

United Nations

Nations Unies

ECONOMIC  
AND  
SOCIAL COUNCIL

CONSEIL  
ECONOMIQUE  
ET SOCIAL

UNRESTRICTED

E/P.V.80  
27 March 1947  
English

NOTE: Any corrections made under Rule 46 of the Rules of Procedure for the Economic and Social Council should be submitted in writing within forty-eight hours to Mr. E. Delavenay, Director, Editorial Division, in Room CC-87 at Lake Success. Corrections cannot be accepted unless they are accompanied by, or incorporated in, a covering letter on the notepaper of the delegation. The envelope containing the corrections should be marked "Urgent" and bear the appropriate document symbol number.

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE EIGHTIETH MEETING OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL  
(Thirtieth Meeting of The Fourth Session)

Lake Success, New York  
Thursday, 27 March 1947 at 11:00 am

PRESENT:

The PRESIDENT: SIR RAMASWAMI MUDALIAR

Mr. Kaminsky	Byelorussian SSR
Mr. Smith	Canada
Mr. Fausto Soto	Chile
Dr. Chang	China
Mr. Ojuna	Cuba
Mr. Papanek	Czechoslovakia
Mr. Boris	France
Mr. Kirpalani	India
Mr. Hakim	Lebanon
Mr. van Kleffens	Netherlands
Mr. Reid	New Zealand
Mr. Moe	Norway
Mr. Arca Parro	Peru
Mr. Turhan	Turkey
Mr. Morozov	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Mr. Mayhew	United Kingdom
Mr. Stinebower	United States of America
Mr. Stolk	Venezuela

---

The PRESIDENT: The Council is now in session.

Before we take up the regular items on our agenda, the representative of the USSR wants to make a statement.

MR. MOROZOV (USSR) (Interpretation from Russian): Mr. President, I, as well as other Members of the Economic and Social Council, received yesterday the text of a resolution, which was accepted, on the question which was raised by the World Federation of Trade Unions. On this occasion I wish to state that the Soviet delegation reserves its right to raise this question at one of the coming meetings of the Economic and Social Council.

The reason for this is that we feel that not only is it incorrect in so far as substance is concerned, but also because the resolution was accepted in violation of the Rules of Procedure of this Council.

#### ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

The PRESIDENT: The first item on the agenda is reconsideration of the resolutions submitted by the Committee appointed by the Council regarding the establishment of the Economic Commission for Europe. In view of the fact that the Committee has discussed this question fairly thoroughly and submitted these resolutions, I suggest that no general discussion on this subject be held at this stage, but any delegations that want to place any views on record with reference to this matter can do so and I propose, after those submissions are made, to take up the draft amendment that has been suggested by some of the delegations.

The delegation of the USSR has submitted a series of amendments to these resolutions and I would invite reference to E/368 and not the number which has been put on the agenda paper. Document E/368 is the document that has to be consulted in this connection.

MR. BORIS (France)(Interpretation from French): Mr. President, the text which has been submitted to the Economic and Social Council comes as a result of a great amount of work. This text was arrived at in an atmosphere of goodwill, and we wish here to pay tribute to this atmosphere of goodwill. We see in it a good omen for our tasks in the future. Of course, certain divergencies of opinion were expressed and they probably will be expressed at this meeting. But, all participants were animated by the same spirit of trying to reach the ultimate end of creating an instrument which, in their view, would re-establish European economy, would re-establish the equilibrium of economy in the world, and therefore would establish peace.

As the final discussion is just about to start, we wish to state that inasmuch as the text which is before you, is a result of various concessions on various sides, it does not answer the desires of the French delegation on all points. However, we do not wish to prolong the discussion and we will give up our right to submit modifications and amendments which we have supported in former debates.

However, Mr. President, on one point it is our duty to make an observation. This concerns point number one of document E/363/Rev.1 which reads as follows:

"The Draft Terms of Reference for the European Commission do not include a specific reference to the particular importance of the German economy to the European economy as a whole and several delegates felt that such reference should be incorporated somewhere in the Draft Terms of Reference."

The amendment which we have submitted is contained in great part in what we see here. The allusion to German economy took the form of recommendations, inasmuch as we wanted German economy<sup>to</sup> be considered in respect to European economy as a whole. When this text was submitted by the French delegation, we acted as interpreters of the desires of many of the representatives. However, when a discussion did take place, although everybody agreed on the principle, some representatives felt that there would be some difficulty in incorporating the amendment in a text of this nature. It was only for reasons of form that the formula was not retained in the text. I am stating this, Mr. President, in order that there could be no misunderstanding, no misapprehension, concerning the reasons for which the formula, which was suggested, is not included in the final text which is being considered.

