

**ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL**

**CONSEIL
ECONOMIQUE
ET SOCIAL**

UNRESTRICTED

E/P.V.83
29 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-THIRD MEETING OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL
(Thirty-Third Meeting of the Fourth Session)

Lake Success, New York
Saturday, 29 March 1947 at 10:30 am

PRESENT:

The PRESIDENT: SIR RAMASWAMI MUDALIAR

Mr. Smith	Canada
Mr. Santa Cruz	Chile
Dr. Chang	China
Mr. Osuna	Cuba
Mr. Papanek	Czechoslovakia
Mr. Boris	France
Mr. Kirpalani	India
Mr. Hakim	Lebanon
Mr. Phillepse	Netherlands
Mr. Reid	New Zealand
Mr. Moe	Norway
Mr. Arca Parro	Peru
Mr. Turhan	Turkey
Mr. Morozov	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Mr. Phillips	United Kingdom
Mr. Stinebower	United States of America
Mr. Stolk	Venezuela

The PRESIDENT: The Council is in session.

Before we take up the items on the Agenda, the representative of the USSR wishes to make a statement.

MR. MOROZOV (USSR)(Interpretation from Russian): Mr. President, during one of the previous meetings of the Economic and Social Council, the Soviet delegation reserved for itself the right to take up again the discussion of the matter raised by the WFTU with regard to the extension of the rights of this organization.

In this connection, I would like to draw the attention of the Members of the Council to the following: On the 24th of March a British proposal was put to a vote regarding the guarantees and implementation of the rights of the trade unions. This matter was put to a vote in accordance with Articles 57 and 59 of the Rules of Procedure. I received the text of the British proposal after the meeting. It was not circulated among the Members of the Council when the question was put to a vote.

The Economic and Social Council, in the view of the Soviet delegation, cannot take a decision according to which a matter raised by one organization-- and in this case by the WFTU--should be referred by the Council, without any discussion as to the substance, to the consideration of another organization.

After having consulted a number of delegations, the Soviet delegation moves to revise the contents of the Resolution which was adopted and to adopt in its place the following text, which will be a very simple one:

"The Economic and Social Council decides that the discussion of the question of guarantees, development and implementation of the rights of the trade unions shall be delayed until the next session of the Economic and Social Council."

The PRESIDENT: I will have that circulated and will consider whether the Rules permit us to take that into consideration at the end of the session, after we have finished the items on the agenda. The same objection may be raised by some other representative, that they have not seen the Resolution in writing. So, if the honourable representative of the USSR will kindly hand it to me, I will have this circulated and take it up at a later stage at today's session.

We will now take up the items on the agenda.

REPORT OF THE STATISTICAL COMMISSION AND WORLD STATISTICAL CONGRESS

The PRESIDENT: The first item is the Report of the Statistical Commission and World Statistical Conference.

There are two amendments that have been handed in, one by the representative of the United States and the other by the representative of the United Kingdom, with reference to the Resolutions that the Committee has supported on the Report of the Statistical Commission. The Resolutions, as reported by the full Committee of the Council, are now before the house, and I shall take up the amendments that have been suggested by these two delegations.

(During the above remarks, Mr. Morozov, representative of the USSR, left the Table and was replaced by Mr. Chernyshov)

We will take up the proposal of the representative of the United Kingdom first. On page 2, the third paragraph runs as follows: "Directs the Non-Government Organization Committee to consider for admission to consultative status only such non-governmental international organizations interested in the development of statistics as are prepared to relate their statistical activities to those of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies in accordance with the principles set forth by the Statistical Commission."

The suggestion of the United Kingdom delegation is as follows:

"Requests that the Secretary-General in developing his relationships with non-governmental organizations interested in statistics be guided by the principles set forth by the Statistical Commission and that he especially consider the desirability of:

- "(a) eliminating duplication in statistical programmes and activities as between such organizations and the statistical services of the United Nations.
- "(b) assuming responsibility for such statistical activities as might be more appropriately undertaken by the United Nations than by the non-governmental organizations."

MR. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom): Mr. President, the reason for this amendment is that it did not seem appropriate to my delegation for the Non-Governmental Organization Committee to adopt this rather dictatorial, if I may use the word "dictatorial", line towards the organizations concerned with statistics, and that, in fact, one would get much better results if one developed a system of co-operation on the lines laid down in our amendment.

The PRESIDENT: The amendment is now up for consideration before the Council.

MR. STINEBOWER (United States): Mr. President, to simplify discussion I want to state that the amendment which the United States delegation has put into this same paragraph was, of course, prepared quite independently but simultaneously. It ^{sought} / the same end, and we could very happily take the British text as the basis for discussion and would be glad to withdraw the amendment to the same paragraph that we have.

In doing that, though, I think there are two small changes in the British text which we would like to suggest. The first would be to take the word "his" out in the first line: "Requests that the Secretary-General in developing relationships..." And in sub-paragraph (a), strike out the words, "the statistical services of," so as simply to say: "(a) eliminating duplication in statistical programmes and activities as between such organization and the United Nations."

The PRESIDENT: I take it you have no objection to the amendment otherwise. (No objection voiced)

The PRESIDENT: Any other alterations?

I will put the amendment to the vote of the Council.

MR. CHERNYSHOV (USSR) (Interpretation from Russian): The amendment which has just been moved by the United Kingdom representative is in accordance with the text of the Report of the Statistical Commission. However, the Report of this Commission, as far as this part is concerned, is not in accordance with the principles laid down during the Second Session of the Economic and Social Council and which cover their relationship with the non-governmental organizations.

In accordance with the agreements reached at the Second Session of the Council, all non-governmental organizations must submit applications to a special committee on consultation with non-governmental organizations. This committee, after consultation, must allow these non-governmental organizations the status of Category A, B, or C. The Report of the Statistical Commission

has bypassed these decisions of the Council and proposed to establish direct relationships with these organizations through the Secretary-General, and that is why I submit again that this decision of the Commission is in contradiction with the decisions adopted by the Council. The Soviet delegation would like to draw the attention of the Council to this fact.

Mr. President, you participated as a Member of the Council in the negotiations with non-governmental organizations and you participated in this decision. That is why I would like to draw your particular attention to this point, and that is why, consequently, the amendment of the United Kingdom representative on this point is again the same position. And I would like this question to be discussed: Do we, fully conscious of this fact, wish to make an exception for the statistical non-governmental organizations or not?

The PRESIDENT: I think it is a substantial point that has been raised by our colleague from the Soviet Union.

MR. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom): I think it is a substantial point, but I think there is an easy answer to it. In talking about non-governmental organizations, we naturally meant organizations which are in consultative relationship--

The PRESIDENT: Which have been brought into consultative relationship, you mean.

MR. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom): Yes, and it would be quite easy to add those words.

The PRESIDENT: I was, myself, a little worried about that.

"...relationships with non-governmental organizations interested in statistics and brought into consultative relationship with the Council..."

I will read the amendment as now further amended.

"Requests that the Secretary-General in developing his relationships with non-governmental organizations interested in statistics and brought into consultative relationship with the Council be guided by the principles set forth.

by the Statistical Commission and that he especially consider the desirability of:

"(a) eliminating duplication in statistical programmes and activities as between such organizations and the statistical services of the United Nations.

"(b) assuming responsibility for such statistical activities as might be more appropriately undertaken by the United Nations than by the non-governmental organizations."

The proposal is that this paragraph be substituted for sub-paragraph (b) on page 2 of the resolution.

Those who are in favour of making the substitution will please raise their hands.

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

The PRESIDENT: It is adopted.

The PRESIDENT: Then there is another proposal of the United States delegation with regard to Lines 6 to 8 of page 4. The present text reads as follows: "Authorizes the Statistical Commission to invite a Committee of Experts of not more than seven members serving in their individual capacities, to make proposals to the Commission on a standard industrial classification." The text that is now proposed as an amendment is: "

"Authorizes the Statistical Commission to invite not more than seven experts to work with the Special Committee established by the Commission to make proposals to the Commission on a standard industrial classification."

MR. STINEBOWER (United States): Mr. President, this is suggested as an amendment, as the paper before you indicates, purely because it was our understanding that this is what the Committee adopted out of a fairly confused discussion, rather than what is reported in the paper before us. At least, this is what we thought we voted for.

