preceding day. He pointed out that the words "On page 19" in the first line should read "On page 27".

Mr. COPPOCK (United States of America) stated that it was difficult to revise a statistical questionnaire without carefully considering all the factors involved. The first idea in the USSR amendment, that is, who owned and operated the means of transport and communications, was also in the existing text, but the second idea, namely, which countries owned the ships employed in the foreign trade of the trust territories, seemed to him obscure. Generally speaking, countries as such did not own ships. If the question was intended to refer to the flag of shipping concerned, it should appear in the questionnaire in connection with tonnages of goods rather than in the paragraph under discussion.

The matter of government subsidies which figured in the USSR amendment was also in the existing text.

With regard to the second amendment relating to data concerning the increase or decrease of the amount of foreign investments, he considered the wording of the amendment even less specific than the text proposed by the Transport and Communications Commission. The amendment, which was itself ambiguous, did nothing to repair the slight ambiguity in the original text, to which the attention of the Trusteeship Council might be drawn. Substantively, the United States delegation had no objections to the amendments, though it could not agree that they helped in any way to clarify the issue. He suggested that the best procedure would be for the record of the discussion in Committee to be transmitted to the Trusteeship Council, and that the Committee make no change to the text of the amendments to the questionnaire proposed in document E/789.

Mr. WARNER (United Kingdom), while maintaining that the existing text would in due course yield all the information desired by the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and that the amendments submitted by the latter would not result in any fuller statistics, stated that his delegation had no substantive objections to the first amendment.

With regard to the second amendment he maintained his position that the point was fully covered by the text of the Report.

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) emphasized that his amendment was designed to ensure full information on ships servicing foreign trade with the trust

territories. The information should not be given globally, but should separate the figures for internal and foreign commerce.

With regard to his second amendment, he would not insist if representatives had serious objections to changing the text. He believed that his amendment did clarify the question and would be of assistance to the Transport and Communications Commission.

Answering the Chairman, he added that though he had not formally withdrawn his second amendment, he would not press it.

Mr. HALSTEAD (Canada) did not consider that the first amendment added any point of substance to the questionnaire, and in regard to the second, he agreed with those representatives who had argued that the existing wording was more precise and more to the purpose. He recalled that the questionnaire had been drawn up by experts, and supported the proposal of the representative of the United States to maintain the original wording and to transmit the discussions of the Committee to the Trusteeship Council, which might in due course take such action as it saw fit.

Mr. SMOLIAR (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) recapitulated the distinction between shipping in internal and foreign commerce, and once more emphasized that the first amendment submitted by the Soviet delegation stressed the aspect of foreign trade.

Mr. WALKER (Australia) believed that the records of the discussion in the Committee would indicate to the Trusteeship Council the Committee's recognition of the importance of shipping engaging in the foreign trade of the trust territories. He endorsed the proposals made by the representatives of the United States and Canada.

Mr. WARNER (United Kingdom) with reference to the first amendment pointed out that it was difficult to show in statistical form the distinction between the flag of a vessel and its ownership.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that in view of the discussion which had taken place, the two parts of the USSR amendment should be voted separately. This was agreed.

The amendment submitted by the Soviet delegation and reading as follows:

"Give details as to who owns and operates the means of transport and communications, and, in particular, as to which countries own the ships employed in the foreign trade of the trust territories, as well as the amount of Government subsidies to each particular form of transport and communications";

was put to the vote and rejected by 4 votes to 2, with 8 abstentions.

The second amendment reading as follows:

"Give data concerning the increase or decrease of the amount of foreign investments in transport and communications of the trust territories for the last five years"

was put to the vote and rejected by 9 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had now to adopt a resolution relating to the report of the Transport and Communications Commission, and pointed out that the Social Committee had adopted the following text with regard to the report of the Population Commission, a precedent that might well be followed; "the Committee agreed on 15 August 1948 to recommend to the Council to transmit to

the Trusteeship Council the passage from the report of the second session of the Transport and Communications Commission relating to the provisional questionnaire of the Trusteeship Council." The Committee might add a sentence instructing the Secretary-General to transmit to the Trusteeship Council the summary records of the meetings at which the report had been discussed.

There being no objections, the CHAIRMAN declared the resolution adopted by the Committee.

2. REPORT OF THE UNIVERSAL POSTAL UNION (Item 27 of the Council Agenda) (Documents E/811, E/977)

On the invitation of the CHAIRMAN, Mr. R. DICE, representative of the Universal Postal Union, took his place at the Committee table.

The CHAIRMAN requested the Committee to note that in virtue of Article 2 of the Agreement between the United Nations and the Universal Postal Union, the representative of the Universal Postal Union had the right to be present at the meetings of the Economic and Social Council when matters relative to the Union were under consideration. The representative had the right to take part in discussions, but no right to vote.

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) drew attention to page 2 of the Report (document E/811), which stated that all countries members of the Union were represented at the Postal Congress held in Paris in 1947, except Costa Rica, Spain and the Spanish Colonies. He inferred from the above statement that Spain was a member of the Union but was not represented at the Congress.

