

United Nations

**ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL**

Nations Unies

**CONSEIL
ECONOMIQUE
ET SOCIAL**

MASTER FILE
UNRESTRICTED
E/P.V.109
8 August 1947
English

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL
Fifth Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND NINTH MEETING

Lake Success, New York,
Friday, 8 August 1947, at 3.00 p.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 ninth meeting of the Economic and Social Council open.

TRADE UNION RIGHTS (Continued)

Mr. MOROSOV (USSR) (Interpretation from Russian): As the Members of the Economic and Social Council certainly remember, the World Federation of Trade Unions presented a draft resolution dealing with the assurance of trade union rights at the Fourth Session of the Economic and Social Council. This draft resolution was not discussed in its essence at that particular session. It is only now that the Economic and Social Council began a discussion with regard to the essence of this problem. The question is therefore on the agenda for the second time. The only difference is that other documents have been presented by other organizations in addition to the proposals submitted by the World Federation of Trade Unions.

The Soviet Union delegation proposes that we discuss at this session of the Economic and Social Council the proposal submitted by the World Federation of Trade Unions, as it has its own value and significance, and an essential question is dealt with in this proposal which is of the greatest importance to the working people throughout the world. Therefore, I shall not speak with regard to the essence of other documents, especially the document presented by the International Labor Organization, in which the principles are drafted for the future conventions on freedom of association. This document seems to us to be rather in the nature of giving information. We cannot consider the essence of this document, for it is clear from the document itself that the International Labor Organization envisages the continuation of discussion with regard to these principles among its own members during the year 1948.

The General Assembly of the United Nations allowed the World Federation of Trade Unions to submit to the Economic and Social Council matters to be placed on the agenda. Employing this right given to it by the General Assembly, the World Federation of Trade Unions asked the Economic and Social Council to include on the agenda the question of trade union rights. This request was granted.

If the decision of the General Assembly of 15 December 1946 is to be fulfilled, so as to assure the widest cooperation of the Economic and Social Council with the World Federation of Trade Unions, this Session of the Economic and Social Council must discuss carefully the proposals presented by the World Federation of Trade Unions and dealing with the question of trade union rights.

In the document presented by the World Federation of Trade Unions, the attention of the Economic and Social Council is drawn to the fact that a policy is being followed in many countries to liquidate the basic rights of trade unions. Leaders of the trade unions are being dismissed and arrested; their houses are being occupied by police forces, their newspapers closed, and the governments appoint new "leaders." Workers of coloured races and natives are forbidden to form union organizations. All these facts can be called attempts to strangle trade unions, and that is exactly the way the document of the World Federation of Trade Unions characterizes it.

In particular, as it appears from the statement by the Secretary of the General Labour Confederation of Greece to the Commission of the Security Council, the working class of Greece is deprived of a trade union movement. Duly elected central bodies of trade unions, as well as the leadership of federations and of separate unions, were dismissed, and the Government appointed instead its own supporters from among those who were voted down by the workers in union elections. The leadership of the General Labour Confederation of Greece, elected by a majority at the 8th Congress of the Confederation, also was dismissed. Such facts may be listed without an end. However, I shall limit myself to these particular facts, for the other situations are well-known to the Members of the Economic and Social Council.

The Soviet Union delegation wants to bring to the attention of the Council the fact that in the document of the World Federation of Trade Unions, we are reminded of the fact that the Second World War was won with the active collaboration and participation of the workers of the world and to a great extent, this was due to the sacrifices of these workers. This document also brings to the attention of the Council some observations with regard to the rights of unions which contribute to the development of peace and security in the world, and which must be given to workers all over the world.

The development of trade unions throughout the world is one of the main prerequisites for the accomplishment of the aims of the United Nations, the establishment of peace, the solving of the main economic, political, cultural and social problems before us, the establishment of the basic rights of man and the basic freedoms without regard to race, sex, or religion.

The Economic and Social Council must help the World Federation of Trade Unions in this desire to protect the rights of the unions from all attempts that are meant to prevent their free development. The Soviet Union, therefore, supports the proposal presented to the Council by the World Federation of Trade Unions, and appeals to other Members of the Council to support this proposal.

I should like to say a few words with regard to the statements that have been made and to certain proposals that have been presented to the Council, as for example, the proposal of the United Kingdom delegation. The Soviet Union delegation cannot agree with the draft proposal of the United Kingdom delegation, for this proposal mentions the report of the International Labour Organization when it is well-known to the Members of the Economic and Social Council that the initiative of the resolution on union rights is that of the World Federation of Trade Unions. We cannot understand how this important fact can be ignored -- how we can disregard the importance of the step undertaken by the World Federation of Trade Unions in presenting to the Economic and Social Council the question of union rights which is of such vital concern to unions throughout the world. How can we ignore the initiative of the World Federation of Trade Unions, an organization having tens of millions of members and organizing workers in many countries?

The United Kingdom representative spoke of the competence of the International Labour Organization. We cannot agree with his understanding of the tasks of that specialized agency. We cannot approve this view of the monopoly of the International Labour Organization.

The World Federation of Trade Unions is an organization of workers in many countries. The International Labour Organization has its own tasks, which are completely different from those of the World Federation of Trade Unions. There is a difference between the two organizations in structure as well.

Therefore, in this particular draft resolution, the wrong approach is reflected as to the role of different organizations, the wrong approach which appeared in previous sessions of the Economic and Social Council.

I do not want to discuss the essence of these proposals. I only want to bring the Council's attention to one point in the first part of the document. Paragraph 8 deals with the responsibilities and obligations of unions. One must keep in mind that this particular matter of responsibility of the unions is being used in many countries in order to suppress the unions. Therefore, if the Council should accept such an approach, it would mean that the Council would arrive at entirely different results from the ones they attempted to accomplish.

The Soviet Union delegation, therefore, cannot agree to the proposal of the United Kingdom delegation which was supported by the Netherlands and the United States. The Soviet Union delegation once more wants to express its full support of the proposals of the World Federation of Trade Unions and wants to appeal to the other Members of the Council to support these proposals.

Mr. THORP (United States): I think that the history of this particular matter is of substantial bearing in considering the course that we should take from this point forward. I think the Members of the Council are perfectly clear on the fact that the problem was submitted to the Council by the World Federation of Trade Unions, and that after very careful consideration it was decided that the Council should not act upon the recommendation at that time but should refer it for consideration to the International Labour Organization and to the Commission on Human Rights.

That was a decision carefully made, having in mind that this problem was an exceedingly difficult problem and should have prolonged, expert and careful consideration. We now meet again. It is on our agenda. We have what might be called an interim Report from the International Labour Organization. I think that we should regard this Report as a basis for great encouragement.

Here was a very difficult problem which was referred to that Organization. It has reported back to us that it adopted resolutions which covered all the main items raised in the documents sent to it, and that it is looking forward to a program of developing an international convention which would provide some firm basis for action in this field.

It is important to notice that these resolutions were adopted unanimously. We now have a record of substantial progress before us as far as the International Labour Organization is concerned. It is a program which indicates that ILO expects to

make still further progress on this matter in the near future.

We have not heard yet from the Commission on Human Rights, and yet this whole problem is very closely tied in to the broader problem with which that group has to deal. It is a problem of one type of freedom which is obviously related to other types of freedom, particularly the types of freedom that are necessary to permit groups of people to do particular things which they may wish to do, and which, within the principles of the freedoms that are supported in the Charter, they have every right to do.

So we have the problem on our agenda again, and the question is: What do we do now? We have had four proposals; one proposal by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, which is that we go back to the original resolutions suggested by the World Federation of Trade Unions and approve them at this meeting. That is, of course, what was discussed at the earlier meeting and which was on the agenda at that time. It was then that we wanted to get the expert bodies to deal with the problem. I see no reason why the Council should change its course, particularly in the light of the fact that the decision has already been taken that this problem requires much more careful and detailed consideration than that which it has already been receiving.

