

UNITED NATIONS  
ECONOMIC  
AND  
SOCIAL COUNCIL



GENERAL

E/AC.24/SR.52  
17 July 1950

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Dual Distribution

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Eleventh Session

CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FIFTY-SECOND MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,  
on Tuesday, 11 July 1950, at 10.30 a.m.

CONTENTS:

1. Inter-governmental organizations (item 44 of the agenda)  
(E/AC.24/L.1 and E/1687) (continued)  
No. 26 International Penal and Penitentiary Commission  
(E/1735, E/1735/Add.1, E/AC.24/L.5 and E/AC.24/L.6)  
(continued) pages 4 - 12  
  
Inter-American Commission of Women (E/AC.24/L.4) pages 12 - 13
2. Draft resolutions of the Co-ordination Committee for  
submission to the Council (E/AC.24/L.2) pages 13 - 15

/Present:

Present:

Chairman:

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico)

Members:

Australia

Mr. CUMES

Belgium

Baron de KERCHOVE d'EXAERDE

Brazil

Mr. MURTINHO

Canada

Mr. BIERLIS

Chile

Mr. RODRIGUEZ

China

Mr. TSAO

Denmark

Mr. RICARD

France

Mr. PERIER

India

Mr. SEN

Iran

Mr. SOTOUEH

Mexico

Mr. CALDERON-FUIG

Pakistan

Mr. AKHTAR

United Kingdom of Great Britain and  
Northern Ireland

Mr. LEDWARD

United States of America

Mr. CATES

Representatives of specialized agencies:

International Labour Organisation

Mr. COX

United Nations Educational, Scientific  
and Cultural Organization

Mr. BERKELEY

World Health Organization

Dr. HAFEZI

Representatives of non-governmental organizations

Category A

International Organization of Employers

Mr. KUNTSCHEM

Category B

Commission of the Churches on  
International Affairs

Mr. MOURAVIEFF

International Institute of  
Administrative Sciences

Mr. GRANDJEAN

/Secretariat

Secretariat

Mr. Martin HILL

Director of co-ordination for specialized  
agencies and economic and social matters

Mr. DELIERNEUX

Deputy Director, Sub-Division of Social  
Activities

Mr. URQUHART

Secretary to the Committee

1. INTER-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS (item 44 of the agenda) (E/AC.24/L.1 and E/1687) (continued)

No. 26. International Penal and Penitentiary Commission (E/1735, E/1735/Add.1, E/AC.24/L.5 and E/AC.24/L.6) (continued)

The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to the draft resolution (E/AC.24/L.6) submitted by the Canadian delegation. He expressed the hope that representatives would confine their remarks to that draft resolution and to the text (E/AC.24/L.5) he himself had submitted as a working paper at the fifty-first meeting, as the general aspects of the question had already been fully discussed then.

Mr. BERLIS (Canada), introducing his draft resolution, stated that his Government was generally in favour of the principle of integrating international activities within the United Nations, because it believed that work would thereby be carried out on a wider basis. His Government, however, had always maintained that the appropriate way of achieving such integration was for member governments of the organizations concerned to take the initiative.

His Government was not altogether satisfied with the plan for the integration of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission (IPPC) within the United Nations as described in document E/1735, and had grave doubts concerning the financial implications outlined in document E/1735/Add.1, from which it appeared, despite the explanations given at the previous meeting, that the cost of integration would be greater than the total of the annual contributions at present being paid by members of the Commission. He was **still not convinced** that the additional expenditure could be justified.

Another real objection to the plan was the rigid programme and procedure envisaged. In his opinion, it would have been preferable were the Department of Social Affairs to be allowed more latitude to adapt the programme to circumstances as the work proceeded.

He feared also that the way in which the integration was to be carried

out might constitute an undesirable precedent for similar processes of absorption within the United Nations of the activities of other international bodies. The agreement appeared to him to be somewhat unilateral in character. The United Nations was apparently to take over far-reaching commitments which were by no means offset by the undertakings given by IPFC. For instance, it was proposed that the United Nations should initiate an elaborate programme of work, and that it should employ members of the IPFC secretariat. Furthermore, the Economic and Social Council was expected to approve a plan and recommend it to the General Assembly before knowing whether IPFC would accept it. Whereas on the other side, there was no assurance even that the existing assets of IPFC would be transferred to the United Nations, as had been the case when the functions of the Office Internationale d'Hygiène Publique had been similarly absorbed by the World Health Organization. The only concession which IPFC would be making was in agreeing to dissolve itself, on condition that the United Nations accepted all other provisions of the plan.

He had framed his draft resolution with these considerations in mind, so as to ensure that the assets of IPFC would be made over to the United Nations, thus facilitating the process of integration.

