



Tuesday, 27 February 1951, at 3 p.m.

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Trade-union rights: allegations regarding infringements of trade-union rights (E/1882, E/1882/Add.1 to 5, E/1922 and E/1922/Add.1) (<i>continued</i>)	67
Report of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs (fifth session): report of the Social Committee (E/1930)	71
Report of the Permanent Central Opium Board: report of the Social Committee (E/1931)	73

President: Mr. Hernán SANTA CRUZ (Chile).

Present: The representatives of the following countries:

Belgium, Canada, Chile, China, Czechoslovakia, France, India, Iran, Mexico, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

The representatives of the following specialized agencies:

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

Trade-union rights: allegations regarding infringements of trade-union rights (E/1882, E/1882/Add.1 to 5, E/1922 and E/1922/Add.1) (*continued*)

[Agenda item 14]

COMMUNICATIONS RELATING TO STATES MEMBERS
NEITHER OF THE UNITED NATIONS NOR OF THE
INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANISATION

1. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to go on to consider communications in the fourth category set out in the memorandum by the Secretary-General (E/L.142).

2. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) said his delegation strongly opposed the inclusion in the agenda of the communication from the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions relating to Romania (E/1882/Add.1). The purposes for which it had been addressed to the Secretary-General were incompatible with those which the discussion of such matters in the United Nations was intended to achieve. Its sole aim was to initiate a political campaign, inspired by the principles of United States foreign policy and its examination would in no way help to create the atmosphere of under-

standing and co-operation, which should govern the Council's work.

3. Mr. CORLEY SMITH (United Kingdom) did not share the Polish representative's view but wondered whether the Council should deal with matters affecting States which were members neither of the United Nations nor of the International Labour Organisation. Council resolution 277 (X) contained no specific provision to that effect and he doubted whether the Council was in fact competent to consider such communications.

4. Mr. WAGNER DE REYNA (Peru) recalled that his country had always drawn a very clear distinction between trade-union activities and political activities; it considered that the trade unions were departing from their proper functions whenever they became political organizations or tools used as such by those who did not wish to wage an overt struggle. The communication from the Union General de Trabajadores de España en el exilio (E/1882, section I) was a case in point. The organization was essentially a political organization of Spaniards in exile; and represented them alone; the stand it had taken in regard to the allegation submitted was evidence of its complete lack of impartiality.

5. That organization complained, in particular, that the statute of the National Mutual Aid Bank of Building and Public Works Workers required, *inter alia*, that "all producers affected by the National Labour Regulation for the building industry shall be compulsory beneficiary members". According to the UGTE, that provision amounted to the suppression of personal initiative and of the freedom of choice of workers in the building industry. The organization was thus complaining of compulsory social insurance, which had been recognized to be a valuable and beneficial institution for the workers.

6. The UGTE also complained that the internal regulations of a Spanish ship-building company penal-

ized offences such as "whistling, humming or singing..." by the loss of two days' pay. It was not difficult, however, to imagine circumstances in which such behaviour would be entirely out of place. At the 444th meeting the representative of Poland had said that the Council must be satisfied that communications had been submitted in good faith. In his opinion, that was not strictly true where the communication from the UGTE was concerned.

7. In its petition, that organization had requested the civilized world to recognize and declare that trade-union freedom did not exist in Spain and that, consequently, the Falangist dictatorship régime, which had disgraced the Spanish land, should be denounced as a danger to the freedom and life of Spaniards and as a constant threat to the peace between the free peoples. In his opinion, it was not within the competence of the Fact-Finding and Conciliation Commission to consider such a request. Moreover, Spain was not a member of the International Labour Organisation and the Commission could not carry out its task unless the Government of Spain enabled it to do so. The refusal of a State to admit an investigating body to its territory could not, however, be regarded as an admission of the validity of the charges against it. Such a presumption would be without foundation in international law.

8. The communication from the UGTE raised no issues which might be the subject of enquiry from a trade-union standpoint; the Council should therefore abstain from considering it, if it wished to remain within its competence.

9. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) was in full agreement with the representative of Poland; he strongly protested against the placing on the agenda of the communication relating to infringements of trade-union rights in Romania and wished his protest to be recorded in the report.

