

United Nations

**ECONOMIC  
AND  
SOCIAL COUNCIL**

Nations Unies

**CONSEIL  
ECONOMIQUE  
ET SOCIAL**

UNRESTRICTED  
E/P.V. 107  
6 August 1947  
English

**MASTER FILE**

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL  
Fifth Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTH MEETING

Lake Success, New York,  
Wednesday, 6 August 1947, at 11 a. m.

Acting President : Mr. Jan PAPANEK (Czechoslovakia)

NOTE: This verbatim record is issued under rule 35 of the rules of procedure of the Economic and Social Council.

The rules of procedure do not provide for the submission of corrections to the verbatim record, but only to the summary record (rule 49).

Interpretations as delivered at meetings are recorded in the present verbatim record for the convenience of representatives, and corrections to these interpretations need not be submitted.

Corrections to the text of original speeches should be sent to the Secretary of the Economic and Social Council for the guidance of the writers of the summary records.

The PRESIDENT: I declare the one hundred and seventh meeting of the Economic and Social Council open,

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ON THE DRAFT CONVENTION ON THE CRIME OF GENOCIDE (E/447, E/476, E/522)

The PRESIDENT: I wish to advise the Members of the Council that document E/522 contains the draft resolution adopted by the Social Committee.

As there are no observations on this proposed draft resolution, I shall consider it adopted by the Council.

PROGRESS REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ON IMPLEMENTATION OF  
RESOLUTION 58 OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY ON ADVISORY SOCIAL WELFARE  
FUNCTIONS OF UNRRA TRANSFERRED TO UNITED NATIONS.

Mr. MALIK (Lebanon): The only comment I wish to make is in regard to the passage which states: "Recognizes that the Member nations of the United Nations should, if interested, share the benefits of Advisory Social Welfare services." It seems to me that this is not exactly what was intended to be said, because who else would share these benefits if it were not the Member nations concerned?

We do not mean here to state something which is obviously implied in the very existence of these services. These services were intended for Member nations, and to merely reiterate that fact seems to me not exactly what was meant. I think that what is meant in the passage is that the maximum number of Member nations should share in the benefits, or as many Member nations of the United Nations as possible should share in the benefits.

Merely to leave it in the form in which it is would not indicate what the Norwegian representative or any of the other representatives had in mind. As it is, it is merely an irrelevancy.

I would suggest the following: "Recognizes that as many Member nations of the United Nations as possible should, if interested, share the benefits of Advisory Social Welfare services."

Mr. HAARR (Norway): I have had the opportunity on earlier occasions to defend this sentence in the Committee of the Whole, in the Drafting Committee and then again in the Committee of the Whole. I do not understand why this sentence should raise so many objections. I am sorry that I should have to explain the meaning of this sentence.

In view of the contention made by the Secretariat in this matter, the purpose of these words is to introduce a change. The Advisory Social Welfare Services have in the past been limited to the less developed countries, and have in accordance with the original instructions given by the General Assembly had the character of emergency aid. In the opinion of the Norwegian delegation, the work which has already been accomplished should be made a basis for the future activities in this field. We regard these activities as important and valuable to the countries which receive the services and to the United Nations as an organization.

Originally, the Norwegian delegation moved for a more far reaching proposal; that is, that these services should be broadened and put on a permanent basis. However, we realized that the time for that had not yet<sup>come.</sup>

It is important to keep the door open for the future. We should disregard the original principle that these services are only emergency aid to be given to a limited number of countries, and that when the emergency situation has eased, these services should then be abandoned.

The Norwegian delegation feels that the services should be put on a permanent basis. Now is the time to state that the services should be available to all Members. If the services are permanent there cannot be any limitation, and that is very important. I believe it is important to do that now.

It is important to change this activity from an emergency programme to a more permanent activity which the United Nations should maintain. How this more permanent basis can be achieved can be discussed later after the Social Commission has expressed its view, but I still think it is important to give the Social Commission a statement as a criticism of what has been done. It has been limited so far, but in future it ought not to be limited.

Mr. PERRY (New Zealand): The New Zealand delegation regrets that it finds itself unable to agree with the resolution reported by the Social Committee, and I would like to move an amendment in the following terms:

"The Economic and Social Council, taking note of the progress report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of Resolution 58 of the General Assembly on the Advisory Social Welfare Functions of UNRRA transferred to the United Nations,

"Requests the Social Commission at its next session to review the report of the Secretary-General and to make recommendations concerning this report and the need for the provision of such services to Member Nations and the methods of financing such services."

