

**ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL**

**CONSEIL
ECONOMIQUE
ET SOCIAL**

UNRESTRICTED
E.P.V.67
13 March 1947
English

NOTE: Any corrections made under Rule 46 of the Provisional 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 SIXTY-SEVENTH MEETING OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL
(Seventeenth Meeting of the Fourth Session)

Lake Success, New York
Thursday, 13 March 1947 at 2:45 p.m.

PRESENT:

The PRESIDENT:

SIR RAMASWAMI MUDALIAR

Mr. Kaminsky	Byelorussian SSR
Mr. Davidson	Canada
Mr. Yang	China
Mr. Santa Cruz	Chile
Mr. Perez Cisneros	Cuba
Mr. Papanek	Czechoslovakia
Mr. Royer	France
Mr. Malik	Lebanon
Mr. van Kleffens	Netherlands
Mrs. Mehta	India
Mr. Reid	New Zealand
Mr. Moe	Norway
Mr. Arca Parro	Peru
Mr. Morozov	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Mr. Mayhew	United Kingdom
Mrs. Woodward	United States of America

The PRESIDENT: The Council is in session.

REPORT OF THE SOCIAL COMMISSION (continued).

The PRESIDENT: The Vice-Chairman of the Social Commission will now make a few remarks.

(At this point Mr. Wilson, Vice-Chairman of the Social Commission, assumed a seat at the Council table).

MR. WILSON (Vice-Chairman, Social Com.): Mr. President, I wish to make a few remarks with regard to some of the criticism that has been made with regard to the Social Commission's Report.

A few of the Members have rather faint praise for the report, but I think that as time goes on and more study is given to the recommendations

contained therein, they will find that their criticism is based mainly on a misunderstanding of what the Commission really wishes to recommend. I would also like to emphasize that the work that was given to the Social Commission raises a tremendous number of subjects, most of which are of the greatest importance, and some of which are very difficult indeed to solve.

As this was the first meeting of the Commission and Members had not had the opportunity of understanding each other's point of view and as it took a considerable number of them quite a while to get to understand the problems that were before the Commission, it is to be understood that the Commission's report might have been a better one if we had more time to deal with the many and intricate problems that were before us.

There was some criticism with regard to the suggested relations between the Social Commission and the specialized agencies. I must say that I am very surprised indeed that there should have been this criticism which I think can only arise out of a misunderstanding or possibly the vague wording of Annex 1 or the Resolution of the Commission itself.

If there was one thing more than another that was apparent during the meetings of the Commission, it was the fact that everyone was very anxious indeed that the closest and most friendly relations should exist between the Commission and the various specialized agencies and also between them and the non-governmental agencies. But, in particular, it was emphasized on innumerable occasions that such and such work was in the field of the International Labor Organization or the Food and Agricultural Organization, or UNESCO and the various other organizations. Instead of there being any tendency towards ignoring these organizations or dictating to them, everything possible was said that showed that the Commission was determined, on their part, to work in the fullest harmony with the specialized agencies.

Of course, there are two sides to every question, and it is not sufficient that the Social Commission should work in the closest harmony or hope to work

in close harmony with these organizations. They must reciprocate, and I have no doubt that they will do so.

There has been some talk that because the resolution of the Commission dealing with specialized agencies said that the Commission approved the method of co-operation expounded in the report of the Secretariat, Document E/C.N.5/4, that the Commission, as a matter of fact, had accepted every word in that document.

I am certain that those of us who were present at the Commission never had any idea at all that they approved of the recommendations in that particular document, Annex 1, that they were endorsing every possible word that was in it. Anyway, even the words to which some slight exception is taken can have more than one meaning, and I am certain the Members of the Commission have no idea that the words were to mean that we were to curtail in any way possible the work of the specialized agencies or to take over work which they are particularly well qualified to do.

It was rather surprising to me this morning when I heard the tone of criticism of the representative of the ILO in that particular matter, because they were present at the meetings of the Commission, and they must have heard ^{our} the numerous expressions of/desire to work with them, and they were present when this particular resolution adopting Annex 1, et cetera, was passed.

At no stage did any of the specialized agencies, and certainly not the ILO, raise any objection to any word in the resolution or in Annex 1 itself, so that I am unable to understand ^{it} except that there is some unfortunate misapprehension -- and I wish to assure the Council that it was the last thing that the Commission had in mind, to either ignore or to supersede any of the specialized agencies.