10. Mr. KORNEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that his delegation had always taken the view that the problem of infringements of trade-union rights should be considered as a whole. In any event, the Council should only consider genuine complaints, not those which contained unwarranted slanders. He associated himself with the Polish and Czechoslovak delegations in making a strong protest against the consideration of the communication relating to Romania.

11. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) found it surprising that the representative of a Member State should be defending the Spanish Government only four years after the fascist régime of Franco had been denounced. His delegation protested against the inclusion of the communication relating to Romania in the agenda, having regard to the fact that one of the purposes of the United Nations as set forth in the Charter was to promote international understanding and co-operation.

12. On the other hand, the allegation submitted by the UGTE was authentic; it was a complaint from a trade-union organization the members of which had been compelled to go into exile to escape a repressive poli-

tical régime and which was fighting for the same cause as had led to the creation of the United Nations. The Franco Government had been condemned long before — at the Potsdam and San Francisco Conferences, as well as in General Assembly resolution 39 (I) which had called upon the Spanish people to liberate themselves from the fascist régime. He therefore considered that the Council was in duty bound to give full consideration to the communication from the Union General de Trabajadores de España en el exilio.

13. Mr. WAGNER DE REYNA (Peru) wished to make it clear that he held no brief for Spain. He had simply wished to point out that the communication from the UGTE raised not trade-union but political issues and that the Council should for that reason abstain from considering it.

14. Baron VAN DER STRATEN-WAILLET (Belgium) felt that the Council must decide whether to adhere strictly to the procedure laid down in resolution 277 (X). In his delegation's opinion, the Council would be failing in its duty if it merely rejected communications relating to countries which were members neither of the United Nations nor of the International Labour Organisation, since it was called upon to deal with all cases of oppression of the workers. His delegation had therefore thought it appropriate to submit, jointly with the delegation of Sweden, a draft resolution (E/L.144) setting out a procedure to enable the governments of non-member States to defend themselves against allegations of infringements of trade-union rights in their territory, which any government desirous of safeguarding the rights of the workers would normally wish to do. Governments should, however, defend themselves by presenting facts and not by resorting to slanders, lies or insults.

15. After the remarks made by the representatives of Poland, Czechoslovakia and the USSR, it would, however, be difficult to give proper consideration to the communication relating to Romania. Since he felt that questions of the same nature should receive similar treatment, he was willing to accept the view expressed by the United Kingdom representative and simply to take note of the fourth group of communications.

16. Mr. SCHAULSOHN (Chile) did not consider that the competence of the United Nations and, in the case in point, of the Economic and Social Council, should be limited exclusively to matters relating to Member States. Article 55 c of the Charter contained provisions to that effect, and the United Nations had already dealt with matters affecting non-member States, such as allegations regarding infringements of human rights in Hungary, Romania and Bulgaria, as well as the question of Franco Spain. The universal character of the United Nations was generally recognized. That was what the Chilean delegation had had in mind in stating, at the time resolution 277 (X) was adopted, that the procedure laid down in that resolution should not detract from the Council's competence to deal with all matters affecting trade-union rights. His delegation was therefore of the opinion that the Council should consider communications regarding infringements of trade-union rights without distinguishing between the

States concerned and without regard to their political ideology.

17. Since, however, it seemed unlikely that a constructive solution could be found in the Council in every case, and since resolution 277 (X) did not expressly provide for cases affecting States which were members neither of the United Nations nor of the International Labour Organisation, the joint draft resolution of Belgium and Sweden provided an appropriate solution, proposing as it did a procedure for solving the problems raised by communications affecting such States. In his view, the proposal should not prevent the Council from undertaking a new examination of those communications; he could not agree with the United Kingdom representative that the Council was not competent in the matter.

18. Mr. CORLEY SMITH (United Kingdom) said that a number of political issues had been raised in the course of the discussion; he therefore wished to make it clear that his suggestion related solely to the question of procedure, its only purpose being to ensure that the same rule applied to all.

19. Mr. KIRPALANI (India) thought that no distinction should be drawn between countries on the basis of their political ideology. If the Council adhered to the procedure laid down in resolution 277 (X), there were ample grounds for the United Kingdom representative's misgivings. Moreover, if it was difficult to obtain the full co-operation of Member States, it would be even more difficult to obtain the co-operation of non-member States.

