



## CONTENTS

## Page

Social activities ( <i>continued</i> ): (b) Report of the Social Commission (E/2247); report of the Social Committee (E/2305, E/L.452) ( <i>continued</i> )	705
Implementation of recommendations on economic and social matters (Council resolution 283 (X)) (E/2165 and Corr.1 and Add.1 to 44, E/2166, E/L.403, E/L.454)	706
Calendar of conferences for 1953 (E/2308, 2308/Add.1, E/L.418) ( <i>continued</i> )	709
Programme of conferences at Headquarters and Geneva (E/2298, E/L.451/Rev.3)	

*President:* Mr. S. Amjad ALI (Pakistan).

*Present:* The representatives of the following countries:

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

Observers from the following countries:

Chile, India, Lebanon.

The representative of the following specialized agency:

International Labour Organisation.

**Social activities (*continued*): (b) Report of the Social Commission (E/2247); report of the Social Committee (E/2305, E/L.452) (*continued*)**

[Agenda item 11 (b)]

DRAFT RESOLUTION II F (E/2305) (*continued*)

1. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that the amendment proposed by his delegation (E/L.452) was designed to complete draft resolution II F submitted by the Social Committee (E/2305), so as to stress the importance of the priority programmes established by the Co-ordination Committee. His delegation proposed the addition of the following text at the end of draft resolution II F: "and to section II on United Nations priority programmes in the report of its Co-ordination Committee (E/2306) as approved by the Council".

2. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) did not think it desirable to lay such stress on the priority programmes. The question of priorities had

been closed when the report of the Co-ordination Committee (E/2306) had been adopted (662nd meeting), and the insertion of the United States amendment in the Social Committee's draft resolution II F was superfluous.

3. Mr. AMANRICH (France) thought that the amendment submitted by the United States delegation might be useful; his delegation would accordingly vote for it. It would also vote for draft resolution II F, submitted by the Social Committee.

4. Mr. ANDERSON (United Kingdom) recalled the stand on the priorities taken by his delegation at the previous meeting. He asked for a separate vote on the amendment, on which he would abstain, though he would vote for the draft resolution as a whole.

5. Mr. BORATYNSKI (Poland) drew the Council's attention to the danger of adopting two lists of priorities, one directly and the other indirectly.

6. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) pointed out that there was no question of adopting two lists of priorities. It was simply a matter, on the one hand, of approving the Social Commission's programme and, on the other, of asking the Commission to reconsider its work in the light of the priority programmes adopted by the Council. He agreed with the USSR representative that his delegation's amendment was not indispensable, but he did think it was desirable.

7. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the amendment proposed by the United States of America (E/L.452) to draft resolution II F (E/2305).

*The amendment was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.*

8. The PRESIDENT put to the vote draft resolution II F (E/2305), as amended.

*The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 14 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.*

DRAFT RESOLUTION II A (E/2305)

9. The PRESIDENT proposed that the Council should adopt draft resolution II A in the report of the Social Committee (E/2305), whereby the Council would take note of the report of the Social Commission (E/2247).

10. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) thought that the Council should stress the importance of the report by expressing its appreciation of the work done by the Social Commission, and not merely take note of the report. He wished to express his gratitude to Mr. Georges-Picot, the Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Social Affairs, and to all the staff of that Department.

11. He proposed that the Council should insert the words "with satisfaction" after the words "takes note" in the text of the draft resolution under consideration.

12. Mr. SUMMERS (Canada) was quite satisfied with the report, but thought that the Council need only take note of it.

13. Mr. NOVAK (Czechoslovakia) pointed out that the Council had had occasion to note certain inadequacies in the achievements of the Social Commission. Examination of the work of that Commission at a plenary meeting had shown that, far from seeking to solve serious problems by dealing with their causes, it was merely noting the existence of certain facts. It was concerning itself only with questions of secondary importance and was avoiding the examination of practical and vital problems such as the decline in standards of living caused by the implementation of the rearmament programmes. The Social Commission should devote itself to the study of questions of principle; it should in particular make some contribution to solving the problems of raising standards of living. Only in that case could the Council describe its work as satisfactory.

14. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that his Government realized the importance of the work of the Social Commission. He wished to congratulate Mr. Georges-Picot on the valuable assistance which his Department had rendered to the Commission and the Council.

15. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the amendment proposed by the representative of Uruguay.

*The amendment was adopted by 9 votes to 4, with 5 abstentions.*

16. Mr. FENAUX (Belgium) wished to explain his vote. He fully appreciated the work of the Social Commission and the Secretariat, but he did not think that the Council should automatically express satisfaction, as seemed to have become the practice of late. Such an attitude might cause difficulties in cases where certain delegations wished to make reservations on matters of principle. He had abstained for that reason, but would vote for the amended draft resolution.

17. Mr. ABDON (Iran) and Mr. ANDERSON (United Kingdom) explained that they had abstained for the same reasons as the representative of Belgium. They, too, would vote for the amended draft resolution.

18. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) pointed out that the Council had for some time been using certain laudatory

formulae, so that the omission of the words "with satisfaction" might have been an undesirable exception. That was why he had voted for the amendment submitted by the delegation of Uruguay.

19. Mr. SUMMERS (Canada) explained that he had voted against the Uruguayan amendment solely as a matter of principle. He would nevertheless congratulate the Secretariat on its work.

20. Mr. HSIA (China) said that he wished to express his satisfaction at the way in which the Department of Social Affairs had carried out its task, and had accordingly voted for the Uruguayan representative's amendment.

21. The PRESIDENT put to the vote draft resolution II A (E/2305), as amended.

*The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 15 votes to 3.*

22. Mr. NOVAK (Czechoslovakia) explained that he had voted against the draft resolution because the amendment proposed by the Uruguayan delegation and agreed to by the Council had altered the substance of the text.

23. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he had voted against the amended draft resolution because he did not consider the report of the Social Commission at all satisfactory.

**Implementation of recommendations on economic and social matters (Council resolution 283 (X)) (E/2165 and Corr.1 and Add.1 to 44, E/2166, E/L.403, E/L.454)**

[Agenda item 24]

24. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that the Secretary-General's report (E/2166) gave an idea of the extent to which some governments co-operated in implementing the recommendations on economic and social matters. However, only thirty governments had answered the Secretary-General's request, and several of the replies were so brief as to do little to enlighten the Council. Thus it would seem that the methods employed in pursuance of resolution 283 (X) were not satisfactory.

25. It would be a mistake to think that governments were not interested in implementing the recommendations. The record of their replies to specific requests to governments contained in Council and Assembly resolutions was very much better, particularly where the resolutions required that replies should be submitted by a given time. Since an increasing number of resolutions fell into that category it was becoming less and less necessary to continue the general reporting procedure set forth under resolution 283 (X). As a matter of fact, there was evidence of considerable duplication of effort. That was why he thought the Council should have the courage to reverse its previous decision and amend the procedures applied under resolution 283 (X). The delegations of the United States and the United Kingdom had presented a draft resolution (E/L.454) to that effect.

26. The purpose of the resolution was to develop a procedure by which, first, specific indications of the timing of the report expected from governments in implementation of the resolutions concerned would in future as far

as possible be included in the Council's resolutions. Secondly, the Council would recommend to the General Assembly that, wherever practicable, it should adopt similar procedures in the formulation of General Assembly resolutions. Lastly, it would decide to include each year in its annual report to the General Assembly information regarding replies received from governments on the implementation of recommendations of the General Assembly and the Council; and, as appropriate in the course of its work, it would consider the desirability of reviewing the implementation of certain of its recommendations. Those were the proposals contained in draft resolution E/L.454. He recognized that it represented a radical alteration of the provisions in force but hoped, nevertheless, that the Council would adopt it for the sake of efficiency and in order to avoid unnecessary duplication.

