

UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL



GENERAL

E/AC.24/SR.70
21 August 1950

Original: ENGLISH

Dual Distribution

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Eleventh Session

CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE SEVENTEETH MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Friday, 4 August 1950, at 10.30 a.m.

CONTENTS

Relations with and co-ordination of specialized
agencies (item 43 of the agenda) (continued)

Draft report of the Co-ordination Committee and
amendments thereto proposed by delegations (E/AC.24/L.18)

/Present:
E/AC.24/SR.70

Present:Chairman: Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico)Members:

Australia	Mr. CUMES
Belgium	Baron de KERCHOVE d'EXAERDE
Brazil	Mr. MURTINHO
Canada	Mr. HALSTEAD
Chile	Mr. BERNSTEIN
China	Mr. TSAO
Denmark	Mr. FRILS
France	Mr. PERIER
India	Mr. VELLODI
Iran	Mr. SOTCUDER
Pakistan	Mr. AKHTAR
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. SCOFES
United States of America	Mr. ROSEMAN

Representatives of specialized agencies:

International Labour Organisation	Mr. COX Mr. LEMOINE
Food and Agriculture Organization	Mr. OLSEN
United Nations, Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization	Mr. TERENCE
World Health Organization	Dr. FORREST Dr. HAFEZI
Interim Commission of the International Trade Organization	Mr. ROYER

Secretariat:

Mr. Martin Hill	Director of co-ordination for specialized agencies and economic and social matters
Mr. Urquhart	Secretary to the Committee

/RELATIONS WITH

RELATIONS WITH AND CO-ORDINATION OF SPECIALIZED AGENCIES (item 43 of the agenda) (continued)

Draft report of the Co-ordination Committee and amendments thereto proposed by delegations (E/AC.24/L.18)

The CHAIRMAN congratulated the working group on its work in connexion with the preparation of the draft report of the Co-ordination Committee on relations with and co-ordination of specialized agencies (E/AC.24/L.18).

Referring to the amendments to the report submitted by various delegations, he suggested that the amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 12, 15, 18, 19 and 21, which involved drafting changes only, should be taken up first.

It was so agreed.

Mr. TSAO (China), referring to the suggestion made by the Chinese representative at the previous meeting that the Chinese delegation's views on a section of the seventh report of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (E/1682) should be included in the report of the Co-ordination Committee, said that, in order to facilitate the Committee's work, he would not press for further discussion of that question. His delegation reserved its right, however, to revert to the matter at a plenary meeting of the Council.

The CHAIRMAN thanked the representative of China for his statement, and said in that case the motion for the adjournment of the debate on the matter, moved by the Australian representative at the last meeting, could be considered as withdrawn.

Amendment No. 1

Amendment No. 1, submitted by the United Kingdom delegation, was adopted.

Amendment No. 2

Amendment No. 2, submitted by the United Kingdom delegation, was adopted.

/Amendment No. 3

Amendment No. 3

Mr. HALSTEAD (Canada), referring to amendment No. 3 submitted by the Danish delegation, thought that that delegation simply wished to add to the third paragraph on page 3 of the draft report a statement to the effect that United Nations organs should deal with major objectives as a team. Although he had no objection to the substance of that statement, he felt that it would be unwise to lift a sentence from the report of the Secretary-General on concentration of efforts and resources of the United Nations and specialized agencies (E/1683) and insert it in the Committee's report. He therefore suggested that the words "and which might be tackled by United Nations organs as a team" should be substituted for the corresponding phrase in the Danish amendment.

Mr. FRIIS (Denmark) agreed.

Mr. CUMES (Australia) suggested that the words "either by one agency or" should be inserted after the word "tackled" in the phrase proposed by the Canadian representative.

Mr. FRIIS (Denmark) had no objection to the amendment suggested by the Australian representative, provided it was acceptable to the other members of the working group.

Amendment No. 3, submitted by the Danish delegation, as amended by the Canadian and Australian representatives, was adopted.

Amendment No. 8.

Mr. SCOPES (United Kingdom) said that his delegation considered that amendment No. 8, submitted by the French delegation, did not exactly reflect the decision previously taken by the Committee, which was more clearly reflected in the original draft of the report. He was however prepared to accept it, provided the word "referred" was replaced by the word "recommended".

/The CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN agreed that the French amendment as modified by the United Kingdom representative would reflect more exactly what had previously been agreed on by the Committee. He pointed out that when the Committee had agreed to refer the United Kingdom proposal to the Council for discussion in connexion with item 4 of the Council's agenda, it had tacitly accepted that proposal and recommended its acceptance to the Council.

Mr. PERIER (France) felt that the expression "tacitly accepted" accurately described what had taken place at the 64th meeting of the Committee. The United Kingdom proposal had not been discussed at length, and when it had been approved by the Committee he had had some doubts about it, as his delegation was not, generally, speaking, in favour of setting up new committees. Later, however, he had heard that a more detailed proposal (E/L.72), which the French delegation supported, had been submitted in connexion with item 4 of the Council's agenda. He would therefore accept the United Kingdom representative's modification.

