



UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL



GENERAL

E/AC.24/SR.64
3 August 1950.

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

RECEIVED
13 SEP 1950

MTD. 112

Dual Distribution

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL
Eleventh Session
CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE SIXTY-FOURTH MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 20 July 1950, at 10.30 a.m.

CONTENTS:

Relations with and co-ordination of specialized agencies
(item 43 of the agenda)(E/1670, E/1682, E/1683, E/1683/Add.1,
E/1684, E/1685, E/1734, E/1741, E/1743, E/AC.24/L.1, E/AC.24/L.7,
E/AC.24/L.8, E/AC.24/L.9, E/AC.24/L.9/Add.1, E/AC.24/L.9/Add.2,
E/AC.24/L.10 and E/AC.24/L.11) (Continued)

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. FRIIS

France

Mr. PERIER

India

Mr. VELLODI

Iran

Mr. SOTOUDEH

Pakistan

Mr. AKHTAR

United Kingdom of Great Britain
and Northern Ireland

Mr. LEDWARD

United States of America

Mr. ROSEMAN

Representatives of specialized agencies:

International Labour Organisation

Mr. ALVARADO

Mr. COX

Food and Agriculture Organization

Mr. McDOUGALL

Mr. OLSEN

United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

Mr. BERKELEY

Representatives of specialized agencies (continued):

International Civil Aviation Organisation	Mr. MARLIN
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development	Mr. LOPEZ-HERRARTE
International Monetary Fund	Mr. WILLIAMS
Universal Postal Union	Mr. RADICE
World Health Organization	Dr. FORREST Mr. BERTRAND Miss HOWELL

Secretariat:

Mr. Powers	Administrative and Financial Services
Mr. Urquhart	Secretary to the Committee

RELATIONS WITH AND CO-ORDINATION OF SPECIALIZED AGENCIES (item 43 of the agenda) (E/1679, E/1682, E/1683, E/1683/Add. 1, E/1684, E/1685, E/1734, E/1741, E/1743, E/AC.24/L.1, E/AC.24/L.7, E/AC.24/L.8, E/AC.24/L.9, E/AC.24/L.9/Add.1, E/AC.24/L.9/Add.2, E/AC.24/L.10 and E/AC.24/L.11) (continued)

Mr. ALVARADO (International Labour Organisation), speaking at the invitation of the CHAIRMAN, said that he had been asked by the specialized agencies to express their joint views on the discussions in the Committee. The fact that the specialized agencies were speaking with one voice was in itself a proof of their mutual collaboration and of the fact that there did exist a real desire for such an atmosphere of co-ordination, without which the mere preparation of plans would not be sufficient. To avoid confusion and misunderstanding, however, it was necessary to bear in mind that there were differences in the agreements between the United Nations and the different specialized agencies, (for example between those with the Bank and Fund and those with other specialized agencies), and that their budgetary systems and administrative procedures, as well as their structure and functions, varied from one to another.

The suggestions that had been made in the Committee could be divided into three groups: the first which related to the internal working of the United Nations, it would not be proper for the specialized agencies to comment upon; the second group, that dealing with questions, both general and particular, of great complexity and of a controversial nature, the specialized agencies would only comment on in a limited manner; the third included proposals that formed a fit subject for the comments of the specialized agencies and which would appear to be most useful.

Generally speaking, the specialized agencies had welcomed the evidence of a desire on the part of the Committee that the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (ACC) should assume greater responsibility and initiative in co-ordination matters. The specialized agencies were loyal supporters of the ACC and would do their best to ensure that ACC continued to merit that confidence. The ACC acted as a link between decisions regarding policy and programmes taken by the competent organs of the United Nations and specialised agencies, and the actual carrying out of those policies and programmes by the organisations con-

cerned, and thus stood at a point where initiative in co-ordination matters was most valuable.

The specialized agencies welcomed the Canadian delegation's approach expressed in section 10 of document E/AC.24/L.9/Add.1, but thought that some slight changes in drafting might perhaps be required to ensure that it did not produce any avoidable delays in the work of the agencies. The suggestions in the Canadian draft resolution were closely related to those of the United Kingdom and the United States of America set out in sections 1 and 2 of document E/AC.24/L.9, and should be considered together with them. In particular, the suggestion of the United States delegation in section 2 was relevant, and in considering the drafting of the Canadian proposal the ideas contained in those two proposals might be given some weight.

