

UNITED NATIONS ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS



ELEVENTH SESSION, **388th**
MEETING
FRIDAY, 14 JULY 1950, AT 10.30 A.M.
PALAIS DES NATIONS, GENEVA

CONTENTS

	Page		Page
Statements on Press releases	95	Report of the Commission on the Status of Women (fourth session) (E/1712 and E/1712/Corr.1): report of the Social Committee (E/1764)	97
Advisory social welfare services (E/1702 and E/1702/Add.1): report of the Social Committee (E/1760 and E/1760/Corr.1)	96	Report of the Population Commission (fifth session) (E/1711 and E/1711/Add.1): report of the Social Committee (E/1761 and E/1761/Corr.1)	100

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, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, International Refugee Organization.

Statements on Press releases

1. The PRESIDENT said that, before proceeding with the agenda, he would call upon the United Kingdom representative to make a statement.

2. Lord ALEXANDER (United Kingdom) said that he wished to comment on the accuracy of the Press releases issued by the Information Centre of the European Office of the United Nations, with particular reference to Press release No. ECOSOC/203; that release purported to give a summary of the statement he had made to the Council at its 382nd meeting held on Monday, 10 July 1950, on the subject of methods of financing the economic development of under-developed countries.

3. The first paragraphs of the release could be dismissed as being merely muddled and inadequate. For instance, he was quoted as having said that "as in the nineteenth century, capital investment must be encouraged". In point of fact, what he had said was:

"In the nineteenth century there had been a large flow of private capital from the more developed to the less developed countries, which was now very greatly reduced. The problem facing the Council was therefore that of stimulating a new flow of capital from the more to the less developed countries in conditions very different from those prevailing in 1914."

Rough-and-ready summaries of that kind were highly dangerous. If summaries could not be reasonably accurate, none should be made at all.

4. The second paragraph was particularly misleading. He had recalled the fact that the United Kingdom Government had stated, two years ago, in connexion with a long-term programme, that it hoped by the middle 1950's to have an annual balance-of-payments surplus of about 100 million pounds sterling, but that statement had been rendered as follows: "She (the United Kingdom) had hoped that by the middle of 1950 her balance-of-payments surplus would amount to 100 million pounds sterling". Indeed, when making his statement in the meeting, he had taken special care to add, after referring to the middle 1950's: "namely, 1953 or thereafter". In view of the fact that a copy of his statement had been circulated in advance there would seem to be no excuse for such a mistake, which could surely not be imputed to an ulterior motive. But it was disturbing that the Information Centre of the United Nations, money for which was provided by governments, should give an exactly opposite impression of what a speaker had said. The sentence which he had just quoted from the Press release ended with the following words: "and the United Kingdom would be obliged to concentrate all her efforts on the development of her own overseas territories". He could not imagine where the Information Centre had got that idea. He had said that he felt sure members of the Council would agree with him that the first responsibility of his Government was towards its dependent territories and had added that "some obligations of this kind will continue"; in other words, that the United Kingdom intended to meet those obligations.

5. He was bound to state that he was not a little amazed to find such confusion and such incompetence which was all the more inexcusable since advance copies of the speech had been given to the writer of the Press release. He was aware that similar objections had been raised previously in the Council. If Member States contributed

funds to maintain an Information Centre, they were entitled to expect adequate service.

6. Mr. BORIS (France) stated that, at previous sessions, his delegation also had noted inaccuracies in Press releases. When it had drawn attention to them it had done so in no carping spirit and had often even refrained from doing so, since it realized how difficult it was to produce absolutely accurate reports at short notice.

7. Since, however, the question had been raised, he wished to make an observation on the subject of the Press release relating to the 135th meeting of the Social Committee on Wednesday, 12 July. The remarks made by the French representative on that Committee on the question of "jamming" were very carefully phrased, since the question bordered on the political field. Expressions which the French representative had never used should not have been placed between quotation marks. He would like to draw the attention of the Information Centre to the fact that quotation marks should be used only when a text had been accurately verified, and that could be done by listening to the sound records.

8. The PRESIDENT stated that, as the Council was aware, the United Nations Department of Public Information was independent of the Council secretariat and that consequently there was no action that the Council could appropriately take. The Secretary to the Council would, however, report the statements made by the United Kingdom and French representatives to the Secretary-General, who would take the necessary steps to ensure that such errors did not recur.