MR. CHERNYKHOV (USSR) (Interpretation from Russian): Mr. President, I participated in the discussion of this point in the Committee of the Whole. I moved a proposal regarding the non-desirability of appointing a Committee of Experts, and this proposal was accepted by the Committee. The Committee decided that we should allow the Statistical Commission the right, in case of necessity, to invite experts to its discussions and it was added that their number should not exceed seven. In the draft resolution, I believe reference is made inaccurately to the Committee of Experts. That was the very subject of our discussion. The Rapporteur of the Statistical Commission agreed to our decision, stating that if we were unwilling to allow him this point, he would agree with us that the Statistical Commission should invite experts without appointing a special committee to that effect. The Soviet delegation motivated

its views by stating that by appointing such a committee of experts, other Commissions would perhaps also request this right of appointing a special Committee of Experts and, in that way, a special new agency of experts might grow out of this precedent.

Now, as a result of this resolution, E/AC.6/10, such a committee is provided for, and that, I submit, is in contradiction with the decision of the Committee of the Whole.

Now, as regards the United States amendment, I submit that this amendment also provides for such a Committee of Experts appointed by the Commission. Now, the Commission has not yet appointed such a Committee. It only moved this recommendation to the Committee of the Whole, which rejected this plan, allowing the Committee to invite experts only in case of need.

In view of the very complexity of the statistical problems, and taking this into account, the Soviet delegation moves again that no Committee of Experts be appointed but that the Statistical Commission be allowed to invite experts in case of need.

MR. STINEBOWER (United States): Mr. President, I am afraid the Soviet representative has misunderstood the intention of the American amendment. It was our understanding, as he has stated, that the Committee of the Whole decided not to approve the recommendation of the Statistical Commission for a Committee of Experts but instead provided merely that the Commission may invite not more than seven experts to work with it. Now, the special committee that is referred to here is not the Committee of Experts which they recommended but a Committee of members of the Commission, which it has already established, and which is an internal committee of the Commission itself.

So, I think there is no inconsistency between the amendment that is proposed here and the view just expressed by the Soviet representative.

The PRESIDENT: I think the position is quite clear. The Commission elected a Sub-Committee of the Commission composed of certain persons--not necessarily statistical experts in this sense--to consider the matter of industrial classification. That is a Sub-Committee of the Commission. It is open to the Commission to establish a sub-committee, as I have already said. Now, if this Sub-Committee wants the help of certain experts, I understand that the decision of the Committee of the Whole--unfortunately I was not present--was in favour of allowing the Sub-Committee to invite experts to appear before them and help them, but not to establish a Committee of Experts, as such, who would meet among themselves and then present a report to the Sub-Committee.

Therefore, if the decision of the Committee of the Whole was merely to enable the Sub-Committee to invite individual experts to help them in this task, then the proposal of the United States delegation is in accordance with this decision of the Committee. They limited the number of experts that may be invited to not more than seven, for financial reasons. That, I understand, is the proposal of the United States, and in view of that, I do not see any inconsistency between what the Soviet delegation has said and the proposal put forward by the United States delegation.

MR. CHERNYSHOV (USSR) (Interpretation from Russian): I would like to draw the attention of the Council to the Report of the Statistical Commission, page 11, where it is said: "That the Commission recommends that the Economic and Social Council empower the Statistical Commission to appoint a Committee of Experts." This is a recommendation to the Council. Now, this Council, at the meeting of the Committee of the Whole, decided not to allow the appointing of this Committee. I submit that we should not establish this precedent, for

other Commissions may make similar requests. If there is need for a sub-commission, then the Statistical Commission can appoint one, but I believe that this would allow the creation of a new structural body.

Now, the Secretary-General has already explained that he may call experts, that he had funds which would allow him to call experts, and that is why the Council could allow this Commission to call experts without appointing a special body.

The PRESIDENT: May I remove some ambiguity which the representative of the Soviet Union still feels. If you say "invite not more than seven experts", I think the difficulty is that it may be a Committee of Experts. May I suggest the following language: "Authorizes the Statistical Commission to invite individual experts, not more than seven in number, to work with the special committee established." That would clearly demonstrate that it is not proposed to have a Committee of Experts but merely individuals appearing before the Commission.

MR. CHERNYSHOV (USSR) (Interpretation from Russian): Mr. President, this proposal would be acceptable to our delegation, with the exception of the last words "special committee". I believe that we should not appoint such a special committee but that we should confine ourselves to allowing the Commission to call experts. They will be in a position to solve any problems, so why appoint a special committee to that effect?

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States): Mr. President, this is another drafting change for which I must apologize, but I believe it will clarify the issue.

Paragraph 41 of the Report of the Statistical Commission, on page 17, says: "The Commission elected a Committee on Industrial Classification composed of members of the Commission to perform the functions indicated in paragraph 40 (b)." Then, it indicates which members of the Commission were elected.

If the words "special committee" were changed to "Committee on Industrial Classification established by the Commission," it would certainly be clear then that we are not creating any committee here by any action of this Council. We are only asking these experts to work with a committee which the Statistical Commission has itself established from among its own members.

The PRESIDENT: Yes, that will further clarify it -- ". . .with the Committee on Industrial Classification established by the Commission." This is on page 17 of the Report of the Statistical Commission, where the Committee on Industrial Classification is established.

May I read the amendment as it is now finally drafted:

For the paragraph beginning, "AUTHORIZES the Statistical Commission to invite a Committee of Experts. . .", on page 4, the following be substituted: "AUTHORIZES the Statistical Commission to invite individual experts, not more than seven in number, to work with the Committee on Industrial Classification established by the Commission, to make proposals to the Commission on a standard industrial classification."

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

The PRESIDENT: The amendment is accepted.

I now put the resolutions relating to the Report of the Statistical Commission, as amended, to the vote.

Mr. PHILLIPSE (Netherlands): May I ask one question in relation to this resolution?

The third paragraph of the resolutions on page 3 says: "INVITES Members of the United Nations to participate in the World Statistical Congress by naming delegations" -- et cetera.

Simultaneously with this Congress, there will meet in Washington the International Statistical Institute, of which some States who are not Members of the United Nations are members. I may mention Switzerland as an example. I think it would be wise if we made a provision that such nations could participate at the same time in the World Statistical Congress. I do not want to move an amendment at this time, which I do not think is appropriate, but perhaps the next Session of the Council would leave us ample time to come back to this matter.

Mr. CHERNYSHEV (USSR) (Interpretation from Russian): Mr. President, as regards the resolution as a whole, the Soviet delegation would like to make two comments.

The first comment concerns the World Statistical Congress which is planned in this resolution. As has already been stated by the Soviet delegation in the Committee -- and I should like to repeat the statement -- the Soviet delegation did not participate in the decision on this point because the Soviet delegation could not consult the competent agencies.

Now, as regards the Report of the Statistical Commission and the resolutions which derive from the Report, the Soviet delegation would like to draw the attention of the Council -- and would like this to be recorded -- to the fact that the Soviet Union will submit to the United Nations data only of a general nature, in accordance with its domestic rules and domestic arrangements.

(Mr. BCRIIS, representative of France, spoke in French.)

The PRESIDENT: That will be considered at the next Session.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States): There is a small verbal change at the top of page 5 which I think needs to be noted. It really begins at the bottom of page 4: "(a) to arrange for the publication of a Supplement to the Monthly Bulletin of Statistics describing in detail the statistical series contained in the Bulletin and to provide for a revision" -- and here the words "of the Supplement" should be added -- "from time to time as occasion warrants." It is the Supplement to be revised and not the statistical data.

The PRESIDENT: I take it that this set of resolutions is approved by the Council.

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

The PRESIDENT: The resolutions are accepted.

The reservation made by the Soviet delegation will be on record.

REPORT OF THE SOCIAL COMMISSION

The PRESIDENT: We will now take up the Report of the Social Commission. There is an amendment proposed by the United Kingdom and there is a corrigendum put forward by the Secretariat itself.

I shall first take the corrigendum, so that the honourable representatives will have the corrected version.

