

UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS



ELEVENTH SESSION, 399th
MEETING
WEDNESDAY, 2 AUGUST 1950, AT 10.30 A.M.
PALAIS DES NATIONS, GENEVA

CONTENTS

	Page		Page
Assistance for the civil population of Korea: communication from the Secretary-General (E/1807)	213	Interim Co-ordinating Committee for International Commodity Arrangements: <i>Review of international commodity problems, 1949</i> : report of the Economic Committee (E/1774)	218
Refugees and stateless persons: report of the <i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee on Statelessness: first report of the Social Committee (E/1806)	213		

President: Mr. Hernán SANTA CRUZ (Chile).

Present: Representatives of the following countries:

Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Denmark, France, India, Iran, Mexico, Pakistan, Peru, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Representatives of the following specialized agencies:

International Labour Organisation, Food and Agriculture Organization, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

Assistance for the civil population of Korea: communication from the Secretary-General (E/1807)

1. The PRESIDENT read a cable which he had received from the Secretary-General of the United Nations communicating to the Economic and Social Council a resolution on assistance for the civil population of Korea which had been adopted at the 479th meeting of the Security Council (E/1807).

2. He pointed out that the resolution adopted by the Security Council meant that that body rightly felt that the United Nations, which had intervened in accordance with the provisions of the Charter in the question of the aggression committed in Korea, should also assist, by all the means at its disposal, the Korean people who were undergoing great sufferings as a result of that aggression.

3. In accordance with Article 65 of the Charter, the Security Council was asking the Economic and Social Council to provide such assistance as the Unified Command might request for the relief and support of the civilian population of Korea. That was a task which came within the duties and powers which Chapters IX and X of the United Nations Charter assigned to the Economic and Social Council. He believed that he would be interpreting the unanimous opinion of the Council in stating its gratification at the request made by the Security Council and its readiness to assume the responsibilities placed upon it. There was, however, the ques-

tion how the Economic and Social Council should carry out the responsibilities entrusted to it by the Security Council. That question, and the machinery to be used, would have to be studied carefully and a decision reached by each of the governments represented on the Economic and Social Council.

4. He therefore proposed that a new item: " Assistance for the civil population of Korea ", should be placed immediately on the agenda of the eleventh session of the Council, so that it might be dealt with in the near future when delegations had received instructions from their governments.

5. As President of the Economic and Social Council he hoped that in addition to a decision on the way in which the assistance requested by the Security Council should be given, the Council would adopt a resolution on the long-range economic and social problems of the Korean people. He did not think that it would be difficult to make arrangements which, without infringing the powers, duties and responsibilities of the Unified Command of the United Nations and of the Security Council, would enable the Economic and Social Council to be ready, as soon as the operations undertaken to put an end to the aggression in Korea were terminated, to fulfil its specific functions of promoting social, economic and humanitarian progress in a region which had suffered a real catastrophe.

6. If there were no objections to his proposal, the question: " Assistance for the civil population of Korea ", would be included in the agenda of the eleventh session of the Economic and Social Council, as supplementary item No. 2.

It was so decided.

Refugees and stateless persons: report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Statelessness: first report of the Social Committee (E/1806)

7. The PRESIDENT drew the attention of the members of the Council to the first report of the Social Committee

on the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Statelessness (E/1806), and, in the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Delhousse, called upon the Vice-Chairman of the Social Committee to introduce that report.

8. Mr. DAVIDSON (Canada), Vice-Chairman of the Social Committee, said that the first report of the Social Committee was self-explanatory. The Social Committee had examined at its 157th meeting a draft resolution submitted by the United States delegation (E/L.79) which involved the reconvening of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Statelessness. The Social Committee had felt that, even before it had completed its consideration of the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, it was of the utmost importance that a recommendation for the reconvening of the *Ad Hoc* Committee should be transmitted to a plenary meeting of the Council at the earliest possible moment, and it was for that reason that the first report on item 32 (b) of the agenda had been submitted.

9. He drew attention to the specific recommendations in the Social Committee's report on which the Council had been asked to pronounce. Those recommendations were:

"(1) That the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, including the draft international agreements contained therein, be transmitted to the General Assembly for consideration at its fifth session.

"(2) That the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Statelessness and Related Problems be reconvened in Geneva on . . . to review the draft international agreements contained in the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee in the light of comments of governments and the discussion and decisions of the Council at its eleventh session."