Advisory social welfare services (E/1702 and E/1702/Add.1): report of the Social Committee (E/1760 and E/1760/Corr.1)

9. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the report of the Social Committee on advisory social welfare services (E/1760 and E/1760/Corr.1). The financial implications of the draft resolution on advisory social welfare services would be found in document E/1702/Add.1.

10. Mr. FEARNEY (United Kingdom) said that he did not wish to repeat at length the statements made by him in the Social Committee, which, he wished to note, had expressed its satisfaction with the manner in which the Social Commission had revised General Assembly resolution 58 (I), concerning advisory social welfare services. The only point which he would emphasize in plenary was that, by its resolution 316 (IV), the General Assembly had requested the Council to revise that resolution in the light of the discussions held in the Third Committee of the Assembly,¹ but had not asked for an expansion of the budget of the programme of advisory social welfare services. The expansion of activities within the existing budget was a different matter. In his delegation's view, and for the reasons already stated by him in the Social Committee, paragraph 3 of part B

of the draft resolution, relating to financial participation, by requesting governments, made such an expansion possible. He had therefore to reserve his delegation's position with regard to any increases in the budget allocated to the advisory social welfare services.

11. Mr. CALDERÓN PUIG (Mexico) shared the views of the United Kingdom representative and wished to recall his statement in the Social Committee² on the reference made in paragraph 3 of part B of the draft resolution to the financial participation of governments "to the maximum possible extent" in the services provided to them. He was opposed to an attempt to put into juxtaposition two conflicting principles, one of which—namely, that of international collaboration in the field of advisory social welfare services—had been generally accepted. His delegation would have preferred the deletion of that clause, because it could hardly be hoped that those governments which made requests for the services of experts would be able to pay for them out of their own funds. The whole scheme had been initiated in order to help countries which could not afford to create the requisite social services. How, then, could they be expected to withdraw funds normally used for children, the sick and the aged, in order to use them for the benefit of experts? He was not raising that issue on his own Government's behalf, but in general terms with reference to the broader implications of the text.

12. He therefore formally proposed the deletion of the last clause of paragraph 3 of part B of the draft resolution, reading, "and in conformity with the principle that each requesting government shall be expected to participate financially to the maximum possible extent in the services provided to it".

13. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that his delegation would have considerable difficulty in accepting the Mexican amendment in view of the fact that the whole scheme was conceived as a co-operative venture and was based on the assumption that governments might make their contributions not only in the form of funds but also in terms of services requiring the transfer of funds to the United Nations. The draft resolution gave expression to that valuable principle of mutual endeavour, a reference to which he would not like to see omitted.

14. Mr. CALDERÓN PUIG (Mexico) suggested that, in the light of the United States representative's statement, an explicit reference should be made in the text to the supply of services.

15. Mr. WALKER (Australia) said that the problem turned on an interpretation of the wording, which his delegation took to mean that the financial contributions of governments would not necessarily be made in the form of a cheque made out to the United Nations. If, for instance, the travelling expenses of an expert from the coast to the interior were paid for by the government using his services, that payment, made in local currency, would be considered as a financial contribution.

¹ See *Official Records of the fourth session of the General Assembly, Third Committee, 352nd to 354th meetings inclusive.*

² See document E/AC.7/SR.130.

16. He would therefore propose that the draft resolution should be adopted on the explicit understanding that paragraph 3 of part B would be interpreted in those terms.

17. Mr. CALDERÓN PUIG (Mexico) said that, in the light of the explanations given by the United States representative and the interpretation offered by the Australian representative, he would withdraw his amendment and vote for the draft resolution, provided that the Secretariat took note of that interpretation of the financial aspects of the scheme.

18. The PRESIDENT said that it was by no means easy for the Council to decide on a certain interpretation, since what really mattered were the words which were actually used. Speaking in the light of his experience, he would recall that the Secretariat had always given a liberal interpretation of General Assembly resolution 58 (I), fully taking into account the financial circumstances of various countries. Those governments which could not make a substantial contribution made a small one by offering services. He did not doubt that the Secretariat would interpret the resolution before the Council in the same spirit.

19. Since the Mexican amendment had been withdrawn, he would put the draft resolution (E/1760 and E/1760/Corr.1) to the vote.

