

ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCILCONSEIL
ECONOMIQUE
ET SOCIAL

UNRESTRICTED

E/AC.24/SR.41

4 August 1949.

Dual DistributionECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCILNinth SessionCO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FORTY-FIRST MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Friday, 29 July 1949 at 10.30 a.m.

Contents:

RELATIONS WITH AND CO-ORDINATION OF SPECIALIZED
AGENCIES - CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT REPORT (Item
34 of the Council Agenda) (Resumed from the
38th meeting) pages 3 - 13

Present:

Chairman: Mr. PLIMSOLL

Members:

Belgium	Baron de KERCHOVE d' EXAERDE
Brazil	Mr. MACHADO
Byelorussian SSR	Mr. AGAPOV
Chile	Mr. RODRIGUEZ
China	Mr. TSAO
Denmark	Mr. DAHLGAARD
France	Mr. AMANRICH
India	Mr. SEN
New Zealand	Miss HAMPTON
Poland	Miss CZARKO
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. BORISOV
United Kingdom	Miss SALT
United States of America	Mr. STINEBOWER
Venezuela	Mr. NASS

Representatives of Specialized Agencies:

International Labour Organization	Mr. JENKS Mr. EVANS
Food and Agriculture Organization	Mr. OLSEN
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization	Mr. TERENCE
Universal Postal Union	Mr. RADICE
World Health Organization	Dr. HAFEZI
International Refugee Organization	Miss BAVERSTOCK

Secretariat:

Mr. Martin Hill	Director of Co-ordination for Specialized Agencies and for Economic and Social Matters
Mr. Perez Guerrero	Adviser on co-ordination
Mr. Sze	Secretary to the Committee

RELATIONS WITH AND CO-ORDINATION OF SPECIALIZED AGENCIES -
CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT REPORT (Item 34 of the Council Agenda)
(Document E/AC.24/W.26).

The CHAIRMAN invited discussion of the draft report of the Co-ordination Committee (Document E/AC.24/W.26).

Preamble.

Following a proposal by the French representative, the Committee agreed to append a footnote to page 1 giving the reference numbers of all the summary records of the committee's meetings throughout the ninth session.

The Committee unanimously adopted the preamble.

I. Programme Co-Ordination.

1. Methods of Work.

Section 1 was adopted without comment.

2. Priorities.

Section 2 had already been adopted by the Committee at its 38th meeting.

3. Topics selected for study.

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) asked whether the question covered by the second paragraph (Technical Assistance for Economic Development) would eventually be considered by the Co-ordination Committee.

The CHAIRMAN replied that that topic would not be considered by the Co-ordination Committee at the present session unless the Council expressly wished it.

Mr. SEN (India) proposed that a sentence be added to the paragraph on Housing to the effect that the Co-ordination Committee had felt that the Social Commission should pay urgent attention to this problem.

The CHAIRMAN, supported by the United Kingdom representative, said the Social Commission's priorities had already been laid down, and that the addition proposed by the Indian representative was therefore unnecessary.

Mr. BORISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought the paragraph on Housing should be left as it stood, since the Social Committee had not studied the question in any great detail.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) proposed that the word "organizational" be substituted for the word "substantive" in the last sentence of the paragraph on Housing since it was the organizational aspects of the question which the Committee had in fact discussed.

Miss SALT (United Kingdom) supported the United States amendment, and pointed out that the Co-ordination Committee did not have complete knowledge of the Social Committee's programme and, therefore, could not lay down priorities for it.

Mr. SEN (India) replied that the report of the Committee was a factual record, and should therefore include a reference to the feeling of the Committee that the question of Housing should be given urgent consideration by the Social Commission. However, in view of the opposition to his proposal he would not press it.

The Committee unanimously adopted the paragraph on Housing as amended by the United States proposal.

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) proposed the addition of a sentence to the paragraph on Fellowships, stating that in preparing his report, the Secretary-General should bear in mind the proposed activities in the field of technical assistance, since fellowships and technical assistance were closely related problems.

The CHAIRMAN replied that the point raised by the Brazilian representative was already covered by the statement in the second paragraph of Section 3, to the effect that all the recommendations of the Committee were subject to such decisions in regard to technical assistance as might be made by the Council or the General Assembly.