10. He pointed out that the Social Committee had taken its decision that the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee with the draft international agreements should be sent to the General Assembly after considering the alternative possibility of convening a diplomatic conference. The majority of the Social Committee had been in favour of transmitting the report direct to the General Assembly after it had been reconsidered by the *Ad Hoc* Committee.

11. Mr. POWERS (Secretariat) said that he wished to correct an impression given in the estimate of financial implications submitted by the Secretary-General (E/L.79/Add.1) that the subsistence allowance of members of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Statelessness would be paid by the Secretariat. The information given in that document, and in the statement made by the Secretariat representative in the Social Committee, had been based upon information received by cable. That information had since been corrected, and, as soon as it was clear what the actual cost of reconvening the *Ad Hoc* Committee in Geneva would be, a revised document would be issued. Although the subsistence allowance of members of the Committee would not be reimbursed, their travelling expenses would be paid in accordance with General Assembly resolution 231 (III). Before issuing a final statement, however, he wished to check the precedents which the General

Assembly had in mind when it approved paragraph 2 (b) of appendix A to General Assembly Resolution 231 (III).

12. Referring to document E/L.79/Add.1, he said that the statement that the total cost of holding a meeting of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Statelessness in Geneva would amount to 16,040 dollars was inaccurate, and that the total should be reduced by 3,640 dollars. The maximum expenditure for the meeting would therefore amount to 12,400 dollars. He regretted that the Council had been misinformed and at the first available opportunity steps would be taken to issue a revised statement.

13. Mr. FEARNLEY (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had consulted its Government again on the question before the Council. The United Kingdom Government was still not satisfied with the proposals put forward in the Social Committee. He asked whether the Secretariat could furnish more detailed information as to why it would not be possible for the *Ad Hoc* Committee to meet a little later in the year at Lake Success. The only information available from Lake Success when the Social Committee had discussed the question was that it would be impossible to hold the meeting there, but no supporting evidence had been given.

14. Mr. EVANS (Secretariat) said that a cable had been received from Lake Success giving the reasons why it would not be possible to hold a session of the *Ad Hoc* Committee at Headquarters. The cable assumed that the *Ad Hoc* Committee would meet during the second half of August, and stated that at that time a large proportion of Headquarters conference staff would be on home leave in Europe, and it would not be possible to get them back to Lake Success before the beginning of the General Assembly in September. The staff at Headquarters were fully occupied with meetings which were taking place and which would continue during the period in question, and also by the heavy volume of work entailed in preparing documentation for the General Assembly.

15. Mr. FEARNLEY (United Kingdom) thanked the representative of the Secretary-General for his explanation. He wished to make it clear that the United Kingdom delegation in no way wished to prejudice the meeting of the *Ad Hoc* Committee which, in its opinion, might prove a satisfactory way of giving a final revision to the draft convention relating to the status of refugees before it was submitted to the General Assembly. At the same time, his delegation was far from convinced that a rapid convening of the *Ad Hoc* Committee would lead to a satisfactory consideration of the various texts and comments submitted. The Council might not take a final decision on the draft convention before the middle of the following week, at the earliest, and that would be only a few days before the *Ad Hoc* Committee was expected to meet, according to the suggestions made in the Social Committee. There was a great danger that if the *Ad Hoc* Committee was convened at such an early date a number of officials who had represented their governments at the first session of that Committee would not be able to attend. Governments might find themselves in the position of not being able to send their

experts to attend the meetings, and that fact might affect the quality of the work of the *Ad Hoc* Committee.

16. He wondered whether, as the Secretary-General considered it impossible to hold the meeting at Lake Success, the session in Geneva could not be postponed, and arrangements made with the secretariat of the International Refugee Organization to service the meetings. That might help to obviate the two dangers which he saw in convening the *Ad Hoc* Committee for 14 August. He suggested, therefore, that the meeting might be called either at the end of August or early in September. He did not in any way wish to delay or seem to obstruct action on the question, however, and if neither the Council nor the Secretary-General felt able to support his suggestion, he would only say that his Government would not be able to support the convening of the *Ad Hoc* Committee for 14 August, and might find itself in the position—if the *Ad Hoc* Committee were convened for that date—of being unable to send the same representative who had attended the first session of the Committee. That might also be true of other countries represented on the *Ad Hoc* Committee, and it was for that reason that he hoped that the Council would be able to find some more satisfactory solution to the problem.

