

Document in

Mr. Bruce Turner

G. S. Yates

31 Jan. 19 50

Distribution of documents to UNOs in
consultative status with EXOPO

You may find this scheme which we have worked out with Mr. de Wilt of interest from the general budgetary point of view. As you know, for a long period now the Management Survey and other sections interested have had in mind a re-organisation of UN document distribution to external bodies generally. We have been anxious, however, that another session of Exocent should not go by with an unperfected system, and the present modifications will not prejudice any more general reform which may eventually be decided upon. Paras. 3 and 7 should save respectively a considerable expenditure on copies of records and on documents of subsidiary bodies of the Council.

Documentation

UNCLASSIFIED

Mr. Martin Hill (CC: Mr. Lefebvre, Mr. Green, Miss Osborne)

G.E. Yates

Action of G.A. Resolution on Proliferation

31 Jan. 1950

As I mentioned to you on the telephone, I have pointed out verbally to the divisions concerned with current meetings that if, as a result of instructions on this subject from your office, a paper is produced for each of the subsidiary bodies of the Economic and Social Council (over twenty), as well as the two versions, one mimeographed and one printed, already produced in the A/ series, this will itself be one of the worst examples of proliferation that could be imagined. The Chairman of the Economic and Employment Commission has mentioned this to the Commission verbally on our suggestion, which seems the proper procedure. I gather, however, that papers are still being submitted — though I have on my own responsibility asked Mr. Lefebvre to hold them up meantime — and that the directors concerned want some modification of your instructions.

It seems to me that all this should have been self-evident to all concerned, but it is of course not for anyone outside the Executive Office to amend your instructions, and it seems urgent that whatever red-tape is required should be produced without delay.

Documentation

EGA 71/1/02

27 January 1950

Mr. I.N. Djajadiningrat,
First Secretary,
Republic of the United States of Indonesia
Mission to the United Nations,
Empire State Building,
350 Fifth Avenue
Room 6214
New York 1, N.Y.

Sir,

I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of and to thank you for your letter of 24 January 1950 enclosing copy of a letter of the same date addressed to the Secretary-General by the Head of the Mission of the Republic of Indonesia to the United Nations.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your obedient servant,

G.E. Yates
Secretary, Economic and Social Council

Mme. François
Official Records Division
Georges Dumontet, Secrétaire
du Comité de procédure

Compte rendu analytique provisoire
E/AC.28/SR.43

23 janvier 1950

Je vous serais reconnaissant de bien vouloir apporter
les corrections suivantes au texte du compte rendu analytique
provisoire de la 43ème séance du Comité de Procédure,
document E/AC.28/SR.43:

1. Page 7, paragraphe 28, première ligne : les mots
"(Secrétaire de la Commission)" doivent se lire :
"(Secrétaire du Comité)".
2. Page 7, paragraphe 28, première ligne, après
la parenthèse, insérer le membre de phrase suivant :
"répondant à une question préalablement posée par
les représentants du Royaume-uni et du Brésil
(E/AC.28/SR.40)".

Documentation

Mme. François
Official Records Division
Georges Dumontet, Secretary
of the Committee on Procedure

Provisional summary record
E/AC.26/SR.41

25 January 1950

Mr. Hyde, representative of the United States on the Committee on Procedure, wishes to have a correction made to the provisional summary record of the 41st meeting of the Committee (document E/AC.26/SR.41).

The correction is as follows: page 6, paragraph 26, line 2, after the words "the clause providing that the agenda", add the words "and the basic documents".

Documentation

Mr. L. Haller

G.E. Yates

file

20 January 1950

I would like to confirm that Miss Winslow of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace will send a messenger to the Manhattan Building on Saturday morning, 21 January, sometime after 10 a.m. to pick up

100 copies of the French text of Document E/C.2/235
(Consultation between the United Nations and Non-Governmental Organizations : Communication from the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace) and

100 copies each (or 50 each if 100 would entail a reroll) of the English text of E/C.2/231/Add.3 and E/C.2/231/Add.3/Corr.1 (Activities undertaken by Non-Governmental Organizations up to 1 June 1949 in connexion with their consultative status : Comments of Non-Governmental Organizations on the existing consultative arrangements.)

I should be grateful if you would make the necessary arrangements to ensure that these documents will be handed to the representative of the Carnegie Endowment in accordance with the above arrangements.

five

Documentation

18 January 1950

TO: Director, Official Records Division
Room F-520

FROM: Mr. George Dumontet, ECOSOC Secretariat

SUBJECT: Summary Record E/AC.28/SR.38

The Russian Delegate has requested the following correction
to the above Summary Record:

Paragraph 61: Delete the first sentence which reads: "Mr.
Kamenev (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that he would
not press his amendment."

