

United Nations

Nations Unies

MASTER FILE

**ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL**

**CONSEIL
ECONOMIQUE
ET SOCIAL**

UNRESTRICTED

E/P.V. 82
28 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 twenty-four 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 EIGHTY-SECOND MEETING OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL
(Thirty-Second Meeting of the Fourth Session)

Lake Success, New York
Friday, 28 March 1947 at 2:45 p.m.

The PRESIDENT: Sir Ramaswami MUDALIAR

(This Verbatim Report was made subsequent to the meeting from sound recordings. Therefore, no attendance list can be furnished, nor can the individual speakers be properly identified. Due to the fact that only original speeches were recorded on the sound recordings, no report of interpretations could be included.)

The PRESIDENT: The Council is in session.

The representative of Venezuela has requested that Item 18, Expert Assistance to Member Governments, be taken up first. If the Council will permit him to have his motion accepted, that item will be taken up now.

EXPERT ASSISTANCE TO MEMBER GOVERNMENTS

The PRESIDENT: Item 18, Expert Assistance to Member Governments, E/AC.19/1, 26 March 1947.

The resolution reads as follows:

"THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL,

"Being charged under Chapter IX and Articles 62 and 56 of Chapter X of the Charter of the United Nations with the task of promoting economic, social, and cultural progress and development;

"And taking note of the Resolution of the General Assembly of 14 December 1946 on Provision of Expert Advice by the United Nations to Member Governments;

"A. Instructs the Secretary-General to establish machinery within the Secretariat designed to perform the following services in relation to expert assistance to Member Governments:

1. Assistance to Member Governments in obtaining information on expert personnel, research facilities and other resources that the United Nations and specialized agencies can make available to Member Governments on request, and especially to the less-developed countries for aiding them in their development.
2. Elaboration of plans and programmes for the most efficient utilization of such personnel, facilities, and resources.

3. Assistance to Member Governments which seek expert advice in securing, on terms mutually agreed upon, such advice, particularly in the form of teams of experts who would study specific problems and recommend appropriate practical solutions for the consideration of the Member Governments concerned.

"B. Instructs the Secretary-General in implementing the above instruction to work at every stage in close co-operation with the specialized agencies and in this connection, further instructs the Secretary-General to obtain a report on this subject from the Co-ordination Committee for submission to the Council if possible at its Fifth Session.

"C. Instructs the Secretary-General, in co-operation with the Co-ordination Committee, and without prejudice to any action to be taken on immediate requests, to study the general procedures and terms, including financial arrangements, which might be followed by the United Nations and specialized agencies in respect of technical assistance provided by them to Member Governments.

REPRESENTATIVE OF VENEZUELA: Mr. President, in the Drafting Committee we agreed unanimously to this paper, as the Chairman has just read it.

There is, in my opinion, a doubt regarding the document submitted by the Secretariat. We have one, E/324/Add.1, which is the estimate presented on 23 March in which the Secretariat gives a figure of approximately \$19,000 as the correct additional cost on a narrow basis of services of that scope and then E/328/Add.1/Rev.1, in which they say, "On further consideration of the financial implications of the Draft Resolution on Expert Assistance to Member Governments, the Secretary-General has come to the conclusion that the Secretariat

functions envisaged under this resolution can be provided for within the framework of the existing budget."

I wish to remind the Members of the Council that after the Indian representative expressed his point of view, the representatives of the United Kingdom, the United States, and France immediately said that with the additional explanations of the Indian representative, they will warmly endorse the proposal that I had the honour to put forward before.

If I remember well, the representative from India in that expose that was so warmly approved mentioned that the machinery within the Secretariat, according to him, should be a minimum of one senior officer, two junior officers, and six clerks.

The Secretariat, in the first paper, E/324/Add.1, cuts that down substantially to much less than that minimum which has been suggested by the delegation from India, and furthermore, in this Add.1/Rev.1, cuts it to zero.

The USSR delegation very rightly had requested the Secretariat for the paper explaining what would be the expense incurred for this machinery. I use "machinery" although I do not like that very much, but the English-speaking representatives in the Drafting Committee substituted the word "machinery" by the word "section" or "unit" which we had suggested.

I do not like either, E/324/Add.1, and of course much less, E/328/Add.1/Rev.1. If we are going to establish a machinery, because that machinery does not exist within the Secretariat, that is the whole purpose of this resolution, and I want to make very clear those scruples in my mind, because regarding the draft itself we agreed to that unanimously in the Drafting Committee.

MR. KIRPALANI (India): Mr. President, I should like to endorse generally what my colleague from Venezuela has said. In the Plenary Session, when this matter first came up for consideration, I had said this was a very modest proposal

we were making, but it was the first concrete step in providing technical assistance to less-developed areas.

I had then given my idea of what sort of unit might be set up in the Secretariat. I had mentioned then that we wanted a senior officer, two deputies, and about six assistants, who would look after the kind of activity that we had in mind.

In the committee stage, the word "section" did not find favour, because it was felt that would unduly restrict the authority and power of the Secretary-General, which he rightly must possess in organizing Secretariat activities, and for that reason it was suggested that we accept the word "machinery."

From this paper, E/324/Add.1, it would appear that the modest activity that we contemplated was going to be reduced so as to become almost redundant and will not serve the purpose.

I am not suggesting that the Secretariat have, themselves, done this on their own. They have followed the discussions, but I would like to re-emphasize that we want, if not a section, a unit of the sort of strength that we suggested there.

The PRESIDENT: I can only take it that this paper, put forward by the Secretariat, means that the present staff can cope with this work, and on that basis we shall accept it.

The directions of the Economic and Social Council are quite clear in this resolution, if it is approved by the Council, and it is for the Secretariat to carry it out. Their responsibility will be all the greater if they say that they can carry it out without additional staff and without additional expenditure.

MR. KIRPALANI (India): Thank you, Mr. President.

(The representative of USSR spoke in Russian)

The PRESIDENT: I think it is possible to earmark certain staff for work of this kind, and if that is done within the existing staff, even that would be the establishment of machinery.

Any of that is consequential action of the Secretariat from the passing of this Resolution, and I think in fairness to ourselves and as a matter of caution we might adopt the language that was decided upon unanimously by the Drafting Committee and leave it to the Secretariat whether it will be new machinery that will be established or the existing machinery remodeled for this purpose. The words "establish machinery" are capable of both meanings.

REPRESENTATIVE OF VENEZUELA: Mr. President, maybe I have a very simple mind, and I do not understand the complexities, but I do not know how it is possible to establish machinery and at the same time not to incur any expenditure otherwise than by just using employees that are doing some other work for a purpose for which we declare in that Resolution that machinery should be established.

I repeat, maybe there are some thin ends that I am not able to grasp, but I regret to say that I am not satisfied with the explanation from the Secretariat.

The PRESIDENT: I suggest that instead of going into the intricacies of Secretariat arrangements or the subtleties of the Secretariat's division or allotment of work, we may satisfy ourselves by adopting this resolution, and see how it works.

MR. KIRPALANI (India): We do not--at least I, the representative of India, do not -- suggest that we amend this Resolution, but under the Resolution passed by the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council, before

initiating any activity, has to get an idea of the expenditure involved. Now what I have said is merely a commentary on the Secretariat paper E/324/Add.1, and if you will permit me and if such commentary is permissible, we would say that the staff mentioned there "one, professional, and two, secretarial staff" is, in our view, inadequate for carrying out the activity in this Resolution.

The PRESIDENT: That will go on record.

I now put it to the Council to adopt this Resolution.

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

The PRESIDENT: The Resolution is carried.

We now go back to our agenda.

REPORT OF THE SOCIAL COMMISSION

The PRESIDENT: The Report of the Social Commission, Item 10: I understand the amendments proposed for this are not ready, so that will be held over for the time being.

ONE DAY'S PAY PROPOSAL AND INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S EMERGENCY FUND

The PRESIDENT: The next item is number 11, One Day's Pay Proposal and International Children's Emergency Fund. I think this subject has occupied more time of the Members of the Council than is justified, both in Committee and outside, and I hope we shall not spend very much more time in accepting this proposal.

Are there any remarks on this Resolution?

MR. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom): There is an amendment which the United Kingdom has put in on this. Before putting it in we ascertained whether it would command support. Our feeling was, after that consultation, that it would command support, and that is why we do suggest that the Committee give consideration to it forthwith.

The PRESIDENT: Can you read out the amendment? If it is of any substance or is a long amendment, we shall hold it over.

MR. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom): Well, it is quite a long amendment, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT: Well, then, it will be better to take it up later. I understand the amendment has only just been handed over, and it is now being mimeographed.

MR. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom): The amendment is before us here. It is in paper E/A.C.7/14/Add.1.

The PRESIDENT: The representative of the United Kingdom could certainly point out the difference between this amendment and the original version. I think we might be able to dispose of this immediately.

E/A.C.7/14/Add.1. is the paper you are referring to, is it not? Will you kindly not read out the whole resolution, but point out what is the difference.

(The representative of the USSR spoke in Russian)

HOUSING AND TOWN PLANNING

The PRESIDENT: Item number 12, Housing and Town Planning, paper E/364. There have been no amendments handed in about this Resolution.

"THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

"1. INSTRUCTS The Social Commission in collaboration with the Economic and Employment Commission to continue its study of housing problems in close co-operation with each other and with specialized agencies and the other inter-governmental organizations concerned with these problems;

"2. INSTRUCTS the Secretary-General in co-operation with the specialized agencies and inter-governmental organizations to arrange for a study of housing problems which should be the basis for further consideration of these problems by the Social Commission in collaboration with the Economic and Employment Commission, and requests him to make the necessary arrangements to provide facilities which will include the collection and dissemination in the appropriate form of information relating to rural and urban housing and town planning and to report thereon to the Social and Economic and Employment Commissions; and

"3. DIRECTS the Secretary-General to submit to the Social Commission a proposal regarding an international conference of experts on housing, including a statement of objectives, scope and composition, "On the basis of such a proposal the Social Commission in collaboration with the Economic and Employment Commission shall submit recommendations to the next session of the Council as to what further action should be taken."

May I take it that this Resolution is accepted?

(The representative of the USSR spoke in Russian).

The PRESIDENT: The proposal is that the clause "which should be the basis for further consideration of these problems by the Social Commission in collaboration with the Economic and Employment Commission" may be deleted, and a consequential amendment on the basis of such a proposal be deleted also. It would then read: "Instructs the Secretary-General in cooperation with the specialized agencies and inter-governmental organizations to arrange for a study of housing problems, and requests him to make the necessary arrangements to provide facilities," et cetera.

(The representative of France spoke in French.)

(The representative of the USSR spoke in Russian.)

The PRESIDENT: I understand the proposal of our Soviet colleague to be namely this: The words "which should be the basis" may be deleted. The further consideration by the Social Commission in collaboration with the Economic and Employment Commission would still take place on the basis of the Secretary-General's reports, and similarly, the Social Commission in collaboration with the Economic and Employment Commission will submit recommendations to the Economic and Social Council at its next session, but it should not form the basis of the social work as already done by the Social Commission.

(The representative of France spoke in French.)

The PRESIDENT: Yes. It is only the words "which should be the basis" in the second paragraph and the words "on the basis of" and "of the Resolution" that are proposed to be deleted.

MR. KOTSCHNIG (United States): Mr. President, we would have no objection to the deletion of these words in the first instance, "which should be the basis." It would then read "for a study of housing for further consideration of these problems by the Social Commission." That is my understanding.

On the other hand, on the second point I think we should maintain the words "on the basis of such a proposal," because the Social Commission has not given us so far the kind of statement which is viewed here under paragraph 3. It has not given us a statement regarding the objectives, the scope and the composition of such a conference, and therefore it appears to us that it is in order to say that further discussion should be on the basis of this additional material that for the time being does not exist. In other words we would agree to the deletion in the first instance, but would prefer its retention in the second instance.

(The representative of the USSR spoke in Russian.)

The PRESIDENT: Shall we say "in the light of such a proposal" instead of "on the basis," because if the Secretary-General has to make a proposal somebody must consider that? In paragraph 3, we say, "...direct the Secretary-General to submit to the Social Commission a proposal regarding an international conference. In the light of such proposal the Social Commission, in collaboration with the Economic and Employment Commission, shall submit recommendations, not on the basis of..." -- that is to say, having taken into consideration the proposal also.