MR. van KLEFFENS (Netherlands): Mr. President, I am very happy that the French delegation made the declaration that has just been made. I think it is very conciliatory and should help us to adopt the text of the French amendment, minus that one part of the sentence that the French delegation itself proposed. I think that we are all at one, Mr. President, to have uppermost in our minds what is of such concern to the French delegation; namely, "the particular importance"--I quote the words of the draft--"of the German economy to the European economy as a whole..."

I think that it is the general sense of this meeting that the particular importance of the German economy is one of the most important elements in the whole of this matter. I, for one, should like to go on record as being constantly imbued with that importance; that is one of the most significant things that we should keep in mind / when dealing with this matter, and I hope that the European Commission will do likewise.

MR. MAYHEW (United Kingdom): On behalf of the United Kingdom delegation, may I also say for the record how happy we were to hear the point made by our French colleague. We too warmly appreciate the particular importance of the German economy to the economy of Europe as a whole. Our view is that the omission of this phrase is simply a drafting convenience.

MR. STINEBOWER (United States): Mr. President, I should like to associate the United States' views with those which have just been expressed by the representatives of France, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom.

I should like to take just one more minute to express the particular satisfaction which the United States feels that after six months of intensive labour we have come to so fruitful a result and are about to create an Economic Commission for Europe which, in our view, will be one of the most forward-looking steps towards international cooperation in these urgent problems of reconstruction that we can take.

MR. MOROZOV (USSR) (Second interpretation; original in Russian):

Mr. President, I wish to ask for clarification concerning the order which we will follow in discussing the proposed draft and the amendments, particularly the amendments which have been tabled by the representative of the USSR. In so far as the question which has been raised by the French representative is concerned, I wish to state that we feel that only the government of the occupational forces is responsible for the economic development, the economic tendencies, and all the problems linked with the German economy. The Economic and Social Council or its Commissions are not competent to interfere in the field which is the direct responsibility of the government of the occupational forces.

Therefore, I object to any mention of German economy in the Terms of Reference of the Economic Commission for Europe.

MR. ARCA PARRO (Peru): Mr. President, the Peruvian delegation attaches the greatest importance to this document, because it is the result of the long work that has been undertaken by the Preparatory Commission and by this Council itself. In view of the general agreement which the different delegations have shown on this draft resolution, I do not believe it is necessary for me to make any lengthy remarks. However, I cannot refrain from stating a few facts regarding the general framework of this Economic Commission for Europe.

When the original idea of setting up an Economic Commission for Europe was discussed at one of our former Sessions, there was a very strong feeling that whatever organ was established -- a commission or otherwise -- to deal with the different problems of the reconstruction of Europe or the general reconstruction of devastated areas should be framed so as to reflect a different point of view from the one which the Drafting Committee has at last taken on this subject.

It was considered that the reconstruction of the devastated areas was just part of the general world economy problem that we are now facing as a consequence of the impact of the war. And from such a point of view, whatever measures could be taken in order to rebuild and to reorientate the economy of the devastated areas, we have to consider the interests and the problems of the different parts of the world. I thought -- and that was the feeling of a number of delegations -- at the final stage something of this type could be done, in order to empower the Economic Commission to work on the general outline. But now, according to the terms of reference which the Economic Commission for Europe has to follow, it really is confined to a sort of administrative body that will be concerned with a very narrow scheme or programme simply on the problems of Europe.

According to those terms of reference, no other country's problems or future aims will be taken into consideration in connection with the full development of Europe, except the United States, outside of Europe. I am not trying to insinuate that the composition or membership of the Commission should be changed - not at all. It is not in my mind to suggest anything of that kind. I just want to make it clear for a number of countries, and in particular for countries that are known as Latin-American countries, that the reconstruction of Europe is not something strange to our own problems. I think it has been said more than once how close we were to Europe along different trends of thought, of business, of trade, and in general, in economic fields; how war has changed -- just for a while, I hope -- the situation; how we have to work over again in order to make those new contacts and to reopen our markets, which were important not only from our point of view, but from Europe's point of view, too. I think we needed them, but they needed us, too. There are a number of commodities, of consumer goods, that could be obtained in Latin-American countries. Just to mention a number of countries, there are Argentina, Brazil, and Chile, where such products as wheat, foodstuffs in general, and minerals have

produced in enormous quantities, and Europe needs them, of course, but in order to produce and to develop our economy we want to know what the programme of reconstruction of Europe means to us. What do they expect from us? Are they going to take into account whatever development we are doing -- and we are willing to enlarge this -- or is it going to be confined, the reconstruction of Europe, just to the limits of the geographic territory of Europe? I do not think that could be done in such a way.