The amendment would delete the second paragraph of the resolution coming from the Social Committee. That is the paragraph which states: "Recognizes that the Member Nations of the United Nations should, if interested, share the benefits of advisory Social Welfare services."

It would also delete the final paragraph requesting the Secretary-General to consult the Social Commission and would introduce certain amendments which are referred to in the third paragraph where there is a reference to the Social Commission.

The New Zealand delegation felt that the second paragraph of the Committee's resolution was not very clear in intent. However, the intention of that paragraph has been clarified by the representative of Norway, and the issue has been clearly raised before this Council. The issue, as the New Zealand delegation sees it, is not whether it is proper and right for the United Nations to conduct certain activities in relation to social welfare functions on a permanent basis, but whether it is right and proper for this Council at this stage, without having considered in detail the matter, to prejudge the issue before the Social Commission has made a full examination of the whole proposal. We feel that should not be done, and further that there is no necessity for it to be done. We feel that the field is quite open for permanent and extended social welfare functions to be carried on by the United Nations without, at this stage, putting any particular words into a resolution which this Council adopts.

Up to the present time, the activities of the United Nations in this field have been linked to the activities previously carried

on by UNRRA. As we see it, the Social Commission will review the report of the Secretary-General in detail. We very much doubt whether it is necessary to give the Social Commission any express direction to consider the future programs in this sphere. We think on a reading of the report of the Secretary-General it would be essential, when the Social Commission reviewed that report, to consider what was to happen in the future, whether it was going to continue for one year or for ten years or permanently.

However, to cover that particular point, certain words have been added to the third paragraph of the Social Committee's report, and have, in effect, been taken from the second clause which we are deleting.

May I read again the final and operative clause of the resolution proposed by the New Zealand delegation. "The Economic and Social Council requests the Social Commission at its next session to review the report of the Secretary-General and to make recommendations concerning this report and the need for the provision of such services to Member Nations and the methods of financing such services." We therefore request the Social Commission to examine the particular point.

Now the further difficulty may be raised that it is essential for some recommendation to go forward to the General Assembly. As we see it, it is not perhaps formally correct to adopt the procedure suggested in the final paragraph of the Social Committee's resolution, to request the Secretary-General to consult with the Social Commission. I imagine the Secretary-General through the appropriate offices of his Secretariat will, in fact, be consulting--not exactly consulting, but assisting the

Social Commission in its work. In actual fact, the provision of necessary finances for the continuation of social welfare functions has already been raised in the budget, and I should imagine that it would be simply normal procedure for the appropriate committees of the General Assembly, when considering that particular item in the budget, and when considering the appropriate section of the Economic and Social Council's report, to consider what had been done and what had been recommended by the Social Commission.



If at that stage the General Assembly, as a proper organ, decides to make express provision for the continuation on a permanent basis of activities in this sphere by the United Nations, then certainly the matter will have been properly considered and will be put in order. But at this stage to request the Secretary-General to review his budgetary provisions on the basis of something that the Social Commission is going to do when we do not know what the Social Commission has done or how it is going to approach the matter, seems to me to be pre-judging an issue in a way that this Council should not do. This Council should not go to the General Assembly and in effect say "We have not considered this matter ourselves but we want you to do whatever the Social Commission proposes."

The Social Commission is an expert body but not an organ that should report directly to the General Assembly. We consider, therefore, that the resolution proposed by the Social Committee is not satisfactory and we submit an amendment which we believe will cover all the essential matters at issue and still leave the way open for the Social Commission and the General Assembly, or later, if the General Assembly desires this Council to consider the matter, for this Council to consider in detail and in the proper manner exactly what should be done about the future activities.

I should only like to add that we do not desire to pre-judge this issue, but most certainly the New Zealand delegation and the New Zealand Government have every sympathy with the necessity for the proper provision of social welfare advisory functions in whatever form may be agreed upon by the United Nations, internationally

MB/GG,

E/P.V.107  
27-30

if that is approved; and if the necessary financial provisions are accepted; otherwise, through some other procedure, but we do not feel that at this stage the Council should pre-judge the matter.