The specialized agencies would welcome some general statement of criteria to be used in deciding priorities, but it should be noted that the undertaking of projects usually depended on whether they could be financed out of funds available, either by placing a new project ahead of an existing one, or by setting aside or winding up certain outstanding projects. On that question of priorities and criteria, the specialized agencies felt sure that the ACC would welcome the opportunity of thoroughly investigating what could and what could not be done along those lines, having regard to the heterogeneous character of the existing relationships, and the methods of handling priorities in the various organizations concerned. No doubt the ACC could indicate lines along which such a co-ordinated approach might be expected to evolve. That was a continuing task, and a general policy covering all contingencies could not be laid down.

He did not think that the specialized agencies should make any comments on the suggestions made in sections 6 and 8 of document E/AC.24/L.9. They welcomed, however, the suggestion made in section 7. The French delegation's suggestion in section 9 was comprehensive, but perhaps rather laconic, and it might be possible for the Committee to keep the various items listed by the French delegation in mind when it drafted a general resolution or gave other related draft resolutions their final form.

He concluded by saying that the representatives of the specialized agencies were willing to answer any specific questions put to them.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that a small working group be set up to prepare a final joint text embodying the suggestions of delegations on documents E/1682 and E/1683, and to submit it at the next meeting.

He asked the Brazilian representative what action he wished to take regarding his suggestions on priorities.

Mr. MURTINHO (Brazil) pointed out that his delegation had originally submitted those suggestions with the object of promoting a general discussion on them. However, that object seemed to have been fulfilled, since he had been able to discuss personally with the various members of the Committee the advantages and disadvantages of the various suggestions. Consequently, he did not think that a general discussion would now be of any interest.

If the Committee mentioned the Brazilian suggestions in its report and drew the attention of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination to them, his delegation would be entirely satisfied.

In reply to a question by the CHAIRMAN, he explained that his delegation did not wish to press its suggestions at present. They might be mentioned in the report, and the matter thus brought to the attention of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination, which could then give its opinion on the subject. The suggestions would thus have a chance to ripen, and might perhaps lead to a formal proposal later.

Mr. BERNSTEIN (Chile) saw no objection to the Committee stating in its report that it took note of the Brazilian representative's suggestions with interest, without commenting on them.

Mr. MURTINHO (Brazil), replying to the CHAIRMAN, said that he agreed to his suggestions being incorporated in an annex to the report.

Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom) pointed out that the practice in the past had been to refer such expressions of views to the ACC for information, but not for comment. If it were decided to incorporate the Brazilian representative's

suggestions in the report, he hoped that no reply would be required from the ACC.

He thought that any decision reached on the question would apply also to governments' comments on the draft resolution concerning the Catalogue of Economic and Social Projects.

Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) considered that the Brazilian representative's suggestions were full of interest, but that they required maturer consideration by delegations. They might be sent to the ACC for information, but he thought it would perhaps be even more desirable to leave them over until a later session of the Council, so that governments could consider them. If it were decided, however, to incorporate them in an annex to the report, it should be indicated that no action was required by the ACC.

In reply to the CHAIRMAN, he said that, if the Brazilian suggestions were incorporated in an annex, there should be no need to send them to governments, for the report would be widely circulated.

Mr. TSAO (China) said that the Brazilian representative was fully entitled to request that his suggestions be embodied in the Committee's report. The Committee itself would decide whether they should also be sent separately to governments, and whether the ACC should be asked to comment on them.

He formally requested that the statement he had himself made at the previous day's meeting regarding the report to the ACC be included either in the Committee's report or in an annex to it.

The CHAIRMAN said that that would be a matter for the Committee to decide.

Mr. HALSTEAD (Canada) had understood that the Brazilian representative's suggestions were very informal. As they might prove embarrassing if circulated in their present form, the Brazilian Government might perhaps consider modifying the text before circulation. He asked, therefore, whether it would not be preferable for the Brazilian Government to formulate them more fully and to circulate them before the next or a later session of the Council, in order that

governments might be given an opportunity of commenting on them.

Mr. MURTINHO (Brazil) thanked the Committee for the attention it had given to the Brazilian suggestions. In point of fact, he found himself in agreement with the various suggestions put forward by the representatives who had just spoken.

He thanked the Chilean representative for suggesting that the Committee's report should contain a summary of the Brazilian ideas, putting them forward as a suggestion. That exactly met the wishes of his delegation, which desired to learn the opinion of governments on them.

Moreover, he agreed with the United Kingdom representative that it would be unreasonable to ask the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination to reply to the questions formulated in the Brazilian suggestions. It should be left full freedom in the matter, and not be obliged to comment on the suggestions.

The United States representative's proposal that the question be deferred to a later session seemed to be the best; it would give representatives time for study and enable them to shape their attitude if the Brazilian delegation decided later to submit its suggestions as a formal proposal.

He also agreed with the Canadian representative. The Brazilian suggestion, which had been very hastily drafted, should not indeed be circulated in its present form.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that a paragraph should simply be inserted in the Committee's report to the effect that the Committee noted the Brazilian representative's suggestions with interest, and recorded them for the information of the ACC.