There was some objection also taken to the use of the words in saying that the Social Commission instructs the Secretariat to do this and to do that. That is another occasion where it only needs a little explanation. It was stated in the Commission on many occasions that it was understood, of course, that any resolution passed by them or any instruction given by them was subject to the approval of this Council. I can assure the Chairman and representatives that the Commission has no desire at all to take a dictatorial attitude or to assume powers that are not theirs; that those words, "We instruct," are given in the ordinary sense, subject to the approval of the Council itself.

The problems that confront the Social Commission are many and they cannot be solved in a few minutes. There will be many sessions of the Commission before we can bring you recommendations in connection with all of the subjects that were before us. In the main, we made one or two recommendations which I will have an opportunity of explaining in Committee, if necessary, but we made, in the main, only a few decisions. The others were instructions to the Secretariat, subject to the approval of this Council, to study certain matters. We set up a Temporary Social Commission to which was referred many of the controversial subjects with which we will have to deal, and they were asked to make a study of it because the Commission itself did not have the necessary time to devote to all these questions.

I might mention that, in the opinion of a considerable number of the Members of the Commission, we were rather dissatisfied that we were not able to sit longer. The Commission only had twelve working days and, owing to the fact that there is no provision for the payment of overtime to Members of the Secretariat and Staff, we were only able to work about five and a half hours a day. Therefore, it was felt by a considerable

number of the representatives that the time allotted to us was not sufficient for the enormous task which confronted the Social Commission. As a result, some of the things we are only making preliminary investigations into, but at the next session of the Commission we will be in a position to deal with them in a better manner than we could at the first.

The distinguished representative from Peru raised a question regarding the standard of living and other matters that are mentioned in pages 22 and 23 of the Commission's Report. I would say that there is a misunderstanding here and some rather slipshod drafting, perhaps, which is due to the fact that we were so hurried at the finish, and that there is nothing in the recommendation here that cannot be supported one hundred percent.

The question that he raised about standard of living, for instance, should have been "standards of living," not "standard of living". There is more than one standard of living throughout the world. Standard of living depends upon the country and the climate and various other factors in different parts of the world; and what would be a minimum standard of living in, say, New Zealand or the United States would be a standard of living which was entirely luxurious and unnecessary in some other parts of the world, say, Ceylon or places where the climate is much different. So that what the Secretariat were instructed to do was to prepare a report dealing in particular with standards of living in different countries of the world, in order that we would have some basis for the proposals we wished to bring before the Council at a later stage, in connection with making, or trying to make, it possible for every country in the world to give to their peoples a guaranteed minimum family income.

As I said, that guaranteed family income would vary in the different countries, but that is what the Social Commission has in mind, if I can interpret it. That is the basic fact that they want to see operating

throughout the world -- that every person in the world is entitled, as a right, to the basic necessities of life: to housing, to clothing, to education, and to necessary medical attention. Those are ^{the} basic necessities of life without which men and women cannot live a full and free life, and that is the purpose of all the recommendations that the Social Commission makes.

The question arising out of the provision of social security for everyone was considered at very great length by the Commission, and while there was general agreement as to the objective, it was realized that the attainment of a minimum family income for everyone, at all times, in all circumstances, was both difficult and complex. The Secretariat, therefore, was instructed to study the conclusions already arrived at by the ILO and by other specialized agencies, and to submit a report to this Commission -- not to this Council at this stage but to the Commission -- setting out the measures that, in their opinion, were necessary to be taken to solve effectively the problems connected with social security for all. In particular, the Secretariat was to obtain information on standards of living in the different countries, of social security schemes in the various countries, of the care and rehabilitation of disabled and handicapped persons, of practical methods of cooperation between the Social Commission and the Trusteeship Council, with a view to raising standards of living in the trusteeship countries, and to co-ordinate the activities of the voluntary organizations in this particular field of social security. No one can take exception to that, I think, and indeed, as the representative for New Zealand said yesterday, if the Council does not stand for that, and indeed if the United Nations does not stand for that, to secure for everyone the necessities of life, then indeed some of us have made a great mistake in what the United Nations does stand for.

The ILO, in their Report to the Council this morning, stated that the Report that was asked for by the Commission would take quite a lot of time and that it would ^{not} be available very early. It was also suggested that the Report should come direct to this Council instead of going to the Social Commission. I would say, Mr. President, that it would be against the best interests of this Council to agree that the Report should be made first to this Council. I take it that the reason for setting up a Social Commission is to do as much preliminary work as is possible so as to save the time of this Council, and to bring propositions forward in more concrete fashion than would otherwise be the case. I would suggest that the Council ought to support and endorse the recommendation of the Commission that the ILO and other specialized agencies place at the disposal of the Secretariat the information that they have, and cooperate as fully as they possibly can in drafting this particular Report so that the Commission, at its next session, may go thoroughly into the matter before bringing a recommendation to this Council.