17. Mr. ROCHEFORT (France) said that if the *Ad Hoc* Committee were to meet on 14 August, it would make matters rather difficult for his delegation, since the French expert could not arrive in Geneva before the 16 or 17 August. However, should the Council decide that the *Ad Hoc* Committee was to meet on 14 August, a member of the permanent French delegation would attend the first few meetings.

18. With regard to the constitution of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, he would remind the Council that the French delegation, at the 156th meeting of the Social Committee, had proposed that certain governments which had not hitherto taken part should be represented on the *Ad Hoc* Committee, and had suggested in particular that States which were not members of the United Nations but had been invited to submit their comments on the draft convention should be given the opportunity of sending observers. The States in question were Austria and Italy, whose representatives should be invited to make oral statements if they so desired.

19. He would also like to propose that the *Ad Hoc* Committee should resume its correct title, which was "*Ad Hoc* Committee on Refugees and Stateless Persons", in view of the fact that that title corresponded more closely to its functions than the existing one.

20. Finally, since Press release No. 266, published on 31 July, had not given an accurate account of the attitude taken by the French delegation, he would like, once again, to state what that attitude was. At the 156th meeting of the Social Committee, the French delegation had declared itself in favour of referring the draft convention and protocol first to the *Ad Hoc* Committee and then to the General Assembly, since it considered that so serious a question should receive the sanction of the supreme organ of the United Nations. It did not, however, insist on that procedure being adopted at any price, and would be prepared, if necessary,

to agree to a settlement of the question of those instruments by means of diplomatic conferences.

21. He also recalled the fact that the French delegation had persuaded the Social Committee, at its 158th meeting, to recommend that the Council should consider two questions of importance—namely, the definition of the term "refugee" and the preamble to the draft convention. Document E/1806, however, did not contain those two points, which had originally appeared in the United States proposal.

22. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said his delegation appreciated the difficulties mentioned by the United Kingdom representative regarding the date for convening the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Statelessness. He felt, however, that those difficulties should be faced. If the Committee met late, as suggested by the United Kingdom representative, it would mean that those members of the Committee who were already in Geneva would have to waste two or three weeks of their time. It would also mean that the Committee would not be able to finish its work before the opening of the General Assembly, and therefore various governments taking part in the General Assembly would not have an opportunity of studying the final results of the Committee's work before the opening of the General Assembly. For those reasons, the United States Government favoured an earlier date for the convening of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, and would be willing to vote for 14 August.

23. As regards some of the issues raised by the French representative, the United States Government felt that the Council should not go back on resolution 248 B (IX), adopted by the Economic and Social Council on 8 August 1949, when the composition of the *Ad Hoc* Committee had been decided. The members had learned to work together and were to be asked to do a rapid piece of work for the Council—namely, to review their own work within a short period. If new members were added at the present stage it would be difficult for the Committee to work smoothly. If any governments wished to send observers to the meetings of the *Ad Hoc* Committee at their own expense there was nothing to prevent them from doing so.

24. His delegation was not concerned about the name of the Committee. The principal thing was that it should do the work assigned to it.

25. Regarding the final suggestion made by the French representative that reference to the definition of the term "refugee" should be added to the Council's decision of principle, he pointed out that the United States draft resolution (E/L.79) was still before the Council.

26. Mr. FEARNLEY (United Kingdom) said he wished to raise two minor points in the light of the remarks of the United States representative. He did not think that a delay of two weeks would make any difference from the standpoint of the General Assembly's work. The question would have to be studied afresh by governments, but since the General Assembly usually met for three months it would be quite possible for governments, even if they received the revised text late in September, to give it appropriate consideration in time for discussion at a later stage in the Assembly.

27. A secondary reason for his delegation's wish that the *Ad Hoc* Committee should be convened later was to give governments more time to send in comments on the draft convention. He mentioned, in that connexion, that a member of the Social Committee had reserved his government's right to submit comments, and it might well be that other governments might also wish to do so. It was on the basis of such comments that much of the work of the *Ad Hoc* Committee would be done, since it was clearly its aim to draw up a draft convention which would take into account the various geographical, political and social conditions prevailing among the various Member States of the United Nations. Should the Council agree to the postponement of the *Ad Hoc* Committee for two weeks, he would suggest that the Secretary-General should be instructed to ask those Member States which had not already submitted comments to do so immediately.