Further, in the list of members of the Universal Postal Union at the end of 1947 (page 25 of document E/811)

Spain and her Colonies appeared to be included as members. The question of membership apart, he asked whether there were any other links, direct or indirect, between the Universal Postal Union and Franco Spain.

Mr. R. DICE (Universal Postal Union) stated that in consequence of the General Assembly Resolution of the United Nations, dated 12 December, 1946, the Postal Congress held in Paris in 1947 passed a resolution suspending Franco Spain from membership of the Union. Spain was not expelled, so that as soon as certain changes took place in the Government of Spain, that country would be able to resume its membership. As long as the above resolution remained in force, Franco Spain would derive no benefits from the Universal Postal Union. That fact was stated in the Final Protocol of the Convention by which the affairs of the Union were ruled and regulated.

In accordance with the Final Protocol, the Universal Postal Union had the power to make certain exceptions which were embodied in that Protocol. Such exceptions had to be approved by the Postal Congress as a whole. The lists referred to by the representative of the Soviet Union applied to the year 1947. Spain was included in the list, since as soon as the existing obstacles to full membership were removed, that country would return to full membership. It indicated that certain territories not members of the Universal Postal Union could be represented by other members.

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) was not satisfied with the answer given. Although Spain did not have full rights, it evidently had subsidiary rights. The Resolution of the General Assembly deprecated any relationship between the specialized agencies and Franco Spain. He requested the representative of the Universal Postal Union to give further details.

Mr. RADICE (Universal Postal Union) reaffirmed that there were no relations between Franco Spain and the Universal Postal Union. Administrative documents were circulated to all postal administrations, including the Spanish; those documents were purely technical postal papers. No documents on international relations outside postal technical information were circulated to Franco Spain. He referred once more to the final Protocol of the Convention. That decision was now in force since the Paris Convention had come into force on July 1, 1948.

Mr. COPPOCK (United States of America) had not noticed any reference to the Final Protocol in the text of the Report (Document E/811). The statement of the representative of the Universal Postal Union had clarified the situation; he therefore ventured to suggest that the Secretariat or the Universal Postal Union circulate a document quoting the Protocol and describing the exact position.

Mr. RADICE (Universal Postal Union) drew attention to the fact that the report before the Committee emanated from the International Bureau of the Universal Postal Union and was an internal business report. All documents relating to the Universal Postal Congress held in Paris in 1947 had been communicated to all countries and to all postal administrations which no doubt had communicated the relevant parts to their Ministers for Foreign Affairs. A supplementary document to E/811 was therefore in his opinion not necessary.

It was the first time that that report had been submitted to the Economic and Social Council and as procedure became more familiar minor doubtful points would be cleared up.

Mr. COPPOCK (United States of America) was satisfied with the explanation given.

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring to the statement that the Universal Postal Union circulated technical documents to all countries, including Spain, stated that there might be different points of view as to what was technical and to what was not. Were there any documents from which representatives could get definite information with regard to those technical operations and the postal links between the Universal Postal Union and Franco Spain?

Mr. RADICE (Universal Postal Union) stated that the documents referred to were purely administrative and were mostly simply notices received from various postal administrations as to their services. They referred to such matters as changes in Postmasters-General, changes in air-mail and postal packet rates. Such notices were sent to the International Bureau which circulated them to all postal administrations. The International Bureau thus fulfilled the function devolving upon it in accordance with paragraph 2 of Article 26 of the Convention. Only ordinary postal transactions were involved.

Mr. LUKAC (Secretariat) read the text of Article 26, paragraph 2, relating to the duties of the International Bureau of the Universal Postal Union.

The CHAIRMAN referred to the statement made by him at the preceding meeting with regard to the two types of

resolution, either of which the Committee could adopt with reference to the report of the International Postal Union.

Mr. CORIAT (Venezuela) proposed that the formula adopted in connection with the report of the International Telecommunication Union be employed again.

The CHAIRMAN, speaking as Chilean representative, said that his delegation had noted with satisfaction the work of the Universal Postal Union as recorded in the report submitted to the Council.

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) reserved the right to state the attitude of the Soviet delegation on the matter in the plenary meeting of the Economic and Social Council in the light of the information given at the present meeting by the representative of the Universal Postal Union. He would abstain from voting on the resolution.

The CHAIRMAN ruled that the Committee would vote on a resolution Taking Note of the Report of the Universal Postal Union and, in the event of its adoption, Recording the reservation made by the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The resolution was put to the vote and adopted by 13 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN, having expressed his thanks to the representative of the Universal Postal Union, Miss HAMPTON (New Zealand) moved a vote of thanks, seconded by Mr. HALSTRAD (Canada), to the Chairman for his skilful guidance of the work of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN thanked the New Zealand and Canadian representatives for their kind remarks and said how much he too had appreciated the spirit of co-operation displayed within the Committee. He now declared its proceedings closed.

The meeting rose at 11.15 a.m.