



CONTENTS

Work of the Council in 1955:

Page

- (a) Basic programme for 1955: allocation of items to sessions 275

President: Mr. Juan I. COOKE (Argentina).

Present:

The representatives of the following countries: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Egypt, France, India, Norway, Pakistan, Turkey, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

Observers from the following countries: Dominican Republic, Iran, Netherlands.

The representatives of the following specialized agencies: International Labour Organisation, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, International Monetary Fund, World Health Organization.

Work of the Council in 1955:

- (a) **Basic programme for 1955: allocation of items to sessions (E/2663, E/2667, E/L.646, E/L.647 and Corr.1)**

[Agenda item 35]

1. The PRESIDENT said that the draft basic programme for 1955 was set out in document E/L.647 and Corr.1 in the form of two lists of items for the nineteenth and twentieth sessions respectively. In compiling the lists the Secretariat had taken into account the Council's instructions in resolution 557 (XVIII). In document E/L.646 the Secretariat had drawn the Council's attention to the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly at its ninth session, which referred to the Council's programme of work.

2. With regard to the General Assembly's resolutions on the question of the establishment of a special United Nations fund for economic development (resolution 822 (IX)) and on the question of the establishment of an international finance corporation (resolution 823 (IX)), the President drew attention to the suggestions made by the Secretary-General in the relevant part of his note (E/L.646) under points (I) vi and vii. Whereas the Council had decided to deal with economic development at its nineteenth session, the General Assembly had requested that the two reports on those items should be considered by the Council at its twentieth session. It was suggested that the two items should be combined under the heading "Financing of economic development". The two other suggestions referred respectively to the report to be submitted by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development under Council resolution 532 B (XVIII) and

the availability to the Council of the first issue of the annual report on the internal flow of private capital to be prepared under General Assembly resolution 824 (IX).

3. The Council had decided to include the reports of the regional economic commissions in its discussion of item 2 of the agenda for the twentieth session, but had been unable to set a date for the session of the Economic Commission for Latin America. Following negotiations between the Executive Secretary of ECLA and the Colombian Government, which had invited the Commission to meet at Bogotá in 1955, it had proved impossible to hold the session in time for the Commission to prepare a report for the Council's twentieth session. The Interim Committee on Programme of Conferences had decided that the Commission should meet on 29 August 1955 and that the Commission's Committee of the Whole should meet not later than the beginning of May, so that its report could be submitted to the Council at its twentieth session.

4. Mr. KING (United States of America) drew attention to the United States communication (E/2667) proposing the inclusion of an item entitled "Development of international travel, its present increasing volume and future prospects" in the agenda of the nineteenth session. The main purpose of the proposal was to have the economic aspects of travel discussed at a high international level. His delegation would prepare a paper on the subject for the nineteenth session. The proposal referred to the broad economic aspects of international travel and was not intended to encroach on the province of the Transport and Communications Commission.

5. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) supported the United States proposal, explaining that his support should not be taken as prejudging the position of his delegation in the discussion of the substance of the item.

6. Mr. CAFIERO (Argentina) asked whether the first report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions¹ was to be included in the discussion of item 6 (Technical assistance) at the twentieth session.

7. Mr. VAKIL (Secretary of the Council) replied that General Assembly resolution 831 (IX) would be included in the documentation before the Council under item 6 (Technical assistance) and that section D of that resolution contained a request to the Council on that subject.

8. Mr. RIBAS (Cuba) doubted whether there would be enough time between the end of the forthcoming session of the Commission on the Status of Women and the resumed nineteenth session of the Council for the Commission's report to be drafted, printed, translated and distributed and for the delegations concerned to consult their Governments.

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Ninth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 45, document A/2661.

9. Mr. VAKIL (Secretary of the Council) remarked that, as indicated in paragraph 2 of the draft programme (E/L.647) the Council might have to waive the "six-weeks rule" in that specific case.

10. Mr. MEADE (United Kingdom) suggested that item 11 (Report of the Commission on the Status of Women) should remain on the draft list for the resumed nineteenth session. If delegations were not ready to discuss it at the resumed nineteenth session, it could be postponed.

11. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) proposed that the item should be postponed until the twentieth session.

12. Mr. CAFIERO (Argentina) and Mr. RAMADAN (Egypt) agreed with the Venezuelan representative.

13. Mr. KING (United States of America) felt that item 11 could be left on the agenda of the resumed nineteenth session, on the understanding that it could be postponed at that time should the Commission's report not be available in time.

14. Mr. RIBAS (Cuba) and Mr. MEADE (United Kingdom) supported the United States view.

15. Miss BERNARDINO (Observer for the Dominican Republic), speaking as the Chairman of the Commission on the Status of Women, said she felt that it would be premature to discuss the Commission's report at the spring session of the Council, particularly as it included such important subjects as the draft convention on the nationality of married women. It would be wiser to postpone the item until the twentieth session.