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

**Report of the Commission on the Status of Women
(fourth session) (E/1712 and E/1712/Corr.1):
report of the Social Committee (E/1764)**

20. The PRESIDENT drew the attention of the Council to the fact that the Social Committee had recommended the adoption by the Council of nine separate draft resolutions (E/1764) on the report of the Commission on the Status of Women (E/1712 and E/1712/Corr.1). He would put them to the vote *seriatim*. He pointed out also that, in connexion with paragraph 5 of that report, the French delegation had submitted a draft resolution on the plight of women survivors of concentration camps (E/L.60).

21. The President put to the vote draft resolution A (E/1764), by which the Council took note of the report of the Commission on the Status of Women (fourth session).

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

22. The PRESIDENT put to the vote draft resolution B, concerning political rights of women.

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

23. Mr. BERNSTEIN (Chile) said that his vote on draft resolution C was to be interpreted in the light of the statements made by his delegation to the Social Committee, wherein it had emphasized that it was obviously unnecessary to issue a study guide or pamphlet for the information of organizations working for the political education of women in certain countries.

24. The PRESIDENT put to the vote draft resolution C concerning political education of women.

The resolution was adopted by 10 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

25. The PRESIDENT ruled that consideration of draft resolution D: "Nationality of married women", should be deferred, pending the distribution of a note thereon by the Secretary-General.

26. The President put to the vote: draft resolution E, concerning the application of penal law to women; draft resolution F, concerning the technical assistance programme in relation to the status of women; and draft resolution G, concerning educational opportunities for women.

The resolutions were adopted unanimously.

27. Sir Ramaswami MUDALIAR (India) drew attention to the fact that the reference made in the text of draft resolution H: "Problems of Greek mothers whose children have not yet been repatriated", to the resolution adopted by the Commission on the Status of Women at its fourth session was not sufficiently clear.

28. He therefore proposed that the text should be amended to read:

"Transmits to the General Assembly the resolution contained in the report of the Commission on the Status of Women . . ."

The proposal was adopted.

The resolution, as amended, was adopted unanimously.

29. Sir Ramaswami MUDALIAR (India) pointed out with reference to draft resolution I: "Communications concerning the status of women", that resolution 76 (V) should be explicitly described as a resolution of the Economic and Social Council.

It was so agreed.

The resolution as amended, was adopted unanimously.

30. Mr. FEARNEY (United Kingdom) said, with reference to paragraph 4 of the Social Committee's report, that the Chairman of the Social Committee had suggested that the resolution of the Commission on the Status of Women relating to the participation of women in the work of the United Nations should be circulated to Member Governments as well as to the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

31. Mr. BROHI (Pakistan) and Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) stated that the Chairman of the Social Committee had suggested that the summary records of the debate should be sent to the Member Governments as well as the Advisory Committee.

32. Sir Ramaswami MUDALIAR (India) said that an explicit reference to the fact that the summary records of the debate in the Social Committee should be forwarded to governments was included in the summary record of the Committee's 134th meeting held on 11 July 1950.³

³ See document E/AC.7/SR.134.

33. The PRESIDENT said that, in the absence of any objection, the phrase "as well as to the Member Governments," would be added at the end of paragraph 4.

It was so agreed.

34. The PRESIDENT asked the Council to consider the French draft resolution on the plight of women survivors of concentration camps (E/L.60).

35. Mr. DE LACHARRIÈRE (France) recalled that the Commission on the Status of Women, in the report on its fourth session, had drawn the Council's attention to the plight of some unfortunate women survivors of Nazi concentration camps who had been subjected to so-called scientific experiments there, from which they had not yet completely recovered. The majority of those women were in France as refugees, but there were probably some in other countries as well. Those women, largely originating from Eastern Europe, had no relatives, no motherland to assist them, and no resources of their own.

36. His delegation had submitted a draft resolution on the subject to the Social Committee,⁴ the last paragraph of which it had modified to take account of an observation by the Danish representative to the effect that the Economic and Social Council itself should be informed of the action taken in that field and not the Commission on the Status of Women, whose competence in the matter was contested by the representative of Denmark.

37. The United Kingdom representative had, moreover, formulated a certain number of observations with regard, *inter alia*, to current negotiations on the problem and to the possibility of obtaining compensation from the German Federal Government at Bonn. The French delegation, in its desire not to disturb the negotiations in progress, had taken those observations into account and had accordingly added to its draft resolution the stipulation that the Secretary-General was requested to consider, "with the competent authorities and institutions", means for alleviating the plight of those victims. The Secretary-General could thus keep himself informed of the negotiations in progress between the Allied High Commission in Germany and the German Federal Government. He could also, if necessary, give those negotiations the support of the authority of the United Nations or, in the event of a delay or failure of the negotiations, could intervene on the latter's behalf.