We have a second proposal which was suggested by the Czechoslovak delegation, which is a proposal that we should ask the International Labour Organization to continue its work, and that we should request the Social Commission to proceed apparently on exactly the same ground--as far as I can tell--simultaneously operating in parallel. That proposal also drops the Commission on Human Rights out of the picture.

We have a third proposal presented by the United Kingdom, in which the Netherlands and the United States participated in its presentation to the Council, which, like that of Czechoslovakia, endorses the work which has been done by the International Labour Organization, but which does not start another organization at work. It asks the International Labour Organization and the Commission on Human Rights to carry on.

We have a fourth proposal presented by the French delegation which, as I understand it, suggests that the second and third proposals should be given to a drafting committee and incorporated in a single document. That seems to me a little bit like telling a man in one automobile to figure out a way in which he can go down two different roads at the same time.

These are conflicting programs, and I just do not understand how any drafting committee can take the two and unify them into a single program. I think basically we are faced with the problem of whether we should continue planning for the work to be done by the International Labour Organization and the Commission on Human Rights, or whether we should drop the Commission on Human Rights and ask the Social Commission to pick it up and operate.

I should like to make several comments on that particular matter. I have a real question about the wisdom and propriety of dropping the Commission on Human Rights out of this picture. This is one matter of many matters which will have to be covered in the Bill of Rights, which is a project we all have very dear to our hearts. It ought to be done with very close collaboration.

If we follow the suggestion of asking the Social Commission

to take on this assignment, we should then request ILO to continue in its efforts, and we should ask the Social Commission to make proposals in order to complete and consolidate the text prepared by ILO. I assume that the International Labour Organization is completing and consolidating the text. There is a request for an analysis of the legal situation. I am sure the International Labour Organization is more competent than the Social Commission to deal with the legal situation in the field of labour.

There is a request to bring in recommendations to the Council concerning the implementation of the proposed principles. When we get to the problem of implementation we shall need the wisdom of every agency that has any interest in this problem. The International Labour Organization has certain established ways of implementing principles of this sort. It may be that we must find some new methods of implementation. I think that when we get to that point, this Council will certainly have to consider it very carefully, because we are limited in just what we can do for the purpose of implementation under the Charter. It is a basic problem that will have to be given prolonged consideration after someone has laid out for us a preliminary analysis.

To come back to the issue of the International Labour Organization or the Social Commission, I do not think there is any question but that the United Nations recognizes the International Labour Organization as the specialized agency within its structure responsible for dealing with problems in the field of trade union rights. It is an experienced and able body. It is already far

WH/rs

E/P.V. 109
40-45

along on this problem. It is a body which has a relationship that is very intimate with the United Nations. It seems to me the most natural thing in the world for the International Labour Organization to carry on this task for us.

Therefore, I should like to support the position taken by the United Kingdom representative, endorsing the draft resolution which he has submitted. I think that resolution gives full recognition to the service performed by the World Federation of Trade Unions. It very carefully describes the fact that the World Federation of Trade Unions submitted a memorandum on this subject to the Council. I do not see how it can be regarded as failing to recognize that. The words are right there in the resolution. This resolution perhaps might be stronger, and if that is the point which the French representative wishes to make, I should be glad to endorse it--a stronger support of the work already done by the International Labour Organization. But basically it gives us a procedure with which to move ahead, and it seems to me it is an orderly one. We have a difficult problem and if we treat it as a crisis problem or we will not treat it wisely. This is a persisting and a permanent problem, and I think we have to make certain that we have all the wisdom that we can obtain in order to deal with it wisely.

I think the International Labour Organization should be commended for the work that it has done and it should be urged to do all that it can to advise us as to how to be fully effective in protecting these very important rights, the so-called trade union rights, the rights of freedom of association.

Mr. STOLZ (Czechoslovakia): I shall try to make the intention of the Czechoslovak delegation clear. When we put the resolution concerning trade union rights before this Council, it was the first time that the Council had the possibility of examining the problems of freedom of association and trade union rights.

At its last session this Council adopted a resolution in general terms asking the ILO and the Human Rights Commission to deal with this matter. In our discussion today, we have been considering the general aspects of this question. In making this proposal, the Czechoslovak delegation thinks that the substance of this matter should also be examined and considered by the appropriate body; we think that body is the Social Commission. A decision was taken at the last session of the Economic and Social Council that the Human Rights Commission may consider those aspects of the subject which might appropriately form part of the Bill of Human Rights.

The United States representative criticized the Czechoslovak proposal for omitting the point that the Human Rights Commission should deal with the subject. However, it was not necessary to include that point because such a decision was already taken. But aside from this, the Human Rights Commission dealt with this problem from the point of view of general principles. However, we have also to face the practical side of the problem, the details and this, the Czechoslovak delegation respectfully submits, should be done by the Social Commission.

On the request of the Council, the ILO very carefully discussed and examined the whole problem, and I think all of us are very grate-

ful for the work of the ILO. The International Labour Conference itself recognizes the complexity of that problem. I could quote passages from the decision taken in the Conference at Geneva, for instance, from the part of the resolution concerning international machinery for safeguarding freedom of association, where the complexity of that problem is stated very clearly.

In paragraph 7 on page 8 of the decisions of the Conference, the International Labour Conference sees the necessity of close co-operation between the ILO and the United Nations, as far as the establishment of permanent international machinery is concerned.

If this is so, who should go into this matter on behalf of the United Nations if not the Economic and Social Council through an appropriate body? In the light of the discussion today and on the basis of the results obtained by the International Labour Conference and the interested parties, as we say in our resolution, the World Federation of Trade Unions and other trade union bodies, who should examine the special character of that problem?

In making this proposal, we never intended to omit the Human Rights Commission in so far as it might, according to the Resolution, elaborate certain clauses which had already been put in.

The United Kingdom representative fears that there would be a loss of confidence, but are we not also suggesting in our resolution that the ILO should be requested to continue its efforts in order that one or several international conventions may be quickly adopted? The United Kingdom representative said that the International Labour Conference represented more governments than the Economic and Social Council; nobody doubts that.

Is it not a fact that the Economic and Social Council has powers delegated to it through the General Assembly from all the Members of the United Nations?

The Czechoslovak delegation suggested a thorough examination and study of this problem by the Social Commission to prepare further steps in the development and safeguard of freedom of association. By approving this, the Council will be approving fully the principle of freedom of association, and it will be approving the authority of this Council and of the United Nations.

Mr. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom): I wish to clarify a misunderstanding held by the representative of Czechoslovakia. I was not challenging the competence of this Council to deal with the matter because there were less governments on this Body than on the ILO. I was speaking of the Social Commission, and I said that the people on the Social Commission were not direct representatives of governments in the same way as we are here and in the same way as the International Labor Organization consists of representatives of governments.

Mr. KAMINSKY (Byelorussia) (Interpretation from Russian): The discussion has shown that certain Members of the Economic and Social Council do not wish at this time to consider the question of union rights in its essence. If I understand correctly, the Council is looking for some way in which to remove this question from the agenda. Certain representatives of this Council and certain representatives even of union organizations are of the opinion that this is neither the time nor the place to consider the question. I cannot agree with such an attitude as far as this problem is concerned.

I should like to touch upon a matter which is connected with the consideration of this question on our agenda. The Economic and Social Council has been seized twice with the question of union rights, and yet a solution to the question has not been found. Certain forces somehow prevent a solution of this question in its essence. As a result, such a clear and indispensable problem has been drawn into other organizations. It has lost its original nature; it is presented in a new light and is so complicated with different additions, that, in essence, the whole matter is being turned against the union rights. The Economic and Social Council is appearing in the role of an organ which is not helping the development of union movement.

I recognize that the question of unionism is quite an acute problem, but I am not of the opinion that the question of the rights of unions should be substituted by other questions where rights of unions will depend on the will of those in power. The Economic and Social Council will certainly be open to criticism if it should refer this question on formal grounds to another body, and not undertake a decision of these important problem at this particular session.