(The representative of the USSR spoke in Russian)

The PRESIDENT: The proposal is that the words "which should be the basis" be deleted from paragraph 2.

(A vote was taken by a show of hands)

The PRESIDENT: The deletion is accepted.

In the last paragraph, instead of the words "on the basis" the words "in the light of such proposals, the Social Commission, in collaboration with the Economic and Employment Commission, shall submit recommendations,"

(A vote was taken by a show of hands)

The PRESIDENT: It is accepted.

I put the resolution, as amended, to the vote of the house.

(A vote was taken by a show of hands)

The PRESIDENT: It is accepted.

(The representative of USSR spoke in Russian)

The PRESIDENT: That is a point that has to be considered in the light of our suggestion. You can say "to the first session of 1948" -- the future session would be much too big, if it should be referred to a future Session of the Council.

(The representative of France spoke in French)

The PRESIDENT: I do not think it is likely that the Social Commission will meet before the next session.

MR. KOTSCHNIG (United States): Except, Mr. President, under another decision which has been taken, their recommendation would have to be before the Council a month before the meeting of the Council, which actually does exclude its being considered at the next session.

You might say either "at the first session in 1948" or "at an early session." In saying that, it would at the same time support the view put forward by the French representative that we should not let this matter just wait indefinitely.

The PRESIDENT: I think "an early session" will be better.

(The representative from France spoke in French)

The PRESIDENT: No, this is a report by the Social Commission to the Council; it is not a report by the Secretary-General.

(The representative from France spoke in French)

The PRESIDENT: May we settle the wording of the last paragraph first, gentlemen, "to an early session of the Council", the last sentence.

(The representative from France spoke in French)

(A vote was taken by a show of hands)

The PRESIDENT: It is accepted.

The financial implications are worked out in paper E/304/Add 1. The personnel, the publication of bulletins on housing, and the organization of an international conference are all dealt with separately. I bring it to the notice of the Council.

(The representative from France spoke in French)

The PRESIDENT: That will be done.

REPORT OF THE POPULATION COMMISSION

The PRESIDENT: Item 13, Report of the Population Commission. I understand
on
there are certain amendments/the resolution of the Population Commission which have

not yet been circulated. Therefore, that will be held over.

The migration resolution is connected with the Population Commission's report. There are no amendments suggested on that. I do not know whether the Council would like to take that up or delay the consideration of that until the Population Commission's report is taken up.

Shall we take up the draft resolution on migration?

(No objection voiced)

DRAFT RESOLUTION ON MIGRATION

The PRESIDENT: The resolution reads:

"THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

HAVING CONSIDERED the recommendations of the Population and Social Commissions relating to migration questions, and being of the opinion that further consideration of them by the Council should be postponed pending further study by the Commissions concerned,

"REQUESTS the Secretary-General

1. To make such studies and arrange such consultations as may be required to achieve an application of the terms of reference of the interested Commissions which, while avoiding duplication of effort will result in effective consideration of problems of migration.

2. To prepare, in consultation with the specialized agencies, documents for the use of the Commissions concerned, comprising:

- (a) current and proposed studies of migration problems;
- (b) plans for the efficient compilation and use of significant information concerning migration movements and policies; and
- (c) studies on migration problems of international urgency, and existing and proposed plans for meeting them.

(The representative from USSR spoke in Russian)

MR. Arca PARRO(Peru): I should like to support the proposal made by the Soviet Union representative to refer this whole study of migration problems to the Population Commission, as it has been said that it is really under this Commission that the necessary experts could be found to prepare all the work that is required in order to plan any future action that has to be taken by the Council.

The PRESIDENT: Any further comments on the resolution?

Mr. PHILLIPS(United Kingdom): Mr. President, I am afraid I cannot agree with the suggestion of our Soviet colleague. I think that this is really a matter of co-ordination, rather than a matter of expert study, and the question of expert study falls within a number of commissions and agencies. I think the real purpose of this was to produce some machinery of co-ordination which has been centered in the Secretariat, I think quite rightly. I would therefore support the draft which has been Brought forward in the President's name, which is an improvement on the draft which came forward at the Committee and was discussed at the Drafting Committee.

The PRESIDENT: Any further remarks?

Representative of CHINA: Mr. President, it appears to me that to refer the matter to the Secretariat for a study does not at all preclude the Commission from making its own study. So I think both of them can be carried on together. I think the draft resolution as it stands seems to be all right.

Mr. Arca PARRO (Peru): I should like to answer in some way the statement made by the Chinese representative. If we refer this just to the Secretariat, it means that the Commission will have no opportunity to intervene in the actual framing of the work.

On the other hand, if it is referred to the Commission, it will be the Commission who will lay the outline for the work, and afterwards, of course, the personnel of the Secretariat will undertake or develop whatever programme has been prepared.

So, from that point of view, I think it is acceptable that the proposition that has been made, the original proposal made by the Social and Population Commissions to establish or set up a joint committee should be adopted. It was rejected, I think, in view of the expenses that would be involved. But, the Population Commission is supposed to meet once more this year, so there will be

an opportunity for this Commission to do this work and to refer later on to the Secretariat.

The PRESIDENT: This matter was fully discussed in the Committee of the Whole of the Council, gentlemen. The original wording of the draft resolution as adopted by the Committee was: "The Economic and Social^{Council} having considered the recommendation of the Social Commission, with which the Population Commission concurred, that there be established an ad hoc technical committee on migration, and having concluded that the purpose of such an ad hoc committee can be better accomplished by other means," and so on. It was suggested by the Committee that this could be so worded as to remove that reflection--if reflection can be spelt out of this language--on the recommendation of the two Commissions. The Population Commission had merely accepted what the Social Commission had proposed. The Chairman of the Population Commission had suggested that this was merely an acceptance of the Social Commission's proposal, without too great an examination of what it implied. Then it was suggested that a draft may be prepared which will give effect to the views of the Council regarding the work that the Secretary-General should carry out, without in any way taking away the work which the Population Commission would itself do later on the material prepared by the Secretary-General.

The result is this draft which I have placed before the Council now for consideration.

(The representative of France spoke in French.)

Representative of NORWAY: Mr. President, I think this problem of migration is one of the most important, most urgent and most pressing problems in the world today, and in whatever way we are going to deal with it, I think that the Secretariat should get started and do some preparatory work. I understand that is the only intention of this resolution. It is quite evident that the question

will come back as well to the Population Commission as to the Social Commission.

The PRESIDENT: As far as the proposals of the USSR and the French delegations are concerned, the resolution will merely say: "The Economic and Social Council, having considered the recommendations of the Population and Social Commissions relating to migration questions, is of the opinion that further consideration of these problems by the Council should be postponed pending further study by the Commission concerned." That will be the proposal.

(The representative of France spoke in French.)

Mr. Arca PARRO (Peru): In the third paragraph of this resolution, as to "establish that the Secretary-General will refer whatever preparatory work has been done to the Population Commission at the second session or meeting of this year," I would just as well have it referred to the Social Commission whenever it meets. So really, the work will be carried on in the first stage by the Secretary-General, then it will be referred to those Commissions.

Representative of CANADA: Mr. President, migration in the world today seems to me so important that we should press on, encourage the adequate pressing on with studies of this very important problem. I do think, therefore, that the draft presented by the President should be accepted so that at least the first stage of adequate co-ordination--which Commissions will study what aspects of the problem--may be got on with.

I agree that the Population Commission is perhaps the most important, but I do not like the change in emphasis in these amendments suggested. I do recommend that the Council accepts the draft in Document E/343/Rev. 1/Add.1.

The PRESIDENT: I have no precise language before me of the amendments that have been suggested. Various ideas have been thrown about. I would like to ask the representative of France to put in precise language what amendment is suggested to this.

(The representative of France spoke in French):

Representative of CANADA: Mr. President, a point in my mind is that the problem of immigration has so many facets; there are questions of government immigration policies which are under active consideration by many governments, including my own at this very moment. There are very many other aspects. A very interesting memorandum submitted to this Council by the World Federation of Trade Unions, for example, mentions one aspect of this problem. There are social aspects. I think the Commission on Human Rights will be concerned with the matter in a certain aspect, and so on.

Now, this problem of overlapping in duplication may become wasteful. It may become very embarrassing and it is for that reason that it seems to me the essential first task is to instruct the Secretary-General to make the necessary studies and arrange for the necessary consultations so as to achieve the co-ordination that we need for an orderly examination of this problem as a whole.

It seems to me it would be a great pity to restrict the subject of migration solely to the Population Commission or to any other Commission. The problem is essentially one of co-ordination, of allocation, of the various facets of the problem to the relevant bodies.

The PRESIDENT: Well, gentlemen, I think I would request the delegations to put in any amendments to this resolution by this evening. I will take it up tomorrow morning.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS

The PRESIDENT:

Number 15: Resolution of the General Assembly concerning the draft on Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms Resolution of the General Assembly.

We have the Resolutions sent up by the Social Commission on the Commission on Human Rights Report. The Resolution, on page 2, about the Commission and Sub-Commission, on a Temporary Sub Commission, has been substituted by the Paper E/386.

E/P.V. 82
45-50

The Resolution on that Paper was accepted by the Committee of the Council last night. The two will be taken together now, including the Paper C/380 and E/379, which gives the recommendations regarding the Members of the two Sub-Commissions on Freedom of Information and on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities.

These resolutions are now for the consideration of the Council.

REPRESENTATIVE OF CANADA: The Canadian delegation submitted, some time ago, an amendment, a proposed addition to the Resolution contained in paper E/386. I understand that has not yet been circulated but should be circulated at any moment.

The PRESIDENT: I thought this was accepted only last night, unanimously.

REPRESENTATIVE OF CANADA: Yes, it was. This is what we proposed/^{as}an addition. The amendment we propose/^{arises}out of a draft resolution on the Report of the Commission on the Status of Women. We feel that it would be more appropriate to make provision for the consultation with the Commission on the Status of Women regarding the Draft Bill of Human Rights in the Resolution, regarding that Bill, than in the Resolution on the work of the Commission of the Status of Women, and it/^{is}for that reason that we are bringing the matter up today.

The PRESIDENT: I understand your proposal is to lift out this recommendation from the Social Commission's resolution, and to put it in this part of the Human Rights Resolution.

REPRESENTATIVE OF CANADA: And to put a provision in the Resolution on the Commission for Human Rights regarding the Bill of Human Rights, yes sir.

The PRESIDENT: I think, as it was considered in connection with the status of women, it will lead to complications if it were considered at this stage. I think it will serve the same purpose/^{if}it comes under that.

REPRESENTATIVE OF CANADA: Very well, sir.

The PRESIDENT: I may explain, with apologizes to the Council, that what we were discussing was that when we considered the Resolutions of the Commission on the Status of Women, it was agreed in the Committee of the whole Council that a representative of the Commission on the Status of Women should be present when sections of the draft of the International Bill of

Human Rights, concerning the particular rights of women, were being considered by the Commission on Human Rights. That part of the Resolution will come up on the Resolution itself, the Commission on the Status of Women, and I propose to deal with it at that stage.

REPRESENTATIVE OF CANADA: I understand this is purely a matter of procedure, sir?

The PRESIDENT: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE OF CANADA: Our recommendation that the appropriate paragraph should then be tacked on ^{to} the Resolution regarding the preparation of the Bill of Rights, will be able to be discussed at that stage.

The PRESIDENT: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE OF CANADA: Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE OF NORWAY: Mr. President, the Norwegian delegation has moved an amendment, or rather, an addition to the Resolution on the International Conference on the Freedom of the Press. I would ask the Chairman if it is in order to move that amendment now?

The PRESIDENT: Have you circulated it?

REPRESENTATIVE OF NORWAY: Yes. It is document E/AC.7/12 Add. 1.

The PRESIDENT: Yes, you can move it if it has been circulated.

REPRESENTATIVE OF NORWAY: Well, Mr. President, the amendment reads as follows:

"Recommends to the Sub-Commission to invite a representative of the International Organization of Journalists to be present as an observer at its meetings, with the right to participate in the debate."