There are various other matters in the Report which I do not think I need refer to at this stage because, as I said, the Committee of the Council will be dealing with it, and I could then more properly refer to the other matters. But I was very glad, indeed, to note that the representative of Canada, who was a Member of the Commission, spoke so well in connection with the Commission's Report. I would emphasize that those persons who were present at the meetings of the Commission are under no misapprehension as to what the Commission means by any of its recommendations, and it certainly does not mean that it is endeavouring in any way to overlook the splendid work that is being done by the ILO and the other specialized agencies. It certainly does not want to take up a dictatorial attitude with regard to them or to any other organization. We do realize

that everything that we do is subject to the decision and approval of this Council.

E/P.V.67
11-15

Only one other matter comes to my mind and that is the question as to whether the terms of reference of the Commission were too broad. I do not think that they can be too broad, but I think that it was possibly a mistake to refer so many important matters at one time to the Commission. It will take dozens of meetings of the Commission to thoroughly thrash out all the problems with which we were confronted in our first session.

It might be thought advisable that the Council should give consideration as to whether the Council itself should be advised as to what particular problems the Council thinks are of most importance and most urgency, so that we could place them on our agenda at the next session and bring down a full report to the Council.

MR. YANG (China): Mr. President, may I just add a very few words on the remarks we have heard today. First of all, may I say that I wish to associate myself with what Mr. Wilson, the Vice-Chairman of the Social Commission, has said about the general attitude of the Social Commission towards the specialized agencies. I think we all want to be of the greatest help and of the least hindrance to the work of these agencies. But perhaps there is a distinction that can be drawn between what is mentioned in the Report itself, as to the difference between an action programme and a study programme.

In matters covered by an action programme, of course we are to so correlate it that there will be no duplication of effort, but with respect to a study programme, we may have more than one organization studying the same thing, at the same time, so that we have more points of view and get a better result. Of course, the Social Commission will be glad to have the assistance of the specialized agencies, but at the same time perhaps, a little initiative in thinking about problems, and initiative on proposals, and offering some advice, is perhaps also within the scope of the function of the Social Commission.

Second, I wish to say that I appreciate thoroughly the very interesting, the very constructive, comprehensive and valuable comments of the representative of the ILO on the general report of the Social Commission. Perhaps I am not the only one of the Commission who wishes that we could have had these very valuable suggestions while the given points were being discussed in the Commission, rather than after the discussion had already taken place.

In the third place, I wish to refer to the remarks of our distinguished colleague from Canada, also referred to this morning. I am sorry that on that particular afternoon I had to follow our Chairman to the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, so that I was not present here when the first discussion of the general discussion of the Commission took place. I may say that I associate myself with him, on the whole, with what he has said, particularly

as to the fact that we ought to be on our guard not to ignore the equal emphasis we ought to place on the social affairs, as well as on the economic affairs, in the work under the purview of the economic and social concept. I particularly associate myself with this emphasis on that point and I also agree with him in saying that as far as Annex 1 is concerned, it was not really the understanding, I think, that it ought to form an integral part of the report itself.

This brings me to the last point, namely, that I would like to make a little suggestion. In the first day, I think, we heard from our distinguished colleague of the United Kingdom that we ought to concentrate, devote our attention to concrete things. Now one of the first suggestions perhaps, is to make our own report a little more concrete and concise. There is some misunderstanding, but that probably can be avoided if, instead of referring to a whole document, a memorandum, a working paper, a report, we should bear out in our report exactly what we have agreed to adopt.

Now since this is a report from the Commission of which I am a Member, I can take more liberty in, shall I say, criticising. If we want really to have a full comprehension of all that is contained in this report, we have to read in addition to this one paper, probably eight or ten other papers of equal or greater length, so I think by spending a little more time while discussing the report in spelling out the things we decide on, we can save the time of others and the time of our discussion if we have those things spelled out instead of having to refer to the given papers relative to the same document.

The PRESIDENT: The Secretariat would like to make a statement now.

MR. STANCZYK (Representing Secretariat): Mr. President, Members of the Council, following the general discussion on the Report of the Permanent Social Commission and in particular the remarks of some of the speakers, I deem it my duty to advance a few additional remarks on behalf of the Secretariat.

I was listening very carefully to both deliberations of the Permanent Social Commission and to the general discussion on its Report at meetings of the honourable Council. I noticed that not one speaker had even tried to tackle the fundamental question of definition, that none of them had given a concise or strict definition of social problems as such; that none of them had stated where this problem began or where it ended. They limited themselves to fairly generalized statements.