38. It was not desirable for the question to be referred to a later session of the Economic and Social Council, since the victims could not wait. He accordingly requested the United Kingdom delegation and the other delegations which had voted against the French proposal in the Social Committee to reconsider their position in the light of the changes made to the draft resolution.

39. He appealed to public opinion in the United Kingdom, with its sense of humanity, its generosity and its respect for human rights. He was convinced that he was not speaking in the name of France alone but was the interpreter of an imperative moral standard, common to all civilized nations, and arising out of the principles

of the Charter. In order to dispel any possible misunderstanding, he would like to say that his country had no desire to revive the old French-German quarrel, that it had taken a definite stand on the side of reconciliation with Germany and the unification of Europe and that, in the case in point, was actuated only by the desire to indemnify the victims.

40. Nor was it his Government's intention to rid itself of a financial burden which, compared to France's hospitality budget as a whole, was not a very heavy one. Such an ulterior motive could really not be attributed to it. If the United Nations decided to leave the task to France, it would continue to fulfil it and would consider it an honour; in his view, however, it would not be his country that would suffer thereby but rather the United Nations itself.

41. If its proposal encountered objections, his delegation would abstain from voting on it and would vote for the proposal only if it were uncontested.

42. Mr. FEARNLEY (United Kingdom) expressed his gratitude to the French representative for the latter's moving statement and said that he was in complete agreement with him on the necessity for action to be taken on behalf of those unfortunate people.

43. The French representative had described the position taken by the United Kingdom delegation in the Social Committee far better than he could, and he would therefore limit himself to recalling that his delegation had proposed that consideration of the French draft resolution (E/L.60) should be deferred, pending the negotiations between the Allied High Commission and the German Federal Government. That proposal had been made not because his Government felt less concern than the French Government, but because both in that particular case and in possible future cases it would seem more proper for the Council to refrain from action while negotiations were being carried on elsewhere, in a spirit of good will and with good prospects of success.

44. In so far as the question of creating a possibly undesirable precedent was concerned, he still maintained that view. But the French representative's statement had persuaded him to support the resolution. In recording his affirmative vote, he must express the hope that the Council would not consider that a precedent in future cases when political negotiations were in progress elsewhere.

45. He would merely add on that point that he was sure that, in considering the Council's request, the Secretary-General would treat the matter with his usual discretion. He also wished to make a suggestion which he hoped would be acceptable to the French representative. Not only women but men also had been victims of those so-called scientific experiments. In his view, the resolution should refer to all the victims.

46. He therefore suggested that the second paragraph should be amended by the inclusion of the words "both male and female" after the word "victims", and by the substitution of the word "such" for the word "these"; the clause would then read: "means for alleviating the plight of such victims, both male and

⁴ See documents E/AC.7/L.32 and E/AC.7/SR.134.

female, as soon as possible . . .” That formula was all-inclusive and covered child victims of either sex. His delegation fully agreed that action was needed and was firmly convinced that, even in cases where scientific experiments had not been inflicted upon them, the victims of the Nazi concentration camps were certainly entitled to compensation in some form.

47. Mr. FRIIS (Denmark) explained that his delegation's doubts regarding points of procedure did not affect its attitude towards the substance of the problem, and that the Danish authorities and leading medical associations had never ceased their protests against the crimes referred to in the resolution. He hoped the Council would give its unanimous support to the French delegation's proposal.

48. Mr. DE LACHARRIÈRE (France) thanked the Danish and United Kingdom representatives. He was grateful to the latter country for its attempt at conciliation, which reflected the generosity of its outlook.

49. The French delegation accepted the United Kingdom representative's amendment, which it considered extremely judicious. Since there was no longer any opposition from the United Kingdom representative, the French delegation hoped to be able to vote in favour of its own resolution.

50. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the fact that the United Kingdom amendment went beyond the scope of the problem since the matter before the Council related to the status of women. In view of its special nature, he would, however, not rule the amendment out of order.

51. If the resolution were adopted as amended by the United Kingdom, the title would have to be amended by the deletion of the reference to women and would therefore read: “Plight of survivors of concentration camps”.

52. He put to the vote the amendment suggested by the representative of the United Kingdom and the consequent amendment to the title of the resolution.

The amendments were adopted unanimously.

The resolution, as amended, was adopted unanimously.