The CHAIRMAN observed that, since the Canadian draft resolution seemed to command general support, he would withdraw the text he had himself put forward as a working paper.

Mr. COTES (United States of America) considered the text presented by the Chairman to be satisfactory and appropriate to the needs of the case. He therefore formally moved it in the name of his own delegation.

Mr. CUMES (Australia) said that he had now received instructions from his Government, and was able to declare its general approval of the plan. But he agreed with the Canadian representative that it was too rigid on many counts and might be modified to suit requirements as they arose.

/For example,

For example, the Australian Government did not see any clear need for an ad hoc Advisory Committee of Experts if provision were already made for consultative groups to deal with specialised topics. Australia would therefore strongly oppose the establishment of such a Committee.

Furthermore, the Australian Government did not wish to see any rigid provisions laid down at that stage for the holding of full-scale conferences. Those should be called if and when the need arose.

Finally, his Government was not convinced as to the desirability of issuing a legislative series. At least, it seemed desirable to defer a decision on such a series until the system of correspondents had been established. At that time, any need for the series could be argued on firmer grounds.

He therefore suggested that the draft plan be amended in those three respects. If the Committee was unable to agree to that, he would propose that the draft plan simply be transmitted to the General Assembly as a basis for discussion, without any expression of approval by the Economic and Social Council.

Mr. SEN (India) expressed his Government's concern that integration should be as rapid and efficient as possible. He felt there were cogent objections to the procedure suggested by the Australian representative, as the IPFC would have to wait a considerable period before learning its fate. He was therefore in favour of the Council's giving general approval to the plan enabling the Secretary-General to proceed with detailed arrangements. He would therefore submit certain amendments to the two draft resolutions before the Committee in the hope that one or other of them would prove to be acceptable.

Taking the United States draft resolution (E/AC.24/L.5) first, he proposed that the words "transfer of functions of IPFC to the United Nations" be substituted for the words "integration of the Commission within the United Nations" in the first paragraph; that the word "generally" be inserted after the word "Approves" in the second paragraph; and that the third paragraph be re-worded to read; "Expresses the hope that IPFC will give early approval of the plan and take action along the lines suggested in it,". He also suggested that a preamble should be added to read "Notes with satisfaction the progress the Secretary-General has made in his negotiations with the representatives of IPFC

With regard to the Canadian draft resolution (E/AC.24/L.6), he suggested that the words "transfer of functions of IPFC to the United Nations," be substituted for the words "integration of the IPFC within the United Nations," in the first paragraph; that the word "Approves" be substituted for the words "Considers that", and the words "as an acceptable basis for the" for the words "provides an acceptable basis for the" in the second paragraph, and that the words "provided that the IPFC agrees to transfer its library, archives, and other assets to the United Nations" be deleted; that the words "the draft plan as early as possible;" be substituted for the words "the approval of such transfer in order to facilitate the integration of its work within the United Nations", in the third paragraph; and that the words "if possible" be deleted from the fourth paragraph. He considered the purpose of his amendments to be self-evident. His main concern was to ensure that the wording of the draft resolution should be couched in such terms as to avoid giving offense on a matter on which IPFC was understandably extremely sensitive.

Mr. BERLIS (Canada) was ready to accept all the amendments moved by the Indian representative to his draft resolution, with the exception of that concerning the deletion of the words "provided that the IPPC agrees to transfer its library, archives, and other **assets** to the United Nations;" from the second paragraph, since those words contained the provision in which his Government was most keenly interested. With regard to the Indian representative's amendment to the fourth paragraph, he had inserted the words "if possible" because it was uncertain whether the transfer could, in fact, be effected before 31 December 1951, but he would not insist on the retention of those words.

Mr. SEN (India) observed that as a result of the Canadian representative's acceptance, his own amendments to the Canadian representative's draft resolution were in effect reduced to a single amendment, namely, that the final clause of the second paragraph be deleted.

Mr. CATES (United States of America) found the Indian representative's amendments to his draft resolution generally acceptable, and re-iterated his concern that general agreement should be obtained on the transfer of functions from IPPC to the United Nations. An important social question of substance - the prevention of crime and the treatment of offenders - was involved, in the study of which the United Nations was genuinely and vitally interested. The arrangement must ensure that the basic work would be carried on and that there would be no duplication of function.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that, as there seemed to be little substantial difference between the two draft resolutions before the Committee, a small drafting committee should be set up for the purpose of formulating a single text.