28. Mr. BROHI (Pakistan) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on the question before the Council when it had been discussed by the Social Committee, but he would have to vote against the proposals before the plenary meeting.

29. His Government could not accept the definition of the term "refugee" as given in the draft convention. That definition covered European refugees only and completely ignored refugees from other parts of the world. He recalled the fact that, at the 258th meeting of the Third Committee of the fourth session of the General Assembly, the Pakistan representative had pleaded—in the event, in vain—that the term "refugee" should also include refugees from areas other than Europe. At the 260th meeting, an assurance had been given by the United States representative, among others, that the *Ad Hoc* Committee would study that problem and, if conditions permitted, would extend the definition to include categories of refugees other than those included in the present definition. No attempt had, however, been made by the *Ad Hoc* Committee to extend the scope of the definition of the term "refugees" in order to include refugees from other parts of the world.

30. The Pakistan delegation was of the opinion that the problem of refugees was not a European problem only, and thought, therefore, that the definition of the term "refugee" should cover all those who might properly fall within the scope of that term. His delegation would therefore have to vote against any proposal which would further the work of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Statelessness.

31. Mr. DE ALBA (Mexico) said that in the Social Committee his delegation had voted for the United States proposals referred to in the first report of the Social Committee (E/1806).

32. Reviewing briefly the discussions in the Social Committee, he said the Mexican Government felt that it would be premature to have the *Ad Hoc* Committee reconsider the draft convention which it had prepared. If the United States representative did not maintain his proposal that the *Ad Hoc* Committee should be convened immediately, he felt that most members of the Council would agree that the draft convention and

the comments thereon made by governments should be submitted direct to the General Assembly.

33. He could not agree with the French representative's suggestion that certain governments should be asked to send observers to the meetings of the *Ad Hoc* Committee.

34. Mr. ROCHEFORT (France) said he was prepared to accept the meeting date proposed by the United States representative.

35. He would likewise not press his proposal to widen the membership of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, provided that the observations of the governments which had been invited to submit comments to the Secretary-General were heard by the Committee. The Committee would in fact have everything to gain from hearing the comments of those governments which, though not members of the United Nations, wished none the less to sign the convention.

36. With regard to the title of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, he wished to press for the change which he had suggested, especially in view of the fact that the refugees themselves protested against the present title.

37. The PRESIDENT reminded the members that there were two proposals before the Council. If any representative wished to amend those proposals, he would have to submit a formal amendment to that effect.

38. Mr. CHA (China) felt that the representative of France had raised an important point in suggesting that the name of the *Ad Hoc* Committee should be changed, as the title of the Committee did not convey the true meaning of the work it was to carry out. If the French representative did not wish to submit a formal motion that the name of the Committee should be changed, he would do so, and would propose that it should be known as the "*Ad Hoc* Committee on Refugees".

39. Mr. PENTEADO (Brazil) said his delegation supported the proposal that the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Statelessness should be convened in Geneva on 14 August 1950.

40. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that the Mexican representative's suggestion that the United States delegation should withdraw its proposal for the reconvening of the *Ad Hoc* Committee impelled him to speak again on the question. The really important part of the question was, he agreed, the transmission of the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee to the General Assembly, the reason for such transmission being the hope that the General Assembly would be able to complete its work on it and have a convention ready for signature before the end of its fifth session. The draft international agreements, however, required modification in the light of the comments of governments and the discussions and decisions of the Council, which could best be carried out by the *Ad Hoc* Committee. It would consequently be a mistake not to reconvene the Committee. To obtain further comments from governments, as the United Kingdom representative had suggested, would probably not be the best way to achieve further progress; it had to be remembered that governments

had already been asked to forward their observations by 1 May 1950, and it was doubtful whether another request for observations would achieve any concrete results. He accordingly adhered to his original opinion, and moved formally that the *Ad Hoc* Committee should be reconvened in Geneva on 14 August.

41. With reference to the suggestion that the title of the Committee was inadequate, he saw no objection to its being changed to the "*Ad Hoc* Committee on Refugees and Stateless People". It was to be noted that the Council resolution 248 B (IX) gave no title to the Committee.