I have had good opportunity to get acquainted with social problems. I have been a trade union official for thirty years. I have been taking part in the work of the International Labour Organisation for more than twenty years in the capacity of workers' representative at first, and subsequently in the capacity of governmental representative. Furthermore, I have been Minister of Labour and Social Welfare during the six years that have been most difficult and most trying for my country. This is why I am well

aware of the difficulty of giving a precise and adequate definition of social problems. Indeed, social problems are not constant and unchangeable items. They originate, they grow, and sometimes diminish and even disappear in the function of the ever-changing economic and political situations of the countries which they affect and are frequently dependent on world wide economic and political trends.

I do not want to abuse this Council's indulgence, but I do trust that you will permit me to give two examples which will set forth my ideas on this subject more clearly than an abstract statement.

(During the above remarks Mrs. Woodward,, representative of the United States, left the Council table and was replaced by Mr.Stinebower; Mr. Reid, representative of New Zealand, left the Council table and was replaced by Mr. Nash.)

Between 1930 and 1934 the whole world was afflicted by a deep economic depression. Throughout the world millions of unemployed were plunged into deepest misery. Countries with the best-developed production apparatus, such as the United States and Great Britain, belonged to those that suffered most. There were 13 million unemployed in the United States; more than 2 million in Great Britain. An additional 15 million workers were unemployed throughout the continent of Europe. Mass unemployment and mass misery, caused primarily by economic conditions, were undoubtedly social phenomena certainly falling within the category of "social problems".

During the last war most of the nations involved in it were again afflicted by misery and hunger. This goes, first of all, for countries that have been invaded and occupied by the enemy. These countries are now faced by tremendous tasks in the field of social welfare. They have to care for millions of parentless children, cripples, the homeless, and people afflicted by incurable illnesses. At present, unfortunately, nobody seems to have a definite idea as to how to approach these tremendous tasks. No one seems to have a clear picture as to how such care should be administered by what organizations, or how it should be financed. And this, too, is a social problem. But this time it was caused by the scourge of war.

By these examples I have tried to prove how difficult and risky it would be to try to give an exact definition of "social problems". They are as manifold in their phenomena as their causes - which may be economic, political and natural - as would be the case in distress caused by catastrophies. If their causes are deep enough, social problems become particularly acute. If their causes are multiple - or if they last for some time - the acuteness of social problems increases, or new ones appear that tax the ingenuity of social workers or public officials called upon to remedy them and to relieve the distress. But, on the other hand, continued

peace and a high level of economic activity are likely to diminish the acuteness of social problems, or even sometimes to put some of them out of existence altogether.

I am telling you this in order to get through with my main idea that there are no ready-made definitions for social problems, their scope, and no ready-made formulae for their solution. We have to use common sense and ingenuity in solving social problems, taking a clue from their ever-changing causes and their size.

That is why - to my great regret - I am unable to agree with the honourable representative from the United Kingdom, Mr. Mayhew, who thinks that the problem of the standard of living is one that falls completely within the province of economists. I highly respect the economic science and our learned economists themselves, but I have some deep lack of confidence in their ability to organize economic life in such a way that - by harmoniously combining raw materials, production apparatus and manpower - humanity would be protected from economic depression and an even flow of goods would be secured, thus improving everybody's standard of living. It seems to me that any economic activity should serve human welfare and contribute to the social progress of mankind. If it fails to fulfil these two aims, it will be futile. The economists of the past often forgot about this function of economic activity, and it is unfortunately possible that they may make the same mistake in the future. Therefore if such an interpretation is given to the tasks of economics, there can be no doubt that all matters connected with the problem of the standard of living fall also within the province of the Social Commission.

We have heard some remarks here that the report of the Social Commission did not present a clear-cut division between the social activities of the

Social Commission itself and those of the specialized agencies. I do not claim that this report of the Social Commission is so precise that no doubts can arise as to the details of what the Social Commission should do, on the one hand, and the specialized agencies on the other. I think that such a detailed division in a report or even in rules of procedure is impossible.

One of the honourable representatives to this Council expressed some doubts as to a few paragraphs of the report. There might be some small slips of a purely formal type in that respect, but I have to ask you for a little forbearance. We are a young organization which has not yet been able to work out its quite proper style and presentation in the preparation of documents and working papers. I trust that - with the progress of time - we shall acquire additional skill in that respect. But even so, I do think that there is every reason to be lenient in the consideration of a report's form, when that form does not alter or affect the contents of the report.

