



UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL



GENERAL
E/AC.24/SR.50
18 July 1950
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Dual Distribution

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Eleventh Session

CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FIFTIETH MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva
on Monday, 10 July 1950, at 10.30 a.m.

CONTENTS:

Inter-Governmental Organizations (item 44 of the agenda)
(E/1687 and E/AC.24/L.1) (Continued)

No: 7: International Office of Epizootics (E/AC.24/L.3/Rev.1) (Continued)	pages 3 - 6
United States proposal relating to the Inter- American Commission of Women	page 6
No:26: International Penal and Penitentiary Commission (E/1735 and E/1735/Add.1)	pages 7 - 10

Present:

Chairman:

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico)

Members:

Australia	Mr. CUMES
Belgium	Baron de KRECHTOTE d'EXAERDE
Brazil	Mr. MURTINHO
Canada	Mr. BERLIS
Chile	Mr. RODRIGUEZ
China	Mr. TSAO
Denmark	Mr. FRIIS
France	Mr. de LACHARRIERE
India	Mr. SEN
Iran	Mr. ESFANDIARY
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
Food and Agriculture Organization	Mr. McDOUGALL
International Civil Aviation Organization	Mr. MARLIN
World Health Organization	Dr. HAFEZI

Representatives of non-governmental organizations:

Category A:

International Organization of Employers Mr. KUNTSCHE

Secretariat:

Mr. Martin Hill	Director of co-ordination for specialised agencies and social matters
Mr. Delierneux	Deputy Director, Division of Social Activities
Mr. Urquhart	Secretary to the Committee

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

No. 7: International Office of Epizootics (E/AC.24/L.3/Rev.1) (continued)

The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the Committee to the draft resolution (E/AC.24/L.3/Rev.1) concerning the consideration of the possibility of establishing an international system for the collection and dissemination of information and for the co-ordination of activities in the control of animal diseases, submitted by the drafting group set up at the forty-ninth meeting.

He then called on the representative of the Food and Agriculture Organization.

Mr. McDUGALL (Food and Agriculture Organization) stated that the relationship between the Food and Agriculture Organization (F.A.O) and the International Office of Epizootics (OIE), which was governed by the 1947 Agreement, had been cordial. However, at the recent conference of F.A.O it had been decided, after a long discussion, to recommend that the present system for the collection and dissemination of information and for the co-ordination of activities in the control of animal diseases should be discussed by representatives of both F.A.O and OIE through a joint Veterinary Committee. As it was probable that certain important countries would not join the International Office of Epizootics, the United States representative on that Committee had presented draft proposals for converting OIE into the Epizootics Office of F.A.O. F.A.O considered that the United States draft constitution was a satisfactory way of ensuring that the continuity of the International Office of Epizootics would be preserved while also securing the nearest practicable approach to a single world-wide authority on epizootics.

Mr. CATES (United States of America) proposed the insertion of the word "unified" after the words "possibilities of establishing a" in the second paragraph of the draft resolution, in order to make perfectly clear the intent that any system of reporting animal diseases would be a truly unified system.

Mr. SEN (India) suggested that the words "satisfactory to all governments concerned," in the same paragraph were somewhat rigid, and that their retention might lead to a single government being in the position to obstruct the work of others by withholding its consent to certain agreed proposals. He therefore suggested the deletion of those words, and the insertion of the word "satisfactory" before "co-ordination of activities in the".

Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom) stated that the wording to which the Indian representative had raised objections was not to be interpreted in a strictly legal sense. The drafting group had merely wished to express its concern that agreement should be reached by all interested governments. If that were understood, he could accept the Indian representative's amendment, though he preferred the original text. He could also accept the United States representative's amendment if it were acceptable to other members of the drafting group.

Mr. FRIIS (Denmark) had no objection to the United States representative's amendment, and agreed with the United Kingdom representative on the Indian representative's amendment.

Mr. MURTINHO (Brazil) supported the United States representative's amendment, which would clarify the meaning of the text. He did not consider that the words "satisfactory to all governments concerned" would be dangerously restrictive in the sense suggested by the Indian representative.

Mr. de LACHARRIERE (France) said he would be reluctant to accept changes in the draft resolution; any modification might upset the balance of the text, which had been discussed in great detail by the drafting group. The insertion of the word "unified" or of a similar expression in the second paragraph had been rejected by the drafting group. Its inclusion would either imply the idea of a fusion between FAO and the International Office of Epizootics, which would be contrary to the wishes of the Committee, or would add nothing at all to the substance of the text.