It is useless to speak again on such matters as the interrelation in economic fields, the interdependence that it has to establish -- and it has already been established by the same economic phenomena. So in keeping away a number of countries like the Latin-American countries, representing fifty percent of the population of this Continent -- we are not so fully developed economically as the rest, particularly the United States and Canada -- and even Canada is not included in this -- means that Europe does not care at all what is happening in those countries, what is happening in the rest of the world. It is the same with the problem of Asia. I think it is a very artificial approach, and I hope to be excused if I am making a mistake. The interpretation that is given to this problem, according to the terms of reference -- I should be glad if that could work, of course, but from a general point of view I think we are trying to make an exclusive proposition in the problems of Europe, that what has happened, what could happen in Europe would not be of interest to the rest of the world, and I do not think that is the case.

I know that there is not enough time to discuss <sup>this</sup> in detail in a session like this, when we are just about to close our meetings, but I would like to draw the attention of the Council, not in any formal proposal, but just for the record, to how this Commission has been very strongly curtailed and diminished, and to the terms of reference that are not <sup>what at</sup> the beginning we thought they were going to be, because the countries that are more closely concerned with those problems are accepting this framework, those terms of reference, as good. So we have no right



really to criticize that. But I think that we have, on the other hand, some right to draw the attention of the Council to the fact that the problems of the rest of the world are so closely connected with the general development of the economic life of Europe that they should be taken into account in some way or another. The specialized agencies will be consulted in some way. The countries particularly concerned could be invited to give their services in some way to the rest as a permanent sort of participation in the development of the work of the Commission.

These are the remarks that the Peruvian delegation would like to go in the record.

MR. SMITH (Canada): Mr. President, the Canadian delegation welcomes the establishment of this Economic Commission for Europe.

This new body, which we are asked to create and which I believe we shall create this morning, is the result of a very long and a very careful preparatory study. The case for this regional body has been made after very thorough investigation and very thorough consideration. There have been working parties in Europe; there have been committees and commissions studying the matter here at Lake Success. There are three existing inter-governmental organizations in Europe with some years of practical experience and effort which it is proposed the Commission will take over.

There is in Europe a special regional problem. The European economy was gravely devastated by war, and reconstruction is an urgent necessity. Anything that this Commission can do -- and we believe, Mr. President, that it can do much, wisely operated, to assist and co-ordinate the reconstruction of the European economy -- will earn for it and for us in establishing it the gratitude not only of Europeans but of all of us, of all peoples throughout the world. Anything that the Commission can do to revive and stimulate trade between the various areas of Europe will earn the gratitude not only of the peoples of those areas but of all of us. The Commission, too, under its terms of reference will seek to revive and stimulate trade, stimulate economic relations in general of the countries of Europe not only among themselves but with all the nations of the world.

In any case, sir, this is a new type of organization, a new type of body, which the United Nations is today asked to create. It is a regional body. For this reason, it will be particularly important that this new machinery be operated wisely and that it avoid the dangers inherent

in too great an emphasis on regionalism.

Two possibilities faced what I may call our founding fathers at San Francisco. After the basic decision that the United Nations should embrace not only political activities but an economic and social side as well, there were two possibilities: to develop this economic work on a regional basis, or to develop it on a functional basis -- finance, trade, and so on, and so on -- on a world-wide scale.

The decision at San Francisco was made after much thought and after very careful reflection for the world-wide functional structure, rather than the regional structure. That decision was, we believe, sound. The Charter of the United Nations emphasizes that economic conditions are of great importance to the maintenance of peace.

If the world should become organized economically not as an integrated and co-ordinated whole but in more or less water-tight regional blocks, it would not follow that such a development would necessarily be conducive to world peace. On the contrary, such a development might stimulate regional exclusiveness and inter-regional competition for domination. This could have very dangerous results in the political, as well as the economic, field.

It was no accident, therefore, that the decision at San Francisco was what it was. It was not an accident that we -- this Organization -- are the United Nations and not the "Regional" United Nations. This wise principle, however, does not, in our opinion, rule out regional cooperation and regional machinery to deal with regional problems. This body that we are today proposing to establish is a clear example of the useful possibilities of regional machinery.