It has also been asked by one of the speakers whether the inclusion of the annex on working relations with Specialized Agencies had been decided by the Commission.

In fact, according to the verbatim record of the meeting, the honourable representative from China suggested that the annex on working relations with Specialized Agencies: "Be quoted in a footnote, or attached to the main report", as a convenience for persons interested in these matters who would not have all the various documents at their disposal.

The Rapporteur added that "If the Commission so wishes, we might add a certain number of annexes to the report just to make certain points more definite... In this way, things might appear more clearly for the reader."

In replying to the Chairman as to whether this would meet his point, the Member from China replied: "Yes".

No objection was raised to this statement by the Chairman, and the draft resolution of Mr. Hauck, the Rapporteur, was adopted by fourteen votes, with none against.

The General Report of the Social Commission was submitted twice to the Commission for discussion. The Commission, after adopting each paragraph separately, adopted the whole of the report by thirteen votes for and none against. But, of course, if this Council holds another view of the matter, it is free to delete this paragraph from the Commission Report.

I think that academic discourses about procedural matters do not seem to bring us close to the real needs which exist and the tasks which are before all of these agencies and institutions to be fulfilled as soon as possible. Any one who presses now for an over-detailed and precise definition of the division of all the activities between the Social Commission, and the specialized agencies; any one who wants now to avoid any doubts, any duplication of small details, will only come to the logical conclusion that we should liquidate the Social Commission or some specialized agencies because only in one central agency could we secure an ideal solution of avoiding any quarrels on competence.

I personally prefer to choose a method of co-operation and co-ordination in approaching social problems in the spirit of the Charter. I believe myself that we can achieve a high degree of co-ordination through the constant co-operation of the representatives of all the agencies, through the working parties, and joint bodies, by a sincere wish of all concerned to avoid duplication, to eliminate faults and deficiencies, and with a will to perfect the daily machinery of practical work, when we come to the concrete implementation of our common tasks.

In this respect the Charter of the United Nations gives us a clear indication as to how to preserve this spirit of co-operation and co-ordination between the various agencies and the Secretariat.

The PRESIDENT: We have had a very full discussion of this Social Commission Report. I would like to refer only to two points that the Vice-Chairman of the Commission raised. One was the shortness of the duration of the Commission's work. This is one of the matters which this Council will take up through the Secretariat.

I can well understand the necessity of tight schedules of various conferences and the strain on the Secretariat officials, particularly the reporters and stenotypists and all the others. It may not have been possible to have a longer session, but this is one of the matters which we propose to look into.

As regards the special complaint that nobody can work beyond five and a half hours, I would like to state in fairness to the Secretariat and to its officials at all levels, that this was necessitated by the fact that a temporary staff was recruited purely for the Social Commission. That temporary staff, of course, claimed the right to work for the period for which they were employed and I must say from my own experience, and in fairness to the officials regularly connected with the United Nations, that they have worked beyond the hours and did not claim trade union rights. In this matter, however desirable or undesirable that may be.

In the course of the discussions on this and other Commissions' Reports, several representatives pointed out the desirability of having some accepted procedure for the submission of these Reports to the Council, of having it in certain accepted forms. There have been many suggestions made during the course of these discussions, and I venture to think that more discussions will be made in the course of discussions on other Reports in the next few days.

I have been considering this subject and I propose that I bring to the notice of the Chairman of the various Commissions, of the views of the Members of this Council on the matter of preparing the Reports and on filing those Reports

so that they may be most usefully presented to the Council. Perhaps in this connection I must state that I am also considering -- and I hope to have the benefit informally of the advice of the representatives -- the time and the method of intervention and the matters on which Secretariat officials of the United Nations can enter into debates in this Council.

One of the matters which has been raised, as I understand, in my absence, by the representative of Canada of which I must take notice is the charge that social questions do not receive as much importance as economic questions. It would be very unfortunate if the impression were to go out that this Council is not asking about and discussing social questions in discussing economic questions.

The debates that we had in the last two days, on the Social Commission Report at any rate, should dispel any such impressions from the minds of the representatives and the minds of the public who have listened to these debates. If his complaint was that the Committee of the Council which met on social questions is a smaller committee than that which was composed the other day on economic questions, I would like to point out that that happened only because the Committee of the Economic Commission was composed after the Committee on social questions was first composed. It is my desire now at the end of this debate to place the proposition before the Council, that the Council should go into committee to consider the Report of the Social Commission also.

I trust that neither the Chair nor the Council will be charged with any bias in favour of one set of questions as against another. In fact we have all realized that economic questions are there to be solved only to promote social interests.