Mr. KAMINSKY (Byelorussian SSR) (Interpretation from Russian): I cannot agree with some of the arguments that have been put forward. It has been said that the consultative activities of UNRRA, in so far as social welfare functions are concerned, must be a permanent basis of our work. I think this is an entirely artificial conception. There is no need for a continuation of advisory functions and this does not correspond to the real facts.

Furthermore, I cannot agree with the suggestion that more countries should be asked to share the benefits of these services. In making this proposal, I think the Lebanese representative was considering the fact that up to the present time the number of countries which applied for such services was very limited. In order to prove the necessity of continuing these functions, he was ready to try, even artificially, to ask different countries to apply for the purpose of increasing the scope of the activities. In practice, we know that very few countries have asked for such help, and we have every reason to expect in the future that these activities will become smaller and smaller, and finally disappear altogether.

The Resolution of the General Assembly on this matter was based on urgent needs. If there is now some demand that these activities should be continued in 1948, before we make any decision with regard to the continuation of such activities, we must first know the results of these activities during 1947. As we all know, we have as yet no data to judge the work of 1947, so that we can determine its success and its achievements, or its failure.

PF/tp

E/P.V.107  
32-35

We must study the question as to whether there is a real necessity to continue these activities in 1948; and even if there were such a necessity, we must alleviate the strain on the United Nations budget with regard to this item because, to the best of my knowledge, each of the countries which may require services of this sort can itself assume the full expense of the help provided to it by the United Nations.

For all these reasons, I do not find it possible for our delegation to be in agreement with the resolution as it stands, and unless it is amended, we will vote against it.

Mr. MOROSOV (USSR) (Interpretation from Russian): I have already had an opportunity of saying that the resolution of the General Assembly mentioned in the first paragraph of the draft resolution submitted to the Council foresees extraordinary measures for 1947 only. The results of these activities in 1947 have, as yet, not been studied by organs of the United Nations, and in particular by the Social Commission, which is the organ of the Economic and Social Council which has to study those questions.

It is the view of our delegation that we should introduce changes in the practice in this field. The Soviet Union delegation feel that the services mentioned in this resolution should be given to countries which present a request for them, but the expense of the services must be borne by the countries and governments which ask for such services. This by no means implies that the United Nations is not to fulfill that sort of function.

In practice we must also remember that the Administrative and Budgetary Committee has raised this question of the expense of such services to be borne by the governments and countries that present the requests for these services, and the fact that the Administrative and Budgetary Committee has raised the question also deserves our full attention.

To summarize the position, it is our opinion that the Economic and Social Council cannot decide on the substance of this matter before the Social Commission discusses it. For these reasons, we consider that the suggestion made by the representative of New Zealand deserves our full attention and corresponds more closely

to the facts than the draft we have before us in document E/520.

Dr. CHANG (China): Firstly, I wish to say that after the discussion the issue is at least clear to this extent, that we are dealing with a measure passed by the General Assembly in Resolution 58, for the continuation of the Advisory Social Welfare services that were initiated and carried on by UNRRA. That was not very clear at the beginning of the discussion, because certain Members seemed to indicate that various Member States enjoyed certain privileges unduly. But really the allocation was altogether a continuation of the UNRRA arrangement; there was nothing different whatsoever.

I think also that whatever we decide here is not at all a matter of criticizing the carrying out of Resolution 58. It is not that at all; it is simply that we are discussing what should be done afterwards to see that more Member States may be able to come in to enjoy the benefits.

Therefore, I am glad indeed that this statement has been made by some Members here, to the effect that our decision would only be for the continuation of the UNRRA arrangements; further, that no Member State has simply taken advantage of this because it is after all merely a continuation of the UNRRA provisions.

I am glad that point is clear, because it was not quite clear in committee meetings. The second matter is that concerning the wording of the resolution. I agree with the representative of Lebanon that the wording can be very much improved. I think that there are certain really very good points in the suggestion of the representative of New Zealand. May I say, however, that this very ill-worded draft resolution has gone through a drafting stage as well as a committee stage. It is the composite result of half a dozen

points of view, and it is not satisfactory to anyone in particular.

I am wondering whether, in view of the time we have already given to it, we might pass it as it is. It is a most unsatisfactory thing to everyone who made suggestions, and yet, on the whole, it contains the various points of view, and also it has no commitment in it. It takes care of the various points of view, as far as possible. Therefore, I think that attempts at amendment might take a little too long, and perhaps a vote on the draft resolution could be taken as it is. Unsatisfactory as it is, it may be the best way for the Council to deal with it.