The Byelorussian delegation, in conclusion, wants to emphasize once more the immediate necessity of this question being considered, this question which is of such importance to the millions of working people in the world.

Mr. MARTIN (Canada): We have had a long, but I think on the whole, a very useful discussion of this extremely important matter, and perhaps I may begin where the last speaker left off.

I am not aware that this Council has sought to shelve this problem or to take any steps that could be justly or accurately characterized as a desire of this Council to do nothing about this problem. Certainly,

I could not sit at this table and agree to do nothing or say nothing if that, in my judgment, had been the case, as evidenced by what we have thus far discussed today. On the contrary, I think it should be noted that everyone who has spoken, regardless of his point of view, has insisted from the declarations that were made that the question was one of fundamental importance, and one that must be dealt with as quickly as was practicable and possible under all the circumstances.

My country has recognized the value of freedom of association for trade unions, and has extended this freedom in a manner that has helped not only the workers of our country, but the Government and industrial effort. Freedom of association for the workers is something which we regard as a fundamental freedom, and we would want the workers of other countries to enjoy what we believe, generally speaking, to be a right exercised in our own country.

I was impressed with the way this debate began. I felt that the Council was at long last, at this particular session, beginning to exercise what I believe to be one of its highest functions. I stated the other day that there was a great danger that the Council might become a cabinet, and that view was supported by my colleague from Lebanon. He too agreed that was a danger which all of us must recognize. One of our functions certainly is not only to take note of things, but in the exercise of our co-ordinating functions, to see that the work of the specialized agencies is being usefully pursued. In hearing a report from one of these specialized agencies, as we did this morning, it seemed to me we were taking advantage of and exercising one of our highest obligations.

The principle of functionalism is one to which my Government attaches a considerable measure of importance, and in this particular field, acknowledging certain limitations, the International Labour Organization, which antedates our own organizations by many years in point of time, seems to be the body best suited, for many reasons, to advise us on the important question of implementation about which I shall want to say something before I am through.

I think that I should take this opportunity to say that my Government, as a Member of this Council, has great faith in the International Labour Organization with its long history and all that it has rendered to the workers of the world. It is a measure of service which is paralleled by no other agency. When it came into being, there were few workers in the world who enjoyed the benefit of social insurance, for instance. I think the figure is given as much less than three million. When one thinks of the many millions of workers in the world who enjoy social legislation in one way or another, acknowledging at once that it is due entirely to the International Labour Organization, one must nevertheless recognize that a good bit of it is due to the direct and indirect work of an organization begun by Albert Thomas. I think to exclude this particular matter from the International Labour Organization would be to withdraw from our reach a source of great efficiency in reference to this particular problem.

The three submissions that we had this morning from three voices of labour on the international level were, I think, on the whole very impressive. We are grateful, as the representative of the United States said, to the World Federation of Trade Unions for its interest and the initiative that it has taken in this problem. It is only fair to say, however, that the ILO itself in its very constitution envisages the necessity of realizing the right of freedom of association of workers. It is only proper to emphasize that in the important Declaration of Philadelphia made at Philadelphia while the war was still in progress, the importance of this matter was recognized by the ILO and by the many countries represented at that important conference.

One has but to read in extended form the terms of the Declaration of Philadelphia to realize how seized the International Labour Organization was with the importance of guaranteeing to the workers, not only the right to be organized, but the right to take action against recalcitrant or unwilling -- and I was going to say, sometimes unimaginative -- employers, action in a way that brings to labour its legitimate rights, that recognizes its legitimate claims.

But having said that much, I do acknowledge that we are indebted for the initiative taken in bringing this matter to the attention of the Council, and I want the spokesman for that organization to note that my country is not failing to consider the important submission that he made. His references to Article 62 and to rule 64 in the rules of procedure are not, it seems to us, however, as simple as his statement suggests.

One of these days we will have to consider just exactly what the implications of Section 7 of Article 2 of the Charter really are.

But at this stage of growth of international organization, we have to take into account the actual wording of Section 7 of Article 2 of the Charter. And when one is talking of the rights of labour as against employers, one should also bear in mind what was said by the representative of the World Federation of Trade Unions about the rights of the workers against the State. In that connection, when one talks about the liquidation of trade union organizations, one must also complain about the shrinkage of trade union power in some countries, if not entirely their liquidation.

This question is an important one, and one is anxious to meet at once the suggestion that this Council should do something about it right away. That is a perfectly legitimate ~~statement and~~ request, and ~~one in~~ which when it was uttered, I shared fully and kept asking myself just how can it be done. But one must look at the problem in all of its aspects. We can make all sorts of declarations at this Council, we can pass all sorts of resolutions, but we must recognize how we are going to implement some of these resolutions.

Again, I call my colleagues' attention to Section 7 of Article 2 of the Charter. We have before us an interim report from the International Labour Organization, and it is a significant one in that it represents the unanimous view, not only of governments, but of the employers and the workers represented at that conference. Therein, we have the outstanding contributory influence of the ILO, for it is the only organization where all three bodies are given the opportunity on an equal footing, not only of discussion, but as the representative of the United Kingdom said this morning, of voting. We will regard the Report which, as I say, is an interim one, on that account as being all the more important and having a value which otherwise it would not have.

We have to consider the means by which we are going to develop, or to realize what all of us really think should be done. The technique through conventions, over which the ILO has a long experience, may be one effective way of ultimately realizing this legitimate aspiration of guaranteeing the right in all countries everywhere of the workers of full trade union organization, and that means the right to resist, and not merely to exist.

We have to consider also, not only leaving this matter in the hands of the International Labour Organization, but into what bodies of this Council or of the United Nations, in addition to the International Labour Organization, we are prepared and disposed to entrust the study of this problem. It is at a stage where further study is obviously required because of the difficult question, again I say, of implementation.

One of our jobs as a Council is to avoid overlapping, in order that an assignment does not reside uneconomically in several departments of United Nations activity. It is inconceivable that this problem could ever be removed from the Commission on Human Rights because of the very nature of that Commission and its ultimate purpose of setting up a Bill of Human Rights.

I cannot see much merit in the suggestion that the matter should, as well -- if we are to understand now from the last statement of the representative of Czechoslovakia that he did not intend a full dropping of the Commission on Human Rights -- be brought to the attention of the ILO, the Social Commission and the Commission on Human Rights.

I agree with the representative of the United States that it is impossible to conceive of a Bill of Human Rights that does not consider and does not touch the particular question under discussion. There are, as he said, four resolutions or suggestions before us: that of the World Federation of Trade Unions; that of the delegation of Czechoslovakia, which recognized the desirability of the International Labour Organization considering its study

of the matter and asking the Social Commission to study the problem as well; and there is a proposal put forward jointly by the United Kingdom, the United States and the Netherlands, and the proposal made by the representative of France

In that connection, I am inclined to believe what the representative of the United States said about that proposal, that it is one which we would be inclined to recognize as valid.

It seems to us that the practical matter is to recognize that in the joint proposals put forward by the three countries involved in the third proposal, we will find under all these circumstances the best practical way of dealing with this problem. In doing that, no one is suggesting a shelving of the matter, no one is seeking to postpone the matter, no one wants to do nothing about the matter, but on the contrary, we feel that is the most effective way to deal with the matter.

I have nothing further to say, except to say that we will support the proposal put forward in the name of the United Kingdom, United States and the Netherlands. In so doing, we are anxious to see that this problem is dealt with as quickly as possible, but in such a manner as to really deal with the problem effectively in terms of implementation and not leave it to pious resolution.

Mr. MOE (Norway): It is not necessary to speak at great length, although the question is very important. I just wanted to make a few remarks.

First of all, I should like to say that the trade unions of my country, the Confederation of Labour--which by the way is a member of the World Federation of Trade Unions--are very satisfied with the results of the deliberations of the International Labour Organization on this question. In fact, they were very impressed by the results obtained.

As the representative of the United Kingdom mentioned this morning, this declaration of principles was accepted unanimously by all the Members of the International Labour Organization. I want to call the attention of the Members of the Council to the fact that not a single trade union delegation voted against these proposals.