As I have said, we have had a very long and interesting discussion on the whole of the Report. I do not propose to take each section separately now in view of this long discussion, but if any representative wants to have discussion on any particular section and wishes to make any special remarks on that section,

EP.V. 67

38-40

I will welcome those remarks. The Report will then go to a committee of the whole.

(During the above remarks Mrs. Woodward replaced Mr. Stinebower, the representative of the United States and Mr. Stolk replaced Mr. Zuloaga, the representative of Venezuela at the Council table.)

MRS. WOODWARD (United States): Mr. President, I should like to comment briefly on item IV A found on pages 7 and 8 of the Report.

Since effective work in the social welfare field is largely dependent on technically qualified staff, it was highly appropriate for the Social Commission to give their attention to problems of training workers in this field. If the United Nations is to facilitate progress in social welfare, it is essential that there may be available in the Secretariat a small number of social welfare technicians to constitute a nucleus for furnishing expert advice on the requests of governments and to assist the Commission in its work. There is no specialized agency at present equipped to furnish these services.

Furthermore, some headquarters staff will be necessary for another year to assist in carrying on certain advisory social welfare functions of UNRRA for which the General Assembly has made provision. The request for an expenditure of 30 thousand dollars for social welfare activities would cover both of these purposes; namely, the temporary functions taken over from UNRRA and the longer-run functions of the United Nations. We understand that this amount would include the employment of consultants on short-term contracts in specialized welfare fields, as needed.

I should like to say further, Mr. President, that we feel the Social Commission has made a commendable beginning in coping with certain problems in its field. The progress evidenced by the Report should be noted with approval.

In future sessions, the Commission will, I am confident, give careful attention to the broader aspects of the social field and will continue to examine the problems of greatest urgency, particularly those not fully covered by specialized agencies.

MR. MAYHEW (United Kingdom): Mr. President, I would like to draw attention to the paragraph at the bottom of page 18 of the Report of the Commission. On this subject, in the discussions in the Social Commission, the United Kingdom representative reserved his position.

The paragraph reads: "The Resolution passed by the General Assembly does not limit the countries eligible for ^{the} advisory welfare services provided by the United Nations. The Commission therefore believed that while special consideration should be given to providing these services to countries which were victims of aggression, and particularly to those which are Members of the United Nations and have been receiving UNRRA assistance up to now, the basic principle should be that of the need of each country for welfare services." The Commission agreed to leave it to the Temporary Social Commission to develop general criteria.

In document E/275, also on page 18, these criteria are laid out. I think that there is no doubt about the desirability of the first two criteria, except that I would say they are in the reverse order. The idea in the mind of the Assembly when this money was voted was that it was a continuation of the UNRRA services. It is true that the Resolution referred to the functions carried on by UNRRA and may be interpreted to include certain provision of services to non-UNRRA countries. We accept this. It is clear, however, that the emphasis should be on the countries which were receiving UNRRA assistance. I think therefore that the Temporary Commission should be instructed to review that criteria with this consideration in mind. Take paragraphs 3 and 4 for instance. Paragraph 3 reads: "More than half of the monies available should be used for assistance to United Nations Member States which received assistance from UNRRA." Paragraph 4 reads: "Some of the money available should also be used for assistance to countries in each of the following groups: (a) ^{non-}United Nations Member

States receiving assistance from UNRRA; (b) United Nations Member States which received no assistance from UNRRA but which, being less developed areas, need social welfare services." The countries which received UNRRA assistance are separated into those which are Members of the United Nations, those put in paragraph 3. We have in paragraph 4 those which are not Members and which did not receive UNRRA assistance.

The United Kingdom Government take the view that it would be a retrograde step to discriminate between countries which are Members of the United Nations and those which are not from among the countries which had been receiving UNRRA assistance. The UNRRA formula covered ex-enemy countries, like Austria and Italy, as well as the United Nations Members who had suffered as a result of the war.

Our concrete suggestion is that these funds should be used as we believe the Assembly intended them to be used, primarily for the continuation of the functions actually carried out by UNRRA. We also recognize that there will be some long-term welfare service functions carried out by small permanent sections in the Secretariat and that these services will be available for the United Nations on the basis of need. These services would cover work not in the field of the work of the specialized agencies. We have no objection to and we would welcome that service which would originate within the general lines given by the Assembly for the continuation of UNRRA functions.

We must make sure that during the present year, while non-UNRRA countries are not excluded, that the great bulk of these services should be given to the UNRRA recipient countries according to the UNRRA formula, that is, without any discrimination against the ex-enemy countries which received UNRRA assistance. This, we are convinced, was the purpose for which the \$670,000 was voted by the Assembly.