The basic San Francisco principle, however, of world-wide functionalism does make it necessary to ensure that regional machinery be wisely operated and that its Terms of Reference be wisely considered.

We welcome, therefore, particularly the provisions in these draft Terms of Reference -- which are, in effect, the basic constitutional law of this new international body -- for general supervision by the Council. We welcome that and we think that is essential. We welcome, too, the provision for very close contact, consultation, and co-operation between this regional body and the world-wide intergovernmental agencies, called in the Charter "Specialized Agencies."

We welcome, also, the provision in the Terms of Reference for participation of non-European Members of the United Nations with the Commission in the deliberations of the Commission whenever matters of particular concern to such non-European countries are under discussion.

We welcome, in short, the clear decision of the Members of the Council, taken in Committee, that this new regional body will be, in effect, not a competitor with, not an alternative to, but an emergency complement to the wider and more permanent intergovernmental organizations already established or prospective and to be established.

The Canadian delegation is in much sympathy with the point so eloquently made by the representative of Peru. The economic and social well-being of the peoples of Europe is of the greatest importance to Canada and, indeed, to all the peoples of the American continent and of other continents throughout the world. We would be concerned if we felt that there were serious danger that this new regional body would stimulate a development of regional exclusiveness.

We have -- when I say "we" I mean humanity at large, Sir -- suffered much in the past from national exclusiveness, from tight national organizations, from nations seeking to live unto themselves and to cut contact with other countries. There is an even greater danger -- but I am confident it will be avoided -- of regional exclusiveness.

If Europeans should seek to live unto themselves solely, that would impoverish all of us -- economically, spiritually, politically, and otherwise. But we are confident that they will not so seek. We are confident that this danger, which does exist, will not materialize; for all of us, all the Members of the Commission and all the Members of this Council who are charged, under these Terms of Reference, with the task of general supervision of the work of the Commission will, I am sure, take such care as is needed to see to it that such dangers of what I may call "improper regionalism" as opposed to proper regional co-operation will not materialize.

In conclusion, Mr. President, the Canadian delegation is very glad to have had the opportunity of playing a small part in the development of these Terms of Reference, and we wish this new subsidiary organization of the United Nations well.

MR. HAKIM (Lebanon): Mr. President, the delegation of Lebanon desires to make a short statement for the record. It considers that the establishment of Economic Commissions for Europe, and for Asia and the Far East, involves the organization, under the aegis of the United Nations, of machinery for economic integration and development on a regional basis.

It notes that the terms of reference of the two Commissions are not limited to economic reconstruction of war devastated areas and necessarily involve plans for economic development. The delegation of Lebanon, therefore, reserves the right to propose, at some appropriate time in the future, the establishment of an economic commission for the Middle East, for the economic integration and development of that region.

MR. MAYHEW (United Kingdom): Mr. President, may I direct the Council's attention to sub-paragraph 2 of Chapter II of the paper before us, which contains what the United Kingdom Government considers an important suggestion for the effective working of the Commission.

I need hardly remind the Council that the United Kingdom Government has given its keenest support to the Commission and the establishment of the Commission, from the start. We have high hopes for the success of the work of the Commission. We feel that the nations of Europe will be meeting on this Commission at a point where their ideological differences are smallest and where the immediate practical advantages of co-operation are greatest.

But this leads me to say that we feel that it is of the utmost importance that the organization of the Commission should, from the start, be on a sound and practical basis. We attach the highest importance to Member Governments appointing permanent national representatives to the Commission. When this matter was raised in the Economic Committee, several delegations expressed the view that it was premature to decide the issue at the present session of the Council and that the question had better be left for

later decision in the light of experience. I do not wish to press the matter to a decision today, but I would venture to point out that unless the Economic Commission organizes itself on the right lines from the start its whole future may be prejudiced.

At the Committee's meeting, it was argued that if the the representatives were always absent from their capitals they would lose touch with the policies of their Governments, and there is clearly some force in this. But surely there is another danger too, a danger of lack of continuity and corporate spirit in the Commission which might arise if the representatives met too seldom or would change too often, as sometimes happens. I am sure that if this Commission is to succeed, continuity and corporate spirit must be built up.

The further objection often raised<sup>is</sup> the difficulty of finding suitable manpower for permanent representation. As I think I have said before, the British are particularly impressed by these manpower arguments, but we for our part have no hesitation in saying that we regard the work of the Commission as of such particular importance that we will willingly play our part in whatever arrangements are finally made. We have firm views on this question of permanent representation, Mr. President, but, on the other hand, I do not wish to take this matter to a decision at the Council session. I am quite ready that the Commission should itself decide these matters at its first meeting, but it is certainly the intention of my Government to raise the matter there.