We have two resolutions before us. I must state that as far as the Norwegian delegation is concerned, we accept every paragraph of the proposal made by the delegation of the United Kingdom, the Netherlands and the United States.

As to the resolution proposed by the delegation of Czechoslovakia, I feel that the clause with respect to the question we are discussing is not quite clear. It states in paragraph (b) that the Council "should request the ILO to continue its efforts in order that one of several international conventions may be quickly adopted." Then it says in sub-paragraph 2 of paragraph (c) that "the Social Commission should bring its recommendations to the Council concerning the implementation of the proposed principles." That means that we should have two bodies working on the question of

implementation of these principles at this time without any cooperation.

I must call the Council's attention to the fact that in the resolution proposed by the United Kingdom it says in the last paragraph "request the Secretary-General to arrange for cooperation between the International Labour Organization and the Commission on Human Rights." According to the text of the Czechoslovak resolution, these two bodies should work separately on the implementation of the principles.

I should also like to call the Council's attention to another point. We all regret, as was stated by the WFTU--and as we are all aware--that trade union rights are suppressed and limited in several countries. However, the practical question that we are faced with is what we are to do about it.

I doubt very much whether the procedure proposed by the delegation of Czechoslovakia would bring speedier results than the one proposed by the International Labour Organization. Why? Because if this Council decides to send this question to the Social Commission, the Social Commission will discuss it. It will report back to the Economic and Social Council. In order that any resolution proposed by the Economic and Social Council should become binding upon the Member nations, it would have to be passed by the General Assembly. The General Assembly holds its next session in September. That will mean three or four months will have elapsed since the International Labour Organization dealt with the proposed international convention and sent it to Member Governments for ratification. We may even find that ten nations

will have had to ratify the convention proposed by the International Labour Organization before the General Assembly would be able to deal with the proposals made by the Social Commission.

It was evidently a strong desire on the part of the World Federation of Trade Unions to have its draft resolution, which was presented at the last session of the Council, discussed. First of all, it was taken into account by the International Labour Conference. It should not be forgotten that twenty-two representatives of trade unions appeared at the Labour Conference. If I am not mistaken, at least fifteen of those representatives are members of the World Federation of Trade Unions. So, I can not understand why the World Federation of Trade Unions could not have gotten its resolution discussed at the Labour Conference.

It is still possible that next year the International Labour Organization will discuss a draft convention on trade union rights. The World Federation of Trade Unions will again be able to present its observations, and it will be able through its representatives who are members of various trade unions to present every idea it wishes. I must confess that I am very astonished that the resolution submitted by the delegation of Czechoslovakia does not take into account the express desire of Leon Jouhaux that the Economic and Social Council should pass its declaration on principles on to the General Assembly.

Leon Jouhaux is one of the leaders of the French Confederation Generale du Travail. He is one of the leaders of the World Federation of Trade Unions. He was one of the leaders at the International Labour Conference. In his speech, which can be found on page twelve of the Report of the ILO, it can be seen that

WH/rs

E/P.V. 109
74-80

he expressly requested that the text accepted by the International Labour Conference should be passed on by the Economic and Social Council to the General Assembly. He said; "If, according to the procedure I have suggested, we can get agreement by the United Nations to the Principles in question, then we will have made a great step forward and we can look to the future with much more assurance."

That is a request from a very eminent representative of the workers of the world and I think it should be taken into consideration. I repeat I am astonished that this request has not been taken note of in the resolution proposed by the delegation of Czechoslovakia. On the other hand, I must say that the resolution of Czechoslovakia takes into account a very real difficulty which confronts us all, and I will be very frank about it. This difficulty is that the International Labour Organization and the United Nations do not have the same membership. The Norwegian delegation is therefore interested in seeing that those Member Nations of the United Nations which are not members of the International Labour Organization have the fullest possibility to express their views on this question and every occasion to study this resolution. That is taken care of in the resolution submitted by the Czechoslovakian delegation if we decide to transmit the Report of the International Labour Organization to the Social Commission for its comments.

I agree with what my French colleague stated this morning in that we should endeavour to work something out along those lines, and if I receive any support, I would propose an amendment to the United Kingdom resolution to the effect that we add the following paragraph:

"Resolves to transmit the Report to the Social Commission requesting the Commission to present its comments on the Report to the next session of the Economic and Social Council in order that the Council may present the comments it desires for the consideration of the International Labour Conference in the drafting of one or more conventions in this matter."

We could accept this idea of the resolution proposed by the delegation of Czechoslovakia; let the Social Commission study the Report; let us get the comments from the Social Commission; let the Economic and Social Council deal with them and transmit them to the International Labour Conference for their consideration.

Finally, I wish to make it quite clear that the intention of this amendment is not in any way to take the matter out of the hands of the International Labour Organization. As I said at the beginning, I am quite sure that the procedure suggested by the International Labour Organization is the best and the most expeditious way to get effective results, and results which are not merely paper resolutions but which are really effective. This amendment is presented in view of the difficulties which are created by the fact that we have different memberships in the two organizations, so that all Members of the United Nations shall have an equal opportunity to express their views on this very important matter.

I might perhaps add as a final note that I have for twenty years been a trade union member myself. Nobody should say therefore that my remarks are occasioned by any ill feeling towards the trade unions.

Mr. THORN (New Zealand): The New Zealand delegation would like first to express its appreciation to the International Labour Organization for the prompt and comprehensive attention it has given to the subject referred to it by this Council. The ILO has not completed its consideration of the matter. That would have been impossible if the ILO was to give the subject that earnest consideration which the importance of freedom of association merits.

But in the view of the New Zealand delegation, the promptitude shown by the ILO in initiating action, and the comprehensive procedure which has been set in motion justifies the belief that at the proper time international action will be taken that will deserve and attain the support of all concerned.

There is one other general aspect of this matter to which I should like to refer. In this case, we have had a matter brought to our attention by a non-governmental organization. We have referred that matter to a specialized agency, the ILO, and other aspects of the question to the Human Rights Commission. Thus we have in this case the possibility of the complete co-ordination of the functions of this Council, its subsidiary organ, the specialized agency and associated non-governmental organizations.

We trust that the possibility will be developed to its logical conclusion. We hold that hope not only because we are represented on this Council, but also because New Zealand is and has long been a Member -- and I may say, an ardent supporter -- of the ILO and because we believe in the right of organization, and we have taken steps in New Zealand to insure the observance of this right.

I cannot overlook the fact also that the New Zealand Federation of Labour, the national trade union body in New Zealand, an organization on whose advice and views the New Zealand government places considerable importance, is a Member of the World Federation of Trade Unions.

I find it difficult to understand the proposal advanced this morning by the representative of the World Federation of Trade Unions. The workers of New Zealand were represented at the International Labour Conference which unanimously adopted the resolutions contained in the Report presented to this Council by the ILO. The New Zealand workers' representative was chosen by the New Zealand Federation of Labour. I cannot believe that their representative, having supported these resolutions at Geneva, now approves or would approve the statement of the World Federation of Trade Unions representative that these resolutions are not satisfactory.

I wish to refer to the draft resolution before the Council presented by the representative of Czechoslovakia and the draft resolution presented by the United Kingdom, the Netherlands and the United States; of these, the New Zealand delegation prefers the latter. We feel that the reference to the Social Commission in the Czechoslovak proposal is liable to lead to confusion, in view of the particular action already initiated by the International Labour Organization, and the fact that we have already asked the Human Rights Commission to consider certain aspects of the question. The proposal of the United Kingdom, the Netherlands and the United States might have been improved by certain minor amendments, but we have no desire to raise these in the Council and we will support their resolution.

Mr. MALIK (Lebanon): I wish to make some comments concerning the two documents before us, E/533 and E/534, as well as the very interesting report which was submitted to us by the International Labor Organization.