42. Mr. FEARNLEY (United Kingdom) was anxious not to delay proceedings, but thought that his delegation could not propose an amendment to the United States proposal until it had received information concerning the possibility, to which it had referred earlier, of a meeting beginning on 28 August and using part of the secretariat of the International Refugee Organization. He therefore asked the representative of the United Nations Secretariat if such a suggestion was feasible.

43. Mr. EVANS (Secretariat) replying, at the invitation of the PRESIDENT, to the United Kingdom representative, said that the crux of the problem concerned the provision of simultaneous interpretation. The suggestion that deficiencies in staff should be made up by the secretariat of the International Refugee Organization had not been examined, but he thought it impracticable, as that organization had never had a conference organization of any size, nor, as far as he knew, had it ever used simultaneous interpretation. If the Council wished him, however, to explore the possibility of using the staff of IRO, that could easily be done.

44. As regards the availability of staff from Headquarters, the question had been referred to the Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Conference and General Services, and the reply received stated that it was impossible for simultaneous interpreters to remain in Geneva for a meeting starting as late as 28 August as they would be required at Headquarters. When the question of a meeting of the *Ad Hoc* Committee had first been referred to Lake Success, the Assistant Secretary-General had suggested that it should reconvene on 7 August, but when the difficulties of meeting at such an early date had become apparent and had been communicated to him, the Assistant Secretary-General had agreed to a meeting starting on 14 August and lasting approximately fourteen days. In the light of those instructions, therefore, it was unfortunately not possible to retain staff from Headquarters for a meeting beginning on 28 August.

45. Mr. FEARNLEY (United Kingdom) said that his delegation, in view of the statement made by the representative of the Secretary-General, did not wish to amend the United States representative's proposal, but regretted its inability to support the proposal, as it did not regard the recovering of the Committee on 14 August to review the draft international agreement as an effective way of carrying out the work to be done. He would accordingly abstain from voting on the United States

representative's proposal, and would reserve his Government's position regarding attendance at the meeting.

46. He asked that the two proposals in document E/1806 should be voted on separately, as his delegation proposed to vote against the transmission of the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee to the General Assembly, on the ground that the question would more properly be dealt with by a diplomatic conference.

47. Mr. ROCHEFORT (France) thought he could dispense with the formality of proposing an amendment with regard to the title of the *Ad Hoc* Committee.

48. On the other hand, he wished to submit to the Council an amendment to document E/1806 to the effect that representatives of States which had been invited by the Secretary-General to submit comments on the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee should, whether Members of the United Nations or not, be admitted as observers and be entitled to a hearing by the Committee.

49. The PRESIDENT said that the French representative's amendment could not be voted on until it had been put in writing and circulated to the members of the Council for consideration.

50. Mr. DE ALBA (Mexico), while agreeing with the PRESIDENT, saw no objection to the French representative's amendment. He suggested, therefore, that it should be referred to the Social Committee for consideration.

51. Mr. ROCHEFORT (France) accepted the method suggested by the representative of Mexico.

52. The PRESIDENT said that he would put to the vote separately the two recommendations contained in the first report of the Social Committee (E/1806). Before doing so, he suggested that the title of "*Ad Hoc* Committee on Statelessness and Related Problems", against which objection had been voiced, should be amended to "*Ad Hoc* Committee on Refugees and Stateless Persons".

It was so decided.

53. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the first recommendation of the Social Committee which read:

"(1) That the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, including the draft international agreements contained therein, be transmitted to the General Assembly for consideration at its fifth session."

The recommendation was adopted by 9 votes to 4, with 2 abstentions.

54. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the second recommendation of the Social Committee, as amended which read:

"(2) That the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Refugees and Stateless Persons be reconvened in Geneva on 14 August 1950 to review the draft international agreements contained in the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee in the light of comments of governments and the discussion and decisions of the Council at its eleventh session."

The recommendation was adopted by 12 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

Interim Co-ordinating Committee for International Commodity Arrangements: Review of international commodity problems, 1949: report of the Economic Committee (E/1774)

55. The PRESIDENT invited the Chairman of the Economic Committee to open the discussion on the draft resolution contained in the report of the Economic Committee (E/1774).