Before I leave this point, Mr. President, may I also draw the Council's attention to paper E/63, circulated by the Secretariat, containing the financial estimates presented by the Secretary-General. In paragraph (b) of this paper, the third sentence reads: "The additional costs for the two sessions of two weeks each during the last two quarters of 1947 will be approximately \$11,800."

E/P.V.80

43 - 45

This seems to imply that the meetings will be quarterly. I would point out to the Council that this is certainly not the view of the British Government and is not the view which has been expressed by the Council itself.



MR. MOE (Norway): Mr. President, the Norwegian delegation wishes to associate itself with the delegations who have already expressed their satisfaction with the practical solution of the question of economic collaboration in Europe. It is our hope that future developments will show that this session of the Council made a decisive decision when it established an Economic Commission for Europe.

I would also like to associate the Norwegian delegation with the remarks made by the representative of Canada. The regional principle has been recognized in the Charter. It is evident that regional collaboration is necessary in practice. Further, on the other hand, we agree, as I had the occasion to state before in this Council, that this regional collaboration must not lead to the division of the world into closed and watertight compartments. But, this is certainly not the intention. It is expressly stated in Point 1 (a) that there should also be collaboration with other countries of the world.

I think that the very important problem raised by the representative of Peru cannot be solved by having a greater number of non-European countries represented on the European Commission. But, it is certainly one of the main tasks of the Economic and Social Council itself to see to it that regional collaboration does not have a bad effect on international collaboration as a whole. This has also been taken into consideration in the draft resolution in Point 4 where it says: "The Commission shall submit for the Council's prior consideration any of its proposals for activities that would have important effects on the economy of the world as a whole."

Far from diminishing the role of the Economic and Social Council, the establishment of regional machinery increases the role, the importance and the responsibilities of the Economic and Social Council. It is the Council that will have to see to it that their regional organizations are closely integrated in the economy of the world as a whole.

It is certainly in this sense that the Norwegian delegation is supporting this very important resolution on an Economic Commission for Europe.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now take into consideration the amendments that have been suggested by the representative of the USSR in document E/368. These amendments were/ of course, by the Committee which framed the terms of reference, but the representative of the USSR is within his rights to move these amendments in Plenary Session.

The first amendment is with reference to paragraph 1. "The Economic Commission for Europe, acting within the framework of the policies of the United Nations and subject to the general supervision of the Council shall, provided that the Commission takes no action in respect to any country without the agreement of the government of that country: (a) initiate and participate in measures..".

The proposal of the Soviet delegation is: "The Economic Commission for Europe, acting within the framework of the policies of the United Nations..."-- and the representative wants the following words afterwards to be deleted: "...and subject to the general supervision of the Council..."-- Then, there is a verbal change: "...provided that the Commission takes no action in respect of any country without the agreement of the government of that country," these words are to be substituted by the words: "...with the approval of the government concerned."

The main question is whether the phrase: "...subject to the general supervision of the Council..." shall be retained there or not.

MR. MOROZOV (USSR)(Interpretation from Russian): As is stated in the beginning of the paragraph, it was foreseen that the Commission would be created to act within the framework of the United Nations. Therefore, it is quite obvious that this Commission would be an organ of the United Nations. It is not necessary to write in a special clause which reads: "and subject to the general supervision of the Council." As a matter of fact, if we leave this clause in the document, we are giving the impression that the Economic and Social Council, when creating the Commission, is afraid that the Commission may step out from under the influence of the Economic and Social Council.

I would also like to state that when we consider the functions of other commissions we do not see any clause to the same effect.

Third, I would like to state that from the Resolution of the General Assembly it is quite obvious for what reason the Commission is being created. It is being created to provide effective aid to countries which have been devastated by the war. Therefore, by including this clause, we only complicate what is already quite clear and quite obvious.

Fourth, when we consider the functions of the Commission, as set out in paragraphs (a), (b) and (c), we see that the Commission is to address itself to the governments concerned. Therefore, we do not see any reason for this clause which is included here, and the Soviet Union delegation feels that the document should not have the preamble stated here but should have the preamble which is in a document that has been cited by the President of the Council.

The PRESIDENT: There has been a proposal that the preamble as it stands now should be substituted by the preamble suggested by the representative of the USSR. Are there any observations?

