

ECONOMIC  
AND  
SOCIAL COUNCILCONSEIL  
ECONOMIQUE  
ET SOCIALE/C.3/SR/8  
16 July 1948  
ORIGINAL: ENGLISHDual distribution for Council Members

## ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

## SEVENTH SESSION

AGENDA COMMITTEE

## SUMMARY RECORD OF THE EIGHTH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,  
Friday, 16 July 1948 at 11 a.m.

## CHAIRMAN:

Dr. Charles MALIK (Lebanon)  
President of the CouncilPresent:First Vice-President  
of the Council:

Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile)

Second Vice-President  
of the Council:

Mr. KAMINSKY (Byelorussian SSR)

Netherlands

Mr. PATIJN

New Zealand

Mr. THORN

Secretariat:

Mr. LAUGIER

Assistant Secretary General for  
Social Affairs.

Mr. YATES

Secretary of the Council.

DISCUSSION ON THE PROVISIONAL AGENDA FOR THE SEVENTH  
SESSION OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (Doc. E/8/30)  
(Continued)

The CHAIRMAN welcomed the Second Vice-President of the Council. He understood that the arrival of the First Vice-President would not be long delayed. The Committee should now, however, proceed to the formulation of definite recommendations on the agenda. He drew attention to the Summary Record of their preceding meeting (Doc. E/C.3/SR.7), and pointed out that in the classification of items on pages 8 and 9 of that document, item 33 had been wrongly included both in category III and among those items on which no decision had been taken; he had also understood that no final decision had been reached on placing item 10 in category III. He further drew attention to document E/C.3/10, which contained the proposal of the representative of New Zealand in its final form, which differed slightly from that in which it had been presented to the Committee at the previous meeting.

The SECOND VICE-PRESIDENT stated that he understood that the representative of New Zealand had not substantially altered the suggestion he had made at the informal meeting of the agenda committee in May. His own comments therefore would be much the same as he had made then.

Mr. THORN (New Zealand) stated that the aim of his proposal was to ensure the expeditious and orderly despatch of the Council's work and to afford the Secretariat adequate time for preparation of the Council's report to the General Assembly. The items on which it was anticipated that a single plenary discussion without reference to a committee would suffice were marked with an asterisk in

document E/C.3/10. All other items in the right hand column would also be discussed in plenary, but would then be sent to committees. One advantage of deciding from the outset to refer certain items to committees without initial plenary discussion was that such procedure would enable committees to be set up at once and the usual loss of several days at the outset of the Council's work by discussions of procedure, would be eliminated. He stressed that it was not intended that those items which were listed in the left hand column of document E/C.3/10 would not be discussed in plenary, but only that the preliminary discussion should be in committee, thereby avoiding repetition and waste of time. It would be seen that the creation of a co-ordination committee to begin its work on 2 August was also proposed. The question of the time available to the Council had impelled him to propose the postponement of a number of items. However, it would be seen that Item 33 (Public Administration), postponement of which he had originally proposed, had now been placed in the right hand column, as he understood that the relevant discussion was not likely to prove as lengthy as he had supposed. The postponement of Item 49 (Infringement of Trade Union Rights) had been suggested to him by study of the documentation submitted by the International Labour Office, and by some knowledge of that now being sent by the American Federation of Labour; the highly political considerations raised by those organisations could not profitably be discussed in the Economic and Social Council. His proposal, as contained in document E/C.3/10, also indicated the order in which the items might be dealt with, although it might be thought desirable to

examine Item 48 (Legal Problems regarding missing DP's), before Item 16 (Report on Refugees) which was clearly highly controversial.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that Item 49, and also Items 2 and 50, had been placed on the provisional agenda on the proposal of the World Federation of Trade Unions, the American Federation of Labour and the Peruvian Government respectively, and that a final decision on those items could not be made in the Agenda Committee without hearing the views of those bodies. He suggested that arrangements be made for representatives of the World Federation of Trade Unions and of the American Federation of Labour, to be present at the next meeting.

The SECOND VICE-PRESIDENT pointed out, with reference to Item 48, that the International Refugee Organisation still did not exist as a specialised agency brought into relationship with United Nations in accordance with articles 57 and 63 of the Charter; it was not therefore entitled to propose items for inclusion in the agenda of the Economic and Social Council or to present its views on such inclusion in accordance with Rules 10 and 14 of the Council's Rules of Procedure. Of the items proposed for remittal straight to committees, Item 16 (Report on Refugees), and also Items 17, 18, 19 and 21, were of great importance and should be discussed in plenary. He was strongly opposed to their being placed in the same category as the other items, mostly of a purely technical order, in the left hand column of document E/C.3/10. On the other hand, he thought that the Reports of the Population and Statistical Commissions which were technical items should be discussed first in plenary.

