

UNITED NATIONS ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL



GENERAL

E/AC.34/SR.14
10 May 1951

ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION OF THE COUNCIL AND ITS COMMISSIONS

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FOURTEENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 27 April 1951, at 2.30 p.m.

CONTENTS:

Draft report to the Economic and Social Council (Conference Room Paper
Nos. 6/Rev.1, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17; E/AC.34/L.6, E/AC.34/L.7)

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. SAKSENA	India
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. BRENNAN	Australia
	Mr. de ALMEIDA	Brazil
	Mr. CHANG	China
	Mr. de SEYNES	France
	Mr. CHERNYSHEV	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
	Mr. OVERTON	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Mr. LUBIN	} United States of America
Mr. MURDEN	

Representatives of specialized agencies:

Mr. ARNALDO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)
Mr. HILL	World Health Organization (WHO)

Secretariat:

Mr. OWEN

Assistant Secretary-General in
charge of the Department of
Economic Affairs

Mr. LUKAC

Director, Division of Transport
and Communications

Mr. YATES

Secretary of the Economic and
Social Council

DRAFT REPORT TO THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (Conference Room Papers
Nos. 6/Rev.1, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17; E/AC.34/L.6, E/AC.34/L.7)

The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the members of the Committee to the draft outline of the report (Conference Room Paper No. 10) and to the various draft sections prepared by the Secretariat (Conference Room Papers Nos. 6/Rev.1, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17). He suggested that the Committee should first discuss the draft outline.

Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) thought that the report should confine itself to a brief statement of the Committee's decisions and should provide in an annex a summary of the various views expressed during the discussion.

Mr. OVERTON (United Kingdom) was in favour of dividing the report into four parts, of which the first would be a short introduction (terms of reference of the Committee, references to the relevant resolutions of the Council and the General Assembly); the second would provide a brief summary of the Committee's discussions, which might be based on Conference Room Paper No. 10 and 13; the third would include the two series of recommendations adopted by the Committee concerning the organization of the Council and of the Commissions respectively, to which would be added as an introduction the preambles also adopted by the Committee; and the fourth would contain all the necessary annexes. For example, the details of the principal votes during the discussion would be given in the annex, since it was not sufficient simply to note the decisions taken in connexion with the final texts, which had, in most cases, been the result of a compromise, without giving any account of the

/successive votes

successive votes which had led to the compromise. In addition, if some delegations felt that their views had not been set forth at sufficient length in the body of the report, it could be arranged that they should submit brief statements which would be annexed to it.

The CHAIRMAN wondered whether it might not be preferable to submit a shorter and more concise report to the Council, prepared by a Rapporteur assisted by one or two members of the Committee.

Mr. de SEYNES (France) thought that nearly all the contents of the various draft sections prepared by the Secretariat should be included in the final report, either in the body of the report or in an annex. In his opinion, the method of substituting for some parts of the report footnotes referring the reader to the relevant documents would not be very satisfactory; members of the Council would find it more convenient if the report contained all the information necessary for understanding the subject. He would therefore be prepared to support the United States proposal, on condition that the annexes to the report gave a clear idea of the question and that room was left in the body of the report for the views of the minority.

Mr. CHANG (China) said that, while the Committee ought to make a detailed and careful examination of the plan prepared by the Secretariat, such an examination, in the case of Conference Room Paper No. 13, for example, would need far too much time and work.

It would therefore be better for the Committee to submit a much shorter report to the Council, stating clearly and concisely the views of the majority and those of the minority. Such a report could be drawn up on the basis of the documents prepared by the Secretariat, which would have to be considerably condensed. The final version would have three parts: a general introduction, a statement of the specific recommendations adopted by the Committee together with a summary of the discussion and an annex. The whole should not be longer than fifteen pages.

Mr. de ALMEIDA (Brazil) thought that the report should confine itself to stating briefly the recommendations adopted by the Committee and should state in an annex the reasons on which the attitude of the Committee and its members

Mr. OWEN (Assistant Secretary-General) explained that in preparing the various draft chapters, the Secretariat had been moved by considerations relating to the character and the terms of reference of the Committee. It had seemed to the Secretariat that the report, which was awaited with the greatest interest, could not merely list the recommendations and decisions adopted by the Committee, but must state besides the reasons behind those recommendations. That was what the Secretariat had tried to do in Conference Room Paper No. 15.

Mr. OVERTON (United Kingdom) agreed with the Assistant Secretary-General. However, he pointed out that it would be advisable to lay more stress on the arguments put forward in favour of the elimination of those commissions which the Committee had recommended should be discontinued.

Mr. CHERMYSEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought there was no need to state in detail the principles on which the Committee's decisions were based. With regard to the recommendations concerning the organization of the Council, the Committee had already agreed on a number of basic ideas which constituted the preamble to those recommendations. With regard to the organization of the Council's commissions, it would be sufficient to indicate briefly the general considerations by which the Committee had been guided, in particular the desire to avoid any duplication and to save money.

The report should therefore merely give a description of the Committee's recommendations and a few explanatory comments about them; it should also have an annex containing the essential documents and the necessary notes of reference.