For the first paragraph on page 2, now reading: "REQUESTS the Secretary-General to report on the possibility of an Eastern Bureau to take the necessary measures for the suppression of the traffic in women and children in those areas and to enquire into the need for the establishment of other regional bureaux" -- the following should be substituted: "REQUESTS the Secretary-General to report on the possibility of implementing the proposal of the League of Nations for the establishment of an Eastern Bureau to take the necessary measures for the suppression of the traffic in women and children in those areas and to enquire into the need for the establishment of other regional bureaux."

That substitution is in accordance with the resolution drafted.

I now take up the amendment proposed by the United Kingdom representative. This is on page 3, in the third paragraph of Section IV. The proposal is to delete the words "where appropriate." That paragraph "AUTHORIZES the Secretary-General in co-operation, where appropriate, with the specialized agencies concerned within the limits of their competence" -- et cetera.

(During the above remarks, Mr. Morozov replaced Mr. Chernyshev as representative of the USSR.)

Mr. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom): Mr. President, I think I need only say a word or two on this.

The reason for the deletion is that it is hard to see that there could be any case in which the Secretary-General would not co-operate with the specialized agencies concerned within the limits of their competence. We have already got the word "concerned" which provides that the consultation take place with the right specialized agencies. We already have "within the limits of their competence," and it is difficult to see what is envisaged by the phrase "where appropriate."

MR. MOROSOV (USSR) (Interpretation from Russian): Mr. President, I believe that these words are quite appropriate and there is no need to delete them. One cannot tie down the actions of the Secretary-General in such a way that whether it be necessary or not there must be co-operation for preliminary consultation with the specialized agency concerned. That is why I must say I do not see any necessity for deleting these words. For by deleting these words we seem to wish to say that whether it be necessary or not, there should be such consultation with these organizations.

The PRESIDENT: A full dress debate on this very phrase was had in the full committee of the Council. The matter of extra caution, that "where appropriate", was inserted afterwards. It was probably taken from the language of the General Assembly Resolution. I believe it was inserted after considering the language of the General Assembly, where the words were put "in consultation with the Economic and Social Council and to make provisions with the co-operation of the specialized agencies where appropriate..." It was considered as necessary and the words were inserted there and are repeated in this Resolution.

Does the United Kingdom delegation want to press this point?

Mr. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom): Well, sir, I am never lacking in respect for the General Assembly but it was we, the Economic and Social Council, who negotiated the agreements with the specialized agencies and it is very difficult to see that there could be any cases, having in mind the terms of the agreement, where it would be inappropriate to consult with the specialized agencies concerned, within the limits of their competence. I cannot see what can possibly be intended by those words except to indicate that there might be some cases where it would be inappropriate, in which case that would be contrary to the agreement between this Council and the specialized agencies.

I feel, myself, that the General Assembly would not feel bound to instruct us on a point of procedure of that kind.

The PRESIDENT: Putting it ⁱⁿ that negative way sounds very bad--it would be inappropriate to consult with specialized agencies in certain points. But I think there are shades of meaning in the word "appropriate" and I do not think that was the sense in which this phrase was put "where appropriate"--where it was necessary, it really means. I do not think that any thought of inappropriateness of consulting specialized agencies was behind these words, either in the General Assembly or here.

"Where appropriate" would have been the right thing. Even there, it could be said it is improper to consult. But that was not the idea.

Mr. MOROSOV (USSR) (Interpretation from Russian): But, since the text of the Resolution is in complete agreement with the decision of the General Assembly, I must say I do not see why we should change it.

The PRESIDENT: I am not suggesting the change.

Mr. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom): Mr. President, I do not think that when the General Assembly passed this Resolution, it really went into this. As a matter of fact, this wording was decided at the UNRRA Council, at Geneva, last summer, and it went through all the various stages and then appeared in the General Assembly Resolution.

I think the simple point for the Council is whether anything is added by those words. It seems to me the only decision that could possibly be in those words, would be some implication that in certain cases it was inappropriate, and that would be contrary to the sense of our agreement. In any case, if you turn over the page to the next point where we suggest the deletion of the words "where appropriate", that has not got any connection with the General Assembly Resolution and it is perfectly clear that the policy of this Council, as laid down in the agreement, is to consult with the

specialized agencies concerned, on all matters with which the specialized agencies are concerned, and there is no reason at this stage to introduce the words "where appropriate", having regard to the terms of our agreement with those agencies.

The PRESIDENT: The amendment is that the words "where appropriate", in this paragraph, Section IV, be deleted.

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

The PRESIDENT: The amendment is lost.

Section V: Requests the Secretary-General in co-operation, where appropriate, with the specialized agencies concerned, to arrange for a study of methods of social welfare administration; methods of furnishing advice and information and providing experts for countries; and how a long-term training programme of assistance to governments may be developed.

It seems to me here that specialized agencies have to come in at practically every stage.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States): Mr. President, I abstained from the vote on the preceding "where appropriate", because it seemed to me to make very little difference, and since it was in the General Assembly Resolution, I thought it was appropriate that it should stay. But here, the words may be more limiting and they particularly seem to put upon the Secretary-General a responsibility for exercising a selectivity which is scarcely appropriate, in our mind, in view of the broad scope of activities which are provided for below. So on this case I shall support the United Kingdom amendment to delete these words.

The PRESIDENT: Are there any further remarks?

Mr. MOROSOV (USSR) (Interpretation from Russian): I believe that as a result of what was discussed earlier, the sense of this amendment is the same, the general principle which has already been laid down as regards the relationship with specialized agencies. Simply the wording of the General Assembly Resolution is maintained here, and that is why I again do not see any reason for deleting it.

The PRESIDENT: The proposal is that these words "where appropriate", be deleted in Section V--requests the Secretary-General in co-operation "where appropriate".

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

The PRESIDENT: The words are deleted.

Section IX, third line. Insert after the words "Secretary-General", the words "after consultation with the appropriate specialized agencies and inter-governmental organizations."

"The Economic and Social Council, having noted the programme of future activities of the Secretariat suggested in the Report of the Social Commission, requests the Secretary-General..." --and now I read it with the amendment: "after consultation with the appropriate specialized agencies and inter-governmental organizations, to report to a future session of the Social Commission on the extent to which social questions within the terms of reference of the Social Commission have been or are being studied by the specialized agencies and inter-governmental organizations and to suggest appropriate measures to enable the Commission effectively to carry out the tasks entrusted to it, in particular the study of standards of living in under-developed countries and areas."

It seems to me you could only do that after consultation with the appropriate specialized agencies and inter-governmental organizations.

MR. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom): Mr. President, again I do not think I need really expatiate on this. The simple point, as you said, is that he could only do it after consultation and it is just as well to record that in the text.

The PRESIDENT: Those who are in favour of inserting these words in the resolution will please raise their hands.

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

The PRESIDENT: The words are inserted. It will be "international organizations," not "agencies."

I now put the resolution on the Social Commission as amended to the vote of the house.

Those who are in favour of adopting these resolutions as amended will please raise their hands.

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

Those against.

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

The PRESIDENT: Adopted.

The financial paper on the Report of the Social Commission is before the Council and I take it it has been noted by the representatives before approving these proposals.

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

We now take up the resolution on One Day's Pay Proposal, and International Children's Emergency Fund.

The drafting sub-committee's proposal is before you and there is a corrigendum again. There is an omission there, an obvious omission, before the "taking note." It should be "The Economic and Social Council, having considered the Report of the Secretary-General in virtue of paragraph 8 of the General Assembly Resolution No. 48 of 11 December 1946, and taking note of

the General Assembly Resolution . No. . 57 of the same date," et cetera.

That will be added to this Resolution,

I will take the United Kingdom delegation's amendment. It is really an alternative to this Resolution and I would request the representative of the United Kingdom to explain his amendment.

MR. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom): Mr. President, this amendment arose from the fact that after seeing the Report of the drafting committee, my delegation and one or two others saw certain points about it where we considered it might be improved. There is no question of limiting the effect of the previous resolution, and we want in no way to go back on our support for this scheme.