E/P.V.67
48-50

With your permission, Mr. President, I should therefore like to move formally that the Economic and Social Council request the Temporary Social Welfare Commission to advise the Secretary-General, in considering those application for advisory welfare services which are submitted by countries formerly assisted by UNRRA, that no discrimination should be made between these countries other than that of their need for these services.

MR. NASH (New Zealand): It is only a minor point, Mr. President, I wondered whether it is quite worded in the way that it should be and I wondered if the representative for the United Kingdom could consider whether we should not instruct the Secretary-General to do the job, instead of requesting a Committee to advise him that it should be done.

The PRESIDENT: That will be taken care of at the committee stage. I agree that this wording is not appropriate, whether it refers to the Temporary Social Welfare Commission or to the Secretariat. This wording is not appropriate.

MR. NASH (New Zealand): If it is to be taken care of later, that is all right.

The PRESIDENT: Yes. I take it that the Council is agreed that in considering these applications for advisory welfare service, no distinction should be made between those countries other than that of the need for such services--those countries which were being helped by UNRRA.

The Council is agreed.

Is there any other point on this social function?

MR. PAPANEK (Czechoslovakia): Mr. President, it seems to me that emphasis should be placed on the countries that need it and that have received UNRRA help, but were United Nations countries and not enemy countries. We must not forget that even if, temporarily, these countries maybe are suffering more--I mean the ex-enemy countries--throughout the war they were much better off and the peoples in the occupied countries, in the devastated countries, were suffering for seven years. And even if they have better conditions in some of them--not all of them--the results, the long-term results for the people of these countries will be much worse than those in the ex-enemy countries, and we must take this into consideration in every decision we are making here.

The PRESIDENT: Is there any other point on this Report? If there is none, then this Report will go before the Committee of the Council. I suggest that the Council should go into Committee, to consider the Report.

Those who are in favour of the Council going into Committee, please raise their hands?

(There was a show of hands.)

The PRESIDENT: Those against?

(There was a show of hands.)

The PRESIDENT: Its is accepted.

MR. MOROZOV (USSR) (Interpretation from Russian): Mr. President, If I understood you correctly, the Economic and Social Council has taken no decision whatever concerning the proposal which has just been formulated by the representative of the United Kingdom, and that this proposal will be considered by the Committee of the Whole.

The PRESIDENT: I put the resolution of the United Kingdom representative to the vote of the Council, that the principle should be that there should be no discrimination, that the help should be given to all countries which were receiving UNRRA aid hitherto. That was accepted by the Council. The Czechoslovakian representative then said, as I understood him, that priority should be given to the Members of the United Nations, as between them and ex-enemy countries which were also receiving aid from UNRRA.

That matter would have to be further considered in Committee but the non-discrimination as to countries which have hitherto been receiving UNRRA aid, was a principle which I understood was accepted by this Council.

MR. MAYHEW (United Kingdom): I regret very much, Mr. President, that I am not still quite clear about your ruling. The point I was making was that, as between those countries which were formerly recipients of UNRRA assistance, there should be no discrimination between those that are Members of the United Nations and those that are not. Do I understand clearly that the Council has decided in favour of that principle?

The PRESIDENT: That was my impression, but if any Members feel that the decision has been taken before they properly understood what the decision was, I must allow them to reopen the question.

MR. ROYER (France) (Interpretation from French): Mr. President, I would hate to admit that I asked for the floor because I did not understand something. However, I must say that the position at the present time is not quite clear. I believe that the proposal which you have placed for a vote, cannot be conciliated with the proposals which have been formulated by the representative from Czechoslovakia. I believe that it is not possible to say that the Council, on the one hand, can favour the proposal which has been formulated by the representative of the United Kingdom, and, at the same time, recommend that the Committee study the proposal which has been formulated by the representative of Czechoslovakia.

I do not think that the Council can ask to take any decisions on this matter at the present time. I believe that the United Kingdom proposal may be quite appropriate. However, I must say that we have not had time to study it. We do not see fully all the implications of that proposal, and we should have time to study it before we can even vote on the principle of it.

MR. KAMINSKY (Byelorussian SSR) (Interpretation from Russian):

Mr. President, I would like to clarify a point. I understood from the last remark that no vote had been taken as yet, and that every one of the representatives was making a last remark before the various proposals which have been formulated are referred to the Committee of the Whole, where they will be considered.