Baron de KERCHOVE d'EXAERDE (Belgium) stated that he found the Canadian draft resolution unacceptable; nor could he endorse the motives which had prompted its submission. The vital thing was that the continuity of the highly scientific research carried out by IPPC should be safeguarded, and the only manner in which that could be achieved was by approving the plan drawn up by the Secretary-General and the experts of IPPC. In his view, therefore, it was



essential to approve the plan outlined in document E/1735. He believed that the United States draft resolution was framed in terms broad enough to ensure approval of the plan and to allow for any future modifications which might be found necessary. He also found the Indian representative's amendments to it acceptable. He could not agree with the Chairman that there was little substantive difference between the two draft resolutions and was sceptical about the possibility of reaching agreement by setting up a small drafting committee.

Mr. CUMES (Australia) re-iterated his Government's support for the general objective of integration, but stated that he could not entirely approve the plan as it stood, because its machinery was too elaborate and inflexible and would entail expenditure which could perhaps be avoided. He was therefore unable to support the existing text of either of the draft resolutions.

Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom) supported the Indian representative's amendments, and said he was prepared to vote for either of the two draft resolutions, as amended.

Mr. CATES (United States of America) stated that if the Indian representative's amendment to the Canadian draft resolution for the deletion of the last clause in the second paragraph were adopted he would vote in favour of that draft resolution, as amended.

In connection with the financial implications of the plan, as noted in document E/1678/Add.1, which were causing concern to the Australian and Canadian representatives, he pointed out that no commitment had yet been entered into, as the whole question of expenditure would require discussion and approval by the General Assembly.

Mr. PERIER (France) stated that, although his Government was not very much in favour of integration, it was prepared to accept the view of the majority. He could therefore support the United States draft resolution as amended by the Indian representative as it seemed to him to offer a more flexible formula.

Mr. SEN (India) said that, apart from the last clause of the second paragraph in the Canadian draft resolution, which was not covered in any way by the United States draft resolution, there was another vital difference between the two texts, in the

exts, in the sense that the Canadian draft resolution contained no reference to the Council's commending the plan to the General Assembly. He therefore proposed that a new paragraph should be inserted between the existing second and third paragraphs in the Canadian draft resolution, to read: "Transmits the draft plan to the fifth session of the General Assembly".

Mr. TSAO (China) had no strong views on the two draft resolutions, which he found to be very similar substantively. He was prepared to vote for either of them.

Mr. CATES (United States of America) suggested that the Indian representative's proposal that the last clause should be deleted from the second paragraph of the Canadian draft resolution should be put to the vote first. Then the Indian representative's proposal for the insertion of a new third paragraph could be put to the vote. If those two amendments were adopted, he could support the Canadian draft resolution and withdraw his own.

Mr. CUMES (Australia) asked that the Canadian draft resolution should be put to the vote paragraph by paragraph, as although able to vote in favour of all the others, he could not support the second paragraph, since he considered that the draft plan had certain important defects.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Indian representative's proposal that the words "provided that the IPPC agrees to transfer its library, archives, and other assets to the United Nations;" be deleted from the second paragraph of the Canadian draft resolution, (E/AC.24/L.6).

The Indian amendment was adopted by 8 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Indian representative's proposal that ~~a new paragraph~~ be inserted between the existing second and third paragraphs of the Canadian draft resolution, to read: "Transmits the draft plan to the fifth session of the General Assembly".

The Indian proposal was adopted by 10 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

/The CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN announced that, in accordance with the wish expressed by the Australian representative, he would put the Canadian draft resolution, as amended by the Indian representative's proposals already accepted by the Canadian representative, to the vote paragraph by paragraph.

The first paragraph, amended to read: "Having examined the report prepared by the Secretary-General in consultation with the IPFC (E/1735 and E/1735/Add.1) concerning the transfer of functions of IPFC to the United Nations, pursuant to resolution 252 B (IX);" was put to the vote.

The first paragraph was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The second paragraph, amended to read: "Approves the draft plan contained in the above-mentioned report as an acceptable basis for the integration of the IPFC within the United Nations;" was put to the vote.

The second paragraph was adopted by 9 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions.

Mr. BERLIS (Canada) asked that the new third paragraph proposed by the Indian representative should be put to the vote for a second time, as the position had changed for his delegation, owing to the adoption of the second paragraph in its amended form.

The new third paragraph was adopted on being put to the vote for the second time by 11 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The fourth paragraph (formerly the third paragraph of document E/AC.7/L.6), amended to read: "Expresses the hope that the IPFC will give favourable consideration to the draft plan as early as possible; and" was put to the vote.

The fourth paragraph was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

Mr. SEN (India) pointed out that the word "such" in the new paragraph 5 had become unnecessary in view of the Indian amendment to the former third paragraph of the original text which had been accepted by the author of the draft resolution. He therefore moved its deletion.

The Indian motion was carried unanimously.

/The fifth

The fifth (formerly fourth) paragraph, with the word "such" and the words "if possible" deleted, was put to the vote.