The aim of this resolution is to make certain additions to it which are largely of an administrative character. May I first direct your attention to the first paragraph, the first line, "approves the proposal outlined in the Secretary-General's Report." That was the original draft by the drafting committee. The difficulty we felt about that was that what we understood the Council was doing was really approving this in principle. I believe that was the intention of the Council, and the second paragraph indeed tells the Secretary-General to go on and explore detailed ways and means of carrying this out. But when you look at the Secretary-General's Report, the proposal outlined does go into questions of procedure to some extent, and therefore we thought that it was more proper simply to approve the proposal in principle, which we believe was the intention, and therefore to delete the words "outlined in the Secretary-General's Report" which might have committed us in advance to certain points of procedure when the real intention was that the Secretary-General should continue to explore, as indeed is laid down in paragraph 2.

That is our first point.

The second point, and this perhaps is a more substantial point, is that under our resolution there would be the possibility of a country making one general appeal which would include both monies for the Children's Fund and monies for the UNESCO Fund. As I think is known to Members of the Council, UNESCO has already launched a voluntary appeal for the rehabilitation of children in the educational field, and it may well be the case that certain countries -- and it would certainly apply in the case of my country -- would wish to have one single appeal for administrative purposes so that they can see the size of the money being raised and how best it can be used, because the question of use may arise in the question of the purchase of goods.

It may, for instance, be possible for the money raised to be used for the health of school children but not for the health of hungry children, to put it rather sharply. It would, for instance, be possible that the money raised might buy chairs for schools, paper, pencils, and objects of that kind within a certain country which had foreign exchange difficulties. On the other hand, that country may not be able to buy food which might be the requirement of the Children's Fund.

Therefore, we wished that there should be provision under which any country that wished could combine the purposes of the Fund with the Children's Fund and the UNESCO Fund. In other words, one single collection could be raised and could be distributed between the two sources in consultation with the Secretary-General.

I come now to the third paragraph which develops further that idea, and asks the Secretary-General to study the proposals in the meantime and to report back to the next Session of the Economic and Social Council how

he proposes in detail to work out these arrangements.

In the fourth paragraph we somewhat expand the conception which was introduced about taking the foreign exchange position of each country into account. We provide specifically "that agreement will be reached between the Secretary-General and each country as to the disposal of the national collections and as to the purchase of supplies within ^{the} / country for use elsewhere."

It would be my hope, Mr. President, that these amendments which we have made would facilitate the operation of the Fund and the co-operation of the administrations of different countries without in any way detracting from the general impact of the appeal. And it is in that spirit which we put it forward.

MR. FAUSTO SOTO (Chile): Mr. President, my delegation is in general agreement with the amendment put forward by the British delegation. We especially think that paragraph 1 of the new British proposal is better than the one we had before because it is true that we can only approve in principle the proposal for a special world-wide appeal for non-governmental contributions.

In regard to paragraph 2, the British delegation has cut out the last part of paragraph 2 of Document E/AC.7/14, that is, the phrase "taking into account the circumstances, including the foreign exchange position of each country." It is true that in some regard this condition has been taken into account in paragraph 4 in the British proposal, but I should prefer -- and I do not know if the British delegation agrees with me -- to put the phrase in again that appears in the first Document, that is, to add to paragraph 2, the phrase "taking into account the circumstances, including the foreign exchange position of each country."

Then paragraph 4, of course, should be a little enlargement of the same idea. That would not change in substance anything.

With these remarks, and if the British representative accepts my suggestions, I should be very glad to suggest this modification.

MR. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom): I accept that.

MR. REID (New Zealand): Mr. President, the principal change in the United Kingdom proposal is the one which changes the original draft from a collection, especially for the Children's Fund, and now leaves it to a collection for children and mothers which may be contributed to some other fund.

The concern of the New Zealand delegation, when this matter was discussed in Committee, was that the public should know when the appeal was launched, where its money was going. The United Kingdom proposal does provide for that in paragraph 4, so that there should be a definite agreement between the Secretary-General and the Governments concerned as to the destination of the proceeds of the collection. The New Zealand delegation is disposed to support this proposal on a number of grounds, the principal one being that there are going to be a number of appeals for relief. The Children's Fund is not a primary relief organization. It is proposed to supply supplementary relief, and it is important that the primary relief needs should be met as well as the supplementary.

I would support also the remarks of the Chilean representative, and agree that the original provision in the United Kingdom proposal is not quite adequate to cover the exchange position. I am glad the United Kingdom delegation are prepared to alter that.

MR. MOE (Norway): Just one point, Mr. President; after the explanations given by the United Kingdom representative, the Norwegian delegation would like to stress one of the points he made, and that is this question of the collaboration between the collection made by UNESCO and this collection on the basis of one day's pay. I think we should try to have collaboration, not only on the national level, but also on the international level, and I think we can put that into this paragraph 2: ". . . request the Secretary-General to continue his exploration . . .", and that also means that the

E/P.V.83
37-40

Secretary-General should get in touch with UNESCO in order to see what could be done in that respect.

MR. BORIS, representative of France spoke in French.

The PRESIDENT: The last proposal will be considered separately. Now under discussion is only the proposal on page 1 of this document.

MR. Arca FARRO (Peru): The Peruvian delegation is willing to support the proposal made by the United Kingdom, but I should like to clarify certain questions which are not so easy to understand, particularly from the explanation that was made by the British representative on this matter. His amendment, it seemed to me, refers to the way in which the funds to be obtained by the International Children's Emergency Fund should be used, not only for relief purposes, strictly speaking, but in some way and in a given proportion by UNESCO. But I do not see any particular reference to the way in which UNESCO could share such funds, unless it is in the mind of the United Kingdom delegation that on paragraph 4(a), the Secretary-General will come to such an agreement, but that will be an agreement with each contributing country as to the way in which the funds could be disposed of.

Since such is the main amendment as suggested by the United Kingdom, I wonder if it would be necessary to establish certain rules under which the Secretary-General would be able to operate them and to negotiate with UNESCO and to see how the joint effort^{of} the International Children's Emergency Fund and UNESCO could launch this single appeal, and whatever monies or funds are obtained could be divided in a given proportion. But I do not see any provision of that type.

This is the point on which I would be glad if the British representative would be kind enough to clarify it.

The PRESIDENT: I think the Secretariat will make a statement on that, which may clarify the position.

MR. ORDING (Secretariat): Mr. President, and Members of the Council: You may remember that at an earlier stage I mentioned to you that this question of relationship to UNESCO had been seriously considered by the Secretary-General, and we have had direct contact ^{and} discussions with representatives

of UNESCO for the purpose here mentioned. However, the preliminary conclusion which came out of these deliberations was this: that it would not be right and, at least, not possible at this stage to decide on the international level how this cooperation should take place and how far it should go, among other things, for the reason, that in certain countries we are told that they would not like to see these two things linked up with this organ. We think that in this respect, as in others, it should leave a quite large flexibility, so that each country can consider on its own as to what extent and how these two things can be linked up with this organ.

May I mention one other point. In the resolution now suggested by the United Kingdom, it is said that a report should be made at the next session of the Council. I would only like at once to make it clear. I hope that it is the opinion of the United Kingdom delegation that this does not mean that the Secretary-General will not be able to act before they have made such a report and before there are new decisions by the Council, because if this project will succeed, we surely will need to have action started. That means establishing machinery and preparations before that time. I would only like to make this clear.

MR. YANG (China): Mr. President, may I say that we wish to associate ourselves with the written proposal in general of the United Kingdom and also the verbal suggestion made by our colleague from Chile.

There are, I understand, three main proposals now made. The first is in paragraph 1 of the recommendation, adding the word "principle" and leaving out the words "outline in the Secretary-General's report." I think this is really more in accord with the actual decision of the discussion in the Committee meeting, because there the outstanding thing

in our mind was the principle of voluntary contribution, and one day's pay was one of the applications which would be considered with some of the other methods which might be proposed.

I also agree with our Chilean colleague that the restoration of the part in the original concerning the foreign exchange position is a desirable one. As to the consultation with each contributing country on the disposal of the national collection, I think it is also a very desirable thing to be undertaken.

So, in general, I support the proposed amendment by our United Kingdom colleague.

MR. STINEBOWER (United States): Mr. President, in this discussion we seem to be completing a fairly full circle.