The Committee should ask the Secretariat to prepare a draft report of that kind, to be put to the vote at the next meeting.

The CHAIRMAN took it that the Committee was agreed on redrafting the draft report prepared by the Secretariat. He asked whether it wished to do the work of revision itself, appoint a Rapporteur for that purpose, or entrust it to the Secretariat.

It was decided to ask the Secretariat to alter the draft report on the basis of the Committee's recommendations.

/Mr. LEBEN

Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) proposed that the report should include: (1) a general introduction setting forth the circumstances in which the Committee had been set up and recalling its terms of reference as well as the appropriate resolutions of the Council and the General Assembly; (2) a statement of the general considerations to which the Committee had devoted its attention; (3) two groups of recommendations, one concerning the organization of the Council and the other the organization of its commissions, each group of recommendations being preceded by a statement of the general principles which had led to their adoption; (4) an annex containing a summary of the various arguments put forward on each question.

Mr. OVERTON (United Kingdom) saw no objection to a recapitulation of Conference Room Paper No. 11 in the second part of the report, but on condition that the wording was altered on the basis, say, of the first proposals formulated by the United States delegation, the phrasing of which was more satisfactory (E/AC.34/2).

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should take up first the general examination of the outline of the report proposed by the United States representative.

Mr. BRENNAN (Australia) accepted that suggestion. During the examination of the United States representative's plan, the Committee would be able to give the Secretariat precise instructions for the preparation of a report based on that plan. With regard to the first part of the report, i.e. the introduction, he thought that Conference Room Paper No. 6/Rev.1 might be used in a summarized form.

Mr. de SEYNES (France) thought that the plan proposed by the United States representative was an excellent one, with the exception of the fourth part. According to that plan, the minority opinion would not be given in the report itself, but in an annex. The French delegation wished to reserve its position on that point. If, moreover, the third part of the report was to contain a statement of principles such as those formulated some days before in the document submitted by the United Kingdom delegation (E/AC.34/L.6), he did not

think it advisable that the minority views should be set forth only in an annex to the report. Those views should not be too far away in the report from the passages in which the majority opinion was set forth.

Mr. OVERTON (United Kingdom) took it that the document submitted by his delegation would be discussed, altered if necessary, voted upon and then included in the report as a recommendation.

Mr. DUBIN (United States of America) thought that a general agreement had been reached on the general principles which had guided the Committee's decisions. Certain divergencies of opinion had come to light regarding the retention or discontinuation of certain commissions. The second part of the report should therefore set forth all the views which had been expressed and not only the point of view of the majority, at the expense of the minority.

Mr. de SÈVRES (France) noted that while the decisions which had been taken on the commissions were clear, they could be interpreted in several ways. Thus, in many cases, it had been decided that the commissions would meet only when convened by the Secretary-General. The document submitted by the United Kingdom seemed to want the Secretary-General to convene the commissions only seldom, if at all. The French delegation could not accept such an attitude and that was why it had suggested including an additional paragraph (Conference Room Paper No. 15).

Mr. de AMENEA (Brazil) supported the French amendment (Conference Room Paper No. 16). He too had the impression that the text submitted by the United Kingdom delegation was an expression of the views of that delegation rather than of the views of the majority. If the Committee was to consider that document, it should also have before it another text which would balance the first. The time was not yet ripe, however, for a discussion of the substance of these documents.

Mr. OVERTON (United Kingdom) explained that in presenting its text, his delegation had merely wished to set forth what it considered to be the guiding principles underlying the decisions of the majority. It was understandable that the French delegation, which was a member of the minority, should be unable to give its unqualified support to the document presented by the United Kingdom. He

Mr. de SEYNES (France) said he did not mind whether his delegation's text was included in one part of the report or the other. What he had feared was that the final report might contain a text presented by the United Kingdom which did not reflect the views of all the delegations that had voted with the majority.

Mr. CHERNYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought that the part of the report devoted to the general principles underlying the Committee's decisions should be brief and should confine itself to statement of general principles, if it was to be acceptable to all.

Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) said that it might be possible, for that part of the report, to make use of Conference ^{Room} Paper No. 11 in a modified form, in order to give the Council a clear idea of the Committee's intentions.

Mr. CHERNYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) expressed concern lest the observations contained in Conference Room Paper No. 11 might be too specific and thereby lead to differences of opinion.

The CHAIRMAN felt that the Secretariat could now be given definite instructions concerning the contents of the report. There was no difficulty as regards the general introduction, which could simply reproduce the text of Conference Room Paper No. 6/Rév.1, provided that the resolutions should not be given in full.

Mr. OVERTON (United Kingdom) said that the report should refer to General Assembly resolution 413 (V) on the concentration of effort and resources in connexion with economic and social work of the United Nations and the specialized agencies.

The CHAIRMAN said that the substance of Conference Room Papers Nos. 11 and 16 might be incorporated in the second part of the report, which would deal with the considerations which had led to the vote of the majority and the principles which that majority thought should be adopted in order to increase the effectiveness of the work of the Council and its subsidiary bodies.