Miss HAMPTON (New Zealand) proposed the deletion from the last sentence of the following words: "which would include the results of further study of a possible joint fellowship programme, including the establishment of a Fellowship Board, of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies", as they did not truly reflect the feeling of the Committee.

On being put to the vote, the New Zealand amendment was adopted by 10 votes to 4.

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) said that although the addition he had suggested was fully substantiated by the summary record of the discussion on fellowships, he would not press it in view of the New Zealand amendment.

The Committee adopted unanimously Section 3 subject to the above amendments.

II. Administrative and Budgetary Co-ordination.

Mr. SEN (India) thought the text of the second paragraph did not go far enough. The Committee had not only discussed various aspects of the problems of geographical distribution of staff, but had studied in some detail how a more equitable distribution might be achieved. He proposed, therefore, that the second sentence of the second paragraph be reworded to read as follows: "It discussed how best to achieve a more equitable geographical distribution of staff in the United Nations and the specialized agencies and agreed with the points raised"

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) had no objection to the Indian amendment, although he considered the text as it stood accurately reflected the feeling of the Committee.

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil), while not opposing the Indian amendment, thought some mention should be made in the second paragraph of the policy which the Committee had apparently agreed on, of instructing the Secretary-General and the specialized agencies to put forward concrete proposals in respect of geographical distribution of staff. Those proposals could then be placed before the fourth session of the General Assembly.

The CHAIRMAN replied that the point raised by the Brazilian representative was already covered, since the first paragraph of Section II stated that fuller details of the various aspects of administrative and budgetary co-ordination would be placed before the Assembly's fourth session.

On being put to the vote, the Indian amendment was adopted by 5 votes to 2 with 7 abstentions.

The Committee unanimously adopted Chapter II subject to the above amendments.

III. Regional Co-ordination.

Miss SALT (United Kingdom) proposed first, that it be made clear that the regional offices referred to were permanent ones, since many temporary offices had been set up in various countries to deal with a particular task, and, secondly, that the words "full and detailed" be deleted from the last sentence, since the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination should be allowed to use its own discretion as to the amount of information which it supplied.

Mr. SEN (India) said the principle laid down in Chapter III should apply to all offices, whether temporary or permanent, since offices might remain "temporary" for a considerable time. The Office of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, which had been established temporarily at Shanghai, and had now been moved to Bangkok, provided an example of that tendency. He proposed therefore the addition of a sentence stating that the principles outlined should also apply to all temporary offices.

Miss SALT (United Kingdom) thought the addition of a sentence stating that the Committee wished its recommendations to apply to permanent or semi-permanent offices should meet the Indian representative's view.

The CHAIRMAN proposed, and the Committee unanimously approved, the following text for the additional sentence: "These principles apply in particular to permanent offices or offices which are likely to remain in existence for some time."

Miss HAMPTON (New Zealand) proposed that in each case the term "regional offices" should read "regional or branch offices" since that was the appellation used by certain specialized agencies.

On being put to the vote, the New Zealand amendment was adopted by 3 votes to 1 with 9 abstentions.

Mr. TSAO (China), after approving the spirit of the second United Kingdom amendment to delete the words "full and detailed" from the last sentence, pointed out that in practice the Committee could well request full information from the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination; but to ask for detailed information might perhaps be going a little far. He would therefore propose the omission merely of the words "and detailed".

On being put to the vote, the United Kingdom amendment to delete the words "full and detailed" from the last sentence of Chapter III was rejected by 8 votes to 3 with 2 abstentions.

The Chinese amendment to delete the words "and detailed" from the last sentence of Chapter III was adopted by 5 votes to 2 with 7 abstentions.

The Committee unanimously adopted Chapter III, subject to the above amendments.

IV. Processes of Co-ordination

1. Number of Co-ordinating Bodies

Section 1 was adopted without comment.

2. Form of Report of Administrative Committee on Co-ordination

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the words "the difficulties and disagreements", in line 5 be replaced by the words "any difficulties being encountered", since the text as it stood gave a wrong impression by suggesting that the Committee desired all disagreements to be recorded; in fact it was only interested in important unsolved substantive disagreements.

Mr. SEN (India) agreed, and felt that the words "as well as the positive aspects of its work" should be replaced by the words "as well as its positive achievements".

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) supported the Indian amendment, since the Council only desired to be informed when deadlocks were reached.