Documentation

Mr. F.P.E. Green, Mr. S. Hessel, Dr. S. Sze

G.E. Yates

Rule 42 of the Council Rules of Procedure

17 January 1950

In order to carry out this rule, I should be glad if you would let me know the names of the officers who will be responsible for approving the summary records of the Council's discussion of the items on the agenda of the forthcoming session of particular concern to your Department.

The persons concerned will require to be available at the following hours :

To approve the records of morning
meetings

between 7 and 8.30 p.m. on the
same day if the meeting ends at 1 p.m.,
or correspondingly later in the case
of more lengthy meetings

To approve the records of afternoon
meetings

between 9.30 and 11 on the following
morning.

The officers named should be persons who will be available, despite pressure of other work, to deal with the records within the hours specified since any delay on their part is liable to upset the schedule for production arranged by the Bureau of Documents, and to lead to much more considerable delays along the line, with consequent complaints from Members of the Council. The schedule is rather a trying one, but it seems to be the best that can be arranged to meet the requirements of the Rule.

Documentation

c.c. Mr. de Walt
Mr. Peissel

Dr. J. Humphrey

G.E. Yates

Submission of papers for the ad hoc Committee
on Statelessness

16 January 1950

I should remind you of the general arrangements for the submission of papers for Committees of the Council, which were summarized for convenience of reference in Ecosoc Secretariat Circular No. 90. The normal rule is that these papers should be submitted to Documents through the Ecosoc secretariat, though as that paper says arrangements can be made by mutual agreement to transfer that duty in the case of Ad Hoc Committees.

2. I have no objection to the transfer being made in the case of the Ad Hoc Committee on Statelessness - indeed it is the sort of Committee in mind when the exception was stated. It is, however, important that the Division to whom the duty is transferred should observe the editorial practice developed for the benefit of the Council, which is set out in the same Ecosoc circular. Document E/AC.32/2, which was submitted before any transfer was made, departs from these practices in quite a number of respects, some of which are likely to result in difficulties (a) in references in versions of the document other than that in the original language and (b) in references to the parts of the document in simultaneous interpretation. Difficulties of this sort are, of course, of a lesser degree in the Committee, where the members are familiar with the subject, than when the question comes before the Council. Perhaps you would give instructions that the agreed editorial, etc. practices are followed in future documents submitted under the transfer arrangement?

Mr. H.B. Caustin

G.E. Yates

1/15/62

9 January 1949

I am glad you brought up this matter, as there are several aspects of general interest, besides a detail.

1. It is true that the technical services gave much more staff leave than had been expected at the Christmas season, thus throwing many of our projected times given in 1/1570 (provisional agenda) out of joint. Although these times had been agreed with us, they did this without consultation, and I have sent the minute of which I attach a copy to M. Reissel

2. It is, however, also true - with particular reference to Mr. Singer's third paragraph - that when a Division completes a long document on Christmas Eve, they cannot expect the technical services to sit through Christmas at it. The point of our reminders to which he refers was to get the document in in time - when it would have had a much better chance of coming out.

3. I am afraid - though obviously I am not in a position to prove it formally - that there may be some reaction here on the part of the technical services - to the unnecessary and disturbing action taken directly by your Division on the "Full Employment" report. Nearly all the rules that have been developed over the last three years for the mutual good of the substantive divisions and the technical conference services were broken - in particular, the noses of M. Le Bosquet, the Translation Division, and the Official Records Division were badly put out of joint. Moreover, as they realized when the hubbub had died down, there was a very small or even negative net result. As near as I can make out, this may be summarized as follows:

- (i) First appearance of reproduced copy delayed several days (a mimeographed version of a document nearly always, in U.N. practice, comes out considerably before a printed);
- (ii) first appearance of printed English to delegations expedited, perhaps by two weeks: no difference, however, to public, since publication date set at 16 January in any case;
- (iii) doubtful earlier transmission to members of the Commission, since the time-table to produce typed copies for them would presumably have sufficed to produce a stencil for an ordinary 1/ document;
- (iv) an ugly gap in the Official Records for the tenth session, since clearly this report arising out of a Council resolution and forming

an item should belong to them, whereas now clearly the thing cannot be printed twice. This result was accomplished at some considerable extra expenditure of man-power hours on the part of the technical services (some of which might even have helped Mr. Singer's report) and on the part of the substantive Divisions.