27. Mr. ANDERSON (United Kingdom) recalled that resolution 283 (X) was intended to assist governments to carry out the recommendations of the United Nations in economic and social matters. United Nations organs were tending to adopt too many and too complicated resolutions, and it was evident that some governments were having difficulties in implementing them. Another consequence was that the Secretary-General frequently found himself in the position of being obliged to request governments for a great deal of information which was not really essential. It was important to avoid overlapping and unnecessary effort, and it was desirable that the General Assembly and the Council should endeavour, so far as was compatible with the requirements of the United Nations, to reduce the number of resolutions calling for action. That could hardly be achieved unless there were a review of the results of past resolutions. As it happened, the procedure recommended under resolution 283 (X) had not supplied that need, owing mainly to the inadequacy of the replies received, and it appeared desirable to simplify the procedure. For those reasons the United Kingdom delegation had associated itself with the United States delegation in submitting their joint draft resolution (E/L.454).

28. Mr. DELHAYE (Belgium) noted that the general position was not as favourable as the authors of Council resolution 283 (X) had hoped. The reform proposed by the United States and United Kingdom representatives would therefore seem to be timely. For that reason he would support the draft resolution submitted by the United States and United Kingdom delegations.

29. Baron VON OTTER (Sweden) approved the United States and United Kingdom draft resolution in principle. However, some paragraphs seemed to him too detailed. In particular, he doubted the usefulness of paragraph 1 of the operative part: the Council already included in numerous resolutions indications of the timing of reports expected from governments.

30. In connexion with paragraph 2 of the operative part, he recalled that the General Assembly had decided to reconsider its procedure for formulating resolutions. As a result of that examination, it would probably institute a new procedure and that would provide a very suitable opportunity for the Secretariat to submit the ideas contained in the draft resolution. The Council should not, therefore, take a definite decision in that matter.

31. He also thought paragraph 3 could perhaps be deleted. The Secretariat would certainly not fail to take into account the desire expressed therein by the authors of the draft resolution and its adoption seemed unnecessary.

32. In conclusion he proposed that the number "twenty-eight" in the second paragraph of the preamble should be replaced by the phrase "a limited number of".

33. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) was strongly opposed to the second paragraph of the preamble of the draft resolution. It was encouraging that nearly half the States Members of the United Nations had taken the trouble to answer the Secretary-General's questionnaire. By stating that "only twenty-eight governments" had replied to the questionnaire, the authors of the draft resolution were making a criticism which he considered inadmissible.

34. He thought the Council should take account mainly, not of the number of replies from governments, but of the achievements of governments as a result of steps they had taken to implement the Council's resolutions. The annexes to the Secretary-General's note (E/L.403) showed that the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Implementation had made a careful study of the resolutions submitted to it.

35. Paragraph 5 of the operative part of the draft resolution stated that the Council was to decide to discontinue the application of paragraph 25 of the annex to resolution 283 (X). That paragraph, which amended Council resolution 203 (VIII), called for two-yearly reports from governments on measures taken to teach the purposes and principles of the United Nations in schools. It would be unfortunate to put an end to the application of the paragraph.

36. He also did not approve of the provisions of paragraph 1 of the draft resolution. By categorically requesting governments to present reports by a certain date, the Council was infringing the very sovereignty of States.

37. For all those reasons he would be unable to vote in favour of the draft resolution, for he approved neither of the way in which the authors had approached the whole problem nor of the wording of certain paragraphs.

38. Mr. AMANRICH (France) recalled his Government's continuous interest in the implementation of recommendations on economic and social matters. The French delegation had been a member of the *Ad Hoc* Committee instructed to present recommendations in the matter to the Council at its tenth session. The French Government had replied to the Secretary-General's questions with special care. The table at the end of the report by the Secretary-General (E/2166) was evidence of the interest it continued to show in the matter.