The PRESIDENT: I wish I could follow the suggestion made by the representative of China, but we have two amendments and we have to dispose of them.

I think we should vote on the draft resolution paragraph by paragraph. The first paragraph can be voted on first and then we can go right to the amendment of the representative of New Zealand, which is that the second paragraph be deleted. If the second paragraph is deleted, the proposal of the representative of Lebanon would be automatically taken care of.

Mr. MALIK (Lebanon): I do not think we can vote on the second paragraph without joining it to the New Zealand amendment. If we vote for the deletion of the second paragraph and then the entire New Zealand proposal does not carry, our first vote will be voided. The New Zealand proposal is not only to delete the second paragraph of the present text, but to replace everything after the first paragraph by an entirely new text. Therefore, I do not think it is proper to vote on the deletion of the second paragraph first. First we have to vote on the first paragraph and then on the entire proposal submitted by New Zealand, without mentioning any word about the deletion of the second paragraph. If that is adopted, then everything is superseded by the New Zealand proposal. If that is not adopted, then we shall have to vote on my amendment.

The PRESIDENT: If we adopt or reject the second paragraph, we should then vote on the amendment to paragraph 3, which is only a small amendment. Most of the text remains as it is in the draft



resolution. There is only one word to be deleted in the second line of paragraph 3; and then there are some changes in line 3 of paragraph 3.

Mr. THORN (New Zealand): It has been pointed out to me that the amendment moved by the New Zealand delegation lacks specific direction to the Secretary-General to make allowance in his budgetary provisions for these services in 1948. I therefore suggest that there be added to the amendment made by the New Zealand delegation the following words: "requests the Secretary-General to take into account the deliberations of the Social Commission in presenting the provisions for such services in 1948."

Mr. CHANG (China): Having heard the changed version proposed by the representative of New Zealand, I am more convinced than before that we should stick to the unsatisfactory proposal, because if we try to redraft the whole thing we shall arrive at something which is just as unsatisfactory. It is in that spirit that I shall vote for the second paragraph, though that paragraph itself may be criticized. Perhaps several other Members may also vote for it, as it is in the interest of saving time.

Mr. MALIK (Lebanon): Following the good example of my New Zealand colleague, I wish to introduce a simplification of my own amendment to paragraph 2. My amendment to that paragraph should really read as follows:

"Recognizes the principle that the advisory social welfare services are open to all Member Nations of the United Nations."

That expresses all we wanted to say in the paragraph, and this would be the simplest way of saying it, without introducing words like "should" and "if interested" and so on, which only put the matter on a much more subjective plane. We want to state here that we recognize the principle that the advisory social welfare services are open to all Nations Members of the United Nations.

Mr. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom): I share the view of our Chinese colleague that the draft prepared by the drafting committee is not satisfactory; it is full of difficulties and parts of it seem to me to be meaningless and slightly wrong on procedure. I will not repeat what has been said so admirably by the representative of New Zealand, but I must express the opinion, on behalf of my delegation, that his text is a much more sensible text, and expresses the precise action which this Council has to take, namely to refer the matter to the Social Commission

and also to ask the Secretary-General to review his budgetary provisions in the light of what the Social Commission recommends.

As regards the clause about recognizing that Member nations should, if interested, share the benefits of the advisory social welfare services, and the Lebanese amendment to that clause, I feel that it will lead us into great difficulties. First of all, what is the operative part of the Charter which is quoted at the beginning of Article 58? The operative part is Article 66 paragraph 2, which states that the Economic and Social Council "may, with the approval of the General Assembly, perform services at the request of Members of the United Nations..."

That is one of the questions which the Social Commission will go into--whether it is to be done by request, or whether the services can be canvassed abroad. I do not think that at this stage we should jump that point and give some kind of recognition in some perfectly vague language which may not fit in with the Charter at all.

Another point about the Lebanese amendment is that it states that these services are open on principle to Member governments. At present they are open on principle also to certain non-member governments. These services are being given at this moment to certain countries which are not members of the United Nations, but which had UNRRA assistance. Clearly we do not want to go into all that now. I would therefore strongly urge that we adopt the New Zealand resolution with the addition which the representative of New Zealand has just proposed.