16. Mr. STANOVNIK (Yugoslavia) felt that the Council should adhere to the arrangements specified in resolution 557 B II (XVIII), and that item 11 should therefore be kept on the draft list for the nineteenth session. He hoped that the Venezuelan representative would not press his proposal.

17. Sir Douglas COPLAND (Australia) agreed with the Yugoslav representative.

18. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) saw no reason for not postponing the item until the twentieth session.

19. The PRESIDENT put the Venezuelan proposal to the vote.

The proposal was adopted by 8 votes to 7, with 3 abstentions.

20. Mr. MEADE (United Kingdom) proposed that consideration of item 9 (Wood-pulp and paper) of the draft list for the nineteenth session should be postponed until the resumed nineteenth session.

It was so decided.

21. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) reminded the Council that at its 826th meeting it had decided, on a motion by the United Kingdom, to postpone indefinitely discussion on a USSR draft resolution (E/L.634)² under which Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania would be admitted to membership in the Economic Commission for Europe. The Soviet proposal was based on the following considerations: that the four countries in question were already participating actively in the work of ECE under paragraph 8 of the Commission's terms of reference;³ that they enjoyed normal economic and cultural relations

with other European countries; that their international trade was increasing; and that their membership would make ECE more fully representative and enable it to make a greater contribution to the solution of European economic problems and the strengthening of economic co-operation between the European peoples.

22. The proposal had won considerable support at the Council's eighteenth session and had been postponed on purely procedural grounds. He therefore asked for an assurance that discussion of it would be resumed at the Council's nineteenth or twentieth session.

23. The PRESIDENT replied that the USSR draft resolution had not been included as a separate item in the draft list for either of those sessions. If, however, it was referred to in the annual report of the Economic Commission for Europe, which was listed in paragraph (c) under item 2 in the preliminary annotations to the draft list of items for the twentieth session (E/L.647), it would doubtless be discussed under item 2 (World economic situation).

24. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that, in order to obviate the procedural difficulties which might recur if the ECE report contained no mention of the USSR draft resolution, an additional sub-paragraph concerning the admission of Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania to ECE should be added to paragraph (c) under item 2 in the preliminary annotations to the draft list for the twentieth session.

25. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) reserved his delegation's right, when item 26 (Consideration of the provisional agenda for the twentieth session and establishment of dates for opening debate on items) of the draft list came before the Council at its nineteenth session, to introduce a proposal that the admission of Spain to membership of the Economic Commission for Latin America should be considered at the twentieth session.

26. Mr. RIBAS (Cuba) said that his delegation favoured the admission of Spain to ECLA and also considered that that country should become a member of ECE.

27. Mr. KING (United States of America) said that he would support the USSR proposal if the USSR representative would accept the elimination of any reference to specific countries. The reference would then be only to "the question of new membership in the Economic Commission for Europe", and would thus meet the wishes of the Venezuelan and Cuban delegations as well as that of the Soviet Union.

28. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) replied that the USSR draft resolution, concerning four specific countries, was already before the Council, and that he would not be justified in accepting any wording less explicit than that used in his proposal.

29. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) read an extract from the summary record of the 826th meeting in confirmation of the Soviet representative's contention that the USSR draft resolution (E/L.634) was still before the Council. He supported the addition of a sub-paragraph to paragraph (c) under item 2 in the preliminary annotations, in the form proposed by the Soviet Union.

30. Mr. MIR KHAN (Pakistan) felt that the wording proposed by the United States representative was the more appropriate because it was the more comprehensive.

31. Mr. RIBAS (Cuba) agreed with the Pakistan representative. Had the United States representative

² See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Eighteenth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 5.

³ *Ibid.*, *Thirteenth Session, Supplement No. 1*, appendix II.

not intervened he would have proposed the addition of Spain to the countries mentioned in the USSR proposal. In the circumstances he would support the United States wording.

32. In reply to a question from Mr. STANOVNIK (Yugoslavia), Mr. KING (United States of America) explained that the wording he had proposed had not been intended to provide for discussion of membership of the regional economic commissions in general. In view of the observations of the Venezuelan and Cuban representatives, he withdrew his proposal and would be prepared to support the addition of Spain to the countries mentioned in the USSR proposal.

33. Mr. CAFIERO (Argentina), supported by Mr. MEADE (United Kingdom), Mr. KING (United States of America), Mr. WOULBROUN (Belgium), Mr. MIR KHAN (Pakistan) and Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela), proposed the addition of the following words at the end of paragraph (c) under item 2 in the preliminary annotations to the draft list of items for the twentieth session: "admission of new members, including those mentioned in the draft resolution in document E/L.634;".

34. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) withdrew his proposal and accepted that of Argentina.

35. Mr. RIBAS (Cuba) supported the Argentine proposal. When the Council considered at its nineteenth session, the provisional agenda for the twentieth session, it should take into account the observations made during the current discussion.

The Argentine proposal was adopted.

36. Mr. RIBAS (Cuba) said that the question of the admission of Spain to membership in ECLA should be dealt with at the twentieth session, when the annual report of that Commission was discussed under item 2, as indicated in paragraph (e) of the annotations under that item.

37. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that a new sub-item entitled "Consideration of the results of the implementation of Economic and Social Council resolution 277 (X) regarding violations of trade-union rights" should be added to the proposed item 13 on the list of items for the nineteenth session (Allegations regarding infringements of trade-union rights). The question had already been discussed in the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations on 6 November 1954⁴ and both the representative of the World Federation of Trade Unions, which had originally proposed the new item, and the representative of the Soviet Union in that Committee had given detailed reasons why it should be included. The main reason was that the International Labour Organisation had completely failed in its task of dealing with complaints about violations of trade-union rights.

38. Mr. MEADE (United Kingdom), speaking as Chairman of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, said that the Committee had considered the memorandum submitted by the World Federation of Trade Unions (E/C.2/R.20) and had heard a representative of that organization. By a vote of 6 to 1 the Committee had decided not to request the Secretary-General to include the proposed item in the provisional agenda of the Council. According to the rules of procedure, that decision was final and the

Council was therefore bound to reject the request of the World Federation of Trade Unions.

39. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) expressed surprise that the United Kingdom representative had taken it upon himself to speak on behalf of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations when in fact he had not been authorized to do so. The United Kingdom representative's reference to the rules of procedure was irrelevant since it was the Soviet Union delegation which was proposing the item originally proposed by the World Federation of Trade Unions.

40. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) whole-heartedly supported the USSR proposal.

41. Mr. TUNCEL (Turkey) opposed the Soviet representative's allegations that the ILO had failed to deal with complaints about violations of trade-union rights. On the contrary, the reports of that body showed that it had taken very effective action. He would oppose the Soviet Union proposal to include a new sub-item under item 13.

42. Mr. KING (United States of America) thought the remarks of the Soviet representative with reference to the United Kingdom representative had been unfortunate. In his original statement the USSR representative had not made it clear whether it was the Soviet Union or the WFTU which was proposing the new item and it had been perfectly in order for the United Kingdom representative to report the facts as they had occurred in the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations.

43. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) said that, having voted against the inclusion of the item in the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, he would follow the same course in the Council. There was no point in the Council's dealing with a matter which was within the special competence of the ILO.

44. Mr. MEADE (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had voted against the inclusion of the item in the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations and would do the same in the Council.

45. The CHAIRMAN put the Soviet Union proposal to the vote.

The proposal was rejected by 11 votes to 2, with 5 abstentions.

46. Mr. STANOVNIK (Yugoslavia) said that he had abstained since the annotation concerning item 13⁵ in the draft programme (E/L.647 and Corr.1) made it quite clear that the Council would take into account resolution 277 (X) in its discussion of allegations regarding infringements of trade-union rights. There was therefore no point in adding the sub-item proposed by the Soviet representative. Every delegation could make comments on the work of the ILO when item 13 was discussed.

47. Mr. EPINAT (France) said that he had abstained because the Council's discussion of item 13 would include a reference to the results of the implementation of resolution 277 (X).

⁵ The annotation concerning item 13 reads as follows:

In conformity with Council resolutions 277 (X), 351 (XII) and 474 (XV), the Secretary-General will put before the Council allegations regarding infringements of trade-union rights relating to States not members of the International Labour Organisation which are received by him before 8 February 1955, and any observations by Governments on allegations transmitted to them.

⁴ See E/C.2/SR.147.

48. Mr. MEADE (United Kingdom) proposed that item 8 (Restrictive business practices), which was on the list for the main part of the nineteenth session, should be taken up at the resumed nineteenth session as the agenda for the nineteenth session was already very heavy.

49. Mr. EPINAT (France) proposed that item 13 should also be taken up at the resumed nineteenth session rather than at the first part of the nineteenth session in order that representatives might have more time to study that important item.

It was so agreed.

50. Mr. MEADE (United Kingdom) proposed that item 20 (Relief and rehabilitation of Korea) in the draft list of items for the nineteenth session, which had been discussed recently in the Second Committee of the General Assembly⁶, should be taken up at the resumed nineteenth session of the Council.

It was so agreed.

The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.

⁶ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Ninth Session, Second Committee, 740th to 742nd meetings.*