The CHAIRMAN, speaking as the representative of Mexico, said that the concept of unification was implicit in the establishment of any international system. He therefore thought the United States representative's amendment was unnecessary. The words "satisfactory to all governments concerned," might perhaps be slightly redundant, but he did not think that their inclusion or deletion was a matter of vital importance.

Mr. SEN (India) reiterated his anxiety lest advantage be taken of that formula by any government with a view to obstructing the co-ordination of activities in the control of animal diseases.

The CHAIRMAN observed that the draft resolution was merely a recommendation to study the possibilities of establishing an international system for the collection and dissemination of information and for the co-ordination of activities in the control of animal diseases. It therefore contained nothing of a binding character, and there was no need for the Committee to go into legal points in detail.

Mr. CUMES (Australia) said that he was concerned to ensure that there was not "a co-ordinated international system" - which implied the continuing existence of a number of autonomous bodies - in that field, but a single international system. For that reason he would support the text of the draft resolution either as originally presented by the drafting group, or as amended by the United States proposal.

Mr. CATES (United States of America) said that in the light of the foregoing discussion and to expedite the Committee's work he was prepared to withdraw his proposal that the word "unified" should be inserted in the second paragraph, on the ground that the phrase "an international system" implied a single, unified system.

He suggested that the anxiety expressed by the Indian representative with regard to the maintenance of the words "satisfactory to all governments concerned," would be allayed if the word "the" were substituted for the word "all". The intent would then be clear that the majority view would prevail, and that no single government could veto action agreed upon by others.

Mr. de LACHARRIERE (France) and Mr. SEN (India) supported the United States representative's suggestion,

The United States representative's suggestion that the word "the" be substituted for the word "all" before the words "governments concerned" in the second paragraph was adopted.

Mr. AKHTAR (Pakistan) proposed the addition of the words "in this respect" at the end of the third paragraph.

The Pakistani amendment was unanimously adopted.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the draft resolution as amended.

The draft resolution (E/.C.24/L.3/Rev.1), as amended, was unanimously adopted.

United States proposal relating to the Inter-American Commission of Women.

Mr. CATES (United States of America) stated that his Government wished to propose the addition of another inter-governmental organization to those listed in document E/1687, namely the Inter-American Commission of Women, which had been removed from the list of inter-governmental organizations as the result of a decision taken at the ninth session of the Council. That body, although it had no separate budget, its expenses now being carried by the Pan-American Union, was recognised as an inter-American specialized organization. It should therefore be added to the list.

The CHAIRMAN stated that the question could be considered by the Co-ordination Committee at a later stage, but that in the meantime the Secretariat would be requested to prepare an explanatory note on the proposal made by the United States representative, so that other representatives might study it at their leisure.

No. 26: International Penal and Penitentiary Commission
(E/1735, E/1735/Add.1)

Mr. CUMES (Australia) pointed out that the report by the Secretary-General on relations with the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission (E/1735) had only been distributed on 27 June. He had not therefore been able to obtain the views of his Government on the matter, and he asked that the discussion be deferred.

The CHAIRMAN said that, while appreciating the point made by the Australian representative, it might be possible to open the general discussion on the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission on the understanding that no decision would be taken until all representatives had been fully briefed by their Governments.

Mr. CUMES (Australia) accepted the Chairman's suggestion.

At the invitation of the CHAIRMAN, Mr. DELLERNEUX (Secretariat) gave a survey of the processes which had led up to the proposal for integration of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission within the United Nations. He recalled that by its resolution 155 (VII) C the Economic and Social Council had asked that the United Nations should assume the leadership in the field of prevention of crime and treatment of offenders. As a result of the adoption of that resolution, the United Nations Secretariat had, in collaboration with interested inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations, drawn up a programme of action and research. The United Nations Secretariat had subsequently convened a meeting of experts at Lake Success. Those experts had been chosen to represent various regions of the world, and their report had been submitted to the fifth session of the Social Commission, which had examined it and integrated it into its programme of work. He pointed out that United Nations had already been rendering certain services in the field of prevention of crime and treatment of offenders under the terms of General Assembly resolution 58 (I), by giving expert advice, and granting fellowships as requested by governments and by including the subject matter in the discussions of the seminar held in Paris.