Mr. KAMINSKY (Byelorussia)(Interpretation from Russian): It seems that some of the amendments suggested are due to a certain lack of understanding of the issue we are discussing. What we are discussing is the advisory social welfare services of UNRRA. Those functions are

GR:cc

E/P.V.107  
48-50

clearly stated in Resolution 58, and it is obvious that while the task of the Economic and Social Council is to work according to a general programme which will clearly be open to all, we are dealing here with just certain countries, namely those which in the past had the help and assistance of UNRRA. The Resolution itself sets out the limitations of that help and of those services, at the same time as it states their urgent character.

For this reason, I do not think it is useful to try to amend or explain the resolution because the text of the resolution is perfectly clear. I fully agree with the suggestion of the representative of the United Kingdom that we should consider the draft submitted by the representative of New Zealand.

Mr HAARR. (Norway): In my opinion, the discussion this morning has not revealed any new views on the matter which have not been expressed earlier. I do not think this is a body for a discussion on the wording of different proposals. That is a task for the Committee of the Whole. I would therefore support the proposal made by our Chinese representative that this matter should be put to vote before wasting any more time.

We have two proposals before us. One is this draft resolution presented by the Committee of the Whole and which was, according to my impression, almost unanimously adopted then. It is regrettable that we did not hear the views of our New Zealand colleague at an earlier stage of this discussion, but I think if we take out this second paragraph, this draft presented by the Committee of the Whole would cover most of the views expressed in the proposal of the New Zealand representative.

I would therefore propose that we take a vote on the draft of the Committee of the Whole paragraph by paragraph and that we do it as soon as possible before wasting much more time.

The PRESIDENT: I can assure the representative of Norway that I will not waste a single minute of the Council's time. However, there are quite a few other representatives who want to express their views.

Mr. GOLDET (France) (Interpretation from French): I should like to draw your attention to one point concerning paragraph 2, which is the paragraph we have discussed so much. I see that in the English text we have a conditional "should, if interested, share the benefits," whereas

in the French text we have a present indicative, "shall."

Therefore, I would like to propose that we should have a text such as the following: "shall be enabled to benefit," in order that we should not have this difference in the two texts.

Mr. PEREZ-CISNEROS (Cuba): I wish to say only a few words to support as strongly as possible what has been said by the representative of Norway.

I think that one of the great achievements of this session has been the way we have been progressing, and I should not like to think that according to this morning's debates the Council had decided to adopt a procedure of confusion which would only mean a loss of time, not to speak about a loss of seriousness.

I think we have before us two alternatives, and that we should decide immediately which one we are going to follow. The first alternative, in view of the different ideas and suggestions and criticisms which have been expressed around this table, would be to send the whole matter back to the Committee. The other alternative would be to do what our Norwegian colleague has suggested, that is, to vote without any delay on each paragraph of the resolution.

Mr. SMITH (Canada): I fully share the desire expressed by my Chinese colleague, and I am sure it is shared by all of us, to get on with this matter quickly. I was at first unable to accept the New Zealand recommendation because it omitted the substance of the fourth paragraph to which I attach importance. But as amended, it seems to me the difference is one of drafting, and I think the advantage is clearly with the New Zealand draft.

If we have an opportunity of voting on this matter, I would vote for that, but either is quite acceptable to me.

Mr SEN (India): If the Chinese proposal had been accepted and the New Zealand proposal had not found some support, I should not have spoken. But I feel it is my duty to point out that the New Zealand proposal as it stands rather commits the Council to a certain course of action. It says, for example, "and the need for the provision of such services." That rather commits the Council. We do not know what sort of services the Social Commission may recommend in the future.

The second point I have in mind is as follows: The New Zealand proposal reads "in presenting the budgetary provisions for such services in 1948." That again rather commits the Council. I should like to mention for the information of the Council that all these points have been gone into very thoroughly in the drafting committee one by one, and I feel that it is very awkward and rather irregular for the Council to reopen this matter for discussion all over again when we already have a perfectly good resolution, not good textually from a drafting point of view, but good in the sense that it combines all essential points, and we should not go against it except for very good reasons.

The PRESIDENT: Let us proceed with the voting. This is a simple matter and we can decide within a few minutes on one text or the other.

The first paragraph of draft resolution E/520 was adopted by seventeen votes with one abstention.