20. Mr. KEARNEY (Canada) thought that the Chilean representative's suggestion was a good one: it was in fact for the governments themselves to reply to the allegations made. The latter should be transmitted to them together with a request that they should indicate whether they were prepared to co-operate in any investigation to which the allegations might give rise or to transmit their reply to the competent body.

21. The PRESIDENT invited the representative of the World Federation of Trade Unions to speak on the question under discussion, if he wished to do so.

22. Mr. SAAD (World Federation of Trade Unions) wished to point out first that the communication of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (E/1882/Add.1) was similar in its attitude to other communications of that organization and that its purpose was to wage a slanderous campaign against the governments of peoples' democracies. The allegations made in that communication did not contain one concrete fact which proved that trade-union rights had been violated in Romania. The accusations were based on garbled quotations from the Labour Code taken out of their context so that the meaning of the text as a whole was completely distorted. It was quite easy to make accusations in that way. In its communication, the ICFTU had endeavoured to show that the decree No. 183 of 17 August 1950 concerning economic offences was a repressive measure aimed at the workers, whereas in reality its sole aim was to provide for their protection. The ICFTU put out such unjustified accusations in

order to divert attention from the real infringements of trade-union rights perpetrated in capitalist countries. He would not dwell on that communication any longer, for its allegations were unfounded and it was slanderous throughout.

23. He thought that the best form of refutation would be to give an account of the activities of the Romanian trade unions. The Labour Code promulgated on 30 May 1950 constituted a new and important victory for the Romanian people against its exploiters. The aim of the Code was to establish and maintain labour conditions for the workers in both public and private enterprises. It contained provisions which could be applied only in countries where the government was in the hands of the working class. Thus it laid down the principle of remuneration according to the amount and quality of the work; it provided also for paid holidays for the workers, for an eight-hour day, free medical attention, social insurance benefits, pregnancy and maternity allowances and numerous measures for the protection of women and children. For example, work for children under 14 years of age was prohibited and night work for children between 14 and 16 years of age, whose working day was limited to six hours. He could not see how such a code could be described as monstrous.

24. With regard to social insurance, it should be noted that since 1949 the operation of that service had been in the hands of the trade unions, which had made it possible to dispense with a cumbersome and costly bureaucracy. As a result the percentage of funds expended on the administration of the services was very small. If a worker was unable to work on account of illness or an accident, he received a considerable allowance from the very first day. During pregnancy women received an allowance equal to their complete salary for three months and to 50 per cent of their wages for nine months. A supplementary grant was paid to cover costs of milk and a layette and other infant needs. In 1950 the sums paid out under social insurance were twenty times as large as those paid out in 1938. That could hardly be described as a régime of oppression.

25. As regards workers' wages, it should be noted that the real wages were constantly increasing while the cost of products was decreasing. In April 1950 the most recent price reductions for certain foodstuffs were 20 per cent. The results of the improvement in the standard of living of the workers could be seen in all fields. Thus, the government had granted credits amounting to 5,500,000,000 leis for the building of peoples' dwellings. Seven holiday camps had been established in the Carpathians and another eighteen in other parts of the country, so that in 1950, 220,000 workers had been able to stay in them, either free of charge or for a moderate payment. The General Confederation of Labour of Romania was responsible for all those activities and the sums expended on them in 1950 had exceeded those for 1949 by 50 per cent and those expended previously by 250 per cent. Such progress could be achieved only in a country where the government was in the hands of the workers. Workers' welfare measures were improving day by day. For

example, in a Bucharest spinning-mill which employed 1,000 workers in 1945, 77 labour accidents had occurred in that year, whereas in the same factory in 1949 there had been only 27 labour accidents, though the enterprise had then employed 2,800 persons.

26. The achievements of Romania in the cultural field were the best answer to the slanderous accusations that the people were being kept in ignorance. In 1949 and 1950, 550,000 workers had attended courses as part of the drive against illiteracy. Their number had exceeded that for previous years by 30 per cent. The measures taken to raise the cultural level of Romanian workers had included the setting up of 6,200 libraries containing more than 5 million volumes and the establishment of so many clubs that soon each enterprise would have its own, as was the case in the USSR. The Romanian trade unions had 130 cinema halls for their own use and encouraged all artistic activities. That was the system which was being described as slavery. In actual fact it was only the expression of the struggle of the working class seeking to defend its rights.