To begin with, I wish to join with all my colleagues who have commended highly the great effort made by the International Labor Organization in dealing with this matter promptly and efficiently. I feel they have advanced this cause a real milestone, for which we should all be very deeply thankful to them.

When I examine the two documents before us, I find there are certain things which cannot be reconciled as between them, whereas there are other things which I feel could be incorporated into the draft resolution proposed by the delegations of the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, and the United States without doing violence to the spirit and principle intended in that document.

For instance, I find in the Czechoslovak resolution that the Economic and Social Council "decides to recognize the principles, proclaimed by the International Labor Conference, as a provisional basis." Something of that meaning is already included in the other joint resolution. As the representative of the United States hinted, it may be that that meaning in document E/533 could be further re-enforced by introducing this idea of the recognition of the principles which are already proclaimed by the International Labor Organization. I believe that could be done.

As to the paragraph which begins with the word "awaits", or the one which begins with the word "notes," we may not put that idea in exactly the same language as that contained in the document submitted by the representative of Czechoslovakia. We may not say "recognizes the principles," and so forth, but we may say "recognizes the importance of the

principles proclaimed by the International Labor Conference," or something to that effect. We may even omit the "provisional basis" phrase as being insufficient because you must indicate the provisional basis for what, which is not indicated in that text. The idea, I think, could be incorporated into the other document under (a) without doing any violence to its spirit.

I also think that the idea under (b) could be incorporated. The resolution states: "to request the ILO to continue its efforts in order that one or several international conventions may be quickly adopted." That, too, could come under the paragraph which begins with "awaits" and the one which begins with "notes." We may single out this notion of conventions and explicitly mention it there as something worthy of urging the ILO to realize as soon as possible.

I feel that is about the extent to which we may reconcile these two documents. I think these two ideas, namely, the endorsement of the principles of the ILO, and the urging of the ILO to carry on its programme for preparing the conventions as soon as possible, could be properly and profitably incorporated into the other document without doing any violence to it.

There remains the crucial issue of the Social Commission, namely, whether or not we ought to transfer this matter also to the Social Commission. I must confess that I feel it is unnecessary to do that at the present stage. I have two simple reasons therefor:

First, as has been mentioned more than once this afternoon and this morning, the matter is already under intensive study by at least two competent organs. It seems to me that it would be wise of us to await the completion of that study before we complicate the matter further by referring it to other bodies.

PF:cc

E/P.V.109
93-95

I am not at all denying the competence of the Social Commission to deal with this problem; I believe it is competent to deal with it. However, since we have decided to submit the matter to these two other organs, we must, in all fairness to them, await their findings with regard to this question before we submit it to other organs.

There is another reason why I think it might be premature at present to submit this problem to the Social Commission. According to the text of the resolution submitted by the representative of Czechoslovakia, the second paragraph states: "That the full exercise of trade union rights is related to all the activities of the Council." If that is true, then we cannot refer this document only to the Social Commission. It seems to me that there is an aspect of this problem which is relevant to the activities of all Commissions.

Certainly, the Economic and Employment Commission has something to say about it; certainly, the Commission on Human Rights has something to say about it; certainly, the Social Commission has something to say about it; certainly, the Transportation Commission has something to say about it, since it does relate to problems of workers engaged in transportation activities throughout the world.

Therefore, if we admit the Czechoslovak thesis that it relates to all the activities of the Council, we cannot then single out one commission and refer the matter to that commission. If the question is related to all the activities of the Council, that is tantamount to saying that we should either submit it to all the standing Committees of the Council or that we should retain it under the direct consideration of the Council as such. I interpret our procedure so far to mean the latter alternative.

The reason why we did submit it last time to the Commission on Human Rights in contradistinction to other commissions was precisely because this Commission was itself specifically designed by the Charter and by the Economic and Social Council to deal with the questions of rights and liberties in general, including tribunal rights.

There was not really an exception there to the principle of all-inclusive interests by the Council in this question.

It seems to me that for these two reasons we cannot combine the idea of submission to the Social Commission, suggested in the Czechoslovak proposal, with the other document before us. These two things do not combine properly.

But I do think the other two principles I spoke of, namely, the endorsement of the conclusions of the ILO and the urging of ILO to carry on its preparation of conventions, could very easily be taken note of under the other document, and that is the extent to which the two documents could be combined.

Mr. d'ASCOLI (Venezuela) (Second interpretation; original in Spanish):
After the brilliant exposition of this matter given by the representative of Lebanon, I should be able to be very brief. In fact, the thought I had in the beginning, which I still have, was to point out that, if we take into account the proposal of the representative of Norway, the time has come to vote on the French proposal. This proposal is now ready to be voted upon. It becomes quite acceptable, if we take into account the Norwegian proposal relating to point (c) of the Czechoslovakian draft resolution. This text, as it now stands, has the inconvenience of eliminating the International Labour Organization from the field of activity which is its own. If we take into account the observations of the representative of Norway, this drawback is removed.

Therefore, I should propose that a vote should be taken now on the appointment of a drafting committee in accordance with the proposal of the representative of France; this drafting committee would have as its task the harmonizing and merging of both proposals in the sense just pointed out by the representative of Lebanon; that is, to incorporate the first part of the Czechoslovakian text--and the representative of Lebanon has shown very convincingly that this part of the Czechoslovakian text can very easily be incorporated--into the texts submitted by the delegations of the United States, the United Kingdom and the Netherlands.

The only point about which I would not be in agreement with the representative of Lebanon concerns the mentioning here of the Social Commission. I think the admission of this Commission to participate in the work in the sense suggested by the representative of Norway is quite admissible. If we, therefore, take into account the Norwegian proposal and add it to the entire text, we could very easily merge those texts into one.

As to the observations made by the representative of Lebanon in regard to the Social Commission and the part it could play in this respect, I point out that this Commission would play a purely advisory role, and that is the part for which it has been created; it has been created as a body of which the Council can ask advice and can obtain it. The Social Commission would not be working in this matter, as the Czechoslovakian resolution suggested, to the exclusion of the International Labour Organization from its natural field of activity. Therefore, to sum up, I propose the Council close the discussion by taking a vote on the French proposal with the additions I have suggested; that is, to establish a drafting committee and to instruct that Committee to merge and harmonize the texts now before the Council, and to take into account the proposal of the delegation of Norway when it deals with point (c) of the Czechoslovakian resolution.

The PRESIDENT: I appreciate the desire of the Members of the Council to complete this discussion. There are three more speakers who wish to be heard. I should like to continue this discussion to its completion. However, I do not think it would be advisable to take a vote on the closure of the debate. If we do that, we shall start to discuss procedural matters and we shall not accomplish our task.

Therefore, if the representative of Venezuela does not insist upon this vote, I shall ask those who wish to speak to be brief in their remarks and, after the completion of the debate, the Council will be able to come to a decision.

Mr. BORIS (France) (Interpretation from French): It seems that my first statement should have been long enough and detailed enough. However, in the discussion that followed a certain misunderstanding seems to have appeared as to the intention of the French delegation in presenting this transitory proposal to the Council. When we made our proposal as to a merger of the two resolutions before us, the French delegation had in view only the facilitating of a compromise. In fact, we did not expect any opposition, as we presented it in the spirit of conciliation. We also did not expect any misunderstanding.

It has been said that to refer the Report of the International Labour Organization to the Social Commission would involve complete revision of the text or a postponement of the necessary measures. We do not and did not intend any delay. If a delay were involved, we would be the first to oppose our proposal.

I should like to point out that the Social Commission is meeting very soon, and that the Social Council has among its Members experts who participated in the discussions of this matter. Therefore, the Social Commission is competent to undertake a profound study of the question -- a study which the Council is not in a position to make.

The Social Commission could study all the aspects and consequences of the question. I would not expect any revision of the text, especially in view of the fact that there was unanimous agreement as to these principles in Geneva. However, the Social Commission could study the effects of these proposals and perhaps make certain additional recommendations.