53. The PRESIDENT requested Members of the Council to revert to draft resolution D, concerning the nationality of married women, set out in the Social Committee's report (E/1764); consideration of that draft resolution had been deferred pending distribution of a note by the Secretary-General. The latter (E/L.63) was now before the Council. The Secretary-General drew the attention of the Council to the fact that, in accordance with article 17 of its Statute, the International Law Commission was enabled to study proposals submitted by the Member States or by the main organs of the United Nations, such transmission always being effected through the Secretary-General. The first operative paragraph of draft resolution D should therefore be amended.

54. Mr. FRIIS (Denmark) asked whether, once the resolution had been put to the vote, the matter would be deleted from the Council's agenda for the current session or whether, it might be taken up again if a reply

from the International Law Commission were received in time.

55. The PRESIDENT replied that the adoption of all resolutions of that type implied the submission of a report to the Council at its following session. It was not usual for the Council to deal twice with the same question in the course of one session unless it had previously so decided.

56. Mr. FEARNLEY (United Kingdom) recalled that draft resolution D was a shorter version of a draft resolution submitted by the United States delegation. The Social Committee had amended it by deleting a reference to the transmission of nationality to children.⁵ That point should be made clear to the International Law Commission.

57. The PRESIDENT suggested that the point raised by the United Kingdom representative would be met if the first paragraph of the draft resolution were amended to read:

“*Noting the recommendation of the Commission on the Status of Women (fourth session) in so far as it related to the nationality of married women,*”.

58. Mr. FEARNLEY (United Kingdom), having indicated his acceptance of the President's suggestion, recalled that his Government was not opposed to the drafting of a convention on that subject, but held that the views of more governments, as to the desirability of such a convention should be known before any further action was taken. The United Nations should not lightly undertake such a complex task when the attitude of so many governments was not known. That view, which he had stated in the Social Committee, had not been accepted and he did not wish to press it further in the Council, but would abstain from voting on the draft resolution. In view of that fact, he could hardly propose a formal amendment to the draft but, since divergent views had been expressed in the Committee on the whole question, he would ask the United States representative, who had sponsored the original draft, whether he would agree that the Secretariat should transmit to the International Law Commission the summary records of the Social Committee's discussions, because they gave a clear picture of the procedural and substantive points raised on the issue.

59. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that he would not object to the adoption of the suggestion made by the United Kingdom representative, although he was certain that the International Law Commission, as a legal body, would in any event duly take into account all the relevant documentation.

60. Sir Ramaswami MUDALIAR (India) said that he did not think that the last paragraph of the draft resolution was sufficiently precise, especially since it contained a request to a legal organization. He wondered exactly what meaning the word “appropriate” and the words “to initiate action” were intended to give.

⁵ See document E/AC.7/SR.134.

61. Mr. BROHI (Pakistan) agreed that the last paragraph of the draft resolution was not very clear, but he wished to point out that a representative of the Secretary-General had spoken at length at a meeting of the Social Committee⁶ on the meaning of article 17 of the Statute of the International Law Commission;⁷ it had been pointed out that no recommendation by the Council would, as such, be binding on the International Law Commission, although the Council could submit a draft recommendation to the General Assembly and the General Assembly could give instructions which would be binding on the Commission; and that, if the Secretary-General forwarded a recommendation of the Council to the Commission, the Commission, by virtue of article 17 of its Statute, would have to take a decision on it. It had been made clear that the time factor was of great importance, for it was doubtful whether the Commission, which had a heavy agenda, would have time to consider at its current session the recommendation of the Commission on the Status of Women.

32. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that he did not think the last paragraph of the draft resolution would be thought ambiguous by those who were familiar with article 17 of the Statute of the International Law Commission; for the phrase "deems it appropriate to proceed", which the representative of India had suggested was not precise, appeared in the first sentence of paragraph 2 of article 17, and the words "initiate action" related to the several procedural steps, which had been laid down in the same article 17.

63. Mr. CALDERÓN PUIG (Mexico) recalled the position adopted by his delegation in the Social Committee:⁸ it was convinced that the problem of nationality was one of the most important in private international law. The problem of the nationality of women was incapable of rapid solution and should be dealt with by a convention of general, and not limited, scope. He felt it inadvisable, in view of the volume of work already entrusted to the International Law Commission, to transmit to it the recommendation formulated by the Commission on the Status of Women at its fourth session on the subject of the nationality of married women. The problem should be put on a much broader basis and that was why he suggested that it should be referred to the International Law Commission through the intermediary of the General Assembly. He therefore proposed that the operative paragraphs of the draft resolution submitted by the Social Committee should be replaced by the following text:⁹

"Invites the General Assembly to transmit to the International Law Commission the recommendation of the Commission on the Status of Women, with a view to enabling the International Law Commission to undertake as soon as possible the drafting of a general convention on nationality which will include the principles recommended by the Commission on the Status of Women."