MR. MAYHEW (United Kingdom): I am inclined to feel, Mr. President, that we should leave these words in. This, after all, is a newly formed Commission, and I think we should make quite clear that it should start out on the right lines from the beginning. I certainly see no harm in having these words in at the moment. It seems to me the Commission has everything to gain from the help and guidance of the Council and that the words should remain.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now put the amendment to the vote of the house. Those who are in favour of substituting the preamble in E/368 for the preamble in the existing text will please raise their hands.

MR. MORCZOV (USSR) (Interpretation from Russian): Mr. President, I did not understand quite fully what you meant. Are we to vote on the amendment which was tabled by the Soviet delegation or do you want to vote on the whole preamble?

The PRESIDENT: The amendment that is going to be put to the vote is the proposal of the Soviet Union delegation to substitute for the first part of paragraph one, up to sub-paragraph (a), the words: "The Economic Commission for Europe, acting within the framework of the policies of the United Nations, with the approval of the governments concerned, shall..." for the existing words in that preamble.

We will now proceed to a vote as to whether the amendment of the Soviet Union representative should be substituted for the existing preamble.

E/P.V.80

53-55

(A vote was taken by a show of hands.)

The PRESIDENT: The amendment is lost.

The next amendment is to paragraph 1(b). The existing paragraph reads: "make or sponsor such investigations and studies of economic and technological problems and developments ~~within~~ <sup>and</sup> member countries of the Commission, ~~within~~ Europe generally, as the Commission deems appropriate." There is an amendment proposed by the Soviet delegation, as follows: "make or sponsor such investigations and studies of economic and technological problems and developments of the countries of the Commission as the Commission deems appropriate." The words that are sought to be deleted are "and within Europe generally."

There is an amendment by the Netherlands delegation which I shall take up after this amendment has been dealt with.

MR. MOROZOV (USSR) (Interpretation from Russian): Mr. President, in the opinion of the Soviet Union delegation, the competence of the Commission should only extend to Members of this Commission. As a matter of fact, we cannot see how the influence of an organization which is created by the United Nations for the economic development of Europe should be extended to all of Europe, in other words, including also countries which are not Members of the United Nations.

In view of these considerations we tabled the amendment for Paragraph (b) and for Paragraph (a), about which I will speak later.

MR. VAN KLEFFENS (Netherlands): Mr. President, inasmuch as the amendment we have had the honour to propose refers to the same question, I was wondering whether it would not be possible that I make my remarks with regard to this Paragraph (b) of Article 1 now, because they also refer to the amendment of the representative of the Soviet Union.

The PRESIDENT: I have no objection that that course. I shall read the amendment proposed by the Netherlands delegation. For the existing paragraph, the following should be substituted: "Make or sponsor such investigations and studies of economic and technological problems of and developments within Member countries of the Commission and within Europe generally, as the Commission deems appropriate." The words "of and" are inserted there.

MR. VAN KLEFFENS (Netherlands): Mr. President, we, too, experienced the difficulty with regard to this point, and the difficulty is perhaps not immediately obvious to a person who reads this text--I mean the text of the Sub-Committee--to a person who reads this text without having taken part

in the debate in Committee.

But it seems to me a very real difficulty, and I shall therefore try to state it as briefly and clearly as I can.

According to the text before us, investigations and studies as there referred to must bear an economic and technological problems and developments either within countries who are Members of the Commission, or else within Europe generally.

You will recall, Mr. President, that the expression "within Europe" has received in Committee what I may describe as an authentic interpretation, namely that it refers exclusively to problems and developments of a general European character, but not -- as the term would seem to imply if there were not that authentic interpretation -- problems and developments wherever they occur in Europe generally, for instance in individual European countries who are not Members of the Commission.

This, to me, seems a very serious shortcoming. For I think it is true to say that there are several European states who are to be Members of the proposed Commission, and who find themselves in serious difficulties because of economic problems and developments, not of a purely domestic character, confined in their scope within the frontiers of those countries, but inextricably bound up with conditions in other countries, among whom non-Member countries take an important place. If, for instance, unhealthy economic conditions in Western Germany were to cause difficulties to my own country, or to Belgium, or to France, or to the United Kingdom, or to any other Member country, the Economic Commission for Europe would not have jurisdiction, according to the text before us as interpreted in Committee, to give any attention to those conditions. I would like to suggest, Mr. President, that this will seriously impair and diminish the useful

nature of the Economic Commission for Europe. I also suggest that it would thereby tend to become a Commission which does not deserve the name "for Europe." And I finally suggest that this is undesirable and should be remedied.