Section 2 was unanimously adopted as amended by the proposals of the Chairman and the Indian representative.

3. Consultation between the Council and Specialized Agencies.

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) said that when it was found impossible to reach agreement in the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination,

representatives of the Governing Bodies of specialized agencies should be invited to the Council table.

Mr. SEH (India) recalled that the Brazilian representative had already raised that point, and that the Committee had not entirely agreed with his view. However, the last sentence might be amended to read "The Committee recommends that the specialized agencies be informed of the Council's readiness to discuss with duly empowered representatives any particular difficulties which the Administrative Committee on Coordination might report".

Section 3 was unanimously adopted as amended by the Indian representative's

4. Consideration of Reports of Specialized Agencies.

Section 4 was adopted without comment.

5. Documentation.

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) suggested that instructions to the Secretariat as to the form of the revised Catalogue of Economic and Social Projects should not be too rigid.

Mr. HILL, Director of Co-ordination for Specialized Agencies and for Economic and Social Matters, thanked the Brazilian representative for his suggestion, and hoped that the Committee would allow the Secretary-General some latitude in the matter. The Secretariat hoped to be able to arrange the projects under broad subject headings, but after preliminary consultation with agencies supplying the information it feared that it might be found too difficult to modify the presentation in that way. He would therefore suggest that the Committee agree to delete the end of the first paragraph from the words "which should be modified in form....", on the understanding that the Secretariat would as far as possible give effect to the wishes of the Committee, the methods to be chosen, however, being left to the discretion of the Secretariat.

Mr. AMARICH (France) supported the Brazilian representative's views and approved the proposal of the representative of the Secretary-General.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) proposed that the second sentence be retained, but be slightly modified to read as follows: "The Committee recommends that the Comparative Review be discontinued in its present form and instead be merged into the Catalogue of Economic and Social Projects, with a fuller index and the necessary cross references".

Miss HAMPTON (New Zealand) was anxious that the Catalogue should be drawn up on a subject basis, to facilitate comparison of the activities undertaken by specialized agencies. The precise projects of each specialized agency in any given field would thus be classified. That was done in the Comparative Review, and she would be opposed to the Catalogue's taking a different form.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the wording of the suggested amendment left it to the Secretary-General to decide whether the classification should be on a subject basis or by specialized agencies.

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) considered that the instructions should be left somewhat vague. The summary records of the Committee's discussion would provide an adequate guide for the Secretary-General as to the wishes of the Committee in the matter. He agreed with the New Zealand representative that the purpose of the catalogue was to facilitate consideration of the problems of co-ordination. Classification by subjects was therefore important. The Secretariat should bear that in mind, or the document would not answer to the requirements of the Committee.

Mr. SEN (India) stated that at an earlier stage he had been in agreement with the New Zealand representative. However, in view of the difficulties pointed out by the Secretariat, he felt the latter should be given some latitude in the arrangement of the material.

Mr. HILL, Director of Co-ordination for Specialized Agencies and for Economic and Social Affairs, said that the Secretariat expected to be able to carry out the wishes of the Committee. It intended to insert a new analytical section in the form of an index, grouping under broad subject headings all specialized agency projects. Full details under each item, however, would continue to be arranged on an agency basis.

The United States proposal to substitute the words "with a fuller index and the necessary cross references" for the words "which should be modified in form so as to be on a subject basis, with a fuller index, in which the projects would be classified according to the agencies undertaking them, and with necessary cross references.", was adopted by 9 votes to 1 with 4 abstentions.

Section 5 as amended was unanimously adopted.

6. Observations on Reports of Specialized Agencies

Section 6 was adopted without comment.

7. Headquarters of Specialized Agencies

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) asked that the names of countries participating in the roll call vote referred to in line 3 on page 12 of the Report be enumerated in a footnote, as was the usual practice.

The Committee unanimously agreed to the request of the representative of Brazil.

Section 7 was unanimously adopted.

8. Inter-agency Agreements

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) pointed out that in view of the words "agreements concluded or contemplated between specialized agencies" in the fourth line, the words "agreements and" should be inserted after the words "nature and scope of" in line 16, to ensure consistency.

It was so agreed.

Section 8 as amended was unanimously adopted.