⁶ See document E/AC.7/SR.133.

⁷ See *Official Records of the second session of the General Assembly, Resolutions, No. 174 (II)*.

⁸ See document E/AC.7/SR.133.

⁹ Subsequently issued as document E/L.64.

64. The PRESIDENT ruled that further discussion of the draft resolution should be deferred until the Mexican representative's proposal had been circulated in writing.

**Report of the Population Commission (fifth session)
(E/1711 and E/1711/Add.1): report of the Social
Committee (E/1761 and E/1761/Corr.1)**

65. The PRESIDENT, drawing attention to the Social Committee's report (E/1761 and E/1761/Corr.1) on the report of the Population Commission (fifth session) (E/1711), to the financial statement (E/1711/Add.1) by the Secretary-General on the Commission's report, and to the Secretary-General's note (E/L.59) on priorities and the financial implications of the work programme of the Commission, invited comments on draft resolution A contained in the Social Committee's report.

66. In the absence of any comments, he put draft resolution A to the vote.

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

37. The PRESIDENT invited comments on draft resolution B on the demographic aspects of technical assistance.

68. In the absence of any comments, he put draft resolution B to the vote.

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

69. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the alternative text (E/L.61) submitted by the Secretary-General for the third and fourth paragraphs of draft resolution C on migration studies, and invited the Assistant Secretary-General to speak on that text.

70. Mr. OWEN (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Economic Affairs) said that both the Population Commission and the International Labour Organisation, among other bodies, were responsible for migration studies. The division of work on such studies between the secretariats of the two organizations was a matter for agreement between the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Director-General of the International Labour Office. The new text submitted by the Secretary-General reflected more accurately than the text agreed on by the Social Committee the relations between the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Director-General of the International Labour Office concerning migration studies. The replacement of the Social Committee's text by the text submitted by the Secretary-General would not affect the substance of the recommendation. He suggested that the text submitted by the Secretary-General would be more correct if the words "as reflected in the agreement" were substituted for the words "by agreement" in the paragraph beginning with the word "Recalling". Referring to the last point of the draft resolution—namely, "a study of adequate practical methods of international financing of European emigration"—he wished to recall that the Economic Commission for Latin America had discussed the matter and had passed a resolution (E/1762) requesting

"the Executive Secretary of the Commission, in co-operation with the International Labour Organisation

and other specialized agencies concerned, to set up a working committee at the secretariat level:

- " (a) To study the relation between economic development of Latin America and immigration;
- " (b) To provide the Latin-American countries, at their request, with:
 - " (i) Surveys with respect to their economic capacity to receive immigration;
 - " (ii) Advice and assistance on the manner in which economic development can be promoted by immigration;
 - " (iii) Advice on the feasibility of adopting specific plans and projects of economic development involving immigration for which financial and technical assistance may be needed from international organizations."

71. The Secretary-General, anticipating that the Council would approve that resolution, had already made certain preliminary arrangements for its implementation, including plans to set up a working committee at the secretariat level and to engage the services of an expert on the subject. The resolution adopted by the Economic Commission for Latin America concerned migration only to that region, whereas it had been urged that the migration studies to which the draft resolution submitted by the Social Committee related should cover European migration to other countries, such as Canada. He would welcome some indication from the Council that it considered that the Secretary-General's preliminary arrangements, to which he had just referred, would satisfy its requirements from the United Nations Secretariat as far as the financing of migration from Europe to Latin America was concerned, and that the Council would not object if the United Nations Secretariat accorded lower priority to the other types of migration to which the draft resolution referred, confining its work on them to general studies until such time as staff and money were available for more detailed studies.

72. If the Council wished detailed studies to be made immediately of all the kinds of migration to which the draft resolution referred, he would have to submit an estimate of the additional sums required for the purpose.