39. Application of the provisions of Council resolution 283 (X) had revealed the need to amend the procedure for implementation. For that reason the French representative whole-heartedly endorsed the United States and United Kingdom draft resolution (E/L.454). In his opinion the third and fourth paragraphs of the preamble to that draft resolution were of the greatest importance. Lastly, he proposed that paragraph 5 of the

operative part should be amended slightly to read: "of the annex to resolution 283 (X) of the Council".

40. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) recalled that, like the French Government, his own Government had taken an active part in drafting Council resolution 283 (X). It was unfortunate that the procedure instituted by that resolution had not produced all the results expected. Nevertheless, the United States Government continued to be keenly interested in the implementation of the Council's recommendation, as its reply to the Secretary-General's questionnaire proved. The draft resolution submitted to the Council in no way indicated a lessening of interest on the part of the United States Government in the matter.

41. Answering the Uruguayan representative, he pointed out that by a resolution adopted recently (resolution 446 (XIV), adopted at the 656th meeting), the Council had amended certain provisions of resolution 203 (VIII); thenceforth governments were invited to report every four years instead of every two on teaching about the purposes and principles of the United Nations in schools.

42. With regard to paragraph 1 of the operative part, of which the Uruguayan representative did not approve, Mr. Kotschnig pointed out that the Council had frequently adopted identical decisions either by inviting governments to inform it directly on the implementation of certain resolutions, or by asking the Secretary-General to make a report to the Council at a given session, a report which could be drawn up only by using information communicated by governments within a certain time limit. Such a provision could hardly infringe the sovereignty of Member States.

43. He accepted the French representative's amendment to paragraph 5 and the Swedish representative's amendment to the second paragraph of the preamble. Answering the latter representative's comment, he recalled that his delegation had always advocated economy of words; but if it were to approve the Swedish representative's other suggestions, it would be deleting most of the provisions of the draft resolution.

44. It was important to mention a definite time limit for the reports expected from governments. That was the best way of obtaining answers in time. He was ready to delete paragraph 2 of the operative part. With regard to paragraph 3, he pointed out that the Council must conform to a General Assembly resolution (119 (II)) which had invited it to study the question of the implementation of recommendations and report to it thereon.

45. Mr. ANDERSON (United Kingdom) proposed that, in order to meet some of the objections raised, the words "relating to economic and social matters" should be added at the end of paragraph 3. He was prepared to accept the Swedish amendment to the second paragraph of the preamble and the French amendment to paragraph 5 of the operative part.

46. Baron VON OTTER (Sweden) drew attention to General Assembly resolution 597 (VI) establishing a special committee to study legal and drafting questions. Since that committee was to report to the Assembly at its seventh session, it was hardly appropriate for the Council to take a separate decision on the matter. Moreover, the measures taken by the Assembly after the submission of the Committee's report could undoubtedly

serve the Council as a guide. He therefore proposed that paragraph 1 should be deleted but would not press for the deletion of paragraph 3.

47. Mr. FAHMY (Egypt) was not convinced by the arguments in favour of retaining the second paragraph of the preamble, which might be interpreted as implying criticism of certain governments. He requested a separate vote on that paragraph.

48. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) did not regard the number of replies received from governments as discouraging. The sponsors of the draft resolution had apparently completely failed to take into account the number of governments which had addressed replies to the Secretary-General.

49. In view of the fact that the whole resolution hinged upon the second paragraph of the preamble and that the adoption of certain other paragraphs would constitute an infringement of the sovereignty of Member States, he asked for the draft resolution to be put to the vote paragraph by paragraph.

50. He would vote against the second paragraph of the preamble.

51. Mr. FAHMY (Egypt) asked the United Kingdom representative to agree to withdraw the second paragraph of the preamble of his draft resolution, since the third paragraph contained the relevant considerations.

52. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that most members of the Council seemed doubtful regarding the value of the draft resolution, the provisions of which had been subject to much criticism. The submission of the draft resolution by the United Kingdom and United States delegations was an attempt to exert pressure on the Council with a view to infringing the sovereignty of Member States. Governments should be absolutely free to submit information under the conditions most convenient to themselves. That freedom should not be restricted by time limits, of which no mention was made in Article 64 of the Charter.

53. His delegation would therefore vote against the draft resolution, which it regarded as unacceptable.

54. Mr. ANDERSON (United Kingdom) said that the sponsors of the draft resolution had not intended any criticism of certain governments. The second paragraph of the preamble merely stated a fact and pointed out that the existing procedure was unsatisfactory. Since, however, the statements made by the Uruguayan and Egyptian representatives showed that the paragraph might be open to misunderstanding, he was prepared to delete it. In that case the word "further" in the third paragraph of the preamble and the word "more" in the same paragraph would also have to be deleted.

55. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) agreed with the United Kingdom representative. The sponsors of the draft resolution had no desire whatever to infringe the sovereignty of States. The only point at issue was the extent to which governments were prepared to co-operate in implementing the Council's recommendations. The Uruguayan and Egyptian Governments were co-operating to the full and the United States delegation was therefore quite prepared to accept their suggestions. The USSR Government, on the other hand, did not reply to the Secretary-General's

questionnaire and in its case, therefore, the results would be the same whatever procedure was adopted.

56. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that, contrary to the United States representative's assertions, his Government had submitted lengthy documents to the United Nations and to the Council containing a great deal of information.

57. The PRESIDENT put the United States and United Kingdom draft resolution (E/L.454) to the vote paragraph by paragraph, reminding the Council that the sponsors of that resolution had agreed to the deletion of the second paragraph of the preamble and paragraph 2 of the operative part.

*The first paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 15 votes to 3.*

*The third paragraph of the preamble, as amended, was adopted by 12 votes to 5, with 1 abstention.*

*The fourth paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 14 votes to 3, with 1 abstention.*

*Paragraph 1 of the operative part was adopted by 11 votes to 5, with 2 abstentions.*

*Paragraph 3, as amended, was adopted by 15 votes to 3.*

*Paragraph 4 was adopted by 15 votes to 3.*

*Paragraph 5 was adopted by 13 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions.*

*The draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 14 votes to 3, with 1 abstention.*

#### **Calendar of conferences for 1953 (E/2308, E/2308/Add.1, E/L.418) (continued)<sup>1</sup>**

#### **Programme of conferences at Headquarters and Geneva (E/2298, E/L.451/Rev.3)**

[Agenda items 36 and 49]

58. The PRESIDENT pointed out that agenda items 36 and 49 were closely related and proposed that the Council should consider them together.

59. Mr. BORIS (France) said that his delegation would have had no objection to the President's proposal were it not for the fact that the Canadian delegation had submitted an amendment (E/L.458) to the joint draft resolution submitted by Argentina, France and Mexico (E/L.451/Rev.3). That amendment concerned an important question of policy, namely whether United Nations bodies and the specialized agencies were required to meet at their respective headquarters except in special circumstances. The adoption or rejection of the amendment would decide that question of policy and would therefore influence the decisions to be taken by the Council on the calendar of conferences. That being so, it might be advisable to confine the initial stages of the debate to that aspect of the problem.

60. The PRESIDENT thought it would be preferable not to limit the debate at that stage. Proposals relating to agenda item 49 would of course be put to the vote before proposals relating to the calendar of conferences for 1953.

*It was decided to consider questions arising out of items 36 and 49 of its agenda simultaneously.*

61. Mr. LALL (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Conference and General Services) said that the memorandum submitted by the Secretary-General to the Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council on the programme of conferences at Headquarters and Geneva (E/2298) had been prepared in pursuance of General Assembly resolution 534 (VI). The object of that resolution was to fix a basic pattern of United Nations conference activities in Geneva, which would lead to the most effective utilization of the available facilities in Geneva and at Headquarters and, possibly, to savings in the total expenditure of the United Nations and the specialized agencies.