When this project was first broached at the General Assembly, it was a very direct one, limited to a specific formula for one day's pay contributions for general relief purposes. The formula has been broadened, and, as I said at the plenary session, with that we agree. Then, we went through a stage in which it was assumed that the proceeds of this collection would best be devoted to the International Children's Emergency Fund. With that view the United States Government still agrees, and with all due respect to your ruling, Mr. President, that we will consider the second part of the British amendment separately, I should say that if we vote for the British amendment, in the light of the discussions that have taken place and with the understandings that are involved, it will be a consequential amendment and we would certainly be obligated to vote for that amendment, too.

I would only point out that in this resolution that is before us, there has now been deleted all reference to the International Children's Emergency Fund, except for some lip service in the preamble. Indeed, sir, I think it is

a very deft surgical operation; it leaves no scar.

The representative of the United Kingdom has said that it would facilitate the operations of the fund. That, I find a little difficult to see.

There is scarcely any reference to the fact that collections might go to the fund. It has been suggested that they might be divided with UNESCO, which I had understood had been satisfactorily worked out, or was in the process of being satisfactorily worked out, between the fund and UNESCO.

But, then, we come to the next purpose to which it was suggested these funds could be devoted--namely, internal purposes--and while I do not have the words verbatim in front of me, if I understood the representative of the United Kingdom correctly, what he said was these funds might actually be used for such things as school lunches for needy but not necessarily hungry children. That causes me a great deal of trouble. It is a point I did not see until it was stated so clearly for us in the explanation of this amendment. I do submit, Mr. President, that raises some difficulties. We request the Secretary-General to continue his exploration of the most appropriate procedures for carrying forward this work and such arrangements as may be necessary for this purpose.

We have heard, with sympathy, some of the representatives around this table plead the plight of children in their own countries, devastated by war, saying that if they were to raise funds they would find it almost impossible to use them for anything except their own needy children. But that is one thing, sir, and it is another thing to suggest that the Secretary-General might be asked to associate himself with appeals for voluntary contributions, the proceeds of which might go for ordinary school lunches in the United States or, if I may say so, in the United Kingdom. That is perverting the purpose

of the Secretary-General. That is not an appropriate role for him, to join with voluntary appeals for such ordinary operations of an internal character in countries which do not take on an international emergency character.

The logical conclusion from what I have said up to now, I take it, Mr. President, is that I am going to oppose the British amendment. I am not. We have heard from the representatives of the Members of this Council the reasons why many of them would find it impossible to associate themselves with a world-wide campaign for funds to go to an international emergency fund for children. If it is impossible, there is no use of our drafting a resolution that will have no effect. But I do think that it is necessary for us to see what we are doing and state openly that we are deftly removing from practically all contributors -- I trust it will not be true for the United States -- any recommendation whatever that they contribute to the International Childrens Emergency Fund.

MR. SMITH: (Canada) Mr. President, I do not intend to speak at any length, sir, but for the reasons outlined by the Canadian delegation at the first debate on this subject in one of the early plenary meetings, we definitely do not feel that it is possible at this time, on the basis of the information we now have, to vote that all the proceeds of the one-day's pay collection should go to the Fund.

We have, as yet, inadequate information from the Fund on such basic matters as its proposed distribution to meet the needs of children in Europe, on the one hand, and in the Far East, on the other. Canada does not feel that there should be discrimination in this matter. We have great sympathy for the Fund; we are at present considering what contribution we can make to it; and we do not, in what I am saying, in any sense imply that we desire to carry out any surgical operation regarding the Fund, but we could not accept the original resolution. On the other hand, we will vote for, and very much hope that the Council will adopt, the United Kingdom resolution.

Apart from these basic reasons which I have alluded to, the economic argument advanced by the United Kingdom representative seems to me very cogent indeed. Some countries -- indeed, many countries -- are not in a position to export food today. A collection from the population of those countries ^{that} cannot

be used for food export -- because those countries have to import their food and do not have any surplus -- would be almost meaningless. But the United Kingdom amendment, which in effect is a new resolution, I agree, does provide the necessary flexibility whereby the contributions from each country can be used in the way most helpful to the general purpose of assisting needy children in devastated areas.

For all these reasons, sir, I very strongly urge that the Council adopt the United Kingdom resolution.

MR. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom): May I, first of all, clear up one point in the remarks of the representative of the United States. He talked about the suggestion that this might be used for lunches for needy children in the United Kingdom. I think he misunderstood my remark on that point completely. I was not dealing with that point at all; I was dealing with the point that it may be possible for a country to produce certain goods which it can give to children, but it may not necessarily be able to produce food for the children.

The Children's Fund is primarily concerned with food, but the UNESCO Fund is also concerned with chairs for them to sit on in school, and educational rehabilitation. One country may be able to produce chairs or papers or pencils, or other things for the use of children, but it may not be able to contribute food. That was the point I was making on that subject.

If I may just deal with one or two other points that have been raised, Mr. Ordning asked whether our paragraph 3 meant that progress would be held up. The answer to that is quite definitely "No." In fact, paragraph 3 says that "... the Secretary-General should report to the next Session of the Economic and Social Council on the progress of this project." There is no question of holding up progress.

As regards the French suggestion to delete the words "in principle" I would be quite happy about that. It seems to me that the way it is stated in paragraph it is clear that it is only the principle as stated, and that action can take place in the meantime and will be reported back to us at the Council.

One further point in relation to the remarks of the United States representative. The whole purpose of our resolution was to allow the different countries to work it out in their own way. There was no suggestion that everybody must make necessarily a single appeal for UNESCO and for the Children's Fund. Different countries may want to do it differently. As Mr. Ordning so rightly pointed out, the success of this scheme will depend upon its flexibility, so that each country can contribute best under its own conditions.

The PRESIDENT: What about the consequential amendment? The French representative had some doubts about that.

MR. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom): Oh, yes, the consequential amendment was in our view purely consequential. It seems to us that the effect of leaving this paragraph in would be to limit the proceeds to going to the Children's Fund, or at any rate it might be interpreted as such.

(MR. BORIS (France): Speaking in French)

The PRESIDENT: I will put the amendment paragraph by paragraph to the vote of the Council.

The first paragraph in the United Kingdom delegation amendment to be substituted for the existing paragraph in the draft resolution, --

MR. PAPANNEK (Czechoslovakia): Mr. President, are you going to take out the words "in principle"?

The PRESIDENT: Do you want to delete it?

MR. PAPANNEK (Czechoslovakia): The representative from the United Kingdom agreed that it should be taken out.

MR. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom): Well, I thought somebody proposed to take it out, but I cannot see that it matters very much. We put it in because that is

really what we are doing at this stage. We are not, in the Council, settling all the details, so I do not think that, on the whole, it is really best to leave it out, unless there is some pressure from any quarter to take it out, and I have not felt that pressure yet.

MR. PAPENEK: (Czechoslovakia) Perhaps we should leave it out.

MR. SMITH (Canada): I think it would be better in, Mr. President.

MR. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom): I think that the United States delegation had a single amendment which also included these words "in principle," and we did not have it processed for distribution when we found it was in the United Kingdom document as well.

This United Kingdom draft gets over some part of the difficulty that we had when we proposed "in principle", because it has deleted the words "outlined in the Secretary-General's Report", but I think that what we have to do is bear in mind that it is ^{the} principle of a flexible appeal that we are making and not an appeal that is limited to any one formula. That is one thing that everyone around the table seems to have been agreed upon, that it is not that one approves in principle the idea of an emergency appeal; it is that he approves in principle the various formulations that have been made and it will still remain for each country to work out the precise form of its appeal. On that basis, the words "in principle" clarify rather than detract from the text.

The PRESIDENT: Would you like to leave it or would you press for its removal?

MR. PAPANEK (Czechoslovakia): With this clarification that it does not limit it, I am satisfied to leave it.

The PRESIDENT: The amendment is proposed that for the existing paragraph 1 in the Draft Resolution, paragraph 1 in the United Kingdom amendment be substituted. We will proceed to a vote on that amendment.

(Whereupon, a vote was taken by a show of hands.)

The PRESIDENT: The substitution is made and approved.