73. Mr. PENTEADO (Brazil) said that he had read the alternative text submitted by the Secretary-General with some surprise, since it was much weaker than the Social Committee's text and there was a difference of substance between the two, in that the Social Committee's text read: "*Requests the Secretary-General . . . to press forward with the migration studies . . .*", whereas the Secretary-General's text read: "*Requests the Secretary-General to consult . . . with a view to pressing forward with the migration studies . . .*". The Social Committee definitely wanted the migration studies to be made; it did not want mere consultation as to whether they should be made.

74. He suggested that the last paragraph of the draft resolution submitted by the Social Committee would be improved if the words "and to prepare" were substituted for the words "as well as". He would vote against the Secretary-General's text and in favour of the Social Committee's text amended in the way he had suggested.

75. Mr. BERNSTEIN (Chile) said that he agreed with the Brazilian representative. He could not support the Secretary-General's text, which was much weaker than the text adopted by the Social Committee.

76. He attached great importance to the resolution on immigration adopted by the Economic Commission for Latin America, at its third session, to which the Assistant Secretary-General had drawn attention and which had not been available when the Social Committee had discussed the matter. He proposed that a reference to that resolution, rather than to the "special studies of migration problems prepared for the Economic Commission for Latin America", should be made in the first paragraph of the draft resolution under consideration.

77. The PRESIDENT thought that, although a reference to the Economic Commission for Latin America's resolution might be added, the mention of the special studies should in any case be retained.

78. Mr. DAVIDSON (Canada) said that he would be satisfied if the United Nations Secretariat followed the Assistant Secretary-General's suggestions concerning priority and the manner of studying the problems of international financing of migration from Europe, provided problems of financing migration from Europe to under-developed countries other than those of Latin America and problems of migration from Europe to highly developed countries were eventually studied as fully as problems of financing European migration to Latin America.

79. He understood the concern expressed by the representatives of Brazil and Chile over the text submitted by the Secretary-General; perhaps that concern might disappear if the Assistant Secretary-General amplified the explanation he had already given. The representative of Canada understood that the Secretary-General had submitted the alternative text because he thought that the Council, if it adopted the Social Committee's text, would thereby instruct the Secretary-General of the United Nations to press forward himself with studies, some aspects of which could more expediently be handled by a specialized agency. The Canadian Government wished the migration studies recommended by the Population Commission to be pressed forward as rapidly as possible to the extent that financial limitations permitted.

80. Mr. OWEN (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Economic Affairs) said that the Secretariat had no wish, and had had no intention, of trying to persuade the Council to adopt a resolution which would be weaker than the one recommended by the Social Committee. It had put forward the alternative text merely because it reflected more accurately the actual relations between the Secretary-General and the specialized agencies concerned, and would consequently provide a smooth basis for an agreement between the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Director-General of the International Labour Office as to the division between them of the migration studies recommended by the Population Commission.

81. Both the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Director-General of the International Labour Office intended to pay great attention to the migration studies, as was shown by the fact that the former had already made preliminary arrangements for studying problems of migration to Latin America so soon after the Economic Commission for Latin America had passed its resolution on migration. He agreed with the representative of Canada that problems of international financing of migration from Europe could be divided into the three categories he had mentioned. As he had already said, arrangements had been made for studying problems of financing migration from Europe to Latin-American countries; the International Labour Office was already studying problems of financing migration from Europe to other under-developed countries; and the United Nations Secretariat would place problems of financing migration from Europe to highly developed countries last on the priority list, unless it received contrary instructions.

82. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that the discussion provided further justification for a remark which had been made in the Social Committee to the effect that it would have been better to discuss the problem of financing migration when item 43 of the agenda: "Relations with and co-ordination of specialized agencies", was taken up. If it had been decided to take it up at that time, it could have been considered in conjunction with the Secretary-General's report on co-operation in the field of migration programmes of the United Nations and specialized agencies (E/1685) which clearly explained that responsibility for studies and action on migration had been divided by decision of the Council itself between the United Nations and specialized agencies.

83. However that might be, he was grateful to the Secretary-General for putting forward the alternative text which took that division fully into account; for he believed that the division ought to be brought out more clearly than in the resolution recommended by the Social Committee. The Secretary-General's text was not weaker than the one adopted by the Social Committee; on the contrary, it was stronger, since it would enable the Secretary-General to make agreements with the executive heads of specialized agencies that they should carry out certain parts of the migration studies which they were more competent to make than the United Nations Secretariat. It should not be forgotten that the International Labour Office unlike the United Nations Secretariat, had recently received a grant of substantial funds for work on migration.