It was so agreed.

Mr. PERIER (France) pointed out that section 5 of document E/AC.24/L.9 related to sub-paragraph (vii) of the summary of French proposals appearing in section 9 of the same document. In that connection, he wished to thank the representative who had spoken on behalf of the specialized agencies for mentioning section 9, and to explain that the reason why he had presented those proposals

so briefly had been to meet the wish expressed by the Chairman. Moreover, the proposals contained in that resumé were not complete, since he had not wished to press certain points which had already been particularly stressed by other delegations and with which he was in full agreement. Consequently, he had preferred to emphasize certain points which had not been raised by other representatives. He fully agreed that those points given in the summary which had been the subject of more detailed proposals should be incorporated in those proposals. His delegation merely asked that the points which had not been dealt with in fuller proposals should be retained.

Accordingly, he singled out section 5, which dealt with a question regarding which no proposal had been made. His suggestion was that the specialized agencies be requested to emulate the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization but it had been pointed out to him that such methods might not be suitable for all the specialized agencies. He quite understood that point of view, and was prepared to make his proposal rather less specific, perhaps by inserting the words "as far as possible" after the words "to emulate such methods" in the first line of the third paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN, speaking as the representative of Mexico, said that he approved of the French representative's suggestion but would prefer, as a slight modification, that the last paragraph read:

"Recommends the other specialized agencies to emulate such methods as far as possible....."

Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America), while appreciating the aim of the French representative's suggestion, thought it desirable that the Committee defer consideration of it until it had discussed UNESCO's annual report. His delegation had various comments to make on that report, and, in fact, doubted whether UNESCO's co-ordination with inter-governmental and other organizations was an unqualified success.

Mr. PERIER (France) said that, in order to meet the objection raised by the United States representative, he would agree that UNESCO should not be specifically mentioned in the French suggestion. He was also prepared to

accept the suggestion that the discussion should be deferred till the Committee had examined UNESCO's report.

The CHAIRMAN, speaking as the representative of Mexico, saw no reason why a specific reference should not be made to a specialized agency if it did particularly good work in any field. He supported, however, the United States representative's proposal that discussion be deferred until the report of UNESCO had been dealt with.

It was agreed to defer discussion of the French representative's suggestion till the annual Report of UNESCO (E/1638) had been discussed.

Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom), speaking to his delegation's suggestion in section 6 of document E/AC.24/L.9, said that a joint draft resolution (E/L.72) containing a similar proposal had been submitted to the Council by the delegations of Canada, Chile, France and the United States of America under item 4 of the agenda. The main differences between his delegation's suggestion and that draft resolution were that in the latter reference was made to the work of the regional economic commissions in particular, and that the ad hoc committee was to submit its report to the thirteenth session of the Council instead of to the twelfth. It seemed to him that the two proposals overlapped, and he thought that the Chairman should discuss with the President of the Council the question of whether the proposals should be taken together and, if so, where.

In reply to the CHAIRMAN, he said that while the joint draft resolution to some extent went beyond his delegation's suggestions, it was clear from the substantive recommendation that it covered the operations of the Council and its subsidiary organs, and therefore to that extent did include those suggestions. He did not think that a discussion of the suggestions should be embarked on until it was known definitely what was entailed in the joint draft resolution.

Mr. PERIER (France) agreed with the United Kingdom representative: certain questions of form and procedure might be connected with questions of substance; in that case caution should be exercised. If a question of substance were to be discussed in connection with another point, it would be preferable to defer the discussion on the question of form.

Mr. FRIIS (Denmark) thought that the joint draft resolution was not concerned with methods of working, but rather with a general examination of the structure of the Council and its Commissions, and that it therefore dealt with a different field from that covered by the United Kingdom delegation's suggestions. He considered, however, that, since the United Kingdom representative had raised the point, it was incumbent on the latter either to seek deferment of discussion of his suggestions until the joint draft resolution had been dealt with, to request indefinite deferment, or to withdraw his suggestions.

Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) considered that the joint draft resolution in document E/L.72 covered a field beyond the competence of the co-ordination Committee, that a decision in plenary would probably be more significant, and that it was for the United Kingdom representative to decide in the circumstances whether his suggestions should be discussed there too.

The CHAIRMAN thought that, as the United Kingdom suggestions dealt with questions of procedure, they should be discussed by the Co-ordination Committee.

Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom) said that the intention of his suggestions was to eliminate duplication of debate and to co-ordinate the different subsidiary bodies of the Council (leaving out of account, however, the regional economic commissions), with a view to reducing the work and time devoted by the Secretariat to servicing the Council and its Commissions. That involved the whole organization of the Council. He would prefer a single debate on the question, either in plenary or by the Co-ordination Committee, and suggested that the Chairman might approach the President of the Council to discuss the matter.