I draw the attention of the Council to the fact that the International Organization of Journalists has been given the status of a consultant organization in Category B, at this session; that is to say, that it has not been passed on by the Council itself yet.

Now the reason why the Norwegian delegation proposes this amendment, is because it is of the opinion that it would be of great advantage to the Sub Commission if a representative of the working journalists were to take part in the discussions on the freedom of information, because whatever decision is made, it would certainly be helpful to the Sub-Commission to have the advice of those who are going to put that decision into practice. If we accept the principle that a journalist should be represented by a spokesman in the Sub Commission, there can be no doubt that the most representative is the International Organization of Journalists, which is the one I mentioned in our amendment.

in

I will just give a few words, sir, a little information on this organization. It was established at the World Conference of Journalists, at Copenhagen, in June of 1946. It is really a merger of two organizations, the pre-war International Federation of Journalists, with its seat in Paris, which suspended activities during the occupation of most of Europe; and of the International Federation of Journalists of Allied and Free Countries, created during the war in London.

Nineteen countries were represented by delegations of the unions of journalists, at this conference in Copenhagen. The nineteen organizations which originally formed the International Organization of Journalists, have a membership of eighty thousand. Since its formation, seven more countries have joined the organization, mainly from Latin America. The International Organization of Journalists is now representing the great majority of working journalists in all of the five continents. As far as is known, there are no similar world-wide organizations representing the journalistic profession in press and radio, or any of these two information media as such.

The Bureau of the International Organization consists of representatives of the national unions of Great Britain, the United States of America, the USSR,

France and Norway. Another reason why this organization should be invited to send a representative to the Sub-Commission, is that at the last Congress in Copenhagen, it dealt extensively with this question of freedom of information, freedom of the press, and it is also going to deal with this question at its international conference in Prague this summer.

It seems to the Norwegian delegation that it is only reasonable that we invite a representative of the journalists to the meetings of the Sub-Commission.

(The representative from Chile spoke in Spanish.)

REPRESENTATIVE OF CANADA: Mr. President, I would support the amendment suggested by the Norwegian delegation. It seems to me very sensible.

REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES: Mr. President, we very much hope that this most important organization will have a large share in the preparations for this Conference, and that the Sub-Commission, which has to work^{out} the draft agenda and carry much of the burden of the preparations, will call on this organization. In other words, we fully agree with the substance of the proposal that has been made. We have some hesitation, however, with regard to this particular amendment because we feel that this question as to who is to be invited by one of the subsidiary bodies of the Economic and Social Council, should be left to that particular Body, whether it is^a Commission or a Sub-Commission.

This Organization has important relationships, as has been pointed out, under Article 71. Therefore, the Commission will be perfectly free to invite this Organization. As a matter of fact, it would be folly on the part of the Sub-Commission, not to invite them. In other words, sir, we do feel that we are again in danger of interfering with the^{internal} arrangements of a subsidiary body which has been created. And that is the only reason--and I emphasize,

that is the only reason--why we have some hesitation in approving the amendment so proposed.

REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED KINGDOM: Mr. President, the formal position is that this Body, as one of the non-governmental organizations with consultative status, can attend this meeting, when it is a public meeting, and make use of its consultative status. I imagine that by singling out this important organization, which we all want to be there, we are not altering that procedure at all. We are simply sending a special invitation to this Body because of its importance. That is the first point I want to make.

The second point I want to make is on the words at the end: "with the right to participate in the debate." It seems to me that those words go a bit beyond the arrangement we have laid down on the Non-Governmental Organization Committee, and I should prefer words as follows: "to be present as an observer at its meetings for the purpose of consultation." If you leave those words "with the right to participate in the debate", you tend to override the Chairman and you tend to break down the idea that these bodies are here for consultation. And we would expect that their advice would be readily drawn upon, but we do not want, at the same time, to lay down a right for participation.

I welcome this proposition in its general form, but I would suggest that we say at the end: "for the purpose of consultation", instead of "with the right to participate in the debate"; and that earlier on we might give some indication that this is by way of special invitation to this Body, which does not preclude any other consultative arrangements being entered into with the other non-governmental organizations concerned in this important subject.

REPRESENTATIVE OF NORWAY: I accept the amendment put forward by the representative of the United Kingdom, although I must draw attention that this is a somewhat particular situation, because the Sub-Commission is really going to deal or to decide what the Members of this Organization are going to

carry out in practice--but I accept it.

The PRESIDENT: The amendment proposed is at the end of the first paragraph, on page 2, before the words "transmits to the Sub-Commission", that the following be inserted: "Recommends to the Sub-Commission to invite a representative of the International Organization of Journalists to be present as an observer at its meetings for the purpose of consultation."

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

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

The PRESIDENT: The amendment is accepted.

Are there any other observations on these sets of proposals?

REPRESENTATIVE OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA: Mr. President, I would like to make a statement in connection with the Resolution "C" on page 3, E/AC. 7/15, and in connection with the document E/379. Is it in order?

The PRESIDENT: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA: Mr. President, I am reluctant to speak on the subject, but I feel strongly that the general development of the situation is alarming and I consider it my duty to draw the attention of this Council to the great responsibility it is taking upon itself in the selection of the Members of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities. I speak on this subject objectively, without personal interest, as Czechoslovakia did not present any candidate for membership on this Sub-Commission.

The Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities is, or rather, should be composed of experts. I ask you, who is an expert on minorities and their problems? Do we have a formula for the settling of minority questions.

Does not life itself, in areas where these questions are met with daily, create real experts? Are not these questions so complex and so different in the various parts of the world that the expert on conditions in Asia, the Caribbean, or Western Europe is not, and cannot be, an expert on these problems in Central or Eastern Europe? Is not the fact that there is no Member from Central Europe on the Sub-Commission a factor which will incapacitate the Sub-Commission when it will, as it must, deal with Central and Southeastern European problems? Or does the decision of the Council not to have a Member from Central and Southeastern Europe mean that all problems of minorities in Central Europe are considered as definitely solved?

I feel that the decision in failing to include at least one Central European or Southeastern European Member is contrary to the letter and to the spirit of the Charter. Certainly it is contrary to the interests of this Council to make such decisions.

The peoples of Central Europe were, for a long time, just objects concerning whom others made decisions without consulting them. Today these peoples of Central Europe want to cooperate in the work of the United Nations, and they must not be deprived of that possibility. If they are deprived of this possibility, the decisions arrived at here will only be paper decisions.

Can you imagine the hundred million people living in Central and Southeastern Europe, United Nations Members, in a region where the problems of minorities and discrimination have been the most acute for centuries, just looking on powerlessly while others academically discuss their problems, perhaps arrive at their solutions, and even try to enforce their conclusions?

I realize that there are difficulties in reaching agreement, but is it not better and is it not wiser to arrive at an understanding, with all of us participating in the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities? You have represented all sections of the world except Central, Eastern, and Southeastern Europe. Is it right, just, or democratic to have four representatives from Western Europe who represent 113,000,000 people, while 260,000,000 people in Central Europe have only one--I repeat--one? Is it just or democratic that six small European countries with a population of 32,000,000 people have two representatives, while five smaller countries in Central And Eastern Europe with a population of 100,000,000 people have none?

I raise these questions because I am gravely concerned with these developments in the United Nations. This is not the first time this has occurred. Only a few weeks ago there was a similar decision in the Headquarters Committee in the selection of the Board of Design Architects. The representation is as unequal as in the present case. I can only come to the conclusion that it is becoming a policy.

Our duty is to work together and to eliminate the formation of blocs, or even the tendency toward the forming of blocs. Disregarding the actions of individual countries, let us work out our problems and eliminate difficulties, but, please, let us not try to avoid issues by disregarding or eliminating from our midst those who are eager to co-operate but sometimes slow to believe in us. Their faith in the fact that the United Nations and the work of this Council is beginning to show positive results can only be strengthened by giving them their rightful opportunity to cooperate.

For these reasons, Mr. President, which I have given, I shall vote against the Resolution.

The PRESIDENT: I would like to make only one remark on that statement of the representative of Czechoslovakia. It is a very important statement. I am sure that all the Members of this Council will give due weight to it and bear it in mind whenever any question of election arises in the future. But I must say it has also been brought to my notice that in the election of the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press, except for China, the whole of Asia and the whole of Africa have been left out of it altogether. A similar complaint has been brought forth by certain representatives, and on my advice that complaint was not expressed openly. In fairness/^{to}them, I think I ought to state now that their complaint has been received.

In this particular case, I should only like to point out one factor: that these two Sub-Commissions are bound to report to the main Commission on Human Rights, and on the main Commission on Human Rights the countries of Central Europe and the countries of Asia and Africa are both represented.

I do not say anything about the elections that have taken place, but I merely want to put the record straight and to give the public the correct impression. In this respect, I should like to point out that the reports of these two Sub-Commissions are bound to pass through the Commission on Human Rights, and on the Commission on Human Rights there are the representatives of Yugoslavia and Byelorussia.

So far as Asia and Africa are concerned, there are represented the countries of Iran, Lebanon, Egypt, and India.

I feel it my duty to bring these facts to the notice of the Council, so that the question may be considered in its proper perspective.

REPRESENTATIVE OF NORWAY: Mr. President, the Norwegian delegation shares the opinion voiced by the Czechoslovak delegation that it is very unfortunate Central Europe is not represented on the Sub-Commission on

Minorities. I should like to add that it is certainly unfortunate also that, apart from China, Asia is not represented on the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information.

The Norwegian delegation agrees with the President that there is perhaps no real danger, because all these questions will be passed on to the Commission on Human Rights, to the Economic and Social Council, and finally to the General Assembly. Therefore, no country is really left out or is unable to voice its opinion on these questions. But the Norwegian delegation should like to point out what it already stressed in the first half of the First Session of the General Assembly: that when this happened, it was really due to our system of elections. The spirit of this system of elections that we have today in the United Nations is expressed in the ruling that there shall be no nominations and no discussion on elections.

In this particular case, we had nominations but we had no open discussion in the Committee or in the Council before the elections. It was impossible to point out, after some Members were elected, that it would not now be just, it would not be right, to elect, let us say, in the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information, somebody from Asia because Asia was not represented.

So we are really prevented from discussing the geographical distribution, that is the principle laid down in the Charter. Our whole system leads to secrecy and to negotiations in the corridors, which are really unworthy of the United Nations as such, instead of leading to open discussions and open elections, as we have in most democratic countries. So the Norwegian delegation is of the opinion that we should give serious thought to the possibility of changing this system of elections.

AC/bh

E/P.V.82
65-70

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

(The representative of the USSR spoke in Russian.)

Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States): Mr. President, while we realize the unfortunate discussion which has taken place, before we vote on these resolutions I think it might be well to point out there is before us a letter that was sent by one of the organizations in Category A which suggests an amendment to our Resolution concerning human rights. It suggests not only the draft submitted by Panama and other Member States but also other drafts/^{that}should be transmitted to the Commission to work on. We are not proposing that this amendment should be adopted, but I think, simply for the record, it might be well to point out that it is clearly understood, I take it, that the Commission on Human Rights and the drafting committee which is being set up, will, of course, take full account of whatever draft resolutions or draft bills of rights are being submitted by non-governmental organizations. I do not think we need to have a discussion on that point.

There is one further point, however, which I would like to raise with regard to the discussion of the Drafting Committee on the Resolution on Genocide.

We suggested a slight amendment which at that time was considered out of order, because the Committee as a whole had not discussed the amendment and we are, therefore, under the obligation to move that amendment now.

I do not know what has happened. We handed it to the Secretariat this morning, and it is not among the documents which have been distributed. But it is such a simple amendment, Mr. President, that perhaps we could handle it even without the written text before us. I refer to the Resolution on Genocide which in (b) says on the very last page of the report: "After consultation of the General Assembly Committee on the Codification of International Law and reference to all Member Governments for comments, to submit to the next session of the Economic and Social Council a draft convention on the crime of genocide."

The proposal which we made already in the Drafting Committee is that we should insert after "Committee on the Development and Codification of International Law" the words "and, if feasible, the Commission on Human Rights, and after reference to all Member Governments..." In other words, we suggest the insertion of nine words "If feasible, the Commission on Human Rights, and after." These words would come after the words "Committee on the Development and Codification of International Law and", so that the paragraph as a whole would read: "After consultation with the General Assembly Committee on the Development and Codification of International Law (and, if feasible, the Commission on Human Rights, and after reference to all Member Governments for comments, to submit to the next session of the Economic and Social Council a draft convention on the crime of genocide."