27. Turning to the allegations regarding infringements of trade-union rights in Japan (E/1882, section V), he recalled that there had been two communications on that question, one from the WFTU and the other from the Confédération générale du travail of France. Trade-union leaders in Japan were being severely persecuted. The chief victims of the measures taken by the authorities were the miners and railway workers, who had been refused the right to strike. Those authorities were using every pretext to persecute the working class. Thus, after a train had been derailed at Mitaka, several workers had been subjected to severe penalties and one or them imprisoned. Similar measures had been taken after an accident which had occurred on 5 July 1950 to the president of a large railway company, though it had subsequently transpired that he had committed suicide.

28. General MacArthur had been responsible for numerous decrees which were in direct violation of trade-union rights. Among them were Government Order No. 201 of 31 July 1948 and the revised National Public Service Law adopted on 30 November 1948, both of which deprived public employees, numbering 1,200,000, of their rights to strike and bargain collectively; the law of 12 December 1948 regimenting work in public utility services, which severely limited the right to strike and other fundamental trade-union rights in such enterprises; and the decree of 12 August 1949, which made it possible for the government to control workers' mass organizations arbitrarily.

29. All those measures constituted acts of provocation directed against the working class at the moment when it was beginning to organize itself in its own defence. All those facts went to show that MacArthur's policy in Japan was aimed at destroying the democratic forces of that country and depriving them of their trade-union rights. That policy was incompatible with the principles framed at Potsdam, which provided for the guarantee of respect for human rights. It was a policy which had as its aim the re-establishment in Japan of the big trusts which would serve to prepare for aggression at the war which certain circles were instigating.

At the invitation of the President, Miss Sender, representative of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, took her seat at the Council table.

30. Miss SENDER (International Confederation of Free Trade Unions) wished to point out, in connexion with the statement made by the representative of the WFTU, that that organization had never adopted an impartial and objective attitude. On the contrary, it primarily had regard to the nature of the government of the country against which charges of infringing trade-union rights were made. In some cases it strongly attacked the allegations made, described them as slanderous and claimed that any request for an explanation would constitute an inadmissible interference in the domestic affairs of the State concerned. In other cases, it reacted entirely differently, both as regards the manner of submitting its own accusations and the treatment it claimed for them.

31. The ICFTU would be happy if the necessary investigations could be carried out in all the cases brought up, without distinction as regards government or political ideology. She considered for instance that the case submitted by her organization on the subject of Romania (E/1882/Add.1) was far better founded than any of the cases submitted by the WFTU, and was convinced that an investigation should be carried out. She was equally convinced that an investigation should be held as a result of the allegations regarding Spain made by the Union General de Trabajadores de España en el exilio (E/1882, section I), or as a result of any other allegation whatever its origin and aim.

32. In the case of the communication from the ICFTU on the subject of Romania, she could not see why, if the living conditions of the Romanian workers were as wonderful as the representative of the WFTU made out, Romania should not invite the Fact-Finding and Conciliation Commission to examine conditions for itself. As long as Romania and other countries in the same position failed to take that course, there would be grounds for serious doubts as to the accuracy of the statements of the WFTU.

33. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) noted that the WFTU representative had deemed it necessary once again to involve the United States of America in the allegations he had made against Japan. The United States delegation wished to recall that its Government was in no way responsible for labour matters in Japan. The question was essentially one for the Japanese Government and the Allied occupation authorities.

34. The discussion concerning States that were members neither of the United Nations nor of the International Labour Organisation should not be prolonged any further. The Council had before it a very reasonable draft resolution submitted by the Belgian and Swedish delegations (E/L.144), inviting the governments concerned to make use of the facilities offered to them.

35. The United States delegation would vote in favour of that draft resolution, if only because it considered that the three cases which had been raised, namely those

of Japan, Romania and Spain, should receive identical treatment.

36. Mr. KORNEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) wished to add some remarks to the WFTU representative's statement. Ever since the end of the war, Japan, for which the United States had assumed full responsibility in every sphere, had been the scene of a violent reactionary campaign against trade-union rights. Since 1945 General MacArthur, the Diet and the Japanese Government had issued laws and decrees considerably restricting trade-union rights, including the right to strike and collective bargaining.