The CHAIRMAN believed that that suggestion would have the approval of the Committee, and himself suggested that it might be left to any delegation that thought fit to introduce the United Kingdom suggestions as an amendment to the joint draft resolution contained in document E/L.72 when it came up for discussion in plenary.

Mr. HALSTEAD (Canada) agreed that the United Kingdom suggestions and the joint draft resolution were not entirely similar, and thought that if the

Committee was in agreement with the general purpose of the former, they might be brought to the attention of the Council in plenary for consideration when the broader draft resolution was discussed.

After some further discussion, the CHAIRMAN proposed that the President of the Council be informed that the United Kingdom suggestions had been approved, and that the Committee wished them to be brought to the attention of the Council in plenary for consideration when the joint draft resolution contained in document E/L.72 was dealt with.

It was so agreed.

Subject to an editorial amendment to the French text, the CHAIRMAN put the Chilean suggestion contained in section 7 of document E/AC.24/L.9 to the vote.

The suggestion was unanimously adopted.

The CHAIRMAN then called for comments on the United Kingdom proposal in section 8 of document E/AC.24/L.9.

Mr. TSAO (China) observed that the United Kingdom proposal was a useful one, but wondered whether it was necessary to indicate both the date of approval by the Secretariat and the date of issue in the documents in question. After all, the date of approval concerned only the Secretariat.

Mr. URQUHART (Secretary to the Committee), explained that some printed documents took several weeks to print, and that it was therefore necessary to indicate some sort of date on the covering chit that accompanied them to the printers.

Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom) said that the object of his delegation's proposal was to ensure that governments had adequate time in which to consider documents. It would satisfy his delegation if the date of issue were shown as the operative date under the six weeks' rule. He was prepared to leave to the Secretariat the question of the machinery necessary to ensure that that was done.

Mr. TSAO (China) suggested that if it was considered desirable to include the date of approval by the Secretariat, it would be better placed at the end of the text.

Mr. MURTINHO (Brazil) emphasized that a distinction must be made between documents which were to be printed and those which were merely to be mimeographed. For the former, there might be a considerable lapse of time - sometimes three or four months - between the date on which the document was completed, and the date of its publication. In that case, both dates should be given, since it was of interest to delegations to know when a document had been sent to the printer.

On the other hand, in the case of short mimeographed documents, the interval between the date of approval and the date of publication was short - two or three days at the most; thus it was unnecessary, in such cases, to indicate the two dates, which would be an entirely superfluous complication.

The CHAIRMAN considered that it was going beyond the competence of the Committee to make suggestions with regard to all United Nations documents.

Mr. FRIIS (Denmark) strongly supported the United Kingdom proposal, and endorsed the Chairman's view with regard to the Committee's competence. It might also be desirable to ascertain from the Secretariat whether any technical difficulties were involved.

Baron de KERCHOVE d'EXAERDE (Belgium) asked what was meant by the date of publication in the case of a French translation of an English document. Was it the date of publication of the original document or that of the translation?

Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom) believed that the Belgian representative's difficulty had arisen out of the mis-translation of the English phrase "date of issue" which might more suitably be rendered by "date de circulation".

The CHAIRMAN believed that the point made by the Belgian representative would be covered by the fact that the date of translation would also be indicated.

Mr. CUMES (Australia) firmly supported the general principle of the proposal, and wondered whether it would not be sufficient to begin the paragraph "That all economic and social documents carry a clear indication of the date of issue from the Secretariat, this date to be, etc."

Mr. URQUHART (Secretary to the Committee) stated that the Secretariat would encounter no serious technical difficulties in giving effect to the United Kingdom proposal, and suggested that the following text might meet all the points that had been raised:

"That all documents of the Council and its Commissions carry a date of issue from the Secretariat as the operative date under Rules 9 and 10 of the Council's rules of procedure and under the corresponding rules of the regional and functional commissions. In the case of long, printed documents where the process of printing takes an appreciable time, both the date of completion of the document and the date of issue will be given".

The text suggested by the representative of the Secretariat was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the representatives of Australia, Brazil, Canada, France, India, Pakistan, the United Kingdom and the United States of America should form a working group, and meet immediately after the close of the meeting to endeavour to combine and harmonise their proposals contained in documents E/AC.24/L.8, E/AC.24/L.9, E/AC.24/L.9/Add.1 and E/AC.24/L.9/Add.2 relating to paragraphs 20-24 of document E/1683.

It was so agreed.

The meeting rose at 12.20 p.m.