Mr. HAISTEAD (Canada) reminded members of the Committee that at a previous meeting certain delegations had drawn attention to the fact that a proposal had already been submitted by the Canadian, Chilean, French and United States delegations (E/L.72), in connexion with item 4 of the Council's agenda, and had expressed the view that the proposal for the setting up of an ad hoc committee to report on the possibility of organizing the Council's methods of work should be discussed as part of that suggestion, and not considered as a separate proposal. He could accept the United Kingdom representative's amendment to the French proposal, but would prefer to see the words "between the eleventh and twelfth sessions of the Council" deleted. He did not feel that the Committee had intended to recommend to the Council the proposal that the ad hoc committee meet at that particular time, since the meeting times of committees would have to be discussed in connexion with the joint proposal submitted under item 4 of the Council's agenda.

/MR. PERIER

Mr. PERIER (France) could not accept the Canadian amendment.

Mr. SCOPES (United Kingdom) fully appreciated the reasons for the Canadian representative's intervention, but felt that the proposal made at the 64th meeting of the Committee had specifically been that an ad hoc committee should meet between the eleventh and twelfth sessions of the Council. That proposal had now been linked for submission to the Council with the joint proposal contained in document E/L.72. The Council was in no way bound to accept the specific recommendations contained in the proposal, and he felt, therefore, that in spite of some conflict with the joint proposal referred to, the Committee's original proposal should be submitted to the Council in the form in which it had emerged from the discussions.

At the request of the CHAIRMAN, Mr. URQUHART (Secretary to the Committee) read out extracts from pages 11 and 12 of the summary record of the 64th meeting of the Co-ordination Committee (E/AC.24/SR.64).

The CHAIRMAN said that in view of the decision reached by the Committee on that occasion it would not serve any useful purpose to re-open the discussion.

Mr. MURTINHO (Brazil) said that after hearing the extract from the summary record, he agreed with the French representative's interpretation of what had happened at that meeting.

The Committee had approved the suggestion made by the United Kingdom representative that the substance of his proposal should not be discussed, and had agreed to the Chairman's suggestion that the whole question be transmitted to the Council. The substance of the United Kingdom representative's proposal had not, however, been approved.

Mr. FRIIS (Denmark) also agreed with the French representative's remarks, but, as the Committee had already taken a decision to refer the matter to the Council, he did not feel that it was of great importance whether the word used in the report was "referred" or "recommended".

/The CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN agreed with the Danish representative. He pointed out that the text of the letter addressed by the Chairman of the Co-ordination Committee to the President of the Council did not state that the Committee had accepted the United Kingdom proposal. It merely said that the Co-ordination Committee had accepted a suggestion made by the United Kingdom delegation that there should be only one discussion (in the Council) of that delegation's proposal.

Several delegations had taken part in the discussion on the United Kingdom suggestion, and it could not therefore be said that that suggestion had not been discussed.

If the word "recommended" was substituted for the word "referred" in the French amendment (No. 8), that would mean that the Co-ordination Committee had merely decided to transmit the United Kingdom proposal to the Council for discussion, and not that it had formally accepted that proposal.

Amendment No. 8, submitted by the French delegation, was adopted, as amended by the United Kingdom representative.

Amendment No. 12.

The CHAIRMAN said that amendment No. 12 was merely a factual account of what the Committee had agreed.

Amendment No. 12, submitted by the Canadian delegation, was adopted.

Amendment No. 15.

The CHAIRMAN said that amendment No. 15 emphasized the conclusions reached in the report of the Committee, and made certain, as a corollary, that the report would be appended to the documents forwarded to the General Assembly.

Amendment No. 15, submitted by the United Kingdom delegation, was adopted.

Amendment No. 18.

The CHAIRMAN said that amendment No. 18 was wider in scope than the original text, and embraced all types of effort, not only financial efforts.

Mr. CUMES (Australia) thought that it would be extremely difficult to express outlay in other than financial terms. If a precise meaning could be given to the expression "efforts and resources", he would be prepared to accept it, but if not, he preferred the original phrasing.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the United Nations was not a financial institution, and that the financial aspect was accordingly not the only aspect that should be considered as a criterion for priorities. He thought therefore that the amendment should be accepted, so that outlay could be regarded in other than purely monetary terms.

Mr. FRIIS (Denmark) said that the question could not easily be discussed unless the problem of priorities in general was also considered; for, in all the criteria for priorities, there were to be found both factors which were measurable and factors which were not, at any rate to the same extent. He would have favoured the amendment on the ground that the purely financial aspect was normally over-emphasized in United Nations discussions, whereas not enough stress was put on increased efforts. As there would be a general debate on the whole question of priorities, he thought that consideration of amendment No. 18 might be deferred till that discussion had been completed.

Mr. CUMES (Australia) hastened to make it clear that he had not suggested that the "results" be expressed in financial terms; he had merely raised the question of whether outlay could be assessed in other than financial terms.

The Committee decided to defer discussion of amendment No. 18, submitted by the Chairman and Vice-Chairman, until discussion of the general question of priorities had been completed.