MR. MOROZOV (USSR) (Interpretation from Russian): Mr. President, I would suggest that we follow the following procedure: inasmuch as the proposal which has been formulated by the representative of the United Kingdom has not been discussed as yet and has been submitted to us at the last moment-- as a matter of fact we have not even had a chance to read it, as there is no actual document -- and as I understand personally that the representative of the United Kingdom does not insist that we discuss this question at present, I suggest that the whole question be referred to the Committee of the Whole and we do not take any decision on the substance of the question. Considering the fact that the question has not been discussed, I believe that this would be the most appropriate procedure.

MR. MAYHEW (United Kingdom): I had felt, Mr. President, that in view of the long discussions in the Social Commission on this question that I would perhaps be entitled to move the resolution. Of course, if it suits the Council better, I warmly agree with the suggestion made by the Soviet delegation.

The PRESIDENT: I am willing to fall in with the suggestion of our Russian colleagues. I want to keep the record clear and correct. The resolution that was moved by the representative of the United Kingdom referred to a recommendation which is contained on page 18 of the Social Commission's Report, and therefore I put it before the Council without further notice. It is one of the points referred to in the Commission's Report, and I did not think that it required any further notice. I declared the resolution carried also because I thought that no objection meant that, and I put it to the Council. After that I declared that the resolution was carried, the Czechoslovakian representative made some remarks which I thought were more appropriate to be considered in the Commission.

I wish to declare that that resolution which I declared adopted by the Council should now be declared not to have been voted upon, and the whole matter will now go to the Committee for the Committee to work on.

Are there any other remarks on any other sections of the Social Commission's Report? There being no further remarks on the sections of the Report, this Report will now go to the Committee of the full Council for consideration.

I propose to take up the Report of the Human Rights Commission tomorrow morning.

WORLD FEDERATION OF TRADE UNION PROPOSAL

I would now like to take up that question which was referred to us regarding the bringing on to the agenda of the item proposed by the WFTU, and in regard to which we thought differently. The twenty-four hours' notice which was required has now elapsed, therefore there is no question of any objection being made on the grounds of twenty-four hours' notice being required. The proposition which I shall now have to put is whether the rule of procedure which we have recently adopted regarding the Agenda Committee, et cetera

E/P.V.67
58-60

should be suspended by the Council and a majority vote will declare what the Commission's decision is on the subject. Then I propose to put to the Council that under its powers to review the agenda from time to time, the subjects from the WFTU should be brought on the agenda of the present session of the Council and should be placed last among the items of the agenda.

Is there any objection to the procedure that I have indicated? Is the Council agreeable to the suspension of the rule of procedure regarding the appointment of an Agenda Committee and the consideration by that Agenda Committee of items proposed by the representative of the World Federation of Trade Unions?

(No objection was voiced.)

MR. MOE (Norway): It seems to me, Mr. President, that we must also then suspend the rule as far as the item submitted by UNESCO is concerned because that is exactly in the same category as the item submitted^{by}/the WFTU. There is no reason to make an exception of the item submitted by the WFTU.

The PRESIDENT: Apart from the fact that^{the} item suggested by UNESCO is an item suggested by a specialized agency, that particular item was already brought on the record of the agenda by a decision of this Council at the opening session on the opening day of the Council. That has already been put on the agenda, along with the resolution given notice of by the honourable representative from Czechoslovakia regarding timber. These two items have already been brought on the agenda by a decision of the Council on the opening day.

Those who are in favour of suspending the ruling will please raise their hands.

(There was a show of hands.)

The PRESIDENT: Those who are against the ruling will please raise their hands.

(There was a show of hands.)

The PRESIDENT: The rule is suspended.

I now propose that the item proposed by the WFTU regarding Trade Unions be placed on the agenda of the Council. Of course, it will be added at the end of the agenda.

Those who are in favour of placing the item on the agenda will please raise their hands.

(There was a show of hands.)

The PRESIDENT: Those who are against will please raise their hands.

(There was a show of hands.)

The PRESIDENT: The proposition is accepted, and the item will find a place on the agenda of the present session of the Economic and Social Council.

Tomorrow, at ten o'clock a.m., the Drafting Committee regarding Commodities and the Timber Resolution will meet. There will be a Plenary Session at eleven o'clock tomorrow, when the Report of the Human Rights Commission will be considered, and then the International Children's Emergency Fund will be considered.

At six o'clock p.m., the Drafting Committee on the Transport and Communications Commission's Report will meet.

On Saturday, the first item that will be taken up will be the item regarding the Assembly Resolution on the Crime of Genocide. Afterwards, the rest of the items which are unfinished tomorrow will be taken into consideration.

The Council will now adjourn and meet at eleven o'clock tomorrow.

(The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.)