/Mr. OVERTON

Mr. OVERTON (United Kingdom) favoured the utilization of document E/AC.34/2, presented by the United States delegation, rather than Conference Room Paper No. 11.

The CHAIRMAN thought it unnecessary to give instructions concerning the text of the third part of the report, since it would be composed of recommendations the text of which had already been adopted. It would include two introductions, one preceding the recommendations concerning the Council, the other the recommendations concerning the subsidiary bodies. The fourth part of the report should contain a summary of the Committee's discussions.

Mr. YATES (Secretary of the Economic and Social Council) asked whether the Committee intended that part of the report to be composed of two sections, the first giving a summary of the debates on the Council itself, the second dealing with the discussions on the functional commissions.

There were in fact three possible ways of drafting that part: the first would be to state, in connexion with each of the organs considered, what the attitude of each delegation had been (that method would have the disadvantage of making the text very long). The second method would be to give the opinions of the majority and those of the minority, without naming the delegations which had supported one or the other. The third, and the one requiring the shortest text, had already been adopted by the Secretariat in Conference Room Paper No. 13: it consisted simply of indicating the opinions expressed in favour of, or against, the retention of each organ and was based on the principle that the differences of opinion were made sufficiently clear by the result of the voting.

Mr. CHANG (China) was in favour of the second method.

Mr. de ALMEIDA (Brazil) agreed, but wondered whether the names of the delegations constituting the majority or minority might not be given in a footnote.

Mr. OVERTON (United Kingdom) thought it would probably be very difficult for the Secretariat to say, in connexion with each opinion, which delegations constituted the majority and which the minority.

79

It would be easier to adopt a method similar to that followed in drawing up Conference Room Papers Nos. 12 and 13, but giving the opinions of the majority before those of the minority.

Mr. YATES (Secretary of the Economic and Social Council) asked the members of the Committee whether they wished the report to incorporate the results of all the votes taken during the session or simply the votes which had already appeared in Journal No.80 of 19 April 1951.

Mr. MURDEN (United States of America) thought that only the votes on the recommendations adopted should be mentioned.

Mr. OVERTON (United Kingdom) thought that the Committee would give the Council an incomplete idea of the discussions which had taken place if it failed to mention the proposals or amendments which had been examined and then rejected.

Mr. CHERNYSHÉV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought there would be no point in recording all the votes which had been taken. It should be enough to state in the paragraph relating to a particular recommendation the date of the meeting at which it had been adopted. The members of the Council would then be able to ascertain what votes had preceded the adoption by consulting the summary record of that meeting.

Mr. OVERTON (United Kingdom) thought it would in any case be necessary to refer to the most important of the ^{proposals and} amendments examined during the session.

Mr. de SEYNES (France) was not in favour of adopting the United Kingdom representative's suggestion, even in its attenuated form. If the Committee wished to include in the report explanations concerning the amendments that had not been adopted, it would have to do so for all the amendments without exception.

/The French

The French delegation would be satisfied if the Secretariat could add a further paragraph to the introductory part of the report on the preparatory work involving the subsidiary organs, stating that some delegations had been unable to associate themselves with the considerations which had guided the majority and hoped that if the Committee's proposals were accepted by the Council, they would not be interpreted in too restrictive a manner. The delegation had submitted an additional paragraph to that effect (Conference Room Paper No.13). It would also be glad if the report could include an explanation of the proposals submitted by France and India in Conference Room Paper No.5.

The CHAIRMAN thought that the Secretariat could mention the reservations just mentioned by the French representative in the fourth part of the report.

Mr. CHANG (China) observed that the report would appear to be the report of a committee of the Council and the Council would therefore take up the matters with which it dealt. It was hardly necessary therefore to touch at present on questions of detail and it would be sufficient to leave it to the Secretariat to prepare a report in conformity with the general principles adopted during the meetings. The Committee could always add to that report, by submitting supplementary evidence.

The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the members of the Committee to Conference Room Paper No.14 which contained a proposal by the Australian delegation and asked whether the Secretariat was to base it in mind in drawing up the report.

Mr. FREEMAN (Australia) recalled that his delegation had felt that it would be premature to examine forthwith the proposals contained in Conference Room Paper No.14. There was a distinction to be made between those proposals in the report.

Mr. de STYRE

Mr. de SEYNES (France), supported by Mr. CHERNYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), did not think that there should be any question at present of the Australian delegation's proposals, since that delegation had reserved the right to submit them again at the next session.

Mr. CHANG (China) suggested that the representatives of Australia and the United Kingdom, who had submitted two separate drafts relating to an introduction to the recommendations on the functional commissions, should try to prepare a joint text which could be inserted in the report later.

Mr. OVERTON (United Kingdom) accepted that suggestion.

Mr. CHERNYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) was not opposed to the suggestion, but pointed out that the members of the Committee had not voted on the texts proposed by the United Kingdom (E/AC.34/L.6) and Australia (E/AC.34/L.7) and they should be able to state their position in the matter before the texts were incorporated in the report.

The CHAIRMAN invited the representatives of Australia and the United Kingdom to prepare a joint text which the Committee would examine at its next meeting which would be held on Friday, 4 May.

The meeting rose at 5.10 p.m.