84. As the representative of the delegation which had proposed the text on which the Social Committee's draft resolution was based, he would vote in favour of the alternative text submitted by the Secretary-General.

85. Mr. CALDERÓN PUIG (Mexico) said that he understood the difficulties relating to the division of migration studies which had induced the Secretariat to submit the alternative text; but he considered there was a difference of substance, and not merely of pro-

cedure, between the two texts, and he would therefore vote in favour of the Social Committee's text with the slight modifications suggested by the representatives of Brazil and Chile.

86. He hoped that the intention mentioned by the Assistant Secretary-General to place the study of financing migration from Europe as a whole—he did not mean migration from Europe to Latin America alone—low on the priority list would be changed in such a way that the plans for the studies would be brought more closely into harmony with the joint statement made by the Foreign Ministers of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America concerning the urgency of the problem.

87. The recent Preliminary Conference on European Migration had reached satisfactory conclusions on many aspects of the problem of European emigration, but it had left open the question of financing it.

88. Sir Ramaswami MUDALIAR (India) said that much of what he had intended to say had already been said by the representatives of the United States of America and Canada. There was only a difference of procedure, not of substance, between the texts of the Secretary-General and the Social Committee. If the Social Committee's text were adopted, the Secretary-General of the United Nations would be responsible for carrying out migration studies which the International Labour Office had been instructed to carry out, and consequently there would probably be a duplication of work, which was inconsistent with the Council's own recommendations concerning co-ordination between the United Nations and the specialized agencies.

89. The draft resolution under consideration related only to migration from Europe. He wondered when the Population Commission would consider the question of emigration from the over-populated areas of Asia and the Far East, where the need for emigration was much graver than it was in Europe and where emigration difficulties were also far greater than they were in Europe since they involved serious social and political questions. He did not wish to imply that he did not want the Secretariat to study problems of emigration from Europe, but he hoped that, despite the difficulties, it would also study problems of emigration from the over-populated areas of Asia and the Far East and perhaps submit a report on them, and he also hoped that the Population Commission would report on those problems to the Council at its thirteenth session.

90. Mr. DURAND (Secretariat) said that at its fifth session, the Population Commission had, in fact, considered problems of emigration from areas of Asia and other regions as well as emigration from Europe, and, as stated in paragraph 37 (d) of its report (E/1711), had requested the Secretary-General to begin studies in the field of migration with countries for which adequate data were or would be made available and to "utilize them as a basis for extending research to other areas of actual or potential emigration or immigration". At that session of the Commission, the representative of the Secretary-General had been asked to state what material was available for studying emigration from countries

outside Europe, and he had replied that it would be comparatively difficult to study emigration from many such countries because of the lack of adequate statistical data.

91. Sir Ramaswami MUDALIAR (India) said that he had read paragraph 37 of the Commission's report, but thought it concerned emigration from Europe alone. The action indicated in that paragraph did not appear to have brought the solution of problems of emigration from Asia and the Far East any nearer. He trusted that the remarks he had made would be borne in mind by the Secretariat.

92. Mr. KAYSER (France) considered the question raised by the Indian representative to be of vital importance. He hoped that the study embarked on by the Secretariat would be continued, and that the problem, which was one of unusual gravity and range, would be examined with all the attention it deserved.

93. The alternative text submitted by the Secretary-General (E/L.61) reflected much more closely the true relationship between the United Nations and the specialized agencies than the resolution contained in the Social Committee's report. However, he noted in the last paragraph a difference of tone, if not of intention, between the two texts. Whereas the Social Committee's

resolution used the words, "in close collaboration . . . to press forward", the Secretary-General's text spoke of "consulting . . . with a view to pressing forward". He was sure that there was no intention on the part of anyone to weaken the Social Committee's resolution, and he suggested that, with a view to bringing the two texts into harmony, an informal meeting should be held of representatives of the Secretariat and the delegations of Brazil, Chile and Mexico, who had been emphatic on the point that the migration studies must retain their urgent character.

94. Mr. CALDERÓN PUIG (Mexico) suggested that other delegations than those mentioned by the representative of France might participate in the informal discussions he had suggested.

95. The PRESIDENT said that he did not consider it necessary for the Council to take a formal decision on the French representative's suggestion; he was certain that the Secretary-General would consult all delegations which had expressed an interest in the text of the draft resolution and the Secretary-General's alternative text, before the Council took up the question again at its next plenary meeting.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.