We now come to Paragraph 2. The proposal is that the existing Paragraph 2 in the Resolution remain. We will proceed to a vote on this paragraph.

MR. FAUSTO SOTO (Chile): One slight clarification, Mr. President. Will the proposal that I made to take into account the foreign exchange position of each country will remain?

The PRESIDENT: That is the idea. We will now proceed to the vote.

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

The PRESIDENT: Paragraph 2 in the original resolution of the Sub-Committee remains.

Paragraph 3 in the Sub-Committee's resolution read: "Urges governments to aid and facilitate this voluntary effort." The proposal is that paragraph 4 of the United Kingdom resolution be substituted.

We will proceed to a vote as to whether paragraph 4 of the United Kingdom amendment should be substituted for the existing paragraph 3 in the resolution of the Sub-Committee.

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

The PRESIDENT: The substitution is made.

MR. MOROZOV (USSR) (Interpretation from Russian): I wish to have recorded that, as a result of my statements during the discussions in the Council, the Soviet delegation will abstain from voting on these points.

The PRESIDENT: We now take up paragraph 3 of the United Kingdom resolution, which does not find a place in the original draft: "Further requests the Secretary-General to report to the next session of the Economic and Social Council on the progress of this project."

We will proceed to a vote as to whether this paragraph should be inserted in the resolution.

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

The PRESIDENT: The paragraph is adopted.

We now take up the consequential amendment suggested by the United Kingdom delegation that the following be deleted: "And having regard to its authorization that the proceeds of the appeal to be issued under paragraph 8 of the General Assembly Resolution No. 48 of 11 December 1946 should go to the Fund."

We will proceed to a vote as to whether that deletion should be made.

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

The PRESIDENT: The deletion is made.

(Mr. Mendes-France, representative of France, replaced Mr. Boris.)

(Mr. Mendes-France, representative of France, spoke in French.)

The PRESIDENT: We now come to paragraph 5 of the amendment of the British delegation: "Authorizes the Secretary-General, after due consultations, to fix a date most suitable for the collection."

We will proceed to a vote as to whether that paragraph should be added.

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

The PRESIDENT: The paragraph is added.

(Mr. Yang, representative of China, replaced Mr. Chang.)

MR. YANG (China): What happens to the other provisions on page 2 of the original draft, E/AC.7/14?

The PRESIDENT: I will put that to the vote of the House, I take it that the rest of the resolution will remain.

MR. YANG (China): The rest will remain, yes.

The PRESIDENT: That is a separate resolution.

Now, the next resolution: "The Economic and Social Council having taken note of the Report submitted by the Executive Board of the International Children's Emergency Fund in virtue of paragraph 8 of the General Assembly Resolution No 1 57 of 11 December 1946, of the recommendations made by the Social Commission in virtue of paragraph 3 (a) of the above-mentioned Resolution of the recommendation by the Executive Board, under paragraph 3 (c) of the same Resolution, that Switzerland be added to its membership, and of the statements concerning the question of contributions to the Fund made by the representatives of various Governments on the Council..." The next paragraph: "And having regard to its authorization that the proceeds of the appeal to be issued under paragraph 8 of the General Assembly Resolution No. 48 of 11 December 1946 should go to the Fund " has been deleted.

I will now put to the vote the whole of this part of the resolution, beginning with "THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL HAVING TAKEN NOTE of the Report..." and going on to the last page of this document.

MR. MDROZOV (USSR) (Interpretation from Russian): Which resolution, Mr. President?

The PRESIDENT: We have now accepted the first part of the resolution in E/AC.7/14, with certain amendments proposed by the United Kingdom delegation. Then, there is the second resolution which begins at the end of that page and goes over, with the annex, to the next three pages. We have already voted to delete the paragraph on the second page: "And having regard to its authorization that the proceeds of the appeal to be issued under paragraph 8 of the General Assembly Resolution No. 48 of 11 December 1946 should go to the Fund." I now put to the vote of the house that portion of the resolution, as amended. Is it quite clear?

MR. YANG (China): Mr. President, may I suggest that on page 2, under paragraph 1, that after the word "Approves" we insert the words "in general", so that it will read "Approves in general the conclusions..."

The PRESIDENT: Will you explain the effect of the amendment you have proposed?

MR. YANG (China): The effect of the amendment is that these conclusions in the Report are not tabulated definitely one, two, three, four, containing a running account. So, I think it is more appropriate to say "Approves in general the conclusions..."

The PRESIDENT: An amendment is proposed to paragraph 1, "Approves in general the conclusions..."

MR. ARCA PARRO (Peru): Why, Mr. President? It would be better to use the same language that we have used in the first part of this resolution,

"in principle" instead of "in general".

The PRESIDENT: I do not know whether we should use either.

MR. MOE (Norway): I agree with you, Mr. President. I do not think we should use so many qualifications. We must take into consideration that this is a Fund that appeals to governments as well as to the public, and our resolution should not be worded so that someone may understand that we do not agree entirely with what the Fund is doing.

Mr. ARCA PARRO (Peru): I withdraw my proposal.

(Mr. van Heuven replaced Mr. Phillipse as the representative of the Netherlands.)

Mr. van HEUVEN (Netherlands): Although we have all the sympathy for the idea of obtaining voluntary contributions toward the International Children's Emergency Fund or for similar purposes, the Netherlands Government must reserve its position, in view of its difficult situation with regard to foreign exchange and transfer problems arising in connection with this matter.

With this reservation, I shall vote in favour of the resolution.

The PRESIDENT: The proposal is that the words "in general" be inserted after the word "approves" in paragraph 1 (a).

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

The PRESIDENT: The amendment is lost.

I now put the resolution to the vote, excluding the clause "and having regard to its authorization".

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

The PRESIDENT: The resolution is adopted.

REPORT OF THE POPULATION COMMISSION

The PRESIDENT: There is an amendment proposed by the delegation of the United Kingdom on the Report of the Population Commission.

On page 6, the first paragraph reads "REQUESTS that the Secretary-General, pending the collection of the above data, proceed with studies" -- et cetera. The proposal is: "REQUESTS that the Secretary-General, subject to the views of the Trusteeship Council and pending the collection of the above data, proceed with studies of the population" -- et cetera.

MR. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom): Mr. President, I do not apologize for bringing this before the Council for a second time, because there is an important matter involved--namely, the matter of our relationship with the Trusteeship Council, which we touched on yesterday.

Now, when that was discussed in the Committee, the United Kingdom delegation brought forth an amendment which was discussed, and the voting on it was 7 to 7, and 8 to 7 on a recount. It is clear that there was some doubt in the Council as a whole as to whether the terms of the official resolution put forward did properly satisfy the need for full coordination and cooperation between our work and that of the Trusteeship Council.

The Trusteeship Council is now sitting, and one of its jobs in the course of its work will be to consider a questionnaire in respect to trust territories in which population questions do arise. It seemed, therefore, to my delegation that it would be wrong and even discourteous for the Economic and Social Council to pass a resolution concerning a study of population questions in the trust territories and to instruct the Secretary-General to make a study, albeit on existing data only, and to issue a report, without any consultation whatsoever with this sister organ which has been recently sitting in a neighboring room and will be here for several days longer. It seems to me essential, Mr. President, that our relationship with the Trusteeship Council should start off on the best possible basis, and I would therefore formally move that we add to the resolution which was passed the other day the words, "subject to the views of the Trusteeship Council," in order that we shall not instruct the Secretary-General to make a study and to issue a report on trust territories without any consultation whatsoever with the Trusteeship Council.

MR. STINEBOWER (United States): Mr. President, the United States delegation is in general agreement with the views put forward by the United Kingdom representative, but we are a little puzzled by a mechanical difficulty that may arise here. Either of two things is possible. It may be that the Trusteeship Council would have no objection and no comments to make, in which case this could go forward quite simply. It might, on the other hand, be that the Trusteeship Council would have some rather pronounced views, in which case we would find ourselves in effect having underwritten those views in advance. We wonder if the same result could not be obtained, since we shall not be sitting long enough to hear the views of the Trusteeship Council--or, at least, I trust a few more hours are going to see our adjournment--by requesting the President of this Council to consult with the President of the Trusteeship Council on this matter, with a view to inviting the Secretary-General to proceed with studies of the population--and so forth.