I think it is hardly necessary to make a great plea for this particular amendment. It simply makes it clear, a matter that I think all of us would agree with, that the Commission on Human Rights has a very real interest in this convention on genocide and that, therefore, somewhere at some stage in the development of that convention the Commission on Human Rights should have the opportunity to comment on that draft.

REPRESENTATIVE OF CUBA: Mr. President, when this matter was discussed in the Committee, I thought we had come to an agreement on account of the fact that both sides, the United States and Cuba, discussed this point and came to an agreement on this. Therefore we are opposed to the mention of the Commission on Human Rights.

I think the matter was discussed and should not be discussed now at this point.

REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES: Well, Mr. President at this point I think it is not quite so simple. Our original motion would have given this whole job of drafting this particular convention to the Commission. We have now receded from that position. I do not think you ought to go to the other extreme and exclude the Commission on Human Rights altogether from any opportunity to make a contribution to this discussion.

We are very careful to put in "if feasible", because we know there is a time element involved and we want to be quite sure that the reference on Human Rights will in no way retard the drafting of this convention and its submission to the General Assembly.

(The representative of the USSR spoke in Russian)

The PRESIDENT: I understand the representative of Russia is referring to his proposal that the composition of the sub-commission should not be accepted, not to the proposal that has just been made by the representative of the United States.

Mr. KIRPALANI (India): Mr. President, with your permission I should like to go back for one minute to the composition of the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and the Press.

Without belittling one word of the very important statement made by the representative of Czechoslovakia, I would just like to indicate to the Council the distribution of membership as a result of the election. Whatever the disparity between Western Europe and Eastern Europe, six representatives will come from Europe, three from North America, one from Latin America, two from Asia, and none from Africa. We have no complaint. The election has been held, and we are not going to suggest that the election be upset, but, sir, with all respect, in connection with the observations that you have made that, after all, the work of the Sub-Commission will have to go to the Commission on Human Rights, may I draw attention to clause (a) of the functions of the Sub-Commission: "In the first instance, to examine what rights and obligations and practices should be included in the concept of freedom of information."

It would have been better if the Sub-Commission had been more representative, so that views on this subject could have been taken in consideration on a more representative scale.

I would, in this particular, only point out the importance that was attached in this Council to the preparation of a preliminary draft of an International Bill of Human Rights and Human Freedoms and indeed that the matter was considered of such vital importance that the Council was at one time determined to set up a special sub-commission, and indeed now have set up a Sub-Commission.

I do not say this by way of complaint, sir.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now put each of these resolutions separately to the vote of the House.

(The representative of the USSR spoke in Russian.)

(The representative of Chile spoke in Spanish)

The PRESIDENT: I have no objection to putting the proposition that the consideration of this series of resolutions be postponed to tomorrow, but I must point out that, so far as I can see, there is no way of re-opening this question and that the elections made will have to be approved now. I do not think most of the representatives who pointed out the defects about this considered it plausible to re-open the election. They suggested that these facts may be borne in mind at future elections, and that is how I took their observations, but in view of the request of the representative of the USSR, I shall put the proposal to postpone it, though I personally feel that by tomorrow morning nothing can be done; in fact, at this session nothing can be done about it. Only for elections at future sessions may we take all this into consideration.

Those who are in favour of postponing the consideration of these resolutions, will please raise their hands.

(A vote was taken by a show of hands)

The PRESIDENT: Four have voted for, and seven against. The postponement is not carried.

I now put the series of resolutions to the acceptance of the Council. The first resolution--in view of the substitution that has been raised in the Resolution on the first page in E/AC.7/15, the words "to the Temporary Sub-Commission and" would go, because there is not going to be a Temporary Sub-Commission.

Those who are in favour of the Resolutions in E/AC.7/15, with the substitution of the new Resolution about the drafting committee in the place of the old Resolution about the Temporary Sub-Commission...

Mr. SMITH (Canada): Mr. President, this is on the understanding that the amendment arising out of a subsequent report and the Canadian proposal would, instead of adding a paragraph to the Draft Resolution on the Status of Women, have a paragraph added to the Draft Resolution on the Commission on Human Rights, and the Bill of Human Rights can still be re-opened at that stage. Is that correct?

The PRESIDENT:--Yes. What I suggest is the Canadian representative may move his amendment at that stage in two forms, that such and such a paragraph be substituted for the paragraph in the Social Commission's Resolution and that this paragraph -- a separate resolution -- be now appended to the resolutions already adopted with reference to the Human Rights Commission.

Mr. SMITH (Canada): Very well, sir.

The PRESIDENT: In that case, there will be a Secretariat job and a direct Secretary job to transfer this Resolution to the Commission's Report.

Those who are in favour of adopting these Resolutions with the substitution for this Resolution on the Sub-Commission, the long Resolution about the Drafting Committee, will please raise their hands.

Mr. PAPANEK (Czechoslovakia): Mr. President, are we voting on all of them?

The PRESIDENT: On these Resolutions in this paper first.

Mr. PAPANEK (Czechoslovakia): Can we separate them because I am in agreement with most of them, but I expressed reservations as far as the composition of...

The PRESIDENT: The composition is going to be separately voted on. The composition is not in these Resolutions at present. That will be voted on.

Those who are in favour of these Resolutions will please raise their hands.

(A vote was taken by a show of hands)

The PRESIDENT: It is accepted, sixteen voting for it.

I now put the compositions of these two Commissions to the vote of the Council. Those who are in favour of adopting the composition suggested by the Committee for the Commission on Human Rights, the Commission on Freedom of Information, and the Commission on Prevention and Discrimination, please raise their hands.

(A vote was taken by a show of hands)

The PRESIDENT: Fourteen Members have voted for, and one against. The composition is accepted.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I am abstaining.

The PRESIDENT: One abstention.

We will now vote on the Resolution on Genocide. I will put the amendment of the United States that in the second paragraph, (b), the words "and, if feasible, the Commission on Human Rights and after reference to all Members" be added. The proposal is that these additional words be inserted after the words "International Law and."

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

(A vote was taken by a show of hands)

The PRESIDENT: The amendment is carried by twelve votes to one.

(The representative of the USSR spoke in Russian)

The PRESIDENT: The amendment proposed by the Norwegian delegation recommends to the Sub-Commission to invite a representative of the International Organization of Journalists to be present as an observer at other meetings for the purpose of consultation. It has already been carried and it will be incorporated as an amendment to the main resolution.

Item 16 has certain amendments which are not yet ready and it will be taken up later.

The next item is the translation of the classics, Document E/AC.7/16.

I have requested the Vice-President to take the Chair for a few minutes.

(Mr. Papanek, the representative of Czechoslovakia and Vice-President of the Economic and Social Council replaced the President in the Chair)

The VICE-PRESIDENT: Document E/AC.7/16, the translation of the classics is now under discussion. Are there any remarks?

Mr. Arco PARRO (Peru): Mr. President, I regret to have to speak again on this subject. In doing so, I would say that I do not overlook the importance of such a task as the translation of the classics, provided it could be done at some particular stage of our development. I think it rather premature to undertake such an enormous job as the translation of the classics and their subsequent publication, before the United Nations or its specialized organ, UNESCO, has yet developed a very wide programme for the purpose of promoting the development of popular culture.

The translation of the classics means that we are going to pay great attention to certain aspects of the development of culture. There is no doubt about that. But for the majority of the population of the world--and I mention that as one of the first tasks--it would be necessary to promote the development of wide-spread knowledge in various fields.

Particularly important is the reduction of illiteracy, which is really of such concern for international relations. Once we have accomplished certain aspects of such a programme, no one would object to the expenditure of money of the United Nations for this type of work.

It is only from that point of view that I am not in agreement with this resolution and particularly, in the way in which it has been drafted. According to the first paragraph of the resolution, it might mean that we have neglected all the aspects of the work that we are supposed to be promoting in the development of culture. It says that the translation of the classics is a project of international concern of great significance for the promotion of international cultural cooperation.

I do not think it is of such great importance, because it is not going to create a new sense of international cooperation. It is only going to revive certain aspects of culture, but it is not going to touch the new trends of thought which are really of most concern for humanity today. I think that what we want to know is what the trends in the future will be more than what they were in the past. We are not going to rebuild the world only on what was taught in the past, but on what we are thinking now and how we are trying to approach the future.

Mr. KORSCHNIG (United States): Mr. President, we fully recognize the importance of the scheme that has been put before us. It has come from the General Assembly which, in turn, has made it clear that they consider this an important undertaking. For this reason, we are prepared to support the resolution; at least, we are prepared to support the essence of the resolution that has been put before us.

The essence of it is that this matter should be referred to the one organization which is, evidently, by far the best qualified to handle it, the organization which has been created for that one kind of thing, although there are other matters which that organization is supposed to do, which, perhaps, from an immediate point of view, are more important. Nevertheless, we strongly favour this matter being transmitted to UNESCO. We also think it would be a good idea to have UNESCO report back to the Council as to what has been done by it with this proposition.

A doubt arises over the second part of the resolution where it says "invites UNESCO", and then gives UNESCO a whole string of recommendations which, perhaps again might be considered interference in the internal affairs of UNESCO. UNESCO is supposed to be the organization which is supposed to know best how to do that kind of thing better than we know it. Therefore, perhaps it is unnecessary and even undesirable to give UNESCO this long list of broad hints as to how they should do that particular job which we ask them to do.

With that in mind, the United States delegation would prefer to have the second part of the resolution deleted. It would in no way change the substance of our action, but it would make it plain that we are leaving it to UNESCO to do the job as best it sees fit. We believe that UNESCO is better qualified to work on this question than we are. In other words, though we do not insist simply in order to get a vote on this, we would move that the second part of this resolution beginning with "invites UNESCO", be deleted while, in our opinion, the first part should be voted affirmatively.

THE REPRESENTATIVE OF NORWAY: I support the remarks made by the representatives of Peru and the United States. As far as I can recall, when we discussed this in the Council, it was the idea that we should get back a much simpler resolution. We agreed especially on one point and that was that this should not entail expenses as far as the United Nations are concerned. But I see here that paragraph (c) says that certain nations do not have sufficient facilities and resources for the authentic translation of numerous classics into their languages and just at the end of paragraph k it says "...suggestions for general assistance in translation, publication and distribution."

I submit, Mr. President, we are on a very dangerous road if the United Nations in this case said that UNESCO should begin the publication of the classics at the expense of the United Nations. I think that this Council should remember that when it looks around the world today there are some very urgent tasks where money is needed more than for this.

However, in order not to be considered as an enemy of the classics, the Norwegian delegation will vote for the resolution and for the United States amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: As far as I see it, there are no expenses included for the United Nations. The resolution refers the problem purely to UNESCO. The proposal of the United States delegation is to delete the second part on page 2 beginning with "invites UNESCO". If there is no other discussion on the subject, I will put it to the vote. Those who are for the deletion of the second part of the resolution please raise your hands.

(A vote was taken by a show of hands and the Vice-President announced the result as follows)

The VICE-PRESIDENT: Nine for deletion and five against. It will be deleted.

Those who are for the resolution as amended, will please raise their hands.

(A vote was taken by a show of hands and the Vice-President announced the result as follows):

The VICE-PRESIDENT: Fifteen for and none against. It is adopted.

The next item is item 19, Alternates for Members of Commissions, Document E/AC.19/2. The text of the resolution reads:

"The Economic and Social Council decides that where a Member of a Commission set up by the Council by resolutions of 21 June 1946 and 1, 2 and 3 October 1946 is unavoidably prevented from attending a session of the Commission, an alternate shall be designated by the Government of the Member in consultation with the Secretary-General to serve in the place of the Member for that session.

"An alternate so designated shall have the same status as a Member of the Commission, including the right to vote."

If I hear no disagreement with the text as proposed, I shall consider it as agreed.

(No response was voiced)

The VICE-PRESIDENT: It is agreed.

The next item is item 20, Sessions of Council Commissions and Sub-Commissions.