37. Under Decree No. 201 of 31 July 1948, officials and workers of State enterprises who were accused of having participated in labour conflicts became liable to criminal prosecution. Penalties might range up to three years hard labour and a fine of 100,000 yens. The decree affected more than 1,600,000 persons.

38. Strikes in Japan were ruthlessly suppressed by the government and the United States occupation authorities. During a miners' strike in January and February of 1950, the police had searched trade-union premises and workers' dwellings, and had arrested eleven trade-union leaders. That example was unfortunately not an isolated one; the same was true of the metal, timber and other industries and of agriculture.

39. On 26 August 1950 the Ministry of Labour had announced that all labour agitation, such as protests against dismissals, would be considered a crime against the State and dealt with accordingly. The government and the United States occupation authorities were exerting increasingly ruthless pressure on the workers. On 5 September 1950 the Japanese military police in Tokyo had attacked unemployed persons who were demanding work. A few days later it had attacked strikers, wounding many of them, and had carried out 124 arrests. On 27 October 1950 the police had dispersed the workers of an electric-motor factory in Tokyo. On 30 August 1950 a decree issued by the judicial administration had dissolved the principal Japanese trade-union organization.

40. All those facts constituted so many infringements of trade-union rights. They were all the more flagrant and reprehensible in that they were at the same time violations of the decisions of the Far Eastern Commission on the maintenance of trade-union freedoms. The responsibility for such a state of affairs devolved entirely on the United States military command.

41. With regard to the accusation against Franco Spain, the USSR delegation considered that no proof was needed to establish that trade-union rights did not even exist in that country. Everyone knew that fascist régimes did not recognize or apply any of the democratic principles, particularly those concerning the condition of the working classes.

42. Mr. WAGNER DE REYNA (Peru) wished to draw attention once again to the political character of the communication from the Union General de Trabajadores de España en el exilio. In view of its nature, it might well be asked whether that allegation should be

examined by the Council on the same footing as those submitted by genuine trade-union organizations.

43. Since the Council had decided to act on that communication, the question should be dealt with in such a way as to deprive it of its purely political character. To ensure that the Spanish Government accepted the intervention of the Fact-Finding and Conciliation Commission on Freedom of Association, it should not be given the impression that the question was a political one, an impression which it would certainly gain from a personal of the communication of the UGTE.

44. Consequently, the Peruvian delegation would submit an amendment to paragraph 3 (a) of the Belgian and Swedish draft resolution (E/L.144) proposing the replacement of the words "the communication from the Union General de Trabajadores de España en el exilio (E/1882, section I)" by some such expression as "the fact that he has received allegations regarding infringements of trade-union rights in Spain".

45. The CHAIRMAN asked the representative of Peru to communicate the text of his amendment to the Secretariat so that it might be circulated and examined at the same time as the draft resolution submitted by Belgium and Sweden.

Mr. Saad and Miss Sender withdrew.

Report of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs (fifth session): report of the Social Committee (E/1930)

[Agenda item 18]

46. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the report of the Social Committee (E/1930).

47. The Social Committee had made three decisions, the first relating to the coca leaf, the second relating to the date, place and duration of the sixth session of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, and the third submitting to the Council four draft resolutions.

48. He proposed that the three decisions of the Social Committee should be considered in the order in which they had been presented.

It was so agreed.

PROBLEM OF THE COCA LEAF

The Social Committee's recommendation was approved.

DATE, PLACE AND DURATION OF THE SIXTH SESSION OF THE COMMISSION ON NARCOTIC DRUGS

49. At the request of Mr. BURINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), the PRESIDENT decided that draft resolution C should be considered at the same time as the date of the next session of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs.

DRAFT RESOLUTION C: INTERIM AGREEMENT TO LIMIT THE PRODUCTION OF OPIUM TO MEDICAL AND SCIENTIFIC NEEDS

50. Mr. BURINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he would like to explain his delegation's

position with regard to draft resolution C. The USSR delegation was opposed to the draft resolution, because it thought the interim agreement to limit the production of opium to medical and scientific needs was unnecessary, in view of the Council's decision calling upon the Commission on Narcotic Drugs to prepare a draft single convention on narcotic drugs which should include provisions for the regulation on the production of opium.