MR. KIRPALANI (India): Mr. President, the delegation of India shares the views expressed by the representative of the United States. But there is a further difficulty in our mind. Does the addition proposed by the United Kingdom representative mean that no further studies could take place within the framework of the existing data, without consulting the Trusteeship Council?

If I recollect the gist of the discussions in the Committee, the idea was that the Population Commission is not debarred from carrying on the work outlined above, so far as the data already available is concerned. The Trusteeship Council was to come in the picture if any further data was to be collected in the pursuit of these studies.

(Mr. MENDES-FRANCE, representative of France, spoke in French.)

The PRESIDENT: That is at the very top of the page, before paragraph 1--
"REQUESTS that the Secretary-General"--et cetera.

(Mr. MENDES-FRANCE, representative of France, spoke in French.)

MR. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom): No, sir, we wanted to avoid the situation in which the Economic and Social Council would instruct the Secretary-General to prepare reports and to issue a series of reports on the trust territories on the basis of the studies which he made, without any prior consultation with the Trusteeship Council. We therefore wanted the words, "subject to the views of the Trusteeship Council," to be added after the words, "REQUESTS that the Secretary-General..." at the top of page 6.

Mr. ARCA PARRO (Peru): Mr. President, as a member of the Population Commission I should like to state very clearly that it is not in the mind of the Population Commission to make any study outside of the factual information that is possible to be found in the different documents or publications. In case it will be necessary to go into the spot--I mean, for a field research or investigation--of course we should have to refer it to the Trusteeship Council. But this is just a sort of preparatory work for whatever studies the Trusteeship Council might require.

We really do not think it is so necessary to put in this clause as suggested by the British delegation, because it will in some way, as it has been explained by the American representative, postpone the work of this Commission on a subject that has already been thoroughly discussed in the Committee of this Council. So for those reasons, I am not willing to support this addition or this amendment as it has been suggested.

Mr. MOROZOV (USSR) (Interpretation from Russian): As far as I know, this problem has been very thoroughly discussed in the Population Commission. These proposals were substantially considered by the Committee of the Whole of the Council. That is why I must say I hardly see why we should take up this matter again and start this discussion all over again. That is why I propose that we leave the text as it was submitted by the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom): Mr. President, we hope, of course, so far as the Economic and Social Council is concerned, that the Trusteeship Council would in fact agree with these studies and these studies would go on. But we have to have some regard as to the form of our relationship with this Body, and may I just refer to the remarks made by the Peruvian representative.

He says: "This is only existing data. Let us go on instructing the Secretary-General to study existing data." Well sir, suppose we take that

decision at the Economic and Social Council and we send an instruction to the Secretary-General -- as we will do if we pass the resolution as it now stands -- now the Trusteeship Council, meeting in another room in a day or two, may agree on a questionnaire to trust territories, on this same question.

Now when the matter was debated the other day, I asked the Secretariat how long it would take them to prepare a study on the basis of existing information, and the date of six months was mentioned. Now we should look very foolish, I suggest, Mr. President, if we put ourselves in the position of saying to the Secretary-General: "Go ahead on existing data", and at the same time another body is sending out a questionnaire on the subject. I do not know how long their questionnaire will take, but the question of form, the question of principle arises. We might tell the Secretary-General to produce a document on the basis of existing data, and at the same time that data was becoming out of date because new data was being obtained by another body. So I do think we have got to have regard to the question of form here.

I do not know what is going on in the Trusteeship Council myself. I do not know how soon they will settle this questionnaire, but it seems to me wrong to start off our relationship with that Body by embarking on a study, by telling the Secretariat to embark on a study, by telling the Secretariat to issue reports before the Trusteeship Council has had an opportunity of considering these very valuable suggestions by the Population Commission. It would be the hope of my delegation that the Trusteeship Council would be constantly obtaining, from the Economic and Social Council, assistance on economic and social matters. The Population Commission clearly has got authority to cover all territories in the world. But before you start a study on just that little group of territories, and no other territories, we are deciding to take those territories alone as the object of our study, and it seems to us wrong to do that when there is a Council, an Organ of the

United Nations in session which has the jurisdiction to consider matters concerning those territories and which will, we hope, seek the assistance of the Economic and Social Council.

(Mr. MENDEZ-FRANCE, representative of France, spoke in French.)

Mr. MOE (Norway): I think, Mr. President, that we all agree with our French colleague that we have to do this in deference to the Trusteeship Council. But I wonder if some of the difficulties are not due to the formulation of the United Kingdom amendment, because it is stated: "subject to the views of the Trusteeship Council." And the way the amendment, if formulated, seems to imply that the Economic and Social Council has to have, so to say, the permission of the Trusteeship Council to proceed with its plans, or the plans of the Population Commission. And that is evidently not the intention of the amendment and that is why I will ask the United Kingdom representative if he could not change the formulation to use the sentence we used in other connections, and say "after consultation with the Trusteeship Council."

The PRESIDENT: I should like to limit this discussion very sharply. We are in danger of going over the whole ground that should be covered when arrangements between the Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council are under consideration. For my part, I should like to say that the Charter gives the Economic and Social Council the right to consider economic and social problems over the whole world. Trusteeship territories and non-trusteeship territories and Member Nations are all taken into consideration. In fact, it could not be otherwise because the economic and social problems cannot be put into one type of problem on the basis of territories. We have seen that already in the discussions that we have had in this Council ^{as to} / undeveloped and under-developed territories and industrial territories, it will be much more difficult to classify territories as trusteeship territories and non-trusteeship territories.

At the same time, the practical problem is not to have duplication among our own Organs, the Organs of the United Nations, and not to have conflicting decisions between organs of the United Nations. That is the very problem that your Council has suggested that I might, as a preliminary matter, with the help of two colleagues of this Council, discuss with the President and two other colleagues of the Trusteeship Council.

Therefore, I would very much deprecate going into that large question of discussion at the present stage. Confining ourselves to the resolution proposal now before the Council, the first part of this resolution also has to be considered where the Council itself has suggested to the Trusteeship Council "the collection of data through the questionnaires provided by Chapter XIII of Article 88, which will make possible a demographic study for each of the Trust Territories," and then follows up with a request to the Secretary-General, bearing in mind completely the fact that the Trusteeship

Council has to consider this matter and probably is considering this matter, and in fact referring it to the Trusteeship Council -- a resolution in a much more limited degree -- asking the Secretary-General, "pending the collection of the above data" -- on which the views of the Trusteeship Council have been invited -- and, in fact, asks co-operation to "proceed with studies of the population of Trust Territories within the framework of existing data."

If there is any qualification to be put on this at all, it may be "subject to any views expressed by the Trusteeship Council," not "subject to the views of the Trusteeship Council." "After taking into consideration any resolutions of the Trusteeship Council," not "subject to the views of the Trusteeship Council".

That means we are asking the Secretary-General to weigh the rules of the Trusteeship Council on this matter. We are therefore confining ourselves unduly, as the Norwegian representative has said. After all, if that sort of language is adopted on every occasion, whether we know that the Trusteeship Council is going to consider the matter or not, we might have to say "subject to the views of the Trusteeship Council." The practical way of getting the views of the Trusteeship Council, if we want those views before we proceed in the matter, is to suggest for the agenda of the Trusteeship Council a particular matter for consideration. We do not want to go into the large question of the arrangements between these two Councils, and I would only suggest at this stage that we might confine ourselves to the precise question that the Secretary-General has been asked to undertake consideration of.

MR. REID (New Zealand): Mr. President, your excellent explanation has made it quite unnecessary for me to give any reasons for the suggestion I want to make since this matter was so thoroughly discussed in Committee. The Council has taken another step, as you have pointed out. It has appointed a Committee to meet with a Committee of the Trusteeship Council, and while it is quite improper that this Council should pass any resolution that would appear to subject the Council or its officers to the direction of any other organ of the United Nations, I would suggest that it is quite proper for the direction to the Secretary-General to be subjected to the officers of this Council.

