

ECONOMIC  
AND  
SOCIAL COUNCILCONSEIL  
ECONOMIQUE  
ET SOCIAL

UNRESTRICTED

E/AC.24/SR.3  
25 February 1948

ORIGINAL : ENGLISH

## COUNCIL COMMITTEE ON MATTERS RELATING TO CO-ORDINATION

## SUMMARY RECORD OF THE THIRD MEETING

Lake Success, New York  
Saturday, 21 February 1948, at 3 p.m.Chairman: Mr. DAVIDSON

(Canada)

Present: Australia

Mr. TANGE

Brazil

Mr. CAMPOS

Canada

Mr. POLLOCK

China

Mr. CHANG

France

Mr. de FOLIN

Netherlands

Mr. de STOPPELAAR

New Zealand

Miss H. N. HAMPTON

Peru

Mr. MONGE

Union of Soviet Socialist

Republics

Mr. CHERNYSHEV

United Kingdom

Mr. PHILLIPS

United States of America

Mr. STINEBOWER

later

Mr. MULLIKEN

Representatives of Specialized Agencies:

International Labour Organization

Mr. JENKS

UNESCO

Mr. ARNALDO

Food and Agriculture Organization

Mr. OLSEN

International Civil Aviation

Organization

Mr. MARLIN

International Bank for Reconstruction

and Development

Mr. LOPEZ-HERRARTE

World Health Organization

Mr. HILL

NOTE: Corrections of this summary record provided for in the rules of procedure should be submitted in writing within the prescribed period to Mr. Delavanay, Director, Editorial Division, Room CC-87, Lake Success. Corrections should be accompanied by or incorporated in a letter written on headed notepaper and enclosed in an envelope marked "Urgent" and bearing the appropriate symbol number.

Secretariat:

Dr. SZE

Secretary of the Committee

DISCUSSION OF UNITED STATES DRAFT RESOLUTION REGARDING RELATIONS WITH  
AND CO-ORDINATION OF SPECIALIZED AGENCIES (document E/647/Rev.1)

The CHAIRMAN asked for discussion of paragraph 1, lines 13  
through 17, on page 3 of document E/647/Rev.1.

Mr. MARLIN (International Civil Aviation Organization) stressed  
the efforts made by ICAO to co-ordinate its programme with those of the  
United Nations Commissions and of other specialized agencies, and wondered  
whether some criticism were implied by the words "and the further steps  
which should be taken to develop effective co-ordination". in the paragraph  
under discussion. ICAO would be glad to know just what objectives were  
contemplated by the resolution.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) assured the representative  
of ICAO that the proposed paragraph did not necessarily imply any criticism  
of the steps taken thus far. It was rather an attempt to ascertain the facts  
and an invitation to the Secretary-General to give his opinion on further  
measures that might be taken. The Economic and Social Council would thus  
be in a position to carry out the responsibility for co-ordination assigned  
it in Chapters IX and X of the Charter. The Council would be derelict in its  
duty if it delegated all of the responsibility to the Secretary-General.

Mr. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom) saw no need for asking for a further  
report on the problem of co-ordination since the Secretary-General, as  
Chairman of the Co-ordination Committee, had already presented two reports  
(document E/614 and E/625) on that subject.

Mr. CHERNYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) felt that the  
paragraph under discussion failed to show clearly the guiding role given

/the United Nations

the United Nations under the Charter in matters of co-ordination. The programmes of the specialized agencies should be made to conform to those of the United Nations and not vice versa.

He also questioned the use of the phrase "the programmes of the United Nations and its subsidiary organs". The problem of co-ordination with specialized agencies did not arise for many of the United Nations organs, such as the Security Council, for example.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) explained that the wording "programmes of the United Nations and its subsidiary organs and specialized agencies" had been taken substantially from the General Assembly resolution 125 (II).

Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) suggested that paragraph 1 of the United States draft resolution should end after the words "specialized agencies" in line 14. There would then be no reference to "further steps toward co-ordination" which involved questions of policy that were the duty of the proposed ad hoc committee rather than of the Secretary-General.

Mr. de FOLIN (France) supported the suggestion of the representative of Canada and agreed that the Co-ordination Committee was not in a position to make recommendations on the policy level. He also pointed out that the Secretary-General, in submitting his report, should fully express his own opinions and not be limited by the views expressed by the representatives of the specialized agencies in the Co-ordination Committee.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States of America) called attention to General Assembly resolution 125 (II) which requested the Council "as a matter of urgency" to consider the "further steps" needed for effective co-ordination of programmes. The United States draft resolution requested a specific report on that one point; it did not ask for a report on everything done in pursuance of the Agreements with the specialized agencies.

/Suggestions made by

Suggestions made by the Secretary-General, including his possible suggestion that no further steps were necessary, might form the framework of the report the Council would have to make to the General Assembly.

Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) explained that the purpose of his proposed amendment was to ensure that the wording of the paragraph under discussion did not give the impression that there would be two groups entrusted with the same task. The Secretary-General should continue the work he had been doing but the proposed ad hoc committee should be responsible for co-ordination at the policy level. Mr. Pollock was willing to alter his proposed amendment so that the paragraph would remain as at present except for the deletion of the words "and the further steps which should be taken."

Mr. CHANG (China) suggested that the proposed ad hoc committee might be given the duty of considering, in consultation with the Secretary-General, what further steps were necessary for the co-ordination of programmes.

In accepting the Chinese suggestion, Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) proposed the deletion of paragraph 1, lines 13 through 17, and the addition in line 50, as point (d) under the terms of reference of the ad hoc committee, of the words "in consultation with the Secretary-General, the further steps which should be taken to develop effective co-ordination of the programmes of the United Nations and its subsidiary organs and the specialized agencies".

Mr. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom) referring both to the point raised by the representative of France that the Secretary-General should express his own opinion and not merely the views of the Co-ordination Committee and to the concern felt by the representative of the United States that the Council should not shirk its responsibilities under the Charter, pointed to lines 323 to 327 in the United Kingdom draft resolution on co-ordination  
/of the activities!

of the activities of the United Nations and the specialized agencies in the economic and social fields (document E/AC.24/2/Rev.1). According to those lines the Council would request the Secretary-General, in transmitting reports to the Council from the Co-ordination Committee and the specialized agencies, to draw its attention to any matters requiring decision or action in connection with its responsibility under Articles 63 and 64 of the Charter.

The United Kingdom delegation felt that the two reports already submitted by the Co-ordination Committee should be studied before other reports were asked for. Thus far there had been no specific criticism to show that the policy of co-ordination was not functioning properly. Until there had been some such criticism, the United Kingdom delegation would vote against a resolution that might lead to a duplication of the work already being done.

Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) thought that even though the Co-ordination Committee might be working satisfactorily at present, the Council had a duty arising from the General Assembly resolution instructing it to give "constant attention" to the "relative priority of proposals". An ad hoc committee such as was being proposed would provide the necessary machinery for taking care of any situation that might arise in the future.

The Committee agreed provisionally to delete paragraph 1 of the United States draft resolution with the understanding that if the suggestion of the United States representative to incorporate the substance of the paragraph into line 50 were not accepted, paragraph 1 would be re-considered.

The CHAIRMAN turned to consideration of paragraph 2, lines 18 to 26.

In reply to a point raised by Mr. MARLIN (ICAO), Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) explained that the reference to the permanent headquarters of specialized agencies applied only to those agencies which as yet had no permanent headquarters.

/Mr. de FOLIN (France)

Mr. de FOLIN (France) observed that the provisional suppression of paragraph 1 asking for a report by the Secretary-General on action taken "in pursuance of the Agreements with the specialized agencies" made a discussion of paragraphs 2 and 3 difficult, as the latter also referred to action taken "in pursuance of the Agreements with the specialized agencies".

Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) suggested that the Committee might meet that difficulty by considering the paragraph dealing with the establishment of an ad hoc committee, lines 46 to 51, thus deciding first on whether or not paragraph 1 should be incorporated into the terms of reference of the proposed ad hoc committee.

Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) supported the proposal of the representative of Canada.

Mr. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom) stressed that there should be no decision on the establishment of an ad hoc committee until the Committee had first examined the material already at its disposal and had determined that there was need for another committee.

Mr. CHANG (China) felt that in view of the General Assembly resolution requesting the Council to give "constant attention" to the problem, it was imperative that there should be a committee to decide what sort of attention was needed and especially to study "the relative priority of proposals" mentioned in the resolution, as well as the "further steps" to be taken. The Co-ordination Committee now in existence deserved commendation, but the members of the Council themselves had a responsibility for carrying out the tasks assigned them both by the General Assembly resolution and the Charter. He urged the Committee to take a decision on the basic question of whether or not to establish an ad hoc committee.

/Mr. CHERNYSHEV (USSR)

Mr. CHERNYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) considered that no decision could be taken regarding the formation of the proposed committee until conclusions had been reached on its functions.

Mr. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom) agreed on the necessity for discussion of the functions of the proposed committee first. The United Kingdom did not necessarily oppose the establishment of an ad hoc committee at a later date, but it did oppose any additional machinery for the period before the next Council.

Mr. CHANG (China) thought that the Committee might examine the questions of the creation of an ad hoc committee and of its functions at the same time, without necessarily attempting to formulate specific terms of reference.

After some discussion, the Committee decided to consider as a whole the paragraph of the United States draft resolution comprising lines 46 through 51.

Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) explained that the United States delegation had introduced its resolution because it considered that the development of regional commissions subsequent to the establishment of the functional commissions had raised a number of problems of relationship between those bodies, which called for examination. The Economic and Social Council might think it well to take some action with reference to the commissions when examining or re-examining its own function with respect to co-ordination. According to their terms of reference, a number of the commissions were given responsibility for a limited measure of co-ordination. The Council had now received a number of reports from various commissions, and was thus in a better position than heretofore to determine its future course of action. Sentence (b) on line 48 was related to the whole co-ordination programme, but the United States delegation would like to have  
/specific decisions

specific decisions of policy on such questions as whether the Commissions might request reports of specialized agencies, and whether the reports from the specialized agencies which are to be submitted annually should be transmitted to the Commissions before the Council itself had acted upon them.

There would not be time during the sixth session of the Economic and Social Council to give adequate consideration to those questions. In the view of the United States delegation, it was imperative for a committee of the Council to meet between the sixth and seventh sessions. Its report would be of great value to the Council in discussing matters of co-ordination during the seventh session.

The United States delegation welcomed the suggestion that certain additional functions should be given to the proposed ad hoc committee, although it had not originally contemplated doing so.

Mr. CHANG (China) considered that the primary objective should be, in accordance with the General Assembly's instructions, to examine proper procedure and methods for the consideration of the relative priority of proposals and the further steps which should be taken to develop effective co-ordination of the programmes of the United Nations and its subsidiary organs on the one hand and the specialized agencies on the other. The task of the ad hoc committee would be : (1) to examine appropriate procedural methods for the consideration of priorities and the co-ordination of programmes; (2) to examine relations between the various bodies.

He suggested that (b) and (c) in lines 48 and 49 might be combined, and that consideration of (a) might be deferred until all the regional commissions had been set up.

Mr. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom) pointed out that the greater part of the Council's work during the past two years had been devoted to organizational matters and the lesser part to matters of substance. The

/Commissions had been



Commissions had been set up after much discussion, first in the Preparatory Commission and then in the Council itself; nuclear Commissions had been set up which had spent time and effort in establishment the Commissions and deciding their terms of reference. He questioned the wisdom of beginning another reorganization when the Commissions had been working for eighteen months or less. The United Kingdom delegation felt strongly that a further period of trial should be allowed them before considering whether any changes should be made in their terms of reference.

The question of the relations between regional and functional commissions had already been raised during the discussion of a New Zealand resolution proposing that the Economic and Employment Commission should make a survey, and the Council had decided by a large majority that to review them would be premature.

He opposed the setting up of an ad hoc committee at the present time.

Mr. CHERNYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) agreed with the United Kingdom representative that there was no necessity to establish an ad hoc committee. The work of the proposed committee would be divided into three parts.

First, it would have the task of examining and probably reviewing relationships between the Commissions. The functional commissions, however, had just begun their work and had not yet proved themselves in practice. Only two of the regional commissions were so far in existence, one was being established and a fourth was in an embryonic stage. The Committee was therefore proposing to reconsider their functions before they were established

Secondly, it was proposed that the Committee should examine the relationships between the Commissions and the specialized agencies. There was no evidence of insufficient or unsatisfactory co-ordination under the agreements approved by the General Assembly; in fact relations were excellent.

/Thirdly, the

Thirdly, the committee was to examine changes in the terms of reference of the commissions which would be required to give effect to its recommendations. In the Second Committee of the General Assembly the United States representative had opposed reviewing the functions and terms of reference of the Commissions of the Economic and Social Council; the position had not changed since then. The terms of reference of the Commissions were the fruit of lengthy studies and it had not been shown that any of them were inappropriate.

He would vote against the United States proposal.

Mr. CAMPOS (Brazil) stated that in the opinion of his delegation the question whether the suggestion contained in (a) was timely depended on how it was interpreted. If the task of the ad hoc committee would be an objective study of relations between the commissions, the arguments of the representatives of the United Kingdom and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics were overwhelming. An investigation of the pattern of relationships that should prevail, however, would not perhaps be premature.

Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) had two observations to make. First, the General Assembly had attached some importance to the question and had requested the Council to consider it as a matter of urgency. Secondly, as pointed out by the United States representative, neither at the present nor any other session would the Committee have time to consider all the details of that complex question. While bearing in mind the objections of the United Kingdom and USSR delegations, the Committee could at least consider how the problem should be approached, within the limits of already existing relations. The problem extended beyond the field with which the Secretary-General and the Committee of experts were competent to deal.

He would suggest that, without going into the detailed question of establishing priorities, the ad hoc committee should be asked to consider

/whether and how

whether and how priorities should be dealt with. The terms of reference could be discussed later but the pattern should be decided now.

Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) agreed with the Chinese representative that a number of serious and important questions relating to co-ordination were the responsibility of the Council. Those questions could not be examined as thoroughly as they deserved during sessions. It had been stated that there was no evidence of a problem in the relations between the Commissions. The United States delegation felt symptoms of difficulty should be taken in hand before they went too far. His object was the fullest utilization of the Commissions so that the organization of the Council should be the most effective possible. No complete change in the terms of reference of the Commissions was contemplated; merely a re-examination of the relations between them. For example, he had in mind the question as to whether agencies could introduce resolutions directly at meetings of commissions.

Mr. TANGE (Australia) agreed with the United Kingdom and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in opposing the establishment of an ad hoc committee, at least for the purposes set forth in the United States draft resolution.

He had noted the stress laid by the Chinese representative on the role of the ad hoc committee in studying the future organization of co-ordination. The United Nations had been discussing procedure for undertaking its co-ordinating role ever since the Executive Committee started work in August 1945. The Economic and Social Council would do better if it submitted to the General Assembly, not recommendations as to methods but reports on substantial results of co-ordination.

He agreed with those speakers who had questioned the wisdom of adopting point (a). It would be premature to probe into relations between Commissions, some of which had scarcely begun to operate.

/With reference to

With reference to point (b), he was not clear whether the United States delegation desired an investigation into the respective constitutions of the commissions or into their activities. In the former case, he did not see that much would be gained by it; in the latter, answers could be obtained to the questions raised by the United States representative without the necessity for an exhaustive enquiry between sessions.

With regard to (c), as the position stood there was a flow of material from the Co-ordination Committee to the Economic and Social Council, which took decisions on problems of co-ordination. His delegation considered that the Secretary-General should be requested to make recommendations to the Council on means of improving co-ordination.

In the opinion of the Australian delegation, the Council would be adequately served if material came direct from the Secretary-General and the Co-ordination Committee. Moreover, more detailed work would be done by the Secretary-General than by a committee composed of members of the Council.

Mr. de FOLIN (France) explained that his delegation felt it would be premature to review the relations between the regional and the functional commissions, and reserved its position in the matter.

He suggested that the point concerning the co-ordination of functions with the specialized agencies should be more clearly stated in the proposed terms of reference of the ad hoc committee.

Mr. CHANG (China) expressed the opinion that the very fact that the Council Committee had spent three days in discussing the matter without being able to come to a decision demonstrated the need of an ad hoc committee to consider it at leisure between sessions. He was opposed to the taking of a vote at once.

Mr. MULLIKEN (USA)

Mr. MULLIKEN (United States of America) moved the following alternative to the paragraph constituting lines 46 to 51 of the United States draft resolution:

"RESOLVED to establish an ad hoc committee of X members to examine the further steps which should be taken to develop effective co-ordination of the programmes of the United Nations and its subsidiary organs and the specialized agencies. That language would not preclude the examination by the Council Committee of problems indicated in points (a), (b) and (c)."

Mr. PHILLIPS (United Kingdom) found the new wording even more difficult to accept than the original draft resolution, because it would give the proposed body imprecise terms of reference.

With reference to point (b) of the original resolution, he pointed out that the matter of the relations between the Commissions and the specialized agencies figured in the agreements between the United Nations and the agencies. In the opinion of the United Kingdom delegation the existing arrangement had worked very well.

With regard to (c), it had been argued that the terms of reference of the Commissions as a whole might not be involved, but once the process of making alterations was put in motion it was difficult to stop.

With reference to (d), the United Kingdom delegation felt that in setting up the proposed committee the Council would be in danger of engaging in the very overlapping of activities and duplication of effort which it was instructed by the General Assembly to avoid. He agreed with the Australian representative that the role of the Secretary-General should be developed, and would support any suggestion to that end.

The existing bodies were doing effective work, and to set up an additional organ might merely weaken them.

/Mr. POLLOCK (Canada)

Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) suggested adding to the new paragraph proposed by the United States representative the words: "taking into specific consideration the views expressed on these questions before the Committee of the Council". Each member of the Committee might make a statement of his views, which the ad hoc committee would take into account.

Mr. CHANG (China) emphasized that the General Assembly resolution requested the Council "to give constant attention to the factor of the relative priority of proposals..." The Council would be failing in its duty if it handed the matter over to the Secretary-General. He would be willing to pare down the terms of reference of the ad hoc committee, on condition that some body of representatives was established to study the problem.

Mr. CHERNYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) saw no reason for enquiring into or reviewing relationships until they had proved satisfactory.

With reference to the rights of the specialized agencies, they were clearly set forth in the agreements between the United Nations and the agencies, and the proposal would merely create additional work for members.

Mr. CHANG (China) would accept the United States amendment in principle, while not committing himself to the exact text.

He suggested that the Chairman should call together a small group to discuss the matter informally and try to reach a compromise.

The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.