51. Consequently, the USSR delegation would vote against draft resolution C.

52. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States) proposed that a vote should be taken immediately on draft resolution C.

53. The PRESIDENT put draft resolution C to the vote.

The draft resolution was adopted by 14 votes to 3.

54. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said his delegation was entirely prepared to meet the request of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs that its next session should take place in April 1951, and not in August. He thought the date might be fixed at 10 April 1951.

55. With regard to the place of the session, the United States delegation did not think the Commission on Narcotic Drugs had put forward a strong enough case to justify the additional expenditure of 71,000 dollars which would be involved if the Commission met at Geneva.

56. The United States delegation therefore proposed that the sixth session of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs should take place at headquarters, beginning 10 April 1951.

57. Mr. TSAO (China) supported the United States representative's proposal.

The proposal was adopted by 12 votes to 4, with 1 abstention.

58. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the Secretariat's suggestion that the session should not last more than two months.

59. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) approved the suggestion, stressing the fact that two months should really be regarded as a maximum.

It was agreed that the maximum duration of the session should be two months.

DRAFT RESOLUTION A: REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON NARCOTIC DRUGS (FIFTH SESSION)

Draft resolution A was adopted.

60. Mr. BURINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) and Mr. BORATYNSKI (Poland) said they would have abstained if draft resolution A had been put to the vote.

DRAFT RESOLUTION B: SINGLE CONVENTION ON NARCOTIC DRUGS

61. Mr. WOLFROM (France) said he approved the Social Committee's report, but recalled that his

delegation would have liked the Council to go further and state explicitly its interest in the preparation of the single convention and the establishment of an international alkaloids monopoly. He also regretted that the Council had not appeared to be disposed to issue a warning without delay concerning the danger created by the development of synthetic drugs.

62. He made it clear that his government reserved the right to place the matter before the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, if it so desired.

Draft resolution B was adopted by 15 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

DRAFT RESOLUTION D: OFFER FOR SALE IN HONGKONG OF 500 TONS OF OPIUM AT PRESENT IN CHINA

63. Mr. TSAO (China) said he wished to explain the attitude of his delegation, which had abstained from voting on that item in the Social Committee. The resolution was somewhat vague. It did not explain that the offer had been made by the communist authorities and not by the Government of China. It also seemed to raise the question whether China was continuing to prohibit the cultivation of opium. The fact was, however, that the Government of China had prohibited such cultivation as early as 1934, and any infringement of that prohibition must be attributed to the communist authorities. Furthermore, that draft resolution did not seem effective enough to meet the social danger to China represented by the existence of so large a quantity of opium. More effective measures should be adopted against the cultivation and export of opium.

64. Mr. BURINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that the USSR delegation had voted against that part of the draft resolution in the Social Committee because the representative of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China had not been permitted to participate in the work of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs and had been unable to provide the explanations that would have enabled the Commission and the Council to form a clearer picture of the situation. The USSR delegation would therefore vote against the draft.

65. Mr. BORATYNSKI (Poland) associated himself with the USSR representative's statement. He recalled that at the fifth session of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs he had voted for the USSR representative's proposal that the representative of the People's Republic of China should be admitted.¹

66. Mr. AHUMADA (Chile) said his delegation had voted for the Social Committee's draft resolution and maintained its position. In addition to the political points brought up by a number of delegations, the item raised a technical question of the utmost importance. The presence of large supplementary amounts of opium created grave dangers for public health. Whatever government was in power in the continental part of China, it could not refuse to co-operate in an international enquiry on that matter.

67. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) associated himself with the declarations of the representatives of the

¹ See document E/CN.7/SR. 100.

USSR and Poland, and opposed the draft resolution prepared in the absence of the legitimate representative of China.

68. Mr. OVERTON (United Kingdom) supported the draft resolution, which in no way prejudged the results of the enquiry to be undertaken and simply asked that the origin of the opium concerned should be ascertained.

69. Mr. KIRPALANI (India) noted that the draft resolution asked only for an enquiry without specifying the origin of the opium concerned. Since the representative of the Secretary-General had stated that a technical enquiry of that kind could in principle be made whatever the relations of the appropriate Chinese authorities with other governments, the Indian delegation was prepared to vote for that draft resolution.