There had been close co-operation with specialized agencies and non-governmental organizations specializing in the field. The World Health Organization had been particularly helpful in the field of medical treatment, the International Labour Organization in that of vocational training, and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization with regard to educational aspects of the question.

The problem had consequently arisen as to how duplication between the activities of the United Nations in that field and the activities of another inter-governmental agency, namely, the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission, was to be avoided. By its resolution 262 (IX) B the Council had requested the Secretary-General to enter into consultation with the Commission with a view to submitting a plan for its eventual integration within the United Nations. It had also invited governments to transmit to the Secretary-General any comments they wished to make on the subject.

The Secretariat, carrying out the request of the Council, had asked the views not only of Member Governments, but also of governments members of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission which were not members of the United Nations. In all, 67 governments had been approached, and 22 replies had been received. A majority of the replies were in favour of integration; a considerable minority, however, did not favour such a step. The results of the consultation with governments had been submitted to the Social Commission in document E/CN.5/203.

As a second step, the Secretariat had invited the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission to send its representatives to Lake Success to discuss a plan for the integration of that body into the United Nations. He briefly outlined the integration plan which had been worked out, and which was contained in document E/1735. Document E/1735/Add.1 outlined the financial implications of the scheme.

The CHAIRMAN thanked Mr. Dellerneux for his statement. Speaking as the representative of Mexico, he said that his Government attached great importance to the plan agreed upon by the Secretary-General and two representatives

of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission; it held promise of great social improvements in the prevention of crime and the treatment of offenders.

The decision as to how much money the United Nations should spend on the plan should be left to the General Assembly.

Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom) said that his Government was ready to accept in its entirety the plan agreed upon after delicate negotiations between the Secretary-General and the representatives of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission. It concerned a form of social work in which his Government had for long been interested; he hoped that the international work being done on the subject would be continued, and that the traditions established by the Commission would not be discarded. He would be glad to sponsor a draft resolution for the Council to approve the plan and to recommend appropriate action for its implementation. Since he hoped that the entry into force of the arrangement would not be delayed beyond 31 December 1951, and since he believed that the arrangement had still to be approved by the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission as well as by the United Nations before it could enter into force, he hoped that it would be placed before the General Assembly for approval at its forthcoming fifth session.

While he agreed with the Chairman that the financial implications of the arrangement should be discussed in detail by the General Assembly rather than by the Council, he wished to state that, although he had no objections to what was said in the Secretary-General's financial estimates (E/1735/Add.1) concerning expenditure on the proposed United Nations consultative groups and quinquennial congresses, he had doubts about the transfer of personnel from the Commission to the Secretariat of the United Nations. It had been frequently urged in the Social Committee of the Council that the personnel of the Department of Social Affairs of the United Nations Secretariat should be capable of working on several subjects, and he wished to re-emphasize in the Committee his delegation's views on that matter.

Mr. TSAO (China) said that in general his Government approved the plan agreed upon by the Secretary-General and the representatives of the Commission, but before committing himself to acceptance of every detail of the plan he would like to know; first, whether the representatives mentioned in paragraph 3(a) of the Secretary-General's report (E/1735) were to be officials representing governments, or persons appointed on account of their expert knowledge and whether, if more than one person was appointed, there would be a difference in status, secondly, whether the status of the members of the ad hoc Advisory Committee of Experts mentioned in paragraph 3(c) would be the same as that of the representatives mentioned in paragraph 3(a) and, finally, whether the persons attending the quinquennial congresses would be experts or government representatives.

Mr. DELIERNEUX (Secretariat) replied that it was intended that the representatives mentioned in paragraph 3(a) should be appointed by governments and not by the Secretary-General, and that it was hoped that each government concerned would appoint experts who were fully qualified to give advice, each on one or more of the subjects which came within the field of the prevention of crime and the treatment of offenders. It was intended that the ad hoc Advisory Committee of Experts should meet every year, and that its composition should change from year to year according to the subjects which it would have to discuss.

It was expected that most of the persons attending the quinquennial congresses would be experts from different countries appointed by their governments, like the representatives mentioned in paragraph 3(a) of the Secretary-General's report.

Replying to the representative of the United Kingdom, he wished to state that the Secretary-General had not agreed that two members of the staff of the Commission should be transferred to the United Nations Secretariat merely because the head of the Division of the Secretariat concerned wished to have more persons under his command, or as a concession to the Commission. The two experts were genuinely required, and would be essential if the plan was to be properly implemented.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.