62. If the Secretary-General was to fix such a pattern, he would have to be notified at least twelve months in advance of the time and place of sessions of the Council and its subsidiary bodies.

63. As the Secretary-General had stated in his presentation of the 1953 budget, the most economical and convenient arrangement from the administrative point of view would be to hold all sessions of the Council and its functional commissions at Headquarters, partly because a technical staff adequate to provide the necessary conference services was permanently maintained at Headquarters and partly because adequate accommodation and facilities were available. If sessions of the Council and its subsidiary bodies were held at Headquarters, it would be possible to provide for a greater measure of flexibility in regard to the date of sessions; it would merely be necessary to ensure that sessions did not coincide with those of the General Assembly and that dates were fixed sufficiently far in advance to enable the Secretary-General to achieve the most efficient and economical utilization of technical staff and facilities.

64. If the Council considered that some sessions should be held at Geneva, important limitations would have to be taken into account. Sessions would have to be co-ordinated with the programmes of the specialized agencies located in Geneva; otherwise, complicated problems of staff and accommodation would arise. Some of the specialized agencies such as the International Labour Organisation and the World Health Organization had their own programme of conferences, which they could not reasonably be asked to alter. The accommodation available, particularly where rooms equipped for simultaneous interpretation was concerned, was strictly limited. Furthermore, if too many sessions were held at Geneva at the same time, competition for the limited supply of temporary staff might increase costs by making it necessary to take more staff from Headquarters.

65. Having regard to those considerations and, in particular, to the accommodation available, the only periods during which sessions could be held at Geneva were February-March and July-August. Any other arrangement would seriously interfere with Geneva commitments to the specialized agencies and to other Geneva-based organs such as the Economic Commission for Europe, the Permanent Central Opium Board, the Narcotic Drugs Supervisory Body and the High Commissioner's Advisory Committee for Refugees.

66. Even during the periods indicated, the facilities at Geneva were limited. Accommodations for the Council would be restricted to at most two rooms with simultaneous interpretation and three or four conference

<sup>1</sup> See 657th meeting.



rooms without simultaneous interpretation. The permanent staff at Geneva was already more or less fully occupied by the local workload, although it was possible, but not probable, that for short periods a few members of the technical staff might be available. Translators-precis-writers, interpreters, documents clerks and mimeograph operators could be recruited locally on a temporary basis.

67. However, despite all such temporary assistance at Geneva, it must be borne in mind that whenever the Council or any of its subsidiary bodies met there, some staff always had to be sent from Headquarters, comprising both substantive and technical staff. The additional expenditures so incurred could on occasion be reduced to some extent through the use of home-leave travel, but such savings were relatively insignificant. Experience has shown that the additional costs involved were heavy and that, over and above such costs, the sending of technical staff from Headquarters, particularly translators-precis-writers, could cause serious dislocation of other work.

68. The observations he had made led to the following conclusions: first, that, so far as administrative considerations applied, all meetings should, if possible, take place at Headquarters; and secondly, that meetings away from Headquarters would always give rise to additional expenditures as substantive and certain categories of technical staff would have to be sent to service such meetings.

69. As document E/L.423/Add.1 showed, the additional cost of a six-week session of the Council at Geneva was estimated at \$US154,000 and, as would be seen from document E/L.418, the additional cost of a four-week session of a functional commission, at \$US34,300, or \$US68,000 for an eight-week session. Even with a fixed pattern of conferences at Geneva those expenditures could not be substantially reduced. However, if a fixed pattern were established, it would ensure the most efficient and economical use of facilities and staff both at Headquarters and Geneva. Furthermore, it would minimize the overlapping of meetings of bodies sent from Headquarters with those of the specialized agencies, and thus it would keep the additional cost involved to a minimum. It would also simplify considerably the administrative planning and co-ordination of conference programmes.