The fifth paragraph, as amended, was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

The draft resolution as amended was adopted as a whole by 9 votes to 1, with 5 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that, as the Canadian draft resolution had been adopted, the United States' draft resolution was disposed of.

Mr. MURTINHO (Brazil), Mr. RODRIGUEZ (Chile) and Mr. BERLIS (Canada) declared that they wished it to be placed on record that they had abstained from voting on the draft resolution as a whole, as amended.

Inter-American Commission of Women (E/AC.24/L.4)

The CHAIRMAN recalled that at the fiftieth meeting a request had been made by the United States representative that the Inter-American Commission of Women be added to the list of inter-governmental organizations, and drew the attention of the Committee to the notes (E/AC.24/L.4) prepared by the Secretariat on the subject.

Mr. SEN (India) suggested that in future delegations making such requests might be asked to circulate the relevant information in advance. He wondered under which heading the Inter-American Commission of Women should figure in the list of inter-governmental organizations given in document E/1687.

At the invitation of the CHAIRMAN, Mr. MARTIN HILL (Secretariat) explained that, under resolution 128 (VI), the Secretary-General had been requested to draw up a list of inter-governmental organizations. The Inter-American Commission of Women had been included in the list, and subsequently deleted owing to doubts about its status.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that, if the Inter-American Commission of Women were re-instated, it might be included in section IV or section VII of the list.

/Mr. MURTINHO

Mr. MURTINHO (Brazil), Mr. RODRIGUEZ (Chile) and Mr. CALDERON FUIG (Mexico) supported the United States representative's request.

The United States representative's request for the inclusion of the Inter-American Commission of Women in the list of inter-governmental organizations was approved.

2. DRAFT RESOLUTIONS OF THE CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE FOR SUBMISSION TO THE COUNCIL (E/AC.24/L.2)

The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the Committee to document E/AC.24/L.2, containing draft resolutions for submission to the Council, which had already been given a first reading.

Draft resolution A

Draft resolution A was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Draft resolution B

At the invitation of the CHAIRMAN, Dr. HAFEZI (World Health Organization) pointed out that, as the Executive Board of WHO was scheduled to meet in January, a special report would have to be drawn up giving the Council an account of the progress made concerning the establishment of official relations with the Permanent Committee of International Congresses on Military Medicine and Pharmacy, since it could not be included in the next regular report to the Council as required under the fourth paragraph of draft resolution B.

Mr. SEN (India) accordingly suggested that the fourth paragraph of draft resolution B should be re-worded to read "Requests the World Health Organization to report to the Council at its thirteenth session on the progress made, and further".

Draft resolution B as amended was unanimously adopted.

Draft resolution C

Draft resolution C was unanimously adopted.

/Draft resolution

Draft resolution D

CHAIRMAN pointed out that draft resolution D (E/AC.24/L.3/Rev.1) had already been adopted in its final form at the fiftieth meeting of the Committee and that no further action was required upon it.

Draft resolution E

Draft resolution E was unanimously adopted.

Draft resolution F

Draft resolution F was unanimously adopted.

Draft resolution G

Draft resolution G was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Draft resolution H

Mr. MARTIN HILL (Secretariat) said that, in view of the decision just taken with regard to the Inter-American Commission of Women, a reference to the fact that that organization was to be included in the list would have to be made in draft resolution H.

Draft resolution H had been drawn up in accordance with the procedure that had been followed at the ninth session of the Council. The question arose as to whether such a resolution was really necessary, and the Committee might think it would be enough if its decisions bearing on the list of inter-governmental organizations were included in its report to the Council.

Mr. SEN (India) stated that his Government was in favour of keeping the number of resolutions down to a minimum. Indeed, he hoped that in future the Co-ordination Committee would exercise restraint in that respect. He would welcome the deletion of draft resolution H as he thought its content could quite appropriately be transferred to the body of the Committee's report to the Council.

Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom) strongly endorsed the Indian representative's



few, as he believed that the regular procedure of the Committee would be improved by the practice of submitting resolutions such as draft resolution H were abandoned.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that draft resolution H should be abandoned, and that the Secretariat should be requested to include an account of the decisions taken by the Committee on the list of inter-governmental organizations in its report to the Council.

It was so agreed.

Mr. MURTINHO (Brazil) stated that it would be difficult to defend the decision to omit the Inter-American Juridical Committee from the next list of inter-governmental organizations if the Inter-American Commission of Women were to be included, as he believed both organizations were on a similar footing.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ (Chile) stated that the Inter-American Juridical Committee had been integrated within the Pan-American Union, whereas the Inter-American Commission of Women still retained a certain degree of autonomy. The constitutional position of the two organizations was therefore not the same.

Mr. MURTINHO (Brazil) said he was satisfied with the explanation given by the Chilean representative.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.

-----