This morning I mentioned that the rights of trade unions come within the competence of the Economic and Social Council: all the social as well as human rights aspects. Just as the Commission on Human Rights was asked to deal with the particular human rights aspects of the problem, so should the Social Commission deal with them, and then give the Council advice on the problems connected with the social aspects of the matter.

I am ready to agree with the representative of Lebanon that perhaps even the Economic and Employment Commission should be given this matter to consider if no loss of time would be involved. In view of the importance of the question, perhaps that suggestion should not be excluded. However, I should not envisage a transferral to that Commission, as I do not see any connection between the problems of the Economic and Employment Commission and the problems we are faced with here.

The French delegation did not wish to criticize the proposal of the International Labour Organization. In fact, we wish to repeat our full approval of the work of the International Labour Organization. I should like to emphasize that if someone should bring in a proposal to the Economic and Social Council which would result in a taking of sides for or against the ILO, that the French delegation would certainly line up with the friends of the ILO and would vote in the direction most favourable to it. Everyone knows that the French delegation has been a friend to the ILO since its inception.

However, I do not believe that such a situation will ever present itself, for I am sure no one would conceive of this idea of dividing the Council along this line.

The French proposal for undertaking a merger of the two texts contemplates certain changes in the separate texts. If certain passages of the text are unclear or appear to set forth the view that the International Labour Organization is to be excluded or that its effect should be minimized, a revision of the text is naturally called for.

I should like to say that in this spirit of full approval of the work of the International Labour Organization the French delegation continues to believe in the possibility of a compromise of the two texts, especially if the Norwegian proposals are accepted as the basis of compromise. The Norwegian proposals seem to be acceptable to all sides, and the French delegation wishes to express its approval thereof.

Mr. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom): I should like to say a word first about the proposal of the representative of Norway. It has always struck me that one of the great contributions of the Norwegian delegation to this Council has been its insistence upon the prevention of duplication of work. We often heard from Mr. Fin Moe on this subject and it has always been a most valuable contribution. I was therefore somewhat disappointed that on this occasion he should want to have this work traversed again by the Social Commission. He had advanced as a reason the fact that membership is bound to weigh in the minds of the Members of this Council, but I would just point out in answer

to this point that the membership difficulty is covered for this Council by the Assembly. The membership of the Social Commission is composed out of members of this Council and of course there is no membership question in relation to the General Assembly. Furthermore, if we adopt this principle of referring to Commissions all matters from specialized agencies where membership questions arose, we should create a very difficult precedent because unfortunately this membership point arises in respect of all the specialized agencies except one, and I do not think that this Council could adopt as a precedent that every report from a specialized agency went necessarily to a commission on that account. I should have thought that membership considerations would have been taken care of in the Council and in the Assembly.

I turn now to the contribution by the representative of Venezuela. I appreciate the spirit in which he has attempted to seek a compromise, but it does seem to me, as the American representative pointed out, that the situation is really incompatible, that we on our side cannot agree to it being referred to the Social Commission, and to refer the matter to a drafting committee in order to solve this incompatibility would place an impossible task upon the drafting committee.

I now wish to say a word with regard to what the French representative just said. I myself, if I may introduce a personal note, am in the unique position of being the only person, I think, on this Council who both sat through the proceedings in Geneva when the International Labour Organization produced their Report and also sat at the last session of the Social Commission as a Member. At that meeting of the Social

Commission, I formed the utmost respect and regard for my colleagues on that Commission. But as concerns the technical nature of this subject matter, I myself, if it should ever fall to my lot to sit on the Social Commission again, would feel the utmost diffidence about handling matters which I saw at Geneva were much better handled by employers and workers and by specialists from governments who were in day-to-day contact throughout with the practical basic problems underlying these considerations. The consideration at Geneva was essentially of a practical nature. The employers were there; the workers were there--the people who had to implement these things--and I would suggest, without the slightest thought of under-rating the Social Commission, that purely on the question of technical competence we could not possibly hope to improve the draft of the proceedings which took place in the International Labour Conference in Geneva.

Finally, may I say a word with regard to the suggestion of the representative of Lebanon. Again I appreciate the sense in which he has put forward his proposal for a compromise resolution. My objection to his suggestions is not based on the fact that I think they are wrong, as I do think in relation to the other suggestions. My objection is rather based on the fact that I do not think it is necessary or indeed that it would be appropriate or very dignified for the Council to make these statements which are in ^{paragraphs} ~~the~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~Czechoslovakian~~ resolution, because they are rather platitudinous. We often do say platitudinous things in the Council from the point of view of obtaining a compromise, but if we can avoid it, I think we should.

Let us see what these two suggestions amount to. The first one recognizes the principles obtained by the International Labour Conference. I should have thought it was perfectly plain that we all did recognize those principles. The whole tenor of the discussion here has been that every delegation in this Council attaches the highest importance to these principles. Indeed, it is consistent with the Charter and its truism to say that we recognize those principles. As regards B, to request the ILO to continue its efforts when it says it is going to continue its efforts and has indeed prepared a vigorous programme along that line, ^{this} seems to me to be slightly redundant. I hope the distinguished Lebanese representative will not misunderstand me. I am not speaking critically of his amendments and I quite understand the spirit in which he submitted them, but I would question myself whether they are necessary and I would myself much prefer to stick to the text in E/533 on the ground that it is advisable for the Council to repeat statements that are obvious, even in order to achieve a compromise, if we can decide to pass a resolution without those rather obvious statements.

Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile)(Second interpretation; original in Spanish):

I wish to express first of all my satisfaction that it now appears clearly from the discussion that neither the Czechoslovak proposal nor the French proposal, supported by the delegation of Chile and by some other delegations, tends to diminish the role of the International Labor Organization or diminish its intervention in this problem. The only thing that appears is that the Economic and Social Council should endeavour to arrive at a rapid and useful solution.

In the Czechoslovak proposal it is suggested that the question be referred to the Social Commission, and in the proposal made by the United Kingdom, the United States and the Netherlands delegations it is suggested that the Commission on Human Rights should be seized of this matter. I should like to bring to the attention of all those who are of the opinion that the Commission on Human Rights should be seized of the matter and be asked to pronounce upon it the fact that neither the resolution of the United Kingdom nor the previous resolution asks for a pronouncement of the Commission on Human Rights. They say only that the Commission should take into account the demand of the World Federation of Trade Unions when it considers the subject in connection with the elaboration of an international bill of rights.

I would also like to call the attention of the Council to the fact that this bill of rights is envisaged only as enunciating general principles, and therefore the Commission on Human Rights will not be called upon to make a report to the Economic and Social Council on this particular matter. If we want such a report, we must say so clearly in the resolution.

GR:cc

E/P.V.109
117-125

The delegation of Chile does not attach too much importance to the question whether the Commission on Human Rights or the Social Commission should present a report. What we consider of the greatest importance is that the Economic and Social Council should receive all the necessary information as soon as possible so that, when the Council meets again soon, we shall not be forced to call for new reports.

In view of the fact that there does not seem to be agreement on the merging of the two proposals, we consider that it is time to proceed to a vote and, for our part, we shall support the Norwegian proposal as being complementary to the proposals of the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, and the United States.

Mr. MOROSOV (USSR) (Interpretation from Russian): I should like to make a few observations. The first one is in connection with certain statements which, to a certain extent, seem to be in reply to my first statement here in the Council. I should like to single out especially the statement made by the United States representative who, apparently in reply to my statement, pointed out that the question was referred to the International Labour Organization after careful consideration of the question presented by the World Federation of Trade Unions.

It seems to me that we are dealing here with misunderstandings. We all know that at the Fourth Session of the Economic and Social Council, the question presented to the Council by the World Federation of Trade Unions was not considered and studied in its essence and that the question was given to the International Labour Organization for reference instead.

I should like to remind the Council, in this connection, of the statement made by the President of the Economic and Social Council that independently from the question of whether or not the International Labour Organization will present a report, the question presented by the World Federation of Trade Unions will once more be on the agenda of the next session.