It is Document E/389 and there is a Chinese amendment on the subject. The document will be distributed.

Dr. CHANG (China): Mr. President, I am just wondering whether we might not proceed from the top down. By the time you reach the last paragraph that is in this Document E/389, by the time you reach the bottom of page one, I think we may then bring up this Chinese amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: The Members have had the document in their hands. Perhaps it is not necessary to read it.

THE REPRESENTATIVE OF NORWAY: Mr. President, on page 2, in the third to the last line it says "concerning the programme of sessions of the commissions and sub-commissions." I will draw your attention to the fact that when we dealt with this in the Committee of the Whole yesterday, the amendments were only read and we did not have them before us. But, for that reason I did not notice that it said "a programme of sessions," because that was not really the intention of the Norwegian amendment, and I do not think it was the intention of the amended amendment of the United Kingdom delegation either.

So, I would propose that we drop this "programme of sessions." It is really the programme of work of the Commissions that was meant.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: How would you formulate it?

THE REPRESENTATIVE OF NORWAY: Just delete the word "sessions," so that the sentence should read, "concerning the programme of the commissions and sub-commissions of the Council and the conferences."

At the same time, Mr. President, may I draw your attention to the fact that Document E/390 is really an addition to this resolution and should be read and voted upon in connection with Document E/389.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: It is considered a separate subject.

THE REPRESENTATIVE OF NORWAY: It is not. No, it was really an addition to this.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: It would be added as a last paragraph.

THE REPRESENTATIVE OF NORWAY: Yes.

THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED KINGDOM: When we discussed this at the committee, I think the Norwegian representative and I were in agreement, and I think we still want to carry out the same thing. But I do not think that his amendment does it because it still has the difficulty that it implies that the Secretary-General will draw up a programme of work for these specialized agencies.

I think we were all clear the last time that what we wanted was the calendar drawn up in respect of the sessions of the commissions, the sub-commissions and the specialized agencies. In addition I thought we were going to have an additional sentence which would say that there would be a discussion at the third session of the Council each year of the work of the Council for the next year.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: I understand that that additional sentence does it.

THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED KINGDOM: Oh, it had not reached me at the time I spoke, but if the Norwegian representative withdraws his suggestion and accepts this one, this meets me.

THE REPRESENTATIVE OF NORWAY: We are really not in disagreement, and I will not make any trouble. I will just put it on the record that as far as I can see or as far as the intentions of the Norwegian delegation are concerned, the implications are that before the third session of the Economic and Social Council, the Chairman should write to the different commissions and ask them what their programmes are, what they are going to work on in the coming year, so the last session of the Economic and Social Council could

take that into consideration when it establishes its own programme. It will be very important, for instance, to have a report from the Commission on Human Rights that its intention is to finish the report at such and such a date so that the question will come up at, let us say, the first or the second or the third session. As I said yesterday, it is quite evident that at the session where this question of the Bill of Human Rights comes up, most of the time of the session will have to be devoted to that Bill of Human Rights. So, perhaps that could be taken into consideration in some way.

There is also a question of the specialized agencies. I mean, if we know beforehand that the coming conference of the International Labour Organization will be mainly devoted to the problem of migration, for instance, it is not necessary for us to deal with the problem of migration, at least not before the conference of the International Labour Organization. It will be better to deal with it afterwards.

Therefore, we must get as much information as we can from the commissions, the sub-commissions and the specialized agencies. There is no intention to impose upon the specialized agencies what their agenda shall be. It is just a polite question of what they are going to do so that we do not collide.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: Do I understand that the text as it is would remain and we would add another paragraph which is contained in Document E/390?

Dr. CHANG (China): I thought the best way would be to proceed from the top down. If we are now beginning from the bottom up, it is a little confusing, is it not?

The VICE-PRESIDENT: There were no remarks about the beginning except yours, which were not ready, so we went to the other side. That was what I understood. But we could come back, after this has been discussed. Every Member read the amendment of the Chinese delegation. We could discuss that or decide upon it now. Are there any objections to it?

Dr. CHANG (China): You do not mean to this so-called Chinese amendment?

The VICE-PRESIDENT: That is it.

Dr. CHANG (China): Are you discussing it now?

The VICE-PRESIDENT: Well, we are ready.

Dr. CHANG (China): Or would you like to vote on the other inasmuch as we discussed the other so much?

The VICE-PRESIDENT: After we agree on this, we will vote on the whole.

I understand there is no objection to adding another paragraph to the text as it is. Then we will vote on the whole of it if we agree on your end of it.

Dr. CHANG (China): All right. Then my amendment really was the result of some talks with certain members of the Secretariat in considering the meetings of the different commissions. As the text of this paper E/389 reads, you will see the last paragraph on page 1 invites the Secretary-General to make arrangements with regard to the dates of commission sessions so that the reports of these commissions would normally be sent to the Members of the Council not later than six weeks before the session of the Council at which they will be examined.

The emphasis here is to invite the Secretary-General in making arrangements with regard to dates of commission sessions in such and such a manner. Now, if this is followed, let us suppose there will be three sessions of the Council, each one lasting roughly four weeks. Then, six weeks before that would be ten weeks for each session. Consequently, it will amount up to thirty weeks of the whole year, when it is not likely that the Secretary-General, following these instructions, will be able to arrange any meetings of the commissions.

Furthermore, there will be at least eight weeks taken up by the General Assembly. So you will have thirty-eight weeks taken from the possibility of arranging meetings for commissions. Fifty-two minus thirty eight--you will have only fourteen weeks left to arrange for two sessions of from four to six of the commissions and then one session from two to six, including the sub-commissions.

You can easily see that the Secretary-General will meet with a very difficult situation. For instance, this noon I was talking with the Secretary in charge of the Human Rights Commission. If this should be carried out, then the Human Rights Commission's last date would be the end of May. Therefore, a meeting should be called around the 12th or the 15th of May in order to finish by the end of May, leaving six weeks for the documents to be sent to people in order that whatever the Human Rights Commission may present to the Council may be considered at the next session.

The same thing applies to the other three or four commissions. I think it makes it impossible. Consequently, the suggestion here in this amendment really has two things practically non-controversial, with only one little point that may be considered controversial. The non-controversial thing is to turn the phraseology around--this is a verbal change--to comply with the former intent of the Article; namely, the intent of the Article is that reports should be considered carefully and should be sent out. That was the important thing. It is not so much to limit the Secretary-General in arranging the meetings.

Therefore, it is a verbal modification, that the reports of commissions will normally be considered by the Council. That is where you begin, after they have been sent to the Members of the Council, not later than so many weeks. That "four" is a little substantial change from our consideration yesterday. I should like to have that voted separately, if people should object, before the session of the Council at which they will be examined.

Now, the next phrase, as I understood yesterday during our discussion, was included by the President, but somehow it was omitted from the final draft as we have it. The President did say it with the exception of the two newly created regional commissions in 1947. I think that was the approximate wording that the President used. This morning we decided there was something to be presented by one of the commissions to the Council at its first session in 1948, so the last clause was added in order to clarify the situation with the exception of those-- that means of the reports of the regional commissions to be presented to the Council up to and including its first session in 1948. That is, after that, the regional commissions should also obey the general rule.

That is my simple proposal.

(The representative of Chile spoke in Spanish)

Mr. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom): Mr. President, I had a very small point to make which I think the Chinese representative will agree to. When we talked about excepting the Regional Commissions until we had had further experience of them, we were not prejudging what we would do when we had that experience, but in the Chinese representative's remarks he did say that when we had this experience we would then apply the same arrangements. As I understand the position, we left it quite open, because a Regional Commission is a different thing from a functional commission, and it may want to work differently and to deal with things with more urgency.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: In any case, even if it were adopted, it seems to me it should apply to the whole document, and therefore it should stay as a separate paragraph. The second part of the Chinese proposition would follow the other part of the amendment; because as it is formulated it would apply only to that change that is proposed by the Chinese representative, as I understand it.

Dr CHANG (China): Yes, Mr. President, it seems to me that the first suggestion here implied would, I think, be accepted by all, namely the verbal change. Instead of simply restricting the Secretary-General in arranging the meetings, what we are interested in is to see that the reports must reach our hands. Therefore, that verbal change should be accepted by all. That is one thing.

Secondly, whether there should be four or six: that deserves to be voted upon. That is another matter.

Now as to the amendment to my amendment, just presented by the representative of the United Kingdom -- would he be satisfied by deleting all the words after "to be presented" in my amendment? That is, "...with the exception of those of the Regional Commissions." Would that be acceptable, because if so I make that withdrawal of the last line "with the exception

of those of the Regional Commissions." But the thing may still be voted on three times, if you like it.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States): Mr. President, I very much appreciate the clarification which the amendment submitted by the representative of China will bring into this document, and I agree with the whole idea, because as he has said, we are not discussing here the schedule of meetings. We are discussing the time of the consideration of their reports.

It may be my stupidity, but I find a slight ambiguity in the way it is expressed, and I wonder if the Chinese representative would have any difficulty in making it read this way: "...decides that the reports of Commissions will normally not be considered by the Council unless they have been sent to the Members of the Council at least ----- weeks before the session of the Council at which they will be examined."

The point is that this really is a negative caveat, and does not say we will proceed to examine them exactly four weeks after they have been sent.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: Then is there agreement with the first part of the Chinese amendment, replacing the last paragraph of the text E/389, page 1? It would then read: "...decides that the reports of commissions will normally be considered by the..."

Dr. CHANG (China): As amended by the United States representative -- "...will normally not be considered by the Council unless they have been..."

The VICE-PRESIDENT: Now is there agreement that we change six to four?

Mr. DAVIDSON (Canada): I would like to make a purely drafting point, sir. I was going to suggest that instead of another sentence about Regional Commissions we put "except Regional Commissions" in parenthesis after "Commission" in the first line. I think that would simplify the whole thing.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: If we adopt that amendment of the Canadian representative, will it apply to all the resolutions, because there are several decisions?

Dr. CHANG (China): Mr. President, may I clarify the matter? I think a vote is needed on the word "four" or "six". That needs a vote. We will leave that question aside. The others are merely verbal changes which I think we all agree are helpful in clarifying the situation. If so, may I read it? If as I understand it, after accepting all amendments to my amendments, the things will read: "...that the reports of commissions (except the Regional Commissions) will normally not be considered by the Council unless they have been sent to the Members of the Council at least so many weeks before the session of the Council at which they will be examined." Delete all the rest, and then that "so many" -- four or six -- we will have to vote on that. Naturally I favour four weeks.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: There is an amendment of the Chinese representative that "six weeks" should be replaced by "four weeks".

Dr. CHANG (China): That is right.

(The representative of France spoke in French):

Mr. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom): I should not like to be put in the position of having to vote for either four or six weeks, if those representatives who came from long distances said that six weeks were necessary. But I wonder whether there is not a factor which might enable us to produce a compromise here. The important thing is that the document should have been a certain period -- four or six weeks -- in the hands of the Government, in the hands of the people considering it. Now in our text here we say "before the session of the Council". Some of the reports may not come up until the Council has been in session for one week or two weeks, or perhaps even

two and a half weeks, so you might, in fact, if you accept the period of six weeks, have a delay of eight weeks so that the report will have been, in fact, in the hands of the Government for eight weeks. Now I wonder if it would not be possible for us to alter the words "before the session of the Council" and put the words "before it is considered at the Council", and then accept a longer period.

I am not quite sure of all the technical implications of that. I presume that the items will have to come on to the agenda of the Council, and when settling the agenda, the Agenda Committee would have to have regard to the period at which the report had been circulated, but I see no reason why we should not put in a principle of this kind, and allow the Agenda Committee discretion to bring on items if the period in which they had been in the hands of the Government is sufficient -- either four weeks or six weeks, or maybe even five weeks, if we could agree.

(The representative of the USSR spoke in Russian):

MR. STINEBOWER (United States): Mr. President, I want to support very strongly those delegations that have spoken in favour of six weeks. I can well understand why they feel six weeks to be essential. It is alleged that it is only ^{one} day by post from Lake Success to Washington, and sometimes that is ^{an} actual fact, but even when it is one day, the United States finds six weeks none too long a time for an adequate consideration of these very important and extensive documents that we get from the Commissions.