9. Review of Agreements

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) pointed out that there appeared to be a contradiction between Chapter V and Section 4 of Chapter IV (page 10). The latter contained a suggestion that the Committee should consider the reports of specialized agencies both from the point of view of substance and from that of co-ordination. The former proposed that no action should be taken on agreements with specialized agencies (Draft Resolution C, page 14, of Document E/AC.24/W.26). He wished to be informed as to whether,

in fact, the Council and its committees were empowered to make substantive recommendations concerning the activities of specialized agencies, or whether the Council could only confine itself to what had become its usual practice, namely, that of simply taking note of their reports.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that there was a difference between the action taken on agreements with specialized agencies, and that taken on their reports. He did not see any inconsistency between Chapter V, which dealt with the former, and Section 4 of Chapter IV, which dealt with the latter.

Mr. AMANRICH (France) thought that the following reply could be made. Document E/1317 (Chapter II, Section F, pages 37-39) dealt with the question of the recommendations which the United Nations could make to the specialized agencies. The text of that section showed that recommendations could be made, within the framework of the agreements.

He therefore considered that there was no contradiction between paragraph 4 of Chapter IV (Document E/AC.24/W.26, page 10) and the text which the Committee was examining. There was thus no necessity to amend the text.

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) asked whether he was correct in interpreting the French representative's remarks as meaning that the United Nations was competent to discuss the work of specialized agencies substantively.

The CHAIRMAN replied that there was no doubt that it was competent to do so, and that the United Nations could make recommendations in accordance with the provisions of the agreement with each specialized agency.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) suggested that the last sentence of the second paragraph of Chapter V might be amended to read: "The Committee recommended that no action be taken". That version would more truly reflect the position than did the original text,

The United States amendment to the second paragraph of Chapter V was unanimously adopted.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America), referring to the third paragraph of Chapter V, recalled the difficulty arising out of minor discrepancies between the English and French texts of Article XXII of the United Nations Agreement with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, and thought that the meaning of the whole paragraph would be made clear if, after the words "coming into force", the following words were inserted: "revision of the agreement would not be mandatory although".

The United States amendment to the third paragraph of Chapter V was unanimously adopted.

Mr. BORISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) agreed with the United States representative that the third paragraph was not clear as it stood, and considered that the Secretary-General's interpretation of Article XXII, referred to in the last sentence, should be quoted in full. That would be preferable to the existing brief footnote reference.

Mr. SEN (India) agreed with the Soviet Union representative that it should be made perfectly clear by direct quotation of the Secretary-General's interpretation, that it referred only to the question of review, and revision on which differences of opinion had arisen.

Mr. AMANRICH (France) proposed that the Committee insert in the report the footnotes included in Document E/1348.

The proposal of the Soviet Union representative was unanimously adopted in the form suggested by the French representative.

Chapter V as amended was unanimously adopted.

VI. Draft Resolutions.

Draft Resolution A.

Draft Resolution A was adopted without comment.

Draft Resolution B.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that draft resolution B was necessary owing to the fact that a previous resolution of the Council had been amended by a decision of the Committee.

Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) asked whether the information provided for would relate to personnel of the regional economic commissions and of the advisory social welfare services as well as of the Economic and Social Departments of the Secretariat.

The CHAIRMAN replied in the affirmative, in so far as it would include the staff of regional commissions.

Draft resolution B was unanimously adopted.

Draft Resolution C.

The CHAIRMAN recalled that draft resolution C had already been adopted by the Council and, therefore, required no further action by the Committee.

He announced that the representative of the International Labour Organization had asked to be allowed to make a statement.

M. JENKS (International Labour Organization), thanking the Committee for affording him an opportunity of speaking, expressed his regret at having been detained in another committee during the discussion of Chapter II (Regional Co-ordination). When the subject had been considered at an earlier stage, he had, on behalf of his Organization, recorded its views that the recommendations, if they were intended to cover branch as well as regional offices, went further than was either necessary or wise. The recommendations would be brought to the attention of the Governing Body of the International Labour Organization, but he reserved its position on the matter.

Mr. AMANRICH (France) drew attention to certain inaccuracies in the French text of the draft report.

The CHAIRMAN replied that the Secretariat would consult the French delegation on such inaccuracies before the Report was transmitted to the Council.

The Report of the Co-ordination Committee (Document E/AC.24/W.26), as amended, was then put to the vote, and adopted for transmission to the Council by 11 votes to 0 with 3 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.