My second observation is as follows: Some Members of the Council have indicated that the report of the International Labour Organization, as well as the proposals of the United Kingdom, the United States and the Netherlands, contains a firm basis and programme for our work which corresponds to the importance of the question. In my opinion, that is far from being true. To the contrary, it seems to me that the proposal of the World Federation of Trade Unions corresponds much more to the importance and the urgency of the problem.

I should like to remind the Council that the World Federation of Trade Unions asked the Council, in view of the urgency and importance of the question, to create a special organ which would be in a position to watch over the implementation of the principles that the World Federation of Trade Unions asked the Council to enunciate.

Contrary to that, in the resolution before the Council, the proposals contained therein mean not only that the Council will not pay the necessary attention to the problem, which would correspond to the importance and urgency of it, but this resolution shows a tendency to refer the entire matter to one specialized agency, and to refer to it this very essential question with which the World Federation of Trade Unions asked the Council and the auxiliary organs of the Council to deal.

The PRESIDENT: In order to avoid any misunderstanding, I should like to state that the original document presented by the World Federation of Trade Unions was and is under discussion as it was adopted in our agenda. However, this morning, before opening this meeting, I saw that it was omitted from today's agenda in the same manner as were omitted the proposals of the delegations of the United Kingdom and Czechoslovakia. When I opened the meeting this morning, I mentioned the specific document that was to be under discussion.

Mr. THORP (United States): I hope very much that I am expressing the feeling of the other Members of the Council in requesting that this discussion be brought to a conclusion. I think it may be -- though there is no way of being sure -- that we have a substantial amount of agreement on one of the proposals before the Council. What I would suggest is that the President formulate the alternatives which he feels have been presented to us, that we vote on these alternatives in whatever order the President feels is appropriate, and then, if not one of the alternatives is satisfactory to the Members, we shall have to have a drafting committee to try to pick enough out of each of the other drafts to build up a new draft which will be satisfactory to the majority of the Members.

It seems to me that by following that course it will be possible for us to see whether we can conclude the matter this time, or whether we need to send it on for a committee to re-word. I would suggest, therefore, that Members who still have debating points which they can make -- I have several myself -- sacrifice themselves so that we can see whether we have a basic agreement on any of the alternatives that have been presented.

The PRESIDENT: Before taking a decision, I ask the representative of the International Labour Organization to make the short statement he desires to make.

On the invitation of the President, Mr. Morse (International Labour Office) took his seat at the Council table.

Mr. MORSE (ILO): I do not believe that it would be appropriate, nor would it be discreet, for me to comment on the discussion this afternoon. I should like, however, to make just two very short points which arise out of the discussion, which I think are pertinent and which I omitted from my original presentation.

The first deals with the matter of where the ILO fits into the total machinery of the United Nations. I believe that it would be appropriate to suggest the thinking of the ILO with regard to this question.

It is the view of the International Labor Organization--the Governing Body--that the ILO is the recognized specialized international organization within the total structure of the United Nations; further, it acts as pert advisor to the United Nations on matters falling within the field of the ILO. In other words, what I am saying is that the ILO considers itself as part of you and as part of the total United Nations picture. I believe this has been underlined and confirmed by the terms and by the spirit of the Agreement arrived at between the United Nations and the International Labor Organization.

Secondly, the International Labor Conference assumes and the International Labor Office assumes that the Economic and Social Council is also of this view. Therefore, it has been an assumption of the ILO that the Economic and Social Council would not contemplate action which would unsettle the driving force and the competence of the ILO.

Lastly, I should like to assure the Economic and Social Council that we will continue with the same promptness which you have this very day commended in your various statements. Reports concerning the 1948 conventions are already in the process of distribution to governments by the International Labour Office. Action with respect to them will be effective, direct, and prompt.

I would conclude with these bare and general remarks, thanking the Council again for its courtesy and for the opportunity which has been accorded us in the making of this report, and I should like to assure the Members of the Council that we, in turn, will transmit to the Governing Body of the International Labor Office your views as expressed this afternoon and as ultimately framed.

PF:cc

E/P.V.109
142-145

The PRESIDENT: There is a proposal that we should decide this question now. If agreeable to the Members of the Council I shall adhere to the following procedure: first of all, there is the proposal submitted by the representative of the Soviet Union that the basis for the decision of this Council should be the original document E/C.2/28, which was the original proposal of the World Federation of Trade Unions.

There were several attempts to reach a compromise on the two resolutions. It is evident that no compromise could be reached. Therefore, I propose that we should vote on the Czechoslovak resolution, and if that is not adopted, then I should propose to vote on the amendment submitted by the Norwegian delegation to the resolution of the United Kingdom, the United States and the Netherlands. If that should be adopted, then it would be included in the resolution and we should vote on that resolution.

Mr. AHMAD (India): The representative of the Soviet Union said that the President of the Economic and Social Council, at the last session stated that this document submitted by the World Federation of Trade Unions, document E/C.2/28, would still remain under consideration. May we have the statement made by the President at the last session read?

The PRESIDENT: That statement was made at the thirty-fourth meeting of the Fourth Session of the Economic and Social Council. It reads as follows: "In pursuance of that resolution, I should think it was my duty as President, whether a Report from the ILO was received or not, to bring the subject again before the next meeting of the Economic and Social Council; to put it, in fact, on the provisional agenda and to have it approved in the final agenda by the Economic and Social Council, apart from the question whether a Report was received from the ILO or not. It is hoped that the Report will be received from the ILO, because this resolution will be transmitted to the ILO in pursuance of the decision of the Economic and Social Council."

The proposal of the Soviet Union representative was re-
jected by ten votes to two, with six abstentions.

The draft resolution of the Czechoslovak representative was
rejected by nine votes to one, with eight abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: Now I wish to read the text of the amendment of the representative of Norway to the draft proposal of the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, and the United States delegations. The amendment reads as follows:

"The Economic and Social Council resolves to transmit the Report to the Social Commission, requesting the Commission to present its comments to the next session of the Economic and Social Council in order that the Council may present the comments it desires for the consideration of the International Labour Conference in drafting one or more conventions in this matter."

The amendment was rejected by seven votes to five, with six
abstentions.

Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) (Spoke in Spanish; no interpretation)

The PRESIDENT: There is an amendment by the representative of Chile to the effect that the amendment as formulated in the draft resolution of the representative of Czechoslovakia under paragraph B should be added to the draft resolution proposed by the three delegations.

The amendment was adopted by five votes to four with nine abstentions.

Mr. MALIK (Lebanon): I think the Council may also adopt paragraph A according to my suggestion, and I would so move.

The PRESIDENT: The representative of Lebanon proposes that another amendment should be added to the draft resolution of the three delegations and he formulates it as it is contained in the draft resolution of the Czechoslovakian representative under paragraph A.

Mr. THORP (United States): The representative of Lebanon did not make that point very clear. I do not know what it would mean if that sub-paragraph were inserted.

The PRESIDENT: Is the proposal of the representative of Lebanon, as formulated in that draft resolution, with or without the last four words?

Mr. MALIK (Lebanon): My motion is in the form which I first suggested, that is, without the last words.

The PRESIDENT: Is it understood that the vote is without the last four words, as formulated by the representative of Lebanon?

Mr. STOLZ (Czechoslovakia): I understood that we were voting for the complete sub-paragraph.

Mr. DAVIDSON (Canada): The same applies to my vote.

Mr. AHMED (India): A point of order. We have voted on the Czechoslovak draft resolution and rejected it. We have also voted on the amendment to that resolution and rejected it. May I know whether the resolutions moved and voted upon by Chile and the one now proposed and voted upon by Lebanon are to be taken as amendments? If they are amendments, they should have been voted upon before the resolution itself. I find that after having rejected the whole resolution, we are now going to adopt this part. This part is certainly not an amendment to the original resolution.

The PRESIDENT: The representatives of Chile and Lebanon have presented their own amendments, but these refer to the resolution of the three delegations; however, they have taken the formula contained in the Czechoslovak draft resolution but they are their own amendments.