As the representative of France has pointed out, there is perfectly good exception in here for an urgent case in this word "normally". I think that one can detect a concern of the representative of China, which I fully share, but this particular rule might operate disadvantageously with special reference to the next session of the Council that we are going to have.

Now, in voting for this resolution with the provision of six weeks in it, I do want to be clear that we attach the greatest importance to the Report of the Human Rights Commission upon which so many things will depend in the way of a Conference of Freedom of Information being considered at the next session of the Council whether the full six weeks have elapsed or not. I hope it may be possible for the six weeks to have elapsed, but we shall want the schedule of this Commission to be pushed up as far as possible by the Secretariat so that the work may be done, but we shall certainly want to see that Report considered at the next session, in view of the uncertainty whether we may or may not have a further session this year.

Now, as to the remarks of the United Kingdom representative about substituting the date of consideration by the Council of the beginning of the session. On that point we would rather rely upon this word "normally" again and treat as an exceptional case, on the decision of the Council, anything that we need to

take up more quickly. But there is a difficulty there. Many of these delegations come from their capitals rather than being permanently stationed here in New York, and I am sure they, as well as we, find that it is a great help for the delegations to have participated in the discussions of these reports/before they leave for the Council session, and it is a relatively poor substitute to have it discussed by the governments and formal instructions sent, which one can read but one does not have quite the same feeling for it that he does if he has participated in the development of his position.

For that reason, I do support the suggestion that we do not shorten the six week period.

MR. CHANG (China): From the point of view of the attention that the Chinese Government would like to give it, I think we should suggest ten weeks because of the longer distance. The reason I made this was really in the interest of arranging of the meetings by the Secretariat. We shall have about twenty-odd meetings of the commissions and sub-commissions, all to be arranged within a possible period of fourteen weeks. Out of the fourteen weeks you will have to take some time out--two weeks out for the Christmas holidays--so you will have only twelve weeks. Now, the Secretariat is signalling me--they want me to speak for them. Of course, they are public servants and they do not want to speak. I am not at all in this case presenting the needs of my Government, which would be ten weeks, but I refuse to submit that now as an amendment. I should say ten weeks. But it is really in the public interest--some of us will have to think of the public interest, even though our public servants do not feel exactly in the position to insist on their needs.

You have about fourteen weeks, and if you take out two weeks for Christmas, you have about twelve weeks for arranging twenty-odd meetings. I think that is really an impossibility.

The representative of INDIA: Sir, with due respect to my honourable colleague from China, I am not quite sure of the mathematics of the Chinese calendar. I am not sure that the thing could not be really well arranged. I see that he personally agrees that, from the point of view of China, six weeks is a very short time.

Since I come from a fairly distant country, I feel that delays in transmission of the documents also have to be taken into consideration. It was pointed out by two or three delegations that what really matters is when the documents are in the hands of the governments and not when they are sent. I have several instances that I can recall when the documents were received after two or three weeks, even when they were sent by air. That factor has to be taken into consideration. In view of that, I think we should retain the original six weeks.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: Could we vote on that before we proceed with further speeches?

We will vote on the proposal of six weeks.

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

The VICE-PRESIDENT: Sixteen for; two against.

DR. CHANG (China): May I make a reservation that I made the proposal for four weeks not in the interest of my Government but in the interest of the Secretariat. That ought to be recorded.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: It will be done, sir.

Now we will vote on the Chinese amendment, as proposed. But there is an amendment of the United Kingdom delegation to the Chinese amendment, which would read as follows: "Decides that the reports of Commissions will normally not be considered by the Council unless they have been sent to the Members of the Council at least six weeks before they are considered by the Council."

The representative of the UNITED KINGDOM: I intended to withdraw that amendment unless anybody else wants to press it, as the other decision was so unanimous.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: Then it would stand "before the session of the Council at which they will be examined."

The representative of CANADA: There are a few words left out. Did you intend to put that separately?

The VICE-PRESIDENT: That will be put separately.

(The representative of the Soviet Union spoke in Russian.)

The VICE-PRESIDENT: Those who are for the text to replace the last paragraph on page one of document E/389, with the amendment of the Chinese delegation will please raise their hands.

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

The VICE-PRESIDENT: It is unanimous; it will be replaced.

The last will be put separately concerning the commissions. Instead of following, it will be a new sentence.

MR. STINEBOWER (United States): Mr. President, I had understood that it was felt we could accomplish this very simply by inserting words in brackets, as follows: "Decides that the Reports of the Commissions (except the regional Commissions)..."

The representative of CANADA: Our amendment was accepted by our Chinese colleague, and I assumed that it was covered when we accepted it.

(The representative of the Soviet Union spoke in Russian.)

The VICE-PRESIDENT: There are two other proposals for amendments to the text. The first is by the representative of the USSR who proposes that the Commission on the Status of Women should be put into the first category of commissions that are meeting twice a year. If there are no other remarks on that, I will ask you to vote on it.

The representative of the UNITED KINGDOM: I would just like to say one word, and that is that we do attach, as I have repeatedly said, importance to the work of the Commission on the Status of Women. What we are trying to do in this paper is to organize the work of the Council. We are trying to get a very great deal into a very limited space of time. A number of very complex problems are pressing upon the United Nations next year. As I made clear at the time I spoke on this earlier, any view that we take as between those that meet twice a year and once a year is based on the agenda, the nature of the subject to be considered, and the business aspect of the question.

(The representative of the Soviet Union spoke in Russian.)

The representative of the UNITED KINGDOM: I am very sorry, Mr. President, but I cannot let that remark pass. I have said here very sincerely, and I repeat very sincerely, that we are deeply attached to the work of this Commission, but it is a question of the organization of the work. The Secretary-General has a limited budget, and certain delegations have come here and cut the budget down--not excluding the delegation on my left--and we really have to try to work out a programme of work within the facilities that we have, on the most business-like basis, and that is the sole basis on which I shall support

the suggestion that it meets once every year.

The representative of CHINA: I would like to ask the honourable representative of the United Kingdom who has used the word "attached" in connection with this Commission, whether any meaning was implied.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: We will vote on the proposal of the representative of the Soviet Union that the Commission for the Status of Women be changed from the second category to the first category.

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

The VICE-PRESIDENT: Three for; eight against. The second part of this proposal is lost by this vote.

Are there any other remarks on the text? Is the Council in agreement with the text of the Draft Resolution, with the amendments presented by the Chinese delegation and the Norwegian delegation?

(No objection voiced.)

The VICE-PRESIDENT: Then we are agreed.

The second proposal was lost because, if there is only one meeting, there is no question of having it in Geneva. I thought that was lost.

(The representative of the Soviet Union spoke in Russian.)

The VICE-PRESIDENT: I understood your proposal that the Commission on the Status of Women--

The representative of the USSR: No, Human Rights and Social Commission.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: There is a proposal that paragraph two on page two should be amended in order that it would read--

(The representative of the Soviet Union spoke in Russian.)

The VICE-PRESIDENT: The representative from the Soviet Union proposes that on page two, paragraph two, line two, the word "Council" should be replaced by the word "Commission."

The representative of NORWAY: I think, Mr. President, that we cannot really do that. That would leave it to the commissions to decide where they will meet. Some would like to meet in Shanghai, and some in Australia. We cannot really do that. It has to be passed upon by the Council. As far as the question itself is concerned, I am very much in favour of having some meetings of the commissions and also of the Economic and Social Council and other Councils in Europe and Geneva. I think that is necessary in order to get the European countries better acquainted with the work of the United Nations. On the other hand, I think that should be left for consideration at a later stage. Anybody who knows anything about the budget of the United Nations today knows that it is almost an impossible proposition. So I think, out of a feeling of responsibility toward the feelings of the General Assembly and toward the intentions of the General Assembly, we should not decide this now.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY-GENERAL: I feel I must make some explanation on behalf of the Secretary-General in this matter. As I have said earlier, it is possible for a certain number of meetings to be held in Geneva. There is a limited staff there. But I think it would be very unwise to leave it to the commissions alone to decide whether there should be meetings in Geneva. It is only possible for a certain number of meetings to be held there, and without consultation with the Secretary-General, I think it might result in a situation where a commission has decided to hold its meetings in Geneva without any practical or financial possibility of so effecting their decision.

(The representative of France spoke in French.)

Dr. CHANG (China): Mr. President, I did not mean to intervene, but I think that instead of meetings in Geneva you might have meant not Shanghai but Shangri-La. I think it is altogether unwise to fix a general principle in regard to this. I am in favour of the present text as printed and then the Council may decide on, naturally, the proposal of the commissions concerned, and then in consultation with the Secretary-General, to hold the meeting in Shangri-La if necessary.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: Can we vote on the amendment of the representative of the Soviet Union?

(The representative of the Soviet Union spoke in Russian.)

MR. STINEBOWER (United States): Surely the representative of the USSR cannot quite mean that last remark, because it is free to any commission to make any recommendation it wishes to the Council as to where it shall next meet, and if that meets with the approval of the Council, in the light of all the circumstances, including advice from the Secretary-General, then it may meet there. This does not bind the commission to meeting only here. It does, it is true, establish a presumption that because of staff, budget and other things, there will need to be special reasons why it should not meet at headquarters.

(The representative of the Soviet Union spoke in Russian.)

The representative of NORWAY: Just a few remarks. I think, Mr. President, that the decision on the principle itself is not necessary because, as far as I remember, it is at least in the Rules of Procedure of the Economic and Social Council that meetings shall be held at headquarters unless the Council otherwise decides.

That is taken care of. It is in our Rules that we can decide to meet at another place. So there is really no decision on principle involved in this. What we are deciding today is only that the Commission on the Status of Women and the other Commissions mentioned--I think it is the Human Rights Commission--cannot meet in Geneva this year. They can take it up next year. Perhaps then the budgetary situation will be different and they may meet there. We cannot really make a new decision of principle at this late hour. So we do prevent the Commission on the Status of Women and the Commission on Human Rights from meeting in Geneva this year, and that is really also unnecessary because we have decided that they shall have only one session and that session has already taken place.

The representative of INDIA: Sir, I think in this whole resolution we are trying to mix up the general with the particular. As a matter of fact, in every paragraph I read some general statements and then some particular statement

Now, I clearly see that the USSR representative has a particular meeting of a particular commission or commissions in view. Now, I do not in fact think that we need to complicate matters. It is quite possible for us to provide for those two commissions. I am sure that the request of the Commission on the Status of Women will not be easily set aside by the Council. That is one of the few commissions, if not the only Commission in this Council whose requests we cannot easily refuse. That being the case, I do not see why that should come here. I should suggest that the words as they are would leave enough scope for the Commission itself to make the request and get that request accepted by the Council.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: Can we vote on the Soviet Union amendment? The Soviet Union representative proposes that the word "Council" in line three, page two of document E/389 be replaced by the word "Commission." We will proceed to a vote on that proposal.

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

The VICE-PRESIDENT: Three for; thirteen against. It is lost.

Now, do we agree with the text, with the amendments as they were agreed upon?

(No objection voiced.)

The VICE-PRESIDENT: The Resolution is agreed upon.

(The representative of France spoke in French.)

The VICE-PRESIDENT: That, if I understand it correctly, will be part of the calendar that has been adopted or will be adopted at the meetings of the commissions. That would be settled at the same time.

(The representative of France spoke in French.)

The VICE-PRESIDENT: We already voted on it.

The representative of the UNITED KINGDOM: That was to instruct the Secretary-General to reconstruct the calendar on the basis of certain principles agreed here. We are now engaged in doing that. But that will not be available in time for decisions taken on that calendar at this session.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: In that case we will have to make the decision in the meeting tomorrow concerning the meetings of the two Commissions who have proposed to meet in Geneva. We have to inform them.

The representative of INDIA: Mr. President, I am wondering whether, with all the discussions on the subject, the Secretary-General's suggestions with regard to the budgetary limitations would make it impossible to have the second meetings of those Commissions in Geneva. If that is the actual condition, I think we should like to be informed, and, if you think it is necessary, to have a vote. We had better have a vote now instead of allowing the matter to go over to tomorrow.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY-GENERAL: Mr. President, I feel that the Secretary-General has a real responsibility to prepare a calendar of meetings for the United Nations as a whole. He has a limited amount of staff and money here in New York and in Geneva. Therefore, it is necessary for him to receive recommendations from the organs of the United Nations as to where you would like to meet, and then to try to fit those recommendations into a workable plan within his limitations. He will endeavour to meet the wishes of the organs as far as possible.