The PRESIDENT: We have a proposal by the representative of New Zealand that the second paragraph should be deleted.

The proposal was adopted by eight votes to seven, with three abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: We will now take up the New Zealand amendment to paragraph three. The amendment reads as follows: "Requests the Social Commission at its next session to review the report of the Secretary-General and to make recommendations concerning this report and the need for the provision of such services and the methods of financing such services."

The amendment was rejected by nine votes to eight, with one abstention.

The PRESIDENT: We shall now take up the New Zealand amendment to the last paragraph. This amendment reads as follows: "Requests the Secretary-General to take into account the deliberations of the Social Commission in presenting the budgetary provisions for such services in 1948."

The amendment was rejected by nine votes to seven, with two abstentions.



We shall now vote on the text of the third paragraph as contained in the draft resolution.

Mr. MALIK (Lebanon): I maintain that those who voted against paragraph 2 did so in view of accepting the New Zealand amendment. Now that the New Zealand amendment has been rejected, I request that a new vote be taken with regard to the acceptance or rejection of paragraph 2.

The PRESIDENT: No; the proposal for the deletion of paragraph 2 was accepted, and the paragraph is therefore deleted.

Mr. MALIK (Lebanon): The deletion was not implicit. It was not merely a deletion; it was a deletion in view of what was coming after the deletion. Since that which came after the deletion was rejected, those who voted against it because they wanted to see the forthcoming part accepted may reconsider.

That is what I had in mind at the beginning, when I stated that we could not vote in such a fashion; that the whole New Zealand/<sup>motion</sup> had to be voted, after which we must go back to the original resolution and vote it paragraph by paragraph.

Mr. KAMINSKY (Byelorussian SSR) (Interpretation from Russian): It seems to me that a rather strange procedure is being suggested to us. We have voted on a series of amendments. One of these amendments received a majority of the votes and was duly accepted. I consider that we are all adults and that we should know what we are doing.

The PRESIDENT: We voted on the amendments and on the individual paragraphs of the resolution. However, we did not vote on the resolution as a whole. Before we vote on the resolution as a whole, if the Members of the Council desire to reconsider voting on paragraph 2, I have no objection to that, but the Members of the Council have to decide on

whether they wish to reconsider their vote on paragraph 2. Following that, we shall vote on the resolution as a whole.

Is there any objection to a reconsideration with regard to paragraph 2?

Mr. THORP (United States): Of course, the President can decide, with the aid of the Council, on methods of procedure. However, if we reconsider paragraph 2, perhaps on the basis of a changed position with regard to paragraph 2, we may have to reconsider paragraph 3. Then, if we change our position on paragraph 3, we may have to reconsider paragraph 4.

It seems to me there is a point at which one does stop reconsidering on the basis of action taken. These are separable matters. We have decided on paragraph 2. It is not related to paragraph 3 or paragraph 4, at least in my judgment. Therefore, I see no justification for reconsidering paragraph 2 on the basis of actions taken with regard to paragraphs 3 and 4. If they are related, they should have been considered together as a group, rather than to have had a division.

The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on the resolution as a whole, namely, paragraphs 1, 3 and 4, the second paragraph having been rejected by the Council.

A vote by show of hands was taken.

The PRESIDENT: There are sixteen votes in favour of the resolution, one against, with one abstention. Therefore, the resolution is adopted.

Mr. CHANG (China): I feel that one remark is necessary. While I appreciate the ruling made by the President, with which I agreed, I think the suggestion to reconsider any paragraph surely was made quite seriously by the representative of Lebanon and in a very mature manner.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ON RELIEF NEEDS AFTER TERMINATION OF UNRRA  
(E/462, E/462/Add.1)

Mr. MOROSOV (USSR) (Interpretation from Russian): The material on the scope of help given in the Report is based on the data of the so-called Special Technical Committee. At the last session I had to point out the important shortcomings of the Report, and I do not intend to repeat what I have said. It is obvious that countries which have suffered heavily from destruction and have suffered from enemy occupation, need help. It is obvious that this help should come, in major part, from countries that did not have to suffer from enemy occupation and destruction.

The PRESIDENT: As no other representatives apparently wish to make any further observations, I wonder whether the Members of the Council would agree with the following suggestion. "The Economic and Social Council notes the Report of the Secretary-General on the relief needs after the termination of UNRRA, and draws the attention of the General Assembly to this Report as it has been prepared on the basis of the Resolution of the Assembly. The Council approves the action which the Secretary-General has taken pursuant to the Resolution of the General Assembly on this matter, and recommends that Member Nations give every possible assistance in achieving the purposes of the Resolution."