Further, the backwash from and reduced lack of confidence on the part of the technical divisions comes mostly to my Division and not that of the Division of Economic Stability and Development.

(I had not intended to say anything about all this, in view of Christmas and all that, but your note leaves me no alternative.)

4. Any system of priorities for the Ecosoc must depend on the cooperation of all Divisions. If one Division is going to claim an exceptional position, it will not be long before others do so and we are back to the chaos of Hunter College. It is in any case a thankless job trying to operate one, and if the decision is to return to that situation, I shall not personally oppose it.

"Detail".

(a) E/1562 is not the top priority. A moment's thought would show anyone, for instance, that documents for the Sub-commission on Discrimination, and the Council Committee on Procedure, which start their meetings today, must have a higher priority on any system.

Mr. Peissel, M. Le Bosquet

G.E. Yates

Time-table for distribution of Ecosoc documents

9 ~~December~~ ^{January} 1950

I would be grateful if, in future, notice were given of substantial alterations of time-tables already agreed upon. The abnormally reduced output, particularly of the Translation Division over the last 10 days or so was no doubt well justified - and in any case is none of my business - but it made hay of the approximate dates for issue of documents given to delegations, in consultation with your Division, in the Ecosoc provisional agenda E/1570. I hope it will be possible to avoid uncoordinated changes of this kind, as they do not redound to the credit of the secretariat (as a whole) with delegations.

Mr. Peissel, M. le Bosquet
c.c. Mr. F.P.L. Green

C.J. Yates

9 January 1950

Translation and distribution of
document E/C.2/235

1. I understand translation of this document into French has been held up because someone has alleged that it does not comply with the rules.

The facts are that Rules 80 and 81 reproducing earlier resolutions - provide that written communications from NGOs are to be circulated

- (i) in full, if received from a category (a) organization, or, if received from a category (b) or (c) organization, if so requested by a member of the Council ;
- (ii) in summary, if received from a category (b) or (c) organization and distribution in full is not requested by a member of the Council.

In this case a request that the document be distributed has been received from a member of the Council, and informal notice given that similar requests would be made by other members.

It, therefore, complies with the rules under which more than two hundred previous documents in this series have been treated without any question being raised.

Further, enough copies have been received from the organization in its original language (English) to be distributed with only a single covering sheet. There is no obligation anywhere on a NGO to provide a translation of its communications, and the use of French as a working language of the Council requires that the document be also translated into and reproduced in French.

2. If this document had not, as above, to be translated and distributed under Rules 80 and 81, there are two other reasons why this would have been necessary :

- (a) The Council Committee on NGOs in effect requested its circulation, at its meeting on 16 November 1949, and the request would have been formal had it not been understood at that time that it would be circulated under the rules;
- (b) It is an important background document for item 30 on the tenth session of the Council agenda, and on the preceding session of the Council NGO Committee scheduled for 23 January, and the Secretary-General would himself have taken the responsibility of transmitting

it in full to the Committee were no other means provided.

3. As regards ~~the~~ reproduction of the document - not translation - it seemed good practice to secure the 1,350 printed English copies in return for 600 French, thus making a net saving to the U.N. of the labour of making English stencils and the paper on 750 copies (net). This is obviously a good bargain for the U.N., but if it is the cost of the paper for 600 copies that is the trouble, I am sure that matter can be readily adjusted in consultation with the Executive Office of the Economic Department. If that is the trouble, however, I suggest this detail should have been brought to my attention in less than three weeks.

In any case, this problem of French copies for the Carnegie Endowment has no bearing on the necessity for distribution of English and French copies to members of the United Nations.

4. The document was submitted on 21 December last, and in view of its importance and length it is urgent that it be distributed to Governments and delegations in good time before the Council Committee on NGOs meets on 23 January, so that the former can brief their delegations in good time. Could all possible efforts therefore be made to expedite production of the French version now, in order to make up for the long delay?