With reference to the proposed postponement of certain items, he recalled that he had himself suggested such action in the case of Item 2. Moreover, they had already heard the representative of the American Federation of Labour at a previous session, and in the absence of any fresh documentation from that organisation, he could not agree that they were under any obligation to hear the representative again.

He also asked the New Zealand representative to explain why Item 38 should be postponed.

Finally, he agreed that there was no need to refer all items to committees and, apart from what he had said about Items 13 and 14, was in agreement with the New Zealand representative as to which items could be treated in plenary only.

The CHAIRMAN stated that the Secretary-General had considered it proper to include on the provisional agenda Item 48 which concerned the work of the Preparatory Commission of the International Refugee Organisation, as that body, even if not in the full sense of the name a specialised agency, owed its existence to a recommendation of the General Assembly.

Mr. THORN (New Zealand) explained that it was his intention that Items 16, 17, 18 and 19 should all be treated in a full-sized committee, made up of representatives of all governments members of the Council and, therefore, little inferior in importance to the Council itself. Every government would have full opportunity for expression of its views on those important items. But the procedure he suggested would avoid repetition. In view of the remarks made at the previous meeting by the Chairman, who was Rapporteur of the Commission on Human Rights, he would agree to Item 17 (Human Rights) being discussed first in plenary, but hoped that in return the Second Vice-President would agree that Items 16, 18 and 19 should be referred direct to committees.

He recalled the reasons he had previously given for the proposal to postpone Item 38, which were the same as those for Item 10, namely, the present unsettled position in the Middle East. At its last session, when the position in the Middle East had been in fact less uncertain than it was at present, the Council had decided to postpone that item because of the situation there.

Mr. PATIJN (Netherlands), supported the New Zealand proposal that Items 16, 18, 19 and 21 be referred to committees without initial plenary discussion, as they had already been the object of lengthy discussion elsewhere. He was prepared to agree to the transfer of Item 17 to the right hand column of document E/C.3/10, but was opposed to the deletion of Item 48. It was right, on the other hand, that Item 38 should be postponed, as the Palestine Commission no longer existed.

The SECOND VICE-PRESIDENT stated that Item 38 had not been placed on the provisional agenda on the initiative of the Palestine Commission, but by virtue of a recommendation of the General Assembly adopted in November 1947 which was still valid and binding on the Council. With reference to Item 48, whatever the intrinsic desirability of examining the provision of death certificates for missing displaced persons, the Committee could not violate the Charter and the Council's Rules of Procedure. Although he did not wish to lay any blame on the Secretary-General for having included that item on the provisional agenda, it would clearly be wrong to retain it as long as the International Refugee Organisation did not exist as a Specialized Agency in relation with United Nations.

Attempts to save time should not be allowed to prejudice the quality of this work or the Council, and such

important items as 16, 17, 18, 19 and 21 should be discussed first in plenary. He stressed, however, that his present statement as to which items could be referred to committees without initial plenary discussion was only an expression of personal opinion, and would not necessarily represent the final view of his delegation.

The CHAIRMAN recalled that at the previous meeting he had expressed the view that it was not in the power of the Agenda Committee to postpone discussion of or to delete Item 38. It was his hope that the Council would decide not to postpone that item, but the responsibility lay with the Council.

Mr. THORN (New Zealand) pointed out that all decisions of the Committee would only take the form of recommendations to the Council. However, he did not oppose the discussion of Item 38 in plenary.

The Committee decided to place Item 38 among items to be discussed in plenary.

The CHAIRMAN stated that the only real departure from previous practice involved in the proposal of the representative of New Zealand was the proposal to refer certain items to committees without initial plenary discussion. He asked if the Second Vice-President and the representative of New Zealand could agree on which items were to be so treated.

Mr. THORN (New Zealand) recalled that he had already agreed to the transfer of Item 17 to the right hand column.

The SECOND VICE-PRESIDENT felt that in view of the importance which the Commission on the Status of Women attached to the fate of their recommendations, it might appear invidious not to discuss Item 21 in plenary before referring it to a committee, especially as sections of the Report of the Commission had been the subject of full

plenary discussion at the previous Session.

Mr. THORN (New Zealand) stated that it was precisely the long and heated discussions in plenary which that item had provoked at the last Session that convinced him that it should now be referred straight to a committee.

The CHAIRMAN associated himself with the view expressed by the Second Vice-President, and assured the New Zealand representative that he would impress on the Plenary Meeting the desirability of keeping discussion on Item 21 short.

Mr. PATIJN (Netherlands) felt that Item 21 should be retained in the left hand column.