Mr. LUNDE (Norway): The Norwegian delegation is perfectly willing to support the resolution which has just been proposed by the President. I must apologize for not asking permission to say a few words before. I should like to make a very short statement in connection with the Report.

The Report contains a short passage on page 6, which reads as follows: "The Norwegian Government intends to take up the question of granting long-term credits to countries in need of relief, in addition to providing cod liver oil to the International Children's Emergency Fund."

As was pointed out by the Norwegian representative when he discussed the International Children's Emergency Fund, the question of a certain grant of cod liver oil has already been settled. As to long-term credits, I might add that certain credits have also been granted already by the Norwegian Government to Finland, Poland, Austria and Greece.

Mr. PEREZ-CISNEROS (Cuba): I am ready to vote in favour of the proposal which the President has just suggested. However, it seems to me that the last part of it, the portion which calls the attention of the governments to the importance of giving their full support to this problem may not be in order. The question is now on the government level. The Secretary-General has already approached the governments, and some of them have expressed formal opinions about it; others are still studying the problem.

In view of the fact that this question is on the government level, I do not think we should at this stage again call the attention of the governments to a matter which they have already considered or which they are considering. However, I realize that the problem is a very important one, and that the governments must do everything possible to contribute to this important work.

Mr. RADIMSKY (Czechoslovakia): At our last session in March the Czechoslovak delegation criticized very severely and for good reason the Report of the Special Technical Committee. I do not wish to repeat the arguments we gave then. I only wish to inform the Council that my delegation will abstain on voting on this resolution.

Mr. GOLDET (France) (Interpretation from French): I have no comment to make on the statement made by our colleague from Cuba. I should simply like to point out that we received this voluminous document of seventy-eight pages only twenty-four hours ago. Therefore, we were not able to study it completely. I note that it refers to the food situation in Europe during the Spring of this year and also during the Summer, which is now nearly finished. I think the only conclusions we could draw would be of a historical character.

The PRESIDENT: There is a proposal by the representative of Cuba that the last part of the draft resolution concerning the governments should be eliminated. It would then read as follows: "The Economic and Social Council notes the Report of the Secretary-General on relief needs after the termination of UNRRA, and draws the attention of the General Assembly to this Report; approves the actions which the Secretary-General has taken pursuant to the Resolution of the Assembly on this matter."

The resolution was adopted.

REPORT OF THE COUNCIL NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS COMMITTEE

The PRESIDENT: The Council might wish to have closed meetings when it comes to discussing individual cases. That is for the Council to decide. In the past the Council discussed some publicly and some in closed meetings.

Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) (Interpretation from Spanish): I do not see any drawback to discussing this question of the non-governmental organizations in public, and therefore I think the session should remain open.

Mr. PEREZ-CISNEROS (Cuba): I am extremely sorry not to share the views just expressed by the representative of Chile. In a matter such as the one we are about to consider I think it would be more delicate to have a closed meeting.

Mr. SMITH (Canada): While I have no objection to expressing in public any views I may feel it necessary to express on individual non-governmental organizations, I think that as a matter of principle it is preferable for the Council to have closed sessions for this purpose.

I would like to make a further point in regard to saving the Council's time. It is that we should use simultaneous translations, which would save us at least fifty percent and probably rather more of the time involved in getting through this work. Personally, therefore, I should favour a closed meeting in Committee of the Whole with simultaneous translation.

Mr. d'ASCOLI (Venezuela) (Interpretation from Spanish): I find myself in complete agreement with the representative of Chile. I do not see any reason, nor has any reason been put forward, for having a closed session. I do not think the matters we are now going to discuss are any more delicate than other matters discussed in the Council, so until reasons are given which can convince me that it would be preferable to have a closed session, I shall vote in favour of an open session with the public admitted to our deliberations.

The PRESIDENT: There are two proposals before us, one that we should discuss this item as a Council and the other that we should first discuss it in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) (Interpretation from Spanish): I did not suggest that it should be discussed in Committee; I suggested that it should be discussed publicly.