I would therefore suggest that the position might be met -- particularly the position mentioned by the United States representative -- if the United Kingdom proposal were altered to read "subject to the direction of the President" or else of the Committee that we set up yesterday. There, we have the officer of the Council subject already to the direction of the President of this Council, and the President or that Committee would be able, after the discussion which is already contemplated with the Trusteeship Council Committee, to give the necessary directions, which probably will be quite minor or may be of no account at all.

But, we would avoid any clash or any confusion between this Council and the Trusteeship Council.

MR. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom): I might explain that the reason why my amendment was worded that way was to avoid the possibility that the Secretary-General might get conflicting instructions from two Councils. Now, we have got to face that position in relation to all of the Councils and that is why, indeed, this item "Relations with the Security Council and Trusteeship Council" appears regularly on our agenda, and why these

discussions will be initiated with the Trusteeship Council. We all hope they will develop into a very fruitful form of co-operation.

Now, your suggestion, Mr. President, would leave that point open. It would rather place the onus on the Secretary-General. If he got different instructions from the Trusteeship Council, he would have to decide, presumably, to carry out both instructions. It was on that account that we suggested the words "subject to the views of the Trusteeship Council" in the absence of any arrangements having yet been developed for consultation between the two Councils.

MR. KIRPALANI (India): Mr. President, I will not -- I cannot -- add, indeed, to the very lucid explanation you gave as to the functions and jurisdiction and authority of this Council. All I am proposing is to achieve the purpose we have in view, and I would suggest consideration of some such words, "pending collection of complete data as proposed to the Trusteeship Council." I say that because we are proposing that we issue certain questionnaires, "pending collection of complete data as proposed to the Trusteeship Council, proceed with the studies. . ."

The PRESIDENT: I do not see how that advances the matter at all. The "above data" would mean the above data collected if and when and after the Trusteeship Council collected such data.

MR. KIRPALANI (India): I said "pending collection of complete data," not "above data." You may say "complete data on the above subjects," because obviously the Secretary-General will have to produce a preliminary report and a final report, and the preliminary report will possibly be produced on the existing data available.

The PRESIDENT: "The Secretary-General, after consultation with the President of the Council." And he will take care to see that in his consultation with the Trusteeship Council President, he takes note of the Trusteeship Council Resolution.

MR. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom): Mr. President, if we are going to have an amendment to mine, the one that is nearest and the one that I would not oppose, if it is the will of the Council, is the one by the Norwegian representative. It does not entirely cover the situation, as I pointed out earlier, but we all hope that it will be a suitable way of getting over our present form difficulty until the arrangements for collaboration are fully developed.

In regard to the Indian suggestion, it is Paragraph 2 that is more worrisome than paragraph 1. Paragraph 1 is simply the collection of data, and if the Secretary-General would like to do that, well, of course, he would quite well do that and the Population Commission might ask him to do it. But Paragraph 2 is the issue of reports, and it seems entirely wrong to ask one Council to issue reports on matters falling within the province also of another Council without any consultation with that Council.

I would therefore accept the words "after consultation with the Trusteeship Council" and perhaps you, Mr. President, might be willing to explain to the President of the Trusteeship Council the difficulty we are in on this, pending the development of satisfactory arrangements.

Mr. KIRPALANI (India): Mr. President, that raises a somewhat important issue, and that is whether the demographic study or any report on demographic studies of trust territories must be issued with the consent of the Trusteeship Council. This is only a demographic study.

Mr. MOROZOV (USSR)(Interpretation from Russian): I consider that in so far as the proposals of the Population Commission lie within the competence of the Population Commission--and I am in agreement with you, Mr. President--and therefore within the functions of the Economic and Social Council, I assume that there is no need to doubt it, whereas if we make any reservations we will therefore acknowledge a certain uncertainty as to our functions and the part we are called upon to play. That is why I insist that we leave the original wording of the Report of the Commission.

Mr. Arca PARRO (Peru): Mr. President, I fully agree with the explanation that you have made about this difficult problem, but although it is in the mind of the different delegations that we should try to meet this British amendment, as we recognize, it is not possible to say "subject to the view of the Trusteeship Council". I wonder if a phrase that I might just give would be the idea of the kind to work in collaboration--those two Councils--and could be expressed like this: "...request the Secretary-General, in accordance with the principles of relationship between the Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council..." Then comes number one-- "...do such-and-such...". so it will be just ' give an idea that we are going to do joint work in some way.

Shall I read that again? "...request the Secretary-General, in accordance with the principles of relationship between the Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council..."

We have in mind that we are working out certain plans for the relationship between the two Councils, so it will come under the framework of this sort of agreement or certain rules that have to be set up, I think.

The PRESIDENT: My only excuse for intervening in this debate and venturing to put forward certain views is that, as President of the Economic and Social Council, I feel that I have a responsibility about how this Council undertakes its task or maintains its own responsibility in this sphere.

I will briefly make my comments on the three proposals made.

With reference to the last proposal, that of the representative of Peru, my difficulty is that we have not yet established principles of relationship, and there is no point in asking the Secretary-General to take note of relationships which have yet to be established. If we were to establish them, there would be no difficulty on this point at all. I hope very much, in view of this discussion, that at the next session of the Council we will be able to establish certain principles, at least,

With regard to the alternatives of the United Kingdom delegation, I personally confess that I see no difference in the two alternatives. The first is: "subject to the ^{view of the} Trusteeship Council!" and that puts the Economic and Social Council under some sort of subordination to the Trusteeship Council in any instructions it may give. It is one thing to have collaboration ^{and cooperation} but it is another to put it in that specific form. Now if you say "after consultation with the Trusteeship Council", first of all, I do not see how the Secretary-General can consult a Council except in the form of consulting it through an item brought on the agenda of the Trusteeship Council; and secondly, suppose the Trusteeship Council gives any instructions which have to be carried out--what is the

Secretary-General to do? Suppose it comes to the Trusteeship Council and the Trusteeship Council says something contrary to what we have suggested here. The same difficulty, the same dilemma will face the Secretary-General as is contemplated now.

It seems to me what we wanted to avoid is, if I have followed the discussion, contrary directions to the Secretary-General from two different organs of the United Nations. I entirely agree that the Secretary-General should not be in the position of receiving contrary directions on any particular matter. My difficulty at the present time is that the Trusteeship Council has not given any directions. Why should we not presume that the Trusteeship Council will take into consideration what we have suggested, and make its directions not contrary to what we have already suggested? There is no difficulty. We are now taking this into consideration, we are following the recommendation of the Commission which we have ourselves established. We are not trying to encroach upon any work that the Trusteeship Council may undertake, or may decide to undertake. If I may put it in somewhat crude language, we are first in the field with the matter, and is it unreasonable to think that the Trusteeship Council at this stage will take it into account in formulating its proposals? Why should we believe that the Trusteeship Council will necessarily give any instructions contrary in this matter? It is as unreasonable for the Economic and Social Council to do that as it will be for the Trusteeship Council to do that. The Secretary-General, if this subject is before the Trusteeship Council, will, I take it, bring this resolution which has been adopted by the Council to the notice of the Trusteeship Council.

I think we might cut the Gordian knot and leave the words as they are, and try to expedite the agreements which must be arranged between the two Councils. Otherwise, I venture to make an appeal that we will get into a long discussion and probably prejudice the issues that may have still to be settled with the Trusteeship Council, and, as I have stressed over and over again, those agreements are not unimportant,

neither are they going to be easy to be settled.

Mr. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom): Mr. President, I agree with so much of what you have said, but I would still hope that we would be able to insert the words "after consultation with", which was the suggestion made by the Norwegian representative. It does, I think, represent a gesture to the Trusteeship Council which we would do very well to make.

The PRESIDENT: The amendment proposes that on page 6 "...request that the Secretary-General...", insert the words "after consultation with the Trusteeship Council and pending the collection of the above data, proceed with studies", et cetera.

(A vote was taken by a show of hands with the following results.)

The PRESIDENT: Five representatives voted for and seven against the amendment, which is lost.

I now put the resolutions on the Population Commission to the vote.

(A vote was taken by a show of hands with the following results.)

The PRESIDENT: The resolutions are adopted.

The Council will now adjourn, and meet at two-thirty punctually.

(The meeting adjourned at 1:00 p.m.)