The Committee being equally divided, it was decided to defer decision on the treatment of Item 21 until the arrival of the First Vice-President.

The SECOND VICE-PRESIDENT stated that he would agree to the retention in the left hand column of Items 23(1), 34, 42, 47, 45, 26, 28 and 29, subject to any decision to the contrary by the Council. Item 48 should be deleted, and if it were decided to retain it, he would raise the matter again in plenary; he would make a similar reservation if it were decided to refer Items 16, 18 and 19 to committees without initial plenary discussion.

The Committee decided that Items 23(1), 34, 42, 47, 45, 48, 16, 19, 18, 26, 28 and 29 should be referred to Committees without initial discussion in plenary, and that they should be considered in that order, the Second Vice-President reserving his position on Items 48, 16, 18 and 19.

Mr. THORN (New Zealand) explained the order in which



he had placed the items to be discussed in plenary. The Adoption of the Agenda - which itself left the door open to any revision of the Order by the Council - and the Report of the Council to the General Assembly, should clearly occupy the first places. Moreover, it was desirable that the committees set up should be kept supplied with work remitted from the plenary meetings, in addition to those items referred to them without initial plenary discussion, and for that reason he proposed that the plenary meetings be next devoted to initial discussion of Item 15, which could then be referred to the Social Committee. Similarly, he proposed that the Reports of the Regional Commissions, the Economic Commission and the Food and Agriculture Organisation would, after initial plenary discussion, be referred to the Economic Committee. But the Council should first have examined in plenary Items 25 - a question of liquidation - and 11. There followed a block of items of minor importance, all of which could be concluded in plenary. Items 3, 37, 36 and 39 should clearly be left to the end, and Item 38 should be placed last.

The CHAIRMAN extended a welcome to the First Vice-President of the Council, who joined the meeting at this stage.

The Committee decided, on the proposal of the SECOND VICE-PRESIDENT, that Item 17 should be placed after Item 24 in the right-hand column; and that Item 11 should be placed after Item 6.

The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Committee had been equally divided on whether or not Item 21 should be discussed in plenary, and asked for the opinion of the First Vice-President.

The FIRST VICE-PRESIDENT felt that the argument of the New Zealand representative, that that question had already been fully discussed in plenary at the last session, was not valid, as certain sections only of the Report of the Commission on the Status of Women had been discussed. He therefore supported the proposal that Item 21 should be discussed in plenary.

The Committee decided by 3 votes to 2 that Item 21 should be discussed in plenary, where, in view of the projected departure of Madame Lefauchaux, Chairman of the Commission on the Status of Women, on 24 July, it would be placed immediately after Item 1.

In reply to the Second Vice-President, the FIRST VICE-PRESIDENT stated that he felt it would have been preferable to allow initial plenary discussion of Items 18 and 19, as some representatives might not have had the chance, as he himself had had, to express their views in full previously, but he would not ask that the discussion be re-opened. He had an open mind on the retention of Item 48.

Mr. YATES (Secretary of the Council), pointed out that the Report of the Transport Commission had long been available, and the Committee decided accordingly to place Item 12 immediately before Item 7.

Mr. THORN (New Zealand) suggested that the Committee recommend to the Council that it consider first Adoption of the Agenda, then the reference to Committees of all those questions which were not to be initially discussed in plenary, and, finally, the remaining items in the right-hand column of document E/C.3/10 in the order now agreed.

The SECOND VICE-PRESIDENT considered such a recommendation unnecessary, as the adoption of the Agenda would in

itself entail adoption of the items recommended by the Committee and of the order in which they were to be discussed.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out, however, that the Council remained free to revise its Agenda at any time under Rule 15 of its Rules of Procedure.

Mr. THORN (New Zealand) asked whether the recommendation of the Agenda Committee should not contain some reference to the question of plenary discussions on the reports of Committees and to the priority of such discussions over items in the right-hand column of document E/C.3/10 which had not been reached.

The CHAIRMAN stated that that was a question which would have to be considered later. With reference to postponements, he recalled that it had been decided to defer decisions on Items 50, 2 and 49 until the next meeting. He could not support postponement of Item 10, and proposed that the Committee adopt a procedure similar to that followed with Item 38, placing Item 10 in the right-hand column between Items 13 and 4.

The FIRST VICE-PRESIDENT supported the Chairman's proposal. The Council had expressed its views very clearly on the establishment of regional commissions for under-developed regions. The Economic Commission for Latin America had already been set up, and consideration of the establishment of an Economic Commission for the Middle East should not be postponed.

Mr. THORN (New Zealand) repeated, for the benefit of the first Vice-President, the reasons for his proposal that Item 10 be postponed.