We have a suggestion before us that two Commissions should meet in Geneva. It is possible that those Commissions could meet in Geneva but only at a particular time that fits in with the Geneva programme. Otherwise,

it would be necessary to engage large numbers of new staff and to extend the actual size of the Geneva premises. I would be prepared to report to the Council tomorrow morning, if the Council would be prepared to allow its decision to be taken tomorrow and not this afternoon, as to the exact time when these Commissions could meet in Geneva this year.

(During the above remarks, Sir Ramaswami Mudaliar reassumed the Chair as the President of the Council.)

The PRESIDENT: I suggest that we accept that suggestion and that we have this matter considered tomorrow morning, when the Secretariat will have more time to consider all the other meetings that are scheduled and how this can fit in

(The representative of the USSR spoke in Russian.)

The PRESIDENT: That will be prepared tomorrow morning. Is there anybody else who suggests that the Council should meet at Geneva?

(No response voiced.)

The President makes no suggestions, but I would only like to say that it might come to that, if various Commissions are meeting in Geneva at the time.

REPORT OF THE COUNCIL NGO COMMITTEE

The PRESIDENT: Item 22 is the Report of the Council NGO Committee. The Council is to adopt the Report.

The representative of NORWAY: Just for the sake of the record, I take it that when we vote on Resolution E/389, we also vote on E/390.

The PRESIDENT: Yes, that is so.

This Report was considered by a full committee of the Council, and now the revised Report is before you, regarding the number of non-governmental organizations which would be approved for acceptance on a consultative status at this stage, their classification and the adjournment of consideration of certain non-governmental organizations which the Committee earlier recommended

for inclusion in a consultative status. My suggestion is that since there was a full examination in the full Committee of the Council, aside from a meticulous examination made by the Committee which you appointed, this Report now be adopted.

(The representative of the USSR, spoke in Russian)

The representative of the UNITED STATES: There are two very small matters I would like to mention. The Secretary has omitted two organizations which I think ought to be listed. They are in the group of organizations which are to be considered later on. They would come naturally on the top of page six. They are the World Government Association and the World Union of Women for International Concord. We feel that international concord is so important that we should not leave out an organization that has that in its title. I take it that is due/ to ^{simply} an omission in the drafting.

The PRESIDENT: Yes, yes.

The representative of the UNITED STATES: Another organization decided by the Committee that does not come up clearly, is the International Women's Cooperative Guild which is mentioned among those organizations which are not to be considered. It is an organization which the Committee decided should be represented through the International Cooperative Alliance. By listing it simply among the organizations which we are not going to consider in the future, the wrong impression is created. I am simply making this clear so as to go on record as favouring the relationship between this organization and our Council, but favouring it through the International Cooperative Alliance. That was a decision of the Committee as a whole and it ought to be brought out somehow. Otherwise, we are in full accord with the report that is now before the Committee and we are ready to vote on it.

(The representative of France, spoke in French.)

The representative of CZECHOSLOVAKIA: Mr. President, I understand that the International Transport Workers Federation listed under (b) is a member of the World Federation of Trade Unions. Is it necessary to have both of them?

The PRESIDENT: This is a particular aspect of workers, and it is, therefore, put under (b).

The representative of the UNITED STATES: Mr. President, according to our information, that organization is not a member of the WFTU. I think that is the information that was given us by the Secretariat. It may be a member at some future date, but it is not at the present moment.

The representative of CZECHOSLOVAKIA: My information or yours is not correct. I just wanted to be sure on that point.

The PRESIDENT: The information at our disposal is that it is not affiliated with the WFTU.

With those observations, and with the inclusion of these two organizations on page six, which means only that they have not been considered, I suggest that the Council adopt the report of the Committee of the Council on NGO organizations.

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

The PRESIDENT: The Report is adopted. The Soviet Union abstains.

ARRANGEMENTS FOR CONSULTATION WITH SECURITY AND TRUSTEESHIP COUNCILS

The PRESIDENT: The next item is arrangements for consultation with Security and Trusteeship Councils. So far as consultation with the Security Council is concerned, it can be taken up a little later; but so far as the Trusteeship Council is concerned, I think we have something to say when such arrangements have to be made. I suggest that we might appoint a small committee which will confer with a similar committee which may be appointed

by the Trusteeship Council, during our next session, unless you leave / to this matter
the Secretariat and the President. I understand that there is not going to
be a permanent or an annual President of the Trusteeship Council. The President
is going to change from sitting to sitting, from session to session. I had
put forward an earlier proposal that I might consult with the President of the Trusteeship Council
then make
and certain proposals, but in view of that fact, I am suggesting that we
might now appoint a small committee of three, and through the Secretariat,
request the Trusteeship Council to appoint a similar committee, which may
confer during the closing days of our session and the opening days of the
Trusteeship Council.

The representative of the UNITED STATES: I am willing to accept this
proposal. We wonder whether it would not be adequate to ask the Secretary-
General to explore the situation, and after consultation with the Presidents
of the two Councils, give us a paper which we could use as a basis to continue
our discussions at the next session. It might be simpler.

The PRESIDENT: I have no objection to that course. The question of
appointing a committee may be taken up later. The only question is that the
Trusteeship Council will be meeting practically at the conclusion of our
session. And if there should be a joint meeting between the two, they would
have to elect their committee now, during this session.

(The representative of France, spoke in French.)

The representative of the UNITED KINGDOM: I would just like to say
that I support the view of the representative of France. We are two organs,
and I think it would be appropriate if we each appointed a small body to
discuss the matter with each other.

(The representative of Peru, spoke in Spanish.)

The PRESIDENT: I do feel that certain questions of policy arise in connection with this and it cannot be settled on the Secretariat level.

The representative of the UNITED STATES: It cannot be settled anywhere overnight, but we are amenable to the suggestion.

The PRESIDENT: Is it agreeable that the Council elect a committee of three persons to confer with a similar committee elected by the Trusteeship Council?

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

The PRESIDENT: The proposal is accepted.

Gentlemen, three names are invited for the purpose. Will some representative nominate the three names? Nominations are quite in order. The representative of Czechoslovakia will kindly nominate three persons.

The representative of CZECHOSLOVAKIA: I think it is the function of the President.

(The representative of France, spoke in French.)

The PRESIDENT: I am very glad to hear the observations of the representative of France, because that is exactly how my mind was working. The three Members of the Trusteeship Council, under the present composition of that Council, are likely to be trustee Members. Therefore, the three Members of this Council may very well be non-trustee Members.

(The representative of France, spoke in French.)

The PRESIDENT: I have no objection, if that is the form it is to take, that the President of the Economic and Social Council will be authorized, after consultation with the President of the Trusteeship Council, to nominate two other Members of this Council to confer with a similar committee of the Trusteeship Council regarding the arrangements that can be arrived at between the two Councils to further the work of both. Are there any objections?

(No objections voiced.)

The PRESIDENT: Thank you.

I do not want to detain this Council which has done such excellent work today, for which I am very grateful, but I would like to dispose of an item which, I think, will not take much time.

FOREIGN EXCHANGE PROBLEMS OF THE DEVASTATED COUNTRIES OF THE UNITED NATIONS
IN EUROPE

The PRESIDENT: This item is number five on the agenda. The paper was introduced at the instance of the representative of the Netherlands, and it was accepted. The delegation of Chile has an amendment to suggest regarding it. Will the representative of Chile kindly explain his amendment?

(The representative of Chile, spoke in Spanish.)

The PRESIDENT: The principle of the amendment is quite clear. The Netherlands delegation contemplated the study of these problems with reference to all devastated areas, both in Europe and in Asia and the Far East. The amendment of the representative of Chile seeks to extend it to underdeveloped areas also, which includes practically most of the world.

The representative of CANADA: Mr. President, I think that this Chilean amendment, with which I am in full sympathy, emphasizes the point I made yesterday that the problem of adequate convertible currencies is not a problem of any particular segment of the world. It is a problem of world-wide concern and interest.

Canada, for example, which has a convertible currency, finds it can maintain that position because of the convertibility of certain other countries, or would find itself in a difficult position with regard to maintaining its own convertibility if the currencies of other countries were not convertible. These problems are not sectional problems.

In connection with the amendment that we extend this study, it seems to me the question of the size of the Secretariat necessary to carry on the study becomes very relevant. Personally, I think the problem should be studied on a world wide scale, but I wonder whether the Secretariat has given us a paper with the financial implications of this amendment.

The PRESIDENT: There is no Secretariat paper on the subject at this stage. This is a new proposal that has come in, and in fact the Secretariat could only work on the problem after it knows whether the Council is likely to adopt this or not. There is no Secretariat paper on this subject at present.

REPRESENTATIVE OF CANADA: I did not expect it. I do think, however, that the extension may involve quite a considerable additional expenditure, and we should bear that in mind in line with the General Assembly's decision.

The PRESIDENT: To that extent the Secretariat is prepared to say that it will involve ^{an} additional large expenditure.

Representative of UNITED KINGDOM: If our responsibility becomes a world-wide responsibility, then it will have budgetary implications. It is very difficult to estimate that at the moment. Our intention was to do as much as we could within the resources already available to us. It is difficult to estimate at the moment.

Representative of THE NETHERLANDS: Mr. President, I will be very brief.

As I remarked yesterday in explaining our proposition to the Committee of the Whole, in replying to the remarks of the representative of Chile, I observed that I realized the question of the freely convertible currencies was not a question which was limited to Europe, and was not limited even to the devastated areas. That does not mean that I believe we should take a decision now to give a large extension to the enquiry we are asking of the Secretariat, and I should like to make one or two observations and to ask you to take caution in this matter.

Yesterday we accepted a few amendments to our proposal, and one of them was that the enquiry, when it was made, should be submitted to the original committees which have been appointed by the Council; that is to say, the Economic Commission for Europe, and the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East. I believe -- and I think the Council believes -- that these bodies would greatly benefit by having the most recent data at their disposal when they start working on the important and difficult task which lies before them. If we, on the other hand, extend the proposal -- with which, I must say, I have quite a lot of sympathy because I realize it is not a limited problem -- at this moment, I fear that the moment the regional commissions receive the reports which we are asking for would be very much delayed, and I do not know whether this would conform to the spirit of the proposal which we have made, which is to get a quick review of some of the most pressing problems connected with the foreign exchange.

I would limit myself to these remarks at this moment.

Representative of PERU: I should like to reply to the remarks made by the representative of The Netherlands, who was the author of the proposition that is being amended by the proposal of Chile.

There is no basic objection to it except, as far as he understands, that the widening of the work to other areas might delay the results of the work that he expected would be used by the Economic Commissions for Europe and Asia. But I understand it is possible to introduce certain divisions of labour as to the work. On the original basis I think there were to be certain groups of experts or certain officers who would take care of a given number of countries, so I do not think from that point of view that it would interfere with the main benefit he expects from this type of investigation.

Having no important objection to this amendment, I should like to support the Council in its adoption, having in mind that very little has been done in a practical way for a large area of the world, as the President has already mentioned, and particularly for Latin American countries.

Representative of NORWAY: Mr. President, the Norwegian delegation has been and is in very great doubt with regard to the wisdom of passing such a resolution in its original form, and even more in the form that is now proposed.

I should like to remind the Council that we established at Bretton Woods two institutions or specialized agencies -- as we hope they may be -- furnished with large amounts of money to take care of long-term and short-term financing, to help the Member countries to get convertible currency and to make the various currencies for Member countries universally convertible. That is the essential task of the World Bank and the Monetary Fund. If we instruct the Secretariat to go ahead with this task there will be much duplication of work and this will entail large expenses for the United Nations. Moreover, the Secretariat cannot, I take it, on the basis of our instructions, do this work in a proper way, because they will not have, I take it, the authority^{to}/critically examine the data from the governments. They cannot merely collect data and publish them; we should not get as a result of it figures which are absolutely incomparable. They cannot be compared. One country may accept a big import programme without much regard to the real meaning of financing its import. Another country may look at it realistically and take into consideration what foreign exchange resources it may have, its exchange resources and its borrowing possibilities, and you would get data which are not comparable at all.