Amendment No. 19

The CHAIRMAN, explaining the amendment, said that clearly-defined regional zones existed within the international sphere; in certain cases, as in that of the work of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, it had been found that various projects could be carried out more efficiently on a regional basis. The amendment would introduce the conception of regional cross-influences between countries.

Mr. PERIER (France), while agreeing with the Chairman on the substance of the amendment, objected to its form, on the ground that it employed a word belonging to the special United Nations jargon, which was understood by people acquainted with the workings of the Organization, but would not be understood by people who did not. He thought that the words "at the national level" in the paragraph in question should rather be amended to read: "at the general or regional level of United Nations activities".

Mr. MURILHO (Brazil) pointed out that it had been intended only that the results be viewed at regional level. He proposed that the word "international" be omitted from the paragraph in question, as it served no useful purpose.

Mr. SOTOUDEH (Iran) pointed out that the idea expressed in the amendment had been incorporated in the following paragraph, and also in the section of the report headed "Scope". If the amendment were adopted it seemed possible that countries not falling within clearly defined regions might be deprived of priority, or otherwise suffer by comparison with others.

The CHAIRMAN could not agree with the French and Iranian representatives. The regional concept was clearly defined and well understood, and had found expression in the regional (economic) commissions. The paragraph and section referred to by the Iranian representative did not specifically envisage the question from the regional point of view, which was a point of view which deserved explicit mention.

Mr. SCOPES (United Kingdom) suggested that the Iranian representative's objection would be met by the use of the word "or" instead of "and" between "national" and "regional".

Mr. AKHTAR (Pakistan) thought that adoption of the amendment would entail a similar addition after the word "national" at the beginning of the paragraph.

After some further discussion, amendment No. 19, submitted by the Chairman and Vice-Chairman, was adopted, as amended by the United Kingdom representative.

Amendment No. 21

The CHAIRMAN, introducing amendment No. 21, said that he had found agreement among various delegations that the word "real" was unnecessary, and that the description of the General Assembly resolution was not required. He withdrew that part of the amendment which proposed the deletion of the word "strongly", as he had found that some delegations approved of it.

Mr. CUMES (Australia) thought that if the words "on proliferation" were omitted, a description of the General Assembly resolution should be inserted, as it seemed to him that reference to a resolution should be self-explanatory.

It was agreed to substitute the full title of General Assembly resolution 310 (IV) for the words "on proliferation" in the first paragraph of draft resolution "B" in the report of the Co-ordination Committee.

It was also agreed that the word "real" should be deleted from the fifth line of the penultimate paragraph of that draft resolution.

Amendment No. 4 (a)

Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) said that Amendment No. 4 (a) was purely an editorial change.

Amendment No. 4 (a), submitted by the United States delegation, was adopted.

Amendment No. 4 (b) and Amendment No. 17

Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) said that amendment No. 4 (b) was intended to meet a difficulty his Government felt regarding the exact meaning of the term "national action". In his country, national action meant not only action within a country, but also joint action by two countries, as opposed to international action, which meant action by a number of countries. Thus national action meant not only action by way of self-help, but also bilateral action whereby assistance was provided to one country by another. The original text, according to that interpretation, would seem to require of a country seeking aid from the United Nations or a specialized agency that it resolve its problems, not only by means of its own resources, but also by approaching other countries bilaterally; only after failure of both courses could it ask for international action. His Government believed, however, that even if one country were willing to help another, it might be in the interests of the community of nations that the help be extended to that other country through an international agency; at least, there should be no absolute requirement that the possibilities of bilateral aid must be exhausted before multilateral assistance was requested. His delegation's amendment provided for that contingency.

He had no objection to the incorporation of amendment No. 17 in amendment No. 4 (b).

The CHAIRMAN said that, in his opinion, bilateral action was not national action, but international action, and the working group clearly meant national action to be interpreted as action within one and the same country. It was obvious, however, that the point should be made absolutely clear, otherwise the criteria would give rise to misunderstandings.

Mr. HALSTEAD (Canada) agreed with the Chairman that national action could not be interpreted to include bilateral action. As there was a danger of misinterpretation, however, he suggested the addition to the original text of the word "unilateral" before the words "national action".

/He saw no

He saw no objection to the wording proposed in amendment No. 17.

Mr. AKHTAR (Pakistan) pointed out that the precise meaning of such words as "unilateral", "bilateral" and "multilateral" depended to a certain extent on the context in which they were used. In the context of the draft report, "international" meant "under the aegis of the United Nations Organization and its specialized agencies", and some such qualifying phrase should be inserted to explain it.

He thought that the words "to the international community" should be omitted from amendment No. 4 (b), as they were too comprehensive and too vague for the purposes of the amendment.

Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) thought that the word "unilateral" might have certain unfortunate connotations. With regard to the Pakistani representative's objection, he pointed out that the additional clause in his delegation's amendment was prefaced by the word "or", which made it merely an alternative.

It was agreed that further discussion of amendments No. 4 (b) and 17 should be deferred.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.