The FIRST VICE-PRESIDENT felt the parallel drawn between Items 10 and 38 a false one, as the Middle East was not

limited to Palestine. Moreover, the Council would be able to decide whether the establishment of an Economic Commission for the Middle East was desirable in present circumstances only in the light of the report of the ad hoc committee, which it had itself instructed to study that problem.

Mr. THORN (New Zealand) stated that he reluctantly opposed the CHAIRMAN's proposal. The ad hoc committee's survey had been made before the recent deterioration in conditions in the Middle East, which made the whole picture one of utter uncertainty. No parallel could be drawn between the creation of the Economic Commission for Latin America and the proposed creation of an Economic Commission for the Middle East, in view of the difference in conditions obtaining in the two regions.

The SECOND VICE-PRESIDENT felt that decision on this question should be referred to the Council.

Mr. PATIJN (Netherlands) supported that view. As a compromise, however, he suggested the inclusion of Item 10 in the right-hand column, but near the bottom, so that when it came to consider the item, the Council would be in a better position to assess the course that Middle Eastern developments were likely to take.

Mr. THORN (New Zealand) stated he would agree to that suggestion, but the CHAIRMAN replied that he was opposed not only to postponement of Item 10, but also to any action which might be taken to foreshadow its postponement by the Council. He could not therefore accept the Netherlands proposal.

Disturbed conditions prevailing in Asia and the Middle East had not prevented the setting up of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, and to postpone

consideration of the setting up of an Economic Commission for the Middle East would be glaringly unfair. It was moreover wrong to view the whole of the Middle East in the light of the Palestine problem; that would be to prejudge that problem, and would augur ill for any future action which the United Nations might take in that field.

The FIRST VICE-PRESIDENT warmly supported the statement made by the Chairman. Active economic measures were more than ever necessary in those countries and regions at present beset by political instability.

Mr. PATIJN (Netherlands) withdrew his proposal as it was unacceptable to the Chairman.

The Committee decided by 2 votes to 1 with 2 abstentions to place Item 10 between Items 13 and 4 of those items to be discussed in plenary, the representative of New Zealand reserving his position.

The classification and order of treatment as adopted, subject to the various reservations enumerated above, was as follows:

Items to be referred to committees without initial plenary discussion:

- 23 (1) Narcotic Drugs Commission
- 34 Records of the Council
- 42 Draft rules on calling of international conferences
- 47 Financial procedure
- 45 Rules of procedure
- 48 Legal problems regarding missing displaced persons
- 16 Report on refugees

- 19 Genocide
- 18 Freedom of information
- 26 Relations with and co-ordination of  
specialised agencies
- 28 Commission work programmes
- 29 Draft calendar of meetings for 1949

Items to be discussed in plenary (those marked with  
asterisks to be discussed in plenary only):

- 1\* Adoption of Agenda
- 21 Status of Women Commission
- 46\* Report of Council to General Assembly
- 15 Social Commission report
- 25\* UNAC
- 12\* Transport Commission report
- 7 ECE Report
- 8 ECAFE Report
- 9 ECLA Report
- 5 Economic Commission report
- 6 FAO Report
- 11\* Conservation of Resources
- 14\* Population Commission Report
- 13\* Statistical Commission Report
- 10 Report of ad hoc committee on ECME
- 4\* Research Laboratories
- 40\* ITO Conference
- 41\* Maritime Conference
- 44\* Teaching United Nations principles
- 27 Reports of specialised agencies
- 20 Trade Union rights
- 22 Principle equal pay

- 24\* ICEF
- 1/ Human Rights
- 43\* Use of Geneva library
- 32\* ICAO: General Assembly resolution on Spain
- 30\* Committee on negotiations with specialised agencies
- 31\* Council NGO Committee
- 35\* Translation of the classics
- 33\* Public administration
- 3\* Implementation of economic and social recommendations
- 37\* Election for functional commissions
- 36\* Confirmation members of commissions
- 39\* Election Agenda Committee members
- 38\* Election of members for Economic Board for Palestine.

Item to be deferred:

- 23 (2) Administrative arrangements of Permanent Central Opium Board

No decision was taken on Items 2, 49 and 50 pending hearing by the Agenda Committee, or the Council of the views of the Organisation or Delegation which had proposed each Item.

The SECOND VICE-PRESIDENT recalled that he had suggested that no formal obligation lay on the Committee to invite the representative of the American Federation of Labour to express his views for a second time.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that by Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure "..... a specialised agency ..... which has requested the inclusion of an item in the provisional agenda, shall be entitled to present its views through its representative at any meeting of the Agenda Committee at which the question of the inclusion of the item is discussed"; there could be no doubt that the word "inclusion" referred equally to deletion or retention of an item.

The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.