How this should be remedied is a matter of secondary importance to us, Mr. President, so long as it is done. The simplest way would be, of course, to state explicitly in the Verbatim Record of this meeting "that it is the sense of the Economic and Social Council that the words 'within Europe generally' do not only refer to problems and developments of a general European nature, but also to economic and technological problems and developments within non-Member countries in Europe which cause difficulties to Member countries". This would at any rate reverse the authentic interpretations in Committee to which I have referred.

But perhaps it may be better to state in explicit terms in the text of the resolution (and not merely in the record of the meeting of the Council) the idea that the Economic Commission for Europe may make or sponsor interpretations and studies of economic and technological problems and developments within non-Member countries, especially ex-enemy countries, which may be found to cause difficulties to Member countries. If the Council prefers that method, we shall be very glad to adopt it. And it is for that purpose we have tabled our amendment, but the main point is that this important point should be duly taken care of.



E/P.V.80

59-60

I may add, Mr. President, that we were given a document Number E/AC/17/3/ Add 1 "Draft Terms of Reference for Europe resulting from informal discussions among representatives of France, the United States, the United Kingdom and the USSR," which contains a text that would also, I believe, meet the point, and which reads: "... make or sponsor such investigations and studies of economic or technological problems and developments in Europe" -- the word "generally" has been dropped -- "and within / <sup>Member countries</sup> of the Commission as the Commission deems appropriate." Now, if that text has the approval of the four delegations that are mentioned here in the heading of this paper, we would be glad to give that our vote as well, instead of our own amendment.

MR. MAYHEW (United Kingdom): May I say that I am thankful for the very clear statement of the problem given by our Netherlands colleague and, on behalf of my Government, that we entirely concur in the interpretation he gives of the problem, the point being that the investigations should cover both the individual non-member countries in Europe and also the large areas in Europe covered by more than one country..

The form of words in the amendment we have before us has seemed to me entirely appropriate. I should, however, like to point out that in the concluding words of the introduction to paragraph 1, the control authorities in Germany would, of course, be entitled to refuse agreement to any investigation, if they wish to do so. We hold that by "control authorities" is meant not merely the Four Power Control Council in Berlin but each individual Zone Commander.

But the purpose of my remarks is to say that I associate myself entirely with the interpretation made by our Netherlands colleague.

MR. STEINBOWER (United States): Mr. President, I too will gladly accept the amendment put forward by the representative of the Netherlands. It seems to us that it meets quite adequately the problem that he has set forth and which we understand is a very real problem of expression over which the drafting Committee and the full Committee have worked for some time. This is indeed a solution of it.

I associate myself with what he said by way of interpretation, and without reservation, because we assume this Commission is going to be a reasonable Commission and that the Council is going to be a reasonable Council, we only wish to call attention to the fact that this is also subject to a misinterpretation against which one should guard. In effect, the insertion

E/P.V.80

62-65

of this little word "of" could transfer to the Economic Commission for Europe all of the interests of those countries in this Council because, if I may take, for example, the Netherlands, any economic problem of the Netherlands now is grist for the mill of the Economic and Employment Commission for Europe under this language. I am sure that is not intended. We are willing to rely upon a reasonable interpretation of the word, rather than upon a strict parse of the sentence.

In particular, we do not want to find ourselves with a record here, Mr. President, on the word "of" which will be a little like a long debate we had at San Francisco on the word "the" and then could only be resolved by writing an essay on what our decision meant.

MR. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) (Second interpretation; original in Spanish):  
Mr. President, would it/<sup>be</sup>possible to ask the Secretariat for a French translation of this proposal? The French representative yesterday asked for translations to be circulated in time and I associate myself with this request. I think that it is a very important problem, because it is a drafting point which should be settled in a few minutes.

The PRESIDENT: I was afraid that suggestion would be made at some stage or other. I was very conscious of the lack of French translations in this matter. I only hope that the representative of France in particular, and other representatives who desire to have the French translation, will bear with us when I say that the Secretariat arrangements have just made it impossible, with the various Councils meeting simultaneously, to get the translations in time. I hope they will not insist on it, because that will merely hold up the work of this Council completely. We will try to have the translations as early as possible.

MR. BORIS (France) (Interpretation from French): Mr. President, I will take account of what you have just stated, but nevertheless I must register my regret, inasmuch as the text involved is a very simple text of four lines and deals with a very delicate problem.