56. Sir Ramaswami MUDALIAR (India), Chairman of the Economic Committee, said that the Committee had considered the draft resolution proposed by the Interim Co-ordinating Committee for International Commodity Arrangements (E/1718), and had adopted in its stead the draft resolution contained in document E/1774. The Interim Co-ordinating Committee had suggested that the Council should authorize the Secretary-General to convene, on the advice of the Committee, commodity conferences from time to time when required. The Economic Committee, had, however, taken into consideration the following facts: only certain provisions of the Havana Charter had been adopted in principle; references had been made therein to certain procedures to be adopted before commodity conferences were convened; the Interim Co-ordinating Committee was an *ad hoc* body, not a body of government representatives. It had therefore proposed that the Secretary-General should be authorized by the Council to convene such conferences, on the advice of the Interim Co-ordinating Committee, pending consideration by the Council of his review of the whole position in the light of chapter VI of the Havana Charter and particularly his review of the procedures to be adopted before such commodity conferences were convened. In short, the Economic Committee proposed that the Interim Co-ordinating Committee should convene those conferences until such time as the Council had considered the matter further at its thirteenth session.

57. A further safeguard had been added to the effect that commodity conferences should be convened at the request of an appropriate inter-governmental study group. That interpolation was merely a matter of extra caution, for the Interim Co-ordinating Committee had indeed acted on such requests in the past; the Economic Committee, however, considered it desirable that a specific provision to that effect should be included. The main reason for the Economic Committee's decision that immediate authority should be given to the Interim Co-ordinating Committee was that it was urgent for the latter Committee to convene conferences without delay, but it also felt strongly that such authority should only be granted pending a full study by the Council of the question in the light of the report which the Secretary-General was to make.

58. Speaking as representative of India, he drew the attention of the Council to the last paragraph of the draft resolution. Chapter VI of the Havana Charter was the only chapter containing such principles which had been adopted by governments on the recommendation of the General Assembly. A great many procedural points were involved, and the checks and balances provided

necessitated careful scrutiny. His Government felt that those checks and balances might not operate under existing conditions. The International Trade Organization, when it came into existence, would have certain powers: power of correction, power to delay, power not to give effect to commodity conference agreements. Those powers were not provided for in the existing provisions for conferences to be convened under the authority of the Interim Co-ordinating Committee. His delegation had nothing against the study groups being formed at present under the Interim Co-ordinating Committee, but it felt that there was a real need to consider the establishment of a body which would examine the whole problem, in particular the question of the participation of new States which had not taken part in study groups in the pre-war period. He believed that certain checks and balances should be provided with regard to the convening of commodity conferences, and more particularly with regard to the drawing-up of commodity control agreements. There were provisions for such checks and balances in chapter VI of the Havana Charter, but he did not see any possibility of their being implemented, because of the existing constitutional structure of the Interim Co-ordinating Committee.

59. Finally, it was in a sense unfortunate that only one chapter of the Havana Charter had been accepted in principle by governments. It had been recommended for adoption in the hope that the International Trade Organization would come into existence within a short time, but, although there was some indication of such a possibility, he did not think that that organization would be in existence for at least another two years. The result was that other equally relevant provisions of the Charter had been ignored and were bound to be ignored, in particular the provisions relating directly to commodity agreements to be found in chapter VII, article 72 (d), which provided that the International Trade Organization should have the following function:

"In collaboration with the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations and with such inter-governmental organizations as may be appropriate, to undertake studies on the relationship between world prices of primary commodities and manufactured products, to consider and, where appropriate, to recommend international agreements on measures designed to reduce progressively any unwarranted disparity in these prices."

That was a provision of the utmost importance, complementing as it did the provisions relating to commodity control agreements and price agreements relating to primary products. So far, however, it had been left completely in the air.

60. All those matters required careful consideration by the Council before it approved the convening of commodity conferences and the results of such conferences. If the old arrangements were to continue, and governments were to convene commodity conferences, neither the United Nations, nor the Council, nor the Secretary-General would have any responsibility in the matter. But for the first time the structure of such commodity conferences, their objectives, the manner in which they were to be called, and the results of their deliberations,

had come within the purview of the United Nations. If the International Trade Organization had been in existence, much of the responsibility of the United Nations would have been removed, but, as it was not, it was a responsibility that the Council and the Secretary-General had to undertake, in order to have a complete picture of the position and to keep in mind the repercussions of commodity control agreements or commodity price agreements on the lives of the people producing primary commodities.

61. He hoped that in the study he was to make, the Secretary-General would pay attention to the suggestions he had put forward.

62. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the draft resolution recommended by the Economic Committee (E/1774).

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

The meeting rose at 12 noon.