In order that the result of such studies may be of any value, there must be thorough examination and a critical going-through of everything, and that is just what the Bank and the Fund are doing before they decide on practical matters in connection with the borrowing and exchange of foreign currency.

I am very much afraid we will get a result from the Secretariat which will not contribute to the task that is to make it easier to mobilize or borrow money and to make the foreign currencies more easily interchangeable.

My conclusion is that I think we should ponder seriously before we instruct the Secretariat to embark on such a venture as this, and I would suggest that we postpone the whole matter for consideration at our next Council Session.

Representative of THE UNITED STATES: Mr. President, I believe there is an approach to the problem that can meet the wishes of the various parties.

As we know, the Dutch resolution was directed to the foreign exchange difficulties involved in reconstruction problems in devastated areas, and the study which we discussed yesterday at some length was partially completed but did not cover all areas, and the extension provided by the Chinese amendment was a reminder to the Secretariat to complete the territorial scope of the study. The Dutch amendment is directed, as we know, to a more detailed breakdown of the figures. It seems to us that it is quite a different matter to go into the balance-of-payments problems that are involved in connection with development. We by no means wish to give any indication that we should be disposed to oppose in any way an enquiry, at the suggestion or direction of this Council, by the Secretariat or through the appropriate Commission, which would be the Economic and Employment Commission and its Sub-Commission on Economic Development, into balance-of-payments difficulties hampering economic development. We should very much consider that a proper responsibility of the Economic and Employment Commission and its Sub-Commission.

It may be that the statistical material available from the International Monetary Fund would meet this need; on the other hand, it might not meet the need. The figures available might be comparable or they might not be. They might lend themselves to analysis bearing upon the development problem. I am inclined to think the concern would have to be wider because development problems get into loans and other matters of that kind.

It seems to me that the matter, if it was urgent, should have been brought forward, and might well have been brought forward, in a fuller and more complete form, rather than being added as an amendment to this particular resolution, and I should think there would be no delay, even for urgency. I should think there would be no difficulty in the Council's simply calling to the attention of the Economic and Employment Commission this problem of the balance-of-payments aspect of development problems.

(The Representative of France spoke in French)

(The Representative of the USSR spoke in Russian)

(The Representative of Chile spoke in Spanish)

Representative of NORWAY: Mr. President, the Norwegian delegation can agree with what the French representative has said in his interpretation of The Netherlands' proposal, and can vote for that with the understanding, as stated by the French representative, that the task of the Secretariat will be to receive the data from the competent Fund, where they will be collected, and, moreover, critically to evaluate and examine and revise them. They will receive the data from the competent World Organization and distribute them to the governments.

With regard to the Chilean amendment, I think we should postpone consideration of it. I do not want to detain the Council, but I should like to point to a serious matter with regard to the underlying philosophy of the whole/^{question.} I think it is inspired by the consideration of what we might call the UNRRA period; that is, if a country could prove it was really in great need, then they will send an international organization or other nations that are ready to put up the money and give aid on that basis. But the UNRRA period now is over; we are now in the period of more or less regular borrowing again, regular financing. In addition, there are many sources of meeting the needs; for example, in the United States and some other countries. We have the World Bank, which may do it

on a little more liberal basis. But we are still in the period where the prospect of repayment are not good. I suggest that to say now, and to publish for the whole world, that your needs are colossal and your resources are small and you need such and such large sums of money, does not help the country, does not increase the chances of a country in borrowing money. On the contrary, it may seriously decrease the chances of that country. In order to borrow money now a country will always have to prove its import requirements and the reasonableness of them, and also to prove that the chances of repayment are reasonably good, and so on, and under those circumstances to try to collect data under the pre-supposition that if you can prove colossal need you will get the money from somewhere. But it may have the opposite effect.

In regard to the World Bank, I am not sure that the World Bank executive directors will be very much impressed if they get from the Secretariat a list of data which is inflated in many respects, and deflated in others; not critically evaluated, not examined or revised. I am inclined to believe that in those circumstances the chances for that country to get a loan from the World Bank will probably be less than if such data had not been forthcoming and published.

Therefore, I think we should ponder before we do such a thing, and should really think twice, and not make it on the basis of the UNRRA period, to which there has now been put an end, but should wait on the basis of the real chances of financing and borrowing which we have now, and for consideration of the relevant factors which will have to be taken, and are being taken, into consideration in financing in the present circumstances.

Representative of the UNITED KINGDOM: Mr. President, The considerations which the Norwegian representative has mentioned, and others, could lead into a rather long debate, but at this hour and this stage I would simply say that, broadly, the view of my delegation is that which was expressed so well by the French representative. He spoke from his own profound knowledge of the subject

and put in our minds very well the case for looking into the Norwegian resolution.

As regards the Chilean amendment, we feel, just like the other representatives who have spoken in the same sense, the utmost sympathy for the proposition. The difficulty which we see about it is the extent of the cover of the world's underdeveloped areas which, as the President said, covers a great part of the world, and also the difficulty, which the Secretary-General's representative mentioned, of seeing just the size and nature of the programme involved. I therefore wonder, whether, at this stage, we could accept this resolution right now with the Chilean amendment. I wonder whether we ought not perhaps to leave the Chilean amendment for further study so that we can postpone it for consideration at the next Council Session in the light of any observations which the Secretary-General may wish to give as to the extent of the work involved, and perhaps for further definition of underdeveloped areas, to limit it to countries with special exchange difficulties.

The view, therefore, of my delegation would be to support the Norwegian resolution, but to hope that the Chilean representative would not press at this stage the introduction of these words, "underdeveloped areas," but would leave it for further examination so that it could be considered at the next meeting of the Council on the lines I have suggested.

Representative of INDIA: I have one question, Mr. President: What is this freely convertible foreign exchange? In paper E/288 I see that all calculations were produced in dollars. Am I to understand that is the only freely convertible foreign exchange, or is there any other exchange?

The PRESIDENT: Or is the dollar freely convertible everywhere?

I should like to bring to the notice of the Council the resolution which we have adopted this morning on balance-of-payments; it may be relevant for the consideration of this question. It reads as follows:

"The Economic and Social Council, having noted the recommendation on the question of balance-of-payments contained in the report of the Economic and Employment Commission and the Statistical Commission, requests the Secretary-General: (a) to make the necessary arrangements for full and regular reports on and analyses of balances-of-payments, in close co-operation with and using to the fullest extent possible the resources of the International Monetary Fund and other interested inter-governmental agencies, in order to assist the Economic and Employment Commission and its sub-commissions in considering economic problems related to or arising out of balance-of-payments; (b) to consult with the International Monetary Fund and other interested inter-governmental agencies with a view to developing standards of reporting data in the field of balance-of-payments."

The representative of The Netherlands will conclude the debate.

Representative of THE NETHERLANDS: I was under the impression, and felt that you were under the same impression, that we were in the first place discussing the Chilean amendment. That was the reason why, up until now, I waited to give you further explanation on what we had in mind in presenting our resolution. The President has just read us a resolution which we adopted this morning on the question of balance-of-payments in general. I admit that the fields covered by the resolution read and the one which we are proposing are not very far from one another, but there is one very notable difference. That is the question which has been raised by the representative of India.

Let me explain clearly, Mr. President, that when we read the reports which were so ably drafted by the Secretary-General under the number E/288, we were very much impressed and felt that a study of this kind, in collaboration with the agencies which are competent in the fields -- that is to say, the Monetary Fund and perhaps the International Bank -- would be most useful to us. As it

was explained on pages 16 and 17, it will give a clue to the Indian representative. The reports make no distinction between the currencies freely convertible and the currencies not freely convertible. Both kinds of currencies were included in the calculations and were given in dollars. Yet, Mr. President, if we are to have a true insight into the different foreign exchange positions of the ex-occupied countries and other countries which were devastated through the war in terms of foreign currency, this distinction is important, and we would very much like that such distinction be made and shown systematically. Abnormal circumstances aggravate the position.

I may point out one fact mentioned in document E/288. The Secretariat's estimate of an amount of \$450 million, which is required in 1947 for imports of coal from the United States, are imports which do not take place in normal circumstances. These are an additional burden on the balance-of-payment of the countries involved which need to be clarified and which need to be stated. On top of these larger requirements for overseas we have the problem of Germany, which has been touched upon during the debate and is mentioned in one of the considerations in the "whereases" in the resolution.

I do not want to go into the German problem here, especially not into the regulations which are made for trade between German Zones and the surrounding countries, but I want to draw the Council's attention to the fact of their existence, and to the fact that large additional drains of dollars are caused by these regulations. It is for these reasons we feel that the task undertaken by the Secretariat is not yet finished. It is of great importance that the Secretariat should have the collaboration of the governments and of the Monetary Fund and the Bank, so as not to duplicate the work, but to use each other. For in that way these studies may be completed and the surveys would be concentrated. This would mean investigation of the total amount of freely convertible currency that the devastated countries, including Germany, will need for their

reconstruction as compared to the amounts of the currency actually available to them.

It goes without saying that the requirements of the different countries ought to be estimated on a common basis which is applicable to all cases. There is no other way of making a fair comparison. This has to be done in close co-operation with the governments and agencies concerned.

I quite realize that this is not an easy task, and I agree with our Norwegian colleague that it will be very difficult, with a view to the estimated requirements which various governments are giving to the Monetary Fund and other agencies concerned. This is not the reason we are not looking for perfection. We do what we can, and I do not see any reason for the fact that at the moment we do not have the correct data for all countries and should therefore abstain from the work and not do it. To me it appears better not to let things drift until too late. We feel it is very important that we try to estimate the scope of this problem before it leads to disaster. As a matter of fact, I see a few fields in which the Secretariat and the authorities in the different agencies which are working these fields could make themselves more useful, especially where it could give more useful and practical background for the two regional committees which we are about to establish and which will shortly begin their work.

Therefore, I ask you, Mr. President, to put our proposal to the vote, inviting the Secretariat to proceed with its studies on the lines I have tried to indicate and as they are laid down in the resolution which we have submitted and on which we have accepted several amendments during our session of yesterday.

The PRESIDENT: I will put the amendment first -- the amendment of the representative of Chile, which is as follows: After the fourth paragraph: "Many under developed countries producers of raw materials, have the same foreign exchange difficulties arising from the war."

And then for the portion of The Netherlands resolution on page 2, substitute what is contained in the further part of the amendment of the representative of Chile.

(A vote was taken by a show of hands)

The PRESIDENT: Four have voted for; and two against.

I really think the Council, in fairness to itself, must make up its mind more firmly. I declare the amendment carried.

(Representative of COLOMBIA spoke in Spanish)

(Representative of FRANCE spoke in French)

(Representative of the USSR spoke in Russian)

Representative of the NETHERLANDS: Mr. President, ^{I have} one brief remark. I should like to associate myself warmly with the words which the French representative has said in relation to the Chilean amendment.

The PRESIDENT: We will put the original resolution to the vote of the Council.

Representative of NEW ZEALAND: Mr. President, I voted against the Chilean amendment because I did not feel that it belonged in the resolution which had been proposed by the Netherlands representative. I would be very happy to support a reference to the Economic and Employment Commission to give special study to the position of under-developed countries, and while I am about it, I should be glad to put in a claim for New Zealand and practically all our neighbors.

The PRESIDENT: We will now put the resolution proposed by the Netherlands representative and recommended by the Committee of the Council to the vote of the Council document E/387.

(A vote was taken by a show of hands)

The PRESIDENT: Fifteen representatives have voted for; and two against.

The resolution is carried.

The Council will now adjourn and meet at 10:30 tomorrow, in the same room. The subjects to be taken up for discussion are -- I refer to the agenda now before the Council:

Item 8, Report of the Statistical Commission and World Statistical Congress,

Item 10, Report of the Social Commission,

Item 11, One Day's Pay Proposal and International Children's Emergency Fund,

Item 13, Report of the Population Commission,

Item 14, Migration, -- including any amendments which may be sent in by delegations by this evening.

Item 16, Report of the Commission on the Status of Women.

These six items only will be considered at tomorrow's session, which will be at 10:30 a.m. and again at 2:45 if it does not finish its work in the morning.

The Council is now adjourned.