EW/grp

E/P V.109
162-165

We shall reconsider that amendment.

The amendment proposed by the representative of Lebanon reads:

"...to recognize the principles proclaimed by the International Labour Conference."

The amendment was adopted by thirteen votes to none, with five abstentions.

Mr. MALIK (Lebanon): I suggest that this amendment should come in the second paragraph immediately before the words "to transmit the report..."

Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) (Second interpretation; original in Spanish): I think my amendment finds its place immediately after the amendment of the representative of Lebanon, just before the words "awaits further reports."

The PRESIDENT: Then we will vote on the draft resolution proposed by the representatives of the United Kingdom, the Netherlands and the United States.

The resolution was adopted by fifteen votes to two, with one abstention.

The PRESIDENT: Before the Council adjourns, if Members have no objections to the proposal of the Drafting Committee concerning the Report of the Committee of the United Nations Appeal for Children, I should like to have it adopted. We have deferred this for several days and there was unanimous agreement in the Committee on the subject.

I understand that the Chairman of that Drafting Committee was asked by the Committee to present the final decision of that Committee.

Mr. STOLZ (Czechoslovakia): I am happy to be able to report to you the agreement reached by the Drafting Committee, including the representative of the United States, on the Committee's report to this Council.

Document E/516 Rev. 1, which you now have before you, is the same as the original report, document E/516, except for paragraph (d) on the International Committee. According to the decision by the Council, this paragraph has been given new and thorough consideration by the Drafting Committee, together with the representative of the United States. I shall limit myself to a few comments which I hope will clarify the suggested amendments.

The continued discussion in the Committee confirmed that on the points concerning the nature and the timing of the appeal, as well as the agreements to be made between the Secretary-General and countries, there was no disagreement.

As regards the proposed international bodies, the Committee carefully reconsidered the views of the United States representative and the different interests and aspects which had to be covered in the composition of the international bodies.

As regards the group of distinguished individuals who may be invited by the Secretary-General to give inspiration and support to the appeal, I would only stress once more that it is no committee at all. The Secretary-General is authorized to consult with individuals and to seek their backing.

Furthermore, there was again full agreement on the proposal of the Committee as regards the Special Committee of the Economic and Social Council composed of seven of the Council's Members to assist the Secretary-General between sessions of the Council.

The only point on which an amendment is now suggested is on the International Advisory Committee. The Committee agreed that while still wishing to keep this Committee within a reasonable size, the importance of having direct representation from the National Committees, who will be carrying the brunt of the work, had to be given very serious consideration. The Committee therefore agreed to accept in substance the suggestion by the United States representative of adding representatives of the National Committees to the International Advisory Committee.

However, the following qualifications were added: The representatives of the National Committees may be either the Chairman or another member of the National Committee, and where difficulties arise in sending such a representative to the International Committee, the National Committee may appoint someone to act as liaison between the two bodies. This will give great flexibility of representation which may prove mutually helpful.

It was furthermore agreed that the expenses of the members of the International Committee coming from the National Committees, as well as from the non-governmental organizations, should not be borne by the United Nations.

In now presenting this report, I am happy to look forward to a unanimous vote on this important project. May I say this is a great event worthy of the United Nations. I am confident that through our common efforts it will also be a great success worthy of the united peoples.

JK/GG

E/P.V.109
173-175

I am moving the adoption of the resolution which is on the last page of our report.

Mr. VAN HEUVEN (Netherlands): The Netherlands Government gives serious consideration to the question of whether it would be possible for the governments to participate in the United Nations Appeal for Children or not. Post-war conditions in the Netherlands make this question a difficult one. The Netherlands delegation is aware that the universality of the appeal is of fundamental importance to its success and, therefore, we wish to state that in case the decision on the "One Day's Pay Proposal" will be in the negative, it will not be due to lack of sympathy to the appeal but will be because of other imperative reasons.

The Netherlands delegation will vote for the resolution, but we must make a reservation with regard to the participation of the Netherlands.

The PRESIDENT: As there is no objection, I shall consider document E/516/Rev. 1 adopted.

Mr. MOROSOV (USSR) (Interpretation from Russian): I ask that it be noted that the Soviet Union delegation has abstained from motives that have already been expressed at previous meetings.

Mr. DAVIDSON (Canada): I should like to state, for the record, that as a Member of the Committee I refrained from voting in favour of the paragraph relating to the International Committee. But it was my intention, when the Report came before the plenary session, to vote for it.

Mr. AHMED (India): For reasons that are well-known, I shall have to abstain from voting.

The PRESIDENT: Document E/516/Rev. 1 is adopted unanimously. So far as the Committee is concerned, that will be decided at another meeting of this Council, either next Monday or Tuesday.

The Council has now completed the action it was required to take at this session with regard to the United Nations Appeal for Children, and, before adjourning the meeting, I should like to express what I feel is in the minds of all of us at this table in planning the great campaign for the most moving and irresistible cause in the world today -- the cause of hungry, ragged, and often naked and often homeless children. All of us realize that it is not enough to adopt resolutions to set up machinery here; I feel sure that all of us will wish to bring this world-wide United Nations Appeal to the special attention of our Governments, organizations, and individuals and do everything in our power to help the Secretary-General to make it a success.

Before adjourning this meeting, after what I may say is a good day's work, I should like to inform the Members of the Council that next Monday at 11:00 a.m. we shall have item 36 -- International Control of Oil Resources -- on the agenda. Then we shall discuss all the items

RSH/gpr

E/P.V.109
182-185

we did not finish today, beginning with the Economic Commission for Latin-America. There will be added to the agenda the items on rules of procedure and the 1947 calendar.

Furthermore, at 10 a.m. there will be a meeting of the Drafting Subcommittee on Traffic in Women and Children, and at 10:45 and in the afternoon the Committee on Negotiations with Specialized Agencies will meet to discuss the draft agreement with the ITU.

Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) (Second Interpretation; original in Spanish):
Before adjourning the meeting yesterday, the President stated that the second item on the agenda for today would be the Economic Commission for Latin America. This morning, however, we found that another item had been placed before it. That was the item with regard to Trade Union Rights, and the discussion of that item has consumed the entire day.

I wish to remind the Members of the Council that the Drafting Committee appointed to consider the matter of the Economic Commission for Latin America is now ready with its draft. Therefore, I request that you place this item as the first item on the agenda for the meeting to be held Monday. The item with regard to petroleum might be somewhat long, which would delay still further the consideration of the draft which the Drafting Committee has completed as to the Economic Commission for Latin America.

The PRESIDENT: This means that we are behind our schedule. We have agreed that certain matters were to be discussed on specific dates. We did not finish some of the items on our agenda, which accounts for our being behind in our schedule.

However, if the Members of the Council do not object to adopting the proposal concerning the Economic Commission for Latin America, since it has already been discussed, I shall have no objection to placing it on our agenda so that we can dispose of it as quickly as possible.

As there is no objection, we shall take up the Commission for Latin America on Monday.

Mr. MENDES-FRANCE (France) (Interpretation from French): We are late in accomplishing our programme, and perhaps that is the reason why we have announced three meetings for Monday morning to run concurrently. That will entail certain difficulties for some of the delegations. Therefore, I ask if it would be possible to have ^{of} one/the meetings in the afternoon instead of in the morning. We also could have the Committee on Negotiations with Specialized Agencies meet at 10:00 a.m. instead of 10:45 a.m., or postpone the meeting dealing with Traffic in Women and Children until Tuesday.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): That is only a meeting of a drafting Sub-Committee. I should appreciate it very much if you would agree that we should have both meetings at the same time. Otherwise, the plenary meeting will not be able to open.

Mr. MENDES-FRANCE (France) (Interpretation from French): In that case, perhaps it would be possible to advance the meeting dealing with Traffic in Women and Children one-quarter of an hour and delay the meeting of the Non-Governmental Organization Committee for a quarter of an hour so one would begin when the other would finish.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): It is agreed.

The meeting rose at 7:45 p.m.