I listened a while ago to the translation which was being given and it had no connection whatsoever with the text itself, and it was typical of the translation on a juridical point. Therefore, we feel that in cases of this kind we should ask the Secretariat to make a very special effort to provide us with a French text. Obviously, we do not insist right now because we do not wish to prolong the controversy.

The PRESIDENT: I shall try to see that the best is done under the circumstances. I appreciate the difficulty and I acknowledge the

courtesy of the representative of France in this matter.

MR. BORIS (France) (interpretation from French): Mr. President, will if you/allow me now to say a few words on the substance of the subject, I must say that I support fully the position taken by the representative of the Netherlands, and if he is satisfied with the interpretations that were given, I will follow him in his attitude.

The PRESIDENT: I will now put the amendments to the vote of the Council.

The first amendment that I shall put to the vote of the Council is the amendment moved by our colleague from Soviet Russia, as that is the furthest amendment from the text. The amendment is to substitute, for the words in paragraph 1 (b) which stand in the text, the following words: "(b) make or sponsor such investigations and studies of economic and technological problems and developments of the countries of the Commission as the Commission deems appropriate."

Those who are in favour of that amendment being made will please raise their hands.

(A vote was taken by a show of hands.)

The PRESIDENT: The amendment is lost.

I will now put the amendment of the representative of the Netherlands, inserting the word "of" after the words "technological problems," to the vote.

Those who are in favour of making that insertinn will please raise their hands.

(A vote was taken by a show of hands.)

The PRESIDENT: The amendment is accepted.

I now put to the vote the clause as amended: "(b) make or sponsor such investigations and studies of economic and technological problems of and

developments within member countries of the Commission and within Europe generally as the Commission deems appropriate."

Those who are in favour of the amended clause will please raise their hands.

(A vote was taken by a show of hands.)

The PRESIDENT: The paragraph, as amended, is accepted.

The next amendment, by the Soviet representative, is to paragraph 5 of the terms of reference: "The Commission may, with the approval of the Council, establish such subsidiary bodies as it deems appropriate for facilitating the carrying out of its responsibilities."

This language just read is proposed to be substituted for the existing paragraph 5: "The Commission may, after discussion with any specialized agency functioning in the same general field, and with the approval of the Council establish such subsidiary bodies . . ." et cetera. The proposal, in effect, is that the phrase, "after discussion with any specialized agency functioning in the same general field," should be deleted.

MR. MOROZOV (USSR) (Interpretation from Russian): Mr. President, it seems to me that some of the representatives of the Economic and Social Council want to give exclusive rights to specialized agencies and other inter-governmental organizations, as it is foreseen in items 5, 12 and 13 as well as in paragraph (b) of page four of the proposed project.

The Soviet delegation feels that it is necessary to state once more its point of view, that it feels that the relations between the organs of the United Nations and the specialized agencies should be in accordance with the provisions of Article 70 of the Charter which reads:

"The Economic and Social Council may make arrangements for representatives of the specialized agencies to participate, without vote, in its deliberations and in those of the commissions established by it, and for its representatives to participate in the deliberations of the specialized agencies."

In accordance with this article of the Charter, the specialized agencies may be invited to discuss questions, without a right of vote, in those cases when those questions are being discussed by the organs of the Economic and Social Council and which have a direct bearing to the specialized agency concerned. In other words, these specialized agencies may be invited for purposes of consultation. In paragraph 5, for instance, the Economic and Social Council and the Economic Commission for Europe cannot decide themselves the question of the creation of subsidiary organs, without consultation with the corresponding specialized agencies.

In point 12 there is the obligation for the Commission to invite representatives of specialized agencies. It is also foreseen in that paragraph that the Commission may invite inter-governmental organizations, although such organizations are not foreseen by the Charter.

If we take into consideration that the European Economic Commission is created in the form of a specialized regional organ to resolve the problem of the economic reconstruction of Europe, then it becomes quite obvious that there is an excessive burden for the European Economic Commission because of the quantity of / <sup>non-European</sup> specialized agencies and of inter-governmental organizations. Such a situation can complicate the work of the European Economic Commission to a great extent.

Taking this into consideration, the Soviet delegation tables the proposal to word paragraphs 5, 12 and 13 in a different manner in order to bring them into accord with the Charter.

The PRESIDENT: Further consideration of the amendment will be taken up at the next meeting of the Council. The Council will meet tomorrow at 10:30 a.m..

The Council is now adjourned.

(The meeting adjourned at 1:05 p.m.)