70. All those factors were improvements in themselves and might subsequently lead to savings in the total expenditures of the United Nations and the specialized agencies. However, the extent to which that might be possible would be seen only after some years of practical experience. Such savings, where possible, would be reflected in adjustments of staff between Headquarters and Geneva, reduction in expenditure for temporary staff and in greater co-ordination of common services used by the United Nations and the specialized agencies.

71. Mr. BORIS (France) recalled that the French delegation had been one of those that had requested the inclusion of item 49 in the Council's agenda. It had done so with the idea of complying with the General Assembly's instructions in resolution 534 (VI) concerning the preparation of a pattern of the conferences to be held at Headquarters and Geneva.

72. After studying the memorandum submitted by the Secretary-General (E/2298), the French delega-

tion had come to the conclusion that, while the document was useful and interesting, it did not constitute an adequate basis for a Council decision on so important a question.

73. Admittedly, there were many advantages to the fine, spacious buildings of the United Nations in New York. But those advantages would fail to compensate for the disadvantages, if they were to prove permanent. That was why the French delegation, along with the delegations of Argentina and Mexico, had felt that further study should be given to the matter. He pointed out that the draft resolution submitted by the three delegations (E/L.451/Rev.3) in no way prejudged the Council's ultimate decision when all the elements required for such a decision were available.

74. He would not hide the fact that he had been somewhat surprised at the amendment (E/L.458) which the Canadian delegation had proposed to the joint draft resolution. The amendment tended to settle the matter along the lines envisaged by the Secretary-General; namely, by concluding that it was desirable, except when very special circumstances warranted otherwise, that United Nations bodies and specialized agencies should meet at their respective headquarters. Through the Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Conference and General Services, the Secretary-General had just repeated once again his advice to members of the Council that they should hold all of their meetings in New York. He was sorry that he could not discuss the matter with the Secretary-General, who was in Europe, and give him personally the arguments in favour of a more carefully considered decision.

75. General Assembly resolution 534 (IV) stressed the need for the most effective and economical utilization of the facilities available at Geneva and Headquarters. The French delegation granted the considerations of economy the full importance they deserved, but they must not be allowed to take precedence of such considerations as working efficiency and greater productivity.

76. The Secretary-General was presenting the problem as a choice between two solutions: the first solution was to confine meetings at Geneva to those of the United Nations bodies having a secretariat in that city; the second and more flexible solution came up against the difficulties just mentioned by Mr. Lall. The Secretary-General flatly advocated the first solution, but that solution was unacceptable to the Council if only because it ran counter to the Council's decision to hold its sixteenth session at Geneva. Even apart from that decision, however, the Secretary-General's solution could not, in the opinion of the French delegation, be entertained for a number of reasons.

77. First, if all meetings were to be held in New York, the Headquarters conference schedule and Headquarters services would be overloaded. Those services were already overworked. He had already had an opportunity of pointing out to the Council that the holding of sessions of the three Councils simultaneously had prevented the Secretariat from servicing the Economic and Social Council satisfactorily. The members of the Council had been unanimous in their complaints in that connexion. The United States representative himself had fully supported that view, although he had tried to explain away the deficiencies of the service by ascribing

them in particular to the fact that the Secretariat had been too much on the move and had not had time to put its various services in good working order. Mr. Boris emphasized that five months had elapsed since the Secretariat had returned to Headquarters after the previous General Assembly. It was surprising that the Secretariat should need more than five months to organize its work in New York while two or three days sufficed to set up an excellent service in Geneva. The same people were involved and were certainly industrious and conscientious both in Geneva and in New York. The reason for the present state of affairs was that the Headquarters staff was overworked. It was impossible to hold in New York all the meetings of the principal organs and subsidiary bodies of the United Nations which had their headquarters in that city unless additional staff was engaged. In the existing circumstances the conference services could not service a large number of meetings simultaneously. Proof of that had just been shown, in spite of the fact that few committee meetings had been held and, on the whole, few resolutions submitted during the current session of the Council.