This is a copy of a note which I sent to Caustin this morning - I hope you have no objection to what is in it. I will pass it on to Yates if you consider it necessary. H. W. Singer

Mr. Harold Caustin, Deputy Director
Division of Economic Stability & Development

H. W. Singer

E/1562 (Domestic Financing of Economic Development)

4 January 1950

1. I am sorry to report that this document is not yet out and the latest report is that because of pressure of Security Council documents it may not even be out this week.
2. I have made the strongest possible protests on this constantly to the Economic and Social Council Secretariat. The document has had top priority after the Full Employment report, and yet the obstacles with respect to reproduction seem to be insuperable. During the week that I was away, Miss Mishkin constantly pressed for a statement when the report would be out.
3. I wish to say once more that the delay is in no way our fault. We practically killed ourselves handing the report in on time, in response to the repeated missiles from Yates. After rushing so, it seems very unfair that we shall be again exposed to criticism at the Council meeting for having the documents sent out too late, and possibly having the discussion suffer from statements by delegates ^{that they} did not have time to read the documents properly.
4. I wish to say that Mrs. Herman and Mr. Messing in the ECOSOC Secretariat have been just as concerned as we are about this delay which lies in reproduction and not in the ECOSOC Secretariat. All the same, since the ECOSOC Secretariat is responsible for the sending out of the documents, may I suggest that the situation regarding reproduction of ECOSOC documents does call for a review. The present position is really outrageous. Surely the commitment on our part to prepare the documents for a certain deadline involves a corresponding commitment of the ECOSOC Secretariat and reproduction units to send out the documents on time. This really becomes a vicious circle. Are we, in the future, to disregard Yates' pleas for timely completion of documents—disregard the six weeks' rule altogether?

CC: ECOSOC Secretariat

Form GS/11
1 June 1946
(Rev.)

ROUTING SLIP

TO

Mr. Tate

FOR

APPROVAL	MORE DETAILS
REPLY, PLEASE	YOUR INFORMATION
SEE ME, PLEASE	RETURNED AS REQUESTED
YOUR SIGNATURE	INVESTIGATE AND REPORT
NOTE AND FILE	FOR IMMEDIATE ACTION
NOTE AND RETURN	REPLY FOR MY SIGNATURE
YOUR COMMENTS	INITIAL AND FORWARD

REMARKS:

Not to be re-
garded as a complaint
but I think you should
see H. Cassin

DATE

FROM

P. L. L. L.

Documentation
C.4.

UNITED NATIONS • NATIONS UNIES

Mr. Vanley

INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

Staff meeting
discussion?
AS

TO: Mr. Harold Caustin, Deputy Director
Division of Economic Stability & Development

FROM: H. W. Singer X.4.5.

SUBJECT: E/1562 (Domestic Financing of Economic Development)

Date 4 January 1950

1. I am sorry to report that this document is not yet out and the latest report is that because of pressure of Security Council documents it may not even be out this week.
2. I have made the strongest possible protests on this constantly to the Economic and Social Council Secretariat. The document has had top priority after the Full Employment report, and yet the obstacles with respect to reproduction seem to be insuperable. During the week that I was away, Miss Mishkin constantly pressed for a statement when the report would be out.
3. I wish to say once more that the delay is in no way our fault. We practically killed ourselves handing the report in on time, in response to the repeated missiles from Yates. After rushing so, it seems very unfair that we shall be again exposed to criticism at the Council meeting for having the documents sent out too late, and possibly having the discussion suffer from statements by delegates ^{Mr. King} who did not have time to read the documents properly.
4. I wish to say that Mrs. Herman and Mr. Messing in the ECOSOC Secretariat have been just as concerned as we are about this delay which lies in reproduction and not in the ECOSOC Secretariat. All the same, since the ECOSOC Secretariat is responsible for the sending out of the documents, may I suggest that the situation regarding reproduction of ECOSOC documents does call for a review. The present position is really outrageous. Surely the commitment on our part to prepare the documents for a certain deadline involves a corresponding commitment of the ECOSOC Secretariat and reproduction units to send out the documents on time. This really becomes a vicious circle. Are we, in the future, to disregard Yates' pleas for timely completion of documents--disregard the six weeks' rule altogether?

UNITED NATIONS • NATIONS UNIES

INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

TO: Mr. A. Messing - Room D-210

FROM: Chi-Yuen Wu - AFE Unit - Room G208
Wu

SUBJECT: Document E/1578

Documentation

46

2 Jan. 1950
~~28 Dec. 1949~~
Date

As requested by you, I am sending you herewith for stencilling our master copy of draft of document E/1578 - "Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East: Action Arising out of Resolutions of the Fifth Session". This draft, prepared by the Division of Economic Stability and Development and the Executive Office of the Department of Economic Affairs, has been approved by Messrs. Caustin, Malinowski and Green.

X Inasmuch as we are clearing the draft through the ECAFE Secretariat, we are waiting for Mr. Schaaf's cable, and as there will probably be additional pages, will you please send the stencil to us for our approval before copies are run off.

Stencilling instructions attached herewith.

Encl.

X The draft has been revised according to ECAFE cable received to-day. Please have the document produced. *Wu*
6 Jan. 1950