Draft resolution D was adopted by 14 votes to 3, with 1 abstention.

70. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) said he would like to explain his delegation's vote on the draft resolution that had just been adopted. In that connexion, his government had no national interests to defend and had been able to adopt an entirely impartial and objective attitude, inspired by its duty as a member of the Council and by the desire to combat the illicit use of narcotic drugs, which was such a danger to the physical and moral well-being of individuals and nations.

71. For those reasons his delegation had voted for the draft resolution, thus making its contribution to the struggle against the illicit use of narcotic drugs.

72. In perusing the report of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, however, he had noted that the preparation of the single convention had been somewhat delayed. He would have liked to include in draft resolution B a clause expressing the Council's desire that the convention should be prepared and voted on as quickly as possible. In view of the rapidity with which the discussion had developed, he had been unable to put forward that suggestion.

73. Mr. OVERTON (United Kingdom) said he would like to explain his delegation's vote on the place of meeting of the next session of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs. His delegation had in the first place wished to vote in favour of Geneva, but had modified its position when it had learned of the additional expenditure which such a decision would involve if, as expected, two other Commissions were also meeting there: the Social Commission, and the Commission on Human Rights. If, however, it were subsequently decided that one of those two Commissions should meet away from Geneva, he might feel impelled to raise again the question of the meeting place of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs.

74. The PRESIDENT said the matter would be discussed when the Council considered the programme of meetings for 1951. The Council was always free to change the place of meeting of any of its technical commissions.

75. Mr. STEINIG (Secretariat) remarked that a decision of the Council made it necessary to notify members of technical commissions at least six weeks before the opening of the session. If it were desired that the Commission on Narcotic Drugs should begin its session on 10 April, there would hardly be time to send out the notices.

76. He therefore asked the Council to reach a decision without delay.

77. Mr. WOLFROM (France), who also would have preferred the Commission to meet in Geneva, said that his position in the matter was as defined by the United Kingdom representative, and associated himself with his reservations.

78. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) asked the President if it would not be advisable, in view of the reservations that had just been made, and which he shared, particularly as regards the place of the next session of the Commission on Human Rights, and in order to take the Secretariat's wishes into account, to convene the Committee on Programme of Meetings immediately.

79. The PRESIDENT thought that since no proposal had been made the Committee would have nothing to discuss.

80. Mr. OVERTON (United Kingdom) said the sessions of the various commissions must be closely co-ordinated, and that was the reason for the reservations he had just made.

Report of the Permanent Central Opium Board: report of the Social Committee (E/1931)

[Agenda item 19]

DRAFT RESOLUTION A

Draft resolution A was adopted by 15 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

DRAFT RESOLUTION B

81. Mr. CABADA (Peru) recalled that the Permanent Central Opium Board noted in its report the regrettable insufficiency of the statistical information that had reached it but also drew attention to the difficulties certain governments experienced in compiling statistics.

82. His country had made a great effort to put an end to the clandestine manufacture of cocaine, and for that purpose had established a government monopoly for the manufacture and export of cocaine.

83. Mr. SANGUINETTI (Uruguay) asked for a separate vote on the preamble and the operative part of draft resolution B.

The preamble was adopted by 14 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

The operative part was adopted by 15 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 15 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

84. The PRESIDENT announced that he had consulted the Chairman of the Economic Committee, the Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Economic Affairs and the Director-General of the Technical Assistance Administration as to the order in which matters connected with economic development should be considered.

85. As a result of those consultations, he proposed that the Council should begin with a general discussion on items 5 (expanded programme of technical assistance: report of the Technical Assistance Committee), 6 (financing of economic development of under-developed countries) and 7 (report of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development).

The normal technical assistance programme, which had other aspects than that of economic development, would be considered separately. After the general discussion, each item would be considered separately at a plenary meeting or in the Economic Committee. The discussion would take place the following week.

86. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) reserved his delegation's position with regard to that order of consideration, because he had been unable to ask the opinion of the members of his delegation who were to take part in the discussion.

87. The PRESIDENT said that a decision on that point could be made at the following day's meeting.

The meeting rose at 6.5 p.m.