78. In those circumstances it was clear that the comparative estimates of expenses which had been submitted to the Council were not correct, since they dealt with excellent services in Geneva compared with inferior services in New York. He asked the Assistant Secretary-General to reflect carefully on the real facts of the case—while it clearly cost more for meetings to be well serviced in Geneva than to be badly serviced in New York, he asked whether the difference would be the same if the services at New York were of the same quality as those at Geneva.

79. The figures submitted to the Council were truly surprising. It appeared from the budgetary estimates drawn up for meetings of certain bodies at Geneva that it was more difficult to engage temporary staff in Geneva than to send staff from Headquarters. He did not wish to draw the Council's attention further to those detailed points, though he would like to discuss them with the Assistant Secretary-General. He was mentioning them solely to show that the question was a complicated one and that it should be studied very thoroughly. While it was necessary not to overload Headquarters staff it was also necessary not to overload the staff at Geneva. The solution which should be sought was that envisaged in General Assembly resolution 534 (VI), that is to say, the rational utilization of Headquarters and of the European Office.

80. There was one consideration which some might hesitate to mention, although it was most pertinent—the New York summer. The New York climate was excellent during the greater part of the year, but two months of the year were very trying and it would be wrong not to recognize that fact. The New York summer affected the Secretariat and the delegations in a way that tended to decrease their output.

81. Finally, there was a reason of quite a different order, the importance of which should not be underestimated—the fact that the United Nations should make its influence felt everywhere. It was advisable, for the benefit of Council members, that the Council should meet not merely at Geneva but also in other

countries, in the Middle East and the Far East. It was in support of that principle that the French delegation had suggested that the Council should meet in Europe. It had done so in the interest of the Council's work and to meet the wish expressed by the specialized agencies whose headquarters were in Europe, a wish to which the Secretary-General had referred in paragraph 14 of his memorandum (E/2298).

82. The argument adduced most often in favour of New York was the fact that it had magnificent buildings specially planned for the United Nations. It was easy to retort that buildings just as magnificent were at the Organization's disposal in Geneva. In his opinion it would be uneconomic to leave the Palais des Nations unused as the United Nations would have to pay the expenses of upkeep even though the building was not used. Overhead charges divided between a limited number of conferences might not be justified, and the very existence of the European Office might thus be jeopardized. On the other hand, if the Council voted in favour of a rational use of the buildings in New York and Geneva—the New York buildings were excellent provided too much was not expected of them—permanent staff could be engaged and suitably divided between the two sites, which would obviate the necessity of engaging temporary staff which cost 30 to 40 per cent more and did not give better service. Further, the possibility might be envisaged of concentrating the leave of Headquarters staff in the two summer months when it was preferable that meetings should not be held in New York, and thus achieve economies.

83. He emphasized that the problem should not be attacked in a routine way but with strength and imagination. It should be studied carefully. New solutions should be sought and compared, and an endeavour made to assess output as carefully as costs. That was the work which the French delegation would like the Secretary-General to do, a task which was more than mere accountancy.

84. It was in that sense that the joint draft resolution had been drawn up. He again wished to assure the members of the Council that the draft did not favour Geneva to the detriment of New York. If that had been its aim it would have been drafted differently. The sole objective of the three delegations which were submitting it—one of which had abstained during the recent vote by which the Council had decided to hold its sixteenth session in Geneva—was to prevent a decision of principle being taken before a more thorough study of the question had been made.

85. The French delegation thought that such a study was necessary and hoped that the members of the Council would be of the same opinion. If the Canadian delegation maintained its amendment and insisted that the Council should immediately decide the question of principle the French delegation was ready to take part in that discussion. However, it wished to point out that it would not support any solution which went counter to the aims of the Council and of the specialized agencies and by which the Council's previous decision would be reversed.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.