Mr. PEREZ-CISNEROS (Cuba): The President has just announced that we have two proposals before us, one to discuss this item in plenary session and the other to discuss it in Committee. I think we have also another question to decide, namely, whether to have an open or closed session, no matter whether it is of the Council or of the Committee of the Whole.

The PRESIDENT: Rule 47 says: "The meetings of the Council shall be held in public unless the Council decides otherwise." Therefore I would like to take a vote on whether the meeting should be public or private.

Mr. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom): Someone inquired what considerations were involved in deciding whether to have a private or a public session. So far as I am concerned, I should be quite prepared to have either, but I imagine that the kind of consideration which should be in our mind is concerned with the feelings of the people with whom we are dealing.

For instance, if a representative here should propose that, shall we say, the "Society of Bicyclists Living in the East Nineties" should have category A status, it would be up to somebody else on the Council to say that that was a very poor organization and did not carry any weight whatsoever. That kind of discussion might hurt

GR/tk

E/P.V. 107  
78-80

the feelings of the people concerned, and I imagine that that is one of the considerations which should be in the minds of representatives when they are voting whether the meeting should be in public or in private. They would not have it in their minds that they would want to discuss any points of policy which were not proper for the public ears. I think we should remember that.



Mr. d'ASCOLI (Venezuela)(Interpretation from Spanish): I listened with great interest to the explanations given by the representative of the United Kingdom. In fact, I was the one who asked for explanations, so I listened with particular care. But I think that any organization that places an application knows in advance that the meetings of the Economic and Social Council are public, that the public is admitted to the Council chamber, and that its application will be discussed in full detail before the public.

We have no previous engagement with those organizations to examine their applications in private session, even for the reasons explained by the representative of the United Kingdom. Those organizations which place applications are fully aware of this fact when they do place those applications.

For these reasons, the explanations given, as far as I am concerned, do not appear to be satisfactory..

Mr. THORP (United States): I am inclined to support the notion that this discussion, like our other discussions, should be done in public. I think that the suggestion made by our colleague from Venezuela is an apt one, that there is something corresponding here to the legal concept of assumption of risk, that if an organization files an application, it is exposing itself to complimentary and uncomplimentary remarks. If these bicyclists are not competent bicyclists they deserve to be told so in public and at least to know what is being said about them.

I think that it is quite important for agencies whose applications are being considered here to have some notion as to what the considerations are, rather than to have to get that information second-hand.

So I should hope, in spite of the fact that it may lead to some injured feelings, that we would move ahead and consider these matters in public.

Mr. PEREZ-CISNEROS (Cuba): In order to avoid any misunderstanding about the decision which we took some minutes ago, I wish to add some remarks to what I previously said.

The Cuban Government has always favoured that meetings of national or international bodies be held in public. As a matter of fact, some months ago, in the Pan-American Union in Washington, there was a very serious debate on the subject when the Cuban delegate to the governing board of that Union proposed that the meetings of the Pan-American Union be open, and it was on the suggestion of our delegate that meetings of the Pan-American Union are today open.

However, our Government and our delegation to the Economic and Social Council believe that when you consider names or when you have to express an opinion about an organization, the situation is somewhat different, and that is the very reason why we think that in this case the representatives would move more freely if the meetings were closed rather than open. But, of course, as a matter of principle we favour open meetings. However, in this particular case, we think that the meetings should be closed.

The PRESIDENT: We will now vote on the proposal that the discussion of documents E/500 and E/502 should be held in open meetings.

The proposal was adopted by twelve votes to one, with five abstentions.

Mr. PEREZ-CISNEROS (Cuba): I should like the record to show the abstention of Cuba on the vote.

The PRESIDENT: There is another proposal from the representative of Canada that we should discuss the matter in the Committee of the Whole so that we can make use of the simultaneous translation. I think that would be very advisable since it would help us to finish this item more quickly.

As there is no objection to this proposal, we will meet tomorrow at 11:00 a.m. in the Committee of the Whole and discuss this item, and after we finish this item we will continue in plenary session with the other items we will have on the agenda.

Before adjourning this meeting, I should like to inform the Members what our programme is. After completing the item which we are presently discussing, we shall have the other items on today's agenda and also items which will be adopted in the Committee, namely, the One Day's Pay Proposal, the report on Freedom of Information and of the Press, the Economic Commission for Latin America, and the Rules of Procedure